

ANTIQUITIES ADVISORY BOARD

Minutes of the 208th Meeting
on Thursday, 13 March 2025 at 2:30 pm
at Conference Room, Hong Kong Heritage Discovery Centre
Kowloon Park, Haiphong Road, Tsim Sha Tsui, Kowloon

Present: Prof HUI Cheuk-kuen, Desmond (Chairman)
Prof CHAN Ching, Selina
Mr CHAN Chun-hung, Vincent
Miss CHAN Ka-man
Prof CHEUNG Sui-wai
Ms CHEUNG Yi-mei, Amy, BBS
Mr CHOI Wun-hing, Donald, BBS, JP
Dr KONG Wing-man, Samantha
Prof LAU Sing-yeung, Sunnie
Ms Christina Maisenne LEE, JP
Mr LEE Tsz-leung
Mr MAN Ka-ho, Donald, JP
Ms SEE Sau-mei, Salome
Mr SU Yau-on, Albert, MH, JP
Mr YAM Ming-ho, Caspar
Prof YEUNG Wai-shing, Frankie, BBS, MH, JP
Mr YUEN Siu-bun, Edward

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

Absent with Apologies: Mr CHIU Kam-kuen
Mr FU Chin-shing, Ivan, MH, JP
Prof LAM Weng-cheong

In Attendance: Development Bureau

Miss Pamela LAM, JP
Deputy Secretary for Development (Works) 1

Mr David LEUNG
Commissioner for Heritage [C for H]

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

Ms Winkie CHICK
Assistant Secretary (Heritage Conservation) 3

Ms Phyllis SO
Chief Executive Officer (Heritage Conservation) 1

Ms Josephine YU
Secretariat Press Officer (Development)

Antiquities and Monuments Office

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

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

Mr Clarence HO
Senior Architect (Antiquities & Monuments) 1

Ms Teresa LEUNG
Senior Architect (Antiquities & Monuments) 2

Miss Fanny KONG
Curator (Historical Buildings) 2 [C(HB)2]

Ms Donna MOK
Acting Curator (Historical Buildings) 3 [Atg. C(HB)3] /
Assistant Curator I (Building Survey) 3

Architectural Services Department

Mr Raymond CHAN
Assistant Director (Property Services)

Planning Department

Miss Winne LAU
Assistant Director of Planning/Metro

Opening Remarks

The Chairman welcomed Members and government representatives to the meeting, in particular, the following eight newly appointed Members and Mr David LEUNG who had succeeded Mr Ivanhoe CHANG as the Commissioner for Heritage, attending the Antiquities Advisory Board (the “Board”) meeting for the first time:

- (i) Miss CHAN Ka-man;
- (ii) Ms CHEUNG Yi-mei, Amy;
- (iii) Mr CHOI Wun-hing, Donald;
- (iv) Dr KONG Wing-man, Samantha;
- (v) Prof LAU Sing-yeung, Sunnie;
- (vi) Ms Christina Maisenne LEE;
- (vii) Mr LEE Tsz-leung; and
- (viii) Mr MAN Ka-ho, Donald.

He added that Mr CHIU Kam-kuen, another newly appointed Member, was unable to attend the meeting.

2. As it was a new term of the Board, the Chairman reminded Members to declare any 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 207th Meeting held on 12 December 2024 (Board Minutes AAB/8/2023-24)

3. The minutes of the 207th meeting held on 12 December 2024 were confirmed without amendments.

**Item 2 Matters Arising and Progress Report
(Board Paper AAB/1/2025-26)**

4. ES(AM) briefed Members on the progress of major heritage conservation projects from 1 November 2024 to 15 February 2025 as detailed in the Board Paper, including major preservation, restoration and maintenance of historic building projects.

5. CHE(AM) briefed Members on the progress of archaeological works and educational and publicity activities from 1 November 2024 to 15 February 2025 as well as guided tours and educational programmes arranged as detailed in the Board Paper. She also took the opportunity to thank Members for their ongoing participation in the City Heritage Run, of which the latest tours were launched in Wong Tai Sin District and Northern Metropolis in December 2024 and February 2025 respectively.

**Item 3 Declaration of Two Historic Buildings as Monuments
(Board Paper AAB/2/2025-26)**

6. The Chairman thanked Members for attending the site visit on 5 March 2025 to the following two Grade 1 historic buildings proposed for declaration as monuments:

- (i) Main Building of Old Tsan Yuk Maternity Hospital, 36A Western Street, Sai Ying Pun, Hong Kong (serial no. 132); and

- (ii) Kwong Fook Tsz, 40 Tai Ping Shan Street, Sheung Wan, Hong Kong (serial no. 1092).

He also expressed gratitude to the Central and Western District Office of the Home Affairs Department, the management department of the Old Tsan Yuk Maternity Hospital (“Old Tsan Yuk”), and the Tung Wah Group of Hospitals (“TWGHs”), the owner of Kwong Fook Tsz (the “Temple”), for their support in the research and intended declaration of the two historic buildings as monuments.

7. The Chairman said that Mr Albert SU had declared interest before the meeting that he was the Chief Executive of TWGHs which owned and managed the Temple. He noted Mr SU’s declaration and welcomed him to provide supplementary information when necessary but abstain from discussion and voting on the item.

8. C(HB)2 briefed Members on the heritage value of the Main Building of Old Tsan Yuk and the Temple with the aid of videos and PowerPoint slides.

Main Building of Old Tsan Yuk Maternity Hospital, 36A Western Street, Sai Ying Pun, Hong Kong (serial no. 132)

9. Mr Albert SU supported the proposed declaration. He said that although Old Tsan Yuk no longer operated as a hospital, it currently housed several non-governmental organisations and continued to provide social and healthcare services to the community. It also formed a cluster with other historic buildings in the Central and Western District. He emphasised its historical significance and worthiness of preservation, noting that docent tours of the declared monuments and graded historic buildings in the vicinity could promote heritage education or characteristic tourism, thereby enhancing local tourism. He enquired if there were any plans for the adjoining Second Street Public Bathhouse (the “Bathhouse”).

10. Prof Frankie YEUNG echoed and opined that Old Tsan Yuk, along with nearby historic buildings such as King’s College (declared monument), could provide tourists with in-depth and thematic attractions in Hong Kong. He suggested publishing their historical background and photos on social media such as Xiaohongshu to promote these unique cultural assets.

11. Mr Caspar YAM was supportive of the proposed declaration. He was pleased to see that the assessment on the group value of Old Tsan Yuk had included other considerations such as nearby historic buildings designed and constructed by the same architecture firm, as well as its role in bearing witness to the development of a cluster of medical facilities in the district. He also enquired if there were any plans for the Bathhouse, the only surviving pre-war building of its kind. ES(AM) replied that the Bathhouse was a Grade 2 building and the Antiquities and Monuments Office (“AMO”) would keep in view with the Food and Environmental Hygiene Department, the management department of the Bathhouse, on its future use and upkeeping.

12. Mr Edward YUEN agreed to the proposed declaration considering that Old Tsan Yuk exemplified the integration of Chinese and Western cultures in Hong Kong. He said that women assisting in childbirth in traditional Chinese society were not formally trained, making Old Tsan Yuk a symbol of collaboration between Chinese and Western sectors in the early development of Hong Kong. He also wondered whether it reflected the emergence of charitable and community services in the Western District, an area often been seen as poor and overpopulated in the past.

13. Mr Donald CHOI concurred with Members’ comments, adding that the Annex Block of Old Tsan Yuk which accommodated the Hong Kong Resource Centre for Heritage (previously known as the Conservancy Association Centre for Heritage) was built in the 1900s. He suggested that this inter-related structure should be treated as a compound alongside the Main Building of Old Tsan Yuk for heritage conservation and tourism purposes. ES(AM) replied that the Annex Block was a Grade 2 building and thus fell under the Government’s internal monitoring mechanism. Should there be any works proposals for the Annex Block, AMO would be notified and would offer advice from the heritage conservation perspective.

14. In response to Miss CHAN Ka-man’s enquiry on the proposed monument boundary, C(HB)2 confirmed that the bridge connecting the Main Building of Old Tsan Yuk with the adjacent Annex Block was not included in the demarcation of the proposed monument boundary.

15. Prof Sunnie LAU opined that Old Tsan Yuk demonstrated its authenticity and social value, as it continued to serve the local community to this day. She enquired whether there would be any restrictions on utilising the building by the non-governmental organisations therein upon monument declaration.

16. ES(AM) replied that to ensure declared monuments would be properly protected without affecting their daily operation and maintenance, permits would be issued to their owners or managing parties for carrying out routine maintenance works. For major works or alterations which required special permits, AMO was prepared to provide technical advice to strike a balance between heritage conservation and practical needs. She emphasised the importance of preserving historic buildings as “living monuments” rather than treating them merely as artefacts for display.

17. Mr Albert SU remarked that while Old Tsan Yuk was the first hospital providing maternity services and midwife training for the Chinese community on Hong Kong Island, Kwong Wah Hospital in Yau Ma Tei which opened in 1911 was likely the first hospital established with a Western maternity ward in Hong Kong. He suggested that further research could be conducted in this regard.

18. With no further views from Members, the Board supported the intended declaration of the Main Building of Old Tsan Yuk as a monument under section 3(1) of the Antiquities and Monuments Ordinance (Cap. 53) (the “Ordinance”).

Kwong Fook Tsz, 40 Tai Ping Shan Street, Sheung Wan, Hong Kong (serial no. 1092)

19. Prof CHEUNG Sui-wai supported the proposed declaration, noting that research into Hong Kong’s history would inevitably begin with the Temple due to its profound historical significance. He observed that the Temple featured a plaque presented by the Lan Kwai Fong community, demonstrating that its influence extended beyond the Tai Ping Shan Street area.

20. Ms Salome SEE was supportive of the proposed declaration and was impressed by the excellent management of the Temple by TWGHs. As the three-hall-two-courtyard layout and Shiwan ceramics on the ridge of the Temple were not easily visible from street level, she suggested displaying photos of its layout and architectural features at the Temple for public appreciation. ES(AM)

responded that, as usual, information plaques with QR codes would be installed at declared monuments allowing visitors to access additional information, including photos of the monuments.

21. Ms Amy CHEUNG agreed with the proposed declaration, emphasising how the Temple reflected Hong Kong's history as a city of immigrants, and the inclusiveness of local temples accommodating different religions. She noticed some interior features, such as fluorescent tubes and fans, were more modern and inquired whether resources could be allocated to showcase the Temple's original appearance. ES(AM) explained that the owner of a declared monument was not obligated to restore the building to its original state. Instead, it was more important for monuments to be properly maintained and continued to function under conservation principles. However, AMO could assist owners in restoration efforts based on historical research if needed.

22. Prof Selina CHAN pointed out that apart from its high historical value, the Temple was widely recognised by people from different social backgrounds including elites and the general public.

23. With no further views from Members, the Board supported the intended declaration of the Temple as a monument under section 3(1) of the Ordinance.

Item 4 Assessment of Historic Buildings (Board Paper AAB/3/2025-26)

Confirmation of Proposed Grading Endorsed at the Last Meeting

24. ES(AM) recapped that the Board endorsed the proposed grading of the following three items at its meeting on 12 December 2024:

- (i) Tin Shui Lau Fong, Chek Keng Sheung Wai, Sai Kung North, Tai Po, New Territories (serial no. N430) – proposed Grade 2;
- (ii) Nos. 93 and 94 Ng Fai Tin, Clear Water Bay, Sai Kung, New Territories (serial no. N431) – proposed Grade 2; and
- (iii) No. 6 Arran Street, Mong Kong, Kowloon (serial no. N432) – proposed Grade 3.

25. ES(AM) reported that a one-month public consultation on the proposed grading of the above three items was conducted from 10 January to 10 February 2025. No written submissions were received on the proposed grading status for all items.

26. With no further views from Members, the Board supported the confirmation of the proposed grading status for the three items listed in paragraph 24 above.

New Items for Grading Assessment

27. The Chairman said that the following four items would be discussed at the meeting:

- (i) Nos. 25-26 Tsz Tong Tsuen, Kam Tin, Yuen Long, New Territories (serial no. N433) – proposed Grade 2;
- (ii) Former Garage of Repulse Bay Hotel, No. 60 Repulse Bay Road, Repulse Bay, Hong Kong (serial no. N434) – proposed Grade 3;
- (iii) Former Staff Quarters of Repulse Bay Hotel, Repulse Bay, Hong Kong (serial no. N435) – proposed Grade 3; and
- (iv) No. 153 Queen’s Road West, Hong Kong (serial no. N436) – proposed Grade 3.

28. With the aid of videos and PowerPoint slides, C(HB)2 briefed Members on the heritage value, current conditions and proposed grading of item (i), while Atg. C(HB)3 on items (ii) to (iv).

Nos. 25-26 Tsz Tong Tsuen, Kam Tin, Yuen Long, New Territories (serial no. N433)

29. In response to Prof Sunnie LAU’s enquiry on the locations of other declared monuments or graded historic buildings near Nos. 25-26 Tsz Tong Tsuen (the “Houses”) with shared group value, C(HB)2 explained that the Houses were situated in front of the main entrance of the Residence of Tang Pak Kau (declared monument), and there were many other declared monuments and graded historic

buildings nearby, such as Cheung Chun Yuen (Grade 1), Tang Kwong U Ancestral Hall (declared monument) and Chou Wong Yi Kung Study Hall (Grade 2) in the vicinity. She illustrated the locations with the aid of the Geographical Information System on Hong Kong Heritage available on the Board's website.

30. While supporting the proposed grading of the Houses, Mr Albert SU raised his concern over the decline in the number of similar traditional vernacular houses. Noticing that there were other graded historic buildings nearby which might still be in use, he asked if a systematic approach to repair and maintenance could be implemented so as to preserve their original architectural features and enhance their overall external appearance.

31. Prof Sunnie LAU agreed and cited Lai Chi Wo as a successful example of village revitalisation, attributing its success to the systematic and sustainable restoration of historic buildings. This approach preserved the architectural integrity of the area while showcasing its extensive history and stories to visitors.

32. Prof Frankie YEUNG concurred with the proposed grading and Members' comments. He shared his experience in driving around the neighbourhood and remarked that the provision of ancillary transport facilities was crucial for heritage conservation and tourism in the area.

33. ES(AM) responded that the Commissioner for Heritage's Office and AMO would actively reach out to private owners of graded historic buildings to encourage them to apply for subsidies under the Financial Assistance for Maintenance Scheme on Built Heritage for carrying out maintenance works. To support the private owners to open their monuments for public visits, such as Lik Wing Tong Study Hall (Grade 1) and Cheung Chun Yuen in Kam Tin, AMO would undertake restoration and repair of these premises.

34. With no further views from Members, the Board endorsed the grading of the Houses as proposed Grade 2.

Former Garage of Repulse Bay Hotel, No. 60 Repulse Bay Road, Repulse Bay, Hong Kong (serial no. N434) and Former Staff Quarters of Repulse Bay Hotel, Repulse Bay, Hong Kong (serial no. N435)

35. Mr Edward YUEN considered the former garage (the "Garage") of the

Repulse Bay Hotel would warrant a proposed Grade 2 status and enquired the basis of the current assessment. Atg. C(HB)3 explained that the Garage had seen a number of variations in its use over the years and consequently undergone several internal and external alterations which undermined its authenticity.

36. Ms Salome SEE reckoned that the overall architectural form and external appearance of the Garage were retained, suggesting that it merited a higher grading. Prof Frankie YEUNG echoed.

37. Prof Sunnie LAU asked if major modifications had been made to the façades, noting changes in the architectural form visible in photos. Atg. C(HB)3 elaborated further on the alterations made to the exterior of the Garage, including its roof, the lower front façade and southeast elevation. ES(AM) supplemented that the Historic Buildings Assessment Panel (the “Assessment Panel”) took into account the above-mentioned modifications and assessed the heritage value of the Garage on a holistic approach based on 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.

38. Since the next discussion item i.e. the former staff quarters (the “Quarters”) of the Repulse Bay Hotel was adjacent to the Garage, the Chairman invited Atg. C(HB)3 to proceed with the briefing before the Board finalised their decision on the grading of both buildings. The Board continued their deliberation after the presentation.

39. Ms Salome SEE opined that both structures deserved a proposed Grade 2 status, considering their interconnected aesthetic and historical significance with the Repulse Bay Hotel. She noted that other historic buildings with shared group value had received higher grading. Mr Vincent CHAN agreed in light of their importance.

40. Mr Donald CHOI commented that both the internal layout and exterior of the Garage and Quarters had undergone substantial alterations. He noted that the Garage had been converted into a luxury car showroom and the Quarters into a staff activity room. He considered that the proposed Grade 3 status was appropriate. Prof CHEUNG Sui-wai stressed the importance of maintaining consistency in the assessment of historic buildings. While he acknowledged the aesthetic appeal of the structures, he had reservations about elevating their grading

status, as it might compromise consistency in the grading assessment. Mr Caspar YAM agreed to their views.

41. Mr LEE Tsz-leung supported the proposed Grade 3 status for the Garage and the Quarters. He pointed out that modifications to the front façade of the Garage, including the addition of two new doorways and modification of the original entrance to a window opening had altered the symmetrical design of the main entrances.

42. Prof Sunnie LAU concurred with the proposed Grade 3 status and the need for benchmarking and consistent assessment standard throughout the grading exercise. Ms Christina LEE supported the proposed Grade 3 status in light of significant alterations to both buildings and the need to align with the prevailing yardstick, adding that the Quarters had undergone considerable modifications of which its roof and external staircase were replaced.

43. ES(AM) supplemented that as compared with the Main Building of the Repulse Bay Hotel which had been demolished, the Garage and the Quarters being the ancillary structures were rated lower in terms of its value in reflecting the original functions of the Hotel. Besides, they suffered different levels of damages during the Second World War and there were notable alterations over the past years, particularly to the Garage. Having taken into account the above factors along with their social value, the Assessment Panel recommended proposed Grade 3 status for both buildings. She added that if there was other evidence which had not been considered during the initial assessment, it would be presented to the Assessment Panel for discussion and review of the grading.

44. Miss CHAN Ka-man noted that a 1951 floor plan of the Garage indicated part of its lower floor was temporarily used as storage space. She supported the proposed grading.

45. Dr Samantha KONG expressed her support for the proposed Grade 3 status for the two buildings considering that their authenticity and rarity had been compromised by the alterations. Ms Amy CHEUNG also agreed.

46. With no further views from Members, the Board endorsed the grading of both Garage and Quarters of the Repulse Bay Hotel as proposed Grade 3.

No. 153 Queen's Road West, Hong Kong (serial no. N436)

47. Members had no comment and endorsed the grading of No. 153 Queen's Road West as proposed Grade 3.

(Prof Frankie YEUNG left the meeting at 5:00 p.m.)

Item 4 Any Other Business

48. Mr Caspar YAM noted that some private owners of declared monuments might not fully understand the concept of "Block Permit" and the scope of maintenance works permitted. He suggested including an introduction on AMO's website. He also noted that some interest groups expressed concerns on the demolition of certain non-graded items in the public housing development project at Cha Kwo Ling Village, including Nos. 95 & 95A Cha Kwo Ling Village and the Former Si Shan Public School (the "School"). They claimed that there was new information about the School's connection to an architect and a Guangdong fleet admiral. While noting that the project had already commenced, and its Heritage Impact Assessment ("HIA") report was endorsed by the Board before, he enquired if the status of the non-graded items would be reviewed in light of the new information available.

49. CAS(W)2 emphasised the importance of striking a balance between development and heritage conservation. The HIA was one of the tools to achieve such a balance. He remarked that the relevant HIA report commissioned by the Civil Engineering and Development Department covered information about the School and other heritage resources in the site.

50. In response to Mr Donald CHOI's enquiry about media access to meeting information before the meeting, ES(AM) replied that discussion papers would be uploaded onto the Board's website normally one week before the open meetings.

51. Ms Salome SEE said that many owners of historic buildings were confused over the grading implications on their properties and any obligations they might have if their properties were declared as monuments or graded. She proposed creating video content for platforms like YouTube to address these concerns, including topics such as Government subsidies for maintenance works.

She suggested incorporating existing videos of graded historic buildings captured by AMO to promote tourism. Mr Albert SU echoed and opined that private owners needed not worry much as they could get support from AMO on repair and maintenance as well as research matters, based on his experience in managing declared monuments and graded historic buildings.

52. C for H thanked Members for their comments and agreed to explore ways to enhance publicity and information dissemination. ES(AM) added that AMO would liaise with private owners when proposing monument declarations and determining the scope of Block Permit to ensure reasonable repair and improvement works without affecting original architectural features.

53. There being no other business, the meeting was adjourned at 5:17 p.m.

Antiquities and Monuments Office

June 2025

Ref: AMO 22-3/1