

**ANTIQUITIES ADVISORY BOARD**

**Minutes of the 172<sup>nd</sup> Meeting**  
**on Thursday, 17 September 2015 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 Chung Po-yin  
Prof Ho Puay-peng, JP  
Prof Ho Pui-yin  
Mr Tony Lam Chung-wai  
Mr Philip Liao Yi-kang  
Dr Annissa Lui Wai-ling  
Ms Theresa Ng Choi-yuk  
Ms Yvonne Shing Mo-han, JP  
Ms Karen Tang Shuk-tak  
Dr Joseph Ting Sun-pao  
Ms Ava Tse Suk-ying, SBS  
Sr Wong Bay  
Mr Rex Wong Siu-han  
Mr Conrad Wong Tin-cheung, BBS, JP  
Dr Sharon Wong Wai-yee

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

Absent with Apologies:

Mr Kenny Lin Ching-pui  
Mr Joseph Luc Ngai  
Ms Janet Pau Heng-ting  
Dr Winnie Tang Shuk-ming, JP

In Attendance:

Development Bureau

Mr Albert Lam  
Deputy Secretary (Works)<sup>1</sup>

Mr José Yam  
Commissioner for Heritage

Mr Allen Fung  
Political Assistant to Secretary for Development

Ms Leonie Lee  
Assistant Secretary (Heritage Conservation)<sup>3</sup>

Mr Eddie Wong  
Chief Executive Officer (Heritage Conservation)<sup>1</sup>

Ms Angela Siu  
Curator (Antiquities and Monuments) 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)

Mr Kenneth Tam  
Chief Heritage Manager (Antiquities and Monuments)

Dr Alan Fung  
Assistant Curator I (Buildings Survey)  
*(for item 5 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 of government bureau and departments to the meeting.

### **Item 1      Confirmation of Minutes of the 171<sup>st</sup> Meeting held on 4 June 2015 (Board Minutes AAB/2/2015-16)**

2.            The minutes of the 171<sup>st</sup> Meeting held on 4 June 2015 were confirmed with the following amendments:

- (i)    Proposed by Ms Ava Tse to revise paragraphs 17, 40 and 59 as follows:

“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.”

“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.”

“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.”

**Item 2 Matters Arising and Progress Report  
(Board Paper AAB/15/2015-16)**

3. Ms Susanna Siu briefed Members on the progress of major heritage issues and activities during the period from 1 May 2015 to 31 August 2015, including the declaration of three historic buildings as monuments, 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 relevant Annexes of the Board Paper.

4. In response to Dr Joseph Ting’s enquires, Ms Susanna Siu mentioned that the Antiquities and Monuments Office (AMO) would liaise with the owner of Tat Tak Communal Hall for opening the site to the public as soon as possible, after completion of restoration works. Besides, the former French Mission Building was being converted for use by law-related organisations. DoJ would arrange guided tours of the building for the public upon completion of revitalisation works.

**Item 3 Heritage Impact Assessment (HIA) in respect of the Rear Portion of the Cattle Depot  
(Board Paper AAB/16/2015-16)**

5. Mr Tony Lam declared that he was involved in this project. The Chairman decided that Mr Tony Lam could remain at the meeting without giving any views on the matter.

6. The Chairman introduced the presentation team comprising the

following members:

Mr Tsui Yiu-leung, William, JP,  
District Officer (Kowloon City),  
Home Affairs Department

Mr Lo Chi-sing, Jacen,  
Senior Architect,  
Architectural Services Department

Ms Hui Ka-wai, Minerva,  
Architect,  
Architectural Services Department

Ms Chui Cheuk-wah, Erica,  
HIA consultant,  
AGC Design Limited

7. Mr William Tsui briefed Members on the background of the project which would convert the rear portion of the Cattle Depot to an open space with recreational facilities, as well as the positive impact of the project to the Kowloon City District.

8. Mr Jacen Lo then showed Members the location maps of the project site, including the rear portion of the Cattle Depot and its surroundings, and briefed Members the chronology of the construction of different building structures in the Cattle Depot. He also mentioned the unique scenic characteristics of the coexistence of structures and trees in the rear portion of the Cattle Depot after the decommissioning of the Ex-Ma Tau Kok Animal Quarantine Depot in 1999. He further elaborated how the accessibility of the site could be greatly enhanced by the project after its completion.

9. Ms Erica Chui continued to brief Members on the cultural significance of the Cattle Depot, including its architectural value, authenticity and rarity. Based on its cultural significance, she introduced the five conservation principles to be adopted in the project including the preservation of historic fabrics, minimising new additional works, proper documentation and monitoring, interpretation of artifacts and history of the site, as well as enhancement to the site and the associated social benefits to the local community.

10. Mr Jacen Lo followed by explaining in detail the key design proposal, the impact of the project as well as the corresponding mitigation measures proposed for each part/zone of the rear portion of the Cattle Depot. He also elaborated on the potential visual impact and other impacts during the construction phase of the project with the recommended mitigation measures. He concluded that, according to the HIA, the overall potential impacts on the Cattle Depot site were considered acceptable and manageable with the proposed mitigation measures. The proposed project was also considered technically feasible and acceptable from the heritage conservation perspective.

11. In response to the Chairman's enquiry, Mr Jacen Lo responded that the site area was approximately 6,033 square metres. Mr William Tsui supplemented that given limited financial resources allocated to each district as promulgated in the 2013 Policy Address and the additional project cost required, the Kowloon City District Council decided that the paper factory, which had been closed down and in the vicinity, would not be included in the project site.

12. Though supporting the project, Prof Ho Puay-peng suggested that further consideration should be given to the active use of the open space and the enhancement of historical interpretation areas in the project site. While falling outside the scope of the HIA, he further proposed to have a holistic review on the usage of the project site, together with the surrounding Artist Village and the closed paper factory.

13. In response to Prof Ho Puay-peng's suggestion on enhancing the promotion of art and culture and Dr Annissa Lui's enquiries on public accessibility and availability of recreational facilities at the project site, Mr William Tsui said that the proposed project could increase the visitor flow to the Artist Village at the front portion of the Cattle Depot, through enhancing its public accessibility and organising joint promotional activities with the existing operators at the Artist Village upon the implementation of the project. Besides, the enhanced public accessibility could enhance public understanding on the history of the Kowloon City District, such as the original factory location for different industries. Moreover, easier public access to the To Kwa Wan Sports Centre behind the project site could also be achieved. Apart from displaying the culture and history of the Cattle Depot, Mr Jacen Lo supplemented that the design of the project would be further developed so as to facilitate the promotion of art and culture.

14. As regards the design of the project site, Mr Chan Ka-kui, Prof Ho Puay-peng, Ms Theresa Ng and Mr Rex Wong made the following suggestions:

- (i) to revitalise the water pond at the site;
- (ii) to enhance the utilisation of the project site for the cultural and artistic activities of the Artist Village;
- (iii) to demonstrate more about the operation of the Cattle Depot; and
- (iv) to include commercial element in the adaptive reuse of the project site.

15. In response, Mr Jacen Lo advised that the project design would retain the vision to revitalize the water pond so as to reflect its significance and previous function. Mr William Tsui supplemented that cultural activities had been organised in collaboration with the existing operator at the Artist Village; this mode of cooperation would continue in future to promote the history of To Kwa Wan, as well as to enhance the sense of culture and art in the district. Besides, in view of the space limitation and constraints under the management of a government department, it might not be suitable to include commercial element in the project design.

16. Regarding the enquiries from Ms Karen Tang, Prof Rebecca Chiu and Dr Sharon Wong on the usage of the red brick houses, provision of grassland and organising cross-racial activities at the project site, Mr William Tsui responded that sufficient signage would be installed to direct the public to the project site and local organisations would be invited to organise functions for the local residents. Mr Jacen Lo supplemented that the liaison with different stakeholders, including local parties and the departments concerned would be continued, to study the technical feasibility of incorporating their recommendations in the project design.

17. Prof Ho Pui-yin suggested including historical interpretation about the Cattle Depot from the perspective of public hygiene management, such as the historical development of livestock processing in the urban areas. Mr Philip Liao quoted the successful example of the Meatpacking District in New York illustrating the integration of historical interpretation with cultural art and commercial elements, essence of it could be injected to the current project design.

18. The Chairman summarised that Members' views were mainly related to the mode of operation at the project site in future, such as the connection of history and culture of the whole district with local needs. Also, preferably the



presentation team could provide further information on the detailed project design, in particular, regarding the historic interpretation of the Cattle Depot and its association with the surrounding sites, to Members for information when available in future. Prof Ho Puay-peng raised his concern on the accessibility and the management arrangement of the project site and the Artist Village.

19. In response to the Chairman's enquiry, Mr William Tsui responded that the Artist Village was operated under a management company commissioned by the Development Bureau and some activities had been organised in the Artist Village. He emphasised that through continued liaison with non-government organisations, artists of the Artist Village, District Council and the local parties, their views on the project design for promotion of culture and art would be collected and incorporated where appropriate. He also ensured that sufficient signage would be installed for enhancing the accessibility of the project site.

20. 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 4 Policy Review on the Conservation of Built Heritage: Progress Report**  
**(Board Paper AAB/17/2015-16)**

21. The Chairman invited Ms Angela Siu to report the progress of the Policy Review on the Conservation of Built Heritage (the Policy Review). Ms Angela Siu informed Members that the Policy Review was completed in December 2014 and the review report was released in January 2015. She then reported the latest position in implementing the recommendations of the Board pursuant to the Policy Review, in relation to the economic incentives, grading mechanism, “point-line-plane” approach, alteration and addition works for adaptive re-use of historic buildings, Built Heritage Conservation Fund, research, public education and publicity.

22. In response to Prof Rebecca Chiu's suggestion in providing Members a tabulated overview of the implementation of the recommendations, including the progress, timeframe and target completion date of each of the recommendations, Mr Albert Lam responded that a detailed timeframe of implementation would be

set out upon the confirmation of resources.

23. Regarding the recommendations on the grading mechanism, Mr Tony Lam, Prof Ho Puay-peng, Dr Joseph Ting and Ms Karen Tang raised their concerns on reviewing the list of 1,444 historic buildings, as well as devising a better mechanism to enhance the protection of historic buildings, including those buildings constructed after 1950. It was also proposed to rank the heritage value of individual historic buildings by grouping them under different categories of uses, so as to protect those with higher heritage value as far as possible and in a systematic manner. Sr Wong Bay recommended to conduct risk assessment on re-development potential and maintenance needs for those historic buildings outside the list of 1,444 historic buildings. The Chairman and Ms Karen Tang opined that these measures would require considerable time and manpower resources.

24. Dr Joseph Ting and Mr Philip Liao pointed out the limitation of the existing mechanism, especially the difficulties in protecting historic buildings with high re-development value, no matter what kind of economic initiatives were offered. The Chairman acknowledged the said limitation and the need for further study on the possible causes of the difficulty on preservation of historic buildings, on top of re-development value.

25. Regarding Ms Ava Tse's concern on the user-friendliness of retrieving information of historic buildings from the AAB website, Ms Susanna Siu responded that measures were being taken to improve the search engine and retrieval functions of the website with a view to providing a one-stop search for information on graded historic buildings.

26. Mr Rex Wong pointed out that some developers would prefer to have information on how to deal with the conservation and re-development of a historic site at the same time.

27. Regarding the concern of Ms Theresa Ng on setting up a built heritage conservation fund, the Chairman elaborated that this was a dedicated fund on conservation of built heritage. The fund would sponsor public education and publicity activities, academic researches, public engagement and consultation programmes to enhance public engagement and awareness on conservation of built heritage. Concrete operation plan of the fund would be discussed later. Ms

Theresa Ng emphasised the importance of publicity for the fund in future.

28. Prof Rebecca Chiu commented that some recommendations which required minimal resources or mutual consensus of concerned parties could be rolled out at an earlier stage. Besides, the Government could consider inviting local universities to take part in the preparation of detailed records for historic buildings, as part of community services.

29. In response to Prof Rebecca Chiu's concern on the monitoring mechanism of historic buildings, Mr José Yam said that the existing mechanism had served the function of alerting the Commissioner of Heritage's Office (CHO) and AMO of any demolition or renovation plan of historic buildings through the reports by relevant government departments. Indeed, the Board's recommendation aimed at strengthening the existing mechanism by reviewing the grading status of historic buildings, so that government departments could make use of the up-to-date grading status when liaising with owners of privately-owned historic buildings on their conservation proposals.

30. The Chairman pointed out that the existing mechanism had provided effective alerts, yet it was limited by the restrictions that could be imposed through the grading mechanism. He added that further discussion on legislative enforcement of the grading assessment was needed. Prof Rebecca Chiu agreed and opined that the definition of each grading had to be reviewed. Prof Ho Puay-peng also commented that the Board should further discuss the proposed inclusion of buildings constructed between the 1950s and 1970s in the assessment exercise of historic buildings, and to give advice to the CHO and the AMO for follow-up actions.

31. The Chairman suggested to organise a brainstorming session in late 2015 or early 2016 for Members to have a more in-depth discussion on the need to enhance the assessment exercise of historic buildings, such as by grouping the buildings under different categories of uses and including those buildings constructed before the 1970s. He pointed out that, most importantly, the Board's recommendations pursuant to the Policy Review were accepted by the Government and the implementation of some recommendations was in progress. The Board was also prepared to explore ways to improve the existing mechanism.

32. Ms Karen Tang quoted the example of Meatpacking District to

demonstrate the success of upgrading a district through the conservation of a historic site. With reference to this example, she hoped that the project design of the rear portion of the Cattle Depot could take into account its positive impacts on the development of the whole Kowloon City District. Ms Susanna Siu responded that, in consultation with the District Officer (Kowloon City), researches were being conducted to promote the unique characteristics of the Kowloon City District in history, culture and art. This approach would be extended to other districts to promote their own unique characteristics. Dr Louis Ng supplemented that different government departments would work together to explore ways to promote culture, history and art, as well as heritage conservation, during the development of a district. Advices or suggestions from the Board were always welcome.

33. Mr Stephen Chan opined that District Councils could be invited to take part in the public education activities of heritage conservation, as well as the review of 1,444 historic buildings. Ms Yvonne Shing suggested to make use of the upcoming District Council Election promotional campaigns as a platform for the public education of heritage conservation. Sr Wong Bay also proposed that the promotion of heritage conservation could be carried out on a cross-departmental basis, as each department could also display the history related to its businesses.

34. The Chairman believed that the Development Bureau would take into account Members' comments and he looked forward to the announcement of an overview on the progress regarding the implementation of the Board's recommendations pursuant to the Policy Review.

## **Item 5     Assessment of Historic Buildings**

### **(Board Paper AAB/18/2015-16)**

35. The Chairman recapped that in the previous two AAB meetings, Members had agreed to accord a grading status to the whole site of Shaw Studio (the Studio) and a separate grading status to each of the 23 buildings located within the Studio. Besides, Members also requested to have a review on the proposed grading of individual buildings by the Assessment Panel, with additional information from the AMO on each building for further discussion by the Board.

36. Ms Susanna Siu reported that the one-month consultation was conducted on the proposed grade 1 status to the whole site of the Studio and she briefed Members on the comments received from the public (including one comment from the owner of the Studio expressing reservation on the proposed grading and four comments from other members of the public supporting the proposed grading). The proposed Grade 1 status of the whole site of the Studio was then confirmed as Members raised no further comment on the assessment.

37. Dr Alan Fung continued to brief Members on the supplementary information on the historical background of each of the 23 buildings located at the site of the Studio set out at Annex B of the Board Paper.

38. Regarding the Administration Building (item no. 1), the proposed Grade 1 status was confirmed as Members raised no further comment on the assessment.

39. In response to Ms Ava Tse's enquiry, Dr Alan Fung explained the differences among the Sound Stages I to X in terms of their construction background, in particular, the Sound Stages VII to X were of temporary nature. The proposed grading of the Sound Stages I to X (item nos. 2, 3, 5, 6 and 14) was then confirmed by Members.

40. The proposed Grade 2 status of the Film Store and Dubbing (item no. 4) was confirmed as Members raised no further comment on the assessment.

41. Members continued to discuss the proposed grading of the Colour Laboratory (item no. 7). In response to Prof Ho Puay-peng's enquiry, Dr Alan Fung elaborated that there were several water tanks installed beneath this building. In spite of the fact that it was the first colour laboratory in Hong Kong, Prof Ho Puay-peng did not agree with the proposed Grade 2 status and proposed to accord a Grade 3 status instead, as the building had less historical significance and architectural merit. Prof Chung Po-yin remarked that the establishment of first Colour Laboratory in Hong Kong was an important milestone in the Asian film industry, highlighting that the colour printing technology used to be monopolised by Japan was under challenge, and the building therefore deserved a Grade 2 status under this consideration. By means of voting, only 2 out of 19 Members supported the proposed Grade 3 status suggested by Prof Ho Puay-peng. The proposed Grade 2 status of the Colour Laboratory (item no. 7) was then confirmed by Members.

42. Members went on to discuss the proposed grading of the Production Department (item no. 10) and Canteen (item no. 11). In response to the Chairman's enquiry, Dr Alan Fung supplemented that the Canteen was the earliest building constructed at the site to provide catering services for the construction workers. The proposed Grade 2 status of the Production Department (item no. 10) and the proposed Grade 3 status of the Canteen (item no. 11) were confirmed by Members without further comment.

43. As requested by the Chairman, Dr Alan Fung clarified that the Costume Store (item no. 12) was a permanent structure. Yet there were many temporary shelters built to connect different buildings at the Studio to ensure uninterrupted operation of the Studio under all weathers. The proposed Grade 3 status of the Costume Store (item no. 12) was then confirmed by Members.

44. The discussion moved on to the proposed grading of the dormitories in the Studio. The proposed Grade 2 status of both Dormitory No. 3 (item no. 8) and the Shaw Villa (item no. 9), as well as the proposed Grade 3 status of the TVB Office (former Dormitory No. 2) (item no. 13) were confirmed by Members with no further comment.

45. Members then discussed the proposed Grade 3 status for Dormitory No. 4. Prof Ho Pui-yin, Mr Philip Liao, Sr Wong Bay and Mr Tony Lam expressed that it seemed not justified to accord a Grade 3 status to the TVB Office (former Dormitory No. 2) (item no. 13) and Dormitory No. 4 (item no. 15) because they accommodated less famous artists. It was proposed to accord a higher Grade 2 status to both buildings, having regard to their architectural merits, and the fact that one of them was also designed by the same architect who built Dormitory No. 3 (just accorded with Grade 2 status), with similar architectural features. After discussion, Members decided to review the confirmed grading status of the TVB Office (former Dormitory No. 2) (item no. 13).

46. By means of voting, 12 out of 16 Members supported the proposal to accord a Grade 2 status to the TVB Office (former Dormitory No. 2) (item no. 13). The grading status of that building was therefore revised to Grade 2 and confirmed by Members.

47. The discussion continued with the proposed grading status of Dormitory No. 4 (item no. 15). Dr Alan Fung replied to Mr Philip Liao's enquiry that the

bridge, being the only access to the said Dormitory, was part of the building. By means of voting, 6 out of 16 Members supported the proposal to accord a Grade 3 status, 7 Members supported the proposal to accord Grade 2 and 2 Members abstained from voting. By simple majority, a Grade 2 status of Dormitory No. 4 (item no. 15) was confirmed by Members.

48. The proposed Grade 3 status of the Administrative Staff Quarters (item no. 18), the Guard House (item no. 16) and the Purchasing Department (item no. 17) were then confirmed by Members with no further comment, with the remarks by Prof Chung Po-yin that the Purchasing Department was under the supervision of Ms Mona Fong and mainly responsible for audit work.

49. With respect to the remaining 5 buildings (i.e. item nos. 19-23), Dr Alan Fung advised that no supplementary information was available for Members' reference, except that item nos. 20-22 had undergone alterations before.

50. Mr Rex Wong opined that young generation born after the 1980s had collective memories of the TVB operation at the TVB Production Block (item no. 20) and the TVB House (item no. 21), which deserved to be accorded a grading status. Mr Philip Liao echoed his view.

51. Mr Chan Ka-kui commented that each of the buildings within the site of the Studio should have an individual grading assessment. The Chairman confirmed the understanding of Prof Rebecca Chiu that the remaining 5 buildings had been accorded a nil grading by the Assessment Panel. The grading assessment of these relatively new buildings was somehow related to the discussion on the age threshold of historic buildings during the deliberation of the grading mechanism in the Policy Review.

52. Ms Ava Tse and Prof Chung Po-yin recalled that Members agreed to accord Grade 1 status to the Studio as the site could demonstrate the success of the film production line operated there, as well as its historical significance in the film production industry. These remaining 5 buildings were indeed outside the said production line and belonged to the production of television programmes by the TVB.

53. After deliberations, the proposed nil grading status of the remaining 5 buildings (i.e. item nos. 19-23) was confirmed by Members.

54. Dr Alan Fung then briefed Members on the historical background of the item listed in Annex D, i.e. Watervale House, Former Gordon Hard Camp, Castle Peak Road – Castle Peak Bay Section, Area 48, Tuen Mun, N.T. (Serial No. N216) (the Watervale House), adding that a Grade 3 status was proposed by the Assessment Panel. In response to the Chairman's enquiry, Ms Susanna Siu said that the site did not fall within the government land pending for sale, and there was no demolition risk at this moment.

55. Mr Philip Liao proposed a Grade 2 status to the Watervale House in view of its architectural merits, such as its façade and the rain shelter. Sr Wong Bay supported this proposal.

56. In response to the enquiry from the Chairman, Dr Alan Fung pointed out that single-storey western bungalow was a rare building structure in Hong Kong. Mr Tony Lam agreed on this observation.

57. By means of voting, 12 out of 14 Members supported the proposal to accord a Grade 2 status to the Watervale House. The Grade 2 status of the Watervale House was therefore confirmed by Members.

## **Item 6 Any Other Business**

58. There being no other business, the meeting adjourned at 6:27 p.m.

Antiquities and Monuments Office  
Leisure and Cultural Services Department  
March 2016

---

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