

ANTIQUITIES ADVISORY BOARD

Minutes of the 175th Meeting
on Thursday, 8 September 2016 at 2:30 p.m.
in Conference Room, Hong Kong Heritage Discovery Centre,
Kowloon Park, Haiphong Road, Tsim Sha Tsui, Kowloon

Present: Mr Andrew Lam Siu-lo, JP (Chairman)
Prof Rebecca Chiu Lai-har, JP
Prof Chung Po-yin
Prof Ho Puay-peng, JP
Prof Ho Pui-yin
Mr Tony Lam Chung-wai
Mr Kenny Lin Ching-pui
Dr Annissa Lui Wai-ling, JP
Ms Theresa Ng Choi-yuk
Ms Janet Pau Heng-ting
Ms Yvonne Shing Mo-han, JP
Dr Winnie Tang Shuk-ming, JP
Dr Joseph Ting Sun-pao
Ms Ava Tse Suk-ying, SBS
Sr Wong Bay
Mr Conrad Wong Tin-cheung, BBS, JP
Dr Sharon Wong Wai-yee

Mr Asa Lee (Secretary)
Senior Executive Officer (Antiquities and Monuments)
Leisure and Cultural Services Department

Absent with Apologies: Mr Stephen Chan Chit-kwai, BBS, JP
Mr Chan Ka-kui, BBS, JP
Mr Philip Liao Yi-kang
Mr Joseph Luc Ngai
Ms Karen Tang Shuk-tak

Mr Rex Wong Siu-han

In Attendance:

Development Bureau

Mr Albert Lam
Deputy Secretary (Works)1

Mr José Yam
Commissioner for Heritage

Mr Ricky Wong
Chief Assistant Secretary (Works)2

Mr Allen Fung
Political Assistant to Secretary for Development

Mr Ben Lo
Assistant Secretary (Heritage Conservation)2

Ms Leonie Lee
Assistant Secretary (Heritage Conservation)3

Mr Eddie Wong
Chief Executive Officer (Heritage Conservation)1

Leisure and Cultural Services Department

Dr Louis Ng
Deputy Director (Culture)

Mr Chan Shing-wai
Assistant Director (Heritage and Museums)

Ms Lily Chen
Chief Information Officer (Heritage and Museums)

Ms Susanna Siu
Executive Secretary (Antiquities and Monuments)

Mr Kenneth Tam
Chief Heritage Manager (Antiquities and Monuments)

Mr Ng Chi-wo
Curator (Historical Buildings)²
(for items 3 and 5 only)

Miss Pauline Poon
Assistant Curator I (Building Survey)
(for item 3 only)

Planning Department

Mr Michael Chan
Assistant Director / Metro

Architectural Services Department

Ms Chan Mei-kuen
Senior Maintenance Surveyor / Heritage

Opening Remarks

The Chairman welcomed Members and representatives of government bureau and departments to the meeting.

**Item 1 Confirmation of Minutes of the 174th Meeting held on 18 April 2016
(Board Minutes AAB/6/2015-16)**

2. The minutes of the 174th Meeting held on 18 April 2016 were confirmed without amendment.

**Item 2 Matters Arising and Progress Report
(Board Paper AAB/31/2015-16)**

3. Ms Susanna Siu briefed Members on the progress of major heritage issues and activities during the period from 1 April to 15 August 2016, including

the declaration of Blocks 7, 10 and 25 of the old Lei Yue Mun Barracks in Chai Wan as monuments, as well as the progress of preservation of historic buildings and structures, restoration and maintenance programmes, archaeological projects, educational and publicity activities as detailed in relevant Annexes of the Board Paper.

**Item 3 Assessment of Historic Buildings
(Board Paper AAB/32/2015-16)**

4. Mr Ng Chi-wo reported that the Antiquities and Monuments Office (“AMO”) commenced the one-month public consultation on the proposed grading of the former Fanling Theatre (Serial No. N246) and the former Peng Chau Theatre (Serial No. N55) agreed at the meeting on 18 April 2016, as listed in the Annex of the Board Paper. Four written comments were received from the public supporting the heritage value of the former Fanling Theatre with one suggesting to upgrade the grading to Grade 2 and another suggesting to upgrade the grading to Grade 2 or Grade 3. Miss Pauline Poon then briefed Members on the justifications for the grading status proposed in the submissions, including the historical significance and social value of the former Fanling Theatre in providing entertainment to the ordinary people in 1950s; as well as its group value when linked to the Luen Wo Market at Luen Wo Hui (a Grade 3 historic building), notwithstanding its non-sophisticated architecture. She added that these factors had been covered in the historic appraisal of the building.

5. In response to Dr Joseph Ting’s enquiry, Mr Ng Chi-wo mentioned that the former Cheung Chau Theatre (a Grade 3 historic building) was the only graded theatre located on the outlying islands.

6. Prof Ho Pui-yin and Dr Joseph Ting both proposed to upgrade the grading of the former Fanling Theatre to Grade 3 in view of its historic significance. By means of voting, a Grade 3 status for the former Fanling Theatre was confirmed by Members.

7. The discussion moved on to the proposed grading of the former Peng Chau Theatre. Mr Ng Chi-wo reported that during the public consultation period, one written comment was received from the public, suggesting to upgrade the grading to Grade 3, in view of its historic significance and the group value when

linking to the industrial factories in the vicinity. These factors had also been taken into account in preparing the heritage appraisal. The nil grading status of the former Peng Chau Theatre was then confirmed by Members with no further comment.

8. Separately, in response to the Chairman's request, Mr Ng Chi-wo recapped that at the Board meeting on 18 April 2016, after the deliberation of the proposed grading recommended by the Historic Buildings Assessment Panel for the former State Theatre, the Board requested AMO to conduct further study on the newly received information from the public as well as the alterations to building structure, and to re-submit the appraisal report to the Board for consideration. AMO had accordingly conducted the study.

9. Mr Ng Chi-wo continued to brief Members the latest research findings of AMO, including the historical fact of the State Theatre being used as a venue for charity activities and the background information of its architect. He further reported that both the ceiling and its associated building structures of the former State Theatre remained intact and the layout of the theatre could still be identified. However, the setting and ambience as a theatre had ceased to exist as the original stage and furniture had been removed, and the interior largely altered to operate as a snooker hall. He added that 2 out of 28 remaining standalone theatre buildings in Hong Kong had been graded, namely the Yau Ma Tei Theatre (a Grade 2 historic building) and the Cheung Chau Theatre (a Grade 3 historic building). The former State Theatre was the only standalone theatre building remaining in North Point.

10. As per the enquiry by the Chairman, Mr José Yam advised that the Commissioner for Heritage's Office ("CHO") and AMO had been liaising closely with the relevant departments, and no application or enquiry concerning the redevelopment of the former State Theatre was received so far.

11. Mr Tony Lam said that it was not difficult to reinstate the original condition of the former State Theatre, having regard to the small extent of alterations made to its concrete structure.

12. The Chairman pointed out that as no redevelopment plan of the former State Theatre site was noted so far, there was no cogent need to proceed with the grading assessment of the building at the moment. Nevertheless, with a view to

facilitating further discussion on the grading assessment of the former State Theatre, the Chairman suggested to schedule an informal meeting for the concern group to share the findings in respect of the building with the Board, and to arrange a site visit to the building for Members. Members agreed to the Chairman's suggestions.

**Item 4 Progress Update of Central Police Station Compound Revitalisation Project
(Board Paper AAB/33/2015-16)**

13. The Chairman introduced the representatives of the Jockey Club CPS Limited, the project proponent of the Central Police Station ("CPS") Compound revitalisation project, as follows:

Mr Euan Upston,
Director of CPS,
The Jockey Club CPS Limited

Ms Winnie Yeung,
Head of Heritage,
The Jockey Club CPS Limited

Mr Brian Anderson,
Partner, Purcell

Mr Kenneth Lee,
Senior Project Manager,
The Hong Kong Jockey Club

Mr John Tang,
Head of Public Affairs,
The Jockey Club CPS Limited

14. The Chairman, Dr Joseph Ting, and Ms Susanna Siu declared that they were members of the Heritage Working Group of Tai Kwun. The Chairman, Mr Kenny Lin, and Ms Theresa Ng declared that they were members of the Hong Kong Jockey Club ("HKJC"). Ms Yvonne Law declared that her husband was a

honorary voting member of the HKJC.

15. Mr Euan Upston explained that the presentation aimed at briefing Members the latest position of the CPS Compound revitalisation project, as well as seeking Members' views on the recovery options of the Married Inspectors' Quarters ("Block 4") preliminarily proposed by the HKJC. The views of stakeholders, including the Central and Western District Council would also be collected and the recovery options would be made available publicly. The Board's views on any preferred recovery option(s) would be sought again at a later stage.

16. Mr Kenneth Lee then gave an account of the works carried out for Block 4 before and after its partial collapse on 29 May 2016. After carrying out the necessary stabilisation works for Block 4 and conducting technical assessment on 12 buildings at the site and the Parade Ground and Prison Yard, the resumption of work on these buildings and the open spaces was accepted by the Buildings Department ("BD"). Works on the remaining 6 buildings would resume after acceptance of their technical assessments. He followed by briefing Members the setting up of an independent review panel to look into the possible cause(s) of the incident and to recommend improvement and preventive measures. The findings of the review panel would be available in a few months.

17. Mr Brian Anderson continued to show Members the historical photos and plans of Block 4 and recap the main points of the Conservation Management Plan of the CPS Compound conducted in 2008.

18. Ms Winnie Yeung followed by introducing to Members 8 initial recovery options proposed by HKJC and its revitalisation team in consultation with CHO, BD and AMO. These options covered a broad range of possible solutions, having considered the current conditions of Block 4 and drawing reference from the international heritage practice. The views of stakeholders, including the Central and Western District Council, would be sought and the information on the 8 initial options would be made available to the public. She emphasised that HKJC did not have any preference on the recovery option(s). The practicability of these recovery options would depend on their engineering feasibility and by making reference to the findings of the independent review. Any preferred recovery option(s) would be presented to the Board for discussion at a later stage and the detailed recovery proposal(s) would be submitted to the

Antiquities Authority for approval.

19. Before going into detailed discussion, The Chairman clarified with Mr Euan Upston that these 8 initial recovery options were subject to detailed engineering feasibility study. Members therefore might give views on a general approach, instead of indicating their preference to the recovery option(s) at the moment. HKJC would present to Members again on the feasible recovery options, subject to the findings of the independent review.

20. Mr Tony Lam opined that as Block 4 had a significant group value with other historic buildings at the CPS Compound, priority might be accorded to those recovery options which could maintain the integrity of Block 4.

21. In response to the enquiries of Ms Ava Tse, Sr Wong Bay, and Mr Kenny Lin, Mr Euan Upston explained that remedial measures had been carried out against the defects identified during the renovation and restoration works. Further measures were yet to be adopted later, subject to the findings of the independent review regarding the cause(s) of the partial collapse of Block 4. Besides, each option would be considered in terms of its feasibility, practicability and building safety.

22. When addressing to Ms Janet Pau's concern regarding the resistance of the historic buildings at the CPS Compound against adverse weather conditions in Hong Kong, Mr Kenneth Lee stated that suitable equipment had been installed to monitor the condition of each historic building. Subject to the findings of the independent review panel, further monitoring measures would be considered.

23. In reply to the Chairman's enquiry, Mr Euan Upston expected that the fully developed recovery option(s) might be available in January 2017 the earliest, taking in view the current schedule of the independent review panel, for presentation to Members for further discussion.

24. Mr Kenny Lin expressed concern regarding the expertise of the members serving on the independent review panel, particularly in the areas of preservation of historic buildings and the consideration of recovery options in terms of cost and heritage significance. Mr Brian Anderson elaborated that the recommendations of the independent review on the recovery options would be considered with the preservation of the cultural significance of the CPS

Compound being the prime concern. The technical practicability and building safety would also be important factors for consideration. Mr Euan Upston supplemented that HKJC was fully committed to the heritage conservation of the CPS Compound. Mr Euan Upston said the recovery planning would be conducted in accordance with the international heritage practice, and cost was not a key factor for evaluating the recovery options. The Chairman added that Dr Grey Wong, the Chairman of the independent review panel, had served in the Board for a few years before.

Item 5 Building Remains at the Site of Cochrane Street and Related Conservation Proposal
(Board Paper AAB/34/2015-16)

25. The Chairman invited Mr Ng Chi-wo to brief Members on the latest position with regard to the building remains at the site of Cochrane Street (the “Building Remains”). Mr Ng Chi-wo recapped that at the meeting on 3 March 2016, after Members’ deliberation, the Board decided not to proceed with the grading assessment of the Building Remains. At the subsequent meeting on 18 April 2016, the Board invited AMO to conduct further research on the Building Remains, in light of the information newly received from the Central and Western Concern Group (the “Concern Group”); the Urban Renewal Authority (“URA”) would also be invited to brief Members on its conservation proposal on the Building Remains. He also reported that the Concern Group had presented its findings in respect of the Building Remains to Members at an informal meeting on 15 August 2016. AMO had critically examined all the materials submitted by the Concern Group.

26. Mr Ng Chi-wo went on to elaborate the latest research findings shown in the updated heritage appraisal of the Building Remains, including the special features of the “back-to-back” built tenement houses, the change of ownership of the tenement houses at the location of the Building Remains, as well as the connection, if any, of these owners with the Building Remains. He also pointed out that due to the dilapidated condition of the Building Remains, the features of the tenement houses could hardly be revealed. The remains of the common walls and party walls had also undergone substantial repairs with thick layers of concrete.

27. In reply to Mr Kenny Lin's enquiry, Mr Ng Chi-wo said that it was difficult to determine purely by on-site observation whether the Building Remains were built before or after the fire on Christmas Day of 1878, yet the bricks of the Building Remains showed no apparent burn marks.

28. The Chairman then introduced the representatives of URA as follows to present the conservation proposal of the H18 redevelopment project:

Mr Michael Ma,
Executive Director (Commercial),
URA

Mr Wilfred Au,
General Manager (Planning and Design Division),
URA

Dr Lee Ho-yin,
Head, Division of Architectural Conservation Programmes,
Department of Real Estate and Construction,
Faculty of Architecture,
The University of Hong Kong

29. Mr Michael Ma introduced several projects under URA in preserving the heritage in Central near the H18 Peel Street / Graham Street Development Scheme, including the Pak Tsz Lane Revitalisation Project, the preservation of Century Old Street Market in Graham Street, Peel Street and Gage Street, as well as the preservation of the facades of the historic buildings located at 120 Wellington Street and 26A-C Graham Street to enhance the streetscape and urban fabric. He continued to elaborate the design of H18 Public Open Space which will celebrate the local heritage at Peel Street and Graham Street, including the provision of a green corridor across the 3 sites accentuated with piazzas and courtyard spaces across the centre of the development to connect three development sites of the H18 Peel Street / Graham Street Development Scheme with lush green setting. He further introduced the Cochrane Street Beatification works highlighting the design intent of depicting historical lot pattern.

30. Mr Wilfred Au then briefed Members the latest condition of the Building Remains, being a retaining wall currently maintained by the Lands Department ("LandsD"). He further stated that a preliminary non-destructive

geotechnical assessment on this retaining wall was prepared by geotechnical engineer employed by URA to review the safety and stability of the existing building remains. The assessment report will be completed subject to soil field tests in which the permit was being processed by LandsD. According to the preliminary report, it revealed that the calculated Factor of Safety (“FOS”) of the existing retaining wall was about 0.3 of the minimum FOS against overturning. Though the retaining wall did not have imminent danger, it was considered to be below current geotechnical standard subject to final assessment report after the soil field test. Based on the recommendation from the geotechnical engineer, upgrading works by installing soil nails or building mass concrete wall might be required to comply with the current standard. Besides, different parts of the Building Remains had undergone various degree of concrete alteration. In order to preserve the heritage significance of the Building Remains and enhance the celebration of the local heritage in the public open space, it was proposed to salvage and reassemble the bricks of the Building Remains at their original location as far as practicable to depict the “back-to-back” building typology and to delineate the floor pattern of the historical lot pattern. The proposal adopted a balance approach between heritage preservation and public safety.

31. To facilitate further discussion on the conservation proposal of the Building Remains, Dr Lee Ho-yin pointed out that URA had decided to preserve the Building Remains, which was in line with the Concern Group’s view. Being a retaining wall currently maintained by LandsD, public safety should be the prime concern for relevant departments and organisations when considering the conservation proposal for the Building Remains to facilitate public appreciation in the future. According to the international heritage guidelines, notwithstanding the Building Remains had relatively low heritage and architectural merits as they were solely remains of old tenement houses, they still had high social value when taking into account that they reflected the collective memory of the stringent requirements on scavenging lanes imposed by the Public Health and Buildings Ordinance in 1903, as revealed by the back-to-back construction. He opined that preservation *in-situ* might not be the only way of memorial and the conservation proposal should also satisfy public needs and safety. He further questioned whether it was appropriate to categorise the Building Remains as archaeological relics.

32. Before Members’ deliberation, the Chairman clarified that while the Board would give views on the issue, the decision on the conservation proposal

would rest with URA. Mr Michael Ma agreed and added that the conservation proposal of the Building Remains and its grading assessment were two independent issues. URA would submit the revised landscape master plan (“LMP”) based on the conservation proposal to Planning Department for approval, and the acceptance of revised LMP would give credit to the proposal.

33. Concerning the enquiries raised by Prof Ho Puay-peng and Dr Sharon Wong on further study to the lower part of the Building Remains and archaeological study at the site, Mr Wilfred Au explained that the current condition of the Building Remains was not suitable for any destructive test to mitigate the risk of damaging the bricks and stones. Mr Michael Ma added that they would consider conducting further test at the site after the land was granted by LandsD. Based on the findings of the recent survey conducted by Prof Ho Pui-yin, it was noticed that most interviewees preferred preserving the Building Remains by salvaging and reassembling them at the original location, instead of preserving *in-situ*. Structural safety was also the primary concern. She added that depicting the historical stories behind would be more interesting than simply preserving a piece of wall from the perspective of a historian. URA’s proposal could cater for both the collective memory and the history reassembled.

34. Both Mr Tony Lam and Sr Wong Bay opined that the current condition of the Building Remains was not satisfactory, yet the proposed upgrading works by installing soil nails or building mass concrete wall were not desirable, judging from the perspective of preservation of historic buildings.

35. Prof Ho Pui-yin, Dr Annissa Lui, and Prof Rebecca Chiu supported URA’s conservation proposal as the public could appreciate the local history with interest by walking through the public open space. Dr Joseph Ting emphasised the importance of preserving the Building Remains *in-situ*, in view of the significance of the site in reflecting the type of tenements which were built back-to-back and stories in association with the ownership changes of the land lots.

36. In response to the enquiries of Prof Ho Puay-peng and Ms Ava Tse, Mr Wilfred Au explained that, given the above considerations, the whole part of the Building Remains was proposed to be salvaged and reassembled at its original location instead of being partially retained. The height of the reassembled wall could be comparable to the original wall, depending on the amount of the salvaged

bricks that could be retained for the reassembly. Also, the reassembled wall would be a feature wall rather than serving as a retaining wall.

37. Mr Conrad Wong opined that the Board should not focus on the detailed design of the conservation proposal at the moment, as the current information was not sufficient for making a professional judgment. Nevertheless, the Board could generally comment that public safety should be the primary concern when considering the conservation proposal. Prof Ho Puay-peng echoed his view and suggested that the Board could further discuss the conservation proposal after URA had carried out the study on the lower part of the Building Remains.

38. The Chairman thanked URA for the presentation and welcomed URA to provide the Board with further updates on the conservation proposal through the Secretariat in future. He also hoped that URA could continue to liaise with relevant departments, such as LandsD, regarding the conservation proposal based on further study findings of the Building Remains.

39. Mr Michael Ma hoped that the design concept of the public open space at H18 Peel Street / Graham Street could be implemented in the same way as the successful Pak Tsz Lane Revitalisation Project. He also pointed out that the site indeed fell within the zone of 'Colluvium' solid and superficial geology under HK Geological Map, where approval for any proposed excavation works were strictly controlled and monitored.

40. The discussion moved on to whether grading assessment should be carried out for the Building Remains. The Chairman reiterated that the conservation proposal and grading assessment of the Building Remains were not inter-related. Members were invited to discuss whether to override the Board's decision made at the meeting on 3 March 2016 and to proceed with the grading assessment of the Building Remains, yet the proposed grading would not be discussed at the current meeting.

41. Prof Rebecca Chiu declared that Dr Lee Ho-yin was her colleague.

42. Concerning the enquiries raised by Ms Janet Pau, Sr Wong Bay, Prof Ho Puay-peng, and Mr Kenny Lin on the grading assessment criteria and procedures, as well as Dr Sharon Wong's concern on the archaeological study at

the site, the Chairman explained that if the Board decided to proceed with the grading assessment, AMO would submit the case to the Assessment Panel for consideration of the proposed grading, before presenting to the Board for discussion.

43. Dr Louis Ng clarified that the Antiquities and Monuments Ordinance (Cap. 53) only had definitions of “antiquity” and “relic”. Archaeological remains discovered from an archaeological site would usually be removed and properly kept at a store and that would not be preserved *in-situ*. He pointed out that there were preceding cases in which building structures, instead of historic buildings, were graded. He, therefore, recommended that it was more appropriate for Members to consider the Building Remains as building structures, instead of archaeological remains. He also mentioned that an archaeological site could also be declared as monument, depending on its high heritage significance, even though there was no grading mechanism for an archaeological site.

44. Mr Kenny Lin stressed the importance of maintaining the credibility of the Board on decision-making. There should be clear and strong justifications for the Board to override previous decisions. The Chairman reiterated that under the prevailing practice of the Board, irrespective of when the decision was made, should there be any valid new information received from the public or the Members themselves, the Board could consider reviewing the decisions previously made on grading assessment. Mr Ng Chi-wo recapped that given the dilapidated condition of the Building Remains, and having assessed the Building Remains against the six prevailing grading assessment criteria, the Board decided not to proceed with the grading assessment of the Building Remains. At the request of the Board, AMO had conducted further study on the Building Remains, with reference to the new information received from the Concern Group and the latest findings were just presented to Members. Ms Susanna Siu supplemented that the back-to-back construction, and the common back wall and party wall of tenement houses found in the Building Remains, had already been mentioned in the heritage appraisal presented to Members at the meeting on 3 March 2016. The Chairman also considered that there was no contradiction between the previous and latest research findings on the Building Remains.

45. By means of voting, 10 of the 12 Members supported that grading assessment should be carried out for the Building Remains; while 2 other Members preferred maintaining the Board’s decision at the meeting on 3 March

2016 of not proceeding with the grading assessment. By simple majority, grading assessment would be proceeded for the Building Remains according to the prevailing grading assessment mechanism by AMO.

Item 6 Heritage Impact Assessment in respect of Block 3 at Old Lei Yue Mun Barracks
(Board Paper AAB/35/2015-16)

46. The Chairman introduced the presentation team comprising the following members:

Mr K C Yuen,
Executive Director,
Spence Robinson

Miss Fiona Chau,
Principal Assistant Secretary (Health) 1,
Food and Health Bureau

Dr Janet Kwan,
Acting Head, Programme Management and Professional
Development Branch,
Department of Health

Mr Allan Chan,
Manager (Lei Yue Mun Park) Atg.,
Leisure and Cultural Services Department

Mr Billy Law,
Senior Architect/13,
Architectural Services Department

47. Mr Billy Law briefed Members on the background of the project which involved alteration and conversion of Block 3 at Lei Yue Mun Park (“Block 3”), a grade 2 historic building, into dormitories managed by LCSD during normal times; the same building would be used as a dedicated quarantine centre on a need basis, with the Department of Health overseeing the operation in case of the outbreak of an infectious disease. Mr K C Yuen followed by elaborating the historic,

architectural and contextual value of Block 3.

48. Mr Billy Law moved on to introduce the interior and exterior design proposal, with the aides of photos and layout plans, for the conversion of Block 3 into residential units with showers, toilets and other standard installations. Other facilities would include activity room, medical post, storage rooms and multi-purpose room. Mr K C Yuen further briefed the impact of the proposed works on Block 3 examined in the Heritage Impact Assessment (“HIA”) and explained the corresponding mitigation measures.

49. In response to the enquiries of Prof Ho Puay-peng and Sr Wong Bay, Mr Billy Law explained that the exterior wall of Block 3 would be re-painted in its original plain colour without mouldings. The air-conditioning unit would be installed at the back of Block 3 to minimize visual impact. In addition, implementation of BEAM Plus initiatives is not required according to the joint DEVB TC No. 2/2015 and ENB Circular Memorandum No. 3/2015 on Green Government Buildings, but the provision of greening area would be included in the design as far as possible.

50. Regarding the concern of Prof Ho Pui-yin, Miss Fiona Chau clarified that Block 3 would be converted into a quarantine centre on a need basis, in case of outbreak of an infectious disease. The centre would temporarily house asymptomatic close contacts of infected patients, but not infected patients themselves. Therefore the standard of a quarantine centre, instead of a ward, would be adopted in the design for converting Block 3. Dr Janet Kwan supplemented that under the prevailing legislation, patients with infectious diseases would be isolated and their asymptomatic close contacts would be put under quarantine until the end of the incubation period. The conversion of Block 3 into a designated quarantine centre would provide a proper venue for the said quarantine purpose and its design would be in accordance with international guidelines from the infection control of view. Infectious control measures would also be strictly complied with during the operation of the quarantine centre, aiming at isolating the asymptomatic close contacts during the incubation period and preventing the transmission of disease to the community.

51. Based on the presentation by the project team and views expressed by Members, the Chairman concluded that the Board was generally supportive of the findings of the HIA and further consultation with the Board would not be

necessary.

Item 7 Any Other Business

52. There being no other business, the meeting adjourned at 6:36 p.m.

Antiquities and Monuments Office
Leisure and Cultural Services Department
December 2016

Ref: LCSD/CS/AMO 22-3/1