

ANTIQUITIES ADVISORY BOARD

Minutes of the 170th Meeting
on Wednesday, 4 March 2015 at 3:03 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
Prof Rebecca Chiu Lai-har, JP
Prof Chung Po-yin
Prof Ho Puay-peng, JP
Mr Tony Lam Chung-wai
Mr Philip Liao Yi-kang
Mr Kenny Lin Ching-pui
Dr Annissa Lui Wai-ling
Ms Theresa Ng Choi-yuk
Ms Janet Pau Heng-ting
Ms Yvonne Shing Mo-han, JP
Dr Winnie Tang Shuk-ming, JP
Dr Joseph Ting Sun-pao
Ms Ava Tse Suk-ying, SBS
Sr Wong Bay
Mr Rex Wong Siu-han

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

Absent with Apologies:

Mr Chan Ka-kui, BBS, JP
Prof Ho Pui-yin
Mr Joseph Luc Ngai
Ms Karen Tang Shuk-tak
Mr Conrad Wong Tin-cheung, BBS, JP

Dr Sharon Wong Wai-yee

In Attendance: Development Bureau

Mr Albert Lam
Deputy Secretary (Works) 1

Ms Vivian Ko
Commissioner for Heritage

Mr Ricky Wong
Chief Assistant Secretary (Works) 2

Mr Allen Fung
Political Assistant to Secretary for Development

Ms Leonie Lee
Assistant Secretary (Heritage Conservation) 3

Mr Eddie Wong
Chief Executive Officer (Heritage Conservation) 1

Ms Sharon Yeung
Engineer (Heritage Conservation) Special Duties

Leisure and Cultural Services Department

Dr Louis Ng
Deputy Director (Culture)

Mr Chan Shing-wai
Assistant Director (Heritage and Museums)

Ms Susanna Siu
Executive Secretary (Antiquities and Monuments)

Ms Veta Wong
Principal Information Officer (Cultural Services)

Mr Kenneth Tam
Chief Heritage Manager (Antiquities & Monuments)

Dr Alan Fung
Assistant Curator I (Buildings Survey)
(for item 3 only)

Planning Department

Mr Eric Yue
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 welcomed Members and representatives from government bureau and departments to the meeting, in particular, the three new Members, i.e. Dr Annissa Lui, Ms Theresa Ng and Mr Rex Wong, who attended the meeting for the first time. He also welcomed Dr Louis Ng, Deputy Director (Culture), Mr Chan Shing-wai, Assistant Director (Heritage & Museums) and Ms Susanna Siu, Executive Secretary (Antiquities and Monuments).

Item 1 Confirmation of Minutes of the Special Meeting held on 20 November 2014 and the 169th Meeting held on 4 December 2014 (Board Minutes AAB/13/2013-14 and AAB/14/2013-14)

The minutes of the Special Meeting held on 20 November 2014 and the 169th Meeting held on 4 December 2014 were confirmed with the following amendments:

- (i) Proposed by Ms Yvonne Shing to revise paragraph 29 of the

minutes of the Special Meeting held on 20 November 2014 as follows :

“Ms Yvonne Shing pointed out that as far as she understood, the figures provided by MTRCL were the best estimation based on the available information. Members could make a decision based on the estimation and trust in Government’s integrity in vetting the estimation. In this case, AAB should consider all factors when making a decision, such as cost, time, archaeological and historic value, public convenience, as well as the SCL works programme. Giving the above, she would prefer conservation option 1 for Well J2 and the water channel, and conservation option 2 for the stone structures at the southern end of Adit C.”

- (ii) Proposed by The Chairman and Sr Wong Bay to revise paragraph 35 of the 169th Meeting held on 4 December 2014 as follows :

“The Chairman concluded that Members were in support of the idea to dismantle Well J2 and the water channel, and then reassemble them at the same location, not necessarily at the same level, to facilitate proper interpretation and public appreciation. Yet MTRCL was requested to leave the needed flexibility in their design to allow Well J2 to be reassembled at the same level. The consideration was mainly from the heritage viewpoint in that interpretation and display would be flexible to enhance education and facilitate appreciation by members of the public rather than its lower construction cost. On this basis, he also indicated that AAB would follow up further when the design details had been worked out.”

Item 2 Matters Arising and Progress Report (Board Paper AAB/1/2015-16)

2. Ms Susanna Siu briefed Members on the progress of preservation of historic buildings and structures, restoration and maintenance programmes, archaeological projects and educational and publicity activities as detailed in the

relevant Annexes of the Board Paper.

**Item 3 Assessment of Historic Buildings
(Board Paper AAB/2/2015-16)**

3. Dr Alan Fung briefed Members on the historical background, proposed gradings and comments received from members of the public regarding the items listed at Annex A of the Board Paper. The Chairman said that while public views were received regarding both the grading and preservation of the historic buildings, AAB should focus on giving advice to the grading of the historic buildings. The proposed gradings of all the items listed at Annex A were then confirmed as Members raised no comment on the assessment.

4. Ms Susanna Siu then gave a presentation on the first item “Shaw Studio” listed at Annex B; explaining in detail the historical and architectural merits of the site and the buildings therein. In response to the Chairman’s enquiry, Ms Susanna Siu elaborated that the Assessment Panel had proposed to accord Grade 1 status to the Shaw Studio site as a whole. The Chairman explained to Members that AAB could consider according grading to a site as a whole or to each historic building within the site.

5. In response to the enquiry of Prof Ho Puay-peng on the interior of Shaw Villa (No. 15), Dr Alan Fung advised that inspection on the interior was only conducted for the Administration Building, but not for the Shaw Villa which was still being occupied. Mr Philip Liao opined that the photo showing the exterior of the Shaw Villa was insufficient to illustrate its historical significance and how the film industry interacted with other sectors in Hong Kong. He supplemented that there was a theatre in the Villa for screening new films to facilitate business talks.

6. Apart from the Shaw Villa, Mr Stephen Chan asked whether there were other buildings in the site which might have a higher heritage value. Mr Kenny Lin also enquired if there were other similar film studios in Hong Kong and about the justifications for proposing giving a Grade 1 status to the site. Ms Susanna Siu responded that the Administration Building in the ‘Commercial Group’, Sound Stages in the ‘Industrial Centre’, as well as Dormitory No. 3 (alias Tun Ho Building) and the Shaw Villa in the ‘Accommodation Area’ had higher heritage

value, when compared with other buildings in their respective zones. She continued to elaborate that a Grade 1 status was proposed in view of the historical significance of the Shaw Studio, attributed to its contribution to the success of the film industry in Hong Kong resulting from its systematic and efficient film production.

7. In response to the information provided by Ms Susanna Siu in paragraph 6 above, Prof Ho Puay-peng, Mr Kenny Lin, Prof Rebecca Chiu and Mr Stephen Chan expressed that:

- (i) more detailed information on the historical background and value of each building at the site was needed;
- (ii) some of the buildings (such as the Administration Building, Dormitory No.3, Shaw Villa, Sound Stages I and II) could be declared as monuments and preserved in view of their architectural value, on top of the historical value of the site as a whole, whereas some of the remaining buildings could be accorded a Grade 1 status;
- (iii) it was more appropriate to assess the grading of individual buildings based on their respective historical significance in the development of Hong Kong's film industry and their architectural significances, rather than according a Grade 1 status to the whole site due to the success of the company; and
- (iv) owner's views had to be sought on the proposed grading of the whole site.

8. The Chairman remarked that the grading assessment of the Shaw Studio should not take into account the land ownership and future redevelopment potential of the site.

9. Prof Chung Po-yin opined that the grading and conservation proposal could be considered separately. She pointed out that the integrity of the Shaw Studio site was important as it demonstrated a studio system implemented through a successful realisation of film business strategy, operating in the form of intensive and mass production of films. She supported the proposed grading pending the finalisation of the conservation plan. The Chairman emphasised that AAB was responsible for according an appropriate grading, even if the conservation proposal was uncertain.

10. Mr Philip Liao and Dr Joseph Ting opined that a balance should be struck between heritage conservation and development. Buildings with features of higher heritage value in each zone of the site could be accorded with higher gradings and preserved for demonstrating the workflow of film production. Mr Tony Lam proposed that the whole site could be accorded a Grade 1 status, while individual buildings in the site could be accorded with different gradings.

11. Dr Annissa Lui enquired about the detailed justifications of the proposed Grade 1 status for the whole site. She was concerned about the basis of the grading assessment as some of the buildings were built in recent years. Ms Janet Pau, who echoed with Dr Annissa Lui's views, enquired about the detailed justifications and the appropriateness of the Assessment Panel demarcating the site into three functional zones.

12. In response to the Chairman's enquiry, Ms Susanna Siu reported that the Town Planning Board had approved the planning application for the redevelopment of the Shaw Studio and the developer had just withdrawn the demolition application.

13. The Chairman summarised that Members in general had no objection to the overall value of the site. However, further discussion was required on whether grading should be accorded to individual buildings on the site; or a proposed Grade 1 status should be accorded to the whole site, and some buildings in each of the zones should be accorded with a higher grading. He emphasised that the AAB would not be involved in the negotiation with the site owner. Nonetheless, AAB's advice could be given to the relevant government departments for their further negotiation with the owner on the preservation plan.

14. Mr Kenny Lin, Prof Ho Puay-peng and Prof Rebecca Chiu, who concurred with the Chairman's view, considered that more information should be provided to substantiate the proposed Grade 1 status for the whole site. If the whole site was to be accorded a Grade 1 status, consideration could be given to accord gradings to those buildings with significant heritage value on the site or declare them as monuments.

15. The Chairman pointed out that in the case of the Central Government Offices, different buildings were accorded separate gradings while the whole site was also given a grading. A grading status to the whole site would allow

government departments to negotiate with the owner on the preservation arrangement. The alternative of declaring the site as a proposed monument could be explored if the negotiation failed.

16. Mr Albert Lam observed that the owner had withdrawn the demolition application and that several buildings were not included in the demolition plan. He considered that there was no imminent demolition risk for the whole site. The Commissioner for Heritage's Office and the Antiquities and Monuments Office would continue to discuss with the owner on the preservation plan taking into account the views of AAB Members. He added that the owner was aware of the grading mechanism and the grading proposal. This notwithstanding, the discussion on the preservation plan between the owner and relevant government departments remained harmonious so far.

17. Having regard to the existing information available, Mr Kenny Lin opined that it was quite a rush to accord a Grade 1 status to the whole site at the moment. He proposed that some buildings could first be selected in each zone for grading, before proceeding to accord a Grade 1 status to the whole site.

18. On the other hand, Prof Rebecca Chiu, Mr Stephen Chan, Mr Rex Wong and Ms Ava Tse shared the view that a Grade 1 status could be accorded to the whole site first, followed by further negotiation with the owner to preserve selected buildings. They had no strong views if the owner would demolish those buildings which were newly built and thus of lesser significance.

19. Prof Chung Po-yin elaborated that the whole site comprised buildings which were built at different times, indicating the organic growth and evolution of the Shaw enterprise. Yet she agreed that some significant buildings with higher heritage value should be preserved as far as possible, while demolition of other buildings with less heritage value could be considered. Sr Wong Bay echoed with Prof Chung Po-yin's view and opined that gradings should be thoroughly considered taking into consideration the special merits of each building. The Chairman added that if grading was only given to some selected buildings but not the whole site, the public might perceive the remaining buildings as valueless.

20. Prof Ho Puay-peng and Mr Philip Liao agreed that the site could be accorded a Grade 1 status as a whole, yet the newly built buildings should be excluded. Further information should also be provided to the Assessment Panel

for assessment of individual buildings for future discussion by AAB.

21. The Chairman summarised the discussion by proposing a Grade 1 status to the whole site and the proposal should be put forward for a one-month consultation. Additional information on individual buildings, together with the latest progress of negotiation with the owner, should be provided to AAB for further discussion. In response to the questions raised by Ms Janet Pau, Prof Rebecca Chiu and Ms Yvonne Shing, the Chairman explained that the proposed Grade 1 status represented the overall value of the site, but not the average value of all the buildings on the site. After deliberation, AAB Members supported the Chairman's proposal.

22. Dr Alan Fung then introduced the remaining 3 items listed at Annex B. The proposed Grade 3 status to the “Old Quarry Site Structures at Lei Yue Mun” was confirmed as Members raised no comment on the assessment.

23. On the grading of the 2 items which were located at the Ma On Shan Iron Mine, in response to the enquiries from the Chairman, Prof Ho Puay-peng, Ms Ava Tse, Dr Alan Fung explained that the features related to the Ma On Shan Iron Mine were scattered across the whole Ma On Shan area. It was for consideration whether the whole Ma On Shan area should be graded. On the other hand, the exterior walls and mineral preparation plant, which were the industrial zone and were included in the site tours arranged by the descendants of the Ma On Shan Iron Mine workers, were selected to be graded. The proposed gradings of the two related churches nearby would be submitted to the AAB for consideration from the religious perspective at a later stage. The proposed grading only covered built structures above the ground. Information on the physical conditions of the underground features was not available at the present stage.

24. Sr Wong Bay, Dr Joseph Ting and Prof Ho Puay-peng considered that it would be more appropriate to assess the overall group value of the Ma On Shan Iron Mine in conjunction with these two built structures, the two churches as well as the underground tunnels.

25. Given the views expressed by Members and that there was no urgency to decide on the gradings, the Chairman concluded that AAB would consider the gradings of the exterior walls and mineral preparation plant later, subject to the availability of further information on the overall heritage significance and

industrial features of the Ma On Shan Iron Mine.

**Item 4 Heritage Impact Assessment in respect of the West Wing of the former Central Government Offices in Central
(Board Paper AAB/3/2015-16)**

26. The Chairman introduced the presentation team comprising the following members:

Ms Josephine Cheung,
Principal Executive Officer,
Department of Justice

Ms Teresa Leung,
Senior Project Manager,
Architectural Services Department

Mr Brian Anderson,
Partner,
Purcell

Mr Philip Chan,
Associate Director,
Ronald Lu & Partners (Hong Kong) Ltd.

27. Mr Brian Anderson briefed Members on the Heritage Impact Assessment (HIA) of the West Wing of the former Central Government Offices (CGO West Wing), including the timeline, character defining elements of the building, key issues of the works project and the outcomes of the HIA in respect of the proposed project.

28. Mr Philip Chan then took Members through the details of the key design proposals, including the project objectives and scope, as well as the mitigation measures for the conservation works. He added that the photographic and cartographic surveys had been completed. Since a condition survey would be conducted when the works began, there should be a comprehensive record of the building.

29. The Chairman drew Members' attention that comments were received from the "Government Hill Concern Group" on this project.

30. In response to the questions raised by Prof Ho Puay-peng on the display of the interior structure of CGO West Wing, interpretation arrangement and the restoration of the open compound between the Main Wing and the West Wing, Mr Brian Anderson and Mr Philip Chan explained that:

- (i) the suspended ceiling and the concrete blocks in some areas would be removed to expose some of the original interior structures;
- (ii) part of the original canteen would be converted to a publicly-accessible corridor for connecting the new public lift to the open space on 7th floor, and the corridor was proposed to provide space as a public gallery for display of items with heritage value and the corridor would be visible from Queen's Road Central; and
- (iii) the open compound between the Main Wing and West Wing was outside the project boundary.

31. In response to Sr Wong Bay's enquires, Mr Philip Chan elaborated that CGO West Wing was registered as a 'BEAM Plus New Building'. The target was to attain a gold rating under the Green Building Product Labelling Scheme. The glass of steel windows and some rusty windows would be replaced. The marble cladding on the elevation of the main entrance at the ground floor facing Queen's Road Central would be removed and replaced with appropriate mosaic tiles to match with the original design intent.

32. Regarding the questions raised by the Chairman on the modern security railings around former CGO, Prof Ho Puay-peng and Mr Kenny Lin raised their concerns on the fence arrangement, Mr Brian Anderson pointed out that in the Historic and Architectural Appraisal on former CGO conducted in 2009 and the current HIA, it was recommended to lower or remove the modern railings which were considered to be visually intrusive from the heritage point of view and restrictive to public access. However, since some of the fences were outside the current project boundary, related arrangement would be considered in the planning of the open compound between the Main Wing and West Wing, so that the overall design and arrangement could be considered holistically by the Department of Justice (DoJ), in accordance with the operational and security needs of the offices in the three wings. He added that the public would be allowed access to the

interior of the CGO West Wing at the Queen's Road Central entrance via the new public lift and the public corridor to the open compound.

33. Ms Josephine Cheung supplemented that DoJ would revisit the arrangements for the gates and fences in the three wings, when the planning of the open compound was taken forward, so that the overall design and arrangement of the railings in the CGO Complex could be considered in a holistic manner, having regard to the principle to facilitate public access to the area while ensuring the security of the offices of DoJ and law-related organisations to be housed in the three wings. As regards Mr Kenny Lin's enquiry about the security concern of DoJ which was currently accommodated in the Queensway Government Offices (QGO) with free public access, she pointed out that the physical setting of the QGO and former CGO was rather different, particular in terms of the large number of access points in the former CGO site. Moreover, the security management of the sites of the three wings in the former CGO would have to be taken up by the DoJ.

34. Based on the presentation by the project team and views expressed by Members, the Chairman concluded that the AAB was generally supportive of the findings of the HIA and further consultation with the AAB would not be necessary.

**Item 5 Heritage Impact Assessment in respect of the Proposed Youth Hostel at 122A Hollywood Road, Hong Kong
(Board Paper AAB/4/2015-16)**

35. The Chairman introduced the presentation team comprising the following members:

Ms Candy Chan,
Heritage Consultant,
OKO Consultants Ltd

Mr Daniel Ho,
Associate Director,
CYS Associates (HK) Ltd

Mr Ivan Yiu,
Community Services Secretary,
Tung Wah Group of Hospitals (TWGHs)

Ms Monika Lau,
Architect,
Property Division,
TWGHs

Mr Vincent Fung,
Principal Assistant Secretary,
Home Affairs Bureau

36. Ms Candy Chan briefed Members on the background of the Tung Wah Group of Hospitals' (TWGHs) proposal to redevelop a youth hostel at a vacant school building site at 122A Hollywood Road. The project site was close to two historic sites, namely the Man Mo Temple Compound (MMTC) and the Ladder Street. She also explained in detail the measures addressing the concerns raised in respect of the project, including its development scale, possible physical and visual impact to MMTC, and the linkage between the new building and the history of the project site. She further explained to Members enhancement measures such as the demolition of the fence wall between the project site and the MMTC, so that the proposed heritage bazaar on the ground floor of the project site, and the forecourt of MMTC could be connected.

37. The Chairman reminded that some comments received from the public had been conveyed to Members for information prior to the meeting.

38. Dr Joseph Ting declared that he was the consultant of the Tung Wah Museum.

39. Mr Tony Lam said that it was a suitable opportunity to re-instate the site and return it to MMTC. He considered that if the school building would be demolished, the vacated space could be allocated to MMTC for exclusive use. He also considered that the proposed "W-shaped column" at the heritage bazaar was not compatible with MMTC.

40. Mr Stephen Chan said that Central and Western District Council agreed that the proposed youth hostel would meet local needs. Yet the design of the

youth hostel should be more compatible with the surrounding and the impact on the MMTC during construction should be minimized. It was further proposed to retain the granite doorframe with the word “Tao Wo” at Ping On Lane.

41. In response to Ms Ava Tse’s enquiry about the heritage bazaar, Mr Daniel Ho explained that the heritage bazaar had an area of 330 square meters. The turn table originally shown on the layout plan would be removed. Mr Ivan Yiu supplemented that the carpark spaces in the heritage bazaar complied with the requirement of the Transport Department. They would be used as a loading bay for residents only. The bazaar would remain a space for social and cultural activities. He reiterated that the youth hostel was designed to ensure compatibility with the MMTC. The design aimed to enhance the space utilisation and visual display of MMTC.

42. Prof Ho Puay-peng expressed concerns over the proposed “W-shaped column” and considered that a wall might be more compatible with the design of MMTC. He believed that TWGHs would not use the heritage bazaar as a carpark. However, the flooring there should be compatible with the MMTC. Lastly, it would be beneficial to adjust the colour scheme of the building to resemble traditional Chinese buildings.

43. Dr Annissa Lui opined that there was a genuine need for the provision of youth hostel, and that it was difficult to identify another suitable location in light of the competing demand for land. She preferred a Chinese-style design of the heritage bazaar to match with MMTC and to arrange social activities to facilitate public appreciation of MMTC. She also raised concerns over the security of the hostel as the public could easily gain access to the hostel through the lift.

44. In response to the enquiries of Ms Janet Pau and Sr Wong Bay, Mr Kenneth Tam said that the Antiquities and Monuments Office would give advice for any projects located on private land, so as to minimise as far as possible their visual and structural impacts to the declared monuments in the vicinity. He considered that the space created at the heritage bazaar after the redevelopment would improve the surrounding environment.

45. Sr Wong Bay asked if TWGHs had considered converting the existing school building into a youth hostel, instead of redeveloping it into a new building, as it was a waste to demolish the existing building. If the proposal of converting

the existing building was infeasible, Sr Wong Bay would suggest setting-back the new building boundary to expose the side elevation of MMTC, so that Chinese-style design could be adopted for the new building to match with MMTC. Mr Tony Lam echoed with Sr Wong Bay's set-back proposal. Ms Ava Tse added that the relaxation of height restriction, if required, would be considered by the Town Planning Board on individual merits.

46. Mr Eric Yue advised that the project site fell within an area zoned "Government, Institution or Community" on the Sai Ying Pun & Sheung Wan Outline Zoning Plan. Development on the site was restricted to a maximum building height of 8 storeys. There was no restriction on plot ratio, gross floor area or site coverage for the site.

47. Ms Candy Chan supplemented that they would submit application under Section 12A, after taking into account of operational sustainability and the comments from MMTC and local residents. She added that the proposed youth hostel operation was in line with the aim of TWGHs in serving the youngsters. She furthered that the construction work would be closely monitored so as to avoid posing negative impact on Ping On Lane.

48. Ms Yvonne Shing proposed to adopt a "M-shaped column" instead of a "W-shaped column" as the name of MMTC started with the character "M".

49. Mr Ivan Yiu reiterated that the current proposal was a feasibility study and conceptual design. TWGHs would incorporate Members' comments in the detailed design as far as possible, such as the style and flooring of the heritage bazaar. He also stressed that the heritage bazaar would be used by MMTC for displaying heritage items of MMTC and organising events such as mid-autumn festival celebration.

50. Mr Kenny Lin expressed concerns over the visual impact of installing glass panel at the upper part of the youth hostel. On the other hand, Prof Ho Puay-peng opined that a vertical column system was better than "W or M-shaped column". He preferred Chinese-style materials. He also agreed the set-back proposal for creating more space between the youth hostel and MMTC.

51. Mr Rex Wong pointed out that the height increase would incur additional construction cost, which might have an impact on the operational sustainability of

the project.

52. Based on the presentation by the project team and views expressed by Members, the Chairman concluded that AAB considered that the design and mitigation measures should be refined for this HIA. In particular, TWGHs should consider Members' views including the set-back proposal, design of the façade, height of the building, design and the materials to be used in the heritage bazaar, as well as the glass panel installed at the upper part of the youth hostel. TWGHs was invited to submit the revised proposal for the consideration of the AAB after incorporating the comments of AAB.

Item 6 Any Other Business

53. There being no other business, the meeting adjourned at 18:18 p.m.

Antiquities and Monuments Office
Leisure and Cultural Services Department
June 2015

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