

Islands District Council
Paper No. 73/2014

Public Consultation
on the Review of Policy on the Conservation of Built Heritage

Purpose

This paper briefs Members on the consultation document on the review of the policy on the conservation of built heritage (“policy review”) issued by the Antiquities Advisory Board (“AAB”) on 4 June 2014, and invites Members’ views on the various issues covered by the consultation document.

Background

2. As announced by the Chief Executive in his 2013 Policy Address, we have worked to strike a balance between the need to respect private property rights and the need to preserve our heritage. On the premises of respecting private property rights, we need to offer appropriate economic incentives to encourage private owners to either hand over or conserve historic buildings in their ownership. In light of the experience gained over the past few years, we need to review the policy on the conservation of privately-owned historic buildings. This will include formulating a set of more detailed mechanism and criteria for determining the extent and means to use public resources for the conservation of privately-owned historic buildings, and studying whether there is a need to enhance conservation of such buildings in the context of town planning. The Government would also examine whether the setting up of a heritage trust would help in the conservation of privately-owned historic buildings and if so, the feasibility of setting up a trust in the context of Hong Kong. The AAB has assisted the Government in conducting the policy review at the invitation of the Development Bureau.

Public Consultation on the Review of the Policy on the Conservation of Built Heritage

3. In the past year, the AAB has, in preparation for the consultation document on the policy review, exchanged views with over 150 stakeholders, including Legislative Council Members, the Chairmen and Vice-chairmen of the 18 District Councils, professional organisations, concern groups, owners of privately-owned historic buildings, business chambers, academics, etc.

After exchanging views with the stakeholders, the consultation document has now been completed.

4. The AAB published the consultation document on the policy review on 4 June 2014 for a two-month public consultation until 8 June 2014. The consultation document has been uploaded to AAB's dedicated website on the policy review (<http://www.builtheritagereview.hk>). Through the consultation document, the AAB would like to collect the views of the public on the following major issues:

- a) Should we regulate or restrict private owners from demolishing or altering their graded historic buildings through the law? If affirmative, what should be the scopes and ways to do so? Should different treatments be applied to buildings with different gradings?
- b) Should we, on the grounds of conservation, purchase or resume historic buildings from private owners? Should there be any predominate requirements (such as depending on the heritage value of the buildings, criteria for and means of compensation or whether the buildings are open to public)?
- c) Should we impose restrictions on the development (for instance, to impose restrictions on the heights, uses and designs of buildings, as well as the width of streets) of certain streets or areas (such as Tai O, Kowloon City, Tai Hang and Sai Ying Pun) in order to preserve their heritage merits?
- d) Should we allow relaxation of or exemption from the legislative requirements for historic buildings while the primary objective of the Buildings Ordinance is to protect structural safety and health standard?
- e) Do you think that Hong Kong should set up a heritage trust? If so, what should be its functions? Is it appropriate to support the trust with public funds? If yes, which functions of the trust should be supported by public funds?
- f) Do you think that we should provide more incentives to private owners in order to encourage them to preserve their historic buildings? If yes, what kind of extra incentives should be provided (for example, should we provide extra developable area in addition to the compensation for the exact loss of developable area as a result of conservation, or should we set up a heritage conservation

award for Hong Kong to recognise the efforts of private owners and various organisations in heritage conservation)?

- g) In addition to providing subsidies for heritage maintenance works, should we provide subsidies for consultant's fees and additional construction costs arising from preservation? Should the higher the grading of a historic building, the larger the amount of grant be given?
- h) Which aspects in the public education, consultation and publicity works in relation to heritage conservation should be further enhanced? What channels can be used to enhance such works?
- i) If certain historic buildings cannot be open to the public, do you accept other viewing methods (such as 3D laser scanning, as well as photographic and cartographic recording, for the public to appreciate the interior of declared monuments and historic buildings)?
- j) Other comments?

Comments Sought

5. While conducting the public consultation, the AAB would particularly like to know the views of District Council Members on the various issues covered by the consultation document. Members are welcome to send their comments to the AAB Secretariat through the following channels:

- a) To complete the attached Comment Form, and return the duly completed Comment Form to the AAB Secretariat via the respective District Council Secretariats on or before **28 July 2014**; or
- b) To submit comments to the AAB Secretariat by post (mailing address: 136 Nathan Road, Tsim Sha Tsui, Kowloon), by fax (2189 7264) or by email (comment@builtheritagereview.hk) on or before **4 August 2014**.

**Secretariat, Antiquities Advisory Board
July 2014**



回應表格

歷史建築保育政策公眾諮詢

Feedback Form

Public Consultation - Policy on Conservation of Built Heritage

請於2014年8月4日或之前透過以下方式提交你的意見：

Please send us your views through the following channels on or before 4 August 2014:

郵寄地址：香港九龍尖沙咀彌敦道136號古物諮詢委員會秘書處

Address : Secretariat, Antiquities Advisory Board, 136 Nathan Road, Tsim Sha Tsui,
Kowloon, Hong Kong

電子郵件 E-mail: comment@builtheritagereview.hk 傳真 Fax: (+852) 2189 7264

姓名/機構名稱 Name/Organisation : _____

電子郵件 E-mail : _____

你是否歷史建築的業主 Are you an owner of a historic building ? ☐ 是/Yes ☐ 不是/No

歡迎提出意見 Views are Welcome

1. 我們應否透過法例規管或限制私人業主拆卸或改動他們擁有的評級歷史建築？若然如是，有關規管的範疇和形式應該如何，以及不同評級的建築應否有不同的處理方法？

Should we regulate or restrict private owners from demolishing or altering their graded historic buildings through the law? If affirmative, what should be the scopes and ways to do so? Should different treatments be applied to buildings with different gradings?

2. 我們應否以公帑購入或強制徵收私人擁有的歷史建築作保育用途？若然，是否需要特定前提（例如視乎有關建築的文物價值、賠償準則及形式或有關建築是否向公眾開放）？

Should we, on the grounds of conservation, purchase or resume historic buildings from private owners? Should there be any predominate requirements (such as depending on the heritage value of the buildings, criteria for and means of compensation or whether the buildings are open to public)?

3. 為了保存一些有文物特色的街道或地區（例如大澳、九龍城、大坑、西營盤等），我們是否應該限制該些街道或地區內的發展（例如限制街道上或區內建築的高度、用途和設計，以及街道的闊度等）？

Should we impose restrictions on the development (for instance, to impose restrictions on the heights, uses and designs of buildings, as well as the width of streets) of certain streets or areas (such as Tai O, Kowloon City, Tai Hang and Sai Ying Pun) in order to preserve their heritage merits?

4. 《建築物條例》以保障樓宇安全和衛生標準為大前提。我們應否放寬或豁免條例對歷史建築的規管？

Should we allow relaxation of or exemption from the legislative requirements for historic buildings while the primary objective of the Buildings Ordinance is to protect structural safety and health standard?

5. 你認為香港應否成立文物保育基金？若然，文物保育基金應負責什麼職能？運用公帑支持基金的運作又是否恰當？若然，你認為應該支持基金哪些職能？

Do you think that Hong Kong should set up a heritage trust? If so, what should be its functions? Is it appropriate to support the trust with public funds? If yes, which functions of the trust should be supported by public funds?

6. 為進一步鼓勵私人業主保育他們擁有的歷史建築，我們應否向他們提供更多誘因？若然，我們應提供什麼額外誘因（例如在補償因保育而引致的損失時，不僅提供發展面積相若的補償，還應向業主提供額外的發展面積；或設立一個屬於香港的文物保育獎項，以表揚那些對文物保育作出貢獻的業主）？

Do you think that we should provide more incentives to private owners in order to encourage them to preserve their historic buildings? If yes, what kind of extra incentives should be provided (for example, should we provide extra developable area in addition to the compensation for the exact loss of developable area as a result of conservation, or should we set up a heritage conservation award for Hong Kong to recognise the efforts of private owners and various organisations in heritage conservation)?

7. 除了資助業主維修其歷史建築外，我們應否就因保育所引致的額外顧問費用和建築成本，向業主提供資助？我們應否就文物價值較高的歷史建築提供較高的維修資助金額？

In addition to providing subsidies for heritage maintenance works, should we provide subsidies for consultant's fees and additional construction costs arising from preservation? Should the higher the grading of a historic building, the larger the amount of grant would be given?

-
8. 你認為我們應在哪方面加強文物保育的公眾教育、諮詢和宣傳工作？可透過什麼渠道和方法加強有關工作？

Which aspects in the public education, consultation and publicity works in relation to heritage conservation should be further enhanced? What channels can be used to enhance such works?

9. 若某些歷史建築未能對外開放，你會接受其他觀賞方法嗎（例如透過三維激光掃描、照片及測繪記錄等形式，讓市民大眾觀賞有關法定古蹟及歷史建築的內外情況）？

If certain historic buildings cannot be open to the public, do you accept other viewing methods (such as 3D laser scanning, as well as photographic and cartographic recording, for the public to appreciate the interior of declared monuments and historic buildings)?

10. 其他意見 Other Comments:

[完 END]