

**ANTIQUITIES ADVISORY BOARD**

**Minutes of the 173<sup>rd</sup> Meeting**  
**on Thursday, 3 March 2016 at 3:02 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  
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  
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: Dr Joseph Ting Sun-pao

In Attendance: Development Bureau

Mr Albert Lam  
Deputy Secretary (Works)1

Mr José Yam  
Commissioner for Heritage

Mr Ricky Wong  
Chief Assistant Secretary (Works)2

Mr Allen Fung  
Political Assistant to Secretary for Development

Mr Simon Chan  
Assistant Secretary (Heritage Conservation)1

Ms Leonie Lee  
Assistant Secretary (Heritage Conservation)3

Mr Eddie Wong  
Chief Executive Officer (Heritage Conservation)1

Ms Angela Siu  
Curator (Antiquities and Monuments) Special Duties  
(for item 5 only)

Mr Kevin Cheung  
Engineer (Heritage Conservation) Special Duties

Mr Terence Lo  
Technical Advisor 2  
(for item 3 only)

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)

Mr Ng Chi-wo  
Curator (Historical Buildings)<sup>2</sup>  
*(for items 4 and 6 only)*

Dr Alan Fung  
Assistant Curator I (Buildings Survey)  
*(for item 4 only)*

Planning Department

Mr Michael Chan  
Assistant Director / Metro

Architectural Services Department

Mr Hui Chiu-kin  
Assistant Director (Property Services)

Ms Chan Mei-kuen  
Senior Maintenance Surveyor / Heritage

**Opening Remarks**

The Chairman welcomed Members and representatives of government bureau and departments to the meeting, in particular, Mr Michael Chan, Assistant

Director/Metro of the Planning Department, and Ms Chan Mei-kuen, Senior Maintenance Surveyor/Heritage of the Architectural Services Department, who attended the meeting for the first time.

**Item 1 Confirmation of Minutes of the Special Meeting held on 25 August 2015 and the 172<sup>nd</sup> Meeting held on 17 September 2015  
(Board Minutes AAB/3/2015-16 and AAB/4/2015-16)**

2. The minutes of the Special Meeting held on 25 August 2015 were confirmed with the following amendments:

(i) Proposed by Ms Ava Tse to revise paragraph 8 as follows:

“8. Ms Ava Tse suggested reviewing the grading status of the Buildings with reference to the grading status of other pawnshops on corner site.”

3. The minutes of the 172<sup>nd</sup> Meeting held on 17 September 2015 were confirmed without amendment.

**Item 2 Matters Arising and Progress Report  
(Board Paper AAB/21/2015-16)**

4. Ms Susanna Siu briefed Members on the progress of major heritage issues and activities during the period from 1 September 2015 to 15 February 2016, 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. She went on to brief Members on the setting up of a new team responsible for conducting 3D scanning for historic buildings as well as the increase of licence fee to excavate and search for antiquities starting from 31 March 2016.

5. In response to the enquiries of the Chairman and Mr Tony Lam, and Prof Ho Puay-peng's concern on the operation of the new 3D scanning team, Ms Susanna Siu replied that:

- (i) the 3D data collected would be used on repairs and maintenance works of declared monuments;
- (ii) priority of conducting 3D scanning would be given to the declared monuments planned for repairs and maintenance works, as well as the graded buildings under demolition threat; and
- (iii) the 3D scanning team would be responsible for both the on-site 3D scanning works and in-house processing of the 3D data collected. Taking the main office of the Antiquities and Monuments Office (AMO) as an example, it would normally take 5 to 6 days' time to complete data collection and about 3 weeks' time for data processing.

**Item 3    Updating of Practice Note and Practice Guidebook on Conservation of Historic Buildings  
(Board Paper AAB/22/2015-16)**

6.        The Chairman introduced the presentation team from the Buildings Department comprising the following members:

Ms Karen Cheung,  
Chief Building Surveyor/Hong Kong East and Heritage,  
Buildings Department

Ms Wendy Leung,  
Senior Building Surveyor/Heritage,  
Buildings Department

Mr Benny Tang,  
Senior Structural Engineer/Heritage,  
Buildings Department

7.        Ms Karen Cheung briefed Members on the background and progress of updating the “Practice Note for Authorized Persons, Registered Structural

Engineers and Registered Geotechnical Engineers on Conservation of Historic Buildings” (the PNAP) and the “Practice Guidebook for Adaptive Re-use of and Alteration and Addition Works to Heritage Buildings 2012” (the Practice Guidebook) in response to the Board’s recommendations under the policy review on the conservation of built heritage (the Policy Review).

8. Ms Karen Cheung further elaborated the new elements in the revised PNAP that had been promulgated in end January 2016. The new contents were to enhance building practitioners’ understanding on the flexibility and the pragmatic approach adopted by the Buildings Department to deal with cases where there were constraints in meeting the standards of prescriptive requirements in the conservation and adaptive re-use of historic buildings. The existing mechanism of processing free pre-submission enquiries and the service provided by the designated Heritage Units in the Buildings Department in handling relevant enquiries and submissions have also been emphasised in the PNAP. She added that updates of the Practice Guidebook would be conducted in two batches, the first one by mid-2016 and the second by end 2016. The aim was to, apart from updating the statutory requirements therein, also showcase building practitioners and private owners of historic buildings the myriad practical solutions to the common problems which might be encountered when attempting to comply with the current building safety and health requirements for heritage conservations. Recently completed projects under the Revitalising Historic Buildings Through Partnership Scheme (the Revitalisation Scheme) would also be included.

9. In response to the enquiries of the Chairman and Mr Stephen Chan, Ms Karen Cheung explained that the PNAP was addressed to registered building professionals for facilitating their alternative designs to meet standards of the prescriptive requirements under the Buildings Ordinance. The Practice Guidebook aimed at providing useful reference to the stakeholders in general. The latest revision of the PNAP had made reference to the part of the Practice Guidebook on alternative solutions in meeting the prescriptive standards.

10. Prof Ho Puay-peng commented that there was not much flexibility in the discussion with the Buildings Department. He proposed to allow more relaxations in the requirements laid down in the PNAP and suggested providing a platform for relevant parties, such as AMO, the Board and building practitioners, to hold case meetings to discuss possible relaxations.

11. Mr Tony Lam acknowledged the updating of the PNAP and Practice Guidebook. Looking ahead, he hoped that more concrete standards acceptable to the Buildings Department could be laid down in the PNAP and Practice Guidebook to facilitate building practitioners to understand how to fulfill the requirements.

12. Mr Philip Liao welcomed the updates and raised if it was possible to expand the scope of the PNAP so that buildings built 40 to 50 years ago but which had not been graded could also be covered. Mr Rex Wong echoed Mr Liao's view and opined that flexibility should also be applicable to the alteration and addition works for adaptive re-use of privately-owned historic buildings or construction of new building(s) within a historic site.

13. Ms Karen Cheung advised that the PNAP provides guidelines specifically to facilitate adaptive re-use of, alteration and addition works to, and preservation-cum-development of historic buildings. Controversial cases including those not relating to heritage buildings would be brought up to the Building Committee comprising representatives from relevant departments for deliberation and making recommendation to the Building Authority. When necessary, representatives from AMO would be invited to join as observers.

14. Mr Philip Liao expressed concern that private owners of old buildings very often faced difficulties in complying with the prevailing requirements under the Buildings Ordinance when re-developing a site, and they eventually might need to rely on developers for implementing any re-development projects. He enquired whether the relaxation could also be applicable to these cases. Ms Karen Cheung replied that the issue in question was outside the ambit of current review exercise.

15. Sr Wong Bay welcomed the updates. He proposed to include further flexibility and provide more scenarios in the Practice Guidebook to demonstrate how different cases would be dealt with in the context of alteration and addition works and preservation-cum-development of historic buildings. He emphasised that apart from revitalisation of historic buildings, their proper maintenance was also necessary. He hoped that there would be more innovative methods in carrying out maintenance works for historic buildings.

16. Mr Conrad Wong wished that the processing time for the applications

for the alteration and addition works and preservation-cum-development of historic buildings could be shortened. He believed that clearer guidelines on the performance-based requirements could minimise the processing time.

17. Ms Karen Cheung responded the publications summarised the real cases encountered in the past few years and experience gained therefrom. The BD would be prepared to accept other alternative approach provided that the safety standards had not been compromised. She welcomed practitioners to approach the Heritage Units of the Buildings Department for overcoming design constraints not resolvable by the current publications.

18. The Chairman thanked the presentation team. He believed that the updates of the PNAP and Practice Guidebook could give an important message to the public about the Government's commitment in preserving and revitalising historic buildings, while a performance-based approach with more flexibility in the applications of works could encourage the private owners of historic buildings to take part in the preservation and revitalisation of historic buildings.

#### **Item 4      Assessment of Historic Buildings (Board Paper AAB/24/2015-16)**

19. Ms Susanna Siu reported that at the meeting held on 17 September 2015, Members agreed to accord the proposed gradings to the Watervale House at Former Gordon Hard Camp in Tuen Mun (Serial No. N216) and the 23 buildings within the Shaw Studio site (Serial No. N222 to Serial No. N244). Subsequently, AMO commenced a one-month consultation on the proposed gradings and no objection was received. The proposed gradings were then confirmed by Members.

20. Dr Alan Fung followed by briefing Members on the historical background of each of the items listed (Serial Nos. N100, N101, N245, N102 and N103) at Annex B of the Board Paper.

21. In response to the Chairman's enquiry, Dr Alan Fung pointed out that all the items were situated on government land since the expiry of the land lease to an iron mine company in 1981. The items for discussion mainly included the portals of 2 mining tunnels, a mineral preparation plant, 2 churches and a group of

mining structures.

22. Mr Tony Lam opined that the whole area had a very high group value, and it had the potential to be developed to a site comprising historical, educational and natural elements. Ms Janet Pau echoed this view. She acknowledged the uniqueness of the site and wished to know whether there was any preservation plan.

23. Dr Annissa Lui mentioned that the Lutheran Yan Kwong Church had renovated the church structure there, aiming at improving the condition of the building for camping and other religious activities. They also wished to arrange docent services for promoting the historical and religious significance of the church.

24. Mr Stephen Chan, Prof Ho Puay-peng, Dr Sharon Wong and Mr Philip Liao also agreed that the whole site had a high group value. In response to their enquiries, Dr Alan Fung further explained that:

- (i) the item under discussion (Serial No. N100) only covered the portal of the mining tunnel, but not the internal part; and
- (ii) there were some structural alterations to the items proposed for grading. For instance, a new ancillary part was built at the side of the Lutheran Yan Kwong Church (Serial No. N102).

25. Prof Ho Pui-yin asked whether the Ma On Shan Old and New Village would also be assessed for grading. Dr Alan Fung replied that according to the available information, all residents of “Wan Ka Tsuen” had already moved out, while some building structures were still there and some of them were owned by a private developer. Prof Ho Pui-yin proposed to include these two villages in the grading exercise.

26. Sr Wong Bay expressed that the mining industry played a significant role in the economic development of Hong Kong and Japan, and therefore considered that a grading higher than the proposed Grade 3 status to all the items was warranted, especially the whole area had religious and tourist resources which could be better developed. He also proposed that the mining tunnels should be graded, likened to the grading of the air-raid shelters. Mr Philip Liao and Ms Theresa Ng echoed Sr Wong Bay’s view on the proposed grading.

27. Prof Rebecca Chiu considered that individual buildings at the site should have different gradings, instead of according a Grade 3 status collectively. She suggested that the site, being a rare place in Hong Kong, could be considered as a case study of grading using the “plane” approach. As the site was situated on Government land, there would be sufficient time for a detailed study.

28. In response to the enquiry of Ms Ava Tse on the development plan for Ma On Shan, Mr Michael Chan advised that a private residential development for the Ma On Shan Village had previously been approved by the Town Planning Board. An engineering feasibility study for potential housing development was being conducted for the lower hill sides, near the existing public estates of Ma On Shan. However, there was no plan for development in the upper parts of Ma On Shan. If required, more detailed information could be provided after the meeting.

29. In response to the enquiry of the Chairman, Ms Susanna Siu mentioned that AMO would study the feasibility of “point-line-plane” approach for preservation of heritage at the Ma On Shan Iron Mine site. After the confirmation of the proposed gradings by Members, a one-month public consultation on the proposed gradings would commence, followed by further in-depth study on other relevant items, such as the villages and mine caves.

30. Prof Ho Puay-peng and Prof Rebecca Chiu both considered that the current information was sufficient for considering the proposed gradings of the items being discussed. They also proposed to devise a separate set of assessment criteria for the grading of “plane” and “line”. In addition, they suggested that during the one-month public consultation period, it should be clearly stated that the Board would further consider the grading and preservation of the site using the “plane” approach. Mr Kenny Lin opined that there seemed to have no urgency to confirm the grading at the moment. He worried that the public would be given false impression that the site was only worthy of a Grade 3 status.

31. By means of voting, 9 Members agreed to confirm the proposed grading at the subject meeting, whereas 12 Members did not. As requested by the Chairman, Ms Susanna Siu explained that the grading status of a historic building could facilitate the application of financial support for the repairs and maintenance works, while AMO would offer technical advice.

32. Mr José Yam supplemented that, as part of the proposal to establish a dedicated fund for the conservation of built heritage which would be discussed in the next agenda item, it was proposed to raise the financial assistance ceiling for works projects under the Financial Assistance for Maintenance Scheme, and to expand the scope of the Scheme to cover all graded historic buildings for non-governmental use such that more comprehensive maintenance works could be carried out. The grading status of a historic building could therefore enable the grant of funding from this Scheme for necessary repairs and maintenance works for the building.

33. In response to enquiry of Ms Karen Tang, Ms Susanna Siu said that survey study on the mine tunnels and villages would be explored. After deliberations, by means of second-time voting, 13 out of 21 Members agreed to confirm the proposed grading at the subject meeting.

34. Members proceeded to consider the proposed Grade 3 status of the Exterior Walls of 240 ML and 110 ML at the Ma On Shan Iron Mine site (Serial No. N100). Prof Ho Pui-yin proposed to accord a Grade 2 status. By means of voting, 9 Members agreed to accord a Grade 2 status, 8 Members agreed to maintain the proposed Grade 3 status and 4 Members abstained from voting. Members therefore agreed to confirm a proposed Grade 2 status for the said item.

35. The discussion moved on to the proposed Grade 3 status of the mineral preparation plant (Serial No. N101). Mr Stephen Chan proposed to accord a Grade 2 status. By means of voting, 9 Members agreed to accord a Grade 2 status, 10 Members agreed to maintain the proposed Grade 3 status and 2 Members abstained from voting. The proposed Grade 3 status was therefore confirmed by Members.

36. Members went on to discuss the proposed Grade 3 status of the site structures at mining settlement (Serial No. N245). The proposed Grade 3 status was confirmed as Members raised no alternative comment on the assessment.

37. The proposed Grade 3 status of the Lutheran Yan Kwong Church, Ma On Shan Tsuen Road (Serial No. N102) was then discussed. Prof Rebecca Chiu proposed to accord a Grade 2 status. By means of voting, 3 Members agreed to accord a Grade 2 status, 13 Members agreed to maintain the proposed Grade 3 status and 5 Members abstained from voting. The proposed Grade 3 status was

therefore confirmed by Members.

38. Discussion continued with the proposed Grade 3 status of the St. Joseph's Church, Ma On Shan Tsuen Road (Serial No. N103). Mr Philip Liao proposed to accord a Grade 2 status. By means of voting, 13 Members agreed to accord a Grade 2 status, 6 Members agreed to maintain the proposed Grade 3 status and 2 Members abstained from voting. Members therefore agreed to confirm a proposed Grade 2 status for the said item.

**Item 5 Establishment of Dedicated Fund for the Conservation of Built Heritage**  
**(Board Paper AAB/23/2015-16)**

39. The Chairman invited Ms Angela Siu to report the progress of the setting up of a dedicated fund for the conservation of built heritage (the Fund) in implementing the Board's recommendation under the Policy Review. Ms Angela Siu briefed Members on the background including the announcement in the 2016 Policy Address that \$500 million would be earmarked to establish the Fund. She continued elaborating the framework of the Fund, covering its administrative nature, the scope of the Fund, and the setting up of a new committee to advise on the operation of the Fund. Members were then invited to note and offer views on the framework of the Fund.

40. In response to the enquiries of the Chairman, Mr Tony Lam, Prof Ho Puay-peng, Mr Stephen Chan and Dr Sharon Wong, Mr Albert Lam elaborated that:

- (i) new resources for the Fund were additional funding on top of the remaining funding under the Revitalisation Scheme. With the new resources, the Fund could cater for launching Batch V of the Revitalisation Scheme;
- (ii) further thoughts would be given for setting up a dedicated committee or multiple committees to advise on the operation of the Fund. This arrangement had yet to be decided; and
- (iii) the Fund had its distinct purposes in the preservation of built heritage, whereas the Lord Wilson Heritage Trust, in recent years, focused on preserving intangible heritage.

41. Sr Wong Bay opined that apart from major restoration works in the Revitalisation Scheme, the Fund should also cater for the needs for minor repairs and maintenance works of historic buildings, including servicing, repairs, replacement and improvements. Mr Kenny Lin pointed out that education was necessary for the private owners of historic buildings to acquire knowledge on necessary repairs and maintenance, before an application for grant could be made. Prof Ho Pui-yin raised concern on the sustainability of the Fund and the detailed guidelines for applying grants from the Fund. Mr Albert Lam explained that:

- (i) detailed guidelines for application of subsidies under the Fund were being drawn up. They would likely be available by mid-2016;
- (ii) under the Financial Assistance for Maintenance Scheme for privately-owned graded historic buildings (FAS), the grant ceiling would be raised and the scope would be expanded to cover all graded historic buildings for non-governmental use;
- (iii) a “two-stage application” of FAS had been implemented since last year so that private owners could commission conservation consultants after securing approval-in-principle in the first stage of application, before submitting details of conservation proposal in the second stage of application for approval; and
- (iv) the Fund would cover academic research related to conservation of built heritage.

## **Item 6 Any Other Business**

42. The Chairman informed Members that some letters had been received from the public regarding the preservation of three items within/near the Urban Renewal Authority (URA) project at Graham Street. Ms Susanna Siu reported that AMO had studied these three items, and according to the current findings, the stone channels along Graham Street and Peel Street were outside the project boundary, while the signboard embedded in the façade of No. 21 Peel Street would be salvaged and displayed in the project area in future.

43. Mr Ng Chi-wo then briefed Members on AMO’s research findings in respect of the brick and stone remains at Cochrane Street. AMO considered that the remains were remnants of the buildings on site. As the buildings had

been demolished leaving only the remains, the style and setting could not be shown clearly though the buildings would likely be in a back-to-back construction style. Besides, the construction year could not be ascertained based on the information available but would likely be pre-1903. After assessing the remains against the prevailing grading criteria, AMO considered that the brick and stone structures would not be accorded a grading status. Nevertheless, AMO would provide its findings to URA to facilitate the latter to explore the feasibility of preserving the remains in the future redevelopment of the site. Members agreed to AMO's views. Prof Ho Puay-peng further asked AMO to request URA to consider preserving the remains in-situ as far as possible.

44. The Chairman continued to brief Members that another letter was just received regarding the suggestion of grading the Former State Theatre. Ms Susanna Siu supplemented that the Buildings Department had so far not received any demolition request. AMO was working with the Historic Buildings Assessment Panel on the proposed grading of the building. AMO would submit the grading assessment on the Former State Theatre to the Board for deliberation at the next meeting, if practicable.

45. Separately, Prof Ho Puay-peng and Ms Janet Pau proposed to assess the grading status of old buildings built in the 1950s and 1960s by categorising them into different types. Mr Tony Lam suggested that the Fund could assist in conducting the research on building categorisation.

46. The Chairman hoped that when the detailed arrangement of the Fund was finalised in mid-2016, the Board could give further comments on the operation mode of the Fund for the Government's consideration.

47. There being no other business, the meeting adjourned at 6:20 p.m.

Antiquities and Monuments Office  
Leisure and Cultural Services Department  
April 2016

---

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