

**ANTIQUITIES ADVISORY BOARD**

**Minutes of the 162<sup>nd</sup> Meeting**  
**on Wednesday, 17 April 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 Chung Po-yin  
Prof Ho Puay-peng, JP  
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  
Mr Joseph Luc Ngai  
Ms Janet Pau Heng-ting  
Ms Yvonne Shing Mo-han  
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, JP

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

Absent with Apologies: Professor Ho Pui-yin  
Professor Tracey Lu Lie-dan  
Professor Billy So Kee-long  
Ms Karen Tang Shuk-tak

In Attendance:

Development Bureau

Ms Grace Lui, JP

Deputy Secretary (Works)1

Miss Vivian Ko

Commissioner for Heritage

Leisure and Cultural Services Department

Ms Cynthia Liu

Deputy Director (Culture)

Dr Louis Ng

Assistant Director (Heritage and Museums)

Mr Tom Ming

Executive Secretary (Antiquities and Monuments)

Ms Angela Siu

Curator (Historical Buildings) 2

*(for item 3 only)*

Dr Alan Fung

Assistant Curator I (Buildings Survey)

*(for item 4 only)*

Planning Department

Mrs Alice Mak

Senior Town Planner/Metro & Urban Renewal

Architectural Services Department

Mr Lam Sair-ling

Senior Maintenance Surveyor/Heritage

**Opening Remarks**

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

**Item 1 Matters Arising**

2. There was no matter arising from the last meeting.

**Item 2 Heritage Impact Assessment (“HIA”) on the Chai Wan Factory Estate  
(Board Paper AAB/7/2013-14)**

3. The Chairman introduced the presentation team that consisted of the following members:

Mrs Iris Chan  
Senior Architect/16, Housing Department

Mr Wilson Tse  
Architect/24, Housing Department

Ms Patricia Lo  
Housing Manager/Hong Kong 1, Housing Department

Mr Henry Lo  
Associate Director, Centre for Architectural Heritage Research, School of Architecture, The Chinese University of Hong Kong

4. Mr Henry Lo briefed Members on the cultural significance and key character-defining elements of the Chai Wan Factory Estate (“Factory Estate”). He also explained in detail the proposal to convert the Factory Estate into public rental housing flats and the corresponding mitigation measures to be introduced.

5. Sr Wong Bay supported the reinstatement of the existing chimney stack and construction of a new bridging link as proposed by the project proponent.

6. To reflect the industrial operation in the old days, Mr Stephen Chan suggested including related artifacts for interpretation in the display area. Mr Henry Lo responded that historic photos, drawings and salvaged artifacts such as

plastic toys might be displayed for public appreciation. Mrs Iris Chan supplemented that some factory owners and a descendent of the original owner of Law Uk Hakka House would attend an experience sharing workshop with the local community next month. The workshop would also be recorded which might be used for future broadcast.

7. Mr Tim Ko added that Chai Wan, with a mixture of different types of public housing buildings, had played an important role in Hong Kong's public housing history. He suggested that relevant information should be included in the interpretation area.

8. Mr Tony Lam supported the idea of using the ground floor units for housing building services, but recommended reserving some area for commercial shops as in the past.

9. Ms Lilian Law enquired about the target tenants of the Factory Estate, who would have significant influence on the final design. She quoted an example that the elderly would need a ramp for easy access to the building. Mr Wilson Tse explained that the existing ramps are very steep and unsafe and a lift would be constructed at each wing for access.

10. Sr Wong Bay, Mr Stephen Chan and Mr Tony Lam did not support the addition of steps onto the ramps. Mr Wilson Tse replied that the new steps with railings and treads would be added in a manner that the original setting of the ramps could still be appreciated. The new steps would be reversible, with minimum intervention to the existing fabrics. Skylight would be introduced from the roof to enhance natural light and ventilation of the ramp area.

11. Ms Lillian Law commented that retaining the ramps would be more helpful to the elderly.

12. In response to Mr Philip Liao's question about the steps added onto the ramps, Mr Wilson Tse said that the width and height of each step would be about 500 mm and 150 mm respectively, whereas the gap between the new steps and the wall would be about 400 mm. Mr Philip Liao worried that the gap between the new steps and the wall would induce potential risk to the elderly, and that the dimension of the steps might cause inconvenience to the users. He suggested taking into consideration of both elements in the detailed design.

13. Prof Rebecca Chiu stressed the importance of maintaining the original elevations of the Factory Estate. She opined that the public should be educated on the heritage significance of the historic building and that their participation in conserving the building should be encouraged.

14. Mr Tony Lam commented that the middle area where new flats would be added, had used to be communal area and suggested its original use be retained. Ms Ava Tse and Ms Lilian Law shared the same view. Ms Lilian Law also stressed the importance of the communal area for the promotion of neighbourliness.

15. Mr Wilson Tse said that taking into account the recreational area on the ground floor and the fifth floor, the provision of recreational/communal area was more than the standard requirement. He also said that the covered linked area was not suitable for communal purpose due to possible nuisance to the adjacent tenants and infringement on their privacy.

16. Mr Kenny Lin worried that it would be inconvenient for the elderly if the new lifts were constructed at the middle of the two wings as suggested. Mr Wilson Tse replied that the new lifts were constructed at the middle rather than at the end of the two wings after taking into account security and management reasons.

17. The Chairman concluded that the Antiquities Advisory Board ("AAB") was generally supportive of the findings of the HIA and further consultation with the AAB would not be necessary. Mr Stephen Chan proposed and Members agreed that the presentation team should submit the revised design of the proposed works for Members' information.

**Item 3 Declaration of Fat Tat Tong, Ha Wo Hang, Sha Tau Kok as a Monument**  
**(Board Paper AAB/8/2013-14)**

18. The Chairman recalled that the Antiquities and Monuments Office ("AMO") had arranged a visit to Fat Tat Tong for Members to get a better understanding of the building on 31 January 2013. He then invited Ms Angela

Siu to give a presentation on the heritage merits of Fat Tat Tong. Ms Angela Siu said that the AAB had accorded a Grade 1 status to the building at its meeting held on 10 November 2010. The heritage value of the building had reached the “high threshold” required for monument declaration.

19. Sr Wong Bay, Mr Tony Lam, Ms Lilian Law, Mr Conrad Wong, Prof Ho Puay-peng and Prof Chung Po-yin supported declaration of the building as a monument.

20. Sr Wong Bay considered the building an attractive piece of architecture and supported to declare it as a monument. Yet, he opined that maintenance was essential to upkeep its condition.

21. Mr Tony Lam and Prof Rebecca Chiu enquired about the arrangements for carrying out maintenance works and public access. Ms Angela Siu replied that large-scale restoration works, including surveys and consultancy studies, were planned to commence in the Financial Year 2014-15. Although the building would continue to serve as residence of the Li’s family, the owner agreed to open the common store room for interpretation upon completion of the restoration works.

22. Mr Conrad Wong expressed his appreciation of the setting of the house and the old furniture inside. The Chairman added that the rear out-houses as well as the courtyard in-between were also of high significance. Both Mr Conrad Wong and the Chairman hoped AMO could explore ways to facilitate public appreciation of the said features.

23. Mr Stephen Chan and Mr Joseph Ngai enquired about the implications on property right after declaring a private building as monument and the arrangement for protection. Mr Tom Ming explained that monument declaration would not affect the ownership of the building concerned. Under the Antiquities and Monuments Ordinance (“the Ordinance”), no person shall excavate, carry out works or demolish a proposed monument or monument unless a permit is granted by the Antiquities Authority, i.e. the Secretary for Development.

24. Ms Grace Lui supplemented that owners of private graded historic buildings could apply for grants under the Financial Assistance for Maintenance Scheme (“FAS”) for carrying out maintenance works. As pre-requisite

conditions for accepting the grant, owners were required to agree to a number of conditions, including not to demolish their buildings, not to transfer the ownership of their buildings, and to allow reasonable public access for appreciation within an agreed period of time after completion of the maintenance works.

25. Ms Ava Tse worried that the owner would not conduct routine maintenance in the long run. Mr Tom Ming replied that AMO would conduct regular inspections for declared monuments to ensure that the building was properly maintained.

26. Ms Lilian Law agreed that regular inspections would help to upkeep the condition of the building.

27. Noting that Fat Tat Tong was located at Sha Tau Kok, Ms Lilian Law and Mr Tim Ko suggested that arrangements could be made to facilitate the public to appreciate the historic buildings and military sites nearby. The Chairman added that it was worth considering setting up a heritage trail in the area.

28. In response to Prof Ho Puay-peng's enquiry on including important elements around the building such as the forecourt and the bridge into the monument boundary, Mr Tom Ming replied that the forecourt and bridge were situated on private lots of other owner(s). Further negotiation with the concerned owner(s) would be required if their land lot(s) were to be included in the proposed monument boundary. Apart from the statutory protection provided under the Ordinance, monuments would also be protected by administrative measures such as the HIA mechanism. If a capital works project would be partly or wholly carried out 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.

29. Noting the land issues, Mr Tony Lam suggested that those important elements be included in the established administrative monitoring mechanism so that the relevant departments would give due regard to them.

---

<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.

30. The Chairman concluded that the AAB supported the proposed declaration of Fat Tat Tong as a monument.

**Item 4     Assessment of Historic Buildings  
(Board Paper AAB/9/2013-14)**

31. Mr Tom Ming recapped that Members had deliberated the items listed in Annex A of Board Paper AAB/5/2013-14 at its meeting held on 20 February 2013. He further suggested Members to continue to discuss the items listed in Annexes B and C of that paper which were set out at Appendix A of Board Paper AAB/9/2013-14.

32. Ms Yvonne Shing asked why the original proposed grading and the proposed grading after review by the Assessment Panel were different for some buildings. Dr Alan Fung explained that the Assessment Panel might adjust the grading after considering the additional information received during the public consultation.

33. In response to Ms Ava Tse and Prof Ho Puay-peng's enquiries on the complete reconstruction of Tam Kung Temple, Shau Kei Wan ("the Temple") in 2002, Dr Louis Ng explained that the coordination mechanism between the AMO, the Chinese Temple Committee ("the CTC") and the administrator of the Temple had not been set up at that time. After this incident, AMO had been working closely with the CTC and would provide technical advice whenever necessary.

34. Though the Temple was reconstructed in 2002, Members agreed to accord a Grade 2 status to the building in view that Tam Kung Temple was rare in Hong Kong and was of high social value.

35. After deliberation, Members endorsed the proposed grading of the first nine items listed in Annex B of Appendix A. Besides, Members also agreed to accord a proposed Grade 3 status to Shek O Bus Terminal Building. Following the usual practice, the AMO would proceed to arrange a one-month public consultation on the proposed grading of the buildings concerned.

36. Mr Tom Ming then informed Members that since the implementation of



administrative monitoring mechanism, 26 items on the list of 1 444 historic buildings had been demolished or substantially altered, and information on these 26 items was set out at Annex C of Appendix A. While the demolished items could no longer be further assessed, the Assessment Panel considered those substantially altered items did not warrant any grading.

37. Mr Joseph Ngai and Prof Ho Puay-peng suggested making available photos of these demolished/substantially altered buildings for public access for education purpose.

38. Mr Tony Lam said that a few graded historic buildings had been demolished for redevelopment but were not listed in the Annex. Mr Tom Ming explained that the Government had held discussions with the owners of those buildings concerned to explore preservation-cum-development options, and the grading of those buildings would be reassessed upon completion of the relevant preservation-cum-development projects.

39. Ms Ava Tse, Mr Kenny Lin and Mr Philip Liao considered that owners might not understand that inappropriate maintenance works would greatly diminish the integrity and authenticity of historic buildings and thus proposed to offer economic incentives and technical advice to owners to help them carry out maintenance works. Ms Lilian Law considered that it was necessary to provide training on the maintenance of built heritage for local professionals.

40. Ms Grace Lui remarked that FAS had been launched to provide financial assistance to owners of private historic buildings to maintain their buildings. AMO was also ready to provide technical advice on any alteration/renovation proposal. AMO had issued letters to owners of all private historic buildings, informing them of the proposed grading and the arrangements of FAS. To facilitate the exchange of experiences on built heritage among professionals from Hong Kong and the Mainland, the “Conference on Materials, Techniques and Construction Management of Heritage Architecture in Mainland China and Hong Kong” was jointly organised by the Construction Industry Council, Department of Architecture of the University of Hong Kong, the Commissioner for Heritage’s Office and the AMO in December 2012.

41. Having considered the photos of all 26 items, Members agreed that the grading assessment for the 26 items should not proceed further. Nevertheless,

Mr Conrad Wong worried that the decision would encourage owners of other private historic buildings to follow suit and request for downgrading or delisting their buildings. Members would deliberate on the improvement measures, including formulation of education and publicity strategy, in the coming policy review to prevent recurrence of those incidents.

**Item 5 Any Other Business**

42. There being no other business, the meeting was adjourned at 6:00 p.m.

Antiquities and Monuments Office  
Leisure and Cultural Services Department  
June 2013

---

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