

**ANTIQUITIES ADVISORY BOARD**

**Minutes of the 183<sup>rd</sup> Meeting**  
**on Thursday, 6 September 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 Rebecca Chiu Lai-har, MH, JP  
Prof Chiu Yu-lok  
Mr Peter Lau Man-pong  
Mr Christopher Law Kin-chung, JP  
Mr Lee Ping-kuen, JP  
Mr 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  
Sr Wong Bay  
Mr Rex Wong Siu-han

Mr Asa Lee (Secretary)  
Senior Executive Officer (Antiquities and Monuments)  
Antiquities and Monuments Office

Absent with Apologies: Prof Ching May-bo  
Mr Ronald Liang  
Ms Yvonne Shing Mo-han, BBS, JP  
Dr Winnie Tang Shuk-ming, JP  
Dr Sharon Wong Wai-yee  
Prof Yau Chi-on

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 Shum Jin  
Assistant Secretary (Heritage Conservation)2 [AS(HC)2]

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

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

Mr Joe Lam  
Engineer (Heritage Conservation) Special Duties  
[E(HC)SD]

Miss Connie Wong  
Secretariat Press Officer (Development) [SPO]

Leisure and Cultural Services Department

Dr Louis Ng  
Deputy Director (Culture) [DD(C)]

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

Antiquities and Monuments Office

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]

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 government representatives to the meeting.

### **Item 1 Confirmation of Minutes of the 182<sup>nd</sup> Meeting held on 21 June 2018 (Board Minutes AAB/7/2017-18)**

2. The minutes of the 182<sup>nd</sup> Meeting held on 21 June 2018 were confirmed without amendment.

### **Item 2 Matters Arising and Progress Report (Board Paper AAB/31/2017-18)**

3. ES(AM) briefed Members on the progress of major heritage conservation projects and initiatives from 1 June to 15 August 2018, including declaration of monuments, restoration and maintenance of historic buildings and structures, archaeological work, and educational and publicity activities detailed in the Board Paper.

### **Item 3 Progress Update of the Central Police Station Compound Revitalisation Project (Board Paper AAB/32/2017-18)**

4. Before the presentation, the Chairman invited Members to take a look at the physical model of the proposed recovery plan for Block 4 of the Central Police Station (“CPS”) Compound, and reminded Members to discuss the recovery plan at open meeting after the presentation by the Jockey Club CPS Limited.

5. The Chairman welcomed the following to the meeting to brief Members on the progress of the CPS Compound revitalisation project:

- (a) Mr Leong Cheung  
Executive Director, Charities and Community

The Hong Kong Jockey Club

- (b) Mr Timothy Calnin  
Director of CPS  
The Jockey Club CPS Limited
- (c) Mr Kenneth Lee  
Senior Project Manager  
The Hong Kong Jockey Club
- (d) Mr Ascan Mergenthaler  
Senior Partner  
Herzog & de Meuron
- (e) Ms Winnie Yeung  
Head of Heritage  
The Jockey Club CPS Limited
- (f) Mr John Tang  
Executive Manager, Public Affairs (CPS & Projects)  
The Hong Kong Jockey Club

6. Mr Leong Cheung briefed Members on the progress of the CPS Compound revitalisation project and the recovery options of the partially collapsed Married Inspectors' Quarters ("Block 4"). After collecting views from various stakeholders, including the Board, a broad range of possible recovery options against the considerations were examined. Two options, namely Options (B) Reconstruction and (C) Adaptation, were shortlisted and considered the most suitable for Block 4. Mr Cheung further explained to Members the key features of the two options and subsequently introduced a hybrid of both options as detailed in the Board Paper.

7. With the aid of photos and layout plans, Mr Ascan Mergenthaler elaborated on the hybrid of Options (B) and (C), including the proposed outlook and new uses of Block 4 after recovery. He further explained the architectural integration of structural strengthening in the extant part of Block 4, the proposed restoration works of the east verandah with operable glazing, as well as the replacement staircases. He then showed Members the artistic impressions of the

north, south and west elevations of Block 4 after recovery.

8. In response to the Chairman, Mr Ascan Mergenthaler explained that taking into account the defective condition of the original stairs and that only fragments remained, in view that Block 4 would be revitalised for wide public access and use, replacement staircases would be built and the granites of the original stairs would be salvaged to be reused in both the replacement staircases and the non-structural parts of Block 4, should this be found technically feasible. *[Post-meeting note: After the meeting, Mr Ascan Mergenthaler clarified in writing to the Chairman that “the original granite stairs between the ground and first floors of the west wing of Block 4 had not been removed; only the timber stairs between the first and second floors were removed as they were found to be unsafe.”]*

9. Regarding the design of the glazed balcony on the west elevation, Mr Kenny Lin, Prof Rebecca Chiu, Sr Wong Bay, Mr Rex Wong and Prof Chiu Yu-lok expressed the following views:

- (a) the contemporary design of the glazed balcony might not be compatible with the other historic buildings at the site;
- (b) whether it was feasible to glaze the two balconies on the south elevation so that they were in line with the design of the big balcony on the west elevation; or to adopt glazing design at the lower levels of the building;
- (c) whether the glazed balcony would affect the natural ventilation of Block 4; and
- (d) historical interpretation should be added to the recovered building to illustrate the heritage significance and the recovery process after the partial collapse for educational purpose.

10. Mr Christopher Law, Mr Rex Wong, Mr Philip Liao and Dr Annissa Lui appreciated the design of the new part of Block 4 as it was a balanced outcome after considering different perspectives. The provision of a glazed balcony of contemporary design was also welcomed as it added merits to the vista of the Parade Ground. It would fulfill both the contextual requirements of the

Compound, and the future needs of using the building at the same time. Further considerations could be made on adding more contemporary and interesting elements to the design of the new building, making it even more attractive.

11. In response to Members' enquiries and comments, the presentation team explained that:

- (a) the design of the glazed balcony aimed at imitating the original balcony demolished years ago. This explained why the architectural design and black colour tone of the original balcony were proposed. The colour of the base of the balcony, however, could be further considered. The glazed balcony could increase the transparency of the building and allow the appreciation of the interior historic fabrics from the Parade Ground, as well as creating more possibilities for future activities and providing a spectacular view of the Parade Ground;
- (b) a range of possible proposals had been examined and considered regarding the design of the balconies on the west and south elevations. The current proposed design of the glazed balcony on the west and the two balconies on the south was considered the best option after reviewing the visual image compatibility, restoration of the original architectural design, structural stability, as well as the natural ventilation within the building; and
- (c) the heritage gallery on the first floor of the new part would be the permanent space for displaying the history of Block 4, a Married Inspectors' Quarters originally, as well as demonstrating the blending of the old and new in the context of heritage conservation.

12. The Chairman thanked The Hong Kong Jockey Club for taking into consideration the Board's comments when drawing up the recovery options and the hybrid option. He was glad to note that the proposed design of the new part had incorporated the original architectural features of Block 4 and that the salvaged materials from the building would be re-used as far as practicable, which showed respect for the heritage of the building. He summarised that Members welcomed the overall design approach yet a few had different views on the detailed design of the glazed balcony in which The Hong Kong Jockey Club

would take note of.

**Item 4     Heritage Impact Assessment in respect of the Proposed Upgrading/Improvement Works for Feature No. 11SW-B/R93 (Sub-Division No. 1) near Duddell Street Steps and Gas Lamps (Board Paper AAB/33/2017-18)**

13.        The Chairman welcomed the following to the meeting to introduce the revised design of the proposed upgrading/improvement works for the slope at Duddell Street, Central (the “proposed U/I works”):

- (a) Mr Fokker Ng Kam-ho  
Senior Engineer  
Ove Arup & Partners Hong Kong Ltd.
- (b) Mr Stephen Lee Hoo-tin  
Senior Engineer  
Highways Department
- (c) Ms Alice Luk Ping-wai  
Engineer  
Highways Department

14.        Mr Stephen Lee recapitulated that the Highways Department (“HyD”) had sought comments from the Board on the design of the proposed U/I works in June 2013. The design had now been revised in response to the concerns raised by the Board in 2013.

15.        With the aid of photos and plans, Mr Fokker Ng recapped the background of the proposed U/I works, including the necessity and previous design of the works, as well as the comments from the Board on the design at the Board meeting held on 27 June 2013. He then explained in detail how the design was revised in response to each of the Board’s comments and concluded that the concerns and views of Members as well as those of relevant government departments had been suitably addressed, visual impact on the declared monument would be avoided and minimal interference with the declared monument nearby would be induced. The proposed U/I works, which were necessary, would be



kept to an absolute minimum.

16. Mr Philip Liao appreciated that the disused tunnels could be preserved and Mr Fokker Ng confirmed that the backfilling of disused tunnels would be reversible.

17. After deliberations, the Chairman concluded that the revised design of the proposed U/I works had addressed Members' concerns and the Board was generally supportive of the Heritage Impact Assessment report and the proposed mitigation measures. Further consultation with the Board was unnecessary.

18. Regarding the concerns of Mr Peter Lau and Mr Stephen Chan on the preservation and grading of air-raid shelters and disused tunnels built during the Second World War, ES(AM) recapped that 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 for the purpose of grading assessment for such items would not be conducted. The Chairman noted that many underground items had high heritage significance. However, due to limited resources and the difficulty of research, the prevailing grading system would focus on “buildings/structures”, while grading assessment for items other than “buildings/structures” would be explored in the future.

## **Item 5      Assessment of Historic Buildings (Board Paper AAB/34/2017-18)**

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

*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)*

19. C(HB)2 recapped that at the meeting on 21 June 2018, the Board 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. Following the established practice, a one-month public consultation on the proposed grading was conducted and no written submission on

the proposed grading of these two items had been received.

20. Mr Philip Liao declared that The Chinese University of Hong Kong was a client of his company.

21. With no further view from Members, 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 was confirmed by the Board.

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

22. 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 public consultation. The Board had been invited to confirm the proposed grading of those buildings in batches. Members were now invited to confirm the proposed grading of the following three buildings:

- (a) Former Chatham English School, No. 1 Chatham Path, The Peak, H.K. (Serial No. 535) (proposed Grade 2);
- (b) No. 3 May Road, The Peak, H.K. (Serial No. 782) (proposed Grade 3); and
- (c) No. 190 Nathan Road, Tsim Sha Tsui (Serial No. 653) (proposed Grade 3).

23. With the aid of photos, C(HB)2 recapped the historical and architectural merits, as well as the latest situation of the three items. Owners of the three items objected the proposed grading as they were concerned that the grading might affect their ownership and had different views on the heritage value of their buildings. For the Former Chatham English School, the tenant did not accede to the request for site visit. The independent Historic Buildings Assessment Panel (the “Assessment Panel”) had reviewed the information provided by the owners of the three buildings and advised that in the absence of new information, the proposed grading of the three buildings should be upheld.

24. In response to the enquiries of the Chairman and Prof Rebecca Chiu regarding the proposed grading for the Former Chatham English School, C(HB)2 explained that the building was built originally as private residence and used as

school for a short period of time before reverting to residential use. Owing to the site constraints, it was difficult to take a wide shot of the whole premises. Aerial photo of the building was, therefore, used for Members' reference.

25. On the proposed grading of No. 3 May Road, Mr Stephen Chan enquired whether the historic post box nearby could be graded. The Chairman recalled that it had been decided that the prevailing grading assessment would focus on historic buildings, instead of movable items like post boxes. The Chairman asked whether buildings combining garage and residential functions were common in Hong Kong. C(HB)2 said that the Stone House at No. 15 Kotewall Road, Mid-levels as suggested by Mr Peter Lau was a Grade 3 building in similar style. Mr Philip Liao added that there were quite a number of similar buildings in Hong Kong.

26. Mr Douglas So enquired about the ownership of the building and the meaning of the name of the building. C(HB)2 advised that the building was privately owned with its garages rented to different tenants. The name of the building was engraved at the entrance but the Antiquities and Monuments Office ("AMO") had no information on its rationale. In response to Mr Kenny Lin and Mr Philip Liao, C(HB)2 elaborated that photos of the buildings' interiors were not available owing to privacy; and the garages were built for the residents nearby rather than a particular estate or premises.

27. At the request of the Chairman, ES(AM) explained that amongst the 1 444 historic buildings considered by the Board in 2009, the Board was invited to process progressively those cases with objections against the proposed grading received during the public consultation. Before confirming the proposed grading, the owners would be clearly informed that grading assessment was administrative in nature and after grading, the owners could apply for financial assistance under the Financial Assistance for Maintenance Scheme on Built Heritage ("FAS") and seek technical advice from AMO for the repairs and maintenance works of their graded historic buildings.

28. Regarding the concern from Ms Ava Tse on the relatively short notice given to the owner of No. 190 Nathan Road for submitting his representation to the Board, C for H supplemented that since 2009, more complicated cases or cases with objection received were processed progressively, following the confirmation of grading for simpler cases or cases without objection

first. Under the prevailing practice, after the confirmation of meeting agenda or whenever re-development plan of the subject site was noted by government departments, the owners with objection would be approached to discuss possible preservation-cum-development proposals. Such arrangement would continue with appropriate timeframe in future.

29. With no further view from Members, the proposed Grade 2 status for the Former Chatham English School (Serial No. 535), and the proposed Grade 3 status for No. 3 May Road, The Peak (Serial No. 782) and No. 190 Nathan Road, Tsim Sha Tsui (Serial No. 653) were confirmed by the Board.

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

*Steps of Pound Lane, Sai Ying Pun, H.K. (Serial No. N27)*

*Pound Lane Public Toilet and Bathhouse, Sai Ying Pun, H.K. (Serial No. N28)*

30. C(HB)2 briefed Members that suggestions on new items for grading assessment were received from the public from time to time. Upon completion of the research on such items, their proposed grading would be presented to the Board for consideration.

31. With the aid of photos and plans, C(HB)2 briefed Members on the location and the heritage value of the Steps of Pound Lane as well as the Pound Lane Public Toilet and Bathhouse, both of which were new items. In response to the enquiries of the Chairman, Mr Stephen Chan and Mr Kenny Lin, C(HB)2 elaborated that:

- (a) the Steps of Pound Lane fell within Sai Ying Pun according to the current maps of Lands Department;
- (b) there were a few historic buildings and structures in its vicinity, such as Kwong Fook I Tsz and No. 4 Hospital Road; and
- (c) only some granites of the Steps of Pound Lane were still kept intact whilst some landings had been resurfaced with concrete.

32. Mr Kenny Lin, Prof Rebecca Chiu, Mr Peter Lau, Prof Chiu Yu-lok, Mr Lee Ping-kuen and Ms Theresa Ng had doubts on the proposed Grade 2 status in

view that:

- (a) some granite steps had already been replaced and some landings resurfaced with concrete; but the grading assessment included those steps reconstructed with modern materials, which was considered undesirable;
- (b) the historical significance of the Steps of Pound Lane in connection with the living environment in the nineteenth century and the outbreak of the Bubonic Plague in 1894 was not convincing and the assessment did not make comparison to other historical steps in the district;
- (c) the heritage value of the Steps of Pound Lane was not comparable to that of the Pottinger Street; and
- (d) the Steps of Pounds Lane was only ordinary pathway and not a structure with historical merits.

33. Ms Karen Tang enquired whether the proposed pedestrian escalator would impact on the Steps of Pound Lane. Mr Stephen Chan responded that the proposed escalator would inevitably affect the important terrace and lane culture in Central and had aroused diverse views from local residents. The discussion on the proposed escalator had, therefore, been shelved at the moment. Prof Chiu Yu-lok opined that the proposed escalator could help bring people to the less accessible parts of the district and to appreciate the terrace and lane culture.

34. Mr Christopher Law and Ms Ava Tse agreed with the proposed Grade 2 status for the Steps of Pound Lane as the historic streets, roads and steps could show the spatial arrangements of a city, as well as the contemporary construction methods and building materials, even if some of the original materials had been replaced. Prof Rebecca Chiu concurred. However, she still opined that the grading boundary, i.e. which part of the item to be graded, should be stated clearly with full justifications.

35. At the request of the Chairman, C(HB)2 elaborated that:

- (a) the grading assessment of the Steps of Pound Lane was suggested by

a concern group;

- (b) the grading assessment focused on the Steps of Pound Lane; although some steps had been replaced and some landings resurfaced by concrete, it still revealed some part of the original form and texture;
- (c) the Steps of Pound Lane was one of the few surviving building structures that had borne witness to the early history of the local Chinese community and the outbreak of the plague;
- (d) Pottinger Street (Grade 1) and Ladder Street (Grade 1) were two examples of historic steps in the district; their heritage value was briefly introduced. ES(AM) supplemented that the Duddell Street Steps and Gas Lamps had been declared as monument; and
- (e) apart from the Steps of Pound Lane, there were still some “steps” in the “new items list” pending grading assessment, e.g. the Steps of Prince’s Terrace and Battery Path, research of which was being conducted and the proposed grading of these items would be presented to the Board for consideration when ready.

36. Concerning the Pound Lane Public Toilet and Bathhouse, C(HB)2 supplemented that the existing multi-storey toilet-cum-bathhouse was constructed in 1961 after the pre-war Pound Lane public bathhouse, the first permanent public bathhouse providing free service opened in 1904, was demolished.

37. In response to the enquiry of Mr Douglas So on the priority of the grading assessment, the Chairman explained that amongst the 1 444 historic buildings considered by the Board in 2009, there were still about 80 items, the proposed grading of which was pending confirmation owing to objection from owners. These cases, together with the new items which might be threatened by redevelopment, would be processed with priority. The grading assessment for other new items without cogent need would be assessed in a lower priority and subject to the availability of resources. C for H cited Maryknoll House as an example to illustrate how an item with redevelopment plan would be processed with priority. He further explained that since the proposed pedestrian escalator might impact on the historic fabrics of the Steps of Pound Lane, the grading of the

item was therefore brought to the Board for discussion. C(HB)2 supplemented that both the steps and the adjacent toilet would be affected by the proposed escalator; and thus both items were presented to Members for grading assessment.

38. Prof Rebecca Chiu and Ms Theresa Ng asked for a detailed report to explain clearly the part of the Steps of Pound Lane proposed to be graded, with full justifications to substantiate the demarcation and to elaborate on the heritage value of the item. C for H said that a heritage appraisal for the Steps of Pound Lane to facilitate Members' deliberation on the grading had been provided to Members before the meeting. The appraisal summarised the research findings on the Steps of Pound Lane and assessed its heritage value against the established criteria, with a list of references consulted. Members' views were welcomed and would be conveyed to the Assessment Panel for consideration.

39. The Chairman concluded that Members might consider the current information insufficient for deciding on the proposed grading of the Steps of Pound Lane and might request a holistic research on the other steps, lanes and terraces, and their underlying culture. He, however, emphasised that AMO would need considerable resources to conduct such in-depth research.

40. By means of voting, nine out of the 13 Members supported deferring the discussion of the proposed grading of the Steps of Pound Lane. Members, however, endorsed the proposed Nil Grade of the Pound Lane Public Toilet and Bathhouse (Serial No. N28).

*Steps of Prince's Terrace, Mid-levels, H.K. (Serial No. N33)*

41. C(HB)2 briefed Members on the location, heritage value and current condition of the Steps of Prince's Terrace.

42. In response to the Chairman, Mr Kenny Lin and Mr Stephen Chan, C(HB)2 explained that the site was under private ownership and management by several owners of the buildings around it. The balustrades on both sides of the stairway were covered by the grading assessment. C(HB)2 elaborated that the item was a remain of Douglas Villas, a magnificent building which was later used as the convent of the Society of the Missions Etrangères and had been demolished. He said that the owners supported the grading assessment of the steps. Mr Stephen Chan recalled that a number of social activities were held there before.

The Chairman added that the owners could apply for financial assistance from the Government to repair and maintain the steps after the item had been graded.

43. After deliberation, Members endorsed the proposed Grade 3 status of the Steps of Prince's Terrace (Serial No. N33).

## **Item 6 Any Other Business**

### **Maryknoll House**

44. At the invitation of the Chairman, C for H briefed Members the background and recent progress of the preservation-cum-development proposal for the Maryknoll House (the "House"):

- (a) noting the change in ownership in August 2016, the Board confirmed the proposed grading of the House in December 2016, aiming at facilitating the Commissioner for Heritage's Office ("CHO") and AMO to liaise with the owner to explore feasible preservation-cum-development proposal(s). At first, the owner preferred a low-density residential development which entailed demolition of the whole or large parts of the House. After much persuasion and rounds of discussion, the owner finally agreed to preserve the entire House in-situ in June 2018 and incorporate it in the proposed residential development plan. The owner subsequently submitted a rezoning application to the Town Planning Board to implement the preservation-cum-development proposal;
- (b) under the preservation-cum-development proposal, the most important heritage components of the House, i.e. the exterior walls and façades, as well as the chapel, would largely be preserved. A new apartment wing attached to the east side of the House and two separate houses would be constructed in the site;
- (c) the owner had shown goodwill in pursuing the preservation-cum-development proposal, such as engaging international experts and architects in heritage assessment and conservation as well as architectural design to prepare the proposal



which sensitively permitted new development in conjunction with the conservation and revitalisation of the House;

- (d) the preservation-cum-development proposal was preliminary and the owner was required to apply for the necessary permission(s) from the Town Planning Board to carry out the proposed alteration to fulfill the prevailing building requirements, and to protect properly the House during the work period; and
- (e) site visits were conducted. The interiors of the House had largely been renovated in modern style.

### **Fanling Golf Course**

45. Following the site visit to The Hong Kong Golf Club Fanling Golf Course (the “Golf Course”) and the letters from the Hong Kong Golf Club (the “Club”) to the Board requesting assessment of the heritage value of the entire Golf Course, at the Chairman’s invitation, ES(AM) briefed Members on the background of the Club’s request:

- (a) two letters dated 3 May 2018 and 19 June 2018 were received from the Club, requesting 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);
- (b) Members visited the site on 17 August 2018 and received a briefing on the history and ecology of the Golf Course; and
- (c) a follow-up letter dated 21 August 2018 from the Club reiterating the request was received.

46. The Chairman supplemented that there were three graded historic buildings at the Golf Course, namely the Fanling Lodge (Grade 1), the Clubhouse (Grade 2) and the Half-way House (Grade 3), all accorded on 16 September 2014. The Chairman also confirmed that no Member attending the meeting was a member of the Club.

47. Mr Rex Wong expressed concern on whether the importance in a particular industry would add merit to the heritage value of an entire site when conducting grading assessment. Ms Ava Tse quoted the grading assessment of pump houses and the dams of the reservoirs, but not the whole reservoir. This could serve as a reference for the current case as both concerned the grading assessment of a site comprising a bundle of buildings and covering a large area that fell into the category of non “buildings/structures”. Mr Christopher Law enquired whether the Board had the authority to grade the entire site. The Chairman quoted the case of Shaw Studio Compound for which the entire site was graded due to its unique nature in showing the different stages of movie making, with individual buildings inside the Compound assessed and graded on their own merits. However, taking the Ma On Shan Iron Mine and the Old Dairy Farm as examples, while the significance of the entire site in the respective industry was well-noted, grading assessment for the entire site was not carried out in view of the difficulty in demarcating the site boundary, which had preservation implications.

48. Mr Stephen Chan, Ms Karen Tang, Dr Annissa Lui, Prof Chiu Yu-lok and Mr Rex Wong supported the conduct of grading assessment for the entire Golf Course, taking into account that the Golf Course (comprising graded buildings, golf courses planted with grass and trees over hundred years, and cemeteries dated to the Qing Dynasty) had special heritage significance when considered as a whole. Grading of individual buildings/structures at the site might not sufficiently reflect the heritage value of the entire site. Lastly, the Golf Course played an important role in the sports development of Hong Kong.

49. Ms Theresa Ng, while in support of grading assessment for the entire Golf Course, opined that the Board should first have an in-depth understanding of the heritage value of each part of the Golf Course before deciding on the grading.

50. Mr Kenny Lin enquired whether the grading assessment of the entire Golf Course had ever been considered by the Assessment Panel or discussed at the Board meeting when the proposed grading of the few historic buildings located at the site was discussed and confirmed. The Chairman recalled that the grading assessment at that time mainly focused on buildings/structures. As decided at the Board meeting in 2017, research or grading assessment for non “buildings/structures” items would not be undertaken.

51. C for H supplemented that the site of Shaw Studio Compound comprised a number of buildings, most of which had been accorded with a Grade 1, 2 or 3 status individually. Furthermore, 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 undertaken.

52. Mr Kenny Lin doubted whether the grading of the entire Golf Course would be a departure from the decision of the Board made on 9 March 2017. Mr Peter Lau and Mr Rex Wong agreed that the decision of the Board had to be followed, yet they were of the view that the Golf Course did not fall into the examples defined as non “buildings/structures” items at the said meeting, since they regarded the Golf Course as a man-made landscape structure. They, therefore, opined that grading assessment of the Golf Course would not contravene the Board’s previous decision and should be conducted.

53. Prof Chiu Yu-lok suggested to conduct the grading assessment of the Golf Course in collaboration with the Intangible Cultural Heritage Advisory Committee as the Golf Course possessed also intangible cultural value in the sports development of Hong Kong. He opined that the proposed redevelopment of the Golf Course for housing development should not have bearing on the discussion on whether the entire Golf Course should be graded or not.

54. By means of voting, six out of the 12 Members supported grading assessment of the entire Golf Course, while one Member abstained. The Chairman concluded that the grading assessment of the entire Golf Course should be conducted subject to the availability of resources of the Assessment Panel and AMO, and that there was no urgent need for the exercise.

### **Repairs and maintenance works of historic buildings**

55. C for H reported that subsequent to the briefing on FAS at the last Board meeting, about 700 letters were issued to private owners and relevant organisations promoting FAS and explaining how they could apply for financial assistance to carry out repairs and maintenance works for their respective historic buildings. Publicity on FAS through newsletters, exhibitions, and publicity activities would continue. Members’ help to promote the scheme was welcome.

The Chairman said that the Board should be updated of progress as appropriate.

### **Uploading of agenda and papers to Board's website**

56. The Chairman reported that a member of the public complained recently on the non-compliance of uploading meeting agenda and papers to the Board's website seven days before the Board meeting. He acknowledged that there were practical difficulties to comply with the uploading schedule in past meetings and apologised for any inconvenience caused to the public in this aspect.

57. C for H explained that, with reference to the "Guidelines and Rules for Observing Open Meetings" and "Media Arrangements", before open meetings of the Board, the Secretariat would upload the agenda and papers on the Board's website. Notwithstanding, because of the complexity and latest development of individual items, adjustments to the uploading schedule of agenda and meeting papers became necessary in order to provide Members with accurate and up-to-date information for the meeting. The Secretariat would try its best to follow the Guidelines in future.

### **The grading assessment of post-1950 buildings**

58. C for H informed Members that a letter was received from Walk in Hong Kong expressing its views on the prevailing grading system and the grading assessment of post-1950 buildings. He briefed Members that preparatory work was being carried out with a view to examining whether, and if so how, the grading assessment of post-1950 buildings should proceed. As reference, there were more than 15 000 post-1950 buildings in Hong Kong. The grading assessment exercise of pre-1950 buildings commenced in the 1990s, identifying 1 444 buildings from a pool of 8 800 buildings for grading assessment, which was still ongoing in 2018.

59. Mr Christopher Law opined that the buildings constructed by the talented builders from Shanghai in the 1950s were of high architectural value, although they had a relatively shorter history than those built in the 1930s. Mr Peter Lau suggested that those buildings constructed during war-time, such as pillbox or military-related structures, also had high heritage value and should be graded. Mr Douglas So raised concerns on the protection of post-1950 buildings under the prevailing grading system and notification system for preservation of

historic buildings.

60. In response to Members' views and enquiries, C for H and ES(AM) elaborated that:

- (a) while the prevailing grading system focused on buildings completed before 1950, the public could suggest new items not falling into the 1 444 buildings for grading. As a matter of fact, some of them were post-1950 buildings, which were considered on a cogent need and case-by-case basis, such as the Hong Kong City Hall (built in 1962, Grade 1), the Building of The Garden Company, Limited (built in 1951-60, Grade 2) and No. 92 Blue Pool Road (alias But Lo) (built in 1950, Grade 2);
- (b) AMO had commissioned a study on the military structures on Hong Kong Island and the research findings were being finalised; and
- (c) the types and scales of post-1950 buildings varied widely, e.g. the Model Housing Estate (built in 1951-1953), the Star House (built in around 1967), the Ocean Terminal (built in 1966), the Chungking Mansions (built in 1961), Mei Foo Sun Chuen (built in 1960s-1970s), and the Hong Kong Funeral Home in North Point (built in 1960s), etc.

61. The Chairman was delighted to know that preparatory work for the study on the grading assessment of post-1950 buildings had commenced. Before the completion of the assessment of pre-1950 buildings, the study of post-1950 buildings could still proceed, if necessary, although the difficulty in the assessment of post-1950 buildings using the prevailing assessment criteria was fully acknowledged. He noted the complexity and scale of the work that might be involved, and pointed out that the Board had recommended in the 2013 Policy Review of Built Heritage Conservation to study buildings built from 1950 to 1979 (catergorised as post-1950 buildings). He hoped that the study would shed light on whether 1950 to 1979 was an appropriate timeframe and define the scope of work, as well as the current social values applicable to the grading assessment of post-1950 buildings. It was hoped that the public could be encouraged to assist in the study of post-1950 buildings through the Built Heritage Conservation Fund.

62. Mr Stephen Chan echoed the views of Prof Chiu Yu-lok to work in collaboration with the Intangible Cultural Heritage Advisory Committee on heritage conservation, in particular the grading assessment from the “plane” perspective. The Chairman agreed that the Board could exchange ideas with other committees on heritage conservation occasionally and informally, outside regular Board meetings.

63. There being no other business, the meeting was adjourned at 6:33 p.m.

Antiquities and Monuments Office

December 2018

---

Ref: AMO/22-3/1