

**ANTIQUITIES ADVISORY BOARD**

**Minutes of the 180<sup>th</sup> Meeting**  
**on Thursday, 7 December 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 Chan Ka-kui, SBS, JP  
Prof Ching May-bo  
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  
Ms Theresa Ng Choi-yuk  
Mr Douglas So Cheung-tak  
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 Stephen Chan Chit-kwai, BBS, JP  
Prof Rebecca Chiu Lai-har, MH, JP  
Mr Philip Liao Yi-kang

Dr Annissa Lui Wai-ling, JP  
Ms Yvonne Shing Mo-han, BBS, JP  
Dr Winnie Tang Shuk-ming, JP

In Attendance: Development Bureau

Miss Joey 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

Ms Leonie Lee  
Assistant Secretary (Heritage Conservation)3

Mr Eddie Wong  
Chief Executive Officer (Heritage Conservation)1

Leisure and Cultural Services Department

Ms Susanna Siu  
Executive Secretary (Antiquities and Monuments)

Mr Vincent Lee  
Senior Architect (Antiquities & Monuments)1

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

Mr Ng Chi-wo  
Curator (Historical Buildings)<sup>2</sup>

Miss Pauline Poon  
Assistant Curator I (Building Survey)

Planning Department

Ms Sally Fong  
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, especially Miss Joey Lam, Deputy Secretary for Development (Works)<sup>1</sup>, and Ms Sally Fong, Assistant Director of Planning/Metro, who attended Board meeting for the first time.

**Item 1      Confirmation of Minutes of the 179<sup>th</sup> Meeting held on 7 September 2017  
(Board Minutes AAB/4/2017-18)**

2.            The minutes of the 179<sup>th</sup> Meeting held on 7 September 2017 were confirmed without amendment.

**Item 2 Matters Arising and Progress Report  
(Board Paper AAB/19/2017-18)**

3. Ms Susanna Siu briefed Members on the progress of major heritage conservation projects and initiatives during the period from 1 August to 15 November 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 the annexes of the Board Paper.

**Item 3 Progress Update of Hung Lau, near Shek Kok Tsui Village, Castle Peak, Tuen Mun, New Territories  
(Board Paper AAB/20/2017-18)**

**(I) Progress Update**

4. The Chairman invited Mr José Yam, Commissioner for Heritage, to update Members on the latest development of Hung Lau, following the Board's recommendation to declare Hung Lau as proposed monument on 9 March 2017.

5. Mr José Yam briefed Members that Hung Lau was declared a proposed monument on 13 March 2017. Following the declaration, the Commissioner for Heritage's Office ("CHO") and the Antiquities and Monuments Office ("AMO") had been actively exploring preservation-cum-development options for Hung Lau with the owner's representatives in the past few months. Consensus was reached with the following major points:

- (a) the owner agreed to preserve Hung Lau;
- (b) as a condition of the Financial Assistance for Maintenance Scheme ("FAS") which the owner had applied for in September 2017, the owner could not demolish Hung Lau and transfer its ownership within ten years from the completion of the maintenance works. The application was being processed; and
- (c) policy support and assistance would be provided to the owner for its proposal for adaptive re-use of Hung Lau under a preservation-cum-development approach, if the proposal was in line

with the prevailing heritage conservation policy.

6. Mr Ng Chi-wo recapped that at the special meeting held on 28 February 2017, Members were briefed on the heritage value and the background of the grading of Hung Lau. The Board had discussed Hung Lau several times since the 1980s and maintained the view that there was no concrete evidence to establish direct relationship between Hung Lau and the 1911 Revolution. The Board accorded Grade 1 status to Hung Lau in 2009 after taking into account the factor of collective memory associated with the building; yet the Board did not recommend declaring Hung Lau as monument after deliberation in 2011. As per the advice of the Board at the special meeting on 28 February 2017, AMO conducted a thorough review on the historical information of Hung Lau, as well as the information submitted by the public and concern groups requesting the declaration of Hung Lau as monument. Most of the information received from the public and concern groups had already been studied and included in previous rounds of research conducted by AMO. The information reviewed could not establish direct relationship between Hung Lau and the 1911 Revolution. AMO had also reviewed other records and consulted relevant organisations, as well as conducted several on-site inspections, and concluded that no evidence could be found to substantiate the construction year of Hung Lau and its direct relation with the 1911 Revolution. AMO's research findings were submitted to the independent Historic Buildings Assessment Panel (the "Assessment Panel") for consideration. The Assessment Panel, after deliberation, took the view that there was no evidence to establish direct relationship between Hung Lau and the 1911 Revolution.

7. Mr Ng Chi-wo went on to elaborate the key findings of the review conducted by AMO and briefed Members on the views of the Assessment Panel on the information reviewed:

- (a) the aerial and old photos of Hung Lau taken since 1949, the earliest government records identified so far, showed the appearance, construction style and materials of Hung Lau, as well as its major changes in the exteriors. These photos, however, could not indicate the construction year of Hung Lau and its relationship with the 1911 Revolution;
- (b) the historical information from various publications by different scholars reviewed mainly described the relationship between the 1911 Revolution

and the former Castle Peak Farm owned by Li Ki-tong (李紀堂). Some of the publications did associate Dr Sun Yat-sen with Hung Lau in the context of the 1911 Revolution. There were, however, considerable doubts from the people, buildings and activities mentioned. For instance, Feng Tzu-yu (馮自由) was mentioned to have met Dr Sun Yat-sen in around 1891-92 in Hung Lau, but this was unlikely as Feng was then only about 10 years old and residing in Japan. Furthermore, it was unlikely that Dr Sun Yat-sen and Chen Cui-fen (陳粹芬) met in a church of China Congregational Church (中華基督教會公理堂, “CCC”) in Tuen Mun as mentioned in some of the publications as CCC did not have any church there at the time;

- (c) a survey plan of 1905 for Lot No. 36 in DD 300 suggested that there were once buildings or structures erected on the site, yet it was unlikely that the present-day Hung Lau was one of the buildings or structures shown on the survey plan as their locations were very different;
- (d) the markings on the two maps of 1904 and 1915 could not be confirmed as the present-day Hung Lau;
- (e) an internal government memorandum issued by a maintenance surveyor who estimated the building then located at the site might be constructed 100 years ago, i.e. in 1868, after visiting the site in 1968. Yet his estimation was never quoted again in all the subsequent internal documents thereafter. The internal memorandum could not, in fact, substantiate the construction year of Hung Lau, not to mention the relationship between Hung Lau and the 1911 Revolution. Furthermore, as Hung Lau was built in reinforced concrete, it was not convincing that it was built in 1868; and
- (f) the view of the first Executive Secretary of AMO on the age of Hung Lau was only partially quoted as “probably built between 1885 and 1890” without mentioning the statement, “but accurate historical records were difficult to obtain” that followed. The statement showed that the first Executive Secretary was skeptical on the view that Hung Lau was built in 1885-1890.

8. After reviewing all the information available, the findings from the review and research on the relationship between Hung Lau and the 1911 Revolution conducted by AMO, the Assessment Panel considered that there was no proven, reliable and concrete new information to substantiate the claim that

Hung Lau had a direct relationship with the 1911 Revolution and that the heritage value of the building had reached the high threshold of declared monument. The Assessment Panel, therefore, was of the view that the Grade 1 status of Hung Lau should be maintained.

## **(II) Members' deliberations**

9. The Chairman pointed out that the purpose of discussion was to respond to public demand and review all historical information available, taking into account the fact that the Board had already discussed and deliberated the subject several times since the 1980s. The Board was clear that the Grade 1 status accorded to Hung Lau was mainly based on its significant social value, rather than the historical value attached to the building.

10. Prof Yau Chi-on, Prof Chiu Yu-lok, Dr Sharon Wong and Prof Ching May-bo concurred with the research findings that there was no concrete evidence to substantiate any direct relationship between Hung Lau and the 1911 Revolution and the Grade 1 status of Hung Lau should be maintained. Their views were recapitulated as follows:

- (a) according Grade 1 status to Hung Lau was mainly to acknowledge its social value;
- (b) the reliability of oral history as concrete evidence to support the relationship between the existing Hung Lau building and the 1911 Revolution was doubtful. For instance, there were certain loopholes in the oral history with Chen Cui-fen, such as the existence of the church in Tuen Mun which was described as the venue where she and Dr Sun Yat-sen first met in 1891; the style and materials of the current Hung Lau building were unlikely to have existed in the New Territories at the time;
- (c) archeological excavation might be able to yield findings that could facilitate the study of the relationship between the current Hung Lau building and the 1911 Revolution; and
- (d) more stringent approach should be adopted to assess the credibility of historical evidence to ensure that no misleading information was disseminated to the public, and to respect private ownership of historic buildings at the same time.

11. Mr Kenny Lin enquired the measures / actions to protect Hung Lau if the owner intended to demolish it within the ten-year undertaking period after restoration under FAS, or after the expiry of the 12-month proposed monument period or during the one-month notice period under the Antiquities and Monuments Ordinance if Hung Lau was recommended by the Board for declaration.

12. Sr Wong Bay enquired the approximate period when reinforced concrete was widely used as construction material. Mr Lee Ping-kuen responded that it was commonly used after World War II.

13. Mr José Yam explained that the declaration of Hung Lau as proposed monument would provide 12-month statutory protection to the building for the Government to liaise with the owner to explore feasible preservation options without affecting the ownership of the building. After arduous discussion with the owner's representatives, consensus had been reached. The owner had applied for funding under FAS to restore Hung Lau and undertaken to preserve it. Should the heritage value of Hung Lau be further substantiated, and subject to the Board's recommendation and the owner's consent, the possibility to declare Hung Lau as monument could not be ruled out. On the other hand, since Hung Lau was sited in "Green Belt", if the owner wished to demolish Hung Lau for redevelopment, approval from the Building Authority and Town Planning Board with support from relevant bureaux and departments would be required. However, if the owner came up with a proposal in line with the prevailing heritage conservation policy to re-use Hung Lau, policy support and assistance could be given to the owner to achieve a win-win situation under a preservation-cum-development approach.

14. Ms Susanna Siu briefed Members that AMO had approached the owner for an archaeological investigation at the site but so far the owner was unwilling to accede to the request.

15. The Chairman thanked government representatives for the updates and was glad to know that CHO and AMO had been liaising with the owner's representatives to explore feasible preservation options and the adaptive re-use of Hung Lau, as well as to explore the feasibility to conduct archaeological investigation at the site in future. He expressed that apart from the Antiquities and Monuments Ordinance, there were other measures that could help preserve



historic buildings. He concluded that the Board concurred that the Grade 1 status of Hung Lau should be maintained.

**Item 4 Heritage Impact Assessment in respect of the Fitting-out Works at the Former Yau Ma Tei Police Station  
(Board Paper AAB/21/2017-18)**

**(I) Presentation by the presentation team**

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

Mr Andrew Sung Wai-fai,  
Senior Property Services Manager/Accommodation Design Group,  
Architectural Services Department (“ArchSD”)

Miss Chan Chi-hang,  
Property Services Manager/Accommodation Design Group 3,  
ArchSD

Ms Chen Hau-nam,  
Building Services Engineer/Accommodation Design Group 2,  
ArchSD

Mr Henry Lo Ka-yu,  
Director,  
Ptah Heritage Ltd

Ms Janice Lam Siu-ping,  
Senior Inspector of Police (3) (Planning & Development),  
Hong Kong Police Force (“HKPF”)

17. Mr Henry Lo briefed Members that the project was to convert part of the ground floor and the entire first floor of the main block of the Former Yau Ma Tei Police Station (“YMT Police Station”) for use as office accommodation by the Operations Section of Cyber Security and Technology Crime Bureau of HKPF. He went on to brief Members on the historical, architectural and social

significance of YMT Police Station, i.e. the second police station erected in Kowloon following the development of Yau Ma Tei district, its neo-classical architectural style with a rare V-shape formed by the two elongated wings of the main block, and the extension and alterations carried out in the police station throughout its history. He then showed the key character defining elements of YMT Police Station via photos and layout plans, and explained the corresponding mitigation measures for the conservation works.

## **(II) Members' enquiries and comments**

18. Sr Wong Bay wondered if YMT Police Station would be converted into a smart and green building under the project, taking into account that the renovated area of the building would be used by the Operations Section of the Cyber Security and Technology Crime Bureau.

19. Mr Douglas So asked whether public access would be allowed to the renovated part of YMT Police Station for appreciation of the historic building, and whether the remaining parts of the police station would be conserved by adopting the same approach when renovation works were conducted in future.

20. Mr Ronald Liang and Ms Theresa Ng enquired whether the window type air conditioners which were causing adverse visual impact to YMT Police Station could be replaced by less obtrusive electrical and mechanical installations.

21. Ms Theresa Ng suggested allowing public access to the compound of YMT Police Station to facilitate public appreciation of the historic building.

## **(III) Feedback from the presentation team**

22. In response to Members' enquiries and comments, Mr Andrew Sung and Ms Janice Lam explained that:

- (a) since YMT Police Station was a historic building, the design of the conversion works would cater for both old and new elements;
- (b) as the renovated area of YMT Police Station would be used by the Operations Section of the Cyber Security and Technology Crime Bureau, public access to the interior of the building would be restricted due to security concern;

- (c) there was no concrete plan for the remaining parts of YMT Police Station, but they would likely be renovated as offices to accommodate other units of HKPF. ArchSD would be consulted when renovation plan was drawn up;
- (d) YMT Police Station was currently heavily surrounded by hoarding to facilitate nearby construction works by the Highways Department. Public access to the compound of the police station could be considered after the completion of works;
- (e) the replacement of the window type air conditioners by split type would need considerable new ducting through the walls. The project team would strike a balance between heritage conservation and visual impact by replacing the window type air conditioners as far as practicable through centralising the split type air conditioners in a discrete location to minimise the disturbance to the historic fabrics whilst improving the visual impact of the building; and
- (f) the current project would only cover the interior of part of the ground floor and the first floor of the main block of YMT Police Station.

#### **(IV) Conclusion**

23. The Chairman summed up that Members' views were mainly related to the electrical and mechanic installations of the site and hoped that the project team could further enhance the design in this respect. He concluded that the Board was generally agreeable to the findings of the Heritage Impact Assessment report and the proposed mitigation measures. Further consultation with the Board would not be required.

#### **Item 5     Assessment of Historic Buildings (Board Paper AAB/22/2017-18)**

##### **Silos and manure pits related to the Old Dairy Farm, Pok Fu Lam (11 items)**

24. Mr Ng Chi-wo recapped that at the meeting on 8 June 2017, the Board decided to assess the heritage value of the items related to the Old Dairy Farm individually instead of grading all items within the site as a whole. At the last

meeting, the Board confirmed the grading of the 21 items relating to the cowsheds, bull pen and paddocks (the “21 items”) and endorsed the proposed grading of the 11 items related to silos and manure pits (the “11 items”).

25. One written submission objecting to the proposed grading of the 11 items as well as the confirmed grading of the 21 items was received during the public consultation period. The submission was made by the same person who sent in his views on the proposed grading of the 21 items discussed at the meeting on 8 June 2017. The views expressed included:

- (a) reiterating the request to accord an overall Grade 1 status to all the items related to the Old Dairy Farm, and maintaining the viewpoint that the estimated construction date of the 21 items should be earlier than that estimated by AMO; and
- (b) among the 11 items, the four silos should have been constructed in 1919 as deduced from the description mentioned in a book published by the Dairy Farm Company Limited in 1919 and a map printed during the Japanese Occupation. Furthermore, Grade 1 status was proposed for the grassland around Chi Fu Fa Yuen where Elephant Grass could still be found, as well as the three manure pits (also around Chi Fu Fa Yuen) which supplied fertilisers to the plantation of Elephant Grass.

26. Mr Ng Chi-wo went on to elaborate the views of the Assessment Panel on the submission, as follows:

The 21 items with confirmed grading

- (a) as reported at the last meeting regarding the estimated construction year of the 21 items, the Assessment Panel maintained its stance that a period (rather than a year) of construction should be adopted in considering the historical value of the items, and hence the adjustment of the years of construction would not affect the grading of the items.

The 11 items with proposed grading

- (a) regarding the history of the four silos, the Assessment Panel considered that the six silos mentioned in the book published by the Dairy Farm Company Limited in 1919 lacked the necessary location plans and

detailed description, indicating that further evidence would be required to prove that the five silos shown in the map printed during Japanese Occupation were among those mentioned in the aforesaid book;

- (b) the Assessment Panel similarly considered that the historical value of the 11 items should better be assessed based on their estimated construction periods. Furthermore, the construction year of an item was only one of the sub-criteria among the six prevailing assessment criteria, and was, therefore, not a significant factor against the overall grading assessment;
- (c) as the conservation of plants was not included in the prevailing six assessment criteria of historic buildings, the Assessment Panel would not conduct grading assessment for the grassland with Elephant Grass; and
- (d) the supply of fertilisers to Elephant Grass was not sufficient to affect the proposed grading of manure pits, which had already been considered by the Assessment Panel.

27. In view of the above, the Assessment Panel maintained the proposed grading of the 11 items.

28. With no further view from Members, the proposed Grade 2 status for items N288, N292, N294, N296 and N297, proposed Grade 3 status for items N290, N291 and N295, and proposed Nil Grade status for items N289, N293 and N330 were confirmed by the Board.

### **Confirmation of proposed grading for items with objections**

29. Mr Ng Chi-wo briefed Members that amongst the 1 444 historic buildings considered by the Board in 2009, there were 91 buildings, the proposed grading of which had yet to be confirmed owing to objection(s) received during the then public consultation. AMO had been inviting the Board to confirm the proposed grading of these items in batches. Members were then invited to confirm the proposed grading of the following three items:

- (a) Precious Blood Convent, No. 86 Un Chau Street, Sham Shui Po (Serial No. 556);

- (b) Precious Blood Hospital (Caritas), No. 113 Castle Peak Road (Serial No. 830); and
- (c) Carmelite Monastery, No. 68 Stanley Village Road, Stanley (Serial No. 584).

30. Mr Ng Chi-wo, with the aid of photos, recapped the historical and architectural merits, as well as the latest situation of the items for Members' information:

- (a) the owner objected to the proposed Grade 2 status for Precious Blood Convent endorsed by the Board on the ground that the building was of low heritage value due to substantial alterations in the interior. Besides, the building which was being used as a retreat venue for the nuns would not be suitable for access by the public;
- (b) the owner objected to the proposed Grade 3 status for Precious Blood Hospital endorsed by the Board as the building was considered to have low heritage value after substantial alterations in the interior; and
- (c) the owner objected to proposed Grade 3 status for Carmelite Monastery endorsed by the Board due to the concern that once graded, the building, a place of seclusion, had to be open to the public.

31. With the photos and plans of similar buildings, Mr Ng Chi-wo made reference to examples with comparable grading status for Members' consideration. He reported that the Assessment Panel maintained the proposed grading of the three historic buildings after considering the views of their respective owners, and supplemented that there was no new information regarding the heritage value of the items, and further views from the owners since 2009.

32. In response to the enquiries from the Chairman, Mr Ng Chi-wo advised that no information or photos regarding the interior of the Precious Blood Convent were available from the owner, as it was a retreat venue for nuns.

33. Prof Ching May-bo and Mr Rex Wong raised concerns on public understanding on the need to open a historic building for public appreciation after being graded. Ms Susanna Siu explained that although owners of private historic buildings were encouraged to allow public access for appreciation after their buildings were graded, it was not a mandatory requirement. Public access to

some buildings might not be suitable due to privacy reasons and/or special purposes, like dormitory and retreat venue. The Chairman recalled that during the review completed in 2014, it was mentioned that if privately-owned historic buildings could not be opened owing to privacy consideration, alternative means to facilitate the public to appreciate the interiors of the historic buildings could be provided as far as practicable. Mr José Yam emphasised that the grading system was administrative in nature and it would not affect the ownership, management, use and development rights of the graded buildings/structures concerned. Following the review completed in 2014, enhanced financial assistance, with higher amount of subsidy and wider scope of works covered, had been offered to the private owners of historic buildings to fund their restoration and maintenance works. Besides, enhanced educational and publicity activities were being carried out for public appreciation of historic buildings.

34. With no further view from Members, the grading of the three buildings, i.e. Grade 2 for Precious Blood Convent (Serial No. 556), and Grade 3 for Precious Blood Hospital (Serial No. 830) and Carmelite Monastery (Serial No. 584) was confirmed.

#### **Review of the confirmed grading of the Sanctuary and Bell Tower of Union Church, No. 22A Kennedy Road, Central**

35. The Chairman recapped that grading of the Sanctuary and Bell Tower of the Union Church on Hong Kong Island (the “Church”) had been confirmed. In response to the recent public views requesting a review on the grading of the two items, the new information received was studied by AMO.

36. At the request of the Chairman, Mr José Yam briefed Members that the planning approval for the redevelopment of the Church was 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 a complete set of photographic and architectural records of the building. Following the establishment of CHO in 2008, CHO had initiated discussion with the owner to preserve the Church since 2011, but to no avail. From 2014 onwards, CHO and AMO had been actively liaising with the owner to preserve the relics and historical building materials and had conducted three-dimensional scanning of the building for comprehensive record. This arrangement was commensurate with the heritage value of the Church, and was on par with that of other Grade 3

historic buildings.

37. Ms Ava Tse declared that she was the Chairman of the Metro Planning Committee under the Town Planning Board when the planning approval for the redevelopment of the Church was granted in 2007.

38. Mr Ng Chi-wo 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 and briefed Members at the meeting on 7 September 2017 that after confirmation of the grading, requests from the public to upgrade the grading of the two items to Grade 1, on the ground that there was new information reflecting the heritage value were received. All information received had been sent to Members before the meeting.

39. Mr Ng Chi-wo elaborated the information received and the views of the Assessment Panel:

- (a) the information received was mainly description on the architectural features of the Church, which had already been considered in the grading assessment of the Church. Some of the information had in fact been included in the appraisal of the Sanctuary and Bell Tower uploaded to the Board's website;
- (b) the present Fellowship Hall was neither the main construction of the Church nor major place for religious activities; and with relatively low heritage value, as such, no grading assessment would be carried out;
- (c) the stone masonry at the entrance of the Church was re-built in around 1969-1971, whilst the other parts of the masonry were either re-constructed as flower beds or located outside the Church. The stone masonry was, therefore, considered to bear no significant heritage value and thus grading assessment would not be carried out;
- (d) the new information on the architect of the Sanctuary and Bell Tower, i.e. Leigh and Orange, was not sufficient to support the proposed upgrading of their grading to Grade 1; and
- (e) the other new information provided was the audio recording by some artists in the Church, such as Yam Kim-fai and Pak Suet-sin mastered their soundtrack for "Princess Cheung Ping" in the Church in 1959.



The Assessment Panel considered such information one of the interludes in the history of the Church and did not merit the upgrade of the grading of the Church.

40. In view of the above, the Assessment Panel upheld the confirmed grading of the Sanctuary and Bell Tower.

41. The Chairman reminded that according to the prevailing practice, unless there was valid new information not yet considered when the item was graded, review of the confirmed grading of the item would not be conducted and review would not be carried out solely based on public views. He summarised that there was no such new information regarding the historical and architecture value of the Church so far.

42. At the enquiry of Mr Rex Wong, Mr José Yam explained that the planning condition stipulated in the approval required the owner to preserve the relics or historical building materials of the Church, such as staircases, railings, windows, as identified.

43. Mr Christopher Law, Sr Wong Bay and Mr Douglas So expressed regret for the Church to be demolished and remarked that:

- (a) the Church was a remarkable building built after World War II with good architectural design and maintenance; and
- (b) it was understandable that the grading status of the Church, i.e. Grade 3, could hardly be upgraded to Grade 1 based on the information available. Nevertheless, the Church bore high social value as many people might have affection towards it due to their personal experiences.

44. Prof Ching May-bo opined that the aesthetic standards as well as the rarity of buildings might change over the years. Dr Sharon Wong added that the surrounding landmarks might enhance the group value of the Church. Mr Ng Chi-wo responded that the group value of the Church had been considered in the earlier assessment as it was one of the six assessment criteria.

45. The Chairman regretted that the Church would likely be demolished due to the re-development plan of the Church. He also acknowledged that the prevailing grading mechanism which was designed for assessing the heritage

value of relatively old buildings with longer history, might have limitations for modern buildings normally with higher collective and social memories. While review of the current mechanism could be carried out in future, it was more desirable to continue to use the current standard and mechanism to review the confirmed grading to maintain consistency.

46. The Chairman reiterated that the review of the confirmed grading of a historic building would only be carried out when there was valid new information not yet considered when the building was graded. As the Assessment Panel recommended maintaining the confirmed grading, with no further view from Members, the Grade 3 status of the Sanctuary and Bell Tower of Union Church, No. 22A Kennedy Road, Central, (Serial Nos. 646 and 669) was maintained.

#### **New items for grading assessment**

*Staff quarters of the Old Dairy Farm (Serial No. N298 – N299)*

*Piggeries of the Old Dairy Farm (Serial No. N300 – N306)*

*Stream crossings of the Old Dairy Farm (Serial No. N307 – N313)*

*Other structures of the Old Dairy Farm (Serial No. N314 – N328)*

47. Through photos and videos, Mr Ng Chi-wo briefed Members on the heritage value of the remaining 31 items of the Old Dairy Farm, including staff quarters, piggeries, stream crossings and other structures, and the views and proposed grading given by the Assessment Panel.

48. In response to the enquiries from the Chairman, Mr Ng Chi-wo explained that:

- (a) there was still water flowing beneath the stream crossings to be graded;
- (b) although there were a number of latrines built before, only item N324 could be identified so far; and
- (c) the water pipe had been included in item N322.

49. With no further view from Members, the proposed Grade 2 status for item N321, proposed Grade 3 status for items N298-N300, N309-N311, N314, N315, N317, N322, N323 and N327, and proposed Nil Grade status for items N301-N308, N312, N313, N316, N318-N320, N324-N326 and N328 were

endorsed. A one-month public consultation would be conducted.

**Item 6 Any Other Business**

50. There being no other business, the meeting was adjourned at 5:30 p.m.

Antiquities and Monuments Office  
Leisure and Cultural Services Department  
March 2018

---

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