

ANTIQUITIES ADVISORY BOARD

Minutes of the 179th Meeting
on Thursday, 7 September 2017 at 2:30 p.m.
in Conference Room, Hong Kong Heritage Discovery Centre,
Kowloon Park, Haiphong Road, Tsim Sha Tsui, Kowloon

Present: Mr Andrew Lam Siu-lo, SBS, JP (Chairman)
Mr Stephen Chan Chit-kwai, BBS, JP
Prof Rebecca Chiu Lai-har, MH, JP
Prof Chiu Yu-lok
Mr Peter Lau Man-pong
Mr Christopher Law Kin-chung, JP
Mr Lee Ping-kuen, JP
Mr Ronald Liang
Mr Kenny Lin Ching-pui
Dr Annissa Lui Wai-ling, JP
Ms Theresa Ng Choi-yuk
Ms Yvonne Shing Mo-han, BBS, 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
Dr Sharon Wong Wai-yee
Prof Yau Chi-on

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

Absent with Apologies: Mr Chan Ka-kui, SBS, JP
Prof Ching May-bo
Mr Philip Liao Yi-kang
Mr Douglas So Cheung-tak

In Attendance: Development Bureau

Mr Albert Lam
Deputy Secretary (Works)1

Mr José Yam
Commissioner for Heritage

Mr Robin Lee
Chief Assistant Secretary (Works)2

Mr Allen Fung
Political Assistant to Secretary for Development

Mr Henry Lok
Assistant Secretary (Heritage Conservation)1

Ms Leonie Lee
Assistant Secretary (Heritage Conservation)3

Mr Eddie Wong
Chief Executive Officer (Heritage Conservation)1

Leisure and Cultural Services Department

Dr Louis Ng
Deputy Director (Culture)

Mr Chan Shing-wai
Assistant Director (Heritage & Museum)

Ms Susanna Siu
Executive Secretary (Antiquities and Monuments)

Ms Lily Chen
Chief Information Officer

Mr Vincent Lee
Senior Architect (Antiquities & Monuments)1

Mr Chin Hoi-fun
Senior Architect (Antiquities & Monuments)2

Mr Ray Ma
Curator (Archaeology)

Mr Ng Chi-wo
Curator (Historical Buildings)2

Miss Pauline Poon
Assistant Curator I (Building Survey)

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 this Board meeting.

Item 1 Confirmation of Minutes of the 178th Meeting held on 8 June 2017 (Board Minutes AAB/3/2017-18)

2. The minutes of the 178th Meeting held on 8 June 2017 were confirmed with the following amendments to paragraphs 14 and 60 proposed by Ms Ava Tse:

“14. Sr Wong Bay supported the archaeological park above the station for displaying the historical relics of the site holistically, yet he considered that the current wall panel design of the station was insufficient to attract visitors from the station to the park. Ms Ava Tse and Mr Kenny Lin echoed. Ms Ava Tse further said that it would be meaningful to view Well J2 from its bottom through transparent panels and the two display cabinets be designed as deep as practicable, perhaps at some sections, to allow the display of larger artefacts. Mr Kenny Lin added that an integration of the designs of the archaeological park and the station concourse was necessary.”

“60. Referring to the concept of ‘Point, Line, Plane’, Ms Ava Tse and Mr Stephen Chan proposed to assess the grading of the items in clusters, so as to reflect the historical significance of the dairy farmland operation as an economic activity and its uniqueness in economic and social context. The Chairman responded that the grading assessments for the buildings and building structures in Shaw Studio and Ma On Shan Iron Mines were of similar nature, as the items were scattered within a site and had a group value to demonstrate the business operation of the site. The difference of the current case was the difficulty to demarcate the site boundary, where the items were widely scattered.”

**Item 2 Matters Arising and Progress Report
(Board Paper AAB/14/2017-18)**

3. Ms Susanna Siu briefed Members on the progress of major heritage conservation issues and educational and publicity activities during the period from 1 May 2017 to 15 August 2017, including the declaration of three historic buildings as monuments, preservation of historic buildings and structures, restoration and maintenance programmes, archaeological projects, educational and publicity activities as detailed in relevant Annexes of the Board Paper. She further reported that subsequent to the presentation by the MTR Corporation Limited (“MTRCL”) on the display and preservation of the relics in-situ unearthed at the site of To Kwa Wan (“TKW”) Station at the last Board meeting, the Antiquities and Monuments Office (“AMO”) had arranged two meetings attended by MTRCL, the Commissioner for Heritage’s Office, the Leisure and Cultural Services Department and the Architectural Services Department to take forward the Board’s recommendations, and to build up a platform to facilitate the exchange of views for a better integration of the designs of TKW Station and the future archaeological park above the station.

**Item 3 Progress Update of the Central Police Station Compound
Revitalisation Project
(Board Paper AAB/15/2017-18)**

(I) Presentation by The Hong Kong Jockey Club (“HKJC”)

4. The Chairman thanked HKJC for updating the Board the latest development of the Central Police Station (“CPS”) Compound revitalisation project and introduced the presentation team with the following members:

Mr Leong Cheung,
Executive Director, Charities and Community,
HKJC

Mr Timothy Calnin,
Director of CPS,
The Jockey Club CPS Limited (“JCCPS”)

Ms Winnie Yeung,
Head of Heritage,
The Jockey Club CPS Limited

Mr Brian Anderson,
Partner,
Purcell

Mr Kenneth Lee,
Senior Project Manager,
HKJC

Mr John Tang,
Executive Manager, Public Affairs (CPS & Projects),
HKJC

5. Mr Leong Cheung briefed Members on the background of the CPS Compound revitalisation project, including the partnership with the Government to revitalise the heritage site for the enjoyment of the public, and the challenges in restoring the historic buildings there to meet modern-day standards. After the partial collapse of the Married Inspectors' Quarters ("Block 4") in May 2016, HKJC presented eight preliminary recovery options of the building to the Board in September 2016, and subsequently conducted comprehensive study on the eight options. It now came up with the analysis and findings of the study, the guiding principles behind the options, as well as the recommendations to be presented to the Board.

6. With the aid of photos and plans, Mr Kenneth Lee briefed Members on the work progress of the project and advised that most of the buildings had been restored or built, and were soon ready for inspection.

7. Mr Brian Anderson followed up to brief Members on the heritage significance of the site as detailed in the Conservation Management Plan conducted in 2008, as well as the structural changes of Block 4 in the past. He recapped briefly the eight preliminary recovery options for Block 4 and the criteria to further assess the options, i.e. the engineering feasibility (as safety was the primary concern); the heritage conservation (i.e. the impact of the option on the heritage value of Block 4); and the contextual value (i.e. the compatibility of the option to meet the aim of the revitalisation project). The options were also

benchmarked against international heritage conservation guidelines. Mr Brian Anderson concluded that three of the recovery options which came closest to meeting the assessment criteria were shortlisted, i.e. Option B (Reconstruction: reinstate the building to its appearance prior to the partial collapse); Option C (Adaptation: differentiate the rebuilt section from the original building in a contemporary manner with associated internal alterations throughout the building, which would tell the history of the partial collapse and its rebuilding); and Option D (Preservation: make safe the building as it is and leave the lost part of the building exposed to tell the history of the partial collapse).

8. Ms Winnie Yeung went on to elaborate the three shortlisted options through their respective preliminary sketches.

9. The Chairman suggested HKJC to briefly supplement the background of Block 4 as some Members were only appointed earlier this year. Mr Leong Cheung explained that the CPS Compound project was a partnership endeavour between the Government and HKJC for revitalising the compound for cultural uses and the idea was mooted in 2007. Works on site commenced in 2011. There were currently 16 historic buildings and 2 newly constructed buildings at the site. Block 4 which had a relatively poor structural condition was originally planned for new uses with lower traffic, such as office uses by non-government organisations. The shortlisted recovery options could still meet the planned uses of Block 4.

10. Mr Leong Cheung concluded that:

- (a) all the three shortlisted options could provide structural strengthening to Block 4 and achieve a balance between safety concern and preservation of the heritage value of the building, as well as achieving sustainability and practicality. HKJC was fully committed to delivering the CPS Compound revitalisation project successfully and was well aware of the time and cost incurred by the options. The time and cost, however, were not the determining factors in selecting the recovery options;
- (b) relevant government authorities had been consulted on the structural strengthening works to be undertaken in Block 4, and the assessment of the recovery options; and

- (c) the Board was invited to comment on the three shortlisted options, and the preferred approach for HKJC to follow up on the technical design, regulatory applications and works.

(II) Members' deliberations

11. The Chairman and Ms Susanna Siu declared that they were members of the Heritage Working Group of JCCPS (the "Working Group"). The Working Group had yet to meet to discuss the recovery options and, therefore, they had not been involved in the shortlisting of the options in that capacity. Sr Wong Bay declared that he was the maintenance surveyor of the CPS Compound from 1975 to 1976, and he was currently the Chairman of the Green Building Council.

12. The Chairman encouraged Members to comment and give views on the shortlisted recovery options. Members' views were summarised in the ensuing paragraphs.

Views on the Three Shortlisted Recovery Options

Option B (Reconstruction)

13. Professor Rebecca Chiu, Mr Lee Ping-kuen, Mr Stephen Chan, Mr Peter Lau and Mr Kenny Lin preferred Option B. Their views were summarised as follows:

- (a) the building, after restoration, would resemble its original outlook and compatible with the remaining part of the building;
- (b) as the building was located at one of the entrances of the compound with relatively high visitor flow and more frequent viewing by the public, recovering of its original appearance was, therefore, preferred;
- (c) as there was already a new building constructed near Block 4, it was not preferred to have another new structure constructed at the site of the collapsed part of Block 4;
- (d) from the structural integrity and safety perspective, however, it was not desirable to use the salvaged materials for the structurally related part in the reconstruction in view of their poor condition after being loaded for a

long period of time. Modern materials would be preferred for enhancing the sustainability of the building; and

- (e) notwithstanding (d), the materials salvaged should be used as far as possible, particularly in those parts which were non-structural. The parts reconstructed using modern materials should be clearly indicated and distinguished from the original ones to avoid confusion and not to falsify the historical evidence of the historic building

Option C (Adaptation)

14. Dr Annissa Lui, Ms Ava Tse, Ms Karen Tang, Dr Sharon Wong, Dr Winnie Tang and Mr Rex Wong preferred Option C, considering that:

- (a) this option allowed more flexibility for the future adaptive reuse of the building and could cater for high traffic flow, thus encouraging more community participation;
- (b) substantial strengthening of the building could be achieved which allowed higher level of sustainability with lower cost on future repair and maintenance;
- (c) as long as the contemporary design was compatible with the remaining parts of the building, it was still acceptable yet distinguishable from the original structure. They were confident that HKJC could come up with a good and compatible design for the purpose;
- (d) the combination of the old and new construction materials could serve as a case study for public education illustrating the interactive process and difficulties in preserving a historic building; and
- (e) a competition for the contemporary design among young architects could be organised for engaging the public in the project.

15. They elaborated further that there were quite a number of precedent cases in which there were divided views for incorporating contemporary design in restoring historic buildings. Such divided views were normal.

16. Mr Kenny Lin and Sr Wong Bay pointed out that whether Option C was acceptable, to a large extent, depending on the final contemporary design

proposed by HKJC, and it was difficult to assess at this stage without detailed information.

Option D (Preservation)

17. Professor Rebecca Chiu, Ms Karen Tang and Mr Kenny Lin opined that Option D was not preferred as the partial collapse was caused by human error, and not by significant historical event that was worthy of commemoration.

Other views

18. Ms Yvonne Shing expressed her concern about the source(s) of funding for the recovery of Block 4. Without particular preference on the options presented by HKJC, she focused on the cost implication and the time required for each option. The chosen option should be based on a balanced decision taking into account various factors including time, cost, sustainability and flexibility.

19. Professor Chiu Yu-lok suggested HKJC to conduct a thorough research on whether traditional materials from similar historic buildings of similar architectural design built in the same era in the United Kingdom could be located for use.

20. Mr Ronald Liang was of the view that apart from building safety as the primary concern of the restoration works, other factors such as cost and type of adaptive reuse were also important to determine the type(s) of materials that should be used for the recovery options as the materials used would have a significant impact on outlook of the building after restoration.

21. Mr Christopher Law and Ms Theresa Ng had no particular preference on the recovery options and would defer to HKJC's final decision in the selection, after taking into account the guiding principles in heritage conservation, the detailed architecture design and proposed adaptive reuse for each of the shortlisted options.

22. Sr Wong Bay expressed that a preference could not be made at the moment, unless detailed design, costs and quality of the works for each of the options were available.

(III) Feedback from the presentation team

Funding for the Recovery Works

23. Mr Leong Cheung advised that HKJC would be fully responsible for the cost of the recovery works of Block 4 as mentioned earlier. He reiterated that the cost would not be the determining factor in the selection of recovery option. Instead, the adaptive reuse of the building itself and the heritage conservation involved were deemed to be factors of more importance for consideration.

Use of Materials for the Restoration of the Collapsed Part of Block 4

24. Mr Kenneth Lee explained that HKJC had conducted a 10-month structural feasibility study for Block 4 after its partial collapse. The study confirmed that the materials salvaged were mainly decorative in nature, and they, together with the traditional materials, could not fulfill the prevailing building safety requirements. The use of modern materials was, therefore, necessary for ensuring the structural safety of Block 4 so as to comply with the prevailing building regulations. The materials salvaged could be incorporated to the façade of Block 4, if required.

25. Mr Brian Anderson echoed Mr Kenneth Lee's views on the impracticability to use the salvaged or traditional materials for the recovery works of Block 4 to meet the prevailing building safety requirements in Hong Kong, although “like for like” approach was normally adopted for the repair of historic buildings in Western practices. He supplemented that Option D would inevitably have certain negative impacts on the architectural value of the building as part of the building had already collapsed. Yet he quoted an example in the United Kingdom where historic buildings were partially preserved with only their residual parts consolidated. Regarding Option C, the new and contemporary design would make a difference to the heritage value of the building, but not necessarily inducing a positive or negative effect. He pointed out that the restoration works should also cater for the long-term sustainability and flexibility in the use(s) of the historic building from the heritage conservation perspective.

26. Regarding the materials to be used in the reconstruction, Ms Winnie Yeung advised that a thorough research had been conducted by going through the documentation on the buildings and their architectural plans available. The

project team also managed to locate certain factories that would be able to produce traditional materials, including those originally produced the building materials of Block 4. Mr Kenneth Lee supplemented that an extensive survey on the existing construction fabric had been conducted to check if the building elements were in a healthy condition for reuse, and modern methods would be considered if these were needed in order to fulfill building safety requirements, but reiterated that maintaining the authenticity of the building was key.

27. Per the request of the Chairman, Mr Brian Anderson reiterated that while “like for like” approach was normally adopted for repairing historic buildings, the use of modern construction methods and materials in combination with traditional materials for strengthening an historic building and maintaining its existing construction fabrics, wherever necessary, was also a well-established practice and had been adopted globally in conserving historic buildings. Prior to the partial collapse of Block 4, such practice had already been widely adopted in the CPS Compound revitalisation project, for example, the strengthening of the timber floorings by modern construction method using steel.

Preference on Recovery Options

28. Mr Brian Anderson explained that the sketches of the shortlisted options were presented only as a visual aid to assist members to understand the differences between the options.

29. From the operational perspective, Mr Timothy Calnin considered that all the three shortlisted options could fulfill the prime purposes of the site, i.e. creating a centre for heritage and arts, achieving financial sustainability and causing little difference in operational expenses. The option which would allow the greatest flexibility in maximising the use of the site for the programmes of contemporary arts and cultural activities, however, would be most preferred.

(IV) Conclusion

30. Based on the views expressed by Members, the Chairman concluded that Options B and C were generally considered acceptable, whereas Option D was least supported. Although no consensus was reached by Members, he hoped that HKJC could consider Members’ views in further developing the preferred recovery option. The Chairman expressed that while both Options B and C were

considered acceptable by Members, he cautioned that from his experience, some in the heritage conservation field would consider Option B of reinstating the building to its appearance prior to the partial collapse as “fake”. He thanked HKJC again for consulting the Board on the matter and welcomed HKJC to provide further updates to the Board in future.

**Item 4 Heritage Impact Assessment in respect of the Lung Tsun Stone Bridge Preservation Corridor at Kai Tak
(Board Paper AAB/16/2017-18)**

(I) Presentation by the presentation team

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

Mr Kevin Li,
Senior Architect / 12,
Architectural Services Department

Ms Helen Wong,
Architect / 102,
Architectural Services Department

Ms Cecilia Suen,
Project Manager / 346,
Architectural Services Department

Mr Tony Lam,
Director,
AGC Design Ltd

32. Mr Kevin Li briefed Members that the project aimed to provide landscape open space within a 30-meter wide preservation corridor for heritage conservation and public appreciation of the Lung Tsun Stone Bridge (“LTSB”) remnants *in-situ*.

33. Mr Tony Lam then showed Members the photos and layout plans of the

LTSB site to brief Members on its location, history and development, as well as the historical, architectural, archaeological, social, contextual, townscape and landscape values of LTSB. He also mentioned the conservation policies and guidelines adopted in the project.

34. Ms Helen Wong then moved on to introduce the current proposed design of the site, with reference to the design of the winning entry in the competition held in 2013 and the views collected in the Value Management Workshop held on 9 March 2016, including the display of the remnants of the whole LTSB with multiple viewpoints and the connection with Kai Tai Development and old urban fabric.

35. Mr Tony Lam emphasised that proper mitigation measures would be taken to minimise the impact that might be caused to the remnants by the construction works. The Heritage Impact Assessment (“HIA”) concluded that the overall potential impacts on the LTSB site were considered acceptable and manageable based on the proposed mitigation measures. The design proposal would minimise any potential impact on LTSB remnants and benefit the community at large. The proposed new use of the LTSB site was also considered technically feasible and acceptable from the heritage conservation perspective.

(II) Members’ deliberations

36. The Chairman and Mr Christopher Law declared that they were members of the assessment panel for the design ideas competition for the LTSB project held in 2013.

37. Mr Rex Wong enquired about the connectivity of the LTSB site to other heritage sites within the district and the impact of the Kai Tak Airport Development to the preservation of LTSB remnants.

38. Professor Rebecca Chiu considered that the contemporary design had an overwhelming effect over the historical interpretation of the site. Ms Karen Tang opined that the design was too modern for a heritage trail. She also suggested the project team to review the adequacy of accessibility facilities for people with disabilities or elderly visiting the site.

39. Dr Sharon Wong suggested the project team to explore the connection of

the history of LTSB with Song Yuan dynasties, apart from Qing dynasty, as well as the display of artifacts excavated at the site, so as to enrich the contents of the historical interpretation. She appreciated the proposal of providing different viewing points for the LTSB remnants at the site.

40. Professor Chiu Yu-lok proposed to enrich the historical interpretation of the project by introducing the phased extension of LTSB in Qing dynasty, including the addition and function of the subsequently built wooden structure, as well as the connection among LTSB, the Pavilion for Greeting Officials, Kowloon Street and Kowloon Walled City.

41. Ms Yvonne Shing proposed to segregate the trails into different sections with detailed historical interpretation for easy understanding by the general public. She was also concerned on the English translation of the name of the design and considered more appropriate to translate the name as “Hidden Dragon in Broken Bridge” or “Broken Bridge · Hidden Dragon”.

42. Mr Christopher Law explained that the winner’s design idea was selected as it could display the LTSB remnants in a lower level, implying that it was an excavated feature. This design was preferred to other designs as it would not upset the historic ambience by overwhelming decorative designs.

43. As the project site was situated at a relatively lower level, Mr Lee Ping-kuen reminded the project team to devise appropriate measures to prevent flooding.

(III) Feedback from the presentation team

44. In response to Members’ enquiries, Mr Tony Lam explained that:

- (a) the site could be accessed from three directions and additional openings from Comprehensive Development Area (“CDA”) sites subject to approval of the lease conditions of the CDA sites in the vicinity;
- (b) as regards the impact to the Kai Tak Airport Development, some of its remnants had intervened to those of LTSB. Having regard to the amount of remnants of the Kai Tak Airport Development left on the site, those parts intervening LTSB would be removed for displaying the LTSB remnants;

- (c) the contemporary design of the project was intended to be simple, concise and distinguishable from the LTSB remnants; and
- (d) so far no artifacts or relics of Song Yuan dynasties were excavated from the site; relics excavated and related to LTSB would be displayed at the site for historical interpretation.

(IV) Conclusion

45. The Chairman concluded that Members' views were mainly related to the detailed design as well as the historic interpretation of the site. He hoped that the public could experience the historical ambience created at the site. He also concluded that the Board was generally supportive to the findings of the HIA and the proposed mitigation measures. Further consultation with the Board would not be required.

Item 5 Assessment of Historic Buildings (Board Paper AAB/17/2017-18)

Public views requesting for review of the confirmed grading of the Sanctuary and Bell Tower of Union Church, No. 22A Kennedy Road, Central

46. Before turning to the discussion of the grading assessment of the items set out in Annexes A and B of the subject Board Paper, the Chairman briefed Members that public views requesting for a review on the confirmed grading of the Sanctuary and Bell Tower of the Union Church on Hong Kong Island ("the Church") had been received.

47. At the request of the Chairman, Ms Susanna Siu recapped that the Board had confirmed the Grade 3 status for both the Sanctuary and Bell Tower of the Church at the meeting in March 2017. After confirmation of the grading, the Secretariat received requests from the public to upgrade the grading of the Sanctuary and Bell Tower of the Church to Grade 1 on the ground that there was new information reflecting the heritage value of the two items. The Antiquities and Monuments Office ("AMO") had since been conducting preliminary study on the new information received. According to the prevailing grading mechanism, any new information with proven evidence would be passed to the independent

Historic Buildings Assessment Panel (the “Assessment Panel”) for consideration, and then submitted to the Board for discussion, if necessary. Ms Susanna Siu supplemented that all the new information received from the public had been sent to Members before the meeting.

48. The Chairman briefed Members that the aforementioned public views had been received following the recent development of the proposed redevelopment of the Church. A reply had been issued to the enquirers conveying that the new information submitted was being studied. Since any new information with proven evidence would first be passed to the independent Assessment Panel for consideration, it was procedurally not appropriate to discuss the matter in today’s meeting.

49. In response to the enquiry from Ms Karen Tang about the schedule of the redevelopment of the Church and if there was any impact to its redevelopment should Grade 1 status be accorded to it, Mr José Yam explained that the planning approval for the redevelopment of the Church had been granted by the Town Planning Board in 2007, with a planning condition requiring the owner to preserve relics or historical building materials of the Church and to keep photographic and architectural records of the Church. AMO had been liaising with the owner to preserve the relics and materials with high heritage value and had conducted a three-dimensional scanning of the Church for keeping comprehensive records. According to the prevailing practice, should there be any valid new information not yet considered in the previous grading assessment, a review of the confirmed grading of a historic building could be considered. AMO was now conducting preliminary research study on the new information received to verify its validity before passing it to the independent Assessment Panel for consideration.

No. 120 Wellington Street, Central

50. Mr Ng Chi-wo reported that with the endorsement of the Board on the proposed grading at the last meeting, two written submissions supporting the proposed Grade 1 status of the building were received during the public consultation period. With no further view from Members, the Grade 1 status of No. 120 Wellington Street, Central (Serial No. N260) was confirmed.

Cowsheds, bull pen and paddocks related to the Old Dairy Farm, Pok Fu Lam (21 items)

51. Mr Ng Chi-wo recapped that at the last meeting, before proceeding to grading assessment of the items of the Old Dairy Farm, the Board decided to assess the proposed grading of each item individually under the notion that items related to the Old Dairy Farm were widely scattered and it was difficult to demarcate the site boundary. The approach to accord a Grade 3 status for relatively intact items and Nil Grade for dilapidated items was also agreed. 21 items relating to cowsheds, bull pen and paddocks were firstly discussed and their proposed grading was then endorsed by the Board at the meeting.

52. Mr Ng Chi-wo reported that eight written submissions were received during the public consultation period, with one support, six objections and one without indicating preference. The main arguments included:

- (a) the grading assessment did not take into account the heritage value of other associated items, such as silos and manure pits, and solely focused on the current condition of the items, without taking into account their architectural merits and layouts;
- (b) the historical significance of some other historical figures, apart from Dr Patrick Manson, was not considered in the assessment;
- (c) the estimated construction date of the items should be earlier according to the information shown in the rates books, aerial photos and the sequence number of the items; and
- (d) the grading of all the items should be assessed as a whole instead of individually, taking into account some architectural merits of the items (such as Hakka stonework techniques and dry wall) and the social significance of the introduction of fresh milk production industry to Japan after the Japanese Occupation in Hong Kong.

53. Mr Ng Chi-wo responded by pointing out that:

- (a) only items under the categories of cowsheds, bull pen and paddocks of the Old Dairy Farm were discussed at the last meeting, and that the discussion on the remaining items under other categories would continue in this meeting;

- (b) the grading assessment by the Assessment Panel had already taken into account the more representative historical figures related to the farm operation, as well as the architectural and social significance of the items;
- (c) the construction year of the items (i.e. 1941 or earlier) was derived by taking a “conservative” approach, evidenced by a map printed during the period of Japanese Occupation (1941 – 1945) or any other plans. The construction year could be earlier than 1941, however, both records from the rates books and aerial photos could not provide concrete evidence to deduce an exact construction date earlier than 1941;
- (d) the heritage value of these items was assessed by the Assessment Panel in accordance with the six prevailing assessment criteria, not solely their level of integrity or construction year. In fact, the Assessment Panel had also acknowledged the limitation of rates books and aerial photos in dating the surviving farm structures. The Assessment Panel, therefore, agreed to the current practice that a period (rather than the year) of construction, based on the map printed during the period of Japanese Occupation or any other plans, as mentioned above, with the location of individual items indicated, was adopted in dating the structures;
- (e) the Assessment Panel also considered it not appropriate to assess the grading of the items as a whole, given their scattered locations in an undefined boundary, and diversity of their integrity and architectural styles. Regarding the Hakka stonework techniques, the Assessment Panel opined that it was difficult to determine that the farm structures were built according to Chinese Hakka stonework techniques, adding that the techniques itself did not attain a sophisticated level of workmanship and thus would not add value to the architectural merit of the structures. Besides, most of the cows had been transported to other parts of Mainland China during the period of Japanese Occupation. By the end of the Japanese Occupation, only about 300 cows remained in the farm, and many of them were in poor health condition as a result of malnutrition. Therefore, proven evidence on the impact of the experience the Japanese learned during the operation of the Dairy Farm to the growth of dairy farming in Japan after World War II was required; and
- (f) after going through the public views received during the public

consultation period, the Assessment Panel maintained its recommendations to the proposed grading of the 21 items comprising cowshed, bull pen and paddocks of the Old Dairy Farm.

54. With no further view from Members, the proposed Grade 3 status for items N267, N270, N273, N275, N276, N278, N279, N280, N281, N282, N283 and N284, and proposed Nil Grade for items N268, N269, N271, N272, N274, N277, N285, N286 and N287 were confirmed.

Confirmation of grading for cases where objection(s) have been received

55. Mr Ng Chi-wo reported that under the list of 1 444 historic buildings, the proposed grading of 91 buildings had been endorsed by the Board in 2009 but yet to be confirmed due to objection(s) received during the then public consultation. AMO would continue to invite the Board to confirm the proposed grading which had been objected before. The items listed at Annex A of the Board paper were five of those cases and Members were invited to confirm their proposed grading in this meeting.

Li Cottage, Tung Lo Wan, Sha Tin (Serial No. 83)

No. 53 Yen Chow Street, Sham Shui Po (Serial No. 162)

Kam Tsin Lodge, No. 8 Kam Tsin South Road, Sheung Shui (Serial No. 573)

Siu Lo, No. 643 Tai Kei Leng Tsuen, Shap Pat Heung, Yuen Long (Serial No. 972)

No. 67 Fung Yuen, Tai Po (Serial No. 1001)

56. Mr Ng Chi-wo recapped the heritage value of the five historic buildings and reported their latest situation for Members' information. With the aid of photos and plans of similar buildings, he also quoted examples with comparable grading status for Members' reference:

- (a) proposed Grade 1 status to Li Cottage was endorsed by the Board in 2009. Objection from the owner was received during public consultation as he had a redevelopment plan for the building. Neither new information regarding the historical background of Li Cottage nor further views from the owner were received since 2009;
- (b) proposed Grade 1 status to No. 53 Yen Chow Street was endorsed by the Board in 2009. Objection to the proposed grading from the owner was

received during public consultation, with concerns over the ownership of the building and privacy after grading, as well as clarification of alterations to the interiors. The Assessment Panel maintained the proposed grading after considering the owner's views;

- (c) proposed Grade 2 status to Kam Tsin Lodge was endorsed by the Board in 2009. Objection to the proposed grading from the owner was received during public consultation, without particular comment on its heritage value;
- (d) proposed Grade 3 status to Siu Lo was endorsed by the Board in 2009. Objection to the proposed grading from the owner was received during public consultation. The owner mainly provided additional information on the historical significance of the building. AMO later updated the heritage appraisal of the building accordingly, yet the Assessment Panel maintained the proposed grading after considering the information provided by the owner; and
- (e) proposed Grade 3 status to No. 67 Fung Yuen was endorsed by the Board in 2009. Objection to the proposed grading from the owner was received during public consultation concerning *fungshui* issues and the difficulties in carrying out repairs and maintenance if the building were graded.

57. In response to the enquiry from Mr Stephen Chan, Mr Ng Chi-wo advised that the owner of Siu Lo objected to the grading assessment of the historic building, and not just on the proposed grading status. Besides, No. 67 Fung Yuen was an isolated historic building surrounded by new buildings and it was observed that someone was residing there.

58. With no further view from Members, the Grade 1 status of Li Cottage (Serial No. 83) and No. 53 Yen Chow Street (Serial No. 162), the Grade 2 status of Kam Tsin Lodge (Serial No. 573), and Grade 3 status of Siu Lo (Serial No. 972) and No. 67 Fung Yuen (Serial No. 1001) were confirmed.

New items for grading assessment

59. The Chairman proposed to discuss the grading assessment of 4 items under the category of silos and 7 items under the category of manure pits of the Old Dairy Farm in this meeting with the remaining items to be discussed at the

next meeting. Members agreed with the proposed arrangement.

Silos of the Old Dairy Farm (Serial No. N288 – N291)

Manure pits of the Old Dairy Farm (Serial No. N292 – N297 and N330)

60. Mr Ng Chi-wo moved on to the grading assessment of silos and manure pits. Through photos and videos of the 11 items concerned, he introduced their heritage value as well as the proposed grading given by the Assessment Panel. Apart from natural depreciation, he pointed out that the unsatisfactory condition of many of the items of the Old Dairy Farm might be due to the fact that they were purposely destroyed or torn down to make way for land surrender, when the site was to be returned to the Government.

61. In response to some public concerns about the significance of the cultural landscape surrounding the Old Dairy Farm items in the grading assessment, Mr Ng Chi-wo emphasised that during the grading assessment, the Assessment Panel had taken into account the significance of the cultural landscape under the prevailing grading assessment criteria.

62. The Chairman drew Members' attention that the items of the Old Dairy Farm were mainly located on government land. Even if the land concerned would not be allocated for other uses, the condition of the items would likely continue to be affected by the surrounding natural environment. While this meeting would mainly focus on the grading assessment of these items, the ways of their preservation would need to be deliberated separately.

63. In response to the enquiries from Mr Stephen Chan, Mr Ng Chi-wo explained that construction year of the items was only one of the factors that would be considered among the six prevailing grading assessment criteria.

64. After deliberation, Members endorsed the proposed Grade 2 status for items N288, N292, N294, N296 and N297, proposed Grade 3 status for N290, N291 and N295, and proposed Nil Grade for items N289, N293 and N330.

65. The discussion on the remaining items of the Old Dairy Farm would continue in the next meeting.

Item 6 Any Other Business

66. As Mr Albert Lam, Deputy Secretary (Works)¹ of the Development Bureau, would proceed on pre-retirement leave soon, the Chairman, on behalf of the Board, thanked him for his support to the Board all along.

67. There being no other business, the meeting was adjourned at 6:12 p.m.

Antiquities and Monuments Office
Leisure and Cultural Services Department
December 2017

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