

## **Steering Committee on Review of the Urban Renewal Strategy**

### **Notes of the Second Meeting**

Date: 21 August 2008 (Tuesday)

Time: 2:30 p.m.

Venue: Room 150, Central Government Offices (East Wing)

#### **Present**

Mrs Carrie LAM	Secretary for Development (Chairperson)
Mr Andrew CHAN	
Professor Stephen CHEUNG	
Mr HO Hei-wah	
Mr KWAN Chuk-fai	
Mr David C LEE	
Professor David LUNG	
Mr Vincent NG	
Professor Nora TAM	
Dr Peter WONG	
Ms Ada WONG	
Mr Laurie LO	Principal Assistant Secretary for Development (Planning & Lands) (Secretary)

#### **In Attendance**

Mr Raymond YOUNG	Permanent Secretary for Development (Planning & Lands)
Mr Raymond CHEUNG	Political Assistant to Secretary for Development
Mr David TONG	Administrative Assistant to Secretary for Development (Acting)
Mrs Ava NG	Director of Planning
Miss Annie TAM	Director of Lands
Mr CHEUNG Hau-wai	Director of Buildings
Mr Quinn LAW	Managing Director, Urban Renewal Authority
Ms Iris TAM	Executive Director, Urban Renewal Authority
Miss Ada CHAN	Assistant Secretary for Development (Urban Renewal)
Dr LAW Chi-kwong	Policy study consultant (Research Team, University of Hong Kong)

Professor Joseph CHAN	Policy study consultant (Research Team, University of Hong Kong)
Ms Lisa HO	Policy study consultant (Research Team, University of Hong Kong)
Mrs Sandra MAK	Public engagement consultant (Managing Director, A-World Consulting Ltd.)
Ms Anna LEE	Public engagement consultant (Deputy General Manager, A-World Consulting Ltd.)
Mr Andrew CHEUNG	Public engagement consultant (Senior Customer Manager, A-World-Consulting Ltd.)

## Action

### **Item 1: Confirmation of minutes of the previous meeting**

The meeting confirmed the minutes of the 1<sup>st</sup> meeting held on 22 July 2008.

### **Item 2: Endorsement of the inception report of the consultant on policy study** **(SC Paper No. 5/2008)**

2. The policy study consultant gave a presentation on the draft inception report. Regarding Members' suggestions raised at the first meeting to include Macau and London in the study, the policy study consultant explained that Macau was not proposed to be covered because it did not have clear urban renewal policy and strategy nor the relevant institutional set-up yet. In the case of London, while Covent Garden was an interesting case, the relevant revitalisation debate took place between 1969 and 1974, and the major part of the revitalisation took place in the 1980's. It was therefore not possible to interview some of the key persons involved. Moreover, since the institutional set-up in London was very different from that in Hong Kong, the lessons learnt there might not be readily applicable to Hong Kong.

3. The Chairperson invited Members to comment on the draft inception report of the policy study consultant.

## Action

4. The meeting agreed that the policy study should be a comparative study to research into urban renewal policies and practices in selected cities with a view to providing a solid and objective basis for review of the overall urban renewal strategy for Hong Kong, rather than a review of the strategy for the Urban Renewal Authority (URA) *per se*. Policy study consultant
5. The meeting agreed that given the time and resource constraints, the policy study consultant should focus on in-depth studies of the six cities recommended. If the Steering Committee identified any other cities which might provide insights or enrich the discussion of alternatives in urban renewal, the consultant would consider carrying out literature reviews on those cities.
6. Members were encouraged to include urban regeneration as a theme of their own overseas visits and share with other members the information they gathered and their experience.
7. Some Members suggested that in the course of the study, the policy study consultant should pay special attention to - Policy study consultant
- (a) the impact of urban renewal, not just the net cash loss or gains of individual projects, but also the wider social and economic impacts on local economies, tourism development, social network and employment opportunities for different sectors of the community;
  - (b) how the public engagement process was conducted when there was a diversity of views on urban renewal projects;
  - (c) the involvement of both public authorities and private sectors in urban renewal work;
  - (d) how urban renewal efforts in different localities could be coordinated so that the special features of one locality would not be indiscriminately

## Action

duplicated in others;

- (e) the coordination of legislation and administrative policies and procedures in the areas of land, planning, heritage and building with regard to urban renewal; and
- (f) the criteria for different types of compensation under urban renewal projects and innovative compensation policies, in particular non-cash compensation, e.g. owners' participation. Special attention should be paid to forms of compensation which could help preserve the social network.

(Mr KWAN Chuk-fai left the meeting at 3:15 p.m.)

8. On the pace of urban decay, Members noted that the design life was only one of the factors affecting the actual life of a building. Other factors included quality control of the construction works and maintenance and rehabilitation efforts.

9. The Chairperson suggested beefing up the inception report as follows –

Policy study  
consultant

- (a) the inception report should reflect some dimensions of urban renewal which had only emerged in recent years, e.g. growing concerns about streetscape and cityscape, heritage preservation and building maintenance; and
- (b) the Development Bureau would provide input to the policy study consultant on descriptions of Government's financial support to the URA.

10. Members noted that subject to necessary amendments, the inception report of the policy study consultant would be uploaded on to the website of the URS Review.

**Item 3: Endorsement of the inception report of the consultant on public engagement**  
**(SC Paper No. 6/2008)**

11. The public engagement consultant gave a presentation on the draft inception report. In order to arouse and sustain public interest, the consultant proposed that in addition to some more traditional public engagement tools, such as workshops, focus groups and opinion surveys, some new initiatives including eForum, online game, media programmes, joint programmes with partnering organisations and "Idea Shops" would be adopted in this exercise to outreach to the wider public.

12. The Chairperson invited Members to comment on the draft inception report of the public engagement consultant.

13. On the proposed use of prevailing web technology, some Members agreed that this could potentially reach out to different sectors of the community. Some Members stressed the need for the public engagement activities to reach out to those people who did not have Internet access. In response, the public engagement consultant explained that those people would be reached through other public engagement tools.

14. Members discussed the choice of partnering organisations to organise joint programmes. Some Members hoped to bring out the voice of the wider public through partnering organisations. Some Members suggested enlisting local NGOs as partnering organisations given their well developed social network in local communities. Some Members suggested enlisting schools as partnering organisations in the light of their interests in social issues. After some discussions, the meeting agreed that it would not be desirable to include an exhaustive list of partnering organisations in the inception report. Interested organisations should be welcomed to offer themselves as partnering organisations.

Public  
engagement  
consultant

## Action

15. Members supported the proposal to set up Idea Shops as a focal point for information dissemination, discussions and feedback collection in local communities. Some Members suggested that the Idea Shops should be located in the target areas for urban renewal, rather than new shopping malls. Some Members suggested that the Idea Shops could facilitate continuous participation by the community through organisation of focus group discussions in conjunction with partnering organisations. Video clips of these discussions could be uploaded on to the URS website. A Member agreed to prepare a paper on how to make use of the Idea Shops to organise community engagement activities. Members noted that as the detailed arrangements would need to be further worked out, the Idea Shops could only be in place at the beginning of Stage 2 of the review at the earliest.

16. Some Members stressed the need to design and carry out the telephone survey carefully in order to reflect public views objectively.

Public  
engagement  
consultant

17. A Member suggested that the public engagement exercise should aim to engage different stakeholders of urban renewal, including the ethnic minorities, owners of residential and commercial properties, hawkers, developers and public transport operators.

Public  
engagement  
consultant

18. In the light of Members' views, the Chairperson suggested beefing up the inception report to –

Public  
engagement  
consultant

- (a) set out more clearly the public engagement tools to be deployed at different stages of the URS Review ; and
- (b) give more details on the public engagement programme for the current stage of the review, including the objective, tools, process and target groups.

19. Regarding paragraph (a) above, Members noted that Stage 1 (i.e. Envisioning Stage) of the URS Review was the agenda-setting stage, at which the public would be invited to set the agenda for the review together. In parallel, the policy study consultant would carry out a comparative study on the urban renewal experience in selected cities. The results of the policy study would inform the discussions at the next stage (i.e. Public Engagement Stage). Stage 2 of the review would aim to produce some options for urban renewal in Hong Kong. Stage 3 (i.e. Consensus Building Stage) of the review would aim to achieve the consensus needed to come up with a revised URS.

20. The Chairperson invited members to indicate interests in taking part in working meetings with the Bureau, URA and the consultant on production of APIs for the Review. The Secretariat would contact Members separately on this.

21. Members noted that subject to necessary amendments, the inception report of the public engagement consultant would be uploaded on to the website of the URS Review.

**Item 4: Any Other Business**

22. There being no other business, the meeting ended at 5:30 p.m.

**Secretariat, Steering Committee on the Review of URS  
September 2008**