

立法會 *Legislative Council*

LC Paper No. CB(1)456/18-19(06)

Ref: CB1/PL/DEV

Panel on Development

Meeting on 22 January 2019

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 since the 2012-2013 legislative session.

Background

Heritage conservation policy and policy statement

2. In 2007, the Government promulgated a new heritage conservation policy and adopted the following policy statement to guide its heritage conservation work:¹

"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."

3. To implement the policy, the Government has taken forward a package of administrative measures, including the requirement for new capital works projects to undergo heritage impact assessments, the initiative

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

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.

Policy review on the conservation of built heritage

4. At the invitation of the Development Bureau ("DEVB"), the Antiquities Advisory Board ("AAB") conducted a policy review on the conservation of built heritage. A two-month public consultation 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.²

5. AAB completed the policy review in December 2014 and made the recommendations listed in **Appendix I**.³ Regarding 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.

6. The Administration announced in December 2015 that it had formally accepted the recommendations.⁴ To take forward the recommendations, the Buildings Department ("BD") would 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 would also carry out a pilot study on the "point-line-plane" approach for conservation.

7. With regard to AAB's recommendation of setting up a dedicated fund on conservation of built heritage, the Administration established the Built Heritage Conservation Fund ("BHCF") in 2016 with \$500 million earmarked to provide subsidies for public education, community

² Source: [AAB's press release issued on 4 June 2014](#)

³ Source: [Report on the Policy Review on Conservation of Built Heritage](#)

⁴ Source: [The Government's press release issued on 19 December 2015](#)

involvement and publicity activities, and academic research. BHCF also provides funding for certain existing government initiatives and activities on built heritage conservation including the Revitalizing Historic Buildings Through Partnership Scheme ("Revitalization Scheme") and the Financial Assistance for Maintenance Scheme ("FAMS").

8. At the Council meeting of 27 January 2016, when replying to Members' questions about the operation of BHCF, the Administration advised that it had no plan at the present stage to expand the scope of BHCF for the purpose of purchasing privately-owned buildings with conservation value, given the limited fund size and the diverse views in the community on the issue.⁵

9. In May 2016, the Advisory Committee on Built Heritage Conservation ("ACBHC") was set up to advise the Government on the operation of BHCF. ACBHC comprises members from different fields and professions including architecture, historical research, social enterprise, engineering, surveying, town planning, business and private practitioners of built heritage conservation.⁶

Major views and concerns expressed by Members

10. The Administration has been providing periodic reports on its heritage conservation efforts to DEV Panel since 2008, and has 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. The LegCo has also formed a number of Subcommittees to scrutinize notices on declaration of various monuments and historical buildings under section 3(1) of the Antiquities and Monuments Ordinance (Cap. 53) ("A&MO"). Members' major views expressed during the relevant discussions are summarized in the ensuing paragraphs.

⁵ Please refer to the [Hansard](#) of the Council meeting of 27 January 2016 (p. 4152-4161).

⁶ The work of ACBHC includes (a) assessing new applications and monitor existing projects under the Revitalization Scheme; (b) monitoring the operation of the FAMS; 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, 18 non-official members and three official members. Source: [The Government's website on heritage conservation](#)

Statutory monument declaration system and administrative grading system

11. According to A&MO, the Antiquities Authority ("AA"), i.e. the Secretary for Development ("SDEV") may, after consulting 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 120 declared monuments in Hong Kong.⁷

Progress of declaration of graded historic buildings as statutory monuments

12. At meetings of DEV Panel and various Subcommittees formed to scrutinize declaration notices, including the recent one published in the Gazette in November 2018 to declare the exteriors of three Grade 1 historic buildings (namely, Fung Ping Shan Building, Eliot Hall and May Hall of The University of Hong Kong) as historical buildings,⁸ Members had repeatedly expressed concern about the slow progress of declaring graded historic buildings as statutory monuments. They questioned about the specific criteria for determining whether a building reached the "high threshold" of monuments, and were concerned that historic buildings might deteriorate over time due to the lack of maintenance, or might be demolished for re-development while pending grading assessment or monument declaration. As such, Members urged the Administration to take more proactive actions in protecting historic buildings by:

- (a) reviewing and improving both the statutory monument declaration system and the administrative grading system;
- (b) setting specific timeframes for conducting assessments under the above two systems; and
- (c) allocating manpower resources if necessary, with a view to expediting the progress of assessments and increasing the target number of graded historic buildings for declaration as monuments each year.

⁷ A full list of declared monuments is available at [the website of the Antiquities and Monuments Office](#).

⁸ Under section 2 of A&MO, "historical building" is a type of "monument".

13. The Administration advised that Antiquities and Monuments Office ("AMO") spared no effort in taking forward the task of conducting professional and independent assessments on the heritage value of historic buildings. In assessing whether a building reached the "high threshold" that justified its declaration as a monument, AMO would carry out on-site inspection, and conduct comprehensive and in-depth assessment based on the information gathered. The time required for the assessment would depend on the depth of information available to AMO, the merits and complexity of each case, and for privately owned buildings, the cooperation of the owners. Since 2008, all Grade 1 historic buildings have been put on the list for consideration of monument declaration and the Administration's target was to declare three graded historic buildings as monuments each year. On the question of whether a more aggressive target could be set, the Administration had elaborated that the crux of the issue was whether there was any Grade 1 historic building having reached the "high threshold" of monument with assessments conducted in a stringent and professional manner.

14. As regards the grading system of historic buildings, AAB accords Grade 1, Grade 2 or Grade 3 status to individual historic buildings 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.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 250 other suggestions for grading some other items have been received from the public.¹⁰

Expansion of heritage conservation from buildings to streets and areas

15. 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.

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\(1\)117/17-18\(04\)](#). Please refer also to the [list of the 1,444 Historic Buildings with Assessment Results \(as at 6 December 2018\)](#) published by AAB.

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.

16. Similar views were brought up by members of the Subcommittee formed to scrutinize the declaration notice published in the Gazette in October 2017 to declare Tung Lin Kok Yuen, Kowloon Union Church and Yueng Hau Temple as historical buildings. In particular, a member suggested that a special protected area should be designated to cover the conjunct Manse building (a Grade 3 historic building) of Kowloon Union Church and the cluster of other historic buildings in the neighbourhood, given the significance of the building cluster in depicting the historical and socio-cultural development of the Jordan area.

17. The Administration indicated that in response to the relevant recommendation made in AAB's report on the policy review on conservation of built heritage, the Administration launched a pilot funding scheme for thematic research projects under BHCF with a research theme of "point-line-plane" approach. The eight degree-awarding academic institutes were invited to submit applications for conducting research on this subject.

Conservation of graded historic buildings in the private domain

18. According to the Administration, in consultation with AAB, the Administration has been reaching out 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.

19. FAMS 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 2018, a total of 60 applications to the Scheme have been approved and 50 applications are being processed.¹¹

20. DEV Panel members noted in AAB's report on the policy review on conservation of built heritage that AAB 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. Panel members were keen to ensure that the Administration would proactively approach the private owner(s) concerned and provide them with economic incentives to preserve their buildings.

21. 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, 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.

The cases of Ho Tung Gardens and Hung Lau

22. 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.¹²

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

¹² Source: [LC paper No. CB\(1\)1459/10-11](#)

23. 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.¹³

24. 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 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.

25. A Subcommittee was formed to study the Hung Lau Notice. In recognition 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 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.

26. The Administration advised DEV Panel in October 2017 that the Commissioner for Heritage's Office and AMO were actively exploring preservation-cum-development options for Hung Lau with its owner's representatives, and both parties had reached consensus.¹⁴ First, Hung Lau

¹³ Source: [Report on the Policy Review on Conservation of Built Heritage](#)

¹⁴ Source: [LC Paper No. CB\(1\)117/17-18\(04\)](#)

would be preserved and would not be demolished. The owner applied for FAMS in September 2017 for restoring Hung Lau. The owner should not demolish Hung Lau or transfer its ownership within 10 years from the completion of the maintenance works. Furthermore, should there be any proposal for adaptive re-use of Hung Lau under a preservation-cum-development approach (which might involve the redevelopment of existing structure(s) besides Hung Lau and/or construction of new buildings), the owner undertook to obtain consent of relevant government departments. Where the proposal was consistent with the prevailing heritage conservation policy, the Commissioner for Heritage's Office would render policy support and assistance to the owner, including supporting the owner to submit planning application and/or rezoning application to the Town Planning Board, as well as applications to other departments for the compliance with relevant statutory requirements such as buildings and fire services.

The Revitalizing Historic Buildings Through Partnership Scheme

27. 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 II**.

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

28. 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,¹⁵ 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.

¹⁵ 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.

29. The Administration advised that the Advisory Committee on Revitalization of Historic Buildings ("ACRHB"),¹⁶ 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 28 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.¹⁷

Repair and maintenance responsibilities

30. Taking into account 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.

31. 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 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

¹⁶ 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.

¹⁷ Source: [LC Paper No. CB\(1\)706/14-15\(01\)](#)

Office under DEVB would facilitate the coordination between NPOs and relevant government departments on such matters.

Public access to the revitalized historic buildings

32. When examining the funding proposals for the revitalization projects mentioned in paragraph 28, some members of the Public Works Subcommittee ("PWSC") 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.

33. 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

34. 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.

Heritage trust

35. At the meeting of DEV Panel on 21 June 2016, 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.

36. The Administration responded that it had commissioned a consultancy study on the feasibility of 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.

Preservation of the General Post Office Building in Central

37. When considering the funding proposal for the public works project on the reprovisioning of the Hongkong Post's Headquarters in Kowloon Bay,¹⁸ some Members urged the Administration to consider preserving the General Post Office ("GPO") Building in Central and requested that the matter be discussed at the DEV Panel.

38. The Administration advised that it respected Members' concerns and was prepared to have further exchanges with DEV Panel members on the future of the GPO Building following detailed discussion in PWSC and Finance Committee on the funding application for reprovisioning the Hongkong Post's Headquarters to Kowloon Bay.

Latest development

39. At the meeting to be held on 22 January 2019, the Administration will update members on the progress made on heritage conservation initiatives since the last report in October 2017.

Relevant papers

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

Council Business Division 1
Legislative Council Secretariat
16 January 2019

¹⁸ The item was endorsed by PWSC at its meeting on 22 June 2018 and approved by the Finance Committee at its meeting on 19 October 2018.

**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](#))

Appendix II

**Progress of projects under the Revitalization Historic Buildings
Through Partnership Scheme (as at 4 January 2019)**

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 ⁽²⁾	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	Completed and in operation	May 2016 (Yellow House and Orange House) and September 2017 (Blue House)
Batch III						
10.	Former Fanling Magistracy	The Hong Kong Federation of Youth Groups Institute for Leadership Development	120.5	3.05	Completed and in operation	1 st quarter 2019 (Trial run in progress)
11.	Haw Par Mansion	Haw Par Music Farm	176.6	4.28		December 2018
12.	Bridges Street Market	Hong Kong News-Expo	90.6	5		
Batch IV⁽³⁾						
13.	No. 12 School Street	Tai Hang Fire Dragon Heritage Centre	46.53	1.71	Renovation works commenced in 4 th quarter 2018	3 rd quarter 2020
14.	Lady Ho Tung Welfare Centre	Lady Ho Tung Welfare Centre Eco-Learn Institute	45.80	3.66		3 rd quarter 2020
15.	Old Dairy Farm Senior Staff Quarters	The Pokfulam Farm	64.51	3.71		4 th quarter 2020
16.	King Yin Lei	No revitalization proposal was selected ⁽⁴⁾	Not applicable			

No.	Historic building	Name of project	Estimated Capital cost (\$ million)	Financial support ⁽¹⁾ (\$ million)	Current status	Commissioning date of the project
Batch V						
17.	Roberts Block, Old Victoria Barracks	Roberts Block Open HeArts Centre	The selected revitalization proposals were announced in July 2018 and preparatory work is now underway.			
18.	Luen Wo Market	House of Urban and Rural Living				
19.	Former Lau Fau Shan Police Station	Hong Kong Guide Dogs Academy				
20.	Watervale House, Former Gordon Hard Camp	Tuen Mun Soul Oasis				
Total government subsidy			1,327.18	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) Fong Yuen Study Hall has been taken up by the Leisure and Cultural Services Department since 1 January 2017 and continued to be open to the public for the time being pending a decision on its long term use.
- (3) Batch IV of the Revitalization Scheme was launched in December 2013 and the selection results were announced in June 2015.
- (4) 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](#))

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)
Panel on Development	31 October 2017	Administration's paper on "Progress Report on Heritage Conservation Initiatives" [LC Paper No. CB(1)117/17-18(04)] Minutes of meeting [LC Paper No. CB(1)484/17-18]
Subcommittee on Antiquities and Monuments (Declaration of Monuments and Historical Buildings) (Consolidation) (Amendment) Notice 2017	--	Report of the Subcommittee [LC Paper No. CB(1)236/17-18]
Subcommittee on Antiquities and Monuments (Declaration of Monuments and Historical Buildings) (Consolidation) (Amendment) Notice 2018	--	Report of the Subcommittee [LC Paper No. CB(1)315/18-19]