Case 1 - Comparison of LDC and URA Projects (A currently non-viable LDC urban renewal project)

	Current LDC Mode of Operation	Proposed URA Financial Package ⁽¹⁾	Proposed URA Financial Package & Increase in Plot Ratio (2)
Gross Development Value (a)	\$2.6 billion	\$2.6 billion	\$3.0 billion
Total Development Cost (b)	\$3.6 billion	\$2.9 billion	\$3.0 billion
Profit (Loss) (a) – (b)	(\$1.0 billion)	(\$0.3 billion)	\$0.01 billion
Return on Cost	-27.8%	-10.0%	+0.5%

Project Description:

Values may not add up to total due to rounding.

Note: (1) Proposed Financial Package: nil land premium, exemption of Government/Institution/Community facilities from gross floor area calculations and streamlined land resumption procedures.

Plot ratio to be increased to current Buildings Ordinance maximum permitted level.

Case 2 - Comparison of LDC and URA Projects (With 10% downward adjustment of Gross Development Value, Acquisition Cost and other Project Costs (A currently non-viable LDC urban renewal project)

	Current LDC Mode of Operation	Proposed URA Financial Package ⁽¹⁾	Proposed URA Financial Package & Increase in Plot Ratio (2)
Gross Development Value (a)	\$2.3 billion	\$2.3 billion	\$2.7 billion
Total Development Cost (b)	\$3.3 billion	\$2.7 billion	\$2.8 billion
Profit (Loss) (a) – (b)	(\$1.0 billion)	(\$0.4 billion)	(\$0.1 billion)
Return on Cost	-29.8%	-14.0%	-4.3%

Project Description:

$$6,400 \text{ m}^2 \text{ project area}$$
 970 flats GFA (Dom) $48,000 \text{ m}^2$ $1,200 \text{ m}^2 \text{ GIC facilities}$ 700 m² open space GFA (Non-Dom) $9,650 \text{ m}^2$

Values may not add up to total due to rounding.

Note: (1) Proposed Financial Package: nil land premium, exemption of Government/Institution/Community facilities from gross floor area calculations and streamlined land resumption procedures.

Plot ratio to be increased to current Buildings Ordinance maximum permitted level.

Case 3 – Cross-subsidization of URA Projects (1)

	Viable URA Project ^(a)	Other Non-Viable URA Projects ^(b)	Total (a) + (b)
Gross Development Value (c)	\$5.1 billion	\$8.1 billion	\$13.2 billion
Total Development Cost (d)	\$3.8 billion	\$9.1 billion	\$12.9 billion
Profit (Loss) (c) – (d)	\$1.3 billion	(\$1.0 billion)	\$0.3 billion
Return on Cost	+34.3%	-10.5%	+2.7%

(a)	8,900 m ² site area	1,115 flats	GFA (Dom) GFA (Non- Dom)	$67,100 \text{ m}^2$ 12,700 m ²	6,400 m ² GIC facilities	340 m ² open space
Non-viable	e Project (6 nos.) Desc	eription:				
(b)	$18,600 \text{ m}^2 \text{ site area}$	2,615 flats	GFA (Dom) GFA (Non-	$134,900 \text{ m}^2$ $26,800 \text{ m}^2$	6,300 m ² GIC facilities	2,500 m ² open space

Dom)

Values may not add up due to rounding.

Wights Ducient (1 mg) Description.

Note: (1) Proposed Financial Package: nil land premium, exemption of Government/Institution/Community facilities from gross floor area calculations and streamlined land resumption procedures.

Case 4 – Cross-subsidization of URA Projects ⁽¹⁾ (With a 10% downward adjustment on Gross Development Value, Acquisition Cost and other Project Costs)

	Viable URA Project ^(a)	Other Non-Viable URA Projects ^(b)	Total (a) + (b)
Gross Development Value (c)	\$4.6 billion	\$7.3 billion	\$11.9 billion
Total Development Cost (d)	\$3.5 billion	\$8.6 billion	\$12.1 billion
Profit (Loss) (c) – (d)	\$1.0 billion	(\$1.2 billion)	(\$0.2 billion)
Return on Cost	+29.6%	-14.2%	-1.3%

Viable Project (1 no.) Description:

(a) 8,900 m² site area 1,115 flats GFA (Dom) 67

15 flats GFA (Dom) $67,100 \text{ m}^2$ $6,400 \text{ m}^2$ GIC facilities 340 m^2 open space

GFA (Non- 12,700 m²

Dom)

Non-viable Project (6 nos.) Description:

(b) 18,600 m² site area 2,615 flats GFA (Dom) 134,900 m² 6,300 m² GIC facilities 2,500 m² open space

GFA (Non- 26,800 m²

Dom)

Values may not add up to total due to rounding.

Note: (1) Proposed Financial Package: nil land premium, exemption of Government/Institution/Community facilities from gross floor area calculations and streamlined land resumption procedures.