

For discussion on  
28 April 2009

**Legislative Council Panel on Development**  
**Progress Report on Heritage Conservation Initiatives**

**PURPOSE**

This paper reports to Members progress made on two important heritage conservation initiatives and the proposed way forward. They are:

- Revitalising Historic Buildings Through Partnership Scheme (the Revitalisation Scheme); and
- the comprehensive grading of 1,444 historic buildings.

**PROGRESS OF BATCH I OF THE REVITALISATION SCHEME AND PLAN FOR LAUNCHING OF BATCH II**

**(A) Progress of Batch I of the Revitalization Scheme**

2. The Revitalisation Scheme invites non-profit-making organisations (NPOs) with charitable status under section 88 of the Inland Revenue Ordinance to apply for adaptive re-use of selected Government-owned historic buildings in the form of social enterprise. Details of the Revitalisation Scheme were set out in Legislative Council Paper No. CB(2)637/07-08(03) dated 20 December 2007. The selection results of Batch I of the Revitalisation Scheme were announced in February 2009. For details, please refer to Legislative Council Paper No. CB(1)816/08-09(03). Since then, the successful applicants, with appropriate support from the Commissioner for Heritage (C for H)'s Office, have promptly proceeded with

various preparatory work including drawing up the scope of pre-construction work, assessing the need for further site investigation/studies, etc. with a view to submitting proposals, as necessary, to the Public Works Subcommittee (PWSC) of the Finance Committee for approval of funding for the necessary renovation works. In this respect, preparatory work for the Old Tai O Police Station has reached an advanced stage. A paper entitled “Revitalisation Scheme - Conversion of Old Tai O Police Station into Tai O Heritage Hotel” has been submitted to the Panel on Development for advice separately. Subject to the support of the Panel, we plan to submit this project to PWSC for consideration for upgrading to Category A at its meeting on 10 June 2009.

**(B) Plan for launching of Batch II**

3. We are also preparing to launch Batch II of the Scheme in mid-2009 and a total of five buildings will be included:

- (1) Old Tai Po Police Station (re-launched)
- (2) The Blue House Cluster
- (3) Former Fanling Magistracy
- (4) Old House at Wong Uk Village
- (5) Stone Houses

----- For details of these buildings, please see **Annex 1**. Batch II will generally follow the terms and process of Batch I, though we will refine the arrangements in light of the review of the Batch I exercise as discussed below.

**(C) Review of the Revitalisation Scheme**

4. We have reviewed the Revitalisation Scheme based on the experience gained in conducting Batch I. We have undertaken to share our findings with applicants for those Batch I buildings as well as other interested organisations.

Invitations to attend a sharing session to be held on 5 May 2009 have been issued.

5. At the meeting held on 3 April 2009, Members of the Advisory Committee on Revitalisation of Historic Buildings conducted an initial review of the operation of the Scheme. The Advisory Committee also requested the Secretariat to further gauge views from relevant stakeholders. As such, we have consulted the Antiquities Advisory Board (AAB) at its meeting on 15 April 2009 which has also provided us with valuable input. Details of the Review are at ----- **Annex 2.**

6. Furthermore, to ensure that the Revitalisation Scheme has the support of the relevant District Councils (DC) and to solicit DCs' inputs to Batch II projects, C for H has been visiting various DCs to gauge their views.

## **GRADING EXERCISE FOR 1,444 HISTORIC BUILDINGS**

### **(I) Conducting of the Grading Exercise**

7. A territory-wide survey on historic buildings in Hong Kong mainly built before 1950 was carried out by the Antiquities and Monuments Office (AMO) in 1996-2000. Some 8,800 buildings were recorded. A more in-depth survey of 1,444 buildings with higher heritage value selected from the 8,800 surveyed buildings was carried out by AMO in 2002-2004. As recommended by Members of the AAB at its meeting of 13 December 2004, an Expert Panel comprising historians and members of the Hong Kong Institute of Architects, Hong Kong Institute of Planners and Hong Kong Institute of Engineers has been formed since March 2005 to undertake an in-depth assessment of the heritage value of these ----- buildings. The composition of the Expert Panel is shown at **Annex 3.**

8. A two-tier assessment approach is adopted for the assessment of these buildings, as endorsed by AAB. All the buildings were first assessed at Stage 1

against six criteria, namely historical interest, architectural merit, group value, social value and local interest, authenticity and rarity. The scores of all the buildings were reviewed at Stage 2 when a comparative rating of the buildings was carried out based on the following three parameters –

- (a) Historical - illustrating a particular historical development with a specific theme;
- (b) Typological - being the key exemplars of particular building types and architectural styles; and
- (c) Contextual - building group able to reflect the development of a settlement/cluster, and its social, cultural and economic lives.

9. With the hard work of the Expert Panel, the assessment was completed in February 2009. The assessment results, together with the proposed gradings by the AMO, were submitted to the AAB for consideration at its meeting on 19 March 2009. Under the proposal of AMO, 212 historic buildings are proposed to be Grade I; 366 to be Grade II; 576 to be Grade III and 290 with no grade. Some of these buildings have been graded by the AAB in the past but they may be accorded a different grading following the Expert Panel's assessment. Under the proposed grading, the total number of graded historic buildings has more than doubled while the number of historic buildings under each grade has also increased. For detailed breakdown, please see the table below:

<b>Grade</b>	<b>No. of Existing Graded Buildings</b>	<b>No. of Proposed Graded Buildings</b>
I	122	212
II	204	366
III	217	576
<b>Sub-total</b>	<b>543</b>	<b>1154</b>
Not Graded	901	290
<b>Total</b>	<b>1444</b>	<b>1444</b>

The definition of the gradings, as agreed by the AAB at its meeting on 26 November 2008, are as follows:

<b>Grade I</b>	Buildings of outstanding merit, which every effort should be made to preserve if possible
<b>Grade II</b>	Buildings of special merit; efforts should be made to selectively preserve
<b>Grade III</b>	Buildings of some merit; preservation in some form would be desirable and alternative means could be considered if preservation is not practicable

**(II) Relationship between the administrative grading system under AAB and the statutory monument declaration system**

10. It should be noted that AAB also agreed at its meeting on 26 November 2008 the establishment of a formal relationship between the statutory monument declaration system and the administrative grading system for historic buildings of AAB. Under the agreed arrangements –

- (a) the list of Grade I buildings, defined as “buildings of outstanding merit, which every effort should be made to preserve if possible” will be regarded as providing a pool of highly valuable heritage buildings for consideration by the Antiquities Authority as to whether some of these may have reached the “high threshold” of monuments to be put under statutory protection;
- (b) the Antiquities Authority is committed to actively considering each and every of the Grade I buildings for possible monument declaration. Given the resources required, the Authority will naturally have to prioritise the list of Grade I buildings for consideration, based on such

factors as the buildings' heritage significance, demolition risks, the owners' and the public's aspirations, etc.; and

- (c) the Commissioner for Heritage's Office will take the initiative to inform private owners of Grade I buildings the status and historical significance of their buildings; their eligibility to apply for financial assistance from Government for maintenance of their buildings; the likely Government intervention in case the buildings are under demolition threat, such as proposed monument declaration by the Antiquities Authority in order to provide immediate protection to their buildings; and a willingness to discuss with the owners possible economic incentives for the preservation of their buildings on a case-by-case basis depending on the merit of each case.

11. It should be noted that such a linkage would not oblige the Antiquities Authority to declare all Grade I buildings as monuments. The building to be declared as a monument must reach the "high threshold", and other factors will also need to be taken into account.

12. For Grade II and Grade III buildings, Government recognises the aspiration of the community to take appropriate actions to preserve them. We would take the view that the buildings should be preserved in such a way which is commensurate with the merits of the buildings concerned, and priority would be given to those with higher heritage value.

13. Moreover, in the light of the new measures on heritage conservation, the administrative grading system of AAB has been accorded new relevance or significance in that –

- (a) the Heritage Impact Assessment mechanism has imposed the requirement for assessing the impact on historic/heritage sites and

buildings (“heritage sites”) arising from the implementation of Government capital works projects so that conservation will be given due consideration. Like monuments and proposed monuments declared under the Ordinance, all graded historic buildings have been classified as “heritage sites” for the purpose;

- (b) the financial assistance scheme to private owners for maintenance has been extended from monuments only to also cover graded historic buildings. Buildings with higher heritage value (i.e. higher gradings) will be accorded higher priority for funding allocation; and
- (c) a number of Government-owned graded historic buildings have been included in the “Revitalising Historic Buildings Through Partnership Scheme” for adaptive re-use through the operation of social enterprises by non-profit-making organisations with funding support from Government. Whether and what changes can be made to the existing elements of the historic buildings in the revitalisation exercise would depend on the heritage value of the historic buildings concerned (i.e. the gradings accorded).

## **WAY FORWARD**

14. At the meeting on 19 March 2009, the AAB discussed the approach on the way forward and agreed to invite the public to give comments on the proposed grading by the end of July 2009. Arrangements have also been made for DCs to provide their views. Upon receipt of all information, the AAB will then consider the preliminary gradings proposed by AMO and will consult the Expert Panel if and where necessary with a view to making a decision on the final gradings. Information on the 1,444 historic buildings has been uploaded to AMO’s website for easy reference of the public.

**ADVICE SOUGHT**

15. Members are requested to note the latest position of the heritage initiatives and the proposed way forward.

**Development Bureau**

**April 2009**



## Historic Buildings for Batch II of the Revitalisation Scheme

### 1. Old Tai Po Police Station

Address: No. 11 Wan Tau Kok Lane, Tai Po, New Territories

Gross Floor Area: 1 300 m<sup>2</sup>

Site Area: 6,500 m<sup>2</sup>

Year Built: 1899

Existing Grading: Grade II

- Possible Uses:
- Hostel
  - Holiday camp
  - Educational institution
  - Arts and cultural village



## 2. The Blue House Cluster

### Blue House

Address: No. 72, 72A, 74, 74A Stone Nullah Lane, Wan Chai, Hong Kong  
Gross Floor Area: 1 052 m<sup>2</sup>  
Year Built: 1923 – 1925  
Existing Grading: Grade I

### Yellow House

Address: No. 2, 4, 6, 8 Hing Wan Street, Wan Chai, Hong Kong  
Gross Floor Area: 456 m<sup>2</sup>  
Year Built: 1922 – 1925  
Existing Grading: Grade II

### Orange House

Address: No. 8 King Sing Street, Wan Chai, Hong Kong  
Gross Floor Area: 198 m<sup>2</sup>  
Year Built: 1957  
Existing Grading: Not yet graded

Site Area for Blue House cluster: About 930 m<sup>2</sup>

Possible Uses for Blue House cluster:

- Education or visitor centre
- Recreation or welfare facility





### 3. Former Fanling Magistracy

Address: No. 302, Jockey Club Road, Fanling, New Territories

Gross Floor Area: About 3 800 m<sup>2</sup>

Site Area: About 12,300 m<sup>2</sup>

Year Built: 1960

Existing Grading: Not yet graded

Possible Uses:

- Arts, culture and creative industry
- Field study, education or visitor centre



#### 4. Old House at Wong Uk Village

- Address: Wong Uk Garden, Yuen Chau Kok, Sha Tin, New Territories
- Gross Floor Area: About 328 m<sup>2</sup>
- Site Area: About 8,790 m<sup>2</sup> (including the adjacent open space with an area of about 8,505 m<sup>2</sup>)
- Year Built: 1911
- Historical Status: Declared Monument
- Possible Uses:
- Café
  - Gallery
  - Activity centre





## 5. Stone Houses

Address:	No. 31-35 Hau Wong Temple New Village, Junction Road, Kowloon
Gross Floor Area:	About 208 m <sup>2</sup>
Site Area:	About 2,870 m <sup>2</sup> (including adjacent open space with an area of about 2,766 m <sup>2</sup> )
Year Built:	1937 – 1957
Existing Grading:	Not yet graded
Possible Uses:	<ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>• Field study, education or visitor centre</li><li>• Activity centre</li></ul>



**Comments Collected and Initial Assessment by  
Advisory Committee on Revitalisation of Historic Buildings  
on the Revitalising Historic Buildings Through Partnership Scheme**

<b>A. Vetting Criteria in General</b>		
	<b>Comments Collected</b>	<b>Initial Assessment/Observations by AC, AAB, etc</b>
1.	<p>Some have asked us to review whether there is any need to add in new items, re-define existing items, or add in specific elements to take into account the uniqueness of each historic building.</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Criteria 1, 2 and 3 are related to intention/concept by the applicant on how to re-use the historic buildings while criteria 4 and 5 are related to the capability of the applicant to deliver the proposed social enterprise. We feel the existing five criteria are balanced, comprehensive and generally well accepted. They should hence be retained.</li> <li>• However, some specific elements/angles can be introduced to take into account the uniqueness of each building. For instance, in the Blue House cluster case, we may consider how the proposal can meet the specific requirement of “留屋又留人” and aspirations of the existing tenants in the assessment. This is pretty similar to the case of Mei Ho House in which a Museum of Public Housing is a “must” in the proposal for the revitalisation of this building. AC would meet with the residents of the Blue House cluster before the vetting process.</li> <li>• As regards the suggestion to provide an extra category of marks outside the</li> </ul>

<b>A. Vetting Criteria in General</b>		
	<b>Comments Collected</b>	<b>Initial Assessment/Observations by AC, AAB, etc</b>
		<p>existing 5 criteria to accommodate the specific requirements, this is not desirable because:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• it will necessitate amending the existing system which is easy to understand and well accepted by all;</li> <li>• in any case, most of the specific requirements arising can be considered under the first 4 criteria. If not, they can be assessed under the last criterion which is a “catch all” criterion.</li> </ul>
2.	<p>Some enquired whether we should apply equal weighting (or assign different weightings) to different aspects to reflect their importance. For instance, since these are historic buildings, heavier weight should be given to criterion 1 “reflection of historical value and significance”.</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• The balanced approach, which is less complex, easy to be understood and now well accepted by stakeholders, should be adopted in the assessment process. Therefore AC will maintain the existing equal weighting on the 5 assessment aspects.</li> </ul>
3.	<p>Some have suggested applications submitted by local organisations should be given priority/ preference over those submitted by overseas organisations.</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Participation in the Scheme by local organisations is of course most welcomed. However, to ensure we get the best possible proposals for our historic buildings, we feel that we should not, as a rule, give preference to local organisations as sometimes overseas organisations can bring in a</li> </ul>



<b>A. Vetting Criteria in General</b>		
	<b>Comments Collected</b>	<b>Initial Assessment/Observations by AC, AAB, etc</b>
		breath of fresh air and very good proposals. They can also help to elevate Hong Kong's international status in certain areas which we are keen to attain.

<b>B. Terminology and Explanation of Individual Vetting Criterion</b>		
	<b>Comments Collected</b>	<b>Initial Assessment/Observations by AC, AAB, etc.</b>
<b>Criterion 1 Reflection of historical value and significance</b>		
1	Some commented that there is confusion between criterion 1 (i.e. reflection of historical value and significance) and 2 (i.e. heritage preservation). For instance, the assessment on “retention of architectural authenticity” can be assessed under both criteria.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Agreed. To provide clarity, we will rename criterion 2 i.e. “Heritage preservation” to “Technical aspects”.</li> <li>• The assessment on “Retention of architectural authenticity” will be moved from criterion 2 “Heritage preservation” to criterion 1 “Reflection of historical value and significance”.</li> <li>• Furthermore, compatibility of the nature of the proposal versus the original use of the historic building will be assessed under criterion 1. For instance, for some buildings with memories of very respectable personalities, some uses will appear incompatible, e.g. drug addiction treatment centre.</li> </ul>
<b>Criterion 2 Heritage preservation</b>		
2	Some commented that the second criterion, i.e. “Heritage preservation” should focus on the technical aspects of the proposals. Please see above.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Agreed. The criterion will be renamed as “Technical aspects” and the assessment will focus on the quality of the technical submission.</li> </ul>
<b>Criterion 3 SE operation</b>		
3	Some considered the definition of social enterprise not clear.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• While the definition of SE is featured in some LegCo documents, the definition of SE is not set out in the Guide to Application.</li> </ul>

<b>B. Terminology and Explanation of Individual Vetting Criterion</b>		
	<b>Comments Collected</b>	<b>Initial Assessment/Observations by AC, AAB, etc.</b>
		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>We agreed and will include the following definition in the Guide, i.e. “There is no universal definition on SE and the concept of SE is still evolving. In general, SE is a business. It should be able to make profits and operate on a self-financing basis. However, the pursuit of maximum profit should not be the primary objective of the organisation and instead, bringing of social value to our community is of paramount importance. The profits also cannot be distributed but should be principally reinvested in the SE business or in the community for the social objectives pursued by the SE.”</li> </ul>
4.	Some commented that it would be difficult to differentiate among renting out, hire of service, outsourcing, etc. and to what extent they are allowed.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>To provide more flexibility to SEs, we will allow these provided that it is of a reasonable extent.</li> <li>It is difficult to specify in quantitative terms to what extent each item is allowed. Instead we will state in the Guide to Application that we will adopt a common sense approach, and the following would be taken into account in assessing whether the case is reasonable: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Percentage of GFA/site area (the larger the percentage, the less desirable);</li> <li>Duration involved (the longer the duration, the less desirable);</li> <li>Importance of such component in</li> </ul> </li> </ul>

<b>B. Terminology and Explanation of Individual Vetting Criterion</b>		
	<b>Comments Collected</b>	<b>Initial Assessment/Observations by AC, AAB, etc.</b>
		<p>the overall proposal (must be of secondary importance).</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• A proportionality test should be adopted in assessing the applications and on the merit of each case. For instance, for a large project providing a large number of courses, we may allow the SE to outsource the operation of a café to an established operator. Also, it is permissible to outsource its laundry service to be cost effective. However, we would not allow an applicant to sub-divide the premises into various shops (or sublet) merely to earn income to make ends meet.</li> </ul>
5.	Some commented that intangible social value such as preservation of traditional culture should be taken into account.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Agreed. We will include both tangible and intangible social value in the assessment. This criterion will also be renamed to “Social value and SE operation” to be more accurate.</li> </ul>
6.	“Demand for services” should appear under “Financial viability” instead of “SE operation” to avoid “double counting”.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Agreed. The “demand for services” will be moved from “SE operation” to “Financial viability”.</li> </ul>
<b>Criterion 4 Financial viability</b>		
7.	Some requested greater clarity on whether donations should be allowed.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• DEVB will state clearly in the Guide to Application that the operation of SE should not rely primarily or heavily on donations and other forms of subsidy</li> </ul>

<b>B. Terminology and Explanation of Individual Vetting Criterion</b>		
	<b>Comments Collected</b>	<b>Initial Assessment/Observations by AC, AAB, etc.</b>
		<p>as the business should in principle be viable and sustainable on its own. However, under special circumstances, e.g. during difficult period like SARS or financial tsunami, donations can be regarded as a fallback source of income.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Again a common sense approach and a proportionality test would be adopted.</li> </ul>
8.	Whether Government subvention would be allowed.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• DEVB will clarify this point in the Guide to Application. Government subvention from other bureaux /departments should be discouraged as this will lead to duplicate financial support from the Government. Perpetual subvention (and not a SE being financially independent) is also against the spirit of SE.</li> </ul>
9.	Some applicants said they found it difficult to prepare the submission in regard to Financial Viability and requested for more assistance.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• DEVB will provide assistance in the following ways: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• A checklist on things applicants should take into account in filling in this section will be attached to the application form. Applicants should go through this checklist carefully before submitting their applications.</li> <li>• DEVB will include a session in the Forum in May 2009 for the potential applicants in which advice on the preparation of the financial section will be given by DEVB's</li> </ul> </li> </ul>

<b>B. Terminology and Explanation of Individual Vetting Criterion</b>		
	<b>Comments Collected</b>	<b>Initial Assessment/Observations by AC, AAB, etc.</b>
		professional accounting colleagues.
10.	Some commented that the element of financial capability now featured under both the criteria of 'Financial viability' and 'Others' and sought clarification.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>We noted this. DEVB will clarify that under the criterion of 'Financial viability', it is the "financial capability" of the SE as a business; while under 'Others', it is the "financial capability" of the applicant organisation (which is relevant in the ability of the organisation to withstand unforeseeable crisis like SARS or financial tsunami).</li> </ul>
<b>Criterion 5. Others</b>		
11.	Whether applicants can seek third party endorsers to support their applications.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Yes. If applicants wish to seek third party endorsers, such as from DCs, they are free to do so but they should preferably provide documentary evidence to substantiate such support.</li> </ul>
12.	The existing criterion by its name is not clear. Suggest renaming the criterion to "Management capability and other considerations"	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Agreed. This criterion will be amended to read "Management capability and other considerations" and will include: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Management capability (including institutional set up, adequacy of resources to deliver the project, track record (if any), level of commitment, etc.), history of organisation, objectives, core services provided, sources of income, etc.</li> </ul> </li> </ul>

<b>C. Modus Operandi</b>		
	<b>Comments Collected</b>	<b>Initial Assessment/Observations by AC, AAB, etc</b>
1	A lot of comments have been received on the cost of preparing the submission, which is high in particular in the second-round submission. There are enquiries whether cash subsidy or subsidy in kind can be provided to the applicants by the Government.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• DEVB has successfully sought approval to reimburse to the selected applicants the cost for the pre-contract preparation works (including preparation of detailed architectural, heritage conservation, structural, geotechnical, building services and landscaping design; quantity surveying services and tender documentation; and minor investigation for site survey, etc.). This will help a lot.</li> <li>• DEVB will also prepare 'generic information' as far as possible to alleviate burden on applicants, e.g. survey on loading, utilities mapping, etc.</li> </ul>
2.	Whether more guidance can be provided to NPOs.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• DEVB will organise a Forum in May 2009 to share experience with previous and potential applicants. After the launch of Batch II, DEVB will invite interested NPOs to visit the buildings via open days and a workshop on how to complete the application form. Suitable information will also be posted on the heritage website to assist the applicants in preparing their applications, e.g. powerpoint used at the Forum.</li> </ul>
3.	Some enquired whether there is a deadline they must get the charitable status under section	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• While we are prepared to be flexible in accommodating interested organisations that may not have</li> </ul>

<b>C. Modus Operandi</b>		
	<b>Comments Collected</b>	<b>Initial Assessment/Observations by AC, AAB, etc</b>
	88 of the IRD Ordinance (Cap. 112).	acquired charitable status at the time of submission of application, the lead applicant (and the co-operating organisations) must have obtained the charitable status within 3 months after the application deadline.
4.	Some NPOs would like to have longer period to prepare their applications	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>For Batch II, the application period will be extended to 4 months.</li> </ul>
5.	Whether those examples about possible uses of the historic buildings will mislead the applicants.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>The examples are for reference only. A remark will be added in the resource kits to explain clearly that applicants are free to propose other uses.</li> </ul>
6.	Some failed applicants have requested for information on the assessment of their applications.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>AC has already agreed to provide the requested information (including the marks).</li> </ul>
7.	Some commented that more public engagement or consultation with the respective DCs should be carried out.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>DEVB should consult parties concerned such as AAB and conduct a Forum with previous and potential applicants on the Revitalisation Scheme and organise a workshop for potential applicants of Batch II in the next few months.</li> <li>On the involvement of DCs, we fully appreciate that DCs are the ones most familiar with the aspirations of the local community and would hence welcome their views. For the Batch II</li> </ul>



<b>C. Modus Operandi</b>		
	<b>Comments Collected</b>	<b>Initial Assessment/Observations by AC, AAB, etc</b>
		and future exercises, DEVB would consult DCs on their aspirations on the buildings concerned in their districts before application is invited. Indeed C for H has been consulting the DCs concerned and hopefully will have visited all the relevant DCs before the roll-out of Batch II in mid-2009.
8	Some commented that the present system tends to favour large organisations thus leaving little room for small organisations to participate.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• In order to allow small organisations to have a greater chance of participation, the following will be undertaken: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• To lower the cost of preparing the submission, the Secretariat will provide more “generic” information and carry out as much ground work/studies as far as possible. This includes survey on loading, utilities mapping, provision of comprehensive conservation guidelines, etc.;</li> <li>• To assist applicants to fill in the section on financial aspect, a checklist will be provided. At the forum to be held in May 2009, the Chief Treasury Accountant of DEVB will also give a session on what constitutes a good submission on this aspect; and</li> <li>• In future, apart from large buildings (e.g. Lai Chi Kok Hospital and North Kowloon Magistracy with GFA of 6,500 m<sup>2</sup> and 7,530 m<sup>2</sup> respectively), small buildings will</li> </ul> </li> </ul>

<b>C. Modus Operandi</b>		
	<b>Comments Collected</b>	<b>Initial Assessment/Observations by AC, AAB, etc</b>
		<p>also be included under the Scheme. In fact, under Batch II, small buildings such as Wong Uk (of GFA of 328 m<sup>2</sup> with an adjacent open space) and Stone Houses (of GFA of 208 m<sup>2</sup> with an adjacent open space) are included. Hence, even if applicants need to find professional firm(s) to assist in preparing the submission, the cost involved will be relatively small.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• However, it is recognized that there will still be a threshold, but this is something which is not unreasonable.</li> </ul>

**Composition of the Expert Panel  
for the Assessment of 1,444 Historic Buildings**

- Dr. Law Kwok Sang (羅國生博士), Hong Kong Institute of Engineers;
- Mr. Jimmy Leung (梁焯輝先生), Hong Kong Institute of Planners;
- Mr. Louis Lor (羅慶鴻先生), Hong Kong Institute of Architects;
- Dr. Siu Kwok Kin (蕭國健博士), former Professor and Head of Chinese Department, Chu Hai College;
- Prof. David Lung (龍炳頤教授), Professor of Architecture Department, The University of Hong Kong; and former Chairman of AAB (served until 19 Oct 2007);
- Dr. Elizabeth Sinn (洗玉儀博士), Honorary Associate Professor of the Centre of Asian Studies, The University of Hong Kong; former Chairman of AAB's Historical Buildings and Structures Committee (served until 3 Jan 2008); and
- Executive Secretary (Antiquities and Monuments)