

ANTIQUITIES ADVISORY BOARD

Minutes of the 182nd Meeting
on Thursday, 21 June 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 Peter Lau Man-pong
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
Mr Douglas So Cheung-tak
Ms Karen Tang Shuk-tak
Ms Ava Tse Suk-ying, SBS
Sr Wong Bay
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 Christopher Law Kin-chung, JP
Mr Philip Liao Yi-kang

Dr Winnie Tang Shuk-ming, JP
Mr Rex Wong Siu-han

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]

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

Ms Joey Lee
Assistant Secretary (Heritage Conservation)3 (Des.)
[AS(HC)3 (Des.)]

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

Mr William Lo
Engineer (Heritage Conservation) [E(HC)]

Leisure and Cultural Services Department

Mr Chan Shing-wai
Assistant Director (Heritage & Museums) [AD(H&M)]

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

Ms Lily Chen
Chief Information Officer [CIO]

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

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

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.

Item 1 Confirmation of Minutes of the 181st Meeting held on 22 March 2018
(Board Minutes AAB/6/2017-18)

2. The minutes of the 181st Meeting held on 22 March 2018 were confirmed without amendment.

Item 2 Matters Arising and Progress Report
(Board Paper AAB/27/2017-18)

3. ES(AM) briefed Members on the progress of major heritage conservation projects and initiatives during the period from 1 March to 31 May 2018, including the restoration and maintenance of historic buildings and structures, archaeological work, and educational and publicity activities detailed in the Board Paper.

Item 3 Preservation-cum-development Proposal of the Hong Kong Sheng Kung Hui Compound in Central
(Board Paper AAB/28/2017-18)

4. The Chairman welcomed the following to the meeting to introduce the preservation-cum-development proposal for the Hong Kong Sheng Kung Hui Compound in Central —

- (a) The Revd Canon Peter Douglas Koon
 Provincial Secretary General
 Hong Kong Sheng Kung Hui
- (b) Mr Kelvin Ng
 Assistant to Provincial Secretary General
 Hong Kong Sheng Kung Hui
- (c) Mr Tong Chun-wah
 Associate, Philip Liao & Partners Limited
- (d) Mr Yu Ka-sing

Principal, Substance Lab Limited

5. Canon Koon briefed Members on the background of the preservation-cum-development proposal (the “Proposal”) of the Hong Kong Sheng Kung Hui (“HKSKH”) Compound in Central (the “Central site”). Apart from being the residence of the Bishop, the HKSKH Compound had also been used for meeting social needs, such as being the temporary campus of Chung Chi College of The Chinese University of Hong Kong. The Proposal at the Central site was one of the eight projects under the “Conserving Central” initiative launched by the Development Bureau in 2009. The original proposal was to preserve all four graded historic buildings in the Central site, namely Bishop’s House, St. Paul’s Church and Church Guest House (all Grade 1) and the Old Sheng Kung Hui Kei Yan Primary School (Grade 2), and to replace other existing buildings by new ones to provide the needed space for religious and community services to be provided by HKSKH. However, taking into account the growing demands in medical services in recent years, particularly in the Central and Western District, HKSKH had revised its original proposal into developing a non-profit-making private hospital at the Central site. HKSKH had engaged a heritage consultant to advise on the preservation and revitalisation of the four graded historic buildings. Canon Koon expressed HKSKH’s wish that the Proposal could improve the environment and enhance the utilisation of the site, in particular, by opening up the site for public appreciation of the historic buildings.

6. Mr Yu Ka-sing elaborated on the details of the Proposal set out at Annex B of the Board Paper, including the preservation of all four graded historic buildings and the replacement of some of the existing buildings by the new hospital building. The Proposal aimed at providing medical and healthcare services to the community, facilitating public appreciation of the graded historic buildings, creating new public space, enhancing greenery in Central, and improving the connectivity between the Central site and its neighbourhood.

7. Mr Tong Chun-wah showed Members the artistic impressions of the Proposal, including the design of the covered atrium which would be opened to the public and connecting the four graded historic buildings. The proposed design aimed at facilitating public appreciation of the graded historic buildings at a close distance and enhancing the connectivity and greenery of the site.

8. The Chairman thanked HKSKH for seeking the Board’s comments on

the Proposal which involved its privately-owned historic buildings at the Central site, which were not subject to Heritage Impact Assessment requirements. He appreciated that good communication could help enhance the preservation of the historic buildings in the HKSKH Compound and hoped that Members' comments from the heritage conservation perspective would be taken into consideration as appropriate when fine-tuning the Proposal.

9. The Chairman drew Members' attention that two letters from concern groups were received right before the Board meeting. The letters were tabled for Members' information. The Chairman summarised that the letters raised concern on the height and bulkiness of the proposed new hospital building which might cause adverse impact on the ambience of the historic buildings and deviate from international conservation standards.

10. Mr Kenny Lin and Mr Peter Lau declared respectively that their brother-in-law and uncle were Anglican pastors. Dr Annissa Lui also declared that she knew Canon Koon personally but had no relationship with HKSKH.

11. The Chairman thanked Mr Stephen Chan for conveying the views of the Central and Western District Council on the Proposal, including its general support for the development of a non-profit-making private hospital, comments on the design of the new hospital building and concern about possible traffic impact near the Central site. He said that the Board should focus on the heritage conservation aspect of the Proposal.

12. While supporting the development of a non-profit-making private hospital at the Central site, Mr Ronald Liang, Prof Ching May-bo, Dr Annissa Lui, Professor Chiu Yu-lok, Mr Kenny Lin, Dr Sharon Wong, Ms Ava Tse, Sr Wong Bay and Mr Douglas So expressed the following views:

- (a) it was for consideration whether the curtain wall design of the new hospital building was compatible with the historic buildings at the Central site;
- (b) the block above the covered atrium could be overwhelming and might obstruct the appreciation of the historic buildings;
- (c) the feasibility of relocating part of the non-essential medical facilities to other buildings should be explored with an aim to reducing the volume of the new hospital building;

- (d) whether the Proposal had considered to preserve the HKSKH Compound on a point-line-plane approach;
- (e) in addition to all four graded historic buildings, it was for consideration whether it was feasible to preserve more existing non-graded buildings at the Central site, and to provide interpretation of the historic buildings and the religious development in Hong Kong;
- (f) apart from greenery, leisure space should also be provided; and
- (g) it was doubtful whether more visitors arising from the Proposal was appropriate and beneficial to the historic buildings.

13. Mr Lee Ping-kuen declared that he was a resident in the Central District. He supported the proposed demolition of the Sheng Kung Hui Diocesan Welfare Council to improve public access to the site and to provide a hospital. However, he considered it necessary to design the location of the vehicular access to the new hospital carefully in view of the traffic in the surrounding area.

14. Sr Wong Bay suggested to include environmental-friendly facilities in the design, and to further refine the design of the new hospital building in the light of the graded historic buildings. He cited Kowloon Hospital as good reference.

15. Mr Douglas So enquired whether the proposed demolition of the non-graded buildings had been considered by the Antiquities and Monuments Office (“AMO”) and whether those non-graded buildings contributed to the overall heritage value of the HKSKH Compound. He opined that the Central Police Station Compound and Shaw Studio were examples to consider preservation of the site as a whole.

16. Mr Kenny Lin asked whether the new hospital building would cause adverse visual impact to the Church Guest House (Grade 1).

17. Mr Peter Lau proposed to consider using the upper portion of the Central site, where the Vicarage, Alford House and Ridley House stood, for the new hospital so as to reduce its volume and to connect the two sections of the site. An alternative vehicular access at Upper Albert Road to the site could also be considered so as to minimise the likely traffic impact.

18. In response to Members’ enquiries and comments, HKSKH explained

that:

- (a) due to the limited space of the Central site and the need to preserve all four graded historic buildings, the footprint of the usable area for the new hospital was rather limited. HKSKH had tried very hard to strike a balance between heritage conservation and provision of medical facilities and services, and at the same time to keep the operating cost of the new hospital to a minimum (which hinged on the number of beds and operating theatres) so as to offer reasonable and affordable services to the community. Operating cost aside, to further reduce the number of beds and operating theatres was not desirable taking into account the aging population and increased demands for medical services;
- (b) the height of the new hospital building was comparable to that of the buildings in the neighbourhood;
- (c) the block above the covered atrium would accommodate operating theatres which should be spacious for operational needs. It was kept at a reasonable distance from the historic buildings so as to minimise the adverse visual impact on the latter. Although the covered atrium would be footed at the Old Sheng Kung Hui Kei Yan Primary School, it would only be at its periphery. The interior of the school had already undergone substantial alterations in the past;
- (d) for the operational needs of the hospital, it was essential that its multifarious functions should be conveniently linked up with easy access, so as to minimise the moving of patients around on trolleys from building to building. It was against this background that the hospital was accommodated in a single integrated building instead of dispersing the functions in several buildings;
- (e) there were remarkable and successful examples of preservation-cum-development projects overseas, in which new buildings (often with curtain wall design) were built adjacent to or adjoining historic buildings harmoniously to meet new needs and at the same time to preserve heritage, and were considered acceptable judging from international conservation practices;

- (f) as the new hospital would operate on a non-profit-making basis, full utilisation of the site to serve the community was preferred. As the site was within walking distance from the clinics in the vicinity, the new hospital would be welcome by doctors based in Central; and
- (g) the Church Guest House and the covered atrium were at 82.2 metres above the Hong Kong Principal Datum (“mPD”) and 68.2 mPD respectively, meaning that the view of the former would not be obstructed by the latter. Besides, half of the Church Guest House had been demolished for reconstruction in the past, leaving only half of the original guest house, with its main façade facing the Upper Albert Road.

19. C for H supplemented that:

- (a) AMO, the independent Historic Buildings Assessment Panel, and the Board had studied the HKSKH Compound. Four of the buildings therein had been assessed and subsequently accorded grading by the Board owing to their heritage value. The HKSKH case was very much different from that of Shaw Studio where the buildings were all related to the various stages and aspects of film production and contributed to the overall value of the site; whereas the HKSKH buildings were built at different times and with mixed uses;
- (b) one of the buildings right across Glenealy was of 117 mPD in height. In addition, the building height restrictions of the area to the west of the Central site ranged from 120 mPD to 150 mPD. Hence, in terms of height, the new hospital building was not incompatible with the buildings in the neighbourhood. Furthermore, HKSKH had already taken into account the development parameters of the vicinity before designing the new hospital;
- (c) under the prevailing heritage conservation policy, while being mindful of the need to respect private property rights, the Government encouraged private owners to preserve their historic buildings with the offer of economic incentives on a case-by-case basis vide preservation-cum-development approach;

- (d) in 2013, HKSKH revisited its proposal made in 2011 after noting the demands for medical services in the Central and Western District and eventually came up with the Proposal for developing a non-profit-making private hospital at the Central site; and
- (e) according to the Approved Central District Outline Zoning Plan where the Central site stood, approval from the Town Planning Board would not be required for the Proposal. At the request of the Government, HKSKH was carrying out assessment on the impacts on traffic, visual, air ventilation, heritage value of the historic buildings etc. arising from the Proposal.

20. Canon Koon thanked Members for their views and appealed to Members' understanding that HKSKH had undergone very thorough consideration and deliberation on the design of the new hospital, striking a balance between a minimum number of beds to keep the operating cost affordable and a volume to make the new hospital building that went well with the surrounding environment. HKSKH would take into account Members' comments when refining the design.

21. The Chairman thanked HKSKH for introducing the Proposal and listening to the Board's comments although it was not required in practice. He summed up that the Board generally supported the development of a non-profit-making private hospital at the Central site, and some Members made comments on the design of the new hospital building. He hoped that HKSKH would take Members' views into account when fine-tuning the Proposal.

Item 4 Declaration of Three Historic Buildings as Monuments (Board Paper AAB/29/2017-18)

22. The Chairman briefed Members that only the exteriors of the three Grade 1 historic buildings of The University of Hong Kong (the "University"), namely Fung Ping Shan Building, Eliot Hall and May Hall, were proposed to be declared as monuments under the Antiquities and Monuments Ordinance (the "Ordinance") considering that their interiors had undergone substantial alterations.

23. Before the presentation, Mr Stephen Chan and Sr Wong Bay declared that they were staff members of the University. In view that the University had a

very long history and produced many alumni over the years, the Chairman suggested and the Board agreed that Members merely being alumni of the University needed not declare interest.

24. At the Chairman's invitation, C(HB)2 briefed Members on the heritage value of the three buildings. C(HB)2 recapped that a visit to the three buildings was organised for Members on 3 May 2018. The University had given consent for the declaration of the exteriors of the three buildings, following the same arrangements for the four declared monuments in the University, i.e. the Main Building, University Hall, Hung Hing Ying Building and Tang Chi Ngong Building. He furthered that AMO had been working closely with the University in preserving the monuments and graded historic buildings therein, such as providing advice from the heritage conservation perspective for conservation works. Recently, the University was seeking advice from AMO on the proposed improvement works to be undertaken in the interiors of the Main Building, though it was outside the monument boundary. With the aid of photos, C(HB)2 briefed Members on the historical significance as well as the architectural merits of the three buildings.

25. Regarding Fung Ping Shan Building, Sr Wong Bay suggested to alert the University to the need of repairing the glass ceiling for safety reason while Dr Annissa Lui suggested to re-instate its rear windows. C(HB)2 responded that the University was considering to re-expose the rear windows by removing the exhibition panels which were blocking them.

26. At the request of the Chairman, C(HB)2, with the aid of a plan, showed Members the locations of all the declared monuments, graded historic buildings (including the former water pumping stations and filters), as well as the University Lodge (Serial No. N40), a new item being studied by AMO and pending grading assessment by the Board, within the University.

27. After deliberations, the Chairman concluded that the Board recommended the declaration of the exteriors of the three Grade 1 historic buildings of the University mentioned in paragraph 22 above as monuments under the Ordinance.

**Item 5 Assessment of Historic Buildings
(Board Paper AAB/30/2017-18)**

Confirmation of proposed grading for items

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

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

28. C(HB)2 recapped that at the meeting on 22 March 2018, the Board endorsed the proposed Grade 2 status for both No. 92 Blue Pool Road in Wan Chai and the Building of The Garden Company Limited in Sham Shui Po. Following the established practice, a one-month public consultation on the proposed grading was conducted with the following written views received:

- (a) one written submission supporting the proposed Grade 2 status of No. 92 Blue Pool Road was received. It commended the owner for preserving this rare historic building and hoped that this could set a good example to other private owners to preserve their historic buildings with significant heritage value for public appreciation; and
- (b) 384 written submissions on the proposed Grade 2 status of the Building of The Garden Company Limited were received, in which two were in support, two without indicating their views and 380 objections (of which 378 were identical petitions):
 - (i) the supporting views opined that the proposed Grade 2 status of the building was proper as it was only a post-war industrial building for practical uses. It could not be compared with those buildings with outstanding historical and architectural merits, and the building was not rare as it did not feature any architectural merit and looked as ordinary as other post-war buildings in Hong Kong. It was the company's products, such as Life Bread, rather than the building, which were etched on Hong Kong people's memory; and

- (ii) the objections opined that the simplicity, colour and proportional arrangements in the architectural design of the building as well as the iconic clock tower demonstrated the essence of post-war modernism. The functional design with sun-shading devices and the company's logo testified to the industrial development of Hong Kong and the important role The Garden Company Limited played in producing food through the use of machines. The building also appealed to Hong Kong people by the iconic design of the clock tower which was already a landmark of the district.

29. C(HB)2 reported that the independent Historic Buildings Assessment Panel (the "Assessment Panel"), after considering the views received, maintained the proposed grading of these two items. In response to the views that the proposed grading of the Building of The Garden Company Limited was assessed solely on its architectural merit, the Assessment Panel reiterated that all the prevailing six assessment criteria, in which architectural merit was one of them, were taken into consideration when assessing the building.

30. In response to the Chairman, C(HB)2 confirmed that the written submissions received did not contain any new information regarding the heritage value of the Building of The Garden Company Limited.

31. With no further view from Members, the proposed Grade 2 status for No. 92 Blue Pool Road in Wan Chai (Serial No. N259) and the Building of The Garden Company Limited in Sham Shui Po (Serial No. N331) were confirmed by the Board.

Confirmation of proposed grading for items with objections

32. C(HB)2 briefed Members that amongst the 1 444 historic buildings considered by the Board in 2009, some proposed grading was not yet confirmed owing to objections received during the public consultation. AMO had been inviting the Board to confirm the proposed grading of those buildings in batches. Members were invited to confirm the proposed grading of the following four buildings:

- (a) CLP Power Hong Kong Limited Administrative Building (the “Administrative Building”) (alias the China Light and Power Company Limited Head Office), No. 147 Argyle Street, Kowloon (Serial No. 212) ;
- (b) No. 3 Li Kwan Avenue, Tai Hang, Wan Chai, H.K. (Serial No. 696);
- (c) No. 4 Li Kwan Avenue, Tai Hang, Wan Chai, H.K. (Serial No. 697);
and
- (d) No. 44 Conduit Road, Mid-Levels East, H.K. (Serial No. 809).

33. C(HB)2, with the aid of photos, recapped the historical and architectural merits, as well as the latest situation of these four items for Members’ information:

- (a) the owner objected to the proposed Grade 1 status for the Administrative Building as the owner had different views on its heritage value. After lengthy discussion, the owner agreed to the preservation-cum-development proposal by preserving the main portion of the Administrative Building which had high heritage value;
- (b) the owners objected to the proposed Grade 3 status for No. 3 and No. 4 Li Kwan Avenue, Tai Hang, Wan Chai, as the interiors of the buildings had been altered substantially and they did not wish to be bounded by the perceived restrictions imposed after the confirmation of grading;
and
- (c) the owner objected to the proposed Grade 3 status for No. 44 Conduit Road, Mid-Levels East, because he had different views on the historical and social values of the building, and opined that the building was constructed in 1952 instead of 1949.

34. C(HB)2 explained that there was no new information regarding the heritage value of the four items. Regarding the construction year of No. 44 Conduit Road, the Assessment Panel agreed with the research findings of AMO, i.e. the building already existed by 1949 as shown in an aerial photo taken in that year. The land document provided by the owner could only show the change of ownership of the land on which the building stood, but not the history of the building. After considering all the views from the respective owners, the Assessment Panel upheld the proposed grading of the four buildings.

35. Regarding the concerns of Mr Stephen Chan and Mr Kenny Lin on the structural safety of the fence wall having regard to the marks on it and the replacement of some of the original windows by new windows at No. 3 and No. 4 Li Kwan Avenue after 2008, C(HB)2 responded that the marks on the fence wall were merely marks of dirt, and the Assessment Panel was fully aware of the replacement of some of the old timber windows when reviewing the objections to the proposed grading of the buildings. In response to the enquiry of Mr Kenny Lin and Ms Ava Tse on the rarity of the buildings, C(HB)2 said that there were quite a number of historic buildings with architectural features similar to No. 3 and No. 4 Li Kwan Avenue; there were also similar historic buildings on Village Road and Yuk Sau Street which were accorded Grade 3 status.

36. Prof Ching May-bo and Mr Kenny Lin proposed to erect information signs at the historic buildings to introduce their interesting stories. C for H explained that as the historic buildings concerned were privately owned, owner's agreement would be required for arranging historical interpretation for their buildings. Notwithstanding the owners' objection to the grading assessment, the Government would continue to explain to the owners that the grading system was administrative in nature, and the ownership, use, management and development rights of their buildings would be fully respected. Assistance would be given to the owners if they were willing to promote their historic buildings to the public. C for H added that the "One Stop Search for Information on Individual Buildings" at the website of the Board would facilitate the public to obtain the heritage appraisals, photos and locations of graded historic buildings. Mr Kenny Lin suggested to add video clips to make the introduction of historic buildings interesting. The Chairman trusted that the Government would continue to allocate resources to enhance the promotion of heritage conservation through information technology.

37. With no further view from Members, the proposed Grade 1 status for the Administrative Building (Serial No. 212), and the proposed Grade 3 status for No. 3 Li Kwan Avenue, Tai Hang, Wan Chai, H.K. (Serial No. 696), No. 4 Li Kwan Avenue, Tai Hang, Wan Chai, H.K. (Serial No. 697) and No. 44 Conduit Road, Mid-Levels East (Serial No. 809) were confirmed by the Board.

New items for grading assessment

Chung Chi College, Staff Quarters D, The Chinese University of Hong Kong, Sha

Tin, N.T. (Serial No. N335)

Chung Chi College, Former Clinic (now Staff Quarters Block G), The Chinese University of Hong Kong, Sha Tin, N.T. (Serial No. N336)

38. Dr Sharon Wong declared herself as full time staff, and ES(AM) and C(HB)2 declared themselves as part-time teaching staff of The Chinese University of Hong Kong (“CUHK”).

39. C(HB)2 briefed Members that the early campus of Chung Chi College of CUHK was an item (Serial No. N104) under the “list of new items for grading assessment” (the “new list”). In May 2017, AMO was notified of CUHK’s redevelopment plan, including redeveloping Staff Quarters D and the former Clinic (now Staff Quarters Block G) at the early campus of Chung Chi College into a multi-purpose development centre. According to the prevailing mechanism, AMO would accord priority to conduct grading assessment for items with cogent needs. These two items were therefore put to the Assessment Panel for assessment.

40. C(HB)2, with the aid of photos and plans, briefed Members on the historical background of Chung Chi College, and then Staff Quarters D and the former Clinic. He added that since both buildings were situated away from the areas frequently visited by students, and were not open to the students, their social value was rather low. The Assessment Panel, based on the prevailing six assessment criteria, proposed to accord Nil Grade for both buildings.

41. Dr Sharon Wong enquired about the group value of the buildings when taking together with other staff quarters or buildings within the early campus of Chung Chi College. C(HB)2 responded that all staff quarters were located within the “staff quarters zone” of the campus.

42. The Chairman briefed Members that whilst AMO was still conducting research on the early campus of Chung Chi College as a whole, and would submit the assessment of the Assessment Panel to the Board for consideration, there was a need to grade these two buildings first in view of their imminent redevelopment threat.

43. Regarding the request of Dr Annissa Lui for information on the other buildings in Chung Chi College in the early days for reference purpose, the

Chairman appreciated that it would be difficult for AMO to provide such information at the moment as the research of the other buildings was still in progress. ES(AM) supplemented that as these two buildings were only staff quarters and were located away from the areas frequented by students, they were not particularly memorable. It was, therefore, considered appropriate that the grading assessment of the two buildings could be conducted first. As an alumnus of CUHK, Prof Chiu Yu-lok expressed that he did not have much affection towards the two buildings as he rarely visited them. He added that they were similar to those civil servants' quarters built in the 1960s, and were not the most significant buildings on the site. He considered that the proposed Nil Grade status for the two buildings was justified.

44. After deliberation, Members endorsed the proposed Nil Grade status of both Staff Quarters D (Serial No. N335) and the former Clinic (now Staff Quarters Block G) (Serial No. N336) of Chung Chi College.

Item 6 Any Other Business

The Hong Kong Golf Club Fanling Golf Course

45. The Chairman informed Members that a letter dated 3 May 2018 from the Hong Kong Golf Club (the “Club”) to the Board requesting to grade The Hong Kong Golf Club Fanling Golf Course (the “Golf Course”) as a whole; and a follow-up letter dated 19 June 2018 inviting the Board to meet with the Club and visit the Golf Course were received. Whilst the former was sent to Members vide email in May 2018, the latter was tabled for Members’ noting.

46. At the request of the Chairman, ES(AM) briefed Members on the background of the grading of the items within the Golf Course:

- (a) the letter dated 3 May 2018 requested the Board to declare the Old Course built in 1911 as monument and to accord a Grade 1 status to the New Course, Eden Course and the Clubhouse (a Grade 2 historic building). Information on the heritage value of the Golf Course was enclosed. The letter dated 19 June 2018 extended invitation to the Board for a meeting with the Club and a visit to the Golf Course;

- (b) there were three graded historic buildings at the Golf Course, namely the Fanling Lodge (accorded Grade 1 on 16 September 2014), the Clubhouse (accorded Grade 2 on 16 September 2014) and the Half-way House (accorded Grade 3 on 16 September 2014);
- (c) at the meeting on 9 March 2017, the Board decided to put those non “buildings / structures” items (such as parks, salt pans, cemeteries, boundary stones, etc.) under the “list of items not falling under the usual category of ‘buildings / structures’ ” and that research or grading assessment for such items would not be conducted; and
- (d) after thorough review, the information enclosed in the letter dated 3 May 2018 had already been considered in the grading assessment of the Clubhouse and the Half-way House. In other words, there was no new information to substantiate a review of the confirmed grading of the two items.

47. The Chairman pointed out that there was no cogent need for grading assessment for the Golf Course nor was there new information to review the grading of the Clubhouse and the Half-way House. Being included as a land option by the Task Force on Land Supply was not a valid ground for grading assessment. In this connection, the Chairman suggested the Board to accept the invitation to meet with the Club and to visit the Golf Course. Members concurred. The Secretariat would follow up.

Repairs and maintenance works of historic buildings

48. The Chairman recapped the enquiry from Sr Wong Bay concerning the monitoring mechanism, as well as education and publicity on proper maintenance of graded historic buildings given the recent incident that an old village school in Yuen Long partially collapsed after days of torrential rain. In response, C for H explained that:

- (a) the building concerned was privately-owned and accorded Grade 3 status. The owner’s application for funding under the “Financial Assistance for Maintenance Scheme for Historic Buildings” (“FAS”) to repair the building had been approved and the owner’s consultant was carrying out the preparatory work prior to the commencement

of the full scale restoration. Unfortunately, the building partially collapsed after days of torrential rain. After the incident, AMO contacted the owner immediately to inspect the building and to provide technical advice to the owner's consultant to revise suitably the scope of works. AMO would continue to provide the necessary assistance and advice;

- (b) under the Built Heritage Conservation Fund which was set up in 2016, a Funding Scheme for Public Engagement Projects on Built Heritage Conservation was launched. Heritage conservation related professional institutes were invited to apply for the Fund for relevant education and publicity projects. Funding for some education and publicity projects had recently been approved, e.g. the project to be carried out by the Hong Kong Institute of Surveyors to organise public engagement campaigns to enhance public awareness and knowledge of repairs and maintenance of privately-owned historic buildings, to mobilise private owners to conserve their historic buildings, and to promote the financial assistance under FAS. Whilst the Government would offer certain incentives, the responsibility to maintain privately-owned historic buildings still rested with their respective owners; and
- (c) letters to remind private owners the importance of timely and regular repairs and maintenance for their historic buildings and inviting them to apply for funding under FAS would be sent out shortly. More publicity on FAS through newsletters, exhibitions, and publicity activities would be arranged.

49. The Chairman suggested that the updated education and publicity plans or campaigns funded under the Funding Scheme for Public Engagement Projects on Built Heritage Conservation should be provided to Members. [Post-meeting note: the relevant information was sent to Members vide email on 3 August 2018.]

50. There being no other business, the meeting was adjourned at 5:25 p.m.

Antiquities and Monuments Office

September 2018

Ref: AMO/22-3/1