

Heritage for the People

Position Paper by the Conservancy Association

October 2003



長春社 since 1968

The Conservancy Association

會址：香港九龍吳松街 191-197 號突破中心 9 樓

Add.: 9/F., Breakthrough Centre, Woosung Street, Kowloon, Hong Kong

電話 Tel.: (852)2728 6781 傳真 Fax.: (852) 2728 5538

電郵 Email: cahk@conservancy.org.hk

網址 Website: www.conservancy.org.hk
www.greeneducation.org.hk

Introduction

1. Historical heritage is important to a city's identity and character. When a historical building is demolished, the loss is irrevocable. If Hong Kong is really to become Asia's World City, we must preserve our valuable cultural heritage.
2. This position paper sets out the Conservancy Association's views on the policy on cultural heritage conservation. In this paper we shall
 - discuss the rationale for heritage conservation,
 - share CA's encounters and experience,
 - from our experience, draw out two important dimensions in heritage conservation, namely, community involvement and government policy,
 - articulate a set of policy proposals on conservation of historical heritage.

Rationale

3. In 2003, SARS and the mass movement on 1 July have combined to show that Hong Kong is more than an economic city. They have demonstrated that beneath the surface of vibrant economy lies considerable strength of character as a mature civil society.
4. In their own separate ways, SARS and 1 July provided the opportunity for Hong Kong to make a kind of statement about itself: a statement that this "world city of Asia" is a city of both substance and depth. We have come to realise that our society embodies not just economic success but also some important, if intangible, assets which are the source of our social cohesion and collective confidence – perhaps befitting the description of "Hong Kong culture" or "Hong Kong character".
5. The Conservancy Association considers that natural and cultural heritage is one such invaluable public asset that belongs to society and posterity. It is part of the "social capital" of Hong Kong. We preserve heritage buildings not just for their architectural merits, but for the character and substance of the society which they embody, the softer side of Hong Kong history and society which Hong Kong stands for. Management of

this asset in a sustainable manner will not only enhance our quality of life, but also contribute to Hong Kong's competitiveness. To take a stronger stand in heritage, against vested interests, also reflects a confidence in ourselves.

6. In many ways, heritage conservation is also a matter of sustainable development and cross-generational equity. We do not have the right to deplete our natural or cultural resource, especially if they are non-renewable, to the detriment of our future generations.
7. Cultural heritage is part of our social capital stock, which is particularly unique on account of their sociological, existential, environmental and artistic elements. Heritage provides a way to understand and interpret the cultural and historical context of a society as a "living" entity. Like natural and ecological resources, the heritage stock is finite and any loss is irreplaceable, hence the need to conserve heritage resources.
8. As early as 1980 the Conservancy Association has been a champion of a comprehensive conservation policy. A renewed call was made in 1993 when the Association published its "Agenda 21 for Hong Kong", and then again in 1996 in response to the Third Review of the 1989 White Paper. In the Hong Kong Conservation Strategy published in 1981 and the Agenda 21 for Hong Kong in 1993, the Conservancy Association advocated a number of principles on government's role in conservation, highlighting the following:
 - a clear mandate for different government agencies;
 - a permanent mechanism for consultation and coordination;
 - the need for an authoritative institution for coordination and compliance;
 - sufficient financial resources for implementation;
 - community empowerment and public participation.
9. All along the Association has emphasized the importance of cultural and historical heritage as an integral part of our environment. As early as 1981, we called for the agriculture to be maintained not just as an economic activity but as part of our cultural diversity. We advocated the preservation and use of space for cultural institutions and activities in the face of growing urbanization.

10. Even though considerable progress had been made in environmental conservation, with respect to heritage, for many years the CA had been a lone voice, and little value was accorded to heritage conservation. Thankfully, this is changing in recent years. Increasingly heritage is cherished by the community at large, perhaps because the stock is diminishing. Heritage conservation is no longer the domain of a few activists, but a concern of the wider community.
11. In recent years, the business community has become a vocal champion for better environment and quality of life. They have abandoned the outdated attitude that conservation and development are opposed to each other. The community, at the same time, increasingly treasures local identity and culture. Tourists are more and more attracted to heritage tourism.
12. All these point to increasingly widespread public support for a sensible government policy on heritage conservation. The time has thus come for a serious examination of Hong Kong's heritage conservation policy.
13. We shall first identify the key issues through sharing the Conservancy Association's own experience and encounters.

Preserving heritage: CA's encounters

Some past experience

14. Since 1968, the Conservancy Association has been involved directly in a number of important cases in heritage preservation, often without success, though there were also some notable victories.
15. One example was the different fate that befell the old Hong Kong Club building and the Supreme Court. Despite a campaign mounted by the CA in the 1970s, the fine Victorian building of the Hong Kong Club was demolished to give way to the present building. By contrast, in the same campaign, the neighbouring Supreme Court building was preserved

and now houses the Legislative Council. The different outcome was very much a reflection of the difficulty involved in preserving buildings in private hands, although it must be said that public ownership was itself no guarantee for successful preservation. The Kowloon-Canton Railway Terminus was a case in point, the KCRC being then a government department. Despite lobbying by the CA, the Terminal building was demolished, with only the clock tower preserved.

16. Another heritage in government hands which was not spared was Victoria Barracks. CA's campaign did not prevent the historic site from being developed into present-day Pacific Place. As a compromise the barrack's Murray House has been reconstructed and now stands in Stanley.
17. Of CA's experience in campaigning for preservation, the case of the Marine Police Headquarter in Tsim Sha Tsui was instructive. CA's campaign went back as early as 1977 when the government planned to level the Tsim Sha Tsui Hill on which the Marine Police Headquarter stands, to replace it with a commercial/residential complex and a public transport terminus. CA formally objected to the plan in 1979.
18. Our rationale for preservation was based not just on the architectural merits of the Marine Police Headquarter, but the fact that the whole Tsim Sha Tsui Hill "as an integrated natural feature would provide pedestrian relief from street level noise, pollution, heat and overcrowding". CA's campaign was detailed in a 50-page report entitled "Retention of Tsim Sha Tsui Hill – A Joint Submission of the Conservancy Association and the Hong Kong Heritage Society" published in 1979.
19. The most notable feature of CA's campaign was the formation of a coalition involving the Heritage Society, the Hong Kong Museum of History, the Hong Kong Archaeological Society, the Hong Kong History Society, the Hong Kong Birdwatching Society and the Hong Kong Institute of Architects, as well as reputable individuals including the then Chairman of Urban Council Mr A de O Sales. This combination of effort – albeit from a relatively narrow section of the community – was surely critical in persuading the government to preserve the site.

20. Although the Marine Police Headquarter was thus spared from bulldozers, the battle was only half-won. The site was merely prevented from disappearing, but nothing was done to use it sensibly to “return” it to the community. As museums after museums were built in its immediate vicinity, the site was left to idle for more than 20 years. It is only recently that the site was being earmarked for a development for heritage tourism.
21. That experience tells us clearly that preserving from demolition is only the minimum in conservation of cultural heritage. A more positive way is needed to relate the heritage value to the community for whom the sites are preserved.
22. In the meantime, under strong development pressure, other buildings of high historical value disappeared one by one, such as Lee Theatre, Wanchai Methodist Church and Tiger Balm Garden, as well as government property like the old market in Peking Road.

Present-day challenges

23. In recent years the CA was involved in a number of campaigns to preserve Hong Kong’s heritage. In many instances, heritage preservation went hand in hand with nature conservation. Sha Lo Tung is a case in point. The valley is best known as an example of a successful campaign by green groups to preserve an ecologically sensitive site. What is less often mentioned is that the valley houses a rare Hakka village of unique historical value. CA is concerned not just with ecological preservation but also the conservation of the rare Hakka village in its entirety. In that respect, the battle is still not entirely won.
24. Likewise, in campaigning for the preservation of Tai Long Wan, CA has succeeded in preventing large-scale development from taking place. However, our interest was not just in preserving the natural environment and landscape, important as they are; but also the high heritage value of what is a unique Catholic village in Hong Kong. Again, this aspect of Tai Long Wan’s preservation is still not assured.

25. As a green group that champions sustainable development, CA is often involved in cases where nature and heritage conservation converges, such as the Former Explosives Magazine in Admiralty, with its own small forest in the midst of the urban concrete jungle.
26. However, there are also many instances where CA's involvement was purely focused on built heritage, Edinburgh Place, for example. In 1999 CA objected to a government plan to turn the historic Edinburgh Place into a temporary highway. CA's objection was heeded and the plan was withdrawn. Furthermore, with a revision in the town plan, it was decided that the City Hall would be preserved as part of Central's "historical corridor". Edinburgh Place and City Hall would, together, become a significant heritage landmark. It is worrying, however, that the temporary highway plan is now being resurrected – an issue which CA is still taking up with the government.
27. The problem becomes more complex with private property. Kam Tong Hall, the former residence of noted historical figure Ho Kom Tong, was a case in point, as is 64 Kennedy Road, the former residence of China Motor Bus founder Ngan Shing Kwan, is another. At this point, the fate of these buildings is still unknown.

Community and government policy

28. CA has been involved in all of the cases cited above. Through our experience two issues have stood out clearly as being, in our view, the most important in ensuring successful and meaningful heritage preservation. One is community involvement; the other is government policy.

Engaging the community and stakeholders

29. As a community group itself, CA has always emphasized the need to engage the community in sustainable development. It should be emphasized that CA's conception of community is an inclusive one that takes all the interested parties into account as stakeholders. Hence, in cases like Kom Tong Hall and 64 Kennedy Road, CA has kept

on trying to open a dialogue with the landowners, although so far little response has been received.

30. In the case of the former explosives magazine of Victoria Barracks at Queen's Lines, Admiralty, CA did not object to the proposal by the Asia Society to use the site as their headquarter; on the contrary the Association supported the beneficial adaptive use of the site for modern cultural purpose. However, CA raised strong objection to the erection of a bulky and highly incompatible building overshadowing the original heritage. At this point the fate of the project and of the heritage site still remains uncertain, and CA's approach to the Asia Society has remained ignored. We have not concluded that therefore the Asia Society was not serious in respecting local cultural traditions, but our experience did reflect the difficulty in heritage conservation, if even a purported cultural body takes that attitude.
31. Another encounter of the CA is that of the Old Stanley Police Station, the oldest police station in Hong Kong. CA raised strong objection when it became known that the site had been rented out by the Government Property Agent for use as a supermarket. We believed it was an incompatible use and besides posing potential risk to the building, did not accord well with the character of the heritage.
32. Given that the leasing was a fait accompli, CA undertook to engage the government and the operator in dialogue. Although the supermarket is now operational, it appears that some form of solution is becoming possible, if the proposal by the CA to establish a compatible Heritage Corridor can be implemented. This would enhance the heritage value of the building, without jeopardizing the commercial operation, and vice versa, with the community – including the supermarket operator – as joint beneficiaries. At the time of this paper, CA and the operator are still engaged in discussion.
33. While CA would persevere in engaging in dialogue with the interested parties, the local community is, in our experience, a most important element to be engaged. The best example from our involvement is the preservation of Woodside.

34. Woodside is a red-brick, two-storey house in Quarry Bay under government ownership, originally built in 1917 for managers of the Swire company. It is the only remaining early-20th century civilian residential house in Hong Kong. The woodland around Woodside is an urban oasis enjoyed by residents.
35. In 1998, the government gazetted plans to turn Woodside and its surrounding woodland into 1,880 flats under the Home Ownership Scheme. The CA led a campaign with the District Council to oppose the plan. Given that government's plan was drawn up in the heyday of the "85,000" housing policy, CA's campaign had seemed a lost cause. With the strong backing of the community (including no less than 16,000 signatures), however, CA submitted a request to the Town Planning Board to re-zone the site to green belt. In September 1998, the Board acceded to the request and changed the zoning accordingly, thus saving Woodside and the woodland. No doubt the community campaign had played the critical part in swaying the Town Planning Board's view.
36. Woodside was a landmark case for heritage preservation, a fine example of sustainable development involving the local community. It has demonstrated that it is possible to mobilize the community, harnessing and reinforcing their care for their own environment, quality of life and sense of belonging. More importantly, success is possible in a non-confrontational way, making use of existing mechanisms of government and administration (in this case, a re-zoning in the town plan). Indeed, much more could have been done to save our heritage, if the mechanism of government and administration can be strengthened.

Government policy

37. The experience of environmental protection is instructive. As a green group, CA does not under-estimate the immense problems and big challenges in the environmental agenda. On the other hand, as the oldest green group, CA has witnessed genuine progress in the environmental movement over the past 20 years. Behind such progress lies strong community involvement resulting from years of effort in community, as well as marked development in government policy. The latter lies at the heart of the problem in heritage conservation.

38. In a paper entitled “Achieving Conservation – A Positive Conservation Policy for Hong Kong” published in 2000, CA has called for a comprehensive conservation policy, covering not just nature conservation but also heritage conservation. We have highlighted possible implementation options such as direct government resumption, setting up a charitable trust, public-private partnership, etc., which are workable solutions already being adopted in other jurisdictions.

39. Now that the government has issued a consultation paper to begin the policy review on nature conservation, a similar exercise on cultural heritage preservation would be an imminent need, given the close association between the two.

40. Using the principles from the more general conservation policy paper of the CA in 2000, we have developed a framework for heritage conservation policy, with concrete policy proposals, which we shall outline in the rest of this paper. The broad structure of our policy model is as follows.

- We shall first highlight the importance for a clear policy direction.
- We shall outline a number of tools for heritage conservation.
- To implement the tools would require a strategy on deploying resources.
- The tools and the resources strategy must be supported by an effective institutional structure.
- Finally, we shall put forward a practical way in combining the various elements of government policy objectives with the involvement of the community, through establishing a Heritage Trust.

Articulating a policy framework

I. Policy direction

41. In any policy review, it is important to first stay focused on the nature of the problem and the objectives of the review. The present challenge is not to develop a policy from

scratch – there are existing administrative tools, and arguably, some existing policies in favour of heritage conservation. What is needed upfront is therefore a clear statement setting out what we want to achieve.

42. To make a general statement to emphasise heritage conservation should be a relatively easy task, for instance, in the Chief Executive's Policy Address. What is more important is to find a way to substantiate this statement, so as to give it "flesh" while at the same time demonstrating that it is a policy-directing statement, not empty rhetoric.

43. We propose that the way to substantiate the policy statement is to make a commitment to benchmark Hong Kong's heritage conservation policy with that of international standards. This can be done simply by committing to accede to well-recognised charters and principles, of which we would propose three, namely:

- the Venice Charter (International Charter for the Conservation and Restoration of Monuments and Sites 1964),
- the New Zealand ICOMOS (International Council on Monuments and Sites) Charter for the Conservation of Places of Cultural Heritage Value,
- the more recent "Principles for the Conservation of Heritage Sites in China" (or "China Principles").

44. Adoption of these charters and principles signifies a determination to fulfill our obligations for heritage conservation. While detailed implementation will take time, an immediate benefit will be to give a strong boost to existing and ongoing efforts. Indeed, with a renewed attitude within the Administration, a lot more can be achieved even within the present system.

45. Even without making any structural changes, under the present policy and administrative framework, heritage conservation can be further enhanced in a number of ways, for instance:

- Requiring all declared monuments and important graded buildings to display information about the site history;

- Making more use of the Lord Wilson's Trust in heritage preservation projects;
- Devoting more resources to the Antiquities and Monuments Office and the Antiquities Advisory Board so as to speed up the task of grading and declaration of monuments;
- Introducing an administrative guideline to make it necessary for prior notice to the AMO to be given for any development proposal or building alteration to all post-war buildings;
- Requiring the Government Property Agent to consult the AAB for use of every historical building in its hands.
- Developing some sort of statement of significance to guide after-use of existing or acquired heritage sites.
- Documenting all the history of all existing heritage/cultural sites of HK

II. Tools for heritage conservation

46. We shall outline four ways in which heritage can be better protected through government policy, namely, planning control, government resumption, public-private partnership, and transfer of development rights.

(a) Planning control: new zoning mechanism

Planning control such as new zoning and tightening of the Hong Kong Planning Standard and Guidelines can be an effective way to achieve heritage conservation. The result will be to impose more stringent conditions on possible developments related to heritage sites, thus often resulting in more constraints on developers. However, this does not mean the additional planning control must be anti-development. On the contrary, we must not under-estimate the problem-solving ability of Hong Kong community, and our ability to find creative win-win solutions.

Accordingly, we propose four new planning tools to enhance heritage conservation.

- (i) A new conservation zoning, "sites of significant historical value", can be introduced into the planning system to define more clearly the heritage to be

protected. This can be applied to individual buildings, building lots or whole areas. It can provide bigger coverage than present declared monuments or archeological sites which are specific to buildings or confined spots.

- (ii) Another zoning called “sites of significant rural character” can be created to describe rural areas such as Lam Tsuen Valley and Long Valley. With or without important habitats or historical monuments, these areas are worthy of preservation because of their rural and cultural character, which in itself is an important heritage.
- (iii) A third type of zoning, “sites of significant cultural value”, can be used to designate a site or area with a local way of life which is recognized and valued by the community, whether in the urban or rural areas. Examples Tai O in Lantau and Shanghai Street in Yamautei.
- (iv) The fourth proposal is to build into the planning guidelines the precautionary principle in treatment of specific classes of historical structures, such as pre-War buildings. Just as fishponds are protected by planning control whereby permission has to be sought for all pond filling, all pre-War buildings can be deemed to have conservation value and while demolition is not ruled out, they should all be subject to Section applications under Section 16 of the Town Planning Ordinance, whereby consultation with the AMO is made mandatory.

(b) Government resumption or buy out

For the government to acquire the heritage site and undertake its management, would be an extreme option which can only be used in exceptional circumstances. However, as an option, it should not be ruled out. Obviously, there is a need for elaborate procedures to be established before this can be applied.

(c) Public-private partnership

“Public-private partnership” denotes an approach rather than a mechanism. There are many ways in which partnership can take place, for example, the declaration of ancestral halls as monuments to be maintained by the government and open to the public, can be considered a kind of public-private partnership. But the most contentious form of public-private partnership would be those that involve the creation of development rights in exchange for conservation. Thus the private sector may be allowed some development over and above what he is entitled to, in order to provide incentive for him to become a party to conservation (a public sector objective).

In order to avoid abuse, in adopting a public-private partnership approach, it must be made very clear at the outset that the objective is conservation and the partnership is merely a means to achieve that.

(d) Non in situ exchange - transfer of development rights

Problems often arise when conservation of valuable historical resources conflicts with established development rights, such as areas with a residential or village zoning. For these cases, conservation can be achieved through transferring the development right elsewhere so that no development eventually takes place in the area to be conserved area. Such a concept is generally accepted amongst conservationists and planners as a practical tool to effect heritage preservation with relatively less financial burden. In the government’s consultation paper on nature conservation, the same concept is discussed briefly (too briefly, in CA’s view). For heritage conservation, especially of the built-heritage, the concept can be much more easily applied, as the area involved is often smaller.

47. In the CA’s earlier paper, we proposed three options to implement transfer of development rights. These three options are still relevant:

- i. A land-swap option: exchanging some government land elsewhere for the conservation area, for example, re-siting traditional villages.

- ii. Upgrading development potential of areas owned by the same developer elsewhere. This could be in the form of extra plot ratio, or up-zoning of areas which would not otherwise have been allowed. This option implies intensive negotiation with the owner or developer.
- iii. Monetisation: The development right is made a commodity which can be freely exchanged.

III. Redeploying public resources

48. Whatever mechanism is adopted for heritage preservation, some public resources will have to be used – or their value would have to be forgone – such as funds for resumption, expenses for maintenance, government land used for land swap, more public resources used to deal with increased congestion in areas accorded higher plot ratio, etc. The public resources will either have to be generated anew, or some form of redeployment of public resources will be needed.

49. Before considering new sources of funding, the government should first exhaust all existing avenues. For instance, if heritage buildings and their immediate surroundings are regarded as “public open space”, then one would find that considerable resources are already available for upgrading of public open space.

50. The Leisure and Cultural Services Department can make heritage preservation a regular consideration in their open space programme, thus diverting resources into heritage preservation and maintenance. Likewise, the District Councils should be encouraged to be involved more in heritage projects.

51. Another approach in re-balancing the resources for conservation is to consider reducing the cost of conservation. Can the conservation cost be minimized by paying only a “fair price”, rather than a speculative price? It is important to differentiate between compensations paid to genuine owners of heritage, and speculative “market-makers” whose sole aim is to achieve an intermediary financial gain through exploitation of development rights.

52. A “see-through” approach similar to the audit-trail concept used by tax authorities in tax assessment against tax avoidance, is worth exploring when determining the “reasonable cost” for acquiring or compensating for conservation.
53. However, at the end of the day, given the magnitude of the problem, new sources of funding will have to be required. The most straightforward solution would be to introduce a development tax for conservation. It has the advantage of linking development explicitly to conservation, thus reminding the public that development means enhancing our heritage, not destroying our past – a logic which the public can easily understand.

IV. Institutional reform

54. Due to the multi-disciplinary nature of heritage conservation, a strong institutional setup is crucial to its success. This should include two elements, namely, an appropriate legislation, with a commensurate authority.
55. We propose that a new Heritage Impact Assessment Bill be introduced. This should take heritage impact assessment away from its currently highly compromised form in the Environmental Impact Assessment Ordinance, thus giving it a proper place in the development process. To have an HIA bill is not a controversial proposal, and given the experience in the EIA Ordinance, an HIA bill should be relatively easy to enact.
56. Of equal importance to policy and legislation is the implementing authority. Currently, different conservation objectives are spread out in different government departments. Our rural heritage embodies buildings, rural land use, landscape and customs, which fall under different departments such as Agriculture Fisheries and Conservation, Planning, Lands, and Home Affairs.
57. A comprehensive solution would entail a re-structuring of the conservation duties, which should best be achieved through the creation of one single entity with a clear mandate for

heritage conservation, for example, an upgrading of the AMO and the AAB into an authority.

58. In the longer term and looking at the broader context, there are many areas of possible convergence in the conservation of nature and cultural heritage, hence the merits of a total revamp in the institutional structure for conservation should be seriously examined, for example, the formation of one single Conservation Authority to undertake various aspects of conservation.

V. Heritage Trust – combining policy and community involvement

59. We recognize that policy overhaul and institutional reform will take time. To spearhead this process, the Conservancy Association would like to make a proposal that integrates the important elements of the framework mentioned above, namely, involving the community, regulating appropriate cultural uses, harnessing resources, and driving institutional change – namely, by creating an authoritative Heritage Trust.

60. The Trust can be created as a public-private partnership, with both government and the private sector contributing to its start-up. Initially, the government should help persuade resource-rich bodies like the Jockey Club to contribute. Since government itself also has a responsibility towards conservation, a substantial contribution should be well justified, perhaps as a one-off grant rather than a recurrent expenditure. Another important source will be the private sector's contribution, especially by developers under other forms of private-public partnership.

61. As a professional body accountable to the public, the Trust should be a much more effective vehicle in raising funds for its recurrent activities, and hence ensure that the heritage under its care will be managed in a sustainable way.

62. The merit of the Trust concept is that it will put our cultural heritage into public ownership, and provide a sustainable way to conserve them.

63. Perhaps the UK National Trust can be used as an example to illustrate the function of the Trust we have in mind. It should be well-resourced enough to buy up land and buildings of high heritage value and manage them, hopefully for a sustainable return.
64. More importantly, only a central body with dedicated professional expertise will be able to conserve and enhance the value of our scattered and varied heritage resources in an integral and wholistic manner.
65. The Conservancy Association has proposed the establishment of nature and heritage trails for every district. If a Heritage Trust were established, it could go further and “connect dots into lines, and lines into networks”.
66. Since the object of the Trust is, in the broadest sense, to safeguard the community’s assets, the best institutional form for the Trust would be to establish it as an independent statutory body, perhaps modeled upon the Community Chest. This has the added advantage of making the Trust a permanent structure in the institutional framework for conservation, thus paving the way for other institutional reform to follow.
67. Although not a “regulator” as such, an effective Nature Conservation Trust will act as Hong Kong’s guardian of our scarce natural and cultural heritage. Through the various stakeholders represented on the Trust, the SAR’s conservation interests will be safeguarded in a professional manner. It could, for example, provide the necessary guidance over problems such as when private sector initiative would be helpful, or when intervention by the public sector is appropriate.
68. By its very nature, the Heritage Trust must be professional in its duty, but fully community-based in its mission. It will be engaged with the community on a day-to-day basis, thus helping develop an informed participatory process by the public. In other words, a professional an expert approach in defining and maintaining heritage will be balanced by a community approach to reflect the public view of what constitutes important collective memory, and what deserves higher priorities for protection. The higher level of public appreciation and acceptance will in turn strengthen the political will and mobilization of public resource for heritage conservation.

Conclusion

69. As the title of our paper suggests, our heritage belongs to the people of Hong Kong. As historical structures, buildings, environments and neighbourhoods disappear one by one, Hong Kong as a community will need to move fast to protect our cultural heritage and make the best and most relevant use of them.

70. Through this paper we have proposed a framework for the policy review on heritage conservation. We have emphasized the importance of engaging the community in heritage conservation. We have also proposed, as an immediate step, the establishment of a Heritage Trust to galvanise efforts in community involvement and institutional reform. We call on the government and the community of Hong Kong to work together positively to safeguard Hong Kong's valuable heritage.