

ANTIQUITIES ADVISORY BOARD

Minutes of the 171st Meeting
on Thursday, 4 June 2015 at 2:35 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 Chung Po-yin
Prof Ho Pui-yin
Mr Tony Lam Chung-wai
Mr Kenny Lin Ching-pui
Mr Joseph Luc Ngai
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
Ms Karen Tang Shuk-tak
Ms Ava Tse Suk-ying, SBS
Sr Wong Bay
Dr Sharon Wong Wai-yee

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

Absent with Apologies:

Prof Ho Puay-peng, JP
Mr Philip Liao Yi-kang
Dr Joseph Ting Sun-pao

Mr Rex Wong Siu-han
Mr Conrad Wong Tin-cheung, BBS, JP

In Attendance: Development Bureau

Mr Hon Chi-keung
Permanent Secretary for Development (Works)

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

Leisure and Cultural Services Department

Ms Michelle Li
Director of Leisure and Cultural Services

Dr Louis Ng
Deputy Director (Culture)

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

Ms Susanna Siu
Executive Secretary (Antiquities and Monuments)

Mr Kenneth Tam
Chief Heritage Manager (Antiquities and Monuments)

Mr Ng Chi-wo
Curator (Historical Buildings)²
(for item 3 only)

Dr Alan Fung
Assistant Curator I (Buildings Survey)
(for item 6 only)

Planning Department
Mr Eric Yue
Assistant Director / Metro

Architectural Services Department
Mr Hui Chiu-kin
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 new Member, Dr Sharon Wong, who attended the meeting for the first time. He also welcomed Mr Hon Chi-keung, Permanent Secretary for Development (Works) of Development Bureau (DEVB), and Mr Hui Chiu-kin, Assistant Director (Property Services) of Architectural Services Department.

2. At the invitation of the Chairman, Mr Hon Chi-keung said that this was the first time he attended Antiquities Advisory Board (AAB) meeting since he took up the new post as Permanent Secretary for Development (Works) in early

April 2015. He was delighted to have the opportunity to exchange views with AAB Members and listen to their expert advice on heritage conservation. Noting the growing public awareness and expectation on heritage conservation issues in Hong Kong, AAB, being an important partner of the Government, had been making significant contribution in promoting heritage conservation and providing advice. The Government was looking hard into the implementation of the recommendations of the Review of Policy on Conservation of Built Heritage concluded last year. Though there would no doubt be challenges ahead, he expressed that DEVB would continue to work closely with AAB on heritage conservation in Hong Kong.

**Item 1 Confirmation of Minutes of the 170th Meeting held on 4 March 2015
(Board Minutes AAB/1/2015-16)**

The minutes of the 170th Meeting held on 4 March 2015 were confirmed without amendment.

**Item 2 Matters Arising and Progress Report
(Board Paper AAB/6/2015-16)**

3. Ms Susanna Siu briefed Members on the progress of major heritage issues and activities during the period from 1 February 2015 to 15 May 2015, including the declaration of three historic buildings as monuments as detailed in a separate Board Paper, as well as 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.

4. The Chairman informed Members that Mr Kenny Lin had raised concerns over progress of the restoration of two timber dragon poles situated in front of the Hung Sing Temple, Ap Lei Chau. Ms Susanna Siu reported that in a detailed inspection of the two dragon poles by the Antiquities and Monuments Office (AMO), it was observed that apart from the damaged dragon pole, the condition of the remaining pole was also not satisfactory. Having considered the physical condition of both poles and concerns of the local community, it was

decided that both poles should be replaced. The old dragon poles were now kept in the temple. The restoration of the temple, including the two dragon poles, was being carried out under section 6 of the Antiquities and Monuments Ordinance (the Ordinance). Subject officers of AMO, who were responsible for conservation of historic buildings, had been gazetted as “Designated Persons” under the Ordinance to carry out the restoration works.

Item 3 Declaration of Three Historic Buildings as Monuments (Board Paper AAB/7/2015-16)

5. The Chairman invited Mr Ng Chi-wo to give a presentation on the heritage merits of three historic buildings proposed to be declared as monuments. Mr Ng Chi-wo briefed Members in detail the historical background, as well as the architectural and heritage value of each of these three historic buildings, namely Signal Tower at Blackhead Point, Tsim Sha Tsui; Race Course Fire Memorial at So Kon Po; and façade of the Old Mental Hospital (the Hospital) on High Street, Sai Ying Pun.

6. Mr Stephen Chan expressed that the evolving uses of the Hospital site had reflected social development over the years. In view of its architectural merits, such as using granite as the building materials and its architectural design, he agreed to declare the façade of the Hospital as monument.

7. Mr Chan Ka-kui also agreed to declare the three historic buildings as monuments, taking into account their individual architectural merits and their representation of architecture in Hong Kong at different eras. He suggested revitalising the emplacement located at the Signal Tower site as one of the tourist attractions. Besides, he hoped that the Sai Ying Pun Community Complex at the Hospital site could be improved in a way to better serve the public and preserve the history and culture there, given this Community Complex, which was completed in 1998, was not compatible with the façade of the Hospital. Prof Ho Pui-yin supported the proposed declaration of monuments, yet she opined that the emplacement-like structure near the Signal Tower was for hoisting typhoon signals instead of for gun installation. She suggested to erect a display board nearby to introduce this historic background. At the enquiry of the Chairman, Mr Ng Chi-wo responded that further research on the suspected emplacement-like structure would be conducted in due course.

8. Sr Wong Bay supported the proposed declaration. But, he pointed out that the Signal Tower had signs of minor defects and repair works had to be arranged as soon as possible. He also declared that he was the maintenance surveyor of the Hospital in the 1970s. Regarding his enquiry about the Methadone Clinic (the Clinic) near the Hospital, Mr Ng Chi-wo responded that the Clinic was accorded with a Grade 2 status by the AAB. The Chairman supplemented that, in general, preference would be given to Grade 1 historic buildings over Grade 2 historic buildings for inclusion into the pool of historic buildings to be considered as monuments. Yet it was more appropriate to interpret the group value of the Hospital with nearby historic buildings as a whole, rather than the Hospital alone.

9. Ms Yvonne Shing proposed to organise more publicity activities on the three historic buildings after their declaration as monuments.

10. Apart from Members' suggestions on the interpretation of the historical merits and publicity of the historic buildings, the Chairman concluded that AAB supported the declaration of the three historic buildings as monuments.

Item 4 Heritage Impact Assessment in respect of the Proposed Youth Hostel at 122A Hollywood Road, Hong Kong – Supplementary Paper on the Revised Design of the Youth Hostel (Board Paper AAB/8/2015-16)

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

Mr Nigel Ko,
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)

Mr Vincent Fung,
Principal Assistant Secretary,
Home Affairs Bureau

12. The Chairman said that this Heritage Impact Assessment (HIA) was discussed in the last AAB meeting and TWGHs would present their revised design of the proposed youth hostel to Members, in response to the comments made by AAB earlier. He drew Members' attention to the comments received from the public which had been conveyed to Members for information prior to the meeting and were tabled. These were made in an informal meeting between some Members and the representatives of a concern group on 6 May 2015.

13. Mr Ivan Yiu briefed Members that the design of the youth hostel had been revised taking into account the views of Members, which included modifying the front portion of the youth hostel and setting it back from Hollywood Road, adopting those materials which were compatible with the Man Mo Temple Compound (MMTC) and minimising the visual impact of the youth hostel to the MMTC at night.

14. Mr Daniel Ho recapped Members' comments on the original design of the youth hostel at the AAB meeting held on 4 March 2015, including setting back the youth hostel from Hollywood Road to align with the MMTC, replacing the W-shaped column on the ground floor with a vertical column, and adopting those materials which were harmonious with the MMTC. Mr Daniel Ho showed Members slides of the original design and explained in detail how the two revised designs [i.e. Revised Design (Option 1) and Revised Design (Option 2)] could address Members' comments.

15. Mr Ivan Yiu recommended the Revised Design (Option 2) (i.e. it contained all the features of Option 1, except that the stair core would be set back from Hollywood Road by approximately 5 800 mm) to Members as it could make good use of the valuable land resources in addressing the housing needs of the youth, as well as providing a bazaar for the activities of the MMTC and enhancing its surrounding environment. He therefore asked for Members' support so that the project could commence for the benefit of the MMTC.

16. Mr Tony Lam, Mr Stephen Chan, Dr Annissa Lui and Ms Ava Tse preferred Revised Design (Option 2) and suggested to:

- (i) turn the planter near the road by 90 degrees with bamboos planted there, so that the building next to the youth hostel could be less visible from the MMTC;
- (ii) arrange a 24-hour public access to the Heritage Bazaar and place some benches there;
- (iii) check whether the design on the 17th floor of the youth hostel was in compliance with relevant legislation under the Outline Zoning Plan; and
- (iv) organise more cultural activities at the Heritage Bazaar (e.g. flea market) to enhance the sense of belongings of the youth to the local community.

17. Mr Daniel Ho advised that the current planter design was to allow Ping On Lane to be more visible to the public. Regarding the views of Mr Stephen Chan and Ms Ava Tse on the planter, opening hours of the Heritage Bazaar and the conservation of Ping On Lane, Mr Daniel Ho responded that as discussed with the Transport Department, the planter was considered necessary to separate the Heritage Bazaar from Hollywood Road, yet the height of the planter could be lowered. Besides, part of the structure of Ping On Lane, which was connected to the former TWGHs Lee Sai Chow Memorial Primary School, would be removed temporarily during the demolition works of the School and re-instated in-situ after completing the youth hostel project. Mr Nigel Ko supplemented that as Ping On Lane was out of the current project area, further research would be conducted on the historical significance of the Lane and how it could be interpreted together with the Heritage Bazaar. Mr Ivan Yiu added that the Heritage Bazaar was for public use, and the Central & Western District Council would be further consulted about its opening hours to ensure full utilisation of the space.

18. Ms Karen Tang pointed out that the height limitation of the youth hostel imposed by the Planning Department was not very clear, as most of the surrounding buildings were in fact much taller than the proposed youth hostel. Yet, she agreed with the Revised Design (Option 2) and expressed that the project should commence as soon as possible.

19. While Revised Design (Option 2) was preferred, Prof Ho Pui-yin opined that the modern design of the youth hostel somehow could not link up with the

MMTC and the history of the site as a free private school. She emphasised that historical connection of the site with the MMTC and the free private school had to be included in the design of the youth hostel. Prof Chung Po-yin echoed the view of Prof Ho Pui-yin and added that the youth hostel should show the historical significance of the site.

20. Sr Wong Bay, Ms Theresa Ng and Ms Janet Pau also preferred Revised Design (Option 2) and raised concerns on:

- (i) the integration and interaction of the modern design of the youth hostel and the historical design of the MMTC;
- (ii) the implementation of environmental protection measures in the design of the youth hostel;
- (iii) the management arrangement to advocate interaction between the youth hostel and the MMTC users; and
- (iv) the targeted resident group of the youth hostel who would use the Heritage Bazaar.

21. Mr Daniel Ho revealed that the Planning Department had commented that any further increase in the proposed building height of about 70 m was not advisable. In order to set back the building, without exceeding the building height limit, the number of units would be slightly reduced from 213 to 210, the headroom of the Heritage Bazaar would be slightly reduced, and the depth of the transfer structure would be compressed. He added that louver blinds would be installed at the windows to prevent sunlight penetration. Exhibitions and displays related to the history of the site would be arranged at the Heritage Bazaar to enhance the integration between the modern design and the history of the site. Mr Ivan Yiu emphasised that the history of the site as a free private school would be displayed at the Heritage Bazaar by different means, such as video broadcasting. Though there was no restriction on the types of youngsters to be admitted to the youth hostel, he hoped that the residents could be more familiar with the history and would be willing to provide volunteer services to the MMTC in future.

22. Mr Joseph Ngai pointed out that the space of the Heritage Bazaar was indeed limited. Prof Rebecca Chiu echoed this view and reminded that the use(s) and purpose(s) of the Heritage Bazaar should be clearly defined and focused because of its limited area. Also, it was not desirable to expect too much on the residents of the youth hostel, given their temporary and short period of stay there.

The design of the Heritage Bazaar could either be matching with or distinctive from the MMTC. She also proposed that the mode of management of the youth hostel, the Heritage Bazaar and the MMTC could be considered separately.

23. Mr Kenny Lin opined that it was not necessary to match the design of the youth hostel with the MMTC. As long as the design had fulfilled its functional requirements, and the existence of the MMTC would not be adversely affected, he considered that it would not be necessary to impose further restrictions on the design of the youth hostel, such as displaying the historical significance of the MMTC. It would be better to give flexibility to its development.

24. Prof Ho Pui-yin and Prof Chung Po-yin clarified that the establishment of the free private school at the site was closely related to the development of the MMTC. Such historical background was a special characteristic of the youth hostel and should be preserved for our descendants. Mr Kenny Lin suggested that this historical fact could be displayed by other means or in other locations, not necessarily be incorporated with the design of the youth hostel. Prof Ho Pui-yin opined that we could make good use of this characteristic of the site previously used as a free private school to display the history.

25. The Chairman concluded that while Members generally had no objection to the redevelopment of the site as a youth hostel with modern design, there were expectations including an integration between the modern design of the youth hostel and the historical design of the MMTC; and that the targeted residents of the youth hostel could be well-defined to facilitate the preparation of management policies and guidelines. He also pointed out that the uses of the Heritage Bazaar could be modified according to the social development.

26. Prof Rebecca Chiu expressed that historical footprints should be preserved during the urban development as it was the best way to learn history from geographical locations.

27. Mr Kenneth Tam pointed out that the current project could relieve the congestion problem near the MMTC and enhance surrounding public spaces. It was still a preliminary stage for the discussion of utilising the Heritage Bazaar to display historical significance of the site. More in-depth discussions should be carried out at a later stage. Also, it would be a rare and successful example nowadays to find a building site equipped with public space and allowing

historical interpretation at the same time.

28. Ms Yvonne Shing reminded the project proponent to consider appropriate governance and management on the uses of the Heritage Bazaar to avoid improper and unfair usage.

29. Mr Nigel Ko mentioned that there had been on-going study on “New meets Old” and details of using the space as an interpretation centre. He noted that AMO would be duly informed in due course. Mr Ivan Yiu acknowledged the comments of Members and would take them into account in the design of the youth hostel.

30. The Chairman summarised that Members in general preferred the Revised Design (Option 2) of the proposed youth hostel and expressed concerns over its administration and management in future, in particular, the historical interpretation arrangement.

31. 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 Redevelopment of the Kwong Wah Hospital
(Board Paper AAB/9/2015-16)**

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

Dr Nelson Wat,
Hospital Chief Executive,
Kwong Wah Hospital

Ms Stella See,
Head, Records and Heritage Office,
Tung Wah Group of Hospitals

Mr W T Lau,
Chief Project Manager (Capital Projects),
Hospital Authority

Mr Michael Yam,
Director,
Simon Kwan and Associates Ltd.

33. Dr Nelson Wat briefed Members on the background of the TWGHs and Kwong Wah Hospital (KWH), as well as the redevelopment need of KWH.

34. Mr Michael Yam continued to brief Members on the proposed redevelopment plan of KWH, as well as the historical, architectural and social value of the Tung Wah Museum (the Museum), which was located at the centre of the KWH compound, surrounded by the existing KWH buildings. He furthered that the redevelopment of KWH could provide opportunities to make the Museum more visible to the public and explained in details the mitigation measures to the visual and construction impact to the Museum, as well as the enhancement measures (such as creation of a central axis with enhanced design of the Medical Mall Atrium and removal of the carpark area around the Museum which would be replaced by a landscaping area) of the redevelopment scheme of KWH. He concluded that all potential impacts on the Museum were considered acceptable and manageable by employing appropriate mitigation measures. The cultural and heritage value of the Museum could also be enhanced by the redevelopment of KWH by providing visual connection, improving physical environment and providing convenient public access. Therefore, the redevelopment plan was considered technically feasible and acceptable from heritage conservation point of view and he hoped that Members could support the proposal.

35. Dr Winnie Tang agreed with the conservation of the Museum under the proposed redevelopment plan of KWH. In addition, she requested the installation of non-reflective and transparent glazing and wished to have technical figures on the degree of non-reflection for reference.

36. Separately, Prof Rebecca Chiu enquired if any management arrangement could be imposed to strike a balance between the entry of visitors to the Museum and the control of access to KWH. She also expressed concerns about the design and usage of the open space between the two sides of the Museum and the

buildings of KWH.

37. To enhance the visual impact of the Museum to pedestrians passing by Waterloo Road, Mr Chan Ka-kui recommended KWH to consider the feasibility of extending the areas at both sides of the Medical Mall Atrium by 10 m. He also recommended KWH to remove the Podium Garden and raise the ceiling of the Medical Mall Atrium. Besides, he wished to have further elaborations on how the interior design of the Medical Mall Atrium and the outer wall design of the KWH buildings could integrate with the Museum.

38. In response to pervious enquiries from Dr Winnie Tang, Prof Rebecca Chiu and Mr Chan Ka-kui, Mr W T Lau responded that:

- (i) transparent glazing would definitely be used and glazing with the highest non-reflection rate available in the market would be considered in detailed design stage;
- (ii) prior appointment would be required for group visit to the Museum; while a designated entrance facing Dundas Street, instead of the main entrance of KWH, might be arranged for access to the Museum to avoid interruption to the daily operation of KWH;
- (iii) the buffer distance provided on both sides of the Museum was proposed to be 10 m, which was close to the current distance and the design aimed at integrating the Medical Mall Atrium with the Museum forecourt. The proposed width of the Medical Mall Atrium at 28.3 m was the maximum from the perspectives of technical feasibility and construction cost; and
- (iv) the Podium Garden was required for ventilation purpose. It would also provide an alternative viewing angle of the Museum.

39. Mr Tony Lam preferred a simple design for the ceiling of the Medical Mall Atrium in showing the Podium Garden, instead of the circular windows design. He also raised concerns over the tall buildings of KWH surrounding the Museum.

40. Ms Ava Tse raised concerns over the design and usage of the area at both sides of the Museum as the back staircases of the KWH buildings were all fronting onto that area. She emphasised the importance of using appropriate materials for the stair doors and the associated façade of the buildings so that the

side view of the Museum would not be down played and adversely affected.

41. Dr Annissa Lui suggested to allow public access to the healing garden and to build a covered walkway leading to the Museum. She also expressed that it would be good if KWH could build a covered walkway along the hospital boundary at Waterloo Road.

42. Prof Ho Pui-yin enquired whether the full glazing of the Medical Mall Atrium could be removed so that the whole area could be opened up to facilitate appreciation of the Museum. She also proposed to plant Chinese herbs in the healing garden.

43. Although further discussions on the building design would still be required in future, Mr Tony Lam appreciated and agreed with the redevelopment proposal as it could facilitate the public to appreciate the Museum.

44. Regarding the previous enquiries from Mr Tony Lam, Ms Ava Tse, Dr Annissa Lui and Prof Ho Pui-yin, Mr W T Lau expressed that:

- (i) the design of circular windows showing the Podium Garden would be modified;
- (ii) although the buffer distance provided on both sides of the Museum was 10 m only, the physical environment around the Museum would still be improved by providing a visual corridor of 60 m from the Museum to Waterloo Road and converting the existing staff barracks at the back of the Museum into a healing garden with 600 square metres;
- (iii) a light-coloured design would be adopted for the outer wall of the KWH buildings;
- (iv) the staircases of the KWH buildings leading to the Museum would only be used for emergency;
- (v) the healing garden was intended for the use by KWH patients and thus visit by a large crowd of the public was not preferred;
- (vi) planting of Chinese herb at the healing garden would be considered;
- (vii) the design of the healing garden would be compatible with the Museum;
- (viii) while it was not feasible to arrange covered walkway along the Waterloo Road boundary of KWH, yet a feasibility study of

providing a direct access between the MTR station and KWH was undergoing;

- (ix) it was necessary to arrange glazing around the Medical Mall Atrium because of the need to ensure a comfortable air-conditioned area for the patients and to maintain the medical safety of the hospital area; and
- (x) the interpretation of the history of KWH would be arranged on both sides of the Hospital Street.

45. Ms Yvonne Shing declared that she was a member of the Hospital Authority Board till 2013 and she was in acquaintance with Dr Nelson Wat. She emphasised that it was important to serve dual purposes of opening up the Museum to the public and maintaining security and medical safety of the KWH.

46. Mr Kenny Lin raised concerns about possible traffic congestion around KWH after launching the redevelopment project and opening up the Museum to the public. Prof Rebecca Chiu was also concerned about the design of the buildings of KWH surrounding the Museum.

47. Sr Wong Bay focused on the operational need of the hospital and proposed to re-shuffle the functions of the hospital on the ground floor. He hoped that environmental protection measures could be adopted in the hospital design and further consideration would be given to the integration of the “old” and the “new”.

48. From the technical point of view, Mr Lam Sair-ling suggested to temporarily close the Museum for arranging supporting works to the structure in order to prevent possible damages to the Museum during the construction works. Besides, he pointed out that a partition wall would normally be erected at the main entrance of a traditional Chinese building to avoid direct viewing of the interiors and to build up a sense of exploration. Prof Ho Pui-yin reminded that an alternative site had to be arranged for the research library located at the Museum during its temporary closure to facilitate public use. Mr W T Lau said that the Museum would be partially opened during the construction period as far as possible.

49. 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 6 Assessment of Historic Buildings
(Board Paper AAB/10/2015-16)**

50. Ms Susanna Siu reported that as at the meeting on 4 March 2015, AAB had endorsed the gradings of 1 307 buildings. In response to Members' comments made on 4 March 2015, the AMO had started a one-month public consultation on the proposed Grade 1 status of the Shaw Studio (the Studio) site. Five comments were received, including one objection from the owners of the Studio requesting gradings of individual buildings in the site and four other comments supporting the proposal. She pointed out that individual gradings to the 23 buildings at the Studio site were proposed by the Assessment Panel which were detailed in Annex C of the Board Paper. She continued to go through the proposed gradings, historical and architectural significance of the 23 individual buildings located at different zones of the site.

51. In view of the fact that the Canteen (No. 11) was the earliest built structure in the Studio site, Mr Stephen Chan asked if it could be accorded with a Grade 2 status or higher. Ms Susanna Siu mentioned that this Canteen had simple and functional design and the Assessment Panel proposed to accord it with a Grade 3 status.

52. Mr Tony Lam would like to know if there were differences in design among Sound Stages I to VI, which were all proposed to be accorded with a Grade 2 status.

53. Prof Ho Pui-yin pointed out that individual buildings at the Studio site, which were proposed to be accorded with a Grade 2 status, seemed to be assessed differently from other Grade 2 historic buildings (which were mainly buildings built in the 1920s and 1930s). Mr Kenny Lin echoed the view of Prof Ho Pui-yin and wished to know the basis for the proposed grading status of individual buildings at the Studio site.

54. Prof Rebecca Chiu questioned if it was appropriate to accord one single grading to the whole site together with individual grading to each building at the site.

55. The Chairman recalled that it was discussed in the last meeting to propose a Grade 1 status to the Studio as a whole and a grading status to each building at the site based on individual merits. Such grading arrangement was also adopted in some precedent cases.

56. The Chairman recapped that as pointed out in the last meeting, the Studio site had high historical value as Sir Run Run Shaw was a successful entrepreneur in the film industry with special business strategies by incorporating the production line, the accommodation of the operator and staff, as well as the management offices at one site. It was also proposed by Members in the last meeting to grade the buildings at the site individually and to identify those buildings with higher heritage value, as compared with other buildings in their respective zones, to facilitate further negotiation with the owners on the preservation of the selected buildings. He echoed Prof Ho Pui-yin and Mr Kenny Lin that from the perspective of architectural merit and historical value, it might be difficult to justify the proposed gradings of several individual buildings. He hoped to have more information on the assessment basis of the Assessment Panel.

57. Ms Susanna Siu elaborated the basis of assessment of the Assessment Panel:

- (i) although the Sound Stages were built by the same designer with a simple and practical design, a Grade 2 status was proposed for them as it was rare around the world to have several intact sound stages preserved until today; the success and contribution of Sir Run Run Shaw in different perspectives were also taken into account; and
- (ii) the Administration Building was well-known to Hong Kong people which could show the history of the Studio and the success of Sir Run Run Shaw, coupled with its unique architectural design. It was therefore proposed to accord it with a Grade 1 status, among 23 buildings at the site.

58. Ms Susanna Siu emphasised that the Assessment Panel had conducted an in-depth discussion and deliberation, and had taken into account historical significances of individual buildings before finalising the proposed gradings.

59. Prof Rebecca Chiu, Prof Ho Pui-yin, Mr Kenny Lin and Ms Janet Pau

shared the views that if the grading of the whole site was different from the gradings of individual buildings at the site, it might disseminate confusing message to the public and the Studio owners on Government's conservation efforts. In addition, there might be a perception of different standards in the assessment of historic buildings. Ms Ava Tse pointed out that as the proposed gradings of individual buildings only focused on the year of construction, use and the respective architects/designer as presented in the additional information, they seemed inconsistent with the full-range assessment of other standalone built heritage. In response, the Chairman pointed out that there were precedent cases in which the grading accorded to a site was different from the gradings of individual buildings in the site. Mr Ricky Wong quoted the Central Police Station Compound (the Compound) as an example, in which some buildings with lower heritage values within the Compound were demolished for accommodating new development needs of the Compound. The Chairman also clarified that there was a clear definition of each grade in the grading system, yet the application of the grading system might be different between a large site with more than one historic building and a standalone historic building.

60. The Chairman reminded Members that in the last meeting, it was proposed to accord a Grade 1 status to the Studio as a whole in view of its historical significance. However, Members also considered it necessary to accord individual grading to each building at the site, based on the individual historical and architectural merits.

61. Mr Stephen Chan mentioned that there were some examples in the Central and Western District demonstrating the grading assessment of point (individual building), line (street) and plane (area).

62. Mr Kenny Lin and Ms Janet Pau proposed to accord a Grade 2 status, instead of Grade 1 status, to the Studio as a whole, in view of the selective conservation approach for individual buildings at the site.

63. Mr Lam Sair-ling opined that it was difficult, but not contradictory, for a site to have high group value while individual buildings within the site might not have high architectural values. Similar examples could be found in other countries. He recalled that in the last meeting, Members considered that the Studio had a high and valuable group value as it demonstrated the highly efficient production line at one site, and thus supported to propose a Grade 1 status to the

site as a whole for further public consultation. Mr Tony Lam echoed Mr Lam Sair-ling's view.

64. In response to the concerns of Ms Janet Pau and Prof Rebecca Chiu on the preservation of historic buildings through grading assessment and the necessity for a built heritage to have architectural merits, the Chairman reiterated that grading status itself had no bearing on whether the historic buildings could be demolished or not, and a built heritage did not necessarily possess architectural merit.

65. Prof Ho Pui-yin opined that careful consideration should be given to this case to avoid public perception that the grading system was not fair, in a way that built heritage whichever associated with celebrities would be accorded with a higher grading status.

66. The Chairman emphasised that it was important to let the public clearly understand our basis of grading assessment. The same basis should be applied across the board, regardless of whether it was a site or a building to be graded, to avoid public criticisms.

67. Ms Karen Tang pointed out that the heritage value of the whole site was attributed to the success of the film production at the site, which formed part of the Hong Kong history, but not to the success of an individual person.

68. Mr Albert Lam supplemented that the redevelopment plan of the site for commercial and residential use had been approved. A proposed Grade 1 status to the site as a whole and the proposed gradings on individual buildings at the site could facilitate the negotiation with the owners on how to preserve the site as far as possible in its redevelopment project. Prof Rebecca Chiu proposed AAB to accord a Grade 1 status to the site as a whole only and the proposed gradings of individual buildings suggested by the Assessment Panel should be used as reference for the negotiation. Mr Albert Lam expressed that AAB's official assessment on the gradings of individual buildings would better facilitate the negotiation with the owners.

69. The Chairman suggested Members to finalise a decision by means of voting and stressed that the decision was not related to the redevelopment plan of the site. A total of ten Members supported the need of according individual grading to each building at the site in the first round, and only five Members

agreed that no further re-assessment of the proposed gradings of individual buildings by the Assessment Panel was required in the second round. The Chairman concluded that individual grading to each building at the site was required and the proposed gradings should be re-assessed by the Assessment Panel for AAB's further consideration.

70. After the deliberations on the Studio, Dr Alan Fung continued to brief Members on the historical background, proposed grading and comments received from members of the public regarding the Old Quarry Site Structures listed at Annex A of the Board Paper. The proposed grading of this item was then confirmed as Members raised no comment on the assessment.

Item 7 Any Other Business

71. There being no other business, the meeting adjourned at 6:21 p.m.

Antiquities and Monuments Office
Leisure and Cultural Services Department
September 2015

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