

**ANTIQUITIES ADVISORY BOARD**

**Minutes of the 161<sup>st</sup> Meeting**  
**on Wednesday, 20 February 2013 at 3:00 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)  
Mr Stephen Chan Chit-kwai, BBS, JP  
Mr Chan Ka-kui, BBS, JP  
Prof Rebecca Chiu Lai-har, JP  
Professor Ho Pui-yin  
Mr Tim Ko Tim-keung  
Mr Tony Lam Chung-wai  
Ms Lilian Law Suk-kwan, JP  
Mr Philip Liao Yi-kang  
Mr Kenny Lin Ching-pui  
Professor Tracey Lu Lie-dan  
Mr Joseph Luc Ngai  
Ms Janet Pau Heng-ting  
Ms Yvonne Shing Mo-han  
Professor Billy So Kee-long  
Dr Winnie Tang Shuk-ming, JP  
Ms Karen Tang Shuk-tak  
Dr Joseph Ting Sun-pao  
Ms Ava Tse Suk-ying, SBS  
Sr Wong Bay  
Mr Conrad Wong Tin-cheung, JP

Ms Becky Lam (Secretary)  
Senior Executive Officer (Antiquities and Monuments)  
Leisure and Cultural Services Department

Absent with Apologies: Professor Chung Po-yin  
Prof Ho Puay-peng, JP

In Attendance: Development Bureau  
Mr Paul Chan, MH, JP  
Secretary for Development  
(for item 1 only)

Ms Grace Lui, JP  
Deputy Secretary (Works)1

Miss Vivian Ko  
Commissioner for Heritage

Leisure and Cultural Services Department  
Mrs Betty Fung, JP  
Director of Leisure and Cultural Services

Ms Cynthia Liu  
Deputy Director (Culture)

Dr Louis Ng  
Assistant Director (Heritage and Museums)

Mr Tom Ming  
Executive Secretary (Antiquities and Monuments)

Mrs Ada Yau  
Curator (Archaeology)  
(for item 5 only)

Ms Angela Siu  
Curator (Historical Buildings) 2  
(for item 6 only)

Dr Alan Fung  
Assistant Curator I (Buildings Survey)  
(for item 7 only)

Planning Department

Mr Michael Chan

Assistant Director/Metro

Architectural Services Department

Mr Fong Siu-wai

Assistant Director (Property Services)

Mr Lam Sair-ling

Senior Maintenance Surveyor/Heritage

**Opening Remarks**

The Chairman thanked Members and representatives from government departments for attending the meeting.

**Item 1     Review on Heritage Conservation Policy**

2.        The Chairman welcomed Mr Paul Chan, Secretary for Development (“SDEV”), to brief Members on the review on the heritage conservation policy.

3.        Mr Paul Chan said that as announced by the Chief Executive in his 2013 Policy Address, we considered that we should review the present policy on the conservation of privately-owned historic buildings. The review would cover areas such as the extent and ways to use public resources to conserve privately-owned historic buildings, the need to establish a set of more standardised mechanism and criteria for providing economic incentives to owners, as well as whether we should advance the conservation of privately-owned historic buildings through town planning. We would also need to examine whether the setting up of a heritage trust will help in the conservation of privately-owned historic buildings and if so, the feasibility of setting up of a trust in the context of Hong Kong.

4.        Mr Paul Chan invited the Antiquities Advisory Board (“AAB”), which was the Government’s important partner on heritage conservation, to assist the Government with the policy review, including offering suggestions on the scope of

the review, advising on the way in which the review should be conducted and the related timetable, and working on a consultation paper by end 2013.

5. Mr Stephen Chan, Mr Tony Lam, Sr Wong Bay, Mr Conrad Wong and Prof Billy So expressed their support to the review.

6. In response to Sr Wong Bay's enquiry on the role of the AAB in the review, Mr Paul Chan explained that the AAB, comprising members from different sectors of the community, would play an important role in offering advice to the Government. The Development Bureau ("DEVB") would also join hands with the AAB to collate views from the public to formulate the policy.

7. Dr Winnie Tang raised that the AAB should be further consulted before finalising any new policy. Mr Paul Chan explained that similar to the making of any policy, AAB's suggestions on the heritage policy would be discussed internally within the Government (and not just within the DEVB) before a decision would be made. Nevertheless, even if some of the AAB's suggestions were not accepted by the Government after consideration, the Government would provide justifications.

8. Ms Lilian Law suggested that the scope of the review be widened to cover the definition of heritage, the proposed heritage trust and the handling of delisting requests from owners of buildings with proposed gradings.

9. Prof Ho Pui-yin asked if the Government would have a preliminary idea on the nature of the heritage trust and the timetable of the policy review. Mr Paul Chan said that the DEVB would welcome suggestions from the AAB.

10. Prof Tracey Lu commented that heritage was a broad term covering archaeological sites, built heritage, intangible cultural heritage, natural heritage, etc. She considered that the Government should have a preliminary scope of the review.

11. Regarding the scope of the review, Mr Paul Chan responded that as announced in the 2013 Policy Address, the review would focus on the conservation of privately-owned historic buildings. He would nevertheless welcome Members' recommendations on the scope of review.

12. The Chairman concluded that the AAB generally showed support to participate in the proposed policy review and suggested that a brainstorming session on the heritage conservation review be arranged shortly for Members' deliberation of various related issues.

(Mr Paul Chan left at this juncture.)

**Item 2 Confirmation of Minutes**  
**(Board Minutes AAB/10/2011-12)**

13. The minutes of the 160<sup>th</sup> Meeting held on 17 December 2012 was confirmed with the following amendments proposed by Mr Tim Ko:

(i) to revise paragraph 53 as follows :

“Mr Tim Ko expressed his shock over the inclusion of Chi Lin Nunnery and Nan Lian Garden into China's World Heritage Tentative List (“Tentative List”) by the State Administration of Cultural Heritage (“SACH”). He considered that some buildings and sites in Hong Kong with higher heritage significance should be more qualified for inclusion into the Tentative List. He also queried why the AAB had not been consulted on the application made by Chi Lin Nunnery.”

(ii) to revise paragraph 56 as follows :

“Prof Tracey Lu commented that the competition for inscription on the World Heritage List was extremely keen. She believed that the nomination of any items in a State Party's Tentative List to United Nations Educational, Scientific and Cultural Organization (“UNESCO”) would be determined by a number of factors. Prof Tracey Lu also mentioned that there was a strict quota for each country every year in the nomination.”

(iii) to revise paragraph 57 as follows :

“Mr Tim Ko, Prof Tracey Lu and Dr Joseph Ting considered that

Chi Lin Nunnery and Nan Lian Garden did not have any association with Hong Kong history and therefore they wondered whether Chi Lin Nunnery and Nan Lian Garden could represent Hong Kong.”

**Item 3     Matters Arising and Progress Report  
(Board Paper AAB/1/2013-14)**

14.        Mr Tom Ming reported that the AAB recommended declaring both the Béthanie and the Cenotaph as monuments at its meeting on 17 December 2012. AMO was proceeding with the declaration procedures as required under the Antiquities and Monuments Ordinance (“the Ordinance”).

15.        Mr Tom Ming then briefed Members on the restoration and maintenance projects as well as the archaeological projects as detailed respectively in Annexes B and C of the Board Paper AAB/1/2013-14. On 31 January 2013, AMO arranged a visit to the Tat Tak Communal Hall at Ping Shan, Yuen Long for Members to get a better understanding of the restoration works there. AMO would consider arranging more visits to historic buildings undergoing restoration works. He further explained to Members that under the notification system recently endorsed by the AAB, the AMO would inform Members of archaeological discoveries of heritage significance or public concern after completion of preliminary assessment on the heritage value of such discoveries.

16.        Mr Stephen Chan asked if the AAB would be consulted/informed of any new usage of a Government historic building, Ms Grace Lui replied that there was no such an arrangement at present but Members might, if they wish, discuss the issue at the brainstorming session.

**Item 4     Heritage Impact Assessment (“HIA”) in respect of the Proposed  
International Culinary College in Pokfulam  
(Board Paper AAB/2/2013-14)**

17.        Before the presentation, Mr Conrad Wong declared his interest as the Council Member of the Vocational Training Council (“VTC”). The Chairman

introduced the presentation team that consisted of the following members:

Mr Gary Au  
Senior Assistant Executive Director (Corporate Governance), VTC

Dr K W Lee  
Head / Estate Health and Safety Division, VTC

Mr Dominic Lam  
Principal Director, Leigh & Orange Limited

Mr Curry Tse  
Principal, China Point Limited

18. Mr Gary Au briefed Members that the site for the development of the proposed International Culinary College (“ICC”) was adjacent to several graded historic buildings and the proposed development was designed not to obscure the cultural significance of the graded historic buildings nearby, namely the Béthanie, the Old Dairy Farm Senior Staff Quarters, the Old Dairy Farm Cowshed and the Old Dairy Farm Main Office Building. Mr Curry Tse explained to Members the cultural significance of the site, the conservation principles adopted and the proposed mitigation measures. Mr Dominic Lam further introduced the design of the proposed ICC, including the Communal Plaza, the Heritage Walk and the interpretation facilities.

19. Mr Tim Ko said that Sir Patrick Manson was the founder of the Old Dairy Farm and due regard should be given to recognise his contributions to medicine and hygiene developments in Hong Kong. Dr Joseph Ting added that Sir Patrick Manson was the “Father of Tropical Medicine” as well as the teacher of Dr Sun Yat-sen.

20. To facilitate public’s appreciation of the story of the Old Dairy Farm, Ms Janet Pau suggested including information of the other remains of the Old Dairy Farm such as the Grass Silo, Manure Pit and Paddock in the proposed interpretation facilities. Mr Tom Ming advised that these buildings had been included in the new item list pending grading assessment by the AAB.

21. Prof Rebecca Chiu suggested that the proposed Heritage Walk be

extended to cover the Pokfulam Village, the University Hall of the University of Hong Kong and the Pokfulam Country Park.

22. Mr Gary Au and Mr Dominic Lam agreed to :

- (i) do more research on Sir Patrick Manson;
- (ii) adopt measures to reach the environmental standards and bring environmental pollution to the minimum;
- (iii) attempt to avoid the corner of the proposed ICC pointing to the Béthanie;
- (iv) further explore means to minimise aesthetic impact of the proposed ICC to the surrounding; and
- (v) use suitable materials for the curtain wall to avoid causing dazzle or mirroring effect.

23. The Chairman concluded that the AAB was supportive of the findings of the HIA and further consultation with the AAB to finalise the HIA report would not be necessary.

**Item 5      Concept Design for Interpretation of the Former Mountain Lodge and Improvement to its Surrounding Areas  
(Board Paper AAB/3/2013-14)**

24. The Chairman introduced the presentation team:

Mr Jacen Lo

Senior Architect, Architectural Services Department

Mr Jim Chan

Architect, Architectural Services Department

25. Mrs Ada Yau briefed Members on the history of the Former Mountain Lodge (“FML”) including the archaeological survey, archaeological investigations and interpretation studies since the discovery of the remains in 2006.

26. Mr Jacen Lo and Mr Jim Chan proceeded to explain the concept design for interpretation of the FML and the proposed improvement works to its



surrounding areas. Based on an all-embracing approach, three designs schemes were drawn up for the presentation of the unearthed architectural features.

27. Dr Joseph Ting and Mr Philip Liao opined that minimal and virtual-imagery approaches could be considered.

28. Dr Joseph Ting expressed appreciation of the current Victorian design of the Peak Garden and suggested that the interpretation facilities at the FML should match the Peak Garden. He proposed, with the support of Mr Bay Wong and Mr Tim Ko, the demolition of the pavilion at the site, which was considered incompatible with the environment.

29. On the contrary, Prof Rebecca Chiu was of the view that the pavilion was one of the landmarks of the area and raised her reservation about the proposed demolition.

30. To address the concern of Sr Wong Bay on the ease of maintenance, Mr Jacen Lo explained that robust and durable materials would be used for all design schemes.

31. Mr Philip Liao cited the Roman Forum as an example and considered protecting the archaeological remains with glass showcases undesirable.

32. Mr Tim Ko supplemented that a military sanatorium had been founded at the site before the FML was built. He considered that the retaining wall of the site, which was still in existence, was of high heritage significance.

33. Mr Tim Ko and Prof Rebecca Chiu supported the idea of restricting vehicle access to Mount Austin Road from the Gate Lodge to the FML site for safety reason.

34. Noting the accessibility constraints of Mount Austin Road, Ms Janet Pau questioned if improvements for public accessibility and safety could be enhanced. Mrs Ada Yau said that the government departments concerned would be consulted if and when necessary.

35. Mr Chan Ka-kui queried if the existing public toilet and kiosk within the site could be compatible with the interpretation facilities. Prof Billy So also

enquired if the pavilion would be renovated with compatible design.

36. Mr Tony Lam and Prof Rebecca Chiu further suggested relocating the public toilet and the kiosk away from the FML site.

37. Mr Tony Lam recommended that a series of interpretation facilities should be arranged along the road from the Gate Lodge to the FML site, introducing the heritage buildings/structures in the vicinity.

38. With Members' above comments, the Chairman concluded that Scheme 1 was the least preferable one and the project team was suggested to explore the design by re-locating the existing toilet and the kiosk.

39. The presentation team reassured that the concept design would be modified with reference to Members' views and the revised design would be submitted to the AAB for comments in due course.

**Item 6 Reaffirmation of the Recommendation to Declare Tat Tak Communal Hall, Ping Shan, Yuen Long as a Monument  
(Board Paper AAB/4/2013-14)**

40. Ms Angela Siu gave a presentation on the heritage merits of the Tat Tak Communal Hall. She said that the AAB accorded a Grade 1 status to the building and recommended declaring it as a monument in view of its outstanding historical and architectural merits in 1997. In the recent assessment exercise of 1 444 historic buildings, the AAB accorded a Grade 1 status to the building again at its meeting on 17 May 2010. The heritage value of the building had undoubtedly reached the "high threshold" required for monument declaration.

41. Prof Tracey Lu and Mr Kenny Lin questioned the need to reaffirm AAB's recommendation made in 1997 to declare the building as a monument.

42. Ms Grace Lui explained that the previous grading of the building was reviewed by the AAB as part of the assessment exercise for the list of 1 444 historic buildings based on a set of revised assessment criteria. With recommendation by the Assessment Panel, the Grade 1 status proposed to the building was endorsed by the AAB again in 2010. Hence, Members were

requested to consider again the recommendation of monument declaration.

43. Dr Louis Ng explained that the AMO would proceed to negotiate with the owner(s) concerned on arrangements for formal declaration after the AAB recommended declaring an item as a monument. In some cases, unforeseeable difficulties would be encountered which might take years to overcome.

44. Mr Chan Ka-kui, Prof Rebecca Chiu and Ms Ava Tse questioned if the proposed boundary for declaration would include the open area in front of, and the landscape behind, the building. Mr Tom Ming clarified that only the building would be declared as a monument and referred Members to the boundary delineated on the plan attached to the paper. He explained that the open area and the landscape were situated on Government land and any improvement works there would be subject to further discussion with the relevant government departments.

45. In response to Mr Kenny Lin's enquiry on including the land adjoining the building in the proposed monument boundary, Dr Louis Ng said that the past practice was that the boundary should be limited to the building itself and "buffer zone" was not recommended provided that access to the monument was viable. Apart from statutory protection under the Antiquities and Monuments Ordinance, monuments were also protected by administrative measures such as the HIA mechanism. If a capital works project is partly or wholly within a "heritage site"<sup>1</sup> or in the vicinity (interpreted as not more than 50 metres measures from the nearest point of the project boundary) of a "heritage site", the project would need to go through the HIA mechanism.

46. The Chairman concluded that the AAB reaffirmed the recommendation of declaring the Tat Tak Communal Hall as a monument. As a related issue, he suggested AMO to prepare a list of items previously proposed by the AAB as worth-considering for monument declaration for Members' reference.

---

<sup>1</sup> Heritage sites include:

- (i) all declared monuments;
- (ii) all proposed monuments;
- (iii) all sites and buildings graded by the AAB;
- (iv) all recorded sites of archaeological interest; and
- (v) Government historic sites identified by the AMO.

47. Sr Wong Bay, Mr Tony Lam and Prof. Tracey Lu suggested to include the following issues for deliberation in the coming brainstorming session :

- (i) the viability of arranging minor maintenance works for privately-owned historic buildings which had been recommended for declaration as monuments by the AAB so as to upkeep their condition during the negotiation with the concerned owners for monument declaration;
- (ii) the possibility of including a “buffer zone” within monument boundary; and
- (iii) public accessibility and appreciation of monuments.

48. Prof Ho Pui-yin took the opportunity to raise her concern over the lack of barrier-free access to the monuments/historic buildings along the Ping Shan Heritage Trail. She considered that enhancement should be made particularly when those buildings were to be restored.

**Item 7     Assessment of Historic Buildings - Finalisation of the Gradings of Buildings and Results of Assessment of New Items  
(Board Paper AAB/5/2013-14)**

49. Mr Tom Ming briefed Members that the AAB agreed to accord a proposed Grade 2 status to the Chai Wan Factory Estate (“Factory Estate”) at its last meeting on 17 December 2012. Following the usual practice, AAB had conducted a 1-month public consultation on the proposed grading and no comment on the proposed grading had been received. As such, Members were invited to confirm the grading of the Factory Estate.

50. To facilitate the formulation of an appropriate conservation management plan for the Factory Estate, the Chairman decided to handle the grading of the Factory Estate at this meeting while the items listed in other Annexes would be dealt with at the next meeting.

51. Sr Wong Bay enquired about the revitalisation of the Factory Estate. Mr Tom Ming explained that the project would have to go through the HIA mechanism and the works details would be submitted for Members’ consideration in due course.

52. After deliberated discussion, Members supported to accord a Grade 2 status to the Factory Estate.

53. Having considered that the gradings of the outstanding 185 buildings in the list of 1 444 historic buildings would take time to be processed due to objections / queries from owners, Members agreed to start discussion on the grading of the new items / categories subject to the availability of research information on their heritage value.

#### **Item 8 Any Other Business**

54. Mr Tim Ko raised that the papers for meetings should reach Members as early as possible for their preparation. It was agreed that papers would be sent to Members via email in addition to the current format of a folder to be delivered by courier.

55. Mr Tim Ko proposed, with Mr Tony Lam's support, that AAB meetings be held more frequently. Mr Kenny Lin and Mr Tony Lam also suggested that meetings / brainstorming sessions in relation to the review on heritage conservation be arranged on Saturdays. The AAB Secretariat would follow up.

56. There being no other business, the meeting was adjourned at 6:35 p.m.

Antiquities and Monuments Office  
Leisure and Cultural Services Department  
June 2013

---

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