

ANTIQUITIES ADVISORY BOARD

MINUTES OF THE OPEN SESSION OF THE 134<sup>th</sup> MEETING  
HELD ON FRIDAY 26 JUNE 2008 AT 2:35 P.M.  
IN CONFERENCE ROOM, HONG KONG HERITAGE DISCOVERY CENTRE.  
KOWLOON PARK, HAIPHONG ROAD, TSIM SHA TSUI, KOWLOON

Present: Mr Edward Ho, SBS, JP (Chairman)  
The Hon Bernard Charnwut Chan, GBS, JP  
Mrs Mariana Cheng Cho Chi-on, BBS, JP  
Ms Susanna Chiu Lai-kuen  
Mr Patrick Fung Pak-tung, SC  
Mr James Hong Shu-kin  
Mr Philip Kan Siu-lun  
Mr Kwong Hoi-ying  
The Hon Patrick Lau Sau-shing, SBS, JP  
Mr Laurence Li Lu-jen  
Prof Bernard Lim Wan-fung  
Dr Ng Cho-nam, BBS  
Mr Ng Yat-cheung, JP  
Mr Almon Poon Chin-hung, JP  
Prof Simon Shen Xu-hui  
Ms Miranda Szeto Shiu-ching  
Ir Dr Greg Wong Chak-yan, JP  
Ms Lisa Yip Sau-wah, JP  
Miss Vivian Yu Yuk-ying  
Ms Heidi Kwok (Secretary)  
Senior Executive Officer (Antiquities and Monuments)  
Leisure and Cultural Services Department

Absent with Apologies:

Prof Leslie Chen Hung-chi  
Mr David Cheung Ching-leung  
Mr Andrew Lam Siu-lo  
Prof Lau Chi-pang  
Dr Linda Tsui Yee-wan  
Mr Bryan Wong Kim-yeung  
Mr Yeung Yiu-chung, BBS, JP

In Attendance: Development Bureau

Miss Janet Wong, JP  
Deputy Secretary (Works)1

Mr Jack Chan  
Commissioner for Heritage

*Leisure and Cultural Services Department*

Mr Thomas Chow, JP  
Director of Leisure and Cultural Services

Mr Chung Ling-hoi, JP  
Deputy Director (Culture)

Dr Louis Ng  
Assistant Director (Heritage and Museums)

Mr Tom Ming  
Executive Secretary (Antiquities and Monuments)

Mr Kevin Sun  
Curator (Archaeology)

Mrs Ada Yau  
Curator (Education and Publicity)

Mr Hessler Lee  
Principal Marketing Coordinator (Heritage and Museums)

Miss Addy Wong  
Senior Marketing Coordinator (Heritage and Museums)

Ms Yvonne Chan  
Executive Officer I (Antiquities and Monuments)

*Planning Department*

Ms Brenda Au  
Acting Assistant Director/Metro

*Architectural Services Department*

Mr S L Lam  
Senior Property Services Manager/Eastern and Antiquities

Opening Remarks

The Chairman opened the meeting by welcoming Mr Jack Chan, Commissioner for Heritage. He also extended his welcome to members and representatives from the Development Bureau and government departments.

**Item 1 Matters Arising and Progress Report  
(Board Paper AAB/61/2007-08)**

Presentation Session

2. Mr Tom Ming highlighted the following items for members' information:
- (a) Declaration of King Yin Lei at 45 Stubbs Road
  - (b) Restoration of King Yin Lei at 45 Stubbs Road

He added that restoration of King Yin Lei would proceed in two phases starting with the roof restoration and the whole project was anticipated to complete in 2010.

Discussion Session

3. In response to a member's enquiry, Mr Tom Ming said that AMO would give members an implementation schedule of the restoration project and a site visit for members would be arranged at an appropriate time
4. In reply to a member's enquiry, Mr Tom Ming informed the meeting that tenders for restoration of the roof and other parts of the building would be called separately in view of the urgent need for repairs to the roof. Before commencement of the roof works, temporary protection measures had been put in place.
5. A member asked if the safe room inside the building would be preserved. Mr Tom Ming responded that in accordance with the conservation guideline, the building would be restored to its original appearance as far as possible.
6. Members noted the Report.

**Item 2 Urban Design Study for the New Central Harbourfront Stage 2 Public Engagement  
(Board Paper AAB/62/2007-08)**

7. The Chairman introduced the following presentation team:
- (a) Mrs Ava Ng, JP, Director of Planning, Planning Department
  - (b) Ms Phyllis Li, Chief Town Planner/Special Duties, Planning Department
  - (c) Mr Fung Kit-wing, Chief Engineer/Hong Kong, Civil Engineering and Development Department
  - (d) Miss Santafe Poon, Aedas Limited, Consultant for the Study
  - (e) Dr Florence Ho, PolyU Public Policy Research Institute, Consultant for the Study
  - (f) Dr Ivan Fung, CityU Professional Services Limited, Consultant for the Study

### Presentation Session

8. Mrs Ava Ng briefed members on the overall urban design vision and objectives for the Urban Design Study for the New Central Harbourfront (the Study). She said that in response to public aspirations, the Study had developed different design concepts for re-assembling Queen's Pier and reconstructing the old Star Ferry Clock Tower, amongst other urban design proposals. She noted that members requested to be consulted on the Study at the AAB meetings in December 2006 and October 2007 and therefore took the opportunity to seek members' views and comments on the Study.

9. Miss Santafe Poon then presented a short video, followed by a PowerPoint presentation on the key features of the Study. She highlighted the two alternative Design Concepts for re-assembling Queen's Pier.

### Discussion Session

10. In reply to the Chairman's enquiry, Mrs Ava Ng informed the meeting that the Stage 2 Public Engagement had commenced in mid April and would last until late July. Exhibitions and consultation sessions would be arranged. The public could visit Planning Department's website at [www.pland.gov.hk](http://www.pland.gov.hk) for information on the Study and the public engagement activities. Views and suggestions were most welcomed.

11. A member asked how Government would make reference to public views collected during the Public Engagement. Mrs Ava Ng responded that the consultants would use the sustainable design assessment framework and the sustainability criteria widely consulted in the Stage 1 Public Engagement as the basis to assess views received in the Stage 2 Public Engagement and refine the design concepts. A concluding forum would also be held to consolidate ideas for a consensus before finalizing the study proposals.

12. In response to a member's views on the pros and cons of the two Design Concepts, Mrs Ava Ng responded that if Concept A was adopted, markings to show Queen's Pier's original location could be considered. Alternatively, information or interpretation of the history of Queen's Pier could also be provided at Queen's Pier's new location. The member further inquired if either Pier 9 or Pier 10 could be dispensed with so as to widen the access to the relocated Queen's Pier. Mrs Ava Ng said that the number of landing steps of Piers 9 and 10 was proposed to be reduced to allow easy access to the landing steps of Queen's Pier.

13. A member preferred Concept A, which looked more symmetrical in overall design with the reconstructed old Star Ferry Clock Tower as a focal point, maintaining an axial relationship with City Hall and Queen's Pier whereas for Concept B, Queen's Pier would lose its pier function though it would be reassembled at its original location.

14. The Chairman shared similar view that for Concept A, Queen's Pier looked more spacious in the foreground with an open visual link with the old Star Ferry Clock Tower while for Concept B, the layout seemed a bit messy and congested with the nearby roads. He hoped that an unobstructed view amongst the three

components, i.e. Queen's Pier, the old Star Ferry Clock Tower and City Hall could be maintained if Concept A would be adopted.

15. A member opined that apart from considering its pier function, the overall significance of Queen's Pier together with City Hall and Edinburgh Place in the context of Hong Kong's historical and cultural development should be an important factor for the AAB's consideration. For Concept A, he commented that if the design of Piers 9 and 10 could not integrate well with Queen's Pier, formerly a protruding pier, it would affect pier safety and Queen's Pier's historic status. For Concept B, he did not mind that Queen's Pier would lose its pier function as he considered its historical and cultural values more important.

16. A member considered that the AAB should comment on the proposals from a historical and heritage perspective, as this was the purpose of the current consultation. He commented that Concept A to reassemble Queen's Pier at the harbourfront could not reveal the relative location of Queen's Pier and the old Star Ferry Clock Tower.

17. A member considered Concept A of reviving Queen's Pier's function at the waterfront more acceptable though the issue of land and sea transport needed to be addressed. He referred to the long distance that passengers had to travel to the relocated Star Ferry Pier and hoped that Planning Department would consider passengers' convenience when Queen's Pier was relocated.

18. A member preferred Concept B as it could preserve Queen's Pier's group value and historical significance. He considered reviving Queen's Pier's function not essential given that several public piers were available.

19. A member said that the revitalization of Queen's Pier should not be overlooked. He remarked that Concept B of reassembling Queen's Pier as a sitting-out area with a water feature far away from the seafront did not give due regard to Queen's Pier's revitalization. He inclined towards Concept A.

20. A member said that the AAB's comments should be consistent with the Grade I status it had accorded to Queen's Pier. He remarked that for Concept B, the reassembled Queen's Pier could serve as a landmark to remind people of the former coastline and its relationship with City Hall and Edinburgh Place though it could not revive its pier function. For Concept A, he suspected that the insertion of Queen's Pier between Piers 9 and 10 might necessitate the redesign and affect the functions of the latter two piers. He suggested either to demolish Pier 9 or Pier 10 so as to provide more space for Queen's Pier or to reassemble Queen's Pier at Stanley similar to Murray House. He also asked if Queen's Pier would be designed as a protruding pier as in the past or would juxtapose with Piers 9 and 10.

21. A member did not think that the general public was fully aware of the axial relationship between Queen's Pier, City Hall and Edinburgh Place. She referred to Concept A and asked if Pier 9 or Pier 10 could be demolished and be replaced by Queen's Pier to make it more spacious if these two piers had to be redesigned to accommodate Queen's Pier.

22. A member remarked that it would be rather funny to reassemble a pier where there was no water. Since placing the reassembled Queen's Pier between Piers 9 and 10 was not entirely satisfactory, he hoped that Government would consider alternative proposal of reassembling Queen's Pier at the waterfront.

23. A member was of the view that Queen's Pier could be considered as revitalized as long as it was reassembled at its original location near the City Hall and Edinburgh Place where the public would continue to go.

24. In response to members' foregoing views and suggestions, Mrs Ava Ng responded that for Concept A, various land and sea transport modes would be provided at the ferry plaza to improve land accessibility to the harbourfront but landing steps could only be available along the main frontage of the Pier abutting the harbour while the steps on the two sides could not be reprovided as the reassembled Pier could not protrude onto the harbour due to compliance with the Protection of the Harbour Ordinance. She said that the public consultation revealed that the public's memories of the Pier were generally associated with waterfront activities/setting whereas their impression of the City Hall and Edinburgh Place context and the activities there were relatively vague.

25. A member asked about the future of Fenwick Pier at the Wanchai harbourfront. Mrs Ava Ng said that the site for the pier and associated buildings was zoned as public open space in the relevant Outline Zoning Plan.

26. A member commended Government's efforts in reconstructing the former Star Ferry Clock Tower in both proposals. He suggested reviewing the height of the reconstructed Star Ferry Clock Tower and the need to attach it to a gallery.

27. Mrs Ava Ng responded that the original height of the Clock Tower and its base was around 24 metres which would be maintained. There were, however, diverse views on whether the reconstructed Clock Tower should be free standing or attached to a gallery.

28. Noting that there was no consensus view and different comments were expressed by Members, the Chairman hoped that the Planning Department would take into account members' comments in finalising the design proposal for the new Central harbourfront. Mrs Ava Ng thanked members for their valuable views and suggestions.

### **Item 3 Discovery of Longjin Bridge in Kai Tak Area (Board Paper AAB/63/2007-08)**

#### Presentation Session

29. Mr Tom Ming briefed members on the discovery of the remains of Longjin Bridge in April 2008 and the plan of conducting further archaeological investigation.

30. Mr Kevin Sun then gave a presentation on the background of Longjin Bridge and composition of the remains unearthed. He said that in view of the influx of

underground water into the test trench, the excavated area would be backfilled for protection of the site and the discoveries. Further archaeological investigation would be arranged during the dry season in late 2008 to ascertain the extent of the Bridge remains.

31. With the additional information, Members noted the paper

**Item 4 Any Other Business**

32. There being no other business, the meeting was adjourned at 4:00 p.m.

Antiquities and Monuments Office  
Leisure and Cultural Services Department  
September 2008

Ref: LCS AM 22/3