

立法會 *Legislative Council*

LC Paper No. CB(1)855/20-21(07)

Ref: CB1/PL/DEV

Panel on Development

Meeting on 10 May 2021

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."

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

Policy review on the conservation of built heritage

3. 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 2014.² 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.

4. 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.

5. 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 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").⁵

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](#)

⁵ FAMS was launched in August 2008 to provide assistance to owners of privately-owned graded historic buildings for carrying out maintenance works. 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 non-profit making organizations. Up to end January 2020, a total of 74 applications have been approved and 67 applications are being processed. (Source: [The Government's website on heritage conservation](#))

6. 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

Amalgamation of the Antiquities and Monuments Office with the Commissioner for Heritage's Office

7. The Antiquities and Monuments Office ("AMO") was set up in 1976 under the Antiquities and Monuments Ordinance (Cap. 53) ("A&MO") to provide secretarial and executive support to AAB in conserving places of historical and archaeological interest and serve as the executive arm of the Antiquities Authority ("AA"), i.e. the Secretary for Development. The Commissioner for Heritage's Office ("CHO") was set up in April 2008 under DEVB to provide support in the implementation of the policy on heritage conservation and keeping it under constant review, taking forward new initiatives on heritage conservation and serving as a focal point of contact, both locally and overseas. To achieve synergy in implementing policy initiatives on heritage conservation and streamline the day-to-day operation, AMO has officially amalgamated with CHO with effect from 1 April 2019. According to the Administration, the amalgamation aims at rationalizing the relationship between AMO and CHO, and will not change the scope of work and the services provided by AMO.

Major views and concerns expressed by Members

8. 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

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](#))

section 3(1) of A&MO. Members' major views expressed during the relevant discussions are summarized in the ensuing paragraphs.

Statutory monument declaration system and administrative grading system

9. According to A&MO, AA 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 126 declared monuments in Hong Kong.⁷

Progress of declaration of graded historic buildings as statutory monuments

10. At meetings of DEV Panel and various Subcommittees formed to scrutinize declaration notices, 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.

11. The Administration indicated that 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,

⁷ A full list of declared monuments is available at [the website of 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.

12. 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.⁸ 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 310 other suggestions for grading some other items have been received from the public.⁹

13. Regarding the grading assessment of post-1950 buildings, a task force was set up under AMO in 2019 to carry out preparatory work. The team has been compiling information on and studying the types and numbers of post-1950 buildings in Hong Kong and making reference to the practices in the Mainland and overseas with a view to formulating a set of assessment criteria and strategy suitable for Hong Kong to carry out the grading assessment.¹⁰

14. At the meeting of DEV Panel on 22 January 2019, the Panel passed a motion urging the Administration to review and amend A&MO so to provide historic buildings with better statutory protection.

⁸ 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](#))

⁹ Please refer to the [list of the 1 444 Historic Buildings with Assessment Results \(as at 11 March 2021\)](#) published by AAB.

¹⁰ Source: Progress Report on Heritage Conservation Initiatives ([LC Paper No.: CB\(1\)464/19-20\(03\)](#))

15. In response to the motion, the Administration advised that pursuing heritage conservation through legislation would infringe private property rights and contradicted the Government's heritage conservation policy premising on respecting private property rights. The Administration would continue to encourage private owners to preserve historic buildings using "preservation-cum-development" approach.

Expansion of heritage conservation from buildings to streets and areas

16. 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.

17. 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 Yeung 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.

18. The Administration advised that AAB explored the "point-line-plane" approach for heritage conservation in the context of its policy review on conservation of built heritage. This approach was adopted in revitalizing the Central Police Station Compound which comprised a group of historic buildings and structures, and developing preservation-cum-development options for the preservation of the Shaw Studio Compound. In addition, the Administration launched a funding scheme under BHCF for carrying out thematic research on built heritage conservation in 2017. Under the scheme, eight degree-awarding academic institutions were invited to conduct thematic studies including the "point-line-plane" approach. These studies, which

commenced in the third quarter of 2018, were expected to be completed by end 2020.¹¹

Conservation of graded historic buildings in the private domain

19. 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.

20. The Administration advised that over the years, it had successfully preserved a number of privately-owned historic buildings by different means and forms. Most owners of the historic buildings concerned responded positively to the possible preservation options proposed by CHO and AMO. For some cases, even though the owners were not willing to preserve the historic buildings in entirety, partial preservation could still be an option. The Administration had also 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 CHO 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 CHO 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.

21. Some Members opined that the ceiling of the grant at \$2 million for each successful application under FAMS was too low. Some owners of historic buildings might intentionally carry out the repair and maintenance works of the buildings in phases in order to obtain more subsidies under separate applications, hence resulting in higher overall cost or compromising works quality. They urged the Administration to review FAMS and increase the subsidies.

22. The Administration advised that it would study whether there was further room for enhancing FAMS, but a major review would be unlikely in the near future. The Administration believed that it was vital to ensure the

¹¹ Source: Minutes of meeting for Panel on Development on 28 April 2020 ([LC Paper No. CB\(1\)890/19-20](#))

prudent use of public fund, and not to take over the responsibility of private owners to properly maintain their own buildings while providing suitable financial assistance. On the whole, FAMS had been operating smoothly.

The Revitalizing Historic Buildings Through Partnership Scheme

23. 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 non-profit making organizations ("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

24. At the DEV Panel meeting 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,¹² 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.

25. The Administration advised that the Advisory Committee on Revitalization of Historic Buildings ("ACRHB"),¹³ comprising members from diverse fields including historical research, architecture and social enterprise, was responsible for assessing the applications based on five criteria, namely (a) reflection of historical value and significance; (b) technical aspects; (c) social value and social enterprise operation; (d) financial viability; and

¹² 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.

¹³ 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.

(e) management capability and other considerations. The selection process was conducted through a competitive process similar to a tender exercise.

26. Members also expressed concern about the effectiveness of some revitalization projects. With reference to the example of the Tai O Heritage Hotel under Batch I of the Revitalization Scheme which had been operating successfully with high occupancy rate, members called on the Administration to duly assess the management capability of the NPOs when considering the applications so as to ensure effective implementation of the revitalization projects. The Administration responded that their policy was to facilitate smooth operation of the revitalization projects on a self-financing basis in the long term. In order to be financially self-sustainable, the operating NPOs would have incentives to boost their visitor number by improving operations.

Repair and maintenance responsibilities

27. 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.

28. 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-in 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. As such, 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 CHO would facilitate the coordination between NPOs and relevant government departments on such matters.

29. In light of the hard time brought by Coronavirus Disease-2019 recently, the Administration had announced the provision of a one-off subsidy of \$3 million under the second round of the Anti-epidemic Fund measures to each of the NPOs running the existing projects under the Revitalization Scheme to support their continued operation.

Public access to the revitalized historic buildings

30. Some members 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.

31. The Administration advised that the opening hours of a historic building depended on its location and how it would be used after revitalization. As for the revitalized Former Fanling Magistracy and the revitalized Haw Par Mansion, the Administration committed that they 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

32. Referring to the project of Savannah College of Art and Design ("SCAD") (Hong Kong), the Former North Kowloon Magistracy revitalized under Batch I of the Revitalization Scheme which had discontinued operation from 1 June 2020, members were concerned that only around 428 000 visitors had participated in the free public activities arranged by the College during its about ten years of operation. Members called on the Administration to conduct a high-level review on the heritage conservation policy, including the mode and effectiveness of the Revitalization Scheme under which the projects were expected to be self-sustainable after the initial period.

33. The Administration responded that all projects other than the Fong Yuen Study Hall and SCAD (Hong Kong) under Batch I to Batch III of the Revitalization Scheme had been operating smoothly. Through the participation of NPOs, the Revitalization Scheme aimed to preserve government-owned historic buildings and put them into good and innovative use, to transform historic buildings into unique cultural landmarks, to promote active public participation in the conservation of historic buildings, and to create job opportunities, in particular at the district level.

Revitalization of King Yin Lei

34. Members were concerned about the way forward for the revitalization of King Yin Lei as while it had been included in Batch III and Batch IV of the Revitalization Scheme, no proposal for its revitalization was selected in both batches. The Administration responded that King Yin Lei was included in Batch VI of the Revitalization Scheme launched in December 2019. In order to attract more NPOs to submit revitalization proposals, the Administration had relaxed the restriction to allow applicants to construct new structures

within the site to increase the gross floor area of the project, provided that the design of the new structures was harmonious with the ambience of King Yin Lei.

Conserving Central

35. Some Members pointed out that unlike the Revitalization Scheme in respect of which the Administration regularly updated LegCo on the progress and sought its funding approval for the new batches of projects, it was more difficult for LegCo to monitor the "Conserving Central" projects such as Tai Kwun - Centre for Heritage and Arts ("Tai Kwun") and PMQ that were taken forward with funding provided by some partner organizations. Members asked about the Administration's role in monitoring the management and operation of Tai Kwun and PMQ, and whether the Administration had any plan for implementing other revitalization projects through similar partnership approach.

36. The Administration advised that it would avoid micro-managing the daily operations of Tai Kwun and PMQ to allow flexibility for the operators to operate within the agreed framework worked out with the Administration, and the operators of Tai Kwun and PMQ were required to submit audited financial reports to the Administration regularly. It also advised that the "Conserving Central" projects had their uniqueness and high historical value, and currently the Administration had no plan for similar projects in other districts. The progress of the "Conserving Central" projects as of March 2020 is set out in **Appendix III**.¹⁴

37. On the preservation-cum-development proposal of the Hong Kong Sheng Kung Hui ("HKSKH")'s Central Compound, members noted that the local community had expressed grave concern about the possible adverse traffic implication of the proposed development of a private hospital under this project. Noting that the Town Planning Board ("TPB") had, in December 2019, decided on the proposed amendments to the draft Central District Outline Zoning Plan ("OZP") which included the imposition of building height restriction at the site of HKSKH's Central Compound and would change the development parameters of the site, members enquired about the latest progress of the proposed amendments to OZP in relation to HKSKH's Central Compound. The Administration replied that HKSKH would review its development plan having regard to TPB's decision. According to the statutory plan-making process, TPB would invite the public to submit further representations on the latest proposed amendments.

¹⁴ Source: [LC Paper No.: CB\(1\)464/19-20\(03\) Annex B](#)

Latest development

38. At the meeting to be held on 10 May 2021, the Administration will update members on the progress made on heritage conservation initiatives since the last report in April 2020. The Administration will also consult members on the proposal to upgrade three public works items (projects under Batch V of the Revitalizing Historic Buildings Through Partnership Scheme) to Category A.

Relevant papers

39. A list of relevant papers with their hyperlinks is in **Appendix IV**.

Council Business Division 1
Legislative Council Secretariat
3 May 2021

**Recommendations of
the Report on the Policy Review on Conservation of
Built Heritage published in December 2014**

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 Revitalizing Historic Buildings Through Partnership Scheme (as at 11 November 2020)

No.	Historic building	Name of project	Capital cost (\$ million) (money of the day prices)	Financial support (\$ million)	Current status	Commissioning date of the project
Batch I						
1.	Former North Kowloon Magistracy ⁽¹⁾	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 (\$ 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		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 Leadership Institute	120.5	3.05	Completed and in operation	December 2018
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		December 2018
Batch IV						
13.	No. 12 School Street	Tai Hang Fire Dragon Heritage Centre	46.50	1.71	Renovation works commenced in November 2019	2 nd quarter 2021
14.	Lady Ho Tung Welfare Centre	Lady Ho Tung Welfare Centre Eco-Learn Institute	57.80	3.66	Renovation works commenced in April 2019	2 nd quarter 2021
15.	Old Dairy Farm Senior Staff Quarters	The Pokfulam Farm	64.50	3.71	Renovation works commenced in June 2019	2 nd quarter 2021

No.	Historic building	Name of project	Capital cost (\$ million) (money of the day prices)	Financial support (\$ million)	Current status	Commissioning date of the project
Batch V						
16.	Roberts Block, Old Victoria Barracks	Roberts Block Open HeArts Centre	153.70	5.00	Renovation works will commence in 2 nd quarter 2022	First phase: 1 st quarter 2024 Second phase: 1 st quarter 2025
17.	Luen Wo Market	House of Urban and Rural Living	57.52	4.11	Renovation works will commence in 3 rd quarter 2021	1 st quarter 2023
18.	Former Lau Fau Shan Police Station	Hong Kong Guide Dogs Academy	78.57	4.92		4 th quarter 2023
19.	Watervale House, Former Gordon Hard Camp	Tuen Mun Soul Oasis	74.80	4.05		1 st quarter 2023
Batch VI						
20.	Former North Kowloon Magistracy	In view of the latest developments of the COVID-19 epidemic, the deadline for applications of the Former North Kowloon Magistracy was 29 January 2021.				
21.	Tai Tam Tuk Raw Water Pumping Station Staff Quarters Compound	Batch VI of the Revitalization Scheme was launched on 3 December 2019. The deadline for application was 3 September 2020.				
22.	Homi Villa					
23.	King Yin Lei ⁽³⁾					
24.	Fong Yuen Study Hall ⁽²⁾					
Total government subsidy			1,703.73	62.92		

Notes: (1) The Former North Kowloon Magistracy was taken up by the Government on 1 August 2020 and included in Batch VI of the Revitalization Scheme on 20 August 2020.

(2) Fong Yuen Study Hall was taken up by the Government on 1 January 2017 and continued to be open to the public. It was included in Batch VI of the Revitalization Scheme on 3 December 2019.

- (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. On 3 December 2019, the Development Bureau announced that King Yin Lei would be included in Batch VI of the Revitalization Scheme.

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

Progress of "Conserving Central" Projects
(as of March 2020)

Central Police Station Compound

The Government in partnership with The Hong Kong Jockey Club ("HKJC") are taking forward the Central Police Station ("CPS") Compound revitalization project, which includes construction works for new buildings, conservation works for historic buildings, infrastructure works within the Compound, and road improvement works in the vicinity of the site. The revitalized CPS Compound operates as Tai Kwun – Centre for Heritage and Arts.

2. Tai Kwun has been opened by phases to the public since May 2018. The revitalization works of all buildings, except Block 4 (Married Inspectors' Quarters), have been completed. In its first year of operation, Tai Kwun attracted more than 3.4 million visitors and staged more than 750 local and international-level art exhibitions and public programmes. In October 2019, Tai Kwun received the Award of Excellence in the 2019 United Nations Educational, Scientific and Cultural Organization ("UNESCO") Asia-Pacific Awards for Cultural Heritage Conservation, which is the awards' highest honour. The international jury of conservation experts commended that the technical quality of the restoration works of Tai Kwun are "standard-setting on an international level, ensuring the authenticity and integrity of the historic fabric". It also recognized that "the innovative architectural solutions and diverse and creative programming of Tai Kwun enlivens the historic space".

3. As for the partially collapsed Block 4, based on the recovery plan supported by the Antiquities Advisory Board ("AAB") in September 2018, HKJC had a rigorous review on the structural issues, including the commissioning of overseas masonry specialists and timber structure experts to conduct detailed inspections of the building. It was found that the building's brickworks and timber structures were in a worse shape than originally envisaged. In view of this, the recovery plan has been updated to include a series of structural strengthening measures which are necessary for ensuring the safety of workers, staff and the public when recovery works are carried out on Block 4, and when the building is open for public use in future. HKJC briefed AAB again in December 2019 to give an update on the progress of Block 4. AAB members appreciated HKJC's efforts and agreed to the updated

recovery plan for Block 4. Members also agreed with HKJC that public safety was the primary concern.

Former Police Married Quarters on Hollywood Road

4. Taken forward by the Musketeers Education and Culture Charitable Foundation Limited, its strategic partners and the Government, the Former Police Married Quarters on Hollywood Road has been revitalized into a creative industries landmark, the "PMQ". Since its commissioning in April 2014, PMQ has organized a series of events, including the recent "YES! KIDS CAN Summer Camp!", "Old Town Walkabout" and "Coffee Agenda". According to a survey conducted by PMQ, the number of visitors since its opening till the end of January 2020 was over 18.11 million.

Hong Kong Sheng Kung Hui's Central Compound

5. Under Hong Kong Sheng Kung Hui ("HKSKH")'s latest preservation-cum-development proposal for its Central site, all four historic buildings¹ will be preserved *in-situ* and a non-profit-making private hospital will be developed in the remaining areas. This hospital will offer an alternative to the medical services provided by the public hospitals. HKSKH has been exchanging views with the Central and Western District Council ("C&WDC") on the proposal since 2013. HKSKH also consulted AAB on the project in June 2018 out of its own initiative. AAB generally supported HKSKH to develop a non-profit-making private hospital at the Central site. Individual members offered comments on the design of the hospital and the conservation proposal of the four historic buildings.

6. The Town Planning Board ("TPB") decided on the proposed amendments to the draft Central District Outline Zoning Plan in December 2019 which included an imposition of building height restriction at the Central site. The proposed amendments will change the development parameters of the site and HKSKH will review its development plan having regard to TPB's decision. According to the statutory plan-making process, TPB will invite the public to submit further representations on the latest proposed amendments.

¹ There are four historic buildings within the Central site, namely, the Bishop's House (Grade 1), St. Paul's Church (Grade 1), the Church Guest House (also known as Martin House; Grade 1), and the Old Sheng Kung Hui Kei Yan Primary School (originally the south wing of St. Paul's College; Grade 2).

Former French Mission Building

7. The Court of Final Appeal was relocated from the Former French Mission Building ("FMB") to the old Supreme Court building at 8 Jackson Road, Central in September 2015. The Department of Justice ("DoJ") has taken over FMB and would provide space in FMB for use by legal services and dispute resolution institutions, after carrying out the necessary renovation works. This is in line with government policy as set out in the 2013 to 2018 Policy Addresses as well as the 2014 Budget Speech to facilitate suitable international legal Organizations as well as local law-related Organizations ("LROs") to set up or develop services in Hong Kong. It would also enable FMB and the former Central Government Offices to form a "legal hub", which is commensurate with the status and historical background of FMB as a declared monument. DoJ briefed C&WDC on the details of the works in March 2016. The renovation works commenced in January 2018 for completion in mid-2020.

Central Market

8. Construction works for the revitalization of the Central Market are in progress and will be completed by phases. Phase 1 works are envisaged to be completed in the third quarter of 2020 and the project will commence to operate in 2021; while the construction works for the entire project will be completed in 2021-2022. The Urban Renewal Authority has established the operation goals and mode of operation according to the guidelines set up via the previous public engagement process. Briefing sessions and workshops have also been conducted to gauge views from practitioners. The tendering for the operator will be conducted in the first quarter of 2020.

Former Central Government Offices

9. Following public consultation, the Government announced in December 2012 its plan to:

- (a) re-use the Former Central Government Offices ("CGO") West Wing, in addition to the Main and East Wings, as offices for DoJ which will allow relocation of all of DoJ's divisions to the former CGO; and

- (b) provide space in the West Wing to LROs to enable them to develop their services as well as to create a favourable environment to attract more international legal and dispute resolution institutions to be set up in Hong Kong.

10. Renovation works for the Main and East Wings were completed in early 2015 and some offices of DoJ have been relocated in the third quarter of the same year. As regards the works for the West Wing, AAB discussed and endorsed the Heritage Impact Assessment report in respect of the project at its meeting in March 2015. DoJ consulted C&WDC in May 2015 and members had no in-principle objection. The renovation works of West Wing commenced in October 2016 and were substantially completed in May 2019. Relocation of DoJ offices by phase started in October 2019, whereas LROs are expected to move in from mid-2020 onwards after completion of their internal fitting-out works.

Murray Building

11. The project of converting the Murray Building into a hotel has been completed. The hotel commenced operation in December 2017.

(Source: [LC Paper No.: CB\(1\)464/19-20\(03\) Annex B](#))

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 "Revitalization 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 — Revitalization Scheme — Revitalization 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 — Revitalization Scheme — Revitalization 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 — Revitalization Scheme — Revitalization 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]

Council/Committee	Date of meeting	Paper
Panel on Development	22 January 2019	Administration's paper on "Progress Report on Heritage Conservation Initiatives" [LC Paper No. CB(1)456/18-19(05)] Minutes of meeting [LC Paper No. CB(1)1331/18-19] Administration's response to the motion carried at the meeting [LC Paper No. CB(1)626/18-19(01)]
Panel on Development	28 April 2020	Administration's paper on "Progress Report on Heritage Conservation Initiatives" [LC Paper No. CB(1)464/19-20(03)] Minutes of meeting [LC Paper No. CB(1)890/19-20]