

ANTIQUITIES ADVISORY BOARD

Minutes of the 181st Meeting
on Thursday, 22 March 2018 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
Mr Chan Ka-kui, SBS, JP
Prof Ching May-bo
Prof Chiu Yu-lok
Mr Lee Ping-kuen, JP
Mr Ronald Liang
Mr Philip Liao Yi-kang
Mr Kenny Lin Ching-pui
Dr Annissa Lui Wai-ling, JP
Ms Theresa Ng Choi-yuk
Mr Douglas So Cheung-tak
Ms Karen Tang Shuk-tak
Ms Ava Tse Suk-ying, SBS
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: Prof Rebecca Chiu Lai-har, MH, JP
Mr Peter Lau Man-pong
Mr Christopher Law Kin-chung, JP

Ms Yvonne Shing Mo-han, BBS, JP
Dr Winnie Tang Shuk-ming, JP
Sr Wong Bay

In Attendance: Development Bureau

Miss Joey Lam
Deputy Secretary (Works)1 [DS(W)1]

Mr José Yam
Commissioner for Heritage [C for H]

Mr Robin Lee
Chief Assistant Secretary (Works)2 [CAS(W)2]

Mr Allen Fung
Political Assistant to Secretary for Development
[PA to SDEV]

Ms Leonie Lee
Assistant Secretary (Heritage Conservation)3 [AS(HC)3]

Mr Eddie Wong
Chief Executive Officer (Heritage Conservation)1
[CEO(HC)1]

Leisure and Cultural Services Department

Mr Chan Shing-wai
Deputy Director (Culture) (Atg.) /
Assistant Director (Heritage & Museums)
[DD(C) Atg./AD(H&M)]

Ms Susanna Siu
Executive Secretary (Antiquities and Monuments)
[ES(AM)]

Mr Vincent Lee
Senior Architect (Antiquities & Monuments)1
[SA(AM)1]

Mr Chin Hoi-fun
Senior Architect (Antiquities & Monuments)2
[SA(AM)2]

Miss Fiona Tsang
Curator (Historical Buildings)1 [C(HB)1]

Mr Ng Chi-wo
Curator (Historical Buildings)2 [C(HB)2]

Miss Pauline Poon
Assistant Curator I (Building Survey) [ACI(BS)]

Planning Department

Ms Sally Fong
Assistant Director/Metro [AD(M)/PlanD]

Architectural Services Department

Mr Hui Chiu-kin
Assistant Director (Property Services) [AD(PS)/ArchSD]

Ms Chan Mei-kuen
Senior Maintenance Surveyor/Heritage
[SMS(H)/ArchSD]

Opening Remarks

The Chairman welcomed Members and representatives of government bureau and departments to the meeting.

2. The Chairman informed Members that one written submission on the grading assessment of the Building of The Garden Company Limited (“Garden”) and one petition regarding the ceramic kiln at Hin Fat Lane (the “Ceramic Kiln”) had been received. He said that the proposed grading of the Garden would be discussed under a separate agenda item, while the case of the Ceramic Kiln could be deliberated under “Any Other Business”.

**Item 1 Confirmation of Minutes of the 180th Meeting held on 7 December 2017
(Board Minutes AAB/5/2017-18)**

3. The minutes of the 180th Meeting held on 7 December 2017 were confirmed without amendment.

**Item 2 Matters Arising and Progress Report
(Board Paper AAB/24/2017-18)**

4. ES(AM) briefed Members on the progress of major heritage conservation projects and initiatives during the period from 1 November 2017 to 28 February 2018, including the restoration and maintenance of historic buildings and structures, archaeological works, and educational and publicity activities detailed in the annexes of the Board Paper.

**Item 3 Assessment of Historic Buildings
(Board Paper AAB/25/2017-18)**

The 31 items related to the Old Dairy Farm in Pok Fu Lam

Staff quarters (Serial Nos. N298 – N299)

Piggeries (Serial Nos. N300 – N306)

Stream crossings (Serial Nos. N307 – N313)

Other structures (Serial Nos. N314 – N328)

5. C(HB)2 recapped that at the meeting on 7 December 2017, the Board endorsed the proposed grading of the 31 items comprising staff quarters, piggeries, stream crossings and other structures. Following the established practice, a one-month public consultation on the proposed grading was subsequently carried out. Three written submissions were received during public consultation, with one support and two objections. The views expressed were summarised as follows:

One support

- (a) the grading assessment for the 31 items was agreed in the light of their current physical condition. It would be desirable if certain items which were relatively intact could be preserved and restored;
- (b) the grading assessment had given the public a valuable chance to appreciate the long-hidden items related to the Old Dairy Farm; and
- (c) did not agree with some of the public views to compare the items of the Old Dairy Farm with Angkor Wat and to inscribe the former on the list of World Heritage Sites as the latter had much higher heritage value than the former.

Two objections

- (a) the first objection opined that all the existing items of the Old Dairy Farm should be accorded Grade 1 status as a whole in view of their group value; and
- (b) the second objection was submitted by the same person who gave his views on the proposed grading of the Old Dairy Farm items discussed at the Board meetings on 8 June and 7 December 2017. His comments on the assessment of seven out of the 31 items included:
 - (i) the items within the boundary of the Old Dairy Farm demarcated on the basis of a map printed during the Japanese Occupation should be accorded Grade 1 status as a whole. The submission also included views from some economists and scholars ;
 - (ii) the piggeries (Serial No. N300) should be accorded Grade 1 status, given its intact structural condition;

- (iii) the piggeries (Serial No. N301) should be accorded Grade 1 status, given the intact condition of its remaining perimeter wall which dated back to the 1900s according to the wall pattern;
- (iv) the stream crossings (Serial Nos. N307 and N308) should be accorded Grades 1 and 3 respectively;
- (v) the boundary stone (engraved with R.B.L. 331) embedded into the pavement of the stream crossing (Serial No. N309) was believed to be related to the Old Dairy Farm, and thus should be accorded Grade 1 status;
- (vi) the masonry parapet wall (Serial No. N312) should be accorded Grade 1 status and be regarded as stream crossing instead;
- (vii) the dairy (Serial No. N320) should be accorded Grade 1 status, given that it was the only dairy among the existing items of the Old Dairy Farm; and
- (viii) two additional items, namely “Bridge 4” and “Bridge 5” (as identified and named by objector) should be included in the grading assessment.

6. C(HB)2 reported that the views received had been passed to the independent Historic Buildings Assessment Panel (the “Assessment Panel”) for consideration. The views of the Assessment Panel were summarised as follows:

First objection

- (a) the proposal to upgrade the proposed grading of all items to Grade 1 as a whole was not backed up by new and proven historical information or evidence.

Second objection

- (a) it would not be prudent to base only on one map printed during the Japanese Occupation to demarcate the boundary of the Old Dairy Farm given the substantial changes in the topography of the area over the years. Furthermore, no new and proven information had been

provided to substantiate a review of the heritage value of the items being graded;

- (b) the views expressed by the economists and Taiwan scholars mainly focused on ecology conservation which was beyond the purview of the grading mechanism of historic buildings;
- (c) no new and proven information on the heritage value of the piggeries (Serial No. N300) was provided. The current condition of the item had been considered when it was assessed by the Assessment Panel;
- (d) no historical research or information with proven evidence was provided to support the estimated dating of the perimeter wall through the wall pattern;
- (e) no new and proven information on the heritage value of the two stream crossings (Serial Nos. N307 and N308) and the dairy (Serial No. N320) had been provided;
- (f) given the Board's decision at its meeting on 9 March 2017, certain items, such as boundary stones, did not fall under the usual category of "buildings/structures" for grading assessment. The Assessment Panel, therefore, would not conduct grading assessment for the stone "R.B.L. 331";
- (g) after comparing the photos of N312 and N318 drawn from the archives of Antiquities and Monuments Office ("AMO"), the Assessment Panel was of the view that the image provided in the submission in respect of the masonry parapet wall (Serial No. N312) should be the masonry parapet wall of Serial No. N318. The small opening under the road surface of N318 was constructed for diversion of underground water and thus the structure was not a stream crossing as claimed; and
- (h) according to the old plans and photos available, "Bridge 4" and "Bridge 5" were not linked up to any farm structures. The Assessment Panel, therefore, considered that there was no solid evidence to substantiate the linkage between the two bridges and the Old Dairy Farm. The Assessment Panel further suggested that their grading assessment might be conducted in future when new information was available to illustrate their linkage with the Old Dairy Farm.

7. In view of the above, the Assessment Panel maintained the proposed grading of the 31 items.

8. C(HB)2 further said that after the one-month public consultation ended, a submission was received from The Dairy Farm Company Ltd. objecting to the proposed Grade 3 status for Staff Quarters Blocks A and B (Serial Nos. N298 and N299) and suggesting Nil Grade status to both of them. As no new information was provided, the Assessment Panel maintained the proposed grading of the two items. Members noted the views of The Dairy Farm Company Ltd. Moreover, late submission would not be considered when confirming the proposed grading of the items according to the prevailing mechanism.

9. 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 confirmed by the Board.

Confirmation of proposed grading for items with objections

10. C(HB)2 briefed Members that amongst the 1 444 historic buildings considered by the Board in 2009, there were buildings with their proposed grading yet to be confirmed owing to objections received during the then public consultation. AMO had been inviting the Board to confirm the proposed grading of those items in batches. Members were now invited to confirm the proposed grading of the following six items:

- (a) No. 5 Broom Road, Happy Valley, Wan Chai (Serial No. 602);
- (b) No. 7 Broom Road, Happy Valley, Wan Chai (Serial No. 603);
- (c) No. 4 Green Lane, Happy Valley, Wan Chai (Serial No. 1007);
- (d) No. 6 Green Lane, Happy Valley, Wan Chai (Serial No. 1008);
- (e) No. 8 Green Lane, Happy Valley, Wan Chai (Serial No. 1009); and
- (f) No. 10 Green Lane, Happy Valley, Wan Chai (Serial No. 1010).

11. C(HB)2, with the aid of photos, recapped the historical and architectural merits, as well as the latest situation of the six items for Members' information:

- (a) the owner objected to the proposed Grade 3 status for Nos. 5 and 7 Broom Road, Wan Chai, as their heritage value was considered low and there might be future re-development; and
- (b) the owners objected to the proposed Grade 3 status for Nos. 4, 6, 8 and 10 Green Lane, Wan Chai, because their heritage value was considered low and the owners had no intention to apply for financial assistance from the Government to maintain them.

12. With photos and information of similar buildings, C(HB)2 made reference to examples with comparable grading status for Members' reference. He supplemented that there was no new information regarding the heritage value of these items or further views from the owners since 2009, and reported that the Assessment Panel maintained the proposed grading of the six items after considering the views of their respective owners.

13. With no further view from Members, the proposed Grade 3 status of the six items detailed at paragraph 10 was confirmed.

New items for grading assessment

No. 92 Blue Pool Road, Happy Valley, Wan Chai (Serial No. N259)

14. Through photos and location plans, C(HB)2 briefed Members on the background of the building located at No. 92 Blue Pool Road, Wan Chai. He elaborated the historical background and architectural merits of the building such as its mosaic floor tiles, terraces, the decorative design of the cast iron letter "W" at the main entrance, dining and living rooms, kitchen, bathrooms, handrails and balustrades, and emphasised the authenticity of the building, with most of its original features and finishing well-preserved and maintained. He further quoted examples of other graded buildings and a declared monument in the vicinity that could cluster with No. 92 Blue Pool Road to provide group value. The

Assessment Panel, based on the prevailing six assessment criteria, proposed Grade 2 status for the building.

15. The Chairman, Prof Ching May-bo and Mr Philip Liao appreciated the authenticity of the building. In response to the enquiries of Mr Chan Ka-kui and Mr Philip Liao on the owners' intention to re-develop the site, ES(AM) and C(HB)2 said that the current owners were very forthcoming in preserving the building as a dedication to their late father and had been very helpful in facilitating AMO's research. At present, they had no redevelopment plan for the site. They would likely welcome guided tours to be arranged for the public to appreciate the building. AMO would continue to liaise with them to explore the feasibility of planned guided tours.

16. In response to the enquiry of the Chairman and Mr Douglas So on the assistance to the owners to conduct research for the building and the cluster of post-war buildings in Happy Valley under a point-line-plane approach, C for H said that AMO would continue to provide assistance to owners to study their respective buildings as appropriate. The grading assessment of the buildings could be conducted first, followed by further liaison with the owners to open their buildings for public appreciation. Having said that, privacy of the owners would be fully respected.

17. After deliberation, Members endorsed the proposed Grade 2 status of No. 92 Blue Pool Road, Wan Chai (Serial No. N259).

Building of The Garden Company Limited, No. 58 Castle Peak Road, Sham Shui Po (Serial No. N331)

18. C(HB)2 reported that views from a concern group on the heritage value of Garden (both the company and the building) were received. The same information and views as previously raised by the public had been considered and reviewed by AMO during the study and subsequently by the Assessment Panel. C(HB)2 went on to clarify some of the views received.

19. Through photos and plans, C(HB)2 briefed Members on the history of the current building of The Garden Company Limited, and elaborated that

according to old block plans and other historical information available, the bakery's operations were expanded to a factory building at the present site in 1938, with an additional factory building constructed in 1951. Later in 1960, according to an occupation permit issued by the Building Authority, the redevelopment of the two factory premises into the current building was completed, with the pre-war premises demolished to make way for the construction of the new building with a clock tower and two extra floors added to the 1951 wing. As such, the current building was constructed between 1951 and 1960, rather than in 1935 as suggested by the concern group. C(HB)2 pointed out that some other information as mentioned in the public views was also not accurate, for instance, the riots which badly damaged the premises at No. 58 Castle Peak Road, Sham Shui Po, broke out in 1956 instead of 1952.

20. C(HB)2 continued to brief Members on the historical merits of the current building and the remarkable history of Garden, such as the production of army cracker in the then pre-war building (demolished) for soldiers fighting against Japanese invasion, the first bakery in Hong Kong with mechanised production of biscuits in 1952 and automated production of bread and confectionery by 1954. He then highlighted the architectural merits of the current building, such as the sun-shading devices, clock tower, the "Garden" and the "bakery chef" logos on the external walls. The Assessment Panel and AMO had visited the current building, including its interior. But, the owner requested that the photos of the interior of the building should not be shown. To date, only experimental baking was conducted on 3/F and 4/F of the current building. C(HB)2 went on to brief Members on the social value of the current building in the Sham Shui Po district and its group value with other historic buildings in the proximity. Having regard to the prevailing six assessment criteria, the Assessment Panel recommended Grade 2 status for the current building.

21. Dr Annissa Lui preferred better use of the site through redevelopment, rather than leaving the current building idle.

22. Regarding the suggestion of the concern group to accord Grade 1 status to the current building so as to preserve it, the Chairman reiterated that the grading assessment would not affect the ownership, usage, management and development rights of privately-owned historic buildings, irrespective of their grading. At the request of the Chairman, C for H briefed Members that the owner of Garden

submitted an application for permission under Section 16 of the Town Planning Ordinance in July 2017 to redevelop the current building. The Town Planning Board (“TPB”) was informed by the Commissioner for Heritage’s Office (“CHO”) that a grading exercise was being carried out for the current building. The TPB would take into account the result of the grading assessment of the current building when considering the application. CHO would continue to liaise with the owner to explore feasible preservation-cum-development options for the current building.

23. Mr Kenny Lin and Mr Lee Ping-kuen suggested preserving the clock tower which was the most impressive feature of the current building and to make it a distinctive landmark in the district.

24. Prof Chiu Yu-lok agreed to accord Grade 2 status to the current building in view of its connection to the social life of local residents although its architectural merit was relatively low. Ms Ava Tse opined that the current building had high social value as it was once the main factory for a well-known bakery brand of Hong Kong.

25. Mr Philip Liao opined that current building would have a relatively low heritage value if it was simply assessed from its architecture and compared it with other historic buildings with more impressive architectural features. The current building possessed certain social value stemming from the collective memories of Hong Kong people treating Garden as a well-known brand of bakery products.

26. At the request of the Chairman, C(HB)2 clarified that the item being assessed was the current building rather than the brand “Garden” or its bakery products. He relayed that the Assessment Panel considered that the founder of Garden was a low-profile figure who was not well known to the public. The Assessment Panel, however, contended that the current building was an important landmark in the Sham Shui Po district and had certain social value. The Assessment Panel had also taken into account the architect Chu Pin who designed the extension of the current building which was a factory with a retail shop and a restaurant, functional in design and featuring typical modernist architectural elements with the clock tower as an iconic feature.

27. In response to Prof Ching May-bo's request, C(HB)2 quoted a few examples of industrial historic buildings in Hong Kong for Members' reference.

28. With no further view from Members, the proposed Grade 2 status for the current building of Garden at No. 58 Castle Peak Road, Sham Shui Po (Serial No. N331) was endorsed.

29. After endorsement of the proposed grading of the current building, the Chairman and Mr Douglas So enquired the next step and the other statutory/procedural requirements of the owner to fulfil in the redevelopment plan of the current building. C for H explained that a one-month public consultation for the proposed grading would be carried out; the Board would then consider the public views received during the consultation and, subject to deliberations, confirm the proposed grading at the next meeting. TPB would be informed of the result of the grading assessment and would take into account the grading status of the current building when considering the planning application.

30. Regarding the further enquiry by Mr Douglas So on the owners' general concern over the redevelopment of historic buildings after grading, C for H emphasised that the grading system was administrative in nature. It aimed to provide an objective basis for determining the heritage value, and hence the preservation need, of historic buildings in Hong Kong. He assured that the rights of ownership, usage, management and development would be fully respected for privately-owned historic buildings. Under the internal monitoring mechanism, applications or enquiries about the redevelopment/alteration of historic buildings received by relevant government departments, such as Buildings Department, Lands Department and Planning Department, would be referred to CHO and AMO, which would then actively liaise with the owners concerned to explore feasible preservation-cum-development options. Various kinds of economic incentives would be provided to the owners on a case-by-case basis.

31. Mr Ronald Liang pointed out that the collective memories should be associated with the clock tower, as well as the "Garden" and "bakery chef" logos on the external walls. He also enquired whether a planning condition could be imposed to provide an area in the new development for display and interpretation purposes. C for H responded that Members' views would be conveyed to the

owner and TPB for further consideration of the Section 16 application.

32. Mr Kenny Lin proposed a more scientific approach to conduct standardised assessment on the proposed grading of historic buildings. The Chairman agreed but pointed out that considerable resources would be required and hoped that the Government would allocate additional resources for the said purposes in future.

33. After deliberation, the Chairman summarised Members' views regarding the redevelopment of the current building of Garden, which were mainly on the display and interpretation of a local long-established brand and bakery products in the new development to maintain the collective memories and characteristics of the current building, to specify the key character defining elements, e.g. the clock tower, the "Garden" and "bakery chef" logos etc. to reflect the heritage value and grading status. He believed that Members' views would be suitably conveyed to TPB and the owner for consideration. Ms Theresa Ng said that the owner would likely be willing to accept the Board's views as they would enhance the image of the brand without hindering the redevelopment proposal.

Item 4 Any Other Business

Ceramic kiln, Hin Fat Lane, Castle Peak Road

34. The Chairman informed Members that a petition letter was received from a concern group, requesting the Board to review the Grade 3 status of the Ceramic Kiln. This request was made in response to the recent amendments to the approved Tuen Mun Outline Zoning Plan No. S/TM/33 with an area near the Ceramic Kiln proposed for rezoning for public housing development. The Chairman had explained to the concern group, when receiving the petition, that under the prevailing mechanism, a review of the grading status would be conducted if there was new information with proven evidence which had not been considered at the time of grading.

35. At the request of the Chairman, C for H elaborated that the proposed

Grade 3 status of the Ceramic Kiln was confirmed by the Board at its meeting held in September 2014. The project proponents, Housing Department and Civil Engineering and Development Department, advised that the Ceramic Kiln was outside the proposed public housing site. According to the prevailing Development Bureau Technical Circular (Works) No. 6/2009 “Heritage Impact Assessment Mechanism for Capital Works Projects”, project proponents and works departments of new capital works projects would be required to assess whether their projects would affect sites or buildings of historic or archaeological significance (collectively known as “heritage sites”). If affirmative, Heritage Impact Assessment (“HIA”) should be undertaken. Mitigation measures should be devised and the Board should be consulted. As there would be certain distance between the Ceramic Kiln and the proposed public housing site, the Chairman suggested that the Board could comment on the project when considering the HIA.

36. Dr Sharon Wong said that she was not a member of the concern group on the Ceramic Kiln, which submitted the petition. She was conducting a research on the Ceramic Kiln funded by the Lord Wilson Heritage Trust and had come into acquaintance with some members of the concern group. As the Ceramic Kiln was the only surviving dragon kiln in Hong Kong as well as the Guangdong-Hong Kong-Macao Bay Area and had high archaeological value, the concern group was eager to know the exact boundary of the public housing site and was worried that the works in future would affect the structural stability of the Ceramic Kiln. She also wondered if the Ceramic Kiln could be revitalised into a “working museum” as suggested in the 1980s. C for H responded that:

- (a) under the prevailing HIA mechanism, the project proponents and relevant works departments of all new capital works projects would be required to conduct HIA if there were heritage sites within 50 metres of their project boundaries. Mitigation measures should be devised and the Board should be consulted on the HIA report. As such, the Ceramic Kiln would be duly protected under this mechanism;
- (b) the use of government land was under the jurisdiction of the Lands Department. Notwithstanding, CHO was open-minded as regards whether the Ceramic Kiln which was on government land should be included in the Revitalising Historic Buildings Through Partnership Scheme, pending the consideration of relevant factors; and

- (c) the public housing site under the proposed amendment did not cover the Ceramic Kiln. The area where the Ceramic Kiln was situated was zoned “Government, Institution or Community” and there was no proposed amendment to the Ceramic Kiln under the current rezoning exercise.

37. In response to the concern raised by Dr Sharon Wong, Mr Lee Ping-kuen, in his capacity as a structural engineer, pointed out that with advanced engineering technology, piling works of a new building would not cause adverse impact to the buildings in its vicinity, in particular, if there was a distance between the two. The Chairman quoted some examples of piling works carried out near historic buildings/structures and declared monuments without causing adverse impact, such as the construction works of the To Kwa Wan Station of the Shatin to Central Link where an ancient well was situated, and the building of a youth hostel next to the Man Mo Temple Compound, a declared monument.

38. Concerning the proposal of turning the Ceramic Kiln into a “working museum” as raised by Dr Sharon Wong, ES(AM) briefed Members that the proposal was discussed in 1983, but was not pursued further by the then Regional Services Department. AD(H&M) reiterated that the proposal was rejected by the then Regional Services Department in 1986.

39. In response to the enquiry of Mr Stephen Chan over the concerns on the distance between the public housing site and the Ceramic Kiln, and the possible reduction of the size of the Ceramic Kiln arising from the public housing development nearby, C for H pointed out that the project proponents were still working on the preliminary project design. According to the current rezoning exercise, the distance between the project boundary and the Ceramic Kiln would likely be less than 50 metres. As such, the project proponents were fully aware of the need for a HIA and that no adverse impact should be caused to the Ceramic Kiln by the public housing development.

40. Regarding the concerns of Prof Ching May-bo and Ms Ava Tse on whether there was buffer zone restrictions among buildings and whether restrictions could be imposed on the project proponents, C for H responded that due to limited land resources in Hong Kong, TPB would consider each planning

application based on individual circumstances, such as whether there were heritage sites or places with ecological value, as well as the comments and views from relevant departments.

41. AD(M)/PlanD briefed Members that the recent amendments to the approved Tuen Mun Outline Zoning Plan No. S/TM/33 were to facilitate public housing development, among others. The draft plan No. S/TM/34 incorporating the amendments had been exhibited for public inspection. TPB would consider the representations submitted by the public, taking into account comments from concerned government bureaux/ departments. The Housing Department, being the project proponent, would be responsible for drawing up/ modifying the project design with the incorporation of mitigation measures, if necessary, having regard to the findings of the HIA. As per the enquiry of the Chairman, she added that TPB would focus more on the appropriate land use of the affected area while the layout of the public housing project, including its exact distance from the Ceramic Kiln, would be subject to detailed design by the project proponent. C for H mentioned that such detailed project information was not yet available as the project was still at its preliminary design stage.

42. Mr Chan Ka-kui suggested exploring the feasibility to incorporate the Ceramic Kiln into the public housing development under the management of the Housing Department. Mr Rex Wong suggested imposing setback requirements in the design of the public housing for better protection of the Ceramic Kiln.

43. To conclude, the Chairman considered that it would be more appropriate to discuss the matter when the HIA report of the public housing development project was submitted to the Board.

Kennedy Town Plague Cemetery

44. The Chairman informed Members that a letter was recently received requesting the Board to protect the grave stones which might originate from the then Kennedy Town Plague Cemetery. At the request of the Chairman, ES(AM) explained that the prevailing grading assessment mechanism focused on the assessment of buildings or structures and that the Board decided at the meeting in March 2017 that certain items such as cemeteries and stone tablets did not fall

under the usual category of “buildings/structures” for grading assessment. As such, AMO would not proceed with the grading assessment of the grave stones. Notwithstanding, AMO would provide advice to relevant government departments from the heritage conservation perspective, where necessary. Members noted.

45. In response to Mr Stephen Chan’s enquiry, ES(AM) explained that the City of Victoria Boundary Stone had been put in a separate list under the HIA mechanism though grading assessment for them would not be undertaken at the moment.

46. There being no other business, the meeting was adjourned at 4:55 p.m.

Antiquities and Monuments Office
Leisure and Cultural Services Department
June 2018

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