

ANTIQUITIES ADVISORY BOARD

Minutes of the 200th Meeting
on Thursday, 9 March 2023 at 2:30 pm
at Conference Room, Hong Kong Heritage Discovery Centre
Kowloon Park, Haiphong Road, Tsim Sha Tsui, Kowloon

Present: Mr SO Cheung-tak, Douglas, BBS, JP (Chairman)
Prof CHAN Ching, Selina
Prof CHEUNG Sui-wai
Ms CHEUNG Tih-lin, Vanessa
Prof CHU Hoi-shan
Mr FU Chin-shing, Ivan, MH, JP
Mr HO Kui-yip, MH, JP
Mr IP Chung-man, Tony, MH
Prof LAM Weng-cheong
Dr LEE Ching-yee, Jane, JP
Prof LI Chi-miu, Phyllis, BBS
Mr SU Yau-on, Albert, MH, JP
Dr YEUNG Wai-shing, Frankie, BBS, MH, JP
Miss YEUNG Wing-shan, Theresa
Ms YIP Ka-ming, Alice
Mr YUEN Siu-bun, Edward

Ms Shirley YEUNG (Secretary)
Senior Executive Officer (Antiquities and Monuments) 2
Antiquities and Monuments Office

Absent with Apologies: Mr CHAN Chun-hung, Vincent
Ms SEE Sau-mei, Salome
Mr SHUM Ho-kit, BBS, JP
Mr TSANG Chiu-tong, Brian

In Attendance: Development Bureau

Mr Ivanhoe CHANG
Commissioner for Heritage [C for H]

Mr Ben LO
Chief Assistant Secretary (Works) 2
[CAS(W)2]

Miss Clarissa WAN
Assistant Secretary (Heritage Conservation) 3
[AS(HC)3]

Mr Eddie WONG
Senior Executive Manager (Heritage Conservation)
[SEM(HC)]

Ms Josephine YU
Secretariat Press Officer (Development)
[SPO(DEV)]

Antiquities and Monuments Office

Ms Fione LO
Executive Secretary (Antiquities and Monuments)
[ES(AM)]

Ms Susanna SIU, MH
Chief Heritage Executive (Antiquities & Monuments)
[CHE(AM)]

Mr Albert YUE
Senior Architect (Antiquities & Monuments) 1
[SA(AM)1]

Ms Teresa LEUNG
Senior Architect (Antiquities & Monuments) 2
[SA(AM)2]

Ms Teresa LO
Curator (Historical Buildings) 2 [C(HB)2]

Miss Beatrice WONG
Curator (Historical Buildings) 3 [C(HB)3]

Architectural Services Department

Mr Alan SIN
Assistant Director (Property Services) [AD(PS)]

Planning Department

Miss Winnie LAU
Assistant Director of Planning / Metro [AD/M]

Opening Remarks

The Chairman welcomed Members and government representatives to the meeting, in particular, the following five newly appointed Members who attended the Antiquities Advisory Board (the “Board”) meeting for the first time:

- (i) Prof CHAN Ching, Selina;
- (ii) Prof CHEUNG Sui-wai;
- (iii) Mr FU Chin-shing, Ivan;
- (iv) Mr SU Yau-on, Albert; and
- (v) Dr YEUNG Wai-shing, Frankie.

He added that Mr CHAN Chun-hung, Vincent, another newly appointed Member, was out-of-town and thus unable to attend the meeting.

2. The Chairman then informed Members that Ms Fione LO and Ms Susanna SIU had assumed the posts of Executive Secretary (Antiquities and Monuments) and Chief Heritage Executive (Antiquities & Monuments) on 16 December 2022 respectively due to the reorganisation of the Antiquities and Monuments Office (“AMO”), and briefly explained their respective job duties.

3. As it was a new term of the Board, the Chairman reminded Members to declare interest when they perceived that there might be conflict of interest in matters being discussed or to be discussed at the meeting.

Item 1 Confirmation of Minutes of the 199th Meeting held on 8 December 2022 (Board Minutes AAB/8/2021-22)

4. The minutes of the 199th Meeting held on 8 December 2022 were confirmed without amendment.

**Item 2 Matters Arising and Progress Report
(Board Paper AAB/1/2023-24)**

5. With the aid of powerpoint, ES(AM) briefed Members on the progress of the major heritage conservation issues from 1 November 2022 to 15 February 2023 as detailed in the Board Paper, including major preservation, restoration and maintenance of historic buildings projects, and CHE(AM) briefed Members on those regarding archaeological work and educational and publicity activities.

6. Mr Edward YUEN enquired if AMO would take part in the “Hello Hong Kong” campaign, a large-scale global promotional campaign currently being rolled out to attract visitors to Hong Kong after the COVID-19 pandemic. CHE(AM) replied that AMO was planning a number of promotional and public education activities and would submit suitable activities for inclusion in the campaign.

7. In response to Miss Theresa YEUNG’s suggestions on enhancing public knowledge on historic buildings, CHE(AM) responded that AMO was expanding the target audience through educational and engagement activities for different age groups.

8. Prof Phyllis LI opined that it would be good to promote Hong Kong’s cultural tourism systemically through the “point-line-plane” approach by linking up the historic buildings and local characteristics of a place so as to give visitors an immersive experience. Also, she suggested exploring collaborations with the Tourism Commission to promote Hong Kong’s heritage holistically.

9. C for H thanked for Members' suggestions, adding that the Development Bureau ("DEVB") had been working closely with the Cultural, Sports and Tourism Bureau and the Hong Kong Tourism Board ("HKTb"). He shared with Members some examples of programmes organised / to be organised by DEVB with the adoption of the "point-line-plane" approach which could deepen visitors' understanding of the historical development of Hong Kong.

10. Prof LAM Weng-cheong commented that the "Light of Jinsha – The Ancient Shu Civilisation" exhibition was very meaningful and looked forward to more exhibitions of similar kinds in the future.

11. Ms Vanessa CHEUNG wished that more collaborations could be explored with HKTb to devise and promote cultural tours of neighbourhoods. Mr Tony IP echoed, and shared with Members a recent collaboration between the Hong Kong Architecture Centre and the New Life Psychiatric Rehabilitation Association on promoting historic buildings via sale of arts creation to visitors in HKTb's Kowloon Visitor Centre.

12. Dr Frankie YEUNG shared Members' views and added that cultural heritage such as Chinese opera should also be considered in the "point-line-plane" approach.

13. Mr Albert SU, being the Chief Executive of Tung Wah Group of Hospitals ("TWGHs"), declared that the Tung Wah Museum, a declared monument which was undergoing maintenance undertaken by AMO as detailed in the Board Paper, was under his management. Besides, he shared with Members the successful organisation of "TWGHs Historical Buildings Photo Competition" in 2022 and considered that it was worthwhile for AMO to explore organising such kind of historical buildings photo competition for promoting Hong Kong to visitors.

Item 3 Assessment of Historic Buildings (Board Paper AAB/2/2023-24)

Confirmation of Proposed Grading for New Items

14. ES(AM) recapped that the Board had endorsed the proposed grading or no grading of the following four items at the meeting on 8 December 2022:

- (i) Nos. 22 to 26 and Structures Nearby, Tai Long, Sai Kung, New Territories, Proposed No Grading (Serial No. N404);

- (ii) New and Ancillary Buildings and Structures, Ham Tin, Sai Kung, New Territories, Proposed No Grading (Serial No. N422);
- (iii) Chiu Lo, DD6 Lot 1218 (near Hon Ka Road), Kam Shan, Tai Po, New Territories, Proposed Grade 1 (Serial No. N394); and
- (iv) Historic Structures at the Former Chiu Chow Pak Yap Cemetery, Pok Fu Lam, Hong Kong, Proposed Grade 2 (Serial No. N423).

15. ES(AM) reported that a one-month public consultation on the proposed grading or no grading of the above four items had been conducted from 5 January to 5 February 2023. No written submission had been received on the proposed grading status of items (i) to (iii). Regarding item (iv), three written submissions were received, all supporting the proposed Grade 2 status of the historic structures at the former Chiu Chow Pak Yap Cemetery (the “Cemetery”). Among the three submissions, one also mentioned the architectural merit of the octagonal pavilion of the Cemetery. All three written submissions had been provided to Members before the meeting. The independent Historic Buildings Assessment Panel (the “Assessment Panel”), after reviewing the written submissions, maintained the proposed grading of the historic structures at the Cemetery.

16. Members had no comment and the Board confirmed the proposed grading or no grading for the four items listed in paragraph 14 above.

Confirmation of Proposed Grading

Former Kindergarten Block of Ying Wa Girls' School, No. 76 Robinson Road, Mid-Levels, Hong Kong, Proposed Grade 3 (Serial No. N41)

17. C(HB)2 recapped that the Board endorsed the proposed Grade 3 status for the former kindergarten block of Ying Wa Girls' School (the “Kindergarten Block”) on 20 September 2010. During the one-month public consultation on the proposed grading earlier, a written submission was received from The Hong Kong Council of the Church of Christ in China (“HKCCCC”), the sponsoring body of the school, objecting to the proposed grading of the Kindergarten Block. In November 2012, HKCCCC further wrote to AMO, requesting the grading assessment be dealt with after completion of the redevelopment project of the school. Since the redevelopment of the school had been completed, AMO had recently contacted the school, which raised no objection to the grading

confirmation.

18. With the aid of powerpoint, C(HB)2 further briefed Members on the heritage value, the current condition and the proposed grading of the Kindergarten Block.

19. In response to Prof Phyllis LI's enquiry on the future plan of the Kindergarten Block, C(HB)2 replied that the school was planning to turn the building into their school history gallery.

20. With no further view, the Board confirmed the proposed Grade 3 status for the Kindergarten Block (Serial No. N41).

Review of Grading

No. 190 Nathan Road, Tsim Sha Tsui, Kowloon, Proposed Grade 2 (Serial No. 653)

21. C(HB)2 recapped that the Board discussed the proposed grading of No. 190 Nathan Road at its meeting on 8 December 2022. Considering that the building's interior had undergone large extent of alterations, some Members had reservation about the proposed adjustment of its grading from Grade 3 to proposed Grade 1. After deliberation, the Board suggested the Assessment Panel to review the heritage value of the building. Subsequently, AMO had obtained additional information from the Buildings Department and conducted further inspections of the building. Having studied the new findings, while noting the high historical value of the building, the Assessment Panel considered that the authenticity of the building had been affected by the substantial alterations of the interior to meet the new uses. After considering the heritage value of the building with regard to the established six assessment criteria (i.e. (i) historical interest; (ii) architectural merit; (iii) social value and local interest; (iv) group value; (v) authenticity; and (vi) rarity), the Assessment Panel recommended adjusting the grading of the building upwards from Grade 3 to proposed Grade 2.

22. With the aid of powerpoint, C(HB)2 showed Members the past and current conditions of No. 190 Nathan Road, including the alterations of its exterior and interior.

23. The Chairman recapped that Members paid a site visit to No. 190 Nathan Road on 5 December 2022, and had a thorough discussion on the building at the previous meeting on 8 December 2022. He summarised Members' views on the building from the previous meeting that the building was of relatively low authenticity and Members had reservation as to whether its grading should be adjusted to proposed Grade 1.

24. Mr HO Kui-yip considered that a proposed Grade 2 status was appropriate for No. 190 Nathan Road. Other than the change of the current archways on the ground floor of the building, the interior (e.g. piers) had also lost its authenticity which made it unable to reflect the then workmanship and architectural style. He supported adjusting its grading to proposed Grade 2. Besides, he remarked that No. 190 Nathan Road could serve as an example to illustrate both interior and exterior were important to reflect the architectural style and authenticity of a building.

25. Ms Alice YIP opined that the proposed Grade 2 status for No. 190 Nathan Road was justifiable, recalling that there were no buildings with extensive alterations accorded Grade 1.

26. Miss Theresa YEUNG supported the proposed Grade 2 status for No. 190 Nathan Road. She also suggested taking the opportunity to conduct public education on classical architectural styles, and shared Mr HO Kui-yip's view that the building could serve as a good example for educating the public about the importance of respecting authenticity in conservation of built heritage. She also wished the public to give careful considerations before making changes to the historic buildings as their heritage values might then be lost.

27. Prof CHU Hoi-shan supported the proposed Grade 2 status for No. 190 Nathan Road. He pointed out that the alignments of the exteriors of the buildings which used to enhance the vista along Nathan Road in the 1950s could no longer be seen nowadays.

28. Mr Ivan FU opined that No. 190 Nathan Road and other art deco buildings next to it used to create a sense of integrity through which their interrelationship in community and historical contexts was reflected. However, the sense of integrity could not be retained due to demolition of neighbouring buildings. Hence, he considered that the building would only warrant a proposed Grade 2 or below status.

29. After deliberation, the Chairman summarised that most of the Members opined that the authenticity of No. 190 Nathan Road rated relatively low while its historical value was high, and having considered all the six assessment criteria, a proposed Grade 2 status would be more appropriate for the building. By means of voting, attending Members unanimously endorsed the grading of No. 190 Nathan Road, Tsim Sha Tsui, Kowloon (Serial No. 653) as proposed Grade 2.

New Items for Grading Assessment

30. The Chairman briefed that the following six items, among which item (i) was visited by Members on 1 December 2022 and items (ii), (v) and (vi) were visited by Members on 3 March 2023, would be discussed at the meeting:

- (i) Wan Chai Fire Station, No. 435 Hennessy Road, Wan Chai, Hong Kong, Proposed Grade 2 (Serial No. N396);
- (ii) Ex-Office Building of Sha Tin Rural Committee, No. 248 Pai Tau, Sha Tin, New Territories, Proposed Grade 3 (Serial No. N397);
- (iii) No. 113 Bonham Strand, Sheung Wan, Hong Kong, Proposed Grade 3 (Serial No. N333);
- (iv) No. 20 High Street, Sai Ying Pun, Hong Kong, Proposed Grade 3 (Serial No. N355);
- (v) Chung Chi College, Staff Quarters E, The Chinese University of Hong Kong, Sha Tin, New Territories, Proposed No Grading (Serial No. N424);
and
- (vi) Chung Chi College, Staff Quarters F (Inter-University Hall), The Chinese University of Hong Kong, Sha Tin, New Territories, Proposed No Grading (Serial No. N425).

31. With the aid of video and powerpoint, C(HB)3 briefed Members on the heritage values, the current conditions and the proposed grading of the above items (i) to (iv), and C(HB)2 on items (v) and (vi).

Wan Chai Fire Station, No. 435 Hennessy Road, Wan Chai, Hong Kong, Proposed Grade 2 (Serial No. N396)

32. Ms Alice YIP supported the proposed grading for the Wan Chai Fire Station (the “Fire Station”). She enquired about the future plan of the Fire Station and how the features or stories of this specially designed fire station could be appreciated by the public. C(HB)3 replied that the Fire Services Department (“FSD”) had advised that there was no redevelopment plan for the Fire Station in the near future. AMO would further liaise with FSD to explore ways to let the public know more about the history of the Fire Station.

33. Dr Jane LEE suggested installing QR code check-points outside the Fire Station or making available online virtual tours so that members of the public could visualize the interior of the Fire Station.

34. Mr Tony IP supported the proposed grading for the Fire Station. He was of the view that the Fire Station together with the Old Wan Chai Police Station (Grade 2) and the Old Wan Chai Post Office (a declared monument) were of group value as the latter two were also public architecture which had served the community for a long period of time and formed part of the history in Wan Chai district. As such, he wished that the stories of these historic buildings could be shared with the public.

35. Mr HO Kui-yip suggested AMO to document the characteristics of the Fire Station, and explore with FSD to promote the heritage values (e.g. in terms of the facilities, architecture and history, etc.) and the contributions of fire services to the public.

36. In response to Prof CHU Hoi-shan’s enquiry on the colour scheme of the Fire Station, C(HB)3 showed Members some photos in the powerpoint with different colour schemes used by the Fire Station before. AD(PS) supplemented that the Architectural Services Department (“ASD”) would carry out regular repair and maintenance for the Fire Station, including its exterior walls. Noting the long history of the Fire Station, the works would be conducted with due care with an aim to minimising disruptions to the original design of the building. In 2007, ASD carried out renovation works for the Fire Station and the current colour scheme of the Fire Station was chosen in consultation with FSD, which was similar to the general practice adopted for other fire stations.

37. Considering that the Fire Station was built about 80 years ago, Mr Edward YUEN said that it would be worth studying how the building had been keeping up itself with the ever-changing needs to enhance its functionality, particularly the fire service technology. In reply, C(HB)3 cited an example of a major renovation carried out in 1967 to cope with the need for the provision of additional quarters on the second and third floors of the Fire Station.

38. Mr Albert SU supported the proposed grading for the Fire Station. Besides, he enquired if the grading would bring about conservation or restoration of the building. He suggested that the notable features of the Fire Station such as the sliding poles as well as the steel hose drying and drill tower should be clearly and properly documented for better preservation. The Chairman echoed, adding that the character-defining elements should be preserved as far as possible. ES(AM) explained that preservation of the character-defining elements of the building had been taken into account in grading assessment, and their conservation or restoration would be considered on a case-by-case basis upon grading.

39. Dr Frankie YEUNG supported the proposed grading for the Fire Station. He enquired if there would be any restrictions imposed on the character-defining elements to protect them against alterations upon grading. The Chairman responded that while the grading system was administrative in nature, he recalled that during the site visit, the Fire Station was well aware of the historical value of those character-defining elements which should be well-preserved.

40. In response to Prof CHEUNG Sui-wai's enquiry regarding the balcony on the first floor of the Fire Station, C(HB)3 replied that balcony access was removed after the original French doors leading to the balcony had been replaced by windows.

41. In response to Prof Phyllis LI's enquiry, C(HB)3 replied that among all fire stations in Hong Kong, the hose drying and drill tower in the Fire Station was the only surviving tower that was made of steel. She added that the brass sliding poles that were retained in the Fire Station could rarely be found in other fire stations as stainless steel ones were commonly used nowadays.

42. Mr HO Kui-yip shared that he had once seen brass sliding poles in another fire station before, so he believed that the Fire Station was not the only one having brass-made sliding poles.

43. After deliberation, the Board endorsed the grading of the Fire Station (Serial No. N396) as proposed Grade 2.

Ex-Office Building of Sha Tin Rural Committee, No. 248 Pai Tau, Sha Tin, New Territories, Proposed Grade 3 (Serial No. N397)

44. Members had no comment and the Board endorsed the grading of the ex-office building of Sha Tin Rural Committee, No. 248 Pai Tau, Sha Tin, New Territories (Serial No. N397) as proposed Grade 3.

No. 113 Bonham Strand, Sheung Wan, Hong Kong, Proposed Grade 3 (Serial No. N333)

45. The Chairman asked if AMO could enter the building of No. 113 Bonham Strand, which was now operating as a Chinese tea shop, for inspection. C(HB)3 replied that AMO had been trying to contact the tea shop operator since December 2022 but in vain. Therefore, AMO was unable to enter the building for inspection. However, AMO managed to find some photos, which were taken some five years ago and posted on Facebook, showing the interior of the ground floor of the tea shop with the ceiling built of concrete.

46. Members had no comment and the Board endorsed the grading of No. 113 Bonham Strand, Sheung Wan, Hong Kong (Serial No. N333) as proposed Grade 3.

No. 20 High Street, Sai Ying Pun, Hong Kong, Proposed Grade 3 (Serial No. N355)

47. In response to Dr Jane LEE's enquiry on the changes of the interior of the building at No. 20 High Street, C(HB)3 replied that no original floor plans of the building could be found. Based on a photo of the building taken in 2009, the French doors and fanlights, which looked the same as the existing ones, could be seen. Besides, according to the oral history interview with the person-in-charge of the service apartment, which occupied the first to third floors of the building, some original floor tiles were retained on the second and third floors when they moved in some five years ago.

48. With no further view, the Board endorsed the grading of No. 20 High Street, Sai Ying Pun, Hong Kong (Serial No. N355) as proposed Grade 3.

Chung Chi College, Staff Quarters E, The Chinese University of Hong Kong, Sha Tin, New Territories, Proposed No Grading (Serial No. N424) and Chung Chi College, Staff Quarters F (Inter-University Hall), The Chinese University of Hong Kong, Sha Tin, New Territories, Proposed No Grading (Serial No. N425)

49. C(HB)2 mentioned that the assessment on Staff Quarters E and F of Chung Chi College (the “College”) of The Chinese University of Hong Kong (“CUHK”) would be introduced together in view of their similar architectural design and the proximity of locations.

50. Prof Phyllis LI viewed that the College was of historical value to CUHK. Noting that Staff Quarters D and G of the College were also accorded no grading in the past, she enquired which buildings of the College would be considered the landmarks for representing its legacy and she considered that buildings of the College could form group value. C(HB)2 responded that since the Staff Quarters E and F were primarily used as office or staff quarters, they had little association with the students. Instead, the Chung Chi Chapel, the Chung Chi Tang, the Elisabeth Luce Moore Library and the student hostels of the College were perceived to have more collective memory among CUHK staff and students. Prof CHEUNG Sui-wai added that the Ad Excellentiam Pavilion built near the entrance of the College on Tai Po Road was also one of the significant buildings as shared by the CUHK staff during the site visit earlier.

51. Prof Phyllis LI further enquired about the long-term plans with regard to Staff Quarters A to C of the College. C(HB)2 replied that no development plans regarding the three buildings had been made known to AMO. As understood from CUHK, these buildings would continue to serve as staff quarters.

52. Mr Tony IP remarked that it would be meaningful to adaptively reuse the two young buildings Staff Quarters E and F from the environmental perspective.

53. Prof CHU Hoi-shan supported the proposed no grading status for Staff Quarters E and F. In response to his enquiry, C(HB)2 replied that no significant incidents took place in the two buildings in the past.

54. Prof CHEUNG Sui-wai shared with Members some major changes of Staff Quarters E and F, such as installation of double glazing and replacement of old lifts by modern ones, from his observations over the past ten years.

55. With no further view, the Board endorsed the proposed no grading for Chung Chi College, Staff Quarters E, The Chinese University of Hong Kong (Serial No. N424) and Chung Chi College, Staff Quarters F (Inter-University Hall), The Chinese University of Hong Kong (Serial No. N425) respectively.

Item 4 Any Other Business

56. There being no other business, the meeting was adjourned at 5:34 p.m..

Antiquities and Monuments Office
June 2023

Ref: AMO/22-3/1