

ANTIQUITIES ADVISORY BOARD

Minutes of the 167th Meeting
on Wednesday, 4 June 2014 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
Prof Ho Pui-yin
Mr Tim Ko Tim-keung
Mr Tony Lam Chung-wai
Mr Kenny Lin Ching-pui
Prof Tracey Lu Lie-dan
Ms Janet Pau Heng-ting
Ms Yvonne Shing Mo-han, JP
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, BBS, JP

Mr Asa Lee (Secretary)
Senior Executive Officer (Antiquities and Monuments)
Leisure and Cultural Services Department

Absent with Apologies:

Prof Chung Po-yin
Prof Ho Puay-peng, JP
Ms Lilian Law Suk-kwan, JP
Mr Philip Liao Yi-kang
Prof Billy So Kee-long

Mr Joseph Luc Ngai

In Attendance:

Development Bureau

Mr Paul Chan, MH, JP

Secretary for Development

(for item 5 only)

Mr Albert Lam

Deputy Secretary (Works)1

Miss Vivian Ko

Commissioner for Heritage

Ms Alice Pang

Chief Assistant Secretary (Works) 2

Mr Ricky Wong

Assistant Secretary (Heritage Conservation) 2

Ms Queenie Lee

Assistant Secretary (Heritage Conservation) 3

Mr Eddie Wong

Chief Executive Officer (Heritage Conservation)1

Leisure and Cultural Services Department

Mrs Betty Fung

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)

Ms Anita Leung
Chief Information Officer

Mrs Ada Yau
Curator (Archaeology)
(for item 2 only)

Mr Kenneth Tam
Chief Heritage Manager
(for item 3 only)

Ms Angela Siu
Curator (Historical Buildings)²
(for item 4 only)

Planning Department

Mr Eric Yue
Assistant Director /Metro

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 Confirmation of Minutes of the 166th Meeting held on 4 March 2014
(Board Minutes AAB/9/2013-14)**

2. The minutes of the 166th Meeting held on 4 March 2014 were confirmed with the following amendments:

- (i) Proposed by the Secretariat to add a post-meeting note after paragraph 25 as follows:

“Post-meeting note

Subsequent to the AAB meeting held on 4.3.2014, a Supplementary AAB Paper 30/2013-14 was circulated to Members seeking their advice on the proposed mitigation measures for the old stone wall in respect of the Re provisioning of Harcourt Road Fresh Water Pumping Station to Cotton Tree Drive.

By the deadline of 1.4.2014, 14 members had expressed support to the mitigation measures proposed in the supplementary paper. 3 out of the 14 members who supported the mitigation measures urged the Water Services Department (WSD) to remove the stone wall by dismantling it into bigger sections for temporary storage and reinstatement, and to maximise the length of the wall to be left intact and preserved. 2 other members did not support the proposed mitigation measures. They had concern over the historic significance of the wall and preferred the Pumping Station be constructed at an alternative site so that the old stone wall would not be affected.

In accordance with Meeting Procedures and House Rules for the Antiquities Advisory Board, the Board may transact any business by circulation of papers, and a resolution in writing. Since a majority of Members (14/23) supported the mitigation measures as detailed in the supplementary paper, the AAB was generally supportive of the findings of the Heritage Impact Assessment and Members have been informed of the result vide a e-mail dated 3.4.2014.”

Item 2 Matters Arising and Progress Report
(Board Paper AAB/33/2013-14)

3. Mr Tom Ming reported that the progress of major projects in respect of historic buildings and structures, archaeological work and educational programmes had been detailed in the relevant Board Paper. The archaeological project of utmost concern to Members and the public was the excavation at the works sites of the To Kwa Wan Station of the Shatin to Central Link. The archaeologists responsible for the project had been invited to the meeting to brief Members on the latest progress.

4. Dr Jin Zhi-wei, one of the archaeologists responsible for the excavation at the works sites of the To Kwa Wan Station, then briefed Members on the latest discoveries in the third archaeological work area, in particular the findings of the 5 test pits (TP1, TP7, TP8, TP9, TP10) in Zone A.

5. In response to media enquiries regarding the suspected destruction of the wells unearthed in Zones B and C, Dr Jin Zhi-wei clarified that two of the said wells were in fact rubbish pits dated to the late Qing dynasty- Republic of China period. The rest were indeed the pile pits constructed by the Mass Transit Railway Corporation Limited (“MTRCL”) in 2013 prior to the commencement of the archaeological work.

6. Owing to the complexity of the archaeological deposits in Zone B, Dr Jin Zhi-wei pointed out that further excavation work had to be carried out for understanding the alignment, distribution and deposition sequence which should be related to the stone structure in F3.

7. As regards Zone A, Dr Jin Zhi-wei informed Members that the excavation work was almost completed and no significant archaeological remains were unearthed so far.

8. Ms Ava Tse opined that areas not covered by the current archaeological work, in particular the areas close to the ventilation shaft and Adit C, could be of archaeological potential in view of the location of the archaeological features already exposed. She also wondered whether another excavation licence would be required for further archaeological excavation. Mr Tom Ming responded that the current archaeological work would focus on

the areas where construction works had been planned. The archaeological issues of other areas would be dealt with at a later stage.

9. The Chairman agreed that priority should be given to areas where construction works would be carried out. He further enquired about the reporting mechanism of archaeological discoveries as well as the time required for conducting a preliminary assessment on their heritage value. Dr Jin Zhi-wei explained that:

- (i) artifacts unearthed from the cultural layer, such as pottery sherds, would be collected from the site and over 1000 boxes of artifacts had been collected up to the present. For unearthed remains, such as the square-shaped well and remnants of buildings, AMO would be notified immediately. The archaeological team would provide information, such as the dating and nature of the unearthed artifacts and remnants to AMO, which might consult AAB as necessary, for advice on the way forward; and
- (ii) an overall analysis on the archaeological discoveries could only be provided after completion of the excavation work.

10. Dr Jin Zhi-wei then clarified that the erection of tents was an essential protective measure for both the archaeological team and the archaeological areas especially in summer time. To avoid public misunderstanding due to insufficient knowledge of archaeology, the Chairman suggested that the reporting mechanism of archaeological work had been enhanced by way of providing monthly reports to AAB. In case of significant discoveries, site visits and briefings would also be arranged.

11. Mr Tom Ming supplemented that photos and preliminary reports prepared by the archaeological team could be uploaded onto AMO's website for reference of the public. He pointed out that in the course of archaeological excavation, some decisions had to be made immediately on-site by the experienced archaeologists to ensure proper protection of the archaeological finds. For instance, the organic and metal artifacts, if exposed, should be removed from the site and treated promptly.

12. Prof Tracey Lu pointed out that archaeology was a profession and archaeologists possessed their own professional codes. The archaeologists

should be entrusted to make their professional judgment. Criticism which was made due to a lack of the fundamental knowledge about archaeology would be unfair to the archaeologists. Relocation of unearthed archaeological finds from the site after detailed recording could facilitate the continuation of excavation work as well as the protection of the archaeological finds. The Chairman echoed that archaeologists should be entrusted to make prompt decisions according to their professional judgment, instead of waiting for AAB's decisions. Prof Tracey Lu, Mr Kenny Lin and Mr Stephen Chan agreed to count on archaeological team's expertise to make decisions on urgent matters.

13. The Chairman pointed out that a designated webpage had been set up under AMO to convey the information on the archaeological work. Besides, three talks on related topics would be held on 7 and 8 June 2014 and 5 July 2014 respectively to enhance public understanding of the subject. Mr Tom Ming supplemented that these three talks would target at the general public, and their topics included basic knowledge of archaeology, the history and culture of Kowloon City and Song-Yuan ceramics discovered in Hong Kong and those unearthed from the works site of the To Kwa Wan Station. In response to Mr Kenny Lin and Dr Joseph Ting's suggestions, the Chairman agreed that more public educational programmes should be explored.

**Item 3 Heritage Impact Assessment in respect of the Revitalisation of the Former Fanling Magistracy
(Board Paper AAB/34/2013-14)**

14. The Chairman introduced the presentation team composed of the following members:

Ms Amy Fung
Deputy Executive Director,
The Hong Kong Federation of Youth Groups (“HKFYG”)

Mr Max WONG
Supervisor (Leadership), HKFYG

Mr CM Lee

Director, LWK

Ms Fanny Ang
Associate, LWK

15. Ms Amy Fung briefed Members on the background of the revitalisation project of converting the Former Fanling Magistracy into “The Hong Kong Federation of Youth Groups Institute for Leadership Development” (“the Institute”), including the partnership with the University of Hong Kong in developing application software for self-guided tours and measures that the Institute would take to reach out to the community.

16. Mr CM Lee then briefed Members on the site plan, cultural significance and character-defining elements of the Former Fanling Magistracy. He also explained in detail the design proposal, result of the Heritage Impact Assessment for the project and the proposed mitigation measures.

17. The Chairman declared that he was an ex-Member of the Advisory Committee on Revitalisation of Historic Buildings and had taken part in the selection of the revitalisation project for the building.

18. Mr Tony Lam expressed his concerns over dismantling the existing special balustrades of the staircase and replacing them by a new one. Dr Joseph Ting echoed the view of Mr Tony Lam and quoted the example of Kam Tong Hall where flower pots were placed aside the balustrades, instead of dismantling the balustrades outright. Mr CM Lee responded that he also agreed to retain the existing balustrades but approval had to be sought from the relevant departments. He would report to AAB if the approval was given.

19. Sr Wong Bay declared interest as the project involved the University of Hong Kong which he was working for. He proposed to retain the Duty Lawyer Office built in 1997 and the two plant rooms as far as possible. Besides, he requested for information on the maintenance plan for the buildings. Mr CM Lee explained that retention of the Duty Lawyer Office and the two plant rooms was not recommended as they were only temporary building structures which were built at a later stage to meet the then operational needs. The existing conditions of them were not satisfactory and they did not match with the surroundings. While the maintenance plan was not included in the

Heritage Impact Assessment, it would be included as part of the design proposal and the works contract.

20. Mr Chan Ka-kui opined that demolition of the Duty Lawyer Office and the two plant rooms was acceptable if they did not match with the main building. He also expressed his concerns over re-locating the plant rooms onto the roof of the hostel block as it might not be in harmony with the overall design.

21. Mr Stephen Chan declared interest as the project involved the University of Hong Kong which he was also working for. He suggested that rules should be set out for visitors to observe so as to protect the historic building.

22. Mr Kenny Lin agreed that the Duty Lawyer Office and the two plant rooms were temporary building structures which did not match with the main building and had no value for retention. Rather, it would be a pity for not retaining the existing balustrades. He proposed to preserve the balustrades and upgrade them with glass/plastic panels. In addition, he questioned the idea of preserving Court No. 2 instead of Court No. 1 for interpretation purpose as the latter was the main court.

23. Prof Rebecca Chiu declared interest as the project involved the University of Hong Kong which she was working as a teaching staff. She enquired about the life span of the building after revitalisation. She also suggested that detailed information about the history of the building and the usage of each room should be displayed. As for the balustrades, while she agreed that they should be retained, the idea of placing flower pots aside might give rise to safety concerns.

24. Prof Ho Pui-yin suggested HKFYG to organise youngsters to collect oral history in relation to the former Fanling Magistracy and social lives in the New Territories, which would enhance their understanding of the local history and educate them that revitalisation of a historic building was closely related to people's daily lives.

25. In response to the comments and enquiries from Members, Ms Amy Fung elaborated that this project was in partnership with the Architectural

Conservation Programme and General Education Unit of the University of Hong Kong. She added that youngsters would also be engaged in formulating the relevant guidelines and participating in activities pertinent to the preservation of the historic building. Mr CM Lee supplemented that:

- (i) youngsters recruited under the project had attended training courses in the University of Hong Kong and started collecting oral history in the local community. The information collected was being consolidated and would be displayed in the Institute later, coupled with information about the historical development of magistracies in Hong Kong, as well as the local stories of northern New Territories;
- (ii) they would continue to discuss with the Buildings Department and explore appropriate ways to preserve the existing balustrades. He cited the example of the North Kowloon Magistracy in which the existing balustrades, with the agreement sought from the Buildings Department, were preserved by installing new glass balustrades aside the existing ones;
- (iii) various measures would be adopted to avoid negative visual impacts caused by accommodating the service room, water tanks and lift shaft on the roof of the hostel block, including installing a lift system without a machine room, minimizing the height of service room and water tanks, setting back the facilities from the façades facing the road and applying roof top greening;
- (iv) detailed usage description and signage would be provided for disabled access facilities; lifting platform would also be installed for barrier free access;
- (v) Court No. 2 was selected for interpretation purpose as its interior condition was better; whereas Court No. 1 had been substantially altered to meet the need for film shooting after the closure of the Former Fanling Magistracy; and
- (vi) the Former Fanling Magistracy was built in 1961; after the restoration works carried out under the revitalisation project, it was believed that this building could be further used for another 20 to 30 years, on top of the normal life span of 50 years for a concrete building.

26. In response to Mr Tony Lam's enquiry, Mr CM Lee replied that the Buildings Department had not asked for an upgrading of the staircases inside the building, with the exception of the existing balustrades, during their initial

contact.

27. Ms Karen Tang enquired about information on the public access of the building, including educational programs and the commencement date. Mr CM Lee replied that a group of youngsters were being groomed as ambassadors of heritage conservation. All the designated areas along the guided tour route would be opened to the public daily for one hour and docent services would be provided by these ambassadors. Both the pavilion park and the open area would be opened for public access daily from 8 a.m. to 9 p.m.

28. Sr Wong Bay requested the presentation team to provide further information about the structural condition of the building, including information about carbonation and the presence of chloride. He also cited the example in Taiwan to upgrade the existing timber railings by non-destructive method, which could be a reference for protecting the existing balustrades.

29. Mr Tim Ko pointed out that the Former Fanling Magistracy could reflect the uniqueness of the New Territories and facilitate youngsters to understand more about the historical development of the New Territories and urban areas.

30. In response to Ms Karen Tang's question, Ms Alice Pang elaborated that the expenditure for restoration works would be met by public funding. Additional funding of \$5 million, at the maximum, could also be sought for the administration of the Institute in the first two years if required. Yet HKFYG had to self-finance the administration of the project in the long run.

31. Given the presentation by HKFYG and views expressed by Members, the Chairman concluded that the AAB was generally supportive of the findings of the Heritage Impact Assessment and further consultation with the AAB would not be necessary.

Item 4 Declaration of Three Historic Temples as Monuments (Board Paper AAB/35/2013-14)

32. The Chairman invited Ms Angela Siu to give a presentation on the heritage merits of the three temples proposed to be declared as monuments.

Ms Angela Siu mentioned that these three temples, namely Lin Fa Temple, Hung Shing Temple and Hau Wong Temple, were situated on private lands under the ownership of the Secretary for Home Affairs Incorporated and were administered by the Chinese Temples Committee. She then briefed Members in detail the heritage value of each temple.

33. Mr Chan Ka-kui supported the declared proposal, yet he pointed out that the outer wall of Lin Fa Temple was recently refurbished in a fashionable style. He thus suggested establishing a mechanism to involve AMO in the refurbishment works of the privately owned monuments, so that their uniqueness could be preserved. Sr Wong Bay echoed Mr Chan Ka-kui's views and suggested to establish a partnership with the temple owners in discussing the scope of temple refurbishment works.

34. Prof Tracey Lu agreed with the declaration proposal, yet she expressed her concerns over the boundary of the monuments. She proposed to set up a buffer zone for maintaining the completeness and landscape of the monuments. Mr Kenny Lin echoed the views and suggested to protect the areas surrounding the monuments through legislation.

35. Ms Janet Pau suggested arranging brochures to be distributed at the heritage sites to travelers and locals for better understanding of the temples. Sr Wong Bay further suggested that the brochures currently distributed at the temples could be improved and updated. Separately, Ms Janet Pau wanted to clarify the land status of the lands under the ownership of the Secretary for Home Affairs Incorporated.

36. In response to the comments and enquiries from Members, Mr Tom Ming explained that:

- (i) any refurbishment of the temples, after their declaration as monuments, would need a permit issued under the Antiquities and Monuments Ordinance;
- (ii) the monument boundary of the temples were based on the actual extent of the concerned buildings and structures; and
- (iii) according to legal advice, the land under the ownership of the Secretary for Home Affairs Incorporated should be regarded as private land.

37. Ms Ava Tse opined that those monuments situated on government

land should have the monument boundaries marked to include more surrounding areas, while restrictions should be imposed on the height of the building structures to be constructed near the monuments to avoid negative visual impact.

38. Prof Tracey Lu acknowledged the difference between monument boundary and buffer zone, yet she pointed out that a construction control area around a monument could avoid the construction of tall buildings in the vicinity, which might have an adverse impact on the monument.

39. Ms Angela Siu supplemented that the land use and building height of areas surrounding monuments could be controlled through zoning. For example, the land in front of the Hung Shing Temple had been zoned as open space.

40. The Chairman summarised that a discussion item could be raised in the coming half year for Members to brainstorm the criteria and mechanism of setting up a buffer zone around a monument. The Chairman also proposed that, after declaration, monument owners should be encouraged to open up their buildings and expose the unique features as far as possible.

41. Miss Vivian Ko informed the meeting that the three temples would be included in the coming Heritage Fiesta as the theme would be on temples and churches in Hong Kong.

42. The Chairman concluded that AAB supported the declaration of the three temples as monuments.

**Item 5 Report on Public Awareness Raising Programmes for the Heritage Conservation Policy Review
(Board Paper AAB/36/2013-14)**

43. The Chairman invited Miss Vivian Ko to brief Members on the progress of the public awareness raising programmes for the heritage conservation policy review.

44. Miss Vivian Ko reported that a variety of public awareness raising

programmes were held during the period from March to June 2014, including roving exhibitions, public lectures, workshops, a dedicated website, a facebook page and a short video. She introduced the programmes in brief and mentioned that the public awareness raising programmes would continue and the website would be updated throughout the review.

45. The Chairman invited Members to visit the website and give comments for further improvement. He elaborated that according to the roadmap, a public consultation document on the policy review would be released today, to be followed by a two-month consultation (“the consultation”). AAB would also arranged opinion surveys, a public forum and thematic focus group discussion sessions. The opinion surveys were being fine-tuned according to Members’ comments. He also invited Members to participate in the activities as far as possible. A resources kit was provided to Members to facilitate their discussion with the public for gathering comments on the focused topics. He reiterated that the purpose of the consultation was to encourage the public to express their views; AAB would submit the analysis of the collected views to the Antiquities Authority (i.e. the Secretary for Development) by the end of this year.

46. The Chairman welcomed Mr Paul Chan, Secretary for Development (“SDEV”), to join the meeting and invited him to brief Members on the consultation.

47. Mr Paul Chan recapped that Members were invited to conduct a policy review on heritage conservation at the first AAB meeting of this term held in February 2013. He expressed his gratitude to Members for their valuable time and efforts put into the policy review in the past year, such as attending working group meetings and meeting key stakeholders, including Legislative Council and District Council Members, Chairman and Vice-Chairman of the District Councils, professional bodies, concern groups, owners of privately-owned historic buildings, business chambers and academics, for in-depth discussions and exchange of views on matters pertaining to the policy review, on top of their normal duties. Due to the wide scope of the review and specialty of individual areas, he acknowledged Members’ efforts in reviewing the design and launching of the public consultation document, as well as the arrangement of public awareness raising programmes. He would meet the media and announce the launching of the

2-month public consultation today after this meeting together with the Chairman. He thanked Members again for their efforts in conducting the policy review and their advice on the preservation of historical remains discovered at the work sites of the To Kwa Wan Station of the Shatin to Central Link.

Item 6 Any Other Business

48. There being no other business, the meeting was adjourned at 17:24 p.m.

Antiquities and Monuments Office
Leisure and Cultural Services Department
September 2014

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