

立法會
Legislative Council

LC Paper No. CB(1)117/17-18(05)

Ref: CB1/PL/DEV

Panel on Development

Meeting on 31 October 2017

Updated background brief on heritage conservation initiatives

Purpose

This paper provides background information on the Administration's heritage conservation initiatives and summarizes the views and concerns expressed by Members on the subject at meetings of the Legislative Council ("LegCo"), the Panel on Development ("DEV Panel") and other relevant committees/subcommittees since the 2012-2013 legislative session.

Heritage conservation policy promulgated in 2007

2. The Development Bureau ("DEVB") took over the policy responsibility on heritage conservation from the Home Affairs Bureau with effect from 1 July 2007. On 10 October 2007, DEVB issued a LegCo Brief which promulgated a new heritage conservation policy in the light of growing awareness of heritage conservation in the community.¹ The new policy objective was set out as follows:

"To protect, conserve and revitalize as appropriate historical and heritage sites and buildings through relevant and sustainable approaches for the benefit and enjoyment of present and future generations. In implementing this policy, due regard should be given to development needs in the public interest, respect for private property rights, budgetary considerations, cross-sector collaboration and active engagement of stakeholders and the general public."

¹ Source: LegCo Brief on Heritage Conservation Policy ([File Ref: DEVB\(CR\)\(W\) 1-55/68/01](#))

3. The LegCo Brief also outlined a package of administrative measures to implement the policy, including the requirement for new capital works projects to undergo heritage impact assessments, the initiative to encourage an adaptive re-use of government-owned historic buildings by non-profit making organizations ("NPOs"), setting up the Commissioner for Heritage's Office, devising appropriate measures to facilitate the conservation of privately-owned historic buildings, extending the financial assistance schemes to enhance the maintenance of such buildings, as well as examining the need for setting up a heritage trust.

The Administration's work on heritage conservation and relevant discussions in the committees of LegCo

4. The Administration has been providing periodic reports on its heritage conservation efforts to DEV Panel since 2008. It has also sought the views of the Panel on individual proposals, including public works projects related to revitalization of historic buildings and redevelopment proposals, from time to time. Highlights of the Administration's work in this aspect in recent years, and Members' views expressed thereon are summarized in the ensuing paragraphs.

The Revitalizing Historic Buildings Through Partnership Scheme

5. The Revitalizing Historic Buildings Through Partnership Scheme ("the Revitalization Scheme") was launched in February 2008 to preserve and put historic government-owned buildings into good and innovative use, promote active public participation in the conservation of historic buildings, and create job opportunities at the district level. Under the Revitalization Scheme, the Administration will finance the restoration and conversion of the historic buildings and provide one-off grants to meet the operating deficits, if any, of the NPOs selected to undertake the revitalization projects for the first two years of operation at a ceiling of \$5 million for each project. Information about the progress of projects under the various batches of the Revitalization Scheme is in **Appendix I**.

Selection of non-profit making organizations for implementing the revitalization projects

6. At the meeting of DEV Panel on 3 December 2014, the Administration briefed Panel members on the funding proposals for revitalizing three government-owned historic buildings, namely the Bridges

Street Market, the Former Fanling Magistracy and the Haw Par Mansion,² under Batch III of the Revitalization Scheme. Some members were concerned about the fairness of the process and the appropriateness of the criteria for assessing the applications from NPOs under the Revitalization Scheme.

7. The Administration advised that the Advisory Committee on Revitalization of Historic Buildings ("ACRHB"),³ comprising members from diverse fields including historical research, architecture and social enterprise, was responsible for assessing the applications based on the following five criteria, namely (a) reflection of historical value and significance; (b) technical aspects; (c) social value and social enterprise operation; (d) financial viability; and (e) management capability and other considerations. The selection process was conducted through a competitive process similar to a tender exercise. The three successful applicants were selected for implementing the revitalization projects mentioned in paragraph 6 because they had obtained passing scores in all of the above five aspects, and they had received the highest overall scores among all other proposals.⁴

Repair and maintenance responsibilities

8. Taking in view that the restoration and maintenance of historic buildings would incur substantial costs, some members stressed the importance of a clear demarcation of the repair and maintenance responsibilities for the revitalized buildings between NPOs and the Administration. Furthermore, a mechanism should be in place to resolve the disputes, if any, over such responsibilities.

9. The Administration advised that according to the Guide to Application of Revitalization Scheme, the Administration should be responsible for the repair and maintenance of the structure of the historic buildings, as well as undisturbed slopes and/or undisturbed retaining walls within the sites. Other than these, the selected NPOs should be responsible

² These three buildings will be transformed into Hong Kong News-Expo, the Hong Kong Federation of Youth Groups Institute for Leadership Development and Haw Par Music Farm respectively.

³ ACRHB was formed by the Administration in 2008 to, among others, help assess applications under the Revitalization Scheme. Upon expiry of the term of office of ACRHB in May 2016, its work has been taken up by the Advisory Committee on Built Heritage Conservation.

⁴ Source: [LC Paper No. CB\(1\)706/14-15\(01\)](#)

for the repair and maintenance of all buildings and areas within the sites. Prior to the NPO's moving into a historic building to commence operation, the Administration would provide funding support to cover the cost for major renovation to the historic building in accordance with the approved proposal. In this connection, major maintenance problems would unlikely arise during the first few years of operation. The Administration assured members that the Architectural Services Department would provide professional and technical advice on matters relating to the maintenance of government-owned historic buildings, and the Commissioner for Heritage's Office under DEVB would facilitate the coordination between NPOs and relevant government departments on such matters.

Public access to the revitalized historic buildings

10. When examining the funding proposals on the revitalization projects mentioned in paragraph 6, some members of the Public Works Subcommittee expressed concern about whether the public would be allowed free access to the revitalized historic buildings. They considered that these buildings should be open to the public free of charge and the opening hours should be flexible enough to facilitate public visits.

11. The Administration advised that the opening hours of a historic building depended on its location and how it would be used after revitalization. The Administration committed that the revitalized Former Fanling Magistracy and the revitalized Haw Par Mansion would be open to the public free of charge seven days a week, while the revitalized Bridges Street Market would be open to the public free of charge six days a week, i.e. Tuesday to Sunday.

Effectiveness of the Revitalization Scheme

12. At the meeting of DEV Panel on 21 June 2016, members asked about the outcome of the Revitalization Scheme so far. In response, the Administration said that, in general, the projects under the Scheme had achieved satisfactory results. Based on the performance of the organizations engaged in the projects under Batch I, the Administration was negotiating with these organizations to renew their tenancies.

Statutory monument declaration system

13. According to the Antiquities and Monuments Ordinance ("A&MO") (Cap. 53), the Antiquities Authority ("AA"), i.e. the Secretary for Development ("SDEV") may, after consulting the Antiquities Advisory Board ("AAB") and with the approval of the Chief Executive ("CE") as

well as the publication of a notice in the Gazette, legally declare a place/building a monument. AA is then empowered to prevent alterations, or to impose conditions upon any proposed alterations as he/she thinks fit, in order to protect the monument. There are currently a total of 114 declared monuments in Hong Kong.⁵

Ho Tung Gardens and Hung Lau

14. Ho Tung Gardens was a privately-owned historic building. In recognition of its high heritage and architectural value, Ho Tung Gardens was confirmed as a Grade 1 historic building and declared a proposed monument under A&MO in January 2011. The Antiquities and Monuments (Declaration of Proposed Monument) (Ho Tung Gardens) Notice ("Ho Tung Gardens Notice"), which was published in the Gazette on 28 January 2011, gave Ho Tung Gardens the statutory protection during the 12-month period from the gazettal date, and hence allowed the Administration more time for further discussion with the owner on preservation options. A Subcommittee was formed to study the Ho Tung Gardens Notice. While the Subcommittee generally welcomed the Notice, it considered that members' concerns regarding the need for a holistic and sustainable policy to preserve privately-owned historic buildings, including a fair and transparent compensation and economic incentive policy, should be referred to DEV Panel for consideration.⁶

15. In the end, the Administration was unable to reach an agreement with the owner of Ho Tung Gardens over the financial compensation in accordance with A&MO or other "preservation-cum-development" proposals. In October 2011, the then SDEV, in her capacity as AA, announced her intention to declare Ho Tung Gardens a monument on a permanent basis. However, having considered the objection made by the owner and all the relevant factors, the then SDEV announced in December 2012 that the CE in Council directed not to pursue the monument declaration. As a result, the mansion of Ho Tung Gardens was removed to make way for private redevelopment.⁷

16. As for the case of Hung Lau in Tuen Mun, which was accorded Grade 1 status in 1981 and has maintained the status since then, the

⁵ A full list of declared monuments is available at [the website of the Antiquities and Monuments Office](#).

⁶ Source: [LC paper No. CB\(1\)1459/10-11](#)

⁷ Source: Report on the Policy Review on Conservation of Built Heritage

Antiquities and Monuments (Declaration of Proposed Monument) (Hung Lau) Notice ("Hung Lau Notice") was published in the Gazette on 13 March 2017 seeking to declare Hung Lau as a proposed monument for the purposes of A&MO. The Hung Lau Notice allowed time for the Administration to discuss with the owner, i.e. Goodberg Limited, on possible preservation options, and temporarily protected Hung Lau from demolition threat for 12 months from the gazettal date. It also enabled AA to consider in a comprehensive manner whether or not the historic building should be declared as a monument on a permanent basis.

17. A Subcommittee was formed to study the Hung Lau Notice. In the light of the high historical value of Hung Lau, in particular its location in the former Castle Peak Farm which was an area closely connected with revolutionary activities led by Dr SUN Yat-sen in the 1900s, the Subcommittee generally supported the Hung Lau Notice. Members were keen to ensure that the Government and AAB would follow up the issues relating to the declaration of Hung Lau as a monument proactively during the aforementioned 12-month period. The Subcommittee passed a motion urging the Antiquities and Monuments Office ("AMO") to conduct an independent expert study on the cultural landscape and heritage value of Hung Lau and, prior to the expiry of the proposed monument declaration, submit the findings to DEV Panel for discussion, and to AAB for consideration as to whether Hung Lau should be declared as a monument.

18. The Administration pointed out that consultancies were commissioned in the case of Ho Tung Gardens to fully assess its heritage value. Yet, unlike Ho Tung Gardens, AMO had in the past few decades studied all materials available on Hung Lau in assessing its heritage value. Meanwhile, AMO would conduct in-depth study on the heritage value of Hung Lau. AMO would submit the updated appraisal report on Hung Lau to AAB. Moreover, in accordance with section 3(1) of A&MO, the Administration would consult AAB on whether AA should declare Hung Lau as a monument. Should AA declare a building as monument by notice in the Gazette, the notice, which was a subsidiary legislation, would be subject to negative vetting by LegCo.

Expansion of heritage conservation from buildings to streets and areas

19. Two declaration notices were published in the Gazette in November and December 2013 to respectively declare the Bethanie and the Cenotaph, and Tat Tak Communal Hall and Fat Tat Tong monuments. Two Subcommittees were formed to examine these two declaration notices. While supporting the Administration to declare these four places monuments in recognition of their heritage merits and architectural values,

the Subcommittees expressed concerns that under A&MO, emphasis was put on the conservation of specific historic buildings, but not their respective surrounding areas. The Subcommittees considered that the Administration should expand the scope of heritage conservation from buildings (point) to streets (line) and surrounding areas (plane), and enhance the cross-departmental coordination work involved. The Subcommittees also noted that a policy review on the conservation of built heritage was underway and the review would cover the issue of adopting the "point-line-plane" approach in heritage conservation.⁸

Grading of historic buildings

20. AAB, having regard to the assessments of the heritage value of individual historic buildings by an independent Expert Panel, the views and information received from members of the public and the owners of the buildings concerned during public consultation exercises, accords Grade 1, Grade 2 or Grade 3 status to individual historic buildings.⁹ The grading system is administrative in nature and does not provide historic buildings with statutory protection. 1 444 historic buildings have been proposed for grading by AAB as a result of a public consultation exercise conducted in 2009. Over 200 other suggestions for grading some other items have been received from the public. Up to December 2016, AAB has confirmed the grading of 1 342 historic buildings.¹⁰

21. In response to members' enquiries regarding the details about the mechanism of re-assessment of the grading of a historic building if members of the public were dissatisfied with the grading endorsed by AAB, the Administration advised that under the current mechanism, AAB might consider reviewing the grading status of a historic building subject to the validity of the new information provided by the public.

Conservation of graded historic buildings in the private domain

22. In consultation with AAB, the Administration has been reaching out

⁸ Sources: LC Papers Nos. [CB\(1\)642/13-14](#) and [CB\(1\)929/13-14](#)

⁹ Grade 1 buildings refer to those of outstanding merit, which every effort should be made to preserve if possible. Grade 2 buildings are those of special merit and should be selectively preserved, and Grade 3 buildings are of some merit, preservation of which in some form would be desirable; alternative means could be considered if preservation is not practicable. Source: [AMO's website](#)

¹⁰ Source: [LC Paper No. CB\(1\)439/16-17\(03\)](#). Details of these historic buildings and their proposed/confirmed gradings are available at [AMO's website](#).

to private owners offering them a wide range of assistance including technical advice and financial assistance in the maintenance of historic buildings, as well as economic incentives for heritage-cum-development projects to encourage the preservation of historic buildings.

23. The Financial Assistance for Maintenance Scheme was launched in August 2008 to provide assistance to owners of privately-owned graded historic buildings for carrying out maintenance works. The amount of grant for each successful application will be determined based on the justifications provided by the applicant. Since November 2016, the grant ceiling has been increased from \$1 million to \$2 million for each works project, and the scope has been expanded to cover not only privately-owned graded historic buildings but also government-owned declared monuments and graded historic buildings leased to NPOs. Up to end-August 2017, a total of 54 applications to the Scheme have been approved and 35 applications are being processed.¹¹

24. Panel members noted in AAB's report on the policy review on conservation of built heritage that it did not recommend a mandatory purchase or resumption of privately-owned historic buildings, while the Administration would provide financial assistance to facilitate private owners to carry out timely maintenance works to protect historic buildings. They enquired if the Administration would proactively approach the private owner(s) concerned and provide them with economic incentives to preserve their buildings.

25. The Administration advised that it had established an internal mechanism to monitor any demolition of/alterations to declared monuments/proposed monuments or graded buildings/buildings proposed to be graded. Under the mechanism, the Buildings Department ("BD"), the Lands Department and Planning Department would alert the Commissioner for Heritage's Office of DEVB and AMO regarding any identified possible threat that had been brought to the departments' attention in the normal course of duty. The monitoring mechanism enabled the Commissioner for Heritage's Office and AMO to take timely follow-up actions with the private owners concerned. However, some private owners might not be interested in discussing the preservation options with the Administration.

Reassembly of the Queen's Pier

26. Some Panel members expressed concern on the Administration's plan to reassemble the Queen's Pier between Central Piers Nos. 9 and 10 instead

¹¹ Source: [The Government's website on heritage conservation](#)

of at its original location. They considered that the Administration's plan was contrary to the purpose of heritage conservation, and called on the Administration to reassemble the Queen's Pier in-situ.

27. The Administration advised that, according to the Civil Engineering and Development Department, reassembly of the Queen's Pier at its original location at the current juncture was impractical from an engineering perspective, as the reassembly works at the original location would be in conflict with a number of existing or planned infrastructures, including that Lung Wo Road would need to be realigned, the existing box culvert underneath would need to be modified, and serious restrictions would be imposed on the planned overrun tunnel for various MTR lines, as well as the future development of Site 4 of the new Central harbourfront. Moreover, as the reassembly at the original location would involve the abovementioned works and additional advance works for the overrun tunnel, higher costs were expected. The Administration had to take into account these relevant factors when considering the in-situ reassembly option.

Policy review on the conservation of built heritage launched in 2014

28. In view of the challenges for the conservation of built heritage, in particular those privately-owned historic buildings, DEVB has invited AAB to assist it in conducting a policy review on the conservation of built heritage. A two-month public consultation on the subject matter was launched in June 2014 on the following major issues: how to enhance protection for historic buildings while giving due regard to private property rights and development needs, how to share the cost of conservation, and the amount of resources the community is prepared to invest in conservation work.¹²

Statutory grading system

29. During the public consultation period, DEV Panel was consulted on the policy review at its meeting held on 24 June 2014. Some members expressed disappointment that in the consultation paper, there was no proposal on setting up a mechanism to upgrade graded historic buildings to statutory monuments.

30. AAB advised that on setting up a mechanism to turn Grade 1 historic buildings into statutory monuments, the issue of whether and how much

¹² Source: [AAB's press release issued on 4 June 2014](#)

public money should be expensed on preserving privately-owned built heritage had to be discussed. Under the policy review, the public were consulted on whether it was necessary to give statutory effects to the grading system to offer more protection for historic buildings. Such statutory effects would have an implication on the right to private property ownership.

Heritage trust

31. Some members expressed concern about the lack of progress of setting up a heritage trust. They considered it important to decide as soon as possible whether a heritage trust should be established to make use of public money to purchase privately-owned built heritage and urged the Administration to put forward a proposal for public discussion.

32. The Administration advised that it had commissioned a consultancy study on the feasibility for setting up a statutory heritage trust and the consultancy report recommended the Administration to set up a trust with an initial injection of \$900 million. The Administration held the view that the recommended amount appeared to be on the low side in meeting the aspiration of the community in protecting and maintaining privately-owned built heritage. As the heritage trust was a major component in the conservation of privately-owned built heritage, some issues mentioned in the consultancy report required further discussion and consultation. As such, the issue had been included in the policy review. The Administration considered it important for the public to reach a consensus on whether to set up a trust and the amount of public money to be injected into the trust.

Recommendations of the policy review

33. AAB completed the policy review on the conservation of built heritage in December 2014 and submitted the relevant report to the Administration. It recommended, among other things: (a) examining the setting up of a statutory grading system for the protection of graded building while safeguarding private property rights; (b) establishing a dedicated fund on conservation of built heritage; (c) exploring the feasibility of conserving and protecting selected building cluster(s) of unique heritage value under the "point-line-plane" approach; (d) consolidating and scaling up the existing economic incentives to attract private owners to conserve their historic buildings; (e) reviewing and, if necessary, amending the Buildings Ordinance (Cap. 123), the relevant Practice Note(s) and the Practice Guidebook for Conservation of Historic Buildings in order to encourage and facilitate private owners of historic buildings to preserve and adaptively re-use their buildings; and (f) stepping

up efforts in public engagement and consultation on issues concerning built heritage conservation.

34. As to whether public funds should be used to purchase or resume privately-owned historic buildings, AAB considered that, given the diverse views in the community on this option, it should not be pursued. Instead, the Administration should provide more attractive economic incentives such as financial assistance, relaxation of plot ratio and land exchange, to facilitate private owners to carry out timely maintenance works and protect historic buildings. The recommendations made by AAB are listed in **Appendix II**.¹³

The Administration's response to the recommendations of the policy review

35. Subsequent to the release of the policy review report by AAB, DEVB established inter-departmental task forces to study and follow up the recommendations listed in the report. The Administration announced in December 2015 that it had formally accepted the recommendations. According to the Administration,¹⁴ to take forward the recommendations, BD will update, by phases in 2016, the Practice Note and the Practice Guidebook for Conservation of Historic Buildings to provide clearer guidelines to private owners and the industry. The Administration will also carry out a pilot study on the "point-line-plane" approach for conservation.

36. In his 2016 Policy Address, the then CE announced that the Administration would earmark \$500 million to establish a dedicated fund on conservation of built heritage ("the Fund"). The Fund will finance the Revitalization Scheme and the Financial Assistance for Maintenance Scheme for historic buildings. It will also provide subsidies for public education, community involvement and publicity activities, and academic research.¹⁵

37. At the Council meeting of 27 January 2016, when replying to Members' questions about the operation of the Fund, the Administration advised that it had no plan at the present stage to expand the scope of the Fund after its establishment for the purpose of purchasing privately-owned buildings with conservation value, given the insufficiency of the amount of

¹³ Source: Report on the Policy Review on Conservation of Built Heritage

¹⁴ Source: [The Government's press release issued on 19 December 2015](#)

¹⁵ Source: [LC Paper No. CB\(1\)452/15-16\(03\)](#)

\$500 million for the said purpose and the diverse views in the community on the issue.¹⁶

38. The Administration announced on 22 April 2016 the appointment of a new Advisory Committee on Built Heritage Conservation ("ACBHC") with effect from 15 May 2016. ACBHC is formed to advise the Administration on the operation of the Fund.¹⁷

Latest developments

39. On 29 May 2016, a portion of Block 4 (i.e. the former married inspectors' quarters) of the Central Police Station ("CPS") Compound collapsed. The CPS Compound is a declared monument and one of the projects under the Administration's "Conserving Central" initiative.¹⁸ The Hong Kong Jockey Club ("HKJC") is taking forward the CPS Compound project in partnership with the Administration with a view to revitalizing the Compound into a centre for heritage, art and leisure.¹⁹ On 31 May 2017, BD released the investigation report on the incident.²⁰ According to the Administration, the investigation findings revealed that the collapse was most likely attributable to the hollowing out of multiple pockets in brick piers and brick walls for the installation of steel members for the timber floor strengthening works of the first floor of the verandah. BD believed that the failure of one of the internal brick piers due to

¹⁶ Please refer to the [Hansard](#) of the Council meeting of 27 January 2016 (p. 4152-4161).

¹⁷ Dr LAU Chi-pang was appointed the Chairman of ACBHC. The work of ACBHC includes (a) assessing new applications and monitor existing projects under the Revitalization Scheme; (b) monitoring the operation of the Financial Assistance for Maintenance Scheme for historic buildings; and (c) advising the Administration on funding support for public education, community involvement and publicity activities, academic research, consultancy and technical studies relating to the conservation of built heritage. ACBHC comprises the Chairman, 14 non-official members in the fields of historical research, architecture, etc., and three official members. Source: [The Government's press release issued on 22 April 2016](#)

¹⁸ Information about the "Conserving Central" initiative can be found in [LC Paper No. CB\(1\)1666/09-10\(05\)](#) and Annex B to [LC Paper No. CB\(1\)987/14-15\(05\)](#).

¹⁹ HKJC will fund the capital cost of the project and all operating deficits until the project is financially self-sustainable. The construction works commenced in November 2011 and were originally scheduled for completion by phases in early 2016.

²⁰ Source: [The Government's press release issued on 31 May 2017](#)

significant loss of sectional bearing area might have triggered the collapse incident.

40. At the meeting to be held on 31 October 2017, the Administration will update the Panel on the progress made on a number of heritage conservation initiatives since its last report in June 2016 and invite members' views on the future work on heritage conservation.

Relevant papers

41. A list of relevant papers with their hyperlinks is in **Appendix III**.

Council Business Division 1
Legislative Council Secretariat
25 October 2017

Appendix I

**Progress of projects under the Revitalization Historic Buildings
Through Partnership Scheme (as at 21 June 2017)**

No.	Historic building	Name of project	Capital cost (\$ million) (money of the day prices)	Financial support ⁽¹⁾ (\$ million)	Current status	Commissioning date of the project
Batch I						
1.	Former North Kowloon Magistracy	Savannah College of Art and Design (Hong Kong)	Not required	Not required	Completed and in operation	September 2010
2.	Old Tai O Police Station	Tai O Heritage Hotel	69.13	Not required		March 2012
3.	Lui Seng Chun	Hong Kong Baptist University School of Chinese Medicine – Lui Seng Chun	29.16	2.56		April 2012
4.	Fong Yuen Study Hall	The Yuen Yuen Institute "Fong Yuen Study Hall" Tourism and Chinese Cultural Centre cum Ma Wan Residents Museum	10.71	2.96		March 2013
5.	Mei Ho House	YHA Mei Ho House Youth Hostel	220.33	5		October 2013
6.	Former Lai Chi Kok Hospital	Jao Tsung-I Academy	270.31	4.57		February 2014

No.	Historic building	Name of project	Capital cost (\$ million) (money of the day prices)	Financial support ⁽¹⁾ (\$ million)	Current status	Commissioning date of the project
Batch II						
7.	Old Tai Po Police Station	The Green Hub for Sustainable Living	58	1.84	Completed and in operation	August 2015
8.	Stone Houses	Stone Houses Family Garden	45.6	2.33		October 2015
9.	Blue House Cluster (Blue House, Yellow House and Orange House)	Viva Blue House	79.4	4.17	The works of Yellow House and Orange House were completed in March 2016 and the works of Blue House are expected to be completed by April 2017	May 2016 (Yellow House and Orange House) and 3 rd quarter 2017 (Blue House)
Batch III						
10.	Former Fanling Magistracy	The Hong Kong Federation of Youth Groups Institute for Leadership Development	120.5	3.05	Renovation works commenced in June 2016	1 st quarter 2018
11.	Haw Par Mansion	Haw Par Music Farm	176.6	4.28		2 nd quarter 2018
12.	Bridges Street Market	Hong Kong News-Expo	90.6	5		

No.	Historic building	Name of project	Estimated Capital cost (\$ million)	Financial support ⁽¹⁾ (\$ million)	Current status	Commissioning date of the project
Batch IV⁽²⁾						
13.	No. 12 School Street	Tai Hang Fire Dragon Heritage Centre	47.13	1.71 (expected)	Renovation works are expected to be commenced in 4 th quarter 2017 subject to funding approval of the Finance Committee	2 nd quarter 2019
14.	Lady Ho Tung Welfare Centre	Lady Ho Tung Welfare Centre Eco-Learn Institute	46.40	3.66 (expected)		3 rd quarter 2019
15.	Old Dairy Farm Senior Staff Quarters	The Pokfulam Farm	65.36	3.71 (expected)		4 th quarter 2019
16.	King Yin Lei	No revitalization proposal was selected ⁽³⁾	Not applicable			
Batch V						
Batch V of the Revitalization Scheme was launched in November 2016 and the selection results would be announced in due course. The five historic buildings are Roberts Block, Old Victoria Barracks in Central; Luen Wo Market in Fanling; the Former Lau Fau Shan Police Station in Yuen Long; Watervale House, Former Gordon Hard Camp in Tuen Mun and Fong Yuen Study Hall in Tsuen Wan.						
Total government subsidy			1,329.23	44.84		

Notes: (1) The Administration will provide a one-off grant to cover startup costs and operating deficits (if any) of the social enterprises for a maximum of the first two years of operation at a ceiling of \$5 million per project.

(2) Batch IV of the Revitalization Scheme was launched in December 2013 and the selection results were announced in June 2015.

(3) The then Advisory Committee on Revitalization of Historic Buildings did not select any proposal for revitalizing King Yin Lei. The Secretary for Development has accepted the Advisory Committee's recommendation that King Yin Lei will not be included in the next batch of the Revitalization Scheme as a suitable proposal that can meet the selection thresholds may not be identified even if the item is re-launched in the next batch. Instead, King Yin Lei will be managed by the Administration and opened for public enjoyment. The Development Bureau is examining the long-term use of King Yin Lei and will announce the details in due course.

(Source: [The Government's website on heritage conservation](#))

**Recommendations of
the Report on the Policy Review on Conservation of Built Heritage**

Protecting historic buildings

1. (a) To better utilize the existing mechanism in providing incentives and facilitation to owners of graded buildings with a view to providing timely maintenance to avoid dilapidation and reducing the risk of large-scale alteration of graded buildings.
- (b) To examine the setting up of a statutory grading system in the longer run for the protection of graded buildings with safeguarding private property rights.
2. Mandatory purchase or resumption of privately-owned historic buildings should not be pursued. Public money should not be used directly to purchase privately-owned historic buildings. To provide more attractive economic incentives such as financial assistance, relaxation of plot ratio and land exchange, to facilitate private owners to carry out timely maintenance works and protect historic buildings.
3. (a) As the first step, to conduct a study to explore the feasibility of conserving and protecting selected building cluster(s) of unique heritage value under the "point-line-plane" approach.
- (b) In the medium term, to arrange thematic surveys, or mapping exercises, on building cluster(s) of heritage value for drawing up appropriate conservation strategies and protection measures if necessary, and for future planning.
4. To review and, if necessary, amend the Buildings Ordinance, the relevant Practice Note(s) and the Practice Guidebook in order to encourage and facilitate private owners of historic buildings to preserve and adaptively re-use their buildings. These measures should not jeopardize building safety and health standards.

Resources for protecting historic buildings

5. To set up a dedicated fund on conservation of built heritage to provide funding for public education and publicity work as well as academic research undertaken by non-government organizations and other bodies to enhance the understanding and awareness of the public on built heritage conservation; to cover certain government initiatives and activities on built heritage conservation, such as the revitalization of historic buildings and promotion on the importance of timely maintenance to the owners to avoid dilapidation. The fund should not be used to purchase or resume privately-owned historic buildings.
6. To consolidate and scale up the existing economic incentives to attract private owners to conserve their historic buildings, such as adopting the "preservation-cum-development" approach. The incentives should be offered through a more formalized, systematic and well-publicized mechanism and according to the scale, building conditions and heritage value of the privately-owned historic buildings.

Public participation in built heritage conservation

7. To build on the existing public education and publicity work to enhance the understanding and awareness of the public (including private owners of historic buildings) on the conservation of built heritage, such as the importance of timely and proper maintenance for historic buildings to avoid dilapidation. Assistance to non-government organizations and other bodies to undertake this could be supported by the proposed built heritage fund. More creative means such as electronic platforms and innovative devices could be explored.
8. To step up efforts in public engagement and consultation on issues concerning built heritage conservation. On individual conservation projects and issues at the district level, the community could be better consulted through collaboration with partners including District Councils and other non-government organizations. Assistance to non-government organizations and other bodies to undertake this could be supported by the proposed built heritage fund. The Antiquities Advisory Board would continue to advise the Antiquities Authority on policies and territory-wide subjects following thorough public consultation and engagement.

9. (a) For government-owned historic buildings, to provide public access as far as practicable.
- (b) For privately-owned graded buildings, where there is owners' consent, to ensure that certain form of public access is available, such as access to the physical buildings or through certain records.
- (c) To allow flexibility on the requirements on public access to privately-owned graded buildings receiving financial assistance from the Government for preservation and/or maintenance, if it is justified on grounds such as privacy or building stability.
- (d) To prepare detailed records of historic buildings with the aid of new technology where appropriate. The records should be easily accessible by the public.

(Source: Report on the Policy Review on Conservation of Built Heritage)

Heritage conservation initiatives

List of relevant papers

Council/Committee	Date of meeting	Paper
Panel on Development	26 February 2013	<p>Administration's paper on "Progress Report on Heritage Conservation Initiatives" [LC Paper No. CB(1)580/12-13(09)]</p> <p>Administration's follow-up paper [LC Paper No. CB(1)738/12-13(01)]</p> <p>Administration's follow-up paper [LC Paper No. CB(1)911/12-13(01)]</p> <p>Minutes of meeting [LC Paper No. CB(1)1078/12-13]</p>
Council meeting	3 July 2013	<p>Hansard — written question (No. 12) on "Conservation and Law Enforcement Actions Regarding Declared Monuments" (p. 14436-14438)</p>
Panel on Development	24 June 2014	<p>Administration's paper on "Review of Policy on the Conservation of Built Heritage, Progress Report on Heritage Conservation Initiatives and Policy Relating to Preservation of Historical Remains Discovered at Works Sites" [LC Paper No. CB(1)1623/13-14(05)]</p> <p>Administration's follow-up paper [LC Paper No. CB(1)1782/13-14(01)]</p>

Council/Committee	Date of meeting	Paper
		Minutes of meeting [LC Paper No. CB(1)214/14-15]
Panel on Development	3 December 2014	<p>Administration's paper on "Revitalisation of the Bridges Street Market, the Former Fanling Magistracy and the Haw Par Mansion under the Revitalising Historic Buildings Through Partnership Scheme" [LC Paper No. CB(1)297/14-15(01)]</p> <p>Administration's follow-up paper [LC Paper No. CB(1)706/14-15(01)]</p> <p>Minutes of special meeting [LC Paper No. CB(1)448/14-15]</p>
Panel on Development	27 January 2015	Administration's paper on "Initiatives of Development Bureau in the 2015 Policy Address and Policy Agenda" [LC Paper No. CB(1)447/14-15(03)]
Panel on Development	23 June 2015	<p>Administration's paper on "Progress Report on Heritage Conservation Initiatives" [LC Paper No. CB(1)987/14-15(05)]</p> <p>Minutes of meeting [LC Paper No. CB(1)1286/14-15]</p>
Public Works Subcommittee	28 October 2015 11 November 2015 25 November 2015 1 December 2015	Administration's paper on "Head 708 — Capital Subventions and Major Systems and Equipment 19QW — Revitalisation Scheme — Revitalisation of the Former Fanling Magistracy into the Hong Kong Federation of Youth Groups"

Council/Committee	Date of meeting	Paper
		<p>Institute for Leadership Development" [LC Paper No. PWSC(2015-16)45]</p> <p>Administration's paper on "Head 708 — Capital Subventions and Major Systems and Equipment 20QW — Revitalisation Scheme — Revitalisation of the Haw Par Mansion into Haw Par Music Farm" [LC Paper No. PWSC(2015-16)46]</p> <p>Administration's paper on "Head 708 — Capital Subventions and Major Systems and Equipment 18QW — Revitalisation Scheme — Revitalisation of the Bridges Street Market into Hong Kong News-Expo" [LC Paper No. PWSC(2015-16)47]</p> <p>Administration's follow-up paper [LC Paper No. PWSC19/15-16(01)]</p> <p>Administration's follow-up paper [LC Paper No. PWSC28/15-16(01)]</p> <p>Administration's follow-up paper [LC Paper No. PWSC52/15-16(01)]</p> <p>Minutes of meeting on 28 October 2015 [LC Paper No. PWSC26/15-16]</p> <p>Minutes of meeting on 11 November 2015 [LC Paper No. PWSC48/15-16]</p> <p>Minutes of meeting on 25 November 2015 [LC Paper No. PWSC56/15-16]</p>

Council/Committee	Date of meeting	Paper
		Minutes of meeting on 1 December 2015 [LC Paper No. PWSC61/15-16]
Council meeting	11 November 2015	Hansard — written question (No. 10) on " Redevelopment of Former St. Joseph's Home for the Aged and Conservation of Its Historic Buildings" (p. 1330-1334)
Panel on Development	26 January 2016	Administration's paper on "Initiatives of Development Bureau in the 2016 Policy Address and Policy Agenda" [LC Paper No. CB(1)452/15-16(03)]
Council meeting	27 January 2016	Hansard — oral question (No. 6) on "Conservation of Built Heritage" (p. 4152-4161)
Council meeting	15 June 2016	Hansard — oral question (No. 3) on "Conservation work of the Government" (p. 11720-11729)
Panel on Development	21 June 2016	Administration's paper on "Progress Report on Heritage Conservation Initiatives" [LC Paper No. CB(1)1034/15-16(03)] Minutes of meeting [LC Paper No. CB(1)1201/15-16]
Panel on Development	24 January 2017	Administration's paper on "Initiatives of Development Bureau in the 2017 Policy Address and Policy Agenda" [LC Paper No. CB(1)439/16-17(03)]

Council/Committee	Date of meeting	Paper
Council meeting	26 April 2017	Hansard — written question (No. 21) on "Revitalization project of the former Central Police Station Compound" (p. 6538-6541)
Council meeting	31 May 2017	Hansard — oral question (No. 4) on "Conservation and revitalization of the Central Market Building" (p.8737-8746)