

**Review of the Urban Renewal Strategy  
Consensus Building Stage**

**Summary of Public Views and Responses**

**Development Bureau  
October 2010**

## **Table of Contents**

### **I. Introduction**

### **II. Ten Preliminary Proposals and Revised Urban Renewal Strategy (Draft)**

### **III. Summary of Public Views and Responses**

- A. Aspirations for Urban Regeneration, District-based and Bottom-up Approach (District Urban Renewal Forum) [Points 1 and 2 under Consensus Building]
- B. Scope of Urban Regeneration (4R Strategy) and Role of URA in Redevelopment [Points 3, 4 and 5 under Consensus Building]
- C. Compensation and Rehousing [Points 6-8 under Consensus Building]
- D. Social Impact Assessment and Social Service Teams [Point 9 under Consensus Building]
- E. Financial Arrangement [Point 10 under Consensus Building]
- F. Others

**Annex :** List of Written Submissions (11 May 2010 to 10 July 2010)

## **I. Introduction**

The Steering Committee on Review of the Urban Renewal Strategy (URS), after consolidation of public views with reference to the experience of other cities and in light of the actual situation in Hong Kong, had put forward its preliminary proposals on the major topics of urban renewal in the booklet entitled “**Public Views and Future Direction – Paper for the Consensus Building Stage of the Urban Renewal Strategy**” (the Paper) published for distribution to the public on 11 May 2010. During the Consensus Building Stage, public views were collated through the following activities and briefing sessions for the relevant committees:-

### **Public Engagement Activities**

- 1 · Consensus Building Workshop on 15 May 2010 (Workshop)
- 2 · Concluding Meeting on 5 June 2010 (Concluding Meeting)
- 3 · Professional Bodies Consultation Meeting on 8 June 2010 (Professional Bodies Consultation Meeting 1)
- 4 · Professional Bodies Consultation Meeting on 10 June 2010 (Professional Bodies Consultation Meeting 2)

### **Briefing Sessions for the Relevant Committees**

- 1 · Land and Development Advisory Committee (LDAC) on 13 May 2010
- 2 · Executive Committee of the Hong Kong Housing Society (HKHS) on 15 May 2010 (private session)
- 3 · Urban Renewal Authority Board on 20 May 2010 (private session)
- 4 · Town Planning Board (TPB) on 4 June 2010
- 5 · Antiquities Advisory Board (AAB) on 24 June 2010
- 6 · Central Policy Unit Part-time Members Meeting on 26 June 2010 (private session)

A special meeting was held by the Legislative Council (LegCo) Panel on Development on 10 July 2010 to hear public deputations on URS Review. The views collated in the above activities as well as the written submissions from individuals and deputations collected from the different channels up to 10 July 2010 and our responses to views expressed on the ten preliminary proposals put forward in the Paper are set out in different sections below.

## II. Ten Preliminary Proposals and Revised Urban Renewal Strategy (Draft)

	<b>Ten Preliminary Proposals</b>	<b>Revised Urban Renewal Strategy (Draft)</b>
1.	Setting-up of a “District Urban Renewal Forum” (DURF)	The revised URS (Draft) has incorporated the relevant section on the setting up of DURF. We propose Kowloon City as the pilot district for setting up of the first DURF.
2.	The URS is a government strategy	The revised URS (Draft) has clearly spelt out that the URS is a government strategy, implementation of which should be undertaken by the URA as well as all the other stakeholders/participants which include related government bureaux and departments, relevant District Councils, the HKHS, the private sector (property owners, developers), individual owners, professionals and non-government organisations.
3.	The URA should adopt a balanced focus on both “Redevelopment” and “Rehabilitation”	The revised URS (Draft) emphasises that the URA is tasked to adopt “Redevelopment” and “Rehabilitation” as its core business. On “Rehabilitation”, we are discussing with the URA and the HKHS on delineating clearly their responsibilities and geographical scopes. On “Redevelopment”, the URA should consider the following factors: (a) whether the proposed project area is old and dilapidated and requires urgent redevelopment as identified by DURF; (b) whether the buildings lack basic sanitation facilities or are exposed to potential fire risks due to lack of proper management and maintenance; (c) whether the living conditions of the residents in the proposed project area are satisfactory; (d) whether the proposed project will improve the area by replanning and restructuring; (e) whether the proposed project area will achieve a better utilisation of land after redevelopment; (f) whether the rehabilitation of buildings in the proposed

	<b>Ten Preliminary Proposals</b>	<b>Revised Urban Renewal Strategy (Draft)</b>
		project area is practicable and viable option.
4.	URA's work in heritage preservation	The revised URS (Draft) has explained that the URA will make reference to the Government's policy on heritage preservation in pursuing its heritage preservation projects. Other than focusing on preservation projects within its redevelopment project areas, the URA would have the flexibility in carrying out heritage preservation outside its redevelopment projects. It can have the flexibility to partner with non-profit making or profit making organisations.
5.	Role of URA in redevelopment	The revised URS (Draft) specifies that the redevelopment by the URA will take more diverse forms, including as "implementer" and "facilitator".
6.	Compensation to residential property owners	The revised URS (Draft) has explained that the distinction in compensation and ex gratia payment for owner-occupiers and owners of vacant and tenanted domestic units will continue. While upholding the current distinction, the URA will adopt a compassionate approach in assessing the eligibility of owners of tenanted domestic units for ex gratia payment on par with owner-occupiers in exceptional circumstances such as elderly owners who rely on the rental of their properties for a living. The URA will offer "flat for flat" in a URA new development in-situ or in the vicinity as an alternative option to cash compensation and ex gratia payment to owner-occupiers of domestic units. As this is an alternative, the cash value under the "flat for flat" option will be equivalent to the amount payable under the option of cash compensation and ex gratia payment.
7.	Affected shop operators	The revised URS (Draft) has explained that the URA will help identify suitable premises in the neighbourhood of the redevelopment projects to enable the

	<b>Ten Preliminary Proposals</b>	<b>Revised Urban Renewal Strategy (Draft)</b>
		affected shop operators to relocate and continue operation in the same area and will assist affected shop owners to lease or purchase shops in the future redeveloped projects upon completion.
8.	Providing assistance to eligible tenants	The revised URS (Draft) has explained that the URA will aim to put in place referral arrangements to help tenants evicted or with their tenancies terminated after a freezing survey but before the URA successfully acquires the properties from their landlords, hence losing their eligibility for rehousing.
9.	Social Impact Assessment (SIA) and Social Service Teams (SSTs)	<p>The revised URS (Draft) has explained that early SIA will be initiated and conducted by DURF before redevelopment is recommended as the preferred option.</p> <p>The revised URS (Draft) also specifies that a trust fund will be set up. The SSTs will directly report to the Board of Trustees of the trust fund. The Government will appoint independent persons onto the Board of Trustees. The Board will maintain transparency in its monitoring of the SSTs and in its financial reporting on the trust.</p>
10.	Self-financing principle of the URA	The revised URS (Draft) has explained that the long-term objective of a self-financing urban renewal programme will continue to be upheld. The URA will continue to be supported by the Government through: (a) the \$10 billion capital injection already made; (b) waiver of land premia for redevelopment sites; (c) waiver of land premia for rehousing sites; and (d) loans from the Government. The Administration will also adopt a macro approach in proactively assessing the economic benefits that the urban renewal project will bring both inside and outside the project boundaries.

### III. Summary of Public Views and Responses

#### A. Aspirations for Urban Regeneration, District-based and Bottom-up Approach (District Urban Renewal Forum) [Points 1 and 2 under Consensus Building]

Serial Number	Key Points	Raised by	Responses
Aspirations for Urban Regeneration			
A-1	<p>➤ The URS should not only provide a direction for the work of the URA but a strategy that can cover all aspects of urban renewal , such as the quality of the overall urban environment, the role and responsibilities of the private sector and the objective to maintain social equality in order to achieve sustainable development.</p>	<p>The Professional Commons Concluding Meeting</p>	<p>➤ These views are in line with the following recommendations in our Paper for Consensus Building(the Paper):</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>● The vision of urban regeneration should go beyond the existing URS, which focuses primarily on redevelopment, to arrest the problem of urban decay and to improve the living conditions of residents in old districts. Urban regeneration should be undertaken comprehensively and holistically to rejuvenate old districts, showcasing local historical, cultural and economic characteristics.</li> <li>● The vision should embrace the concepts of</li> </ul>

Serial Number	Key Points	Raised by	Responses
			<p>sustainable development and building a quality city (including development density, city planning, urban greening, local culture, heritage preservation and harbour beautification, etc.), and be forward-looking in supporting the long-term development of Hong Kong.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>● Instead of relying on the URA as the sole agent, the revised URS should allow private developers, property owners and other organisations to participate in urban renewal.</li> <li>● Urban renewal should be planned at the district level with a “people-centred” approach and a “bottom-up” public engagement process.</li> </ul> <p>➤ The revised URS (Draft) has clearly spelt out that the URS is a government strategy, implementation of the URS should be undertaken by the URA as well as all the other stakeholders/participants which include related government bureaux and departments, relevant District Councils, the HKHS, the private sector (property owners,</p>

Serial Number	Key Points	Raised by	Responses
			developers), individual owners, professionals and non-government organisations.
A-2	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>➤ Urban renewal should be integrated with the overall city planning and the direction of future sustainable development.</li> </ul>	Town Planning Board (TPB) Professional Bodies Consultation Meeting 1 Public Affairs Forum HKIP	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>➤ Thank you for the views. The matter could be discussed at the District Urban Renewal Forum (DURF) in future.</li> </ul>
A-3	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>➤ Reference can be drawn from the case of Singapore where a centralised agent is set up to take forward planning, urban renewal and conservation.</li> </ul>	TPB Professional Bodies Consultation Meeting 1	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>➤ Hong Kong is different from Singapore in that the urban renewal implementation agents in Hong Kong include other stakeholders/participants and is not confined to the URA.</li> </ul>
A-4	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>➤ In taking forward its development projects, the URA should protect</li> </ul>	Public Affairs Forum	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>➤ We attach great importance to preservation of social networks. The Paper proposed that a “flat</li> </ul>

Serial Number	Key Points	Raised by	Responses
	interests of the majority, and more importantly, preserve the social network after redevelopment	Timothy Ma	for flat” option should be offered to affected owner-occupiers so that the ties within the community can be maintained and the owners may return to live in the same neighborhood after redevelopment.
A-5	➤ In planning and taking forward urban renewal, the URA should make sure that local residents of the seven selected districts for redevelopment understand the respective layout plans and are aware of the potential danger caused to their properties and the inconvenience caused to them in the process of redevelopment.	Public Affairs Forum	➤ It is proposed in the Paper that DURF be set up in old districts to enhance the planning work for urban renewal and to achieve “bottom-up” public participation through DURF.
A-6	➤ Redevelopment will damage the existing social network of residents as well as the customer network of shops. It is hoped that there will be planning before redevelopment takes place.	Concluding Meeting	➤ Please refer to the responses above.

Serial Number	Key Points	Raised by	Responses
A-7	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>➤ The “people-centred” approach is supported and the revised URS should take into account community needs.</li> </ul>	REDA	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>➤ Thank you for the views. The revised URS is along this direction.</li> </ul>
A-8	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>➤ A number of members agreed that the URS is a government strategy and the implementation agent should not be confined to the URA because the strategy involves city planning and construction which have far-reaching implications for our future generations.</li> </ul>	Public Affairs Forum	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>➤ Thank you for the views.</li> </ul>
A-9	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>➤ URS is a government strategy. Once the objective of development is clearly set, the Government should not compete with the private sector for profit and the URA should only take a facilitating role to assist the process of redevelopment. It is also required to establish a</li> </ul>	Chan Wah-yu	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>➤ Thank you for the views. According to the draft revised URS, the URA will perform roles as “implementer” and “facilitator”.</li> </ul>

Serial Number	Key Points	Raised by	Responses
	principle under which the majority of profits and achievements generated by redevelopment will be shared by the affected property owners and the public of Hong Kong at large.		
<b>District Urban Renewal Forum (DURF)</b>			
A-10	➤ The new “bottom-up” approach is welcomed. Urban renewal planning should be aligned with the overall urban renewal policy.	LDAC HKIP	➤ Thank you for the views. The revised URS is along this direction.
A-11	➤ The “bottom-up”, “district-based” and enhanced transparency approach is generally supported. DURF may first gauge local views for building consensus at the district level, whereas the TPB may focus on the formulation of statutory plans. A Board member suggested taking forward the improvement and beautification	TPB	➤ Thank you for the views.

Serial Number	Key Points	Raised by	Responses
	projects in districts making available the necessary resources.		
A-12	➤ Supported the proposed “people-centred” and “bottom-up” public engagement approach and the setting up of DURF to collect public views so as to build consensus on the 4R strategy at the district level.	Lam Chi Kam Yeung Wai-sing DAB Public Affairs Forum HKIP HKIS RICS	➤ Thank you for the views.
A-13	➤ The Administration should identify districts where DURF may be introduced and ensure that the members of DURF has adequate representation of their districts.	DAB	➤ Thank you for the views. We suggest Kowloon City to be the first pilot district for setting up DURF..
A-14	➤ DURF should not be guided by local interests. Instead, it should take into account the overall planning and balance community	Chan Wah-yu	➤ Thank you for the views.

Serial Number	Key Points	Raised by	Responses
	needs in the overall interest of the community.		
A-15	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>➤ It was suggested that a Participatory Community Planning Centre should be set up and financed by public funds with decision making power. It should adopt a people-oriented approach under the lead of social workers and with the participation of professionals.</li> </ul>	<p>Workshop Concluding Meeting Urban Social Workers Alliance H15 Concern Group</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>➤ The Steering Committee (SC) holds the view that DURF should not be considered a local arm of the TPB; the TPB will remain to be the sole body to formulate statutory plans.</li> <li>➤ The Government will investigate ways to effectively mobilise the public to participate in the discussions at DURF through local and social service organisations in order to put the “bottom-up” principle into practice.</li> <li>➤ DURF needs to be connected with Government for effective implementation purpose.</li> <li>➤ The proposed membership of DURF includes members from the local community, social workers and professionals.</li> <li>➤ The functions of DURF are mainly to recommend the scope of and strategy for the Urban Renewal Action areas in the district, including the buildings/areas to be rehabilitated, redeveloped or preserved, and district beautification through</li> </ul>

Serial Number	Key Points	Raised by	Responses
			<p>surveys, studies and public engagement activities.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>➤ DURF may commission or suggest relevant government departments to carry out district-based surveys, planning studies and public engagement activities on related issues for discussion. This may encourage local residents to participate and achieve the objective of a “bottom-up” approach.</li> <li>➤ DURF should be independent of District Councils (DCs) and there is no need for DURF to cover the full boundary of the respective DC. This should help DURF to achieve objectivity and serve the wider public interest and minimise any disturbances arising from the change of terms of DCs or local politics.</li> </ul>
A-16	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>➤ DURF should not necessarily be professionally-led but in its composition and membership, it may include a wide range of professional disciplines. Individuals with neutral stance and credibility as well as</li> </ul>	Workshop Concluding Meeting	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>➤ We recommend that DURF should have a diverse composition. It should include not only individuals who are familiar with district issues but also professionals and representatives from regional organisations. Some area representatives will also be returned through elections. We will be prudent in appointing</li> </ul>

Serial Number	Key Points	Raised by	Responses
	<p>representatives of residents and disadvantaged groups should also be appointed to the forums.</p>		<p>appropriate members onto DURF. We will appoint disinterested individuals onto DURF in an attempt to ensure that general community interest will be served so as to complement pure district concern.</p> <p>➤ DURF will organise public engagement activities to consult a wider public.</p>
A-17	<p>➤ To have all members appointed to DURF is neither democratic nor feasible and is therefore not supported. The membership should not be Government or URA led without involving the stakeholders at all.</p>	<p>Workshop 民間聯合聲明 重建業主聯會暨 H19 關注組 Development Concern Group</p>	<p>➤ Please refer to the responses above for the composition of DURF.</p> <p>➤ Stakeholders who are directly affected may voice their opinions by participating in the public engagement activities arranged by DURF.</p>

Serial Number	Key Points	Raised by	Responses
A-18	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>➤ The Administration should monitor more closely how public views are to be collected through DURF.</li> </ul>	Workshop 民間聯合聲明 Concluding Meeting	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>➤ Thank you for the views.</li> </ul>
A-19	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>➤ The Administration should enhance the transparency of DURF and introduce an information system.</li> </ul>	Workshop Professional Bodies Consultation Meeting 1 HKILA HKIP	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>➤ Thank you for the views. Each DURF will be provided with a dedicated website to communicate with and engage the public in order to collect public views.</li> </ul>
A-20	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>➤ There are worries that members of DURF may take a narrow vision on the views and issues in their respective district. If there are diverse views among the districts, the overall planning within or across these districts may be</li> </ul>	Professional Bodies Consultation Meeting 1 Professional Bodies Consultation	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>➤ Please refer to the response above.</li> </ul>

Serial Number	Key Points	Raised by	Responses
	affected.	Meeting 2	
A-21	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>➤ DURF should include the affected local residents (such as owner' corporations (OCs), mutual aid committees, residents' groups, etc.) and consult the chairmen, vice-chairmen and members of these OCs.</li> </ul>	Professional Bodies Consultation Meeting 1 九龍城網絡 HKILA	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>➤ Please refer to the responses above.</li> </ul>
A-22	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>➤ There should be representatives from the Social Welfare Department, the Housing Department and the Housing Authority.</li> </ul>	South Tokwawan Concern Group	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>➤ Please refer to the responses.</li> </ul>

Serial Number	Key Points	Raised by	Responses
A-23	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>➤ Owners should be allowed to participate in DURF to express their opinions.</li> </ul>	關注啓德居民組	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>➤ Please refer to the responses above.</li> </ul>
A-24	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>➤ To set up a planning forum at the district level: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>● Coverage: 2DCs</li> <li>● Membership: 10 elected members with 3 representatives of residents and 3 professionals appointed by elected members</li> <li>● To conduct public engagement activities and to plan and steer the community impact assessment</li> <li>● It will operate with an independent secretariat, social worker teams and financial</li> </ul> </li> </ul>	The Professional Commons Concluding Meeting	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>➤ Please refer to the response above for the mode of operation and coverage of DURF.</li> <li>➤ Please refer to the response above for the composition of DURF.</li> </ul>

Serial Number	Key Points	Raised by	Responses
	sources.		
A-25	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>➤ Members opined that the district representatives from redevelopment projects should be a majority in the urban renewal consultation framework, and consultants who have no connection with the real estate sector should also be invited. The Government should promote public engagement among local residents and foster a closer tie with stakeholders in the districts.</li> </ul>	Public Affairs Forum	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>➤ Thank you for the views. Please refer to the response above for the composition of DURF.</li> </ul>
A-26	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>➤ Some members praised the URS consultation for its comprehensiveness and openness. The proposed DURF is considered very innovative and meets public aspirations.</li> </ul>	Public Affairs Forum	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>➤ Thank you for the views.</li> </ul>
A-27	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>➤ Supported the setting up of DURF but questioned whether DURF</li> </ul>	Yau Yau	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>➤ The first pilot DURF will be set up in Kowloon City district. During the pilot stage, the URA and</li> </ul>

<b>Serial Number</b>	<b>Key Points</b>	<b>Raised by</b>	<b>Responses</b>
	<p>could operate effectively in view of the current political climate. Would the URA not take forward any urban renewal project if consensus could not be reached for any recommendation to be made through DURF? Recommend to have DURF featuring under the existing mechanism.</p>		<p>relevant departments should continue with urban renewal projects that have been initiated or those which require immediate launch in these pilot districts or others, in response to the requests from the local community.</p>
A-28	<p>➤ There are planning committees under DCs which may fulfill similar functions of DURF. There is no need to create another mechanism with overlapping functions.</p>	Concluding Meeting	<p>➤ The establishment of DURF aims to give advice on district-based urban renewal initiatives from a holistic and integrated perspective; to approach urban renewal with a district-based, people-centred and bottom-up approach, so as to align with the overall city planning and to reflect local aspirations for urban regeneration. The proposed DURF may not necessarily be set up on the geographical basis of DC constituencies. DURF is a professionally-led forum and serves different functions. The membership will of course include District Councillors/Areas Committee members. We are finalising the mode of operation</p>

Serial Number	Key Points	Raised by	Responses
			of DURF and will avoid overlapping with DC functions.
A-29	➤ The proposed DURF should be given flexibility in handling inter-district issues.	HKILA	➤ Thank you for the views. We will study the mode of operation of DURF in detail.
A-30	➤ Information such as the priority of projects and the criteria for selecting projects should be released through DURF as far as practicable during formulation of renewal and regeneration programmes.	DAB HKIS	➤ We will explore how to effectively disseminate the information through DURF to achieve transparency and openness as far as practicable. It is envisaged that DURF will only make recommendations on areas within the district which warrant urban redevelopment and that, if the URA accepts any such recommendation, the prioritization of individual redevelopment projects within an area and the exact timetable for such redevelopment will be determined by the URA. Before the URA decides whether and when to initiate a redevelopment project, the URA will not only take into account the local community's views as reflected by DURF and the findings of any social impact assessment studies steered by DURF, but will also consider the condition of the

Serial Number	Key Points	Raised by	Responses
			buildings involved according to the findings of a building conditions survey that the URA is conducting on all buildings aged 30 years or above, the living conditions of residents, as well as the manpower and financial position of the URA itself.
A-31	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>➤ The Administration should require developers of the redevelopment projects to release more information to enhance transparency of the redevelopment process to clear doubts which the affected residents may have.</li> </ul>	DAB	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>➤ DURF may not be able to require developers of redevelopment projects to release commercial information.</li> </ul>
A-32	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>➤ Why should the Administration set up DURF and not empower the DCs to undertake the related work.</li> </ul>	Designing HK 創建香港	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>➤ DURF should be independent of DCs and there is no need for DURF to cover the full boundary of the respective DC. This should help DURF to achieve objectivity and serve the wider public interest and minimise any disturbances arising from the change of terms of DCs or local politics.</li> </ul>

### III. Summary of Public Views and Responses

#### **B. Scope of Urban Regeneration (4R Strategy) and Role of URA in Redevelopment [Points 3, 4 and 5 under Consensus Building]**

Serial Number	Key Points	Raised by	Responses
<b>Scope of Urban Regeneration (4R Strategy)</b>			
B-1	➤ Members suggested that the Government should provide information on redevelopment and rehabilitation of private properties to the public.	LDAC	➤ DURF will study how to make information on urban regeneration projects available to the public.
B-2	➤ The Administration should re-assess the remaining 200 projects with which the URA was tasked and explain to the community why these projects would be undertaken, when and how they would be taken forward with public engagement.	Workshop	➤ Regardless of whether URA plays the role of a “facilitator” or an “implementer” in the future, it must take into account the building conditions and views of DURF before undertaking a particular project, and DURF will consult the public.

Serial Number	Key Points	Raised by	Responses
B-3	<p>➤ It is hoped that URA will listen to the views of Prof. Ho, Director of the School of Architecture at the Chinese University of Hong Kong, and announce the redevelopment projects to be undertaken in the next ten or twenty years (the exact timetable is not required). This is because the owners of existing old building have always relied on the excuse that they were waiting to be redeveloped and thus would leave their properties vacant and out of repair. If they have knowledge of whether their properties will be taken over for redevelopment in the next ten to twenty years, they will make the best use of their resources in their own interest or that of the community at large.</p>	十三街的八十後	<p>➤ Please refer to the responses above.</p>

Serial Number	Key Points	Raised by	Responses
B-4	<p>➤ Agree to a more balanced 4R strategy. The Administration should try to avoid regeneration of an old district by way of redevelopment and should not commence redevelopment rashly. It should consider preserving the local characteristics of an affected district through the other 3Rs, i.e. “Rehabilitation”, “pReservation” and “Revitalisation”.</p>	<p>DAB Public Affairs Forum HKIS HKIP</p>	<p>➤ The major functions of DURF include making recommendation on the scope of and strategy for the “Urban Renewal Action Areas” in the district, including the buildings/areas to be rehabilitated, redeveloped or preserved, and district beautification, etc.</p>
B-5	<p>➤ The 4R Strategy should be people-oriented</p>	<p>Timothy Ma</p>	<p>➤ The URS will adhere to the people-centred principle.</p>
B-6	<p>➤ The policy initiatives should be extended beyond the 4R Strategy, which should include the following:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>● To formulate a holistic preservation policy, under which a dedicated mechanism should be put in</li> </ul>	<p>The Professional Commons</p>	<p>➤ On heritage conservation, the Chief Executive announced a new policy statement and a package of measures on heritage conservation in October 2007. Progress made by the Development Bureau over the past three years included the launch of the Heritage Impact Assessment mechanism, establishment of the Commissioner for Heritage’s Office, launch of the Revitalising</p>

Serial Number	Key Points	Raised by	Responses
	<p>place to balance any conflict between development and conservation. The URA should be responsible for preservation of worthwhile monuments only within its redevelopment areas;</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>● To improve the urban built environment and make use of the forum of the Sustainable Development Council to conduct the relevant review, so as to tackle the abuse by private property developers in building design through the manipulation of the grey areas in planning standards and guidelines;</li> <li>● To strengthen district administration.</li> </ul>		<p>Historic Buildings through Partnership Scheme, extension of government funding for maintaining declared monuments to cover privately-owned graded historic buildings, and the successful preservation of a number of privately-owned historic buildings.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>➤ In the Paper, we suggested that the URA’s work in heritage preservation should in-principle be confined to within its redevelopment project areas. Reference should be made to the Government’s policy on heritage conservation, including using economic incentives (instead of cash compensation) to preserve privately-owned heritage, revitalising heritage buildings via collaborative partnership with non-profit making organisations, and providing more opportunities for the public to enjoy the use of these revitalised buildings. Relevant reference has been incorporated into the revised URS (Draft).</li> <li>➤ The Council for Sustainable Development has completed its report on the public engagement process on Building Design to Foster a Quality</li> </ul>

Serial Number	Key Points	Raised by	Responses
			<p>and Sustainable Built Environment. Reference will be made to the recommendations put forward in the Report when urban renewal projects are launched in future.</p> <p>➤ Enhancing district administration is not a subject of the current Review.</p>
B-7	<p>➤ Members considered that there should be a balance between conservation and development in Hong Kong; otherwise the territory’s distinct cultural heritage will be lost. Other members considered the options of using economic incentives (instead of cash compensation) to preserve privately-owned heritage and revitalising heritage buildings via collaborative partnership with non-profit making organisations feasible as the significance of “revitalisation” can be underlined through adaptive re-use of</p>	Public Affairs Forum	<p>➤ Please refer to the responses above.</p>

Serial Number	Key Points	Raised by	Responses
	historical buildings.		
B-8	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>➤ Members considered that in the light of AAB's limited resources, AAB will benefit if the URA can take up preservation of the 1440 graded historical buildings.</li> </ul>	AAB	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>➤ The role of URA on preservation has been spelt out in the revised URS (Draft).</li> </ul>
B-9	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>➤ Members agreed that the URA should focus on heritage preservation within its projects, but its collaborative partners should not be limited to non-profit making organisations.</li> </ul>	AAB	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>➤ Thank you for the views. According to the revised URS (Draft), the URA should make reference to the Government's policy on heritage conservation, but flexibility would be allowed when it identifies partnership organisations.</li> </ul>
B-10	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>➤ Members agreed that the URA's work in heritage preservation should in-principle be confined to within its redevelopment project areas. It should make reference to the Government's policy on heritage conservation so as to provide more opportunities for the public to enjoy the use of these</li> </ul>	Public Affairs Forum	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>➤ Thank you for the views.</li> </ul>

Serial Number	Key Points	Raised by	Responses
	revitalised buildings.		
B-11	➤ It is suggested that conservation should be given the first priority and reference can be drawn from the practice of London, Paris and Spain.	A member of the public	➤ Please refer to the responses above.
B-12	➤ As far as heritage preservation is concerned, there should be integration with other historical buildings in the district to encourage development of new industries so as to enhance the overall harmony, coordination and effectiveness of sustainable development in the district.	Chan Wah-yu	➤ The functions of DURF include making recommendations on the buildings/areas to be rehabilitated, redeveloped or preserved in the district as well as district beautification, etc. Recommendation can be made on the direction for and the integration of heritage preservation in the district through this platform.
B-13	➤ The URA's work in heritage preservation should not be confined to within its project areas, but should be able to complement the surrounding	Yang Mo	➤ Thank you for the views. URA will take into account the surrounding environment when proceeding with heritage preservation within its redevelopment project areas.

Serial Number	Key Points	Raised by	Responses
	environment.		
B-14	<p>➤ Legislation for the Mandatory Building Inspection Scheme (MBIS) and the Mandatory Window Inspection Scheme (MWIS) should be completed as soon as possible as rehabilitation should be given the top priority. It is suggested that:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>● The new funding for the “Operation Building Bright” (OBB) Scheme should be used mainly to subsidise the buildings lacking management capacities in handling works projects;</li> <li>● In the light of the close relationship between building dilapidation and weak property management, greater effort should be put to</li> </ul>	The Professional Commons	<p>➤ The URA will focus on both “Redevelopment” and “Rehabilitation” in future. In the long run, if the pressure of urban decay is relieved, and public awareness of the importance of building maintenance enhanced through legislation, law enforcement and support services, URA’s work priority may be shifted to rehabilitation.</p> <p>➤ The Development Bureau had introduced the Buildings (Amendment) Bill 2010 into LegCo for the implementation of the MBIS and MWIS in February 2010. They are still being scrutinised by the LegCo Bills Committee.</p> <p>➤ A Study on Building Maintenance Programmes has been completed. The summary of findings of the Study is that the common problems of the various financial support schemes include the lack of awareness of building safety and management issues among property owners, and difficulty in the setting up of owners’ corporations for some buildings. For building</p>

Serial Number	Key Points	Raised by	Responses
	<p>help establish owners' corporations or other property management mechanisms;</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>● Providing assistance for building rehabilitation should be one of the two major tasks of the URA.</li> </ul>		<p>safety, the Government has announced a series of measures on building rehabilitation, including better coordination between the URA and the HKHS and alignment of the various financial support and loan schemes.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>➤ The additional funding for the OBB had been approved to help more property owners who lack the ability to manage works projects.</li> </ul>
B-15	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>➤ A number of members opined that "Rehabilitation" should be given top priority in urban renewal. Besides, a detailed examination of the building before rehabilitation will allow property owners to have a better understanding of the conditions of their properties before deciding to go ahead with redevelopment. Members indicated that as redevelopment takes time, all stakeholders should take the initiative to shoulder the responsibilities of maintenance</li> </ul>	Public Affairs Forum	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>➤ Please refer to the responses above.</li> </ul>

Serial Number	Key Points	Raised by	Responses
	and management of their old properties before redevelopment.		
B-16	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>➤ Members considered that “Redevelopment” should be given priority in the 4R strategy. The actual condition of the district, the housing needs of the residents and the business opportunity for small business operators should also be taken into account to achieve the objective of genuine “pReservation” of buildings after “Redevelopment” and “Rehabilitation”.</li> </ul>	Public Affairs Forum	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>➤ Please refer to the responses above.</li> </ul>
B-17	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>➤ The roles of URA and HKHS in rehabilitation should be clearly defined to avoid overlap.</li> </ul>	TPB	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>➤ Please refer to the responses above.</li> </ul>
B-18	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>➤ Agreed that rehabilitation can prolong the serviceable life of buildings, yet the importance of redevelopment should not be</li> </ul>	Yau Yau	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>➤ Urban renewal will adopt a multi-pronged approach.</li> </ul>

Serial Number	Key Points	Raised by	Responses
	<p>ignored. Besides, redevelopment can provide public open space or facilitate other economic development not attainable by the other 3Rs.</p>		
B-19	<p>➤ Redevelopment is the right way to genuinely improve the living standard of residents living in old buildings, and the strategy of rehabilitation and revitalisation is merely an “ostrich” policy of procrastination. To accelerate the pace of redevelopment, the URA should shorten the time for completion of a redevelopment project from 6 years to 3 years. Redevelopment should not only be regarded as a means to improve the living standard of residents in old districts or increase employment opportunities of the construction sector, but it should</p>	月鳥	<p>➤ Please refer to the responses above.</p>

Serial Number	Key Points	Raised by	Responses
	also be regarded as an indispensable part contributing to the holistic development of Hong Kong to become a modernised and sophisticated city.		
B-20	➤ It is the responsibility of the Development Bureau to promote rehabilitation which should take precedence over redevelopment. The URA claimed that priority would be given to rehabilitation, but in reality it has always sought to carry out redevelopment on prime sites. It always starts with those sites which can generate sizeable profit, and building safety has never been its priority consideration.	重建關注組	➤ Please refer to the responses above.
B-21	➤ The Government should set up a building rehabilitation centre to tackle the problem. In response	關注啓德居民組	➤ On rehabilitation, URA should play a more important role in collaboration with HKHS in the provision of technical and financial assistance.

Serial Number	Key Points	Raised by	Responses
	to public needs, the centre should provide free assistance and service.		➤ Please also refer to the responses above.
B-22	➤ It is suggested that professionals should be deployed by the Government to provide free and priority inspection service for old buildings aged 50 years or above, and resources should be allocated to assist buildings to carry out repair works.	Pun Chi-man	➤ Please refer to the responses above.
B-23	➤ Apart from redevelopment, the URA should also provide assistance to property owners to rehabilitate their properties	REDA	➤ The URA should focus on both “Redevelopment” and “Rehabilitation”.
B-24	➤ There is no policy on preservation of privately-owned historical buildings at present. If individual private property needs to be preserved, compensation should be provided to the property	REDA	➤ On preservation, the URS Review this time recognized preservation as part of the 4R strategy of URS, and focused on proposing the future direction of the URA in preservation work.

Serial Number	Key Points	Raised by	Responses
	owner who will lose his right of development.		
B-25	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>➤ The work in rehabilitation and revitalisation has been undertaken by a number of organisations. It is suggested that the Government should define clearly the roles of the different organisations in rehabilitation and revitalisation under this Review.</li> </ul>	Professional Bodies Consultation Meeting 2	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>➤ The revised URS (Draft) (covering both rehabilitation and revitalisation) recognised the need for participation of related government departments, public bodies, the private sector, individual property owners, professionals and non-government organisations.</li> </ul>
B-26	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>➤ For most of the buildings aged 40 years or above in Hong Kong, it is commonly found that facilities are inadequate, the conditions are poor and the building is not properly maintained. The Administration should formulate a policy as soon as possible to assist these building owners in the old districts to plan comprehensively.</li> </ul>	Chan Wah-yu	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>➤ The Administration is adopting a multi-pronged approach to tackle the problem of building neglect including legislation, enforcement, support and assistance, and publicity and public education.</li> </ul>

Serial Number	Key Points	Raised by	Responses
<b>Role of URA in Redevelopment</b>			
B-27	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>➤ Members considered that the URA may set up a subsidiary company to provide “facilitator” service in this regard to avoid causing confusion with its work under the statutory framework.</li> </ul>	LDAC	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>➤ The URA has considerable experience in urban renewal work. When it is suggested that the URA should play the role of a “facilitator”, the URA is to provide consultation services. The URA is working on the implementation details.</li> </ul>
B-28	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>➤ There were worries that it might create unfair competition if the URA were to provide service acting as a ‘facilitator’. Some considered that this would involve a large amount of resources.</li> </ul>	LDAC Professional Bodies Consultation Meeting 1	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>➤ The rationale for the URA to provide service as a “facilitator” is to provide property owners with another choice and the URA is working on the implementation details. The URA must avoid creating unfair competition in the market.</li> </ul>
B-29	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>➤ Apart from playing the existing role of an “implementer”, it is welcomed that URA will play the role of a “facilitator” in undertaking redevelopment</li> </ul>	DAB Yeung Wai-sing RICS Public Affairs	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>➤ Thank you for the views.</li> </ul>

Serial Number	Key Points	Raised by	Responses
	projects.	Forum	
B-30	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>➤ The URA is obliged to bear a social responsibility and should pursue public interest by actively taking forward projects which are beneficial to the community at large.</li> </ul>	DAB Yeung Wai-sing	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>➤ Thank you for the views. The URA should fulfil its duties and its mission as a public body by improving the living conditions of residents in old districts through redevelopment. The rationale for redevelopment and the project priority should depend on the building conditions, planning considerations, and the living conditions of residents, and not solely on the potential gain of the lot from redevelopment.</li> </ul>
B-31	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>➤ The URA should be the “implementer” of the last resort. It may consider using public funds to facilitate redevelopment in the district.</li> </ul>	Workshop	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>➤ The URA is one of the implementation agents in urban renewal. Its redevelopment projects must be for social purpose and the other organisations or private developers can play a complementary role in taking forward urban renewal. The URA can also help owners assemble titles and collaborate with developers.</li> </ul>
B-32	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>➤ The Administration should study how property owners can</li> </ul>	Workshop H15 Concern	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>➤ On the view that the URA should not only provide “facilitator” service to owners, but</li> </ul>

Serial Number	Key Points	Raised by	Responses
	<p>participate in redevelopment and share the fruits generated by redevelopment. It is suggested that the URA can cooperate with the minority owners in redevelopment through “partnership” which will provide the owners with another choice.</p>	<p>Group Cheung Yiu-tong Concluding Meeting HKIS</p>	<p>should also act as a “partner” to allow owners to participate in redevelopment and share the benefits generated by redevelopment, we have to emphasise that the URA’s redevelopment projects must be driven by good social causes. A model of “owners’ participation” or partnership with owners in redevelopment is an act of investment through redevelopment. Owners can proactively invite the URA, in the capacity of a consultant, to assist them to initiate the assembly of sufficient titles to facilitate redevelopment of their own accord. Unlike those URA-initiated projects which aim to fulfill a social mission, it is difficult for owners in non-redevelopment areas to agree to the use of public power or public funds to assist some owners in old districts to perform an act of investment through redevelopment.</p>
B-33	<p>➤ The Administration should facilitate the participation of private organisations in urban redevelopment. In the case</p>	<p>REDA</p>	<p>➤ It is specified in the revised URS (Draft) that the URA can initiate redevelopment through the following three models:(a) URA can initiate a redevelopment project on its own (URA as</p>

Serial Number	Key Points	Raised by	Responses
	<p>where the private organisation has already assembled the property interests of a site, the URA should not include the site into its redevelopment project and proceed with acquisition. On the contrary, the URA should provide assistance to facilitate such redevelopment with owner participation. The URA should invite owners who have acquired most of the property interests of a site to form partnership. Besides, the URA should increase the profit share of the joint venture partners to encourage private participation.</p>		<p>“implementer”); (b) URA can respond to a joint approach from building owners to initiate redevelopment of their lot(s)/building(s) (URA as “implementer”); and (c) URA can provide assistance to owners as consultant at a service fee to help them assemble titles for owner-initiated redevelopment (URA as “facilitator”). The first two models are implemented under the existing URA framework where the redevelopment projects serve a social mission, while in the latter, the URA provides service as “facilitator” where the redevelopment project will be of an investment nature to realise the redevelopment value of the lot and bring profit to the owners.</p>
B-34	<p>➤ The URA should play the roles of “facilitator” and “technical supporter”.</p>	<p>Concluding Meeting Professional</p>	<p>➤ Please refer to the responses above.</p>

Serial Number	Key Points	Raised by	Responses
		Bodies Consultation Meeting 2	
B-35	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>➤ To provide another option for property owners by proceeding with redevelopment first before recouping the redevelopment cost from the property owners. It is expected that the property owners should be willing to pay back the redevelopment cost (but not the difference) so as to reduce conflict and create a win-win situation.</li> </ul>	Cheung Yiu-tong	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>➤ Please refer to the responses above.</li> </ul>
B-36	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>➤ The URA should deliver on its social mission and strike a balance between the interests of various stakeholders in the community. When assuming the role of a “facilitator”, the URA should</li> </ul>	Workshop K28 Concern Group	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>➤ The URA, as a “facilitator”, could provide consultancy services to the owners to assist them in assembling titles to proceed with redevelopment under the market mechanism and the prevailing legislation. As these services will be similar to the services provided by surveyors</li> </ul>

Serial Number	Key Points	Raised by	Responses
	<p>consider itself as taking up a responsibility and should not charge. Could the URA rely on the Government’s statutory powers in carrying out its role as a “facilitator”?</p>		<p>in the market, the URA should therefore provide such service at a fee to avoid competing for profits with the private sector. The URA is working on the detailed arrangements.</p> <p>➤ Unlike the URA-initiated projects, the URA will not invoke public power to resume land when acting as a “facilitator”, but will be providing assistance as a consultant. It is because it is difficult for owners in non-redevelopment areas to agree to the use of public power or public funds to assist some owners in old districts to perform an act of investment through redevelopment.</p>
B-37	<p>➤ The URA should focus on rehabilitation and redevelopment (the 2R), but may get involved in revitalisation and preservation projects in the district only in special circumstances.</p>	The Professional Commons	<p>➤ The revised URS (Draft) has clearly spelt out that the URA is tasked to adopt “Redevelopment” and “Rehabilitation” as its core business.</p>

Serial Number	Key Points	Raised by	Responses
B-38	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>➤ The URA should abandon projects of high redevelopment value and spell out clearly its scope of business and market positioning.</li> </ul>	The Professional Commons	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>➤ The revised URS (Draft) specifies factors that should be considered for the URA-implemented redevelopment projects. The URA’s rationale for redevelopment and the project priority should depend on the building conditions, planning considerations, and the living conditions of residents, and not solely on the potential gain from redevelopment of the site. The nature of redevelopment should be driven by good social causes.</li> </ul>
B-39	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>➤ The URA, when acting in its capacity of a “facilitator” in projects with owners participation, should still be able to rely on the Lands Resumption Ordinance and provide financial subsidy to a certain extent. The criteria for the owners to obtain URA’s assistance include: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>● The redevelopment projects should bring about greater</li> </ul> </li> </ul>	The Professional Commons	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>➤ The rationale for the URA to provide service as a “facilitator” at a fee is to provide property owners with another choice. The URA must avoid creating unfair competition in the market.</li> <li>➤ The nature of the redevelopment projects initiated by the URA who acts as an implementer should be a social one. A model of “owner participation” is considered an act of investment through redevelopment.</li> <li>➤ Please also refer to response above.</li> </ul>

Serial Number	Key Points	Raised by	Responses
	<p>public interest;</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>● Redevelopment is carried out in accordance with the principles of “environmental and public need as the key” and with “comprehensive care, community support”.</li> </ul>		
B-40	<p>➤ A member opined that the URA is currently playing a role which focuses too much on property development but lacks a holistic vision in district development and over-emphasises on development intensity. It does not demonstrate the “people-centred” principle when undertaking property development. It only stresses business value and profits and overlooks the significance of public open space and the public’s</p>	Public Affairs Forum	<p>➤ Please refer to responses above.</p>

Serial Number	Key Points	Raised by	Responses
	<p>home purchase affordability. The member found it necessary that the URA should review its roles and responsibilities and “detach” itself from the property developers.</p>		
B-41	<p>➤ As an “implementer”, the URA should set clear guidelines on the criteria for the acceptance of redevelopment projects proposed by individual owners and developers, such as requirements that those projects will bring planning gains. As a “facilitator”, the URA should consider undertaking old district improvement projects within specific urban renewal areas including conversion of industrial buildings and renovation of</p>	HKIP	<p>➤ For the rationale behind the URA taking up a “facilitator” in redevelopment projects in future, please refer to the responses above.</p> <p>➤ It is suggested that as a “facilitator”, the URA should provide consultancy service to the owners. Both “Rehabilitation” and “Redevelopment” will be the core businesses of the URA in the future.</p>

Serial Number	Key Points	Raised by	Responses
	buildings etc.		
B-42	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>➤ Members considered that the URA should focus on rehousing and compensating affected residents, while the Development Bureau should focus on redevelopment.</li> </ul>	Public Affairs Forum	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>➤ The URA as a key stakeholder and implementer of the URS will focus on both “Redevelopment” and “Rehabilitation”. The URA will offer fair and reasonable compensation and rehousing arrangements to people affected by redevelopment.</li> </ul>
B-43	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>➤ The URA should take on the role of a “facilitator” and assemble titles for development which is beneficial to all parties.</li> </ul>	Leung Yat-wing	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>➤ We suggest that the URA play the role of a “facilitator” which will provide consultancy services to the owners.</li> </ul>
B-44	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>➤ If the URA acts as a ‘facilitator’ and tries to identify private developers to undertake redevelopment, there are concerns that the private developers will not take into account public views in planning.</li> </ul>	Concluding Meeting	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>➤ As a “facilitator”, apart from providing consultancy service to the owners, the URA will also comply with good corporate guidelines/ethics and request those owners involved in redevelopment to provide assistance to affected tenants.</li> </ul>

Serial Number	Key Points	Raised by	Responses
B-45	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>➤ If the URA shifts its role to a “facilitator”, it will only make compensation to tenants an empty talk.</li> </ul>	重建關注組	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>➤ Please refer to the responses above.</li> </ul>
B-46	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>➤ Since its establishment in 2001, the URA has violated the principle of improving the livelihood of the residents in old districts and their living environment. Instead, through urban regeneration with continuous demolition of old buildings and the development of luxurious apartments, URA’s redevelopment projects have resulted in rows of tall buildings that block ventilation. The URA has also invoked ordinances that evicted underprivileged residents and tenants. Redevelopment</li> </ul>	社區營造計劃	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>➤ Please refer to the responses above.</li> </ul>

<b>Serial Number</b>	<b>Key Points</b>	<b>Raised by</b>	<b>Responses</b>
	should not be the only choice.		
B-47	➤ The URA should consult the stakeholders involved in its urban renewal projects and play the role of an “Enabler” to enable collaboration with the community.	HKIP	➤ Future DURF will recommend the scope and strategy of the district's “Urban Renewal Action Areas”. DURF will consult the public more extensively by organising public engagement activities.

### III. Summary of Public Views and Responses

#### C. Compensation and Rehousing [Points 6-8 under Consensus Building]

Serial Number	Key Points	Raised by	Responses
Compensation based on the value of a notional 7-year old replacement flat			
C-1	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>➤ The compensation mechanism based on the value of a “notional 7-year old replacement flat” should be reviewed as the owners can hardly purchase a flat in the market with the compensation.</li> </ul>	Workshop	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>➤ We need to stress that the current level of “Home Purchase Allowance (HPA) and Ex-gratia Allowance for Owners and Legal Occupiers of Commercial Properties” was endorsed after detailed deliberation at the Finance Committee (FC) in March 2001 and the current compensation policy of the URA was based on the decision of the FC.</li> <li>➤ The Steering Committee on URS Review (SC) did not consider it justified to increase the compensation rates on the ground that the URA was after all operated with public money and there was a need to balance between a fair and reasonable compensation mechanism and the prudent use of public resources. The SC, however, supported that options other than cash compensation could be considered for affected</li> </ul>

Serial Number	Key Points	Raised by	Responses
			<p>owner-occupiers.</p> <p>➤ Preliminary findings of the tracking survey on the redevelopment project in Hai Tan Street, Sham Shui Po, has revealed that about 57% among the 28 domestic owner-occupiers tracked had chosen to purchase smaller replacement units, and about 79% had chosen to buy second-hand flats aged at least 20 years old, while about 46% had retained over \$1 million of the cash compensation. This may well reflect that owners may make different choices.</p>
C-2	<p>➤ The URA's valuation always depressed the value of a 7-year old replacement flat and also the market value of old buildings.</p>	<p>重建業主聯會 暨 H19 關注組</p>	<p>➤ The value per square foot of a 7-year old replacement flat is based on the assessment made by seven professional valuation firms. The rate is then determined by removing the highest and the lowest valuations and taking a weighted average of the remaining five valuations. The seven firms will be selected by open ballot to ensure that the mechanism is open, fair and just. The mechanism and its approaches are transparent and independent.</p>

Serial Number	Key Points	Raised by	Responses
C-3	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>➤ The compensation offered by the URA based on the value of a 7-year old replacement flat in the same district is inadequate. The Government has the responsibility to offer compensation having regard to the actual value such as the development potential of the lot as a whole (not just the single redevelopment project), the existing value and the allowance involved.</li> </ul>	重建關注組	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>➤ Please refer to the responses above.</li> </ul>
C-4	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>➤ The compensation level based on the 7-year old replacement flat in the same district is out of date.</li> </ul>	凌鳳霞	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>➤ Please refer to the responses above.</li> </ul>
C-5	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>➤ To retain the use of the value of a 7-year old replacement flat as the basis for compensation is supported.</li> </ul>	Yau Yau	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>➤ Thank you for the views.</li> </ul>
C-6	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>➤ The URA has adopted the</li> </ul>	Cheung Yiu-tong	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>➤ The URA has used the measurement of saleable</li> </ul>

Serial Number	Key Points	Raised by	Responses
	<p>measurement of the useable area rather than the gross floor area or the saleable area of properties for determining the acquisition price. The useable area of a flat may be only 50% or so of the saleable area. The compensation offered by the URA is not adequate to buy a 7-year old replacement flat in the same district.</p>		<p>area of properties as the basis for determining the acquisition price for such properties.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>➤ The saleable area is defined according to the HKIS' Code of Measuring Practice issued in March 1999 and its Supplement in February 2008. The definition was clearly spelt out and widely accepted. The Government adopts the same measuring standard when invoking the Lands Resumption Ordinance.</li> <li>➤ In determining the acquisition price, the URA will measure the saleable area of properties according to the measurement shown on the building plan approved by the Buildings Department. For properties having no approved building plan, professional surveyors will be appointed by the URA to take measurement on site.</li> <li>➤ Please also refer to responses above.</li> </ul>
C-7	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>➤ It is proposed that the same basis of the gross floor area of properties be used for determining the compensation and the “flat for</li> </ul>	九龍城網絡	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>➤ The URA will use a standardised area calculation method i.e. the measurement of the saleable area as the basis for determining the price for properties acquired for redevelopment and the “flat for flat”</li> </ul>

Serial Number	Key Points	Raised by	Responses
	flat” arrangement.		option.
C-8	<p>➤ Whether the Government has considered helping owners who do not want to sell their flats by putting their flats for sale in the market and inviting the URA or developers to bid by open tender before triggering the compensation mechanism under [land resumption]? This will ensure that the small owners can get reasonable compensation and help resolve disputes.</p>	Cheung Yiu-tong	<p>➤ The Lands Resumption Ordinance is invoked only when the URA initiates redevelopment projects for social purpose. Acquiring properties through open tender is not an approach for redevelopment for a social purpose.</p>
C-9	<p>➤ The compensation mechanism deprives some owners of their interests in the redevelopment potential of their lots. The URA has sacrificed some owners’ chance for full compensation in order to subsidise its other loss-making redevelopment,</p>	重建業主聯會暨 H19 關注組	<p>➤ Article 105 of the Basic Law provides that the Hong Kong Special Administrative Region shall, in accordance with the law, protect the rights of individuals and legal persons to the acquisition, use, disposal and inheritance of property and their right to compensation for lawful deprivation of their property.</p> <p>➤ The “HPA and Ex-gratia Allowance for Owners</p>

Serial Number	Key Points	Raised by	Responses
	rehabilitation or preservation projects. Such a policy goes against Article 105 of the Basic Law.		<p>and Legal Occupiers of Commercial Properties” was endorsed after detailed deliberation at the FC in March 2001 and the current compensation policy of the URA was based on the decision of the FC.</p> <p>➤ It is stipulated in the existing URS that the URA shall exercise due care and diligence in the handling of its finances.</p>
“Flat for flat”			
C-10	<p>➤ Supported the proposed “flat for flat” option and that the affected owners who opt for “flat for flat” should pay the difference in property price.</p>	RICS	<p>➤ Thank you for the views.</p>
C-11	<p>➤ Supported the direction of the new “flat for flat” arrangement, but the feasibility of certain technical issues should be examined, such as the calculation method for the difference in property price.</p>	LDAC HKIS	<p>➤ Please refer to the information on the “flat for flat” arrangement uploaded onto the website of the URS Review for public inspection. URA is working on the other details of the “flat for flat” arrangement.</p>

Serial Number	Key Points	Raised by	Responses
C-12	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>➤ It is proposed that the URA, in introducing its “flat for flat” option, may take reference from the exchange entitlement arrangement for the land in the New Territories where the entitlement is tradable.</li> </ul>	LDAC HKILA	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>➤ Thank you for the views. URA is working on the other details of the “flat for flat” arrangement. The policy intent of the “flat for flat” arrangement is to allow owner-occupiers to retain social networks.</li> </ul>
C-13	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>➤ The “flat for flat” arrangement provides residents an alternative compensation option and can help residents retain their social network which has been built over the years, but its mode of implementation and details require further discussion.</li> </ul>	DAB	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>➤ Please refer to the responses above.</li> </ul>
C-14	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>➤ It is proposed to fix the difference in the price between the new flat and the 7-year old replacement flat in the same district on the valuation date for reference of owners who opt for “flat for flat”</li> </ul>	HKIS	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>➤ Please refer to the responses above.</li> </ul>

Serial Number	Key Points	Raised by	Responses
	and there should be an exit mechanism for these owners.		
C-15	<p>➤ Regarding the “flat for flat” arrangement:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>● the price difference to be paid and the date of calculation need to be clarified;</li> <li>● the calculation method for the size (measurement of gross floor area / useable area) of the new / old flats should also be clarified;</li> <li>● there should be a way out under the arrangement and the right of inheritance should be considered;</li> <li>● the arrangement which only allows owners to select their replacement flats on lower floors of the redeveloped buildings is objected to and the</li> </ul>	Workshop	<p>➤ Please refer to the responses above.</p>

Serial Number	Key Points	Raised by	Responses
	flat selection should not be determined by drawing lots but the preference of owners.		
C-16	<p>➤ It is not genuine “flat for flat” as the proposed criteria are too harsh and the huge profit that may be brought about with high rise redevelopments is not revealed.</p>	H15 Concern Group	<p>➤ The “flat for flat” arrangement will be based on the following two overriding principles:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>● maintaining the HPA rate based on the value of a 7-year old replacement flat as the standard for compensation which, in general, translates into two to three times the market value of a flat in the old buildings;</li> <li>● providing an alternative option for the purpose of maintaining social networks.</li> </ul> <p>➤ The SC considered it appropriate to maintain the HPA based on the value of a 7-year old replacement flat in the same district as the standard for cash compensation to domestic owner-occupiers. The SC took heed of the public views collected in the Public Engagement stage that there should be alternative options to cash compensation to owners affected by redevelopment projects. The “flat for flat”</p>

Serial Number	Key Points	Raised by	Responses
			<p>proposed is an alternative option provided to affected domestic owner-occupiers. The arrangement will enable them to return to live in the same neighbourhood after redevelopment and maintain the social network they have established.</p> <p>➤ The URA can provide consultation services to owners who wish to proceed with redevelopment by assisting them to assemble titles for sale to developers by tender or collaborate with developers in redeveloping the site in order to share the profits brought about by redevelopment.</p>
C-17	<p>➤ Supported to take forward the “flat for flat” arrangement to maintain social networks.</p>	<p>民間聯合聲明 The Professional Commons 社會營造計劃</p>	<p>➤ Please refer to the responses above.</p>
C-18	<p>➤ The public demand that it should be “(square) foot for (square) foot” under the “flat for flat” arrangement. Owners should not be required to pay the difference as the arrangement has nothing to do</p>	<p>Workshop Leung Yat-wing 重建業主聯會暨 H19 關注組 關注啓德居民組</p>	<p>➤ “Flat for flat” is an alternative option to cash compensation provided to affected domestic owner-occupiers. The arrangement will enable them to return to live in the same neighbourhood after redevelopment and maintain the social network they have established. The</p>

<b>Serial Number</b>	<b>Key Points</b>	<b>Raised by</b>	<b>Responses</b>
	with the compensation based on the 7-year old replacement flat.		<p>compensation is based on the value of a 7-year old replacement flat. “Flat for flat” is not to exchange an old flat for a new flat. The “(square) foot for (square) foot” proposal deviates from the basis of offering compensation at the 7-year old replacement flat value.</p> <p>➤ It is reasonable to require owners to pay the difference in property price having regard to our premise that the HPA rate at a 7-year old replacement flat value should be maintained. This is the same as the situation where an owner who has accepted the offer of cash compensation based on the 7-year old replacement flat value is required to pay more when he/she buys a new flat in the same district. It will become “an old flat for a brand new flat” if owners are not required to pay the difference.</p>
C-19	➤ Members opined that the “flat for flat” proposal might not meet the public aspiration to exchange their old flats for new flats.	AAB	➤ Please refer to the responses above.

Serial Number	Key Points	Raised by	Responses
C-20	<p>➤ The cost of construction and development of floor areas designated for government and community facilities should be borne by public money earmarked for the development of the district and its adjoining area rather than by the owners affected by the redevelopment. Will the owners who opt for “flat for flat” be required to pay the difference because the land value is part of the public coffers and the increased land value under the flat for flat arrangement ought to be borne by the owners?</p>	Leung Yat-wing	<p>➤ Under the “flat for flat” arrangement, the price of a new flat will reflect its market value. The difference in price that a domestic owner-occupier is required to pay has nothing to do with the construction and development costs of public facilities.</p>
C-21	<p>➤ Rental subsidy should be provided to owners during the construction period.</p>	<p>Workshop The Professional Commons 九龍城區網絡</p>	<p>➤ It will deviate from the principle of offering cash compensation based on the HPA rate at a 7-year old replacement flat value if we provide rehousing arrangement for owners who opt for “flat for flat”. An owner who opts for “flat for flat” must first accept the level of the cash compensation for his</p>

Serial Number	Key Points	Raised by	Responses
			<p>property as the cash value will form the basis for other related considerations. An owner may instantly draw part of the cash from his compensation for paying rental of his temporary home or other purposes. The owner should resolve his own housing arrangement before the new flat is completed. The provision of the proposed rental subsidy will mean offering multi-benefits to owners and this is unfair to owners who opt for cash compensation.</p>
C-22	<p>➤ The URA needs to explore appropriate rehousing arrangement for owners who opt for “flat for flat” before their new flats are completed.</p>	<p>DAB AAB</p>	<p>➤ Please refer to the responses above.</p>
C-23	<p>➤ The owners should be allowed to use their “flat for flat” entitlement for many other purposes, such as to transfer their entitlement or exercise their own entitlement.</p>	<p>Workshop</p>	<p>➤ The “flat for flat” option is proposed in response to many owners’ aspiration for retaining their social network. The URA is working out other details of the “flat for flat” arrangement.</p>

Serial Number	Key Points	Raised by	Responses
C-24	<p>➤ Supported in-situ rehousing and suggested that 7-year old properties or affordable housing in the same district should be provided to owners who opt for “flat for flat” and the price of the redeveloped flats should be set at the level of the HOS / Sandwich Class Housing flats.</p>	<p>Workshop H15 Concern Group The Professional Commons Cheung Yiu-tong 九龍城網絡 關注啓德居民組</p>	<p>➤ The URA intends to build modest and affordable flats at the Kai Tak site as the first batch of units for the “flat for flat” arrangement.</p>
C-25	<p>➤ Large sites can be developed by phases so that owners affected by the redevelopment at later stage may move in the newly redeveloped flats. For small sites where redevelopment by phases is infeasible, the URA may collaborate with the HKHA and HKHS to allocate certain units to rehouse the affected owners; or it may adopt the practice of the ex-Land Development Corporation</p>	<p>Leung Yat-wing</p>	<p>➤ The URA intends to build modest and affordable flats at the Kai Tak site as the first batch of units for the “flat for flat” arrangement.</p>

Serial Number	Key Points	Raised by	Responses
	to acquire new flats for rehousing purpose.		
C-26	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>➤ Non-domestic owner-occupiers should be entitled to the “flat for flat” arrangement.</li> </ul>	舊樓小業主	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>➤ The “flat for flat” arrangement is intended to allow domestic owner-occupiers to return to the same district so as to retain their social network; whereas the non-domestic owner-occupiers have their own homes somewhere else and do not have such a need.</li> </ul>
C-27	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>➤ It is proposed to adopt the “flat for flat” arrangement offered to owners of Lai Shing Mansion or Prosperous Garden.</li> </ul>	重建業主聯會 K28 Concern Group	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>➤ Please refer to the responses above.</li> <li>➤ The “flat for flat” arrangement for these two projects was offered having regard to their unique background and special circumstances. Such arrangement is therefore not suitable for URA projects in general.</li> </ul>
C-28	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>➤ In-situ resettlement should be provided as far as practicable. There are also concerns about whether the elderly may be rehoused in the same district so as to retain their social network.</li> </ul>	Public Affairs Forum	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>➤ Please refer to the responses above.</li> </ul>

Serial Number	Key Points	Raised by	Responses
	<p>Reference can be drawn to be Prosperous Garden case in Yau Ma Tei where functional housing flats were provided at a site located in the margins of the same district to rehouse the affected residents.</p>		
C-29	<p>➤ Members considered “flat for flat” a viable option. The Administration should offer various repayment arrangements with flexible repayment schedule to cater for the different size and different age profile of the property owners’ household who wish to have a replacement flat. The price of the replacement flats should be set at different levels, depending on the size, floor and orientation of the flat so that these owners may make their choice according to their affordability. To further enhance the “flat for</p>	Public Affairs Forum	<p>➤ The “flat for flat” option is an alternative to the cash compensation for affected domestic owner-occupiers. Under the arrangement, these owners may return to their neighbourhood and retain their existing social network. Under the “flat for flat” proposal, URA will make assessment on the value of a notional 7-year old replacement flat at the same time it assesses the per-square foot price of the new flats. The two reasons for assessing the new flat prices at that juncture are as follows:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>● This is to offer owners who are interested in the “flat for flat” option a confirmed price which will reflect the open market value at the time. This is to prevent participating owners from being affected by the price fluctuations</li> </ul>

Serial Number	Key Points	Raised by	Responses
	<p>flat” arrangement, the Administration should seek to attract the first batch of owners and provide preferential arrangement for the recipients for CSSA, single-parent families and new arrivals.</p>		<p>in the property market; and</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>● The URA cannot ascertain the time taken for the redevelopment process as it involves property acquisition, rehousing of residents, and possible legal procedures.</li> </ul>
C-30	<p>➤ The Administration should respect the wish of residents and stakeholders in offering its “flat for flat” option. Some members considered it hard to implement the “flat for flat” arrangement as it would be difficult for the URA and owners to achieve consensus on the size and price of the properties.</p>	Public Affairs Forum	<p>➤ The “flat for flat” option is an alternative to the cash compensation for affected domestic owner-occupiers. Under the arrangement, these owners may return to their neighbourhood and retain their existing social network.</p>
C-31	<p>➤ Not support the “flat for flat” proposal if it is an enhanced compensation package, as this will mean rewarding, irresponsible owners who do not maintain their</p>	Concluding Meeting	<p>➤ The “flat for flat” option is an alternative to the cash compensation for affected domestic owner-occupiers. Under the arrangement, these owners may return to their neighbourhood and retain their existing social network. The</p>

Serial Number	Key Points	Raised by	Responses
	properties and this deviates from the guiding principle to encourage property owners to carry out their maintenance responsibility.		compensation based on the value of a 7-year old replacement flat will not be increased.
C-32	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>➤ The cash value of “buildings with no redevelopment value” may be similar to that after redevelopment. For these cases, to minimize disputes, the “flat for flat” approach may be applied.</li> </ul>	Concluding Meeting	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>➤ The URA should be consistent in its policies, including its proposed “flat for flat” arrangement when implementing its redevelopment projects. The “flat for flat” option is an alternative to the cash compensation for affected domestic owner-occupiers. Under the arrangement, these owners may return to their neighbourhood and retain their existing social network. The compensation based on the value of a 7-year old replacement flat will not be increased. As such, the compensation level will not vary with the redevelopment value of the flats.</li> </ul>
C-33	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>➤ The time allowed for owners to consider the “flat for flat” option should be extended from 60 days to 90 days. The new flats should be completed in three years so that</li> </ul>	九龍城區網絡	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>➤ The URA is working on the other details of the “flat for flat” arrangement.</li> </ul>

Serial Number	Key Points	Raised by	Responses
	owners who opt for “flat for flat” may move in.		
C-34	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>➤ It is proposed that the Development Bureau may first develop the Kai Tak development site to rehouse the residents in Kowloon City on a “foot for foot” basis.</li> </ul>	關注啓德居民組	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>➤ The Government has identified a suitable site in the Kai Tak Development to develop the first batch of units for the “flat for flat” arrangement.</li> </ul>
“Shop for Shop”			
C-35	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>➤ The “shop for shop” arrangement should be introduced to maintain local economy.</li> </ul>	The Professional Commons Cheung Sin-ye 社會營造計劃	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>➤ Compared to the “flat for flat” arrangement, to implement “shop for shop” poses more insurmountable problems. For instance, each shop is different in terms of location, size and operational needs, and as the URA must comply with the land and planning conditions and must meet various building regulations, fire and safety requirements, it will not be possible to guarantee the provision of similar shop space in the redevelopment project. Moreover, for some of the existing trades, they may not fit in with the planning intention of the site upon redevelopment.</li> </ul>

Serial Number	Key Points	Raised by	Responses
			<p>Besides, as shops need to build customer bases, if the shop in question has relocated elsewhere and established another customer base during the redevelopment period, it is very unlikely that the shop operator will want to move back after redevelopment.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>➤ The URA has recently enhanced its compensation option including the special arrangement under which commercial owner-occupiers may be given priority to lease the new shops in the redevelopment area at market rates.</li> <li>➤ The revised URS (Draft) has clearly specified that the URA will provide assistance to those affected shop owners and operators as far as possible. Moreover, at the initial planning stage, DURF can avoid identifying locations with local characteristics as “Urban Renewal Action Areas” in order to minimise the number of affected shop operators.</li> </ul>
C-36	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>➤ “Shop for shop” should be offered in the same district. Similar shop</li> </ul>	Workshop H15 Concern	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>➤ Please refer to the responses above.</li> </ul>

Serial Number	Key Points	Raised by	Responses
	spaces in the nearby area should be provided on the “foot for foot” basis without the need to pay the price difference.	Group 民間聯合聲明 Concluding Meeting K28 Concern Group Iu Siu-yung Shun Ning Road Support Group	
C-37	➤ The URA is again trying to evade the “shop for shop” issue and this is a solid proof that the consensus is a false one.	重建業主聯會暨 H19 關注組	➤ Please refer to the responses above.
C-38	➤ The URA has the obligation to assist shop operators affected by redevelopment by providing small shop spaces for them in the redevelopment area so as to preserve the social and cultural characteristics of local districts.	重建業主聯會	➤ Please refer to the responses above.

<b>Serial Number</b>	<b>Key Points</b>	<b>Raised by</b>	<b>Responses</b>
C-39	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>➤ Staircase shops, newspaper stalls and rear staircase shops should be reprovisioned to location of similar space and with similar clientele and pedestrian movement. The rental rate of reprovisioned shops should be affordable by shop operators as well.</li> </ul>	Cheung Sin-ye	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>➤ Please refer to the responses above.</li> </ul>
C-40	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>➤ The “shop for shop” proposed in the URS Review is not viable as the URA will collaborate with developers in redeveloping the sites merely into luxury flats and high-end shopping malls. While the URA may reap a huge long-term return by leasing out these shops, it is not going to share the profit with the public. This makes the URA a “robber baron” who seeks every opportunity to seize the ground floor shops.</li> </ul>	Sin Fung-ye	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>➤ Please refer to the responses above.</li> </ul>

<b>Serial Number</b>	<b>Key Points</b>	<b>Raised by</b>	<b>Responses</b>
C-41	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>➤ A member considered the “shop for shop” not viable. There may be a need to set up service teams to assist shop operators.</li> </ul>	TPB	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>➤ The URA will provide further assistance to shop operators to re-start their business, and will provide an alternative for shop operators to lease the new shops in the redevelopment area. However, it is considered infeasible to offer “shop for shop” for shop owners in lieu of cash compensation.</li> </ul>
C-42	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>➤ It is opined that the “shop for shop” option was not feasible because of the property price and it would become viable if the affected shop owners were willing to pay the price difference between the old and the new shop premises.</li> </ul>	Professional Bodies Consultation Meeting 2	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>➤ Please refer to the responses above.</li> </ul>
C-43	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>➤ The Administration may take reference from the exchange entitlement arranged for the land in the New Territories in implementing “shop for shop”.</li> </ul>	HKILA	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>➤ Please refer to the responses above.</li> </ul>
C-44	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>➤ A member opined that the URA</li> </ul>	Public Affairs	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>➤ Please refer to the responses above.</li> </ul>

Serial Number	Key Points	Raised by	Responses
	<p>should encourage shop operators to return to their original district to resume their business after redevelopment and the Administration would only need to compensate for their loss during the period they ceased operation.</p>	<p>Forum</p>	
<p>C-45</p>	<p>➤ While some members share the view in the Paper that it will be infeasible to offer the “shop for shop” option as shop owners may have strong sentimental ties to their shops and do not want to have the shops reprovisioned elsewhere; if they choose to move back to resume business in the redeveloped area, they may face a lot of challenges such as higher rental, smaller shop size and change of space for operation, some members consider that the URA should further study the</p>	<p>Public Affairs Forum</p>	<p>➤ Please refer to the responses above.</p>

<b>Serial Number</b>	<b>Key Points</b>	<b>Raised by</b>	<b>Responses</b>
	<p>feasibility of the “shop for shop” option. There are views that the option will be viable so long as the compensation is reasonable. Another member is of the view that it should be market-led because even if the shop operators resume their business in the same area after the redevelopment, they may not be able to share the benefits brought about by redevelopment as the operating environment has been changed. The URA is asked to provide breakdown of the number of shop operators who have accepted compensation offers or resumed their business in their original area after the redevelopment in the past for reference.</p>		
C-46	➤ The Administration should continue to consider and explore	DAB	➤ Please refer to the responses above.

Serial Number	Key Points	Raised by	Responses
	the feasibility of the “shop for shop” option and provide business opportunity to shop operators in the old districts.	AAB	
C-47	➤ The URA should assist small shop operators affected by major redevelopment projects as they may not be able to find a suitable location in the same district to reprovision their shops. Orthe URA may offer ex-gratia allowance to them on the basis of their years of operation.	HKIP	➤ Please refer to the responses above.
<b>Owner-occupiers and owners of vacant and tenanted domestic units</b>			
C-48	➤ There should not be differentiation in cash compensation for owner-occupiers and non owner-occupiers and the compensation level should be standardised.	Workshop Concluding Meeting	➤ The SC considered that the existing differentiation in compensation for owner-occupiers and non owner-occupiers should be maintained. ➤ First, we need to make it clear that both owner-occupiers and non owner-occupiers are entitled to compensation higher than the market

Serial Number	Key Points	Raised by	Responses
			<p>value of properties. The difference is the HPA rate. The compensation level for owner-occupiers should be sufficient for them to find replacement flats in the same district (the HPA is based on the value of a notional 7-year old replacement flat). There is no policy basis to offer the full HPA to non owner-occupiers.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>➤ The policy basis to offer allowance on top of the compensation based on the open market value of properties is that the URA initiated redevelopment projects are to fulfill its social missions and one of its objectives is to improve the residents' living environment.</li> <li>➤ Based on the points above, the revised URS (Draft) explains that the distinction in compensation and ex gratia payment for owner-occupiers and owners of vacant and tenanted domestic units will continue. The URA will adopt a compassionate approach in assessing the eligibility of owners of tenanted domestic units for ex gratia payment on par with owner-occupiers in exceptional circumstances.</li> </ul>

Serial Number	Key Points	Raised by	Responses
C-49	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>➤ How to define and differentiate the owner-occupiers and non owner-occupiers and how to determine their compensation? As such, both of them should be offered full HPA.</li> </ul>	舊樓小業主	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>➤ The owner-occupier refers to an owner who occupies his property for sole residence and sole residence means the owner does not occupy another property for residential purpose. The occupant of a tenanted or vacant property will be treated as a non owner-occupier. The details of the policy have been uploaded onto the URA's website for public reference.</li> <li>➤ Please also refer to the responses above.</li> </ul>
C-50	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>➤ The difference in the existing HPA rate between owner-occupiers and non owner-occupiers is significant. In assessing the HPA rate for non owner-occupiers, it is suggested to take into account other considerations, such as years of ownership of the property, their current living condition, their level of income and the number of domestic flats owned by them. There should be differentiation in</li> </ul>	HKIS	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>➤ Please refer to the responses above.</li> </ul>

Serial Number	Key Points	Raised by	Responses
	the HPA between an individual owner and a company as the latter is an “investor” owner.		
C-51	➤ How to define an elderly non owner-occupier in special circumstances? It is suggested to allow one tenanted or vacant property (irrespective of residential or commercial premises) owned by elderly owner-occupiers to be eligible for the HPA based on the value of a notional 7-year old replacement flat.	十三街的八十後	➤ The revised URS (Draft) states that the distinction in compensation and ex gratia payment for owner-occupiers and owners of vacant and tenanted domestic units will continue. The URA will adopt a compassionate approach in assessing the eligibility of owners of tenanted domestic units for ex gratia payment on par with owner-occupiers in exceptional circumstances.
C-52	➤ The proposal to offer higher level of HPA rate to elderly non owner-occupier is not supported. If so, whether the URA should also take care of non owner-occupiers who are out of work or with disabilities or those who are single-parent families. There is a	Yau Yau	➤ Please refer to the responses above.

Serial Number	Key Points	Raised by	Responses
	social welfare safety net in Hong Kong and the URA which is financed by public money should not take up the role as another social welfare agent.		
C-53	➤ The Administration's proposal to assist elderly non owner-occupiers in special circumstances by providing a higher level of compensation is supported.	關注啓德居民組	➤ Thank you for the views.
C-54	➤ The SC still failed to positively explore a further feasible compensation option for non owner-occupiers in this Review.	CC	➤ Please refer to the responses above.
C-55	➤ The aspirations of non owner-occupiers have not been addressed. The Government should explain to the public its rationale for not granting their demand. The compensation for non owner-occupiers should not be	David So	➤ Please refer to the responses above.

Serial Number	Key Points	Raised by	Responses
	increased because the Government should not compensate investors with public money.		
C-56	➤ To address the public aspiration, it is suggested that the Development Bureau may ask the current Finance Committee of Legco to further review and revise the differentiation in the compensation level between owner-occupiers and non owner-occupiers.	Cheung Yiu-tong	➤ Please refer to the responses above.
C-57	➤ Non owner-occupiers may be deprived of compensation amounting to nearly a million dollars due to the difference in the compensation between owner-occupiers and non owner-occupiers and such a compensation option contravenes Article 105 of the Basic Law.	重建業主聯會暨 H19 關注組	➤ Please refer to the responses above.

Serial Number	Key Points	Raised by	Responses
Issues relating to tenants			
C-58	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>➤ The Administration should make sure that eligible tenants who have registered in the Freezing Survey are to be compensated and rehoused.</li> </ul>	Workshop 民間聯合聲明 Concluding Meeting Shun Ning Road Support Group The Professional Commons H15 Concern Group Io Ching-po	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>➤ Under the URA's current rehousing policy, all eligible tenants who have registered in the Freezing Survey of any URA project and are still occupying the tenanted units will be rehoused or compensated after agreements on sale of properties are reached between the owners and the URA or the Government has resumed the premises.</li> <li>➤ The revised URS (Draft) has explained that the URA will come up with enhanced arrangements to help tenants evicted or with their tenancies terminated after a freezing survey but before the URA successfully acquires the properties from their landlords, hence losing their eligibility for rehousing.</li> </ul>
C-59	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>➤ The URA should introduce by-laws to prescribe that any owner who leases his registered flat to a new tenant after the Freezing Survey will violate the</li> </ul>	Chan Wah-yu	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>➤ The URA will hold briefing sessions on the planning, acquisition and rehousing arrangements after the Freezing Survey. There will also be a number of briefing sessions for owners and tenants after the projects are authorised. The URA will</li> </ul>

Serial Number	Key Points	Raised by	Responses
	<p>law. The URA should make it clear to the registered owners that the URA is not responsible for any compensation to new tenants who move into registered flat after the Freezing Survey and the owners shall be liable to pay the compensation for any loss arising thereafter. This may prevent those who are disadvantaged in disguise from making use the chance to gain profits.</p>		<p>explain the compensation and rehousing policies for various types of properties in detail and will answer the questions to be raised by owners and tenants at the briefings.</p>
<p>Issues relating to owners, tenants and occupants of rooftop premises</p>			
C-60	<p>➤ Grave disappointment has been expressed that there is no mention of the arrangement for owners, tenants and occupants of rooftop premises in the seven major topics identified throughout the paper. The following arrangements are therefore suggested:</p>	<p>Yeung Kwok-wing Concluding Meeting</p>	<p>➤ The URS Review was launched in July 2008. There was no pre-set agenda of the Review which was implemented through 3 stages of Public Engagement. The seven major topics indentified in the Envisioning Stage have been thoroughly discussed and the Review during the Consensus Building stage, the SC has gauge public views on the ten preliminary proposals.</p>

Serial Number	Key Points	Raised by	Responses
	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. Instead of following the “internal” guidelines established by the Lands Department (LandsD), the URA should put forth the issues for public discussion.</li> <li>2. The registration staff are obliged to explain to owners, tenants and occupants of rooftop premises in detail all relevant policies, such as the rehousing policy for owner-occupiers, the ex-gratia payment for leased units and the rehousing and allowance policies for tenants, during the registration.</li> <li>3. There should be a separate compensation policy for owners of rooftop premises which are unauthorized building works (UBW)</li> </ol>		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>➤ The URA will hold briefing sessions on the planning, acquisition and rehousing arrangements after the Freezing Survey. There will also be a number of briefing sessions for owners and tenants after the projects are authorized. The URA will explain the compensation and rehousing policies for various types of properties (including roof top premises) in detail and will answer the questions to be raised by owners and tenants at the briefings.</li> <li>➤ In handling claims for compensation, irrespective of whether it is statutory compensation or ex-gratia compensation, the LandsD follows current legislation and policies. Since those who own the UBW on rooftop usually are not the owners of the rooftop before the Government resumes the UBW, they are not entitled to the compensation for owners to be paid under the Lands Resumption Ordinance. That said, the LandsD and the URA will assist occupants of the UBW on rooftop to move out by paying them the companionate ex-gratia under the policy on ex-gratia payments which has been set out in a booklet titled “Land</li> </ul>

<b>Serial Number</b>	<b>Key Points</b>	<b>Raised by</b>	<b>Responses</b>
	without a deed (not registered in the Land Registry).		Resumption and Compensation in the Urban Area Guidelines for Owners, Occupiers and Surveyors ” published by the LandsD.

### III. Summary of Public Views and Responses

#### D. Social Impact Assessment and Social Service Teams [Point 9 under Consensus Building]

Serial Number	Key Points	Raised by	Responses
<b>Social Impact Assessment (SIA)</b>			
D-1	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>➤ An independent agent should be commissioned to conduct Social Impact Assessment SIA.</li> </ul>	Workshop	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>➤ We have incorporated in the revised URS (Draft) that early social impact assessments will be initiated and conducted by DURF before redevelopment is recommended as the preferred option. The URA will update these assessments by DURF before implementing any specific redevelopment project.</li> </ul>
D-2	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>➤ Should make reference to the set of guidelines established by the International Association for Impact Assessment:               <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>● SIA should help create a more sustainable and fairer environment in ecological,</li> </ul> </li> </ul>	The Professional Commons	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>➤ The main elements to be covered in an SIA have been specified in the revised URS (Draft).</li> </ul>

Serial Number	Key Points	Raised by	Responses
	<p>socio-cultural and economic aspects;</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>● SIA should not be confined to detection or elimination of negative results. Instead, it should strive to promote development so as to facilitate the consolidation of development objectives; to explore different alternatives in regeneration; and to designate remedial measures;</li> <li>● SIA should be based on community-wide participation. Such assessment should commence as early as at the planning stage, and follow-up audit should be carried out after the redevelopment process;</li> <li>● SIA should pay special attention to issues regarding</li> </ul>		

Serial Number	Key Points	Raised by	Responses
	equality, so that fairer means of resettlement and compensation could be made available to the underprivileged.		
D-3	➤ A member considered that the URA should also carry out community impact assessment after redevelopment, and explain to the public how SIA should be conducted and the financial arrangements involved in the latter development stage.	Public Affairs Forum	➤ Please refer to the responses above.
D-4	➤ Other suggestion: According to page 22 of the Chinese version of the Papers as this type of assessment is not an impact assessment but more an assessment on mitigating measures, it is also suggested that a different name be given to this type of SIAs to avoid confusion.	Yeung Kwok-wing	➤ This is exactly what we proposed in the Paper.

Serial Number	Key Points	Raised by	Responses
D-5	➤ Agree that SIA should be conducted at district-based and project-based levels.	Public Affairs Forum Timothy Ma RICS	➤ Thank you for the views.
<b>Social Service Teams (SSTs)</b>			
D-6	➤ The SSTs should be independent of the URA. The proposal for The URA to employ social workers directly cannot resolve the present problem of conflicting roles of the social workers, and therefore is an unfeasible option.	Workshop Urban Social Workers Alliance HKCSS 重建業主聯會暨 H19 關注組 Concluding Meeting	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>➤ We have commissioned the Research Team of the University of Hong Kong to further study the division of responsibilities of the SSTs.</li> <li>➤ The study raised that it would be more acceptable to the public and the social welfare sector if SSTs were employed by an independent fund.</li> <li>➤ The revised URS (Draft) has incorporated a clause of setting up a trust fund. The SSTs will be financed by the trust fund and will report to the Board of Trustees of the trust fund.</li> </ul>
D-7	➤ The Administration should formulate appropriate measures to minimise the conflicting roles of the SSTs in discharging their	DAB	➤ Please refer to the responses above.

Serial Number	Key Points	Raised by	Responses
	advocacy duty and their case work duty.		
D-8	➤ The duties of rights advocacy and case handling are actually interwoven and should not be split.	Urban Social Workers Alliance HKCSS Concluding Meeting	➤ Please refer to the responses above.
D-9	➤ Social workers can play the role of a facilitator to genuinely materialise the above concept and should not be mere attendee at DURF meetings.	Urban Social Workers Alliance	➤ Members of DURF will include non-government organisations/groups which are experienced in serving the district. Social worker organisations could also be covered.
D-10	➤ SSTs should be independent of the URA and the service can be funded by separate resources or by an independent fund.	Workshop Urban Social Workers Alliance HKCSS Concluding Meeting 關注啓德居民組	➤ Please refer to the responses above.

Serial Number	Key Points	Raised by	Responses
		九龍城網絡	
D-11	<p>➤ The role of “rights advocacy” is clearly stated in the Paper for Consensus Building. HKCSS is glad to see that the community has reached a consensus in principle in this regard. However, detailed information is not available in the Paper and therefore more information should be provided for further discussion.</p>	HKCSS	<p>➤ Social worker’ role in rights advocacy could be materialised at the proposed DURF.</p>
D-12	<p>➤ Recommend that SSTs should be set up in various old urban districts to facilitate early engagement. It is only mentioned in the Paper that DURFs will be set up in various old districts, but this is not equivalent to early engagement. It is necessary to assist the underprivileged to participate in urban renewal or to provide social</p>	HKCSS	<p>➤ Through DURFs, social workers and local residents can be engaged early in the planning work of urban renewal in the district, thus minimising the impact on the residents.</p>

Serial Number	Key Points	Raised by	Responses
	<p>work support to them when they are affected. As such, the setting up of permanent service teams with dedicated social workers to provide services is essential.</p>		
D-13	<p>➤ For the last several months, it has been found that many concern groups and non-government organisations have provided assistance to the affected residents to strive for their rights, so it may not be necessary for the URA to subsidise SSTs for rights advocacy work. However, it is agreed that the role of SSTs in case handling to assist the affected residents is important.</p>	Yau Yau	<p>➤ Thank you for the views.</p>
D-14	<p>➤ SSTs should have experience in administration as well as dealing with compensation and rehousing etc., and therefore their scope of</p>	Professional Bodies Consultation Meeting 1	<p>➤ Please refer to the responses above.</p>

Serial Number	Key Points	Raised by	Responses
	work should not be confined to the areas of social welfare. As economic and environmental considerations are involved, it is proposed that their name be changed to “Community Development Teams” and they should provide service to DURF.	HKILA	
D-15	➤ Members raised concerns over the conflicting roles of the SSTs . It is proposed that a code of practice be formulated and training be provided to the SSTs for their understanding of their roles.	Professional Bodies Consultation Meeting 2	➤ Thank you for the views.
D-16	➤ It is possible to separate the work of rights advocacy and case handling of the SSTs. Besides, the SSTs can act as a bridge between the URA and the affected residents. To enhance independence, the selection and	Public Affairs Forum Timothy Ma	➤ Please refer to the responses above.

<b>Serial Number</b>	<b>Key Points</b>	<b>Raised by</b>	<b>Responses</b>
	overseeing of the SSTs may be done by the Social Welfare Department.		
D-17	➤ It is suggested that the work of rights advocacy and case handling of the SSTs be separated and undertaken by different institutions, and stringent criteria should be adopted for selecting the service providers.	Chan Wah-yu	➤ Please refer to the responses above.

### III. Summary of Public Views and Responses

#### E. Financial Arrangement [Point 10 under Consensus Building]

Serial Number	Key Points	Raised by	Responses
<b>Financial Arrangement</b>			
E-1	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>➤ Agree that the URA should observe the self-financing principle and strive for a fiscal balance, and should not make an unreasonable profit. It is necessary to give due consideration to the interests of various parties, and the economic benefits that the redevelopment project will bring about, both inside and outside project boundaries, should not be ignored.</li> </ul>	DAB	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>➤ Thank you for the views.</li> </ul>
E-2	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>➤ Oppose to the possible privatisation of the URA and the</li> </ul>	Workshop 重建業主聯會暨	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>➤ The Administration does not have any plan to privatise the URA. The main reason for the URA to issue bonds earlier is to maintain sufficient cash</li> </ul>

Serial Number	Key Points	Raised by	Responses
	issuance of bonds in future.	H19 關注組	flow during the acquisition stage of the redevelopment project, and it is not for the purpose of capital financing.
E-3	➤ The URA should enhance financial transparency.	Workshop 重建業主聯會暨 H19 關注組 凌鳳霞	➤ The URA has submitted a paper to the LegCo Panel on Development on 22 June 2010 to disclose financial information on its individual completed projects. The URA will continue to disclose the financial information of its completed projects when it submits its annual report to the LegCo in the years ahead.
E-4	➤ The URA's financial situation should be reviewed every five years. When necessary, the Government should provide additional funding to maintain its financial stability. When the URA participates in revitalisation and preservation projects, it should recoup all the costs involved. The financial situation of the URA should also be under the scrutiny	The Professional Commons	➤ It is specified in the revised URS (Draft) that the URA shall exercise due care and diligence in the handling of its finances, and it is required to submit annually a five-year Corporate Plan and a Business Plan for the next year for the Financial Secretary's approval. In this connection, the Government will examine the URA's financial position every year.

Serial Number	Key Points	Raised by	Responses
	<p>of the Audit Commission to ensure its expenditures are incurred wisely and cost effectiveness could be enhanced.</p>		
E-5	<p>➤ Agree that in the Government’s review of the self-financing principle of the URA, full consideration should be given to the economic benefits that urban regeneration brings about to the areas outside the boundaries of the renewal projects.</p>	<p>Public Affairs Forum Timothy Ma HKIS</p>	<p>➤ Thank you for the views.</p>
E-6	<p>➤ It is suggested that the requirement for maintaining a fiscal balance for each of the projects be relaxed. Members also considered that the Administration does not necessarily have to make profit for redevelopment. If the self-financing principle is abandoned, it may be more</p>	<p>Professional Bodies Consultation Meeting 1</p>	<p>➤ In the Government’s review of the self-financing principle of the URA, full consideration will be given to the economic benefits that urban regeneration brings to the areas outside the boundaries of the renewal projects.</p> <p>➤ The revised URS (Draft) has explained that the long-term objective of a self-financing urban renewal programme will continue to be upheld.</p>

<b>Serial Number</b>	<b>Key Points</b>	<b>Raised by</b>	<b>Responses</b>
	conducive to the development of our society.		
E-7	➤ It is suggested that some of the funds be reserved to rebuild the social network of the affected residents.	Public Affairs Forum Timothy Ma	➤ The setting up of DURF will help facilitate the selection of projects which will not destroy the social network.

### III. Summary of Public Views and Responses

#### F. Others

Serial Number	Key Points	Raised by	Responses
<b>Consultation on the Urban Renewal Strategy Review</b>			
F-1	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>➤ Protest against the Development Bureau (DEVB) for launching fake consultation in Stage 3 of the Public Engagement process, and claim that the “Consensus” so built will also be a false one.</li> </ul>	民間共識聯署 民間聯合聲明 重建業主聯會暨 H19 關注組重 Concluding Meeting	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>➤ The Review is not a fake consultation. During the Review, we have disseminated information to the public through different means and channels including attending meetings of the LegCo Panel on Development to report progress; setting up of a dedicated website and the Urban Renewal Idea Shop; reaching out to the wider public through the media and radio programmes; organising public forums, topical discussions and road shows; distributing dedicated booklets to the public at different stages ; and uploading the relevant topical studies reports, gist of discussions and video clips of various activities onto the URS Review website for public information.</li> <li>➤ Members of the Steering Committee (SC) have</li> </ul>

Serial Number	Key Points	Raised by	Responses
			<p>attended the public engagement activities in person at different stages of the Review. During the “Consensus Building” Stage, they also hosted the group discussions at the Workshop and exchanged views directly with the public during the Q&amp;A session of the Concluding Meeting.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>➤ Ten preliminary proposals have been put forwarded at the “Consensus Building” Stage for the purpose of informed discussion with the public on the specific details of the proposals. Having considered all the views received, the Administration has published the revised URS (Draft).</li> <li>➤ The text of the revised URS (Draft) is now published for public consultation. The public is welcome to give comments on the text of the revised URS.</li> </ul>
F-2	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>➤ A Consensus Building Workshop for the URS Review was organised by the DEVB on 15 May 2010. All the group discussions were led</li> </ul>	<p>民間共識聯署 民間聯合聲明 重建業主聯會暨</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>➤ At the Consensus Building Workshop held on 15 May 2010, seven SC Members and three members from the professional institutes acted as the group leaders at the Workshop. All of them who led the</li> </ul>

Serial Number	Key Points	Raised by	Responses
	<p>by the hosts arranged by the DEVB, who also wrote down the views and spoke on behalf of the groups and summed up the stance of the groups at the Workshop. However, some of the hosts simplified and distorted the views of the participants and thus the views of the public could not be reflected accurately.</p>	H19 關注組	<p>discussions on different topics held a neutral position and had a good understanding of the URS Review.</p>
F-3	<p>➤ Making the following requests to the LegCo Panel on Development :</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. Call on the Administration to give a detailed account of the various policy proposals put forward in the URS Review, and conduct a one-year public consultation exercise on the various policy proposals;</li> <li>2. Call on the Panel on Development to set up a</li> </ol>	民間共識聯署	<p>➤ Since the Review has been conducted for two years, the Secretary for Development made it clear at the meeting of the Panel on Development on 25 May 2010 that the review could not be extended for another 12 months.</p> <p>➤ The Panel on Development held a special meeting on 10 July 2010 to listen to the public views on the URS Review.</p>

Serial Number	Key Points	Raised by	Responses
	<p>sub-committee to examine and discuss various policy proposals put forward in the URS Review; and</p> <p>3. Call on the Panel on Development to hold a public hearing to listen to the initial responses and views of the community to the various policy proposals put forward by the DEVB.</p>		
F-4	<p>➤ Between February and March 2010, the URA spent \$160,000 to sponsor radio programmes so as to screen the audience and arrive at a “fake consensus”.</p>	<p>重建業主聯會暨 H19 關注組</p>	<p>➤ The advantage of sponsored radio programme is that we can have a bigger say in respect of the topics for discussion and the format or time slot of the programme. We need to emphasise that the primary objective of producing this series of radio programmes is to set up a platform to facilitate direct communication with the public and to allow the public to express their views. The radio programmes were mainly in the form of phone-ins</p>

Serial Number	Key Points	Raised by	Responses
			and we had not set any screening criteria or made any screening of the phone calls received. Members of the public were welcomed to freely express their views on various topics of urban renewal.
F-5	➤ The URS has been conducted for nearly two years but the property owners in the affected areas were not entitled to participate. The consensus it meant to arrive at is a false one.	K28 Concern Group	➤ Please refer to the responses above.
F-6	➤ The consultation process of the URS Review was an attempt to defer the reform and the need for accountability of the URA, and to disregard the urgency to amend the primary legislation of the Urban Renewal Authority Ordinance (URAO).	社區營造計劃	➤ The URS Review has been launched without any pre-determined agenda or conclusions. As a public organisation, the URA is bound by the URAO and has to report its operation and work progress to the Government and the LegCo regularly.
<b>Setting up of an independent mechanism and supervision of the URA</b>			

Serial Number	Key Points	Raised by	Responses
F-7	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>➤ Request for setting up of an “Assessment Committee” to assess the accuracy in calculation of the compensation value based on a 7-year old replacement flat by the URA and the setting up of an independent mechanism.</li> </ul>	重建業主聯會 重建業主聯會暨 H19 關注組 重建關注組	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>➤ The value per square foot of a 7-year old replacement flat is based on the assessment made by seven professional valuation firms. The rate is determined by removing the highest and the lowest valuations and taking an average of the remaining five valuations. The seven firms will be selected by open ballot to ensure that the mechanism is open, fair and just. The mechanism and its operation are transparent and independent, so it may not be necessary to set up an “Assessment Committee” to assess the accuracy in calculation of the compensation based on a 7-year old replacement flat by the URA.</li> </ul>
F-8	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>➤ Request for setting up of a “Supervisory Committee” to prevent the URA from abusing its power and financial resources.</li> </ul>	重建業主聯會 重建業主聯會暨 H19 關注組 重建關注組	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>➤ As a public organisation, the URA is governed by the URAO and it has to report its operation and work progress to the Government and the LegCo regularly.</li> </ul>
F-9	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>➤ The financial income of the URA should be under supervision. All of its incomes should be treated as</li> </ul>	Concluding Meeting 九龍城網絡	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>➤ Please refer to the responses above.</li> </ul>

Serial Number	Key Points	Raised by	Responses
	public money and the bonus mechanism for the management of the URA should be abandoned.		
F-10	➤ It is proposed to set up a compulsory mediation mechanism for the participation and negotiation in the urban renewal proceedings with a view to reducing disputes.	TPB	➤ A mediation mechanism may resolve disputes by negotiation and can help reduce disputes arising from urban renewal projects. The Administration is planning to launch a pilot mediation scheme by the end of the year.
F-11	➤ A member considered that urban renewal was essential to Hong Kong subject to the protection of the right of the property owners, and an open and transparent appeal mechanism should be put in place.	Public Affairs Forum	➤ There is an appeal mechanism for compulsory sale cases under certain specific circumstances.
F-12	➤ The Administration should establish a fair and reasonable valuation method to assess the value of the buildings in old districts, and provide an open and fair appeal mechanism to protect	Public Affairs Forum Timothy Ma	➤ Please refer to the responses above.

Serial Number	Key Points	Raised by	Responses
	the right of the property owners of old buildings. A member proposed that the Appeal Panel should comprise of District Councillors and representatives of non-government organisations.		
<b>Details of the Urban Renewal Projects</b>			
F-13	➤ It is proposed to incorporate greening and provide on-street art displays on streets in urban renewal projects.	TPB HKIP	➤ Thank you for the views. In recent years, environmental and greening elements have been incorporated into the URA's projects.
F-14	➤ In taking forward urban renewal, it should as far as possible provide additional recreation areas and create a cultural atmosphere as well as provide additional public open space so as to enhance and beautify the surrounding environment.	Public Affairs Forum HKIP	➤ In taking forward urban renewal, the URA will as far as possible provide open space and beautify the surrounding environment.
F-15	➤ A member indicated that in	Public Affairs	➤ In taking forward a redevelopment project, the

Serial Number	Key Points	Raised by	Responses
	<p>undertaking redevelopment, the URA only emphasised on the number of premises built or small-sized flats developed to commensurate with the purchasing power of the general public, and thus ignored the public aspiration for large-sized properties. A member considered that the URA's development should only be sold to local people and the number of flats each person allowed to purchase should be limited to one. A member agreed that the URA should work out a standard of reasonable living space of a person.</p>	Forum	<p>URA will work out the project design according to the actual circumstances such as the size and location of the site and the market demand.</p>
F-16	<p>➤ A member considered that the Government should take forward urban renewal projects systematically and provide tax incentive to encourage</p>	Public Affairs Forum	<p>➤ The proposed "District Urban Renewal Forum" (DURF) will help formulate the urban renewal blueprint of the district.</p>

Serial Number	Key Points	Raised by	Responses
	property-owners to participate in redevelopment, with a view to maintaining the characteristics of old districts and bringing benefits to tourism.		
F-17	➤ The redevelopment projects undertaken by the URA should not produce luxury apartments, and small and medium-sized flats should be provided.	Workshop H15 Concern Group 關注啓德居民組	➤ The URA intends to build modest and affordable flats in the Kai Tak site as the first batch of units for the “flat for flat” arrangement.
F-18	➤ It is proposed that the URA should fully consult the heritage preservation experts if it has demolition, redevelopment and preservation plans to avoid unpleasant incidents like the cases of Queen’s Pier in Central, Lee Tung Street (Wedding Card Street) in Wan Chai and Wing Lee Street.	Yang Mo	➤ Thank you for the views. In future, DURF would recommend the boundaries of the “urban renewal action areas” and the urban renewal strategy for the district through survey, research and public engagement activities, etc, including the buildings/areas to be rehabilitated, redeveloped or preserved, and district beautification, etc.
F-19	➤ Street characteristics should be preserved to retain the design	HKIP	➤ Thank you for the views.

Serial Number	Key Points	Raised by	Responses
	features of the city.		
<b>Others</b>			
F-20	➤ Demand an equal status for the stakeholders and the URA in the process of negotiation.	重建業主聯會暨 H19 關注組	➤ The revised URS (Draft) has explained that the URA should consider acquiring land by agreement.
F-21	➤ As far as the new URS is concerned, legislative amendment should be subject to scrutiny by the LegCo to ensure that property owners will not be exploited.	重建業主聯會暨 H19 關注組	➤ Please refer to the responses above.
F-22	➤ It is proposed that the “membership” should include an elected district councillor, a senior social worker and a resident (Chairman of an owners’ corporation.)	Yeung Kwok-wing	➤ It is uncertain whether the membership mentioned refers to that of DURF. If yes, please refer to the relevant responses above.
F-23	➤ The methodology of the telephone opinion poll and its credibility are being queried.	Concluding Meeting	➤ Representatives of the Telephone Survey Research Laboratory of the Hong Kong Institute of Asia-Pacific Studies of the Chinese University of

Serial Number	Key Points	Raised by	Responses
			Hong Kong have already responded to the queries at the Concluding Meeting.
F-24	➤ Request for providing information on the public engagement consultant and the telephone opinion poll.	Yeung Kwok-wing	➤ The Public Engagement consultant has responded to the request.
F-25	➤ Details of the implementation of the measures should be announced at the earliest for further study.	Cheung Yiu-tong	➤ The URA will work out the implementation details of the measures.
F-26	➤ An interim URS Review should be conducted two or three years later to ensure urban renewal can address the changing needs.	Cheung Yiu-tong	➤ The Government will review the URS on a regular basis.
F-27	➤ It is hoped that the Administration will closely monitor the implementation of the Land (Compulsory Sale for Redevelopment) Ordinance (LCSRO) and that it will be properly enforced to facilitate	DAB	➤ The Administration will closely monitor the implementation of the LCSRO.

Serial Number	Key Points	Raised by	Responses
	redevelopment of old districts.		
F-28	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>➤ The URA should be affiliated to the Hong Kong Housing Society (HKHS) to assist in urban renewal, and profit-making should not be accorded top priority.</li> </ul>	Concluding Meeting	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>➤ Urban renewal cannot be taken forward by one single organisation. Both the URA and the HKHS are important stakeholders in taking forward urban renewal projects and in implementing the urban renewal policy.</li> </ul>
F-29	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>➤ It is proposed that the URA should be the subsidiary of the Buildings Department.</li> </ul>	K28 Concern Group	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>➤ The DEVB is a policy bureau and the Buildings Department and the URA are the government department/statutory body under the DEVB's purview. Urban renewal cannot be taken forward by one single organisation. Both the URA and the HKHS are important stakeholders in taking forward urban renewal projects and in implementing the urban renewal policy.</li> </ul>
F-30	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>➤ Public engagement should start from schools. It is proposed that the broad concepts of urban renewal should be instilled to the students.</li> </ul>	Public Affairs Forum Timothy Ma	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>➤ Thank you for the views. The URA has published teaching materials on urban renewal.</li> </ul>
F-31	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>➤ The Government and the URA</li> </ul>	Chan Wah-yu	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>➤ Thank you for the views. The proposed DURF</li> </ul>

<b>Serial Number</b>	<b>Key Points</b>	<b>Raised by</b>	<b>Responses</b>
	<p>should proactively advocate initiatives which are conducive to the development of the district, such as measures to resolve over-centralisation of pedestrian flow in the district and the construction of high-speed lifts.</p>		<p>may advise the Administration on the revitalisation of old districts.</p>

## **Annex : List of Written Submissions (11 May 2010 to 10 July 2010)**

### **By post, email and by hand**

	<b><u>Name of Individuals/Deputations</u></b>	<b><u>Abbreviation Code</u></b>	<b><u>Date</u></b>	<b><u>Remarks</u></b>
1.	Chan Wah-yu(Kwun Tong District Council Member)	Chan Wah-yu	28 June 2010	
2.	Cheung Yiu-tong	Cheung Yiu-tong	17 May 2010	
3.	Cheung Yiu-tong	Cheung Yiu-tong	8 June 2010	
4.	Cheung Yiu-tong	Cheung Yiu-tong	14 June 2010	
5.	Concerning Urban Housing Rights Social Workers Alliance	Urban Social Workers Alliance	20 May 2010	The same letter was submitted to the LegCo Panel on Development and was discussed at the meeting on 25 May 2010.
6.	Designing Hong Kong	Designing HK	10 July 2010	
7.	H15 Concern Group	H15 Concern Group	16 May 2010	
8.	Hong Kong Institute of Planners	HKIP	30 June 2010	
# 9.	Hong Kong Institute of Surveyors	HKIS	30 June 2010	Submitted to the LegCo Panel on Development to serve as a public submission for the special meeting on 10 July 2010, which was copied to the Development Bureau (DEVB)

**By post, email and by hand**

<b><u>Name of Individuals/Deputations</u></b>	<b><u>Abbreviation Code</u></b>	<b><u>Date</u></b>	<b><u>Remarks</u></b>
10. Hong Kong Council of Social Services	HKCSS	3 June 2010	
11. 民間共識聯署	民間共識聯署	22 May 2010	Initiating Organisers include: 人民規劃行動、H15關注組 and 順寧道重建關注組 together with other joint deputations/individuals. The joint submission was discussed at the Panel on Development on 25 May 2010.
12. 民間聯合聲明	民間聯合聲明	5 June 2010	Submitted at the Concluding Meeting on 5 June 2010
13. K28 Concern Group	K28 Concern Group	15 May 2010	
14. K28 Concern Group	K28 Concern Group	3 June 2010	The same letter was re-submitted on 5 June 2010.
15. 江瑞祥	江瑞祥	28 June 2010	The same letter was re-submitted on 7 July 2010.
16. 九龍城關注啓德發展居民組	關注啓德居民組	15 May 2010	
17. 九龍城關注啓德發展居民組	關注啓德居民組	29 June 2010	
# 18. 九龍城區舊區網絡	九龍城網絡	26 June 2010	Submitted to the LegCo Panel on

**By post, email and by hand**

<b><u>Name of Individuals/Deputations</u></b>	<b><u>Abbreviation Code</u></b>	<b><u>Date</u></b>	<b><u>Remarks</u></b>
			Development to serve as a public submission for the special meeting on 10 July 2010, which was copied to the DEVB
19. Leung Yat-wing	Leung Yat-wing	15 May 2010	
20. Leung Yat-wing	Leung Yat-wing	6 June 2010	
21. 呂燊	呂燊	22 June 2010	
22. Timothy Ma	Timothy Ma	28 June 2010	
# 23. Real Estate Developers Association of Hong Kong	REDA	30 June 2010	Submitted to the LegCo Panel on Development to serve as a public submission for the special meeting on 10 July 2010, which was copied to the DEVB
# 24. Royal Institution of Chartered Surveyors (HK)	RICS	29 June 2010	Submitted to the LegCo Panel on Development to serve as a public submission for the special meeting on 10 July 2010, which was copied to the DEVB
25. Sin Fung-yee	Sin Fung-yee	14 June 2010	
26. 重建聯區業主聯會	重建業主聯會	17 May 2010	
27. 重建聯區業主聯會	重建業主聯會	10 July 2010	

**By post, email and by hand**

<b><u>Name of Individuals/Deputations</u></b>	<b><u>Abbreviation Code</u></b>	<b><u>Date</u></b>	<b><u>Remarks</u></b>
28. 重建聯區業主聯會暨 H19 業主 及租客權益關注組	重建業主聯會暨 H19 關注組	25 May 2010	Letter to the LegCo Panel on Development and submitted to the DEVB on 25 May 2010
29. 深水埗南昌街舊樓小業主	舊樓小業主	18 May 2010	5 similar letters were received subsequently
30. 士丹頓街及永利街重建租客組	H19 租客組	15 May 2010	
31. The Professional Commons	The Professional Commons	5 June 2010	
32. 姚麗英	姚麗英	26 June 2010	
33. Yau Yau	Yau Yau	6 June 2010	
34. Yeung Kwok-wing	Yeung Kwok-wing	31 May 2010	
35. Yeung Kwok-wing	Yeung Kwok-wing	1 June 2010	
36. Yeung Kwok-wing	Yeung Kwok-wing	3 June 2010	
37. Yeung Kwok-wing	Yeung Kwok-wing	5 June 2010	
38. Yeung Kwok-wing	Yeung	14 June 2010	

**By post, email and by hand**

<b><u>Name of Individuals/Deputations</u></b>	<b><u>Abbreviation Code</u></b>	<b><u>Date</u></b>	<b><u>Remarks</u></b>
	Kwok-wing		
39. Yeung Kwok-wing	Yeung Kwok-wing	14 June 2010	
40. Yeung Kwok-wing	Yeung Kwok-wing	15 June 2010	
41. Yeung Kwok-wing	Yeung Kwok-wing	19 June 2010	
42. Yeung Kwok-wing	Yeung Kwok-wing	25 June 2010	
43. Yeung Kwok-wing	Yeung Kwok-wing	30 June 2010	
# 44. Yeung Kwok-wing	Yeung Kwok-wing	6 July 2010	Submitted to the LegCo Panel on Development to serve as a public submission for the special meeting on 10 July 2010, which was copied to the DEVB
45. Yeung Kwok-wing	Yeung Kwok-wing	8 July 2010	
		Sub-total	45 submissions

## **URS Review Website e-forum**

<b><u>Name of Individuals/Deputations</u></b>	<b><u>Abbreviation Code</u></b>	<b><u>Date</u></b>	<b><u>Remarks</u></b>
46. CC	CC	6 June 2010	
47. David So	David So	11 June 2010	
48. Democratic Alliance for Betterment of Hong Kong	DAB	25 June 2010	
49. Lam Chi Kam	Lam Chi Kam	9 July 2010	
50. MR. To	MR To	28 June 2010	
51. Ms F	Ms F	27 June 2010	
52. 十三街的八十後	十三街的八十後	23 May 2010	
53. 月鳥	月鳥	16 June 2010	
		Sub-total	8 submissions

## **Public Affairs Forum**

<b><u>Name of Individuals/Deputations</u></b>	<b><u>Abbreviation Code</u></b>	<b><u>Date</u></b>	<b><u>Remarks</u></b>
54. Public Affairs Forum	Public Affairs Forum	19 May 2010 to 2 July 2010	A total of 28 voice mails

## **Public Affairs Forum**

<b><u>Name of Individuals/Deputations</u></b>	<b><u>Abbreviation Code</u></b>	<b><u>Date</u></b>	<b><u>Remarks</u></b>
---------------------------------------------------	-------------------------------------	--------------------	-----------------------

Sub-total 28 submissions

## **Public Submissions for the Special Meeting of the LegCo Panel on Development (10 July 2010)**

<b><u>Name of Individuals/Deputations</u></b>	<b><u>Abbreviation Code</u></b>	<b><u>Date</u></b>	<b><u>Remarks</u></b>
55. A member of the public	A member of the public	1 June 2010	
56. Cheung Sin-yee	Cheung Sin-yee	July 2010	
57. Cheung Yiu-tong	Cheung Yiu-tong	7 July 2010	
58. 關注舊區住屋權益社工聯席	舊區社工聯席	30 June 2010	
59. 社區營造計劃	社區營造計劃	July 2010	
60. 觀塘新隆大樓業主立案法團	新隆樓立案法團	10 July 2010	
61. H15 Concern Group	H15 Concern Group	July 2010	
62. Hong Kong Institute of Land Administration	HKILA	June 2010	
63. Hong Kong Institute of Planners	HKIP	30 June 2010	
64. K28 Concern Group	K28 Concern Group	25 June 2010	

**Public Submissions for the Special Meeting of the LegCo Panel on Development (10 July 2010)**

	<b><u>Name of Individuals/Deputations</u></b>	<b><u>Abbreviation Code</u></b>	<b><u>Date</u></b>	<b><u>Remarks</u></b>
65.	Lee Wai-yi	Lee Wai-yi	10 July 2010	
66.	凌鳳霞	凌鳳霞	10 July 2010	
67.	Pun Chi-man (Kowloon City District Council Member)	Pun Chi-man	24 June 2010	
68.	重建關注組	重建關注組	10 July 2010	
69.	Shun Ning Road Support Group	Shun Ning Road Support Group	July 2010	
70.	South Tokwawan Concern Group	South Tokwawan Concern Group	July 2010	
71.	The Professional Commons	The Professional Commons	July 2010	
72.	Yeung Kwok-wing	Yeung Kwok-wing	15 June 2010	
73.	Iu Siu-yung	Iu Siu-yung	25 June 2010	
74.	Io Ching-po	Io Ching-po	July 2010	
75.	Yeung Wai-sing (Eastern District Council Member)	Yeung Wai-sing	8 June 2010	
76.	Yang Mo (Southern District Council Member)	Yang Mo	11 June 2010	
				Sub-total 22 submissions

- Note 1: The above written submissions are listed in alphabetical order.
- Note 2: A total of 27 public submissions have been received for the Special Meeting of the LegCo Panel on Development (10 July 2010), five of which were copied to the DEVB which are marked with a “#” in the column “By post, email and by hand”.
- Note 3: A total of 103 written submissions, together with 93 opinion forms from the Workshop and the Concluding Meeting, have been received.