

ANTIQUITIES ADVISORY BOARD

Minutes of the 190th Meeting
on Thursday, 10 September 2020 at 2:30 pm
at Conference Room, Hong Kong Heritage Discovery Centre,
Kowloon Park, Haiphong Road, Tsim Sha Tsui, Kowloon

Present: Mr Douglas SO Cheung-tak, JP (Chairman)
Ms Vanessa CHEUNG Tih-lin
Prof CHING May-bo
Prof CHIU Yu-lok
Prof CHU Hoi-shan
Mr HO Kui-yip, JP
Mr Tony IP Chung-man
Mr Peter LAU Man-pong
Dr Jane LEE Ching-yee, JP
Mr LEE Ping-kuen, JP
Prof Phyllis LI Chi-miu, BBS
Mr Ronald LIANG
Dr Annissa LUI Wai-ling, JP
Ms Theresa NG Choi-yuk, JP
Mr SHUM Ho-kit, JP
Mr Rex WONG Siu-han, JP
Dr Sharon WONG Wai-yee
Prof YAU Chi-on
Miss Theresa YEUNG Wing-shan
Ms Alice YIP Ka-ming

Ms Shirley YEUNG (Secretary)
Senior Executive Officer (Antiquities and Monuments) 2
Antiquities and Monuments Office

Absent with Apologies: Mr Christopher LAW Kin-chung, JP

In Attendance: Development Bureau

Mr José YAM
Commissioner for Heritage [C for H]

Mr Ben LO*
Chief Assistant Secretary (Works) 2 [CAS(W)2]

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

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

Ms Angela LEE*
Assistant Secretary (Heritage Conservation) 4
[AS(HC)4]

Miss Connie WONG*
Secretariat Press Officer (Development) [SPO(DEV)]

Mr Eddie WONG*
Senior Executive Manager (Heritage Conservation)
[SEM(HC)]

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]

Ms Teresa LEUNG*
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) 1 [ACI(BS)1]

Architectural Services Department

Mr Alan SIN
Assistant Director (Property Services) [AD(PS)]

Ms CHAN Mei-kuen*
Senior Maintenance Surveyor / Heritage [SMS/H]

Leisure and Cultural Services Department

Miss Eve TAM
Assistant Director (Heritage & Museum) [AD(H&M)]

Planning Department

Mr Louis KAU
Assistant Director of Planning / Metro Atg. [Atg. AD/M]

(Note: Government officers who were seated in the Lecture Hall of the Hong Kong Heritage Discovery Centre (“HDC”) to view live broadcasting of the meeting held at the Conference Room of HDC to facilitate social distancing due to the COVID-19 pandemic.)*

Opening Remarks

The Chairman welcomed Members and government representatives to the meeting.

**Item 1 Confirmation of Minutes of the 189th Meeting held on 11 June 2020
(Board Minutes AAB/5/2019-20)**

2. The minutes of the 189th Meeting held on 11 June 2020 were confirmed without amendment.

**Item 2 Matters Arising and Progress Report
(Board Paper AAB/23/2019-20)**

3. ES(AM) briefed Members on the progress of major heritage conservation projects and initiatives from 1 May to 15 August 2020, including preservation, restoration and maintenance of historic buildings and structures, archaeological work, and educational and publicity activities detailed in the Board paper. Besides, she thanked Members for their valuable suggestions on the promotion of the successful restoration of the Duddell Street Steps and Gas Lamps, a declared monument seriously damaged by a fallen tree when Super Typhoon Mangkhut hit Hong Kong in September 2018, at the last meeting. She further reported that a monument plaque with QR code check point had been installed at the site to recap the 15-month painstaking restoration process through a three-minute video.

4. The Chairman and Dr Sharon WONG suggested displaying the QR code check point at eye level to facilitate visitors, in particular the elderly, to scan the QR code. Ms Alice YIP suggested installing QR code check points at other declared monuments as well. Miss Theresa YEUNG echoed and opined that audiovisual aids would enhance visitors' experience and promote public awareness in heritage conservation.

5. ES(AM) thanked Members for their suggestions. She supplemented that the Antiquities and Monuments Office ("AMO") was preparing videos and photos of declared monuments for sharing with the public through QR code check points or on AMO's website.

6. The Chairman thanked AMO and all professional experts involved for completing the arduous restoration project expeditiously. He encouraged Members to share with people around about the project for appreciation of the restored monument whenever passing by Central.

7. The Chairman remarked that there were recently media reports in respect of two Grade 1 historic buildings, namely Former State Theatre at the junction of King's Road and Tin Chong Street in North Point (the "Theatre"), and No. 120 Wellington Street in Central. At the invitation of the Chairman, C for H briefed Members the background and updated the latest development of the two buildings:

- (a) The Theatre site, comprising three lots including the Theatre and the adjacent State Theatre Building, was under the major ownership of New World Development Company Limited ("NWD"). The Theatre was accorded with Grade 1 status by the Board on 9 March 2017. In October 2018, NWD, after acquiring over 80% of ownership of the Theatre site, made an application to the Lands Tribunal for compulsory sale for redevelopment of the subject site. In view of the heritage value of the Theatre, the Commissioner for Heritage's Office ("CHO") and AMO had been proactively discussing with NWD on possible "preservation-cum-development" proposals with a view to preserving the Theatre since 2018. NWD responded positively and indicated that it would conserve the Theatre and redevelop the residential and commercial parts of the Theatre site after acquiring 100% ownership of the subject site. According to the Lands Tribunal's record, the compulsory sale order was granted on 24 August 2020. NWD currently owned more than 90% of the Theatre site. In recent media reports, NWD mentioned that it would closely communicate with the stakeholders and neighbourhoods to explore the feasibility of preserving the Theatre after acquiring 100% ownership of the site and conducting thorough inspection of the Theatre. CHO and AMO would continue to liaise closely with NWD on the conservation of the Theatre.

[Post-meeting note: NWD secured 100% ownership of the Theatre site at the public auction held on 8 October 2020 at a cost of \$4.776 billion.]

- (b) No. 120 Wellington Street, commonly known as Wing Woo Grocery Shop (永和號, the "Building"), was a three-storey shophouse accorded with Grade 1 status by the Board on 7 September 2017. It was part of the "Peel Street / Graham Street Development Scheme (H18)", a redevelopment project of the Urban Renewal Authority ("URA").

Recently, some media reports had written on the possible adverse impact to the Building by the structural strengthening works being carried out by URA. According to the report submitted by the structural engineer and heritage conservation consultant of URA earlier, to ensure public safety, urgent structural strengthening works were recommended in view of the unsatisfactory condition of the Building. In the course of strengthening works, some character-defining elements had to be removed inevitably. URA had committed to salvage the materials of those elements, and to reinstate and re-use them to restore the Building. As H18 was a private redevelopment project and not government's Capital Works Project, it was, therefore, not governed by Technical Circular (Works) No. 6/2009 "Heritage Impact Assessment Mechanism for Capital Works Projects" of the Development Bureau. Nevertheless, URA would submit a detailed restoration proposal, including the conservation management plan, for AMO's consideration. At the moment, URA was carrying out further study on the adaptive re-use of the Building and would closely liaise with AMO and other relevant departments on the matter. In addition, the Secretariat had circulated a press release issued by URA in regard to this matter to Members vide email before the meeting.

8. Dr Sharon WONG enquired if there were other historic buildings which were being revitalised, in particular tenement houses, had undergone structural strengthening during restoration. C for H replied that maintenance or restoration works required for historic buildings would depend on their respective conditions and characteristics. The preservation-cum-development project at No. 179 Prince Edward Road West (Hotel 1936) in Mong Kok where Members had visited, for instance, was revitalised from a tenement building. The recovery for Block 4 of Tai Kwun was a similar example of having to undergo structural strengthening due to the poor and weak condition of the brickwork of the building. In any case, public safety was a predominant factor when considering the proposed works. Regarding the Building at No. 120 Wellington Street, he supplemented that URA representatives had explained in detail of the ongoing works at the Working Group on Historic Town District and Heritage Conservation of the Central and Western District Council on 10 September 2020. URA had committed to closely communicate with the District Council and the community, and disseminate information to the public in a timely manner.

Item 3 Heritage Impact Assessment in respect of the Yau Ma Tei Theatre Phase 2 at Yau Ma Tei, Kowloon – Supplementary Information on the Revised Design of the Yau Ma Tei Theatre Phase 2 (Board Paper AAB/24/2019-20)

9. The Chairman welcomed the following representatives (the “YMTT Phase 2 Project Team”) of the Leisure and Cultural Services Department, the Architectural Services Department (“ArchSD”) and its conservation consultant, and the Food and Environmental Hygiene Department to the meeting to present the revised design of the proposed Yau Ma Tei Theatre (“YMTT”) Phase 2 at Yau Ma Tei, Kowloon adjacent to the YMTT (a Grade 2 historic building), in connection with the updated heritage impact assessment (“HIA”) having taken into account Members’ views and suggestions on the design at the last meeting held on 11 June 2020, in particular the possible visual impact on the YMTT:

- (i) Ms Fionn YEUNG
 Chief Manager
 Performance Venues Management Section
 Leisure and Cultural Services Department
- (ii) Mr Jacen LO
 Senior Architect, Architectural Branch
 Architectural Services Department
- (iii) Miss Bibiana YUEN
 Senior Health Inspector (Cleansing & Pest Control) Yau Tsim 2
 Food and Environmental Hygiene Department
- (iv) Mr Henry LO
 Conservation Consultant
 Ptah Heritage Limited

(Note: Mr CHUNG Ming-cheong, Chief Architect/2, Architectural Branch, and Ms KWOK Ming-lo, Senior Project Manager 328, Project Management Branch 3 of ArchSD sat behind the YMTT Phase 2 Project Team to provide support.)

10. With the aid of photos and layout plans, Mr Jacen LO recapped Members’ comments and concerns expressed at the last meeting on the original design of YMTT Phase 2, i.e. (i) the proposed low block along the pedestrian line

of Waterloo Road would block the view of a front corner of YMTT; (ii) the proposed staircases and lift core inside the low block had used up much space on the ground floor; (iii) the feasibility to remove the low block and compensate by adding two more storeys to the high block; and (iv) the quantity of public toilets at YMTT Phase 2 adjacent to YMTT, a Grade 2 historic building. He went on to explain in detail how the comments and concerns of Members were addressed in the revised design, i.e. (i) setting back the frontage of the low block by approximately 1.1 metres so that more of the corner and front elevation of YMTT could be viewed from Waterloo Road; (ii) relocating the theatre toilets from previous mezzanine floor to ground floor and thus removing the internal staircases and lift core in the low block; (iii) having an external open staircase from ground floor to landscape roof for better appreciation of the east elevation of YMTT; (d) reducing the mass and lowering the height of low block by approximately 0.7 metre for better appreciation of the pitched roof of YMTT and its features; and (v) enhancing the visibility of the east elevation of YMTT by refining the design of the ramp and the use of glass wall with various transparency scales in the low block.

11. Dr Annissa LUI and Ms Theresa NG appreciated the revised design of YMTT Phase 2. Dr Annissa LUI considered that the increase in toilet compartments would be convenient to the elderly and people with disabilities, and the extended foyer would be convenient for vehicles picking up and dropping off visitors. Ms Theresa NG opined that Yau Ma Tei was a district full of local characteristics and an interesting place to explore but lack of rest facilities. She was pleased to see that such facilities would be provided in YMTT Phase 2.

12. Prof CHU Hoi-shan considered that it was good to relocate the theatre toilets to ground floor and remove the lift core at the low block. He further suggested setting forward the external open staircase so as to maximise the internal space of the open courtyard by at least one metre.

13. Miss Theresa YEUNG supported the relocation of the toilets from previous mezzanine to ground floor and the staircase from indoor to outdoor to facilitate the appreciation of the graded buildings in the neighbourhood, e.g. Yau Ma Tei Wholesale Fruit Market (Grade 2), the former pumping station of Water Supplies Department (also known as the Red Brick Building) (Grade 1) and YMTT (Grade 2). She suggested installing display panels with QR code in the open courtyard or landscaped roof to tell the development of YMTT and its neighbourhood.

14. Mr HO Kui-yip was glad that the design of YMTT Phase 2 had been refined taking into account Members' views, in particular the setting back of the frontage of the low block to expose more of the front corner and elevation of YMTT, as well as to use glass wall of various transparency scales in the low block for enhancing visibility of the east elevation of YMTT. He appreciated that under the prevailing height restriction on the high block, it would not be feasible to remove the low block by adding more storeys to the high block. Besides, he also appreciated that the YMTT Phase 2 Project Team had tried its very best to lower the building height of the low block to allow better appreciation of the pitched roof of YMTT. Nevertheless, he noted from the floor plan that a fire service control panel was suggested to be placed under the external open staircase at the open courtyard. He opined that if the panel could be moved further from Shanghai Street, the entrance of the open courtyard would be more spacious and the ambience of the open courtyard would be more harmonious with the bottom part of the staircase revealed.

15. Prof YAU Chi-on thanked the YMTT Phase 2 Project Team for its revised design. He commented that YMTT Phase 2, setting in the vicinity of a cluster of historic buildings (such as the Wholesale Fruit Market and the Red Brick Building), could be linked up together to tell the history and development of Yau Ma Tei. Dr Sharon WONG echoed, adding that unlike the Xiqu Centre of the West Kowloon Cultural District which promoted Chinese operas including Kunqu (崑曲), YMTT Phase 2 could symbolically reflect its primary function, i.e. to promote Cantonese Opera which was rich in local character, through its design.

16. Prof Phyllis Li opined that the revised design had taken into consideration the impact on the heritage as well as the spatial and visual connectivity. She was impressed by the setting back of the frontage of the low block for widening of the street corner view of the front elevation of YMTT. She suggested to take the opportunity of YMTT Phase 2 development to further improve the streetscape and enhance the historical character of Yau Ma Tei with a view to reshaping it into a heritage precinct in future.

17. In response to Prof CHING May-bo's enquiry on whether the revised design of YMTT Phase 2 had taken into account the earlier comments from members of the Cantonese Opera Advisory Committee ("COAC"), Mr Jacen LO replied that the comments of COAC were mainly on the functional aspect of YMTT and YMTT Phase 2 and had been mostly addressed. In particular, the

delivery and storage arrangement of Cantonese Opera equipment between or at the rehearsal rooms and side stage of YMTT Phase 2 had been catered for in the revised design of YMTT Phase 2.

18. Mr Ronald LIANG opined that YMTT Phase 2 was a complex building and thus the design should facilitate wayfinding to better guide visitors, particularly elderly visitors, to find their destinations. Besides, he suggested having about 750 – 800 millimeters of mud paving to tone down the extent of hard pavement on the landscaped roof of the low block and to do gardening there. He stressed the importance of having more landscape and a good lighting consultant for YMTT Phase 2 to perfect the design. Mr HO Kui-yip supplemented that non-soil type planting could be explored for better structural maintenance.

19. Mr Tony IP suggested that the design of the elevation of the high block could be further worked out, considering the challenge to echo the building pattern and concept with the architectural style of YMTT and the modern glass type building of the low block of YMTT Phase 2. Besides, he reminded that the lobby of YMTT Phase 2 was west-facing towards the east elevation of YMTT that might cause solar heat gain and glare issues. Mr Rex WONG shared the same view.

20. The Chairman was delighted that Members supported the revised design of the development project of YMTT Phase 2. He hoped that after the completion of YMTT Phase 2, it would play an important role to link up the heritage in the vicinity and become a landmark of Yau Ma Tei. With no further views from Members, he concluded that the Board endorsed the respective HIA report and the revised design of YMTT Phase 2. Further consultation with the Board was not required.

Item 4 Heritage Impact Assessment in respect of the Revitalisation of Luen Wo Market (Board Paper AAB/25/2019-20)

21. The Chairman welcomed the following representatives (the “LWM Project Team”) of the Lutheran Luen Wo Market – House of Urban and Rural Living Limited (“LWM – HURL Ltd.”), the entity set up to take forward the project, as well as its project and heritage consultants to the meeting to present the HIA of the proposed works (the “LWM Project”) to revitalise Luen Wo Market (“LWM”) at Luen Wo Hui, New Territories, a Grade 3 historic building, into

“LWM – House of Urban and Rural Living” (the “revitalised House”).

- (i) Ms Paulina LAU
Associate, APT Engineering Consultant Limited
- (ii) Ms Wendy NG
Director, Revival Heritage Consultants Limited
- (iii) Mr Benjamin TSANG
Principal, Matter Limited
- (iv) Mr Hezon TANG
Service Director, Hong Kong Lutheran Social Service,
Lutheran Church Hong Kong Synod

(Note: Dr Annissa LUI, Member of the Antiquities Advisory Board (“AAB”) and Chairman (Acting) of LWM – HURL Ltd. and Ms Tiffany HUI, Project Co-ordination Officer of Hong Kong Lutheran Social Service, Lutheran Church Hong Kong Synod, sat behind the LWM Project Team to provide support.)

22. Before presentation, Dr Annissa LUI declared that she was the Chief Executive of Hong Kong Lutheran Social Service (“HKLSS”), Lutheran Church Hong Kong Synod (“LC-HKS”) and Mr Tony IP declared that he was appointed as a consultant for another project of LC-HKS. The Chairman suggested them to withdraw from the discussion (in the capacity of AAB Members) and voting relating to the subject matter.

23. Dr Annissa LUI briefed Members that HKLSS of LC-HKS had submitted an application for the proposed conservation and adaptive re-use of the LWM Project under Batch V of the Revitalising Historic Buildings Through Partnership Scheme (“Revitalisation Scheme”) and was selected among others in 2018. She introduced to Members the background of HKLSS and the LWM Project Team.

24. Mr Hezon TANG briefed Members the objectives of the LWM Project and the educational programmes, including the guided bike tours, to be organised for the community after the revitalisation. With the aid of photos and layout plans, Ms Wendy NG showed Members the location of LWM, as well as its historical, architectural and social significance. She elaborated on the proposed

revitalisation works together with the possible impacts on the graded LWM building and the proposed mitigation measures.

25. Prof CHIU Yu-lok supported the LWM Project. He considered that the term “market” carried an additional meaning of “activity”. It was important to study the communication and network activities in the old days of LWM for understanding more about the clan nearby. Moreover, he suggested working with the Transport Department as well as other relevant departments when designing guided bike tour trails for safety sake, considering that some of the spots of the proposed bike tours were under redevelopment plans. It would be lively to consider bringing back the original path that once used by vehicles to transport pigs as the guided bike tour trails.

26. Prof YAU Chi-on supported the concepts of the LWM Project and the guided bike tours. He wished that the LWM Project could link up the heritage and characteristics of the vicinity so that a full picture of Fanling in the 1950s to 1960s could be presented, considering LWM was once an important religious and social landmark of the district, surrounded by Christian churches, rural committee and clansmen associations, as well as On Lok Tsuen, a leisure and cultural place developed by Mr FUNG Ki-cheuk who was a local merchant-elite and one of the founding directors of Luen Wo Land Investment Company Limited which developed LWM in the past. He added that LWM was once a popular tourist spot in the “one-day tour of New Territories” promoted by the Hong Kong Tourist Association, and suggested exploring promotional campaigns to publicise the LWM Project by taking the opportunity of its 70th anniversary of establishment in January 2021.

27. Miss Theresa YEUNG commented that the LWM Project had adopted the “point-line-plane” approach. The guided bike tours, in particular, could be set as a network model for extending the scope of intangible heritage conservation.

28. Prof Phyllis LI opined that the origin of having LWM as a market town in the community had to be taken into account in the LWM Project. She suggested adopting a “living heritage” approach in the course of revitalisation. Also, other alternative means in the use of the new annex block at the East Plaza could be explored apart from having it for the provision of a bicycle store in support of the guided bike tours.

29. Dr Sharon WONG noted that some of the spots of the guided bike tours were historical sites which AMO had included in its Lung Yeuk Tau Heritage Trail and guided tours. She enquired how the guided tours of the LWM Project would be different from those of AMO. Besides, she wished that the heritage interpretation area at the east wing of the revitalised House could highlight more about the social value of the LWM's old days so that people could understand the transformation of the community, from once agricultural to service industry nowadays.

30. Prof CHING May-bo asked how the proposed works reconciled with the authenticity of the main entrance canopy. Besides, she suggested to study the movement of people in Fanling in the old days before devising the routes of the guided bike tours to enrich the historical contents of the tours. In addition, she expressed concern on the sustainability of the revitalised House and encouraged thinking outside the box when running it.

31. Mr LEE Ping-kuen suggested showcasing the old LWM by photos and videos at the revitalised House for visitors to understand the way of living in the past, and enquired the details of the materials to be used in re-casting the main entrance canopy which was one of the character-defining elements of LWM.

32. Mr HO Kui-yip considered that re-casting the main entrance canopy by using compatible material was appropriate from the safety and future building maintenance perspectives. Opportunity should also be taken to review whether compatible solutions were required for the projections or cantilevered structures for LWM. Besides, he expressed concern on the height and the location of the new annex block at the East Plaza as it might bring visual impact to the side entrance of the market building. The outdoor air-conditioning units on the roof of the new annex block might also hinder the appreciation of the market building and bring noise nuisance to LWM and the neighbourhood during operating hours. Furthermore, he suggested handling the exhaust issue carefully considering that there would be a number of catering services in the revitalised House.

33. Mr Rex Wong considered that the proposed mitigation measures in the HIA report had sufficiently addressed the current poor condition of the main entrance canopy and re-casting of it would not undermine its heritage value.

34. Prof CHU Hoi-shan opined that the design of the new annex block at the East Plaza was compatible with LWM, and enquired about the concept in the layout setting of the open spaces of the East and West Plazas.

35. Mr SHUM Ho-kit supported the proposed revitalisation works. He viewed that it would be challenging to maintain the sustainability of the business of the revitalised House, considering that people in the neighbourhood nowadays were more accustomed to buying in supermarket or even shopping online. It was very important to make the revitalised House unique by having a variety of stalls with characteristics, rather than having only traditional market stalls, to attract both local and overseas visitors. He asked whether the operating hours of the revitalised House would allow for night market. Ms Vanessa CHEUNG echoed and emphasised the importance of community engagement and creation of “market”. She opined that heritage element should also be inspired by modern and innovative applications so as to attract cross-generational visitors and demonstrate the spirit of revitalisation.

36. Ms Alice YIP supported the concept of the LWM Project. She suggested that solar panels could be installed on the iconic E-shaped roof of LWM. She suggested the LWM Project to consider the renewable energy scheme offered to business customers by CLP Power Hong Kong Limited (“CLP”), in which CLP would buy the electricity generated by the installed solar energy system.

37. In response to Members’ views and concerns above, C for H explained that the LWM Project, under Batch V of the Revitalisation Scheme, was chosen among others by the Advisory Committee on Built Heritage Conservation (“ACBHC”) after a vigorous selection process. Members could rest assured that the business nature and strategies of the LWM Project, including the conservation of LWM, the financial sustainability of the project, and the varieties of restaurants and shops therein had been thoroughly reviewed by ACBHC. Upon completion of the LWM Project, the operator of the revitalised House would be required to submit various annual reports to ACBHC. Regarding the concern on the impact on the authenticity of the main entrance canopy that might be brought about by the re-casting works, C for H explained that authenticity, while being one of the factors to consider in the revitalisation project, was not the only one. Other factors such as the practicability of operation, public safety and the overall ambience would also be taken into consideration. CHO considered that the mitigation measures proposed by the LWM Project Team, in particular on the main entrance canopy

issue, were acceptable and agreeable.

38. Mr Hezon TANG thanked Members for their valuable comments and suggestions. In response to the business hours of the revitalised House after commencing operation, he replied that there would be holiday bazaars operating until night time on festive occasions. Regarding the layout setting of the open spaces of the East and West Plazas, he responded that the open spaces were designed to facilitate appreciation of the revitalised House from different views. For instance, visitors could begin their tours by taking seats in the two plazas to appreciate the revitalised House, then walking around other heritage spots in the vicinity or joining the guided bike tours to further explore the heritage and culture in the neighbourhood. Mr Benjamin TSANG supplemented the design of the East and West Plazas, i.e. the former housing outdoor bazaars representing “urban” while the latter featuring a rain garden to create the sunset “rural” mood.

39. Regarding the suggestion of the installation of solar panels, Mr Benjamin TSANG said that different means of energy saving system, such as solar energy system and climber planting had been considered. Besides, much effort had been made in enhancing spatial quality and preserving the architectural value of the market building of LWM. For instance, add-on building services such as air-conditioning and plumbing systems would be installed in the new annex block at the East Plaza to avoid adverse visual impact on the historic market building of LWM. This also explained the reason for the height of the new annex block. Moreover, studies had been carried out on the main entrance canopy and other projections. It was identified that the main entrance canopy was of major concern. Taking structural engineers’ advice and in consultation with AMO, the most practical mitigation measures, including the types of materials to be used, had been adopted with a view to ensuring building and public safety. He further explained that different possible options for housing the new annex block had been explored. It was considered that the corner of the East Plaza, where a recently built residential building was sitting behind, was the best spot as it would facilitate the circulation of visitor flow having considered that the entrance in the front would be the main one used by visitors.

40. With no further views from Members, the Chairman thanked the LWM Project Team and concluded that the Board endorsed the HIA report and the proposed mitigation measures. Further consultation with the Board was not required.

Item 5 Assessment of Historic Buildings (Board Paper AAB/26/2019-20)

Confirmation of Proposed Grading for New Item

41. C(HB)2 recapped that the Board had endorsed the proposed grading of Bonham Road Government Primary School, No. 9A Bonham Road, Sai Ying Pun, Hong Kong (Serial No. N6) at the meeting on 11 June 2020. In line with the established practice, a one-month public consultation on the proposed grading of the item was conducted from 17 June to 17 July 2020.

42. C(HB)2 reported that no written submission had been received on the proposed Grade 1 status of the item.

43. Members had no further view and agreed to confirm the proposed Grade 1 status for Bonham Road Government Primary School.

Confirmation of Proposed Grading for Items with Objections

44. C(HB)2 briefed Members that among the 1 444 buildings considered by the Board in 2009, the proposed grading of some of them had not yet been confirmed due to objections received during public consultation earlier. Since December 2016, the Board had been invited to confirm the proposed grading of these buildings by batches. For this meeting, Members were invited to confirm the proposed grading of the following three items:

- (i) Pedder Building, No. 12 Pedder Street, Central, Hong Kong, Proposed Grade 1 (Serial No. 207);
- (ii) No. 33 Sassoon Road, Stone Manor, Pok Fu Lam, Hong Kong, Proposed Grade 2 (Serial No. 539); and
- (iii) No. 33 Sassoon Road, Garage, Pok Fu Lam, Hong Kong, Proposed Grade 2 (Serial No. 540).

The objection letters and replies in respect of the above three items had been provided to Members before the meeting.

45. With the aid of photos, C(HB)2 recapped the heritage value and the latest condition of the above items. Examples of similar types of graded

buildings were also shown for Members' reference.

Pedder Building, No. 12 Pedder Street, Central, Hong Kong, Proposed Grade 1 (Serial No. 207)

46. C(HB)2 reported that the owner of Pedder Building objected to the proposed Grade 1 status as he considered that the building was not worth the proposed grading and was concerned that the grading might hinder the future maintenance of the property. The owner also submitted an objection letter to the Board prior to the meeting reiterating his views. The independent Historic Buildings Assessment Panel (the "Assessment Panel"), after reviewing the written objections and the information provided by the owner, upheld the proposed grading of Pedder Building as no new information on the heritage value of the building was provided.

47. Members had no comment on the proposed grading and agreed to confirm the proposed Grade 1 status for Pedder Building, No. 12 Pedder Street, Central, Hong Kong (Serial No. 207).

No. 33 Sassoon Road, Stone Manor, Pok Fu Lam, Hong Kong, Proposed Grade 2 (Serial No. 539)

No. 33 Sassoon Road, Garage, Pok Fu Lam, Hong Kong, Proposed Grade 2 (Serial No. 540)

48. C(HB)2 reported that the owner of No. 33 Sassoon Road, Stone Manor and Garage objected to the proposed Grade 2 status, considering that the items were not worth the proposed grading in terms of their architectural value. The owner also submitted an objection letter to the Board prior to the meeting reiterating his views. The Assessment Panel, after reviewing the written objections and the information provided by the owner, upheld the proposed grading of No. 33 Sassoon Road, Stone Manor and Garage as no new information on the heritage value of the building was provided.

49. Members had no comment on the proposed grading and agreed to confirm the proposed Grade 2 status for No. 33 Sassoon Road, Stone Manor, Pok Fu Lam, Hong Kong (Serial No. 539) and No. 33 Sassoon Road, Garage, Pok Fu Lam, Hong Kong (Serial No. 540) respectively.

New Items for Grading Assessment

50. The Chairman thanked Members for attending the half-day site visit on 3 September 2020 to the following three new items for grading assessment:

- (i) Second Street Public Bathhouse, Junction of Second Street and Western Street, Sai Ying Pun, Hong Kong, Proposed Grade 2 (Serial No. N348);
- (ii) No. 112 Jervois Street, Sheung Wan, Hong Kong, Proposed Grade 1 (Serial No. N329); and
- (iii) No. 24 Nga Tsin Long Road, Kowloon City, Kowloon, Proposed Grade 3 (Serial No. N334).

51. With the aid of photos, C(HB)2 briefed Members on the heritage value of the above items and their proposed grading.

Second Street Public Bathhouse, Junction of Second Street and Western Street, Sai Ying Pun, Hong Kong, Proposed Grade 2 (Serial No. N348)

52. In response to Prof CHU Hoi-shan's enquiry on restoring the original colour of the external wall of Second Street Public Bathhouse (the "Bathhouse"), C(HB)2 replied that AMO would comment on the works proposals for graded buildings from the heritage conservation perspective. Paint analysis, for instance, could be conducted to uncover the past paint layers.

53. Mr SHUM Ho-kit supported the proposed Grade 2 status for the Bathhouse, considering that it was the only surviving pre-war building of its kind in Hong Kong. He pointed out the significance of preserving the Bathhouse lay in its high historical value in association with the history of epidemic plagues in Hong Kong in the early days. The Chairman agreed and highlighted the group value of the Bathhouse and the nearby Old Tsan Yuk Maternity Hospital (comprising the Main Building, Grade 1, and Annex Block, Grade 2).

54. With no further view, Members agreed to endorse the proposed Grade 2 status for Second Street Public Bathhouse, Junction of Second Street and Western Street, Sai Ying Pun, Hong Kong (Serial No. N348).

No. 112 Jervois Street, Sheung Wan, Hong Kong, Proposed Grade 1 (Serial No. N329)

55. Mr SHUM Ho-kit supported the proposed Grade 1 status for No. 112 Jervois Street having considered its high historical, social and architectural values. He said that as the owner had told him that the lineage was descended from the Xian Bei clan of the Northern Wei dynasty, it might be worthwhile to study and trace the relationship between the Northern Wei dynasty and the YUEN's lineage. Prof CHIU Yu-lok and Dr Sharon WONG pointed out the complication in the study of genealogy. Prof CHIU Yu-lok also had reservation on the proposed Grade 1 status for the building, having considered its current condition and the alterations it had undergone, for instance.

56. In response to Mr Tony IP and Prof CHU Hoi-shan's concerns on the inaccessibility of the second floor for inspection, the possible unauthorised building works by preliminary visual inspection and the architectural value of the building compared with that of Pedder Building, No. 12 Pedder Street, Central, C(HB)2 explained that although the second floor was not open to the public, its internal layout was basically the same as the first floor. The Chairman added that it was hard to request the owner to open all the space of his property for assessment, and it was also beyond the ambit of the Board to verify if there were any unauthorised building works. According to the established practice, the heritage value of historic buildings was assessed against six criteria, i.e. (i) historical interest; (ii) architectural merit; (iii) group value; (iv) social value and local interest; (v) authenticity; and (vi) rarity. Similar to the case of Pedder Building in Central, Members had not entered the building but assessed it in accordance with the aforesaid six criteria. C for H supplemented that it was difficult to make a direct comparison among different types of historic buildings, for instance, the Former State Theatre, Pedder Building and No. 120 Wellington Street had all been accorded with Grade 1 status but they were of very different types and styles of buildings.

57. Dr Sharon WONG agreed with the views of the Chairman and C for H, and supported the proposed Grade 1 status for No. 112 Jervois Street having considered its high social and historical values. Prof CHING May-bo echoed and pointed out the outstanding cultural significance of the building, which embodied the inheritance and continuity of the family business of Yuen Kat Lam (源吉林).

Dr Sharon WONG also stressed the historical importance of the building as its address plate was still written “Jervois Street” (乍畏街), the old name of 「蘇杭街」, which was very unique. She also appreciated that it was a surviving example of back-to-back typed tenement building. Besides, she suggested studying the pigment business with the brand name of Yuen Kwong Wo (源廣和), in addition to Yuen Kat Lam herbal tea, as she noticed during site visit that some equipment for producing pigment was retained. C(HB)2 responded that although there was not much information available from the YUEN’s family for the time being, AMO would study further the history of Yuen Kwong Wo in future.

58. Prof YAU Chi-on enquired whether No. 112 Jervois Street would be included in the Central and Western Heritage Trail. Besides, he suggested updating the information of Fok Hing Tong, Hong Kong Society for the Promotion of Virtue in “Central and Western Heritage Trail Guide Map” as Fok Hing Tong had already been left vacant for quite some time. C for H thanked for the advice and AMO would follow up accordingly.

59. Mr HO Kui-yip supported the proposed grading and remarked that the balcony on the first floor of the building was in poor condition and suggested the Government to liaise with the owner to maintain the building after it had been graded. C for H shared with Members that the owner would apply for the Financial Assistance for Maintenance Scheme on Built Heritage to carry out maintenance works after the building had been graded, and CHO would closely liaise with the owner regarding the matter.

60. After deliberation, Members agreed to endorse the proposed Grade 1 status for No. 112 Jervois Street, Sheung Wan, Hong Kong (Serial No. N329).

No. 24 Nga Tsin Long Road, Kowloon City, Kowloon, Proposed Grade 3 (Serial No. N334)

61. In response to Prof Phyllis Li’s enquiry on the classification of the “four generations of tenement house”, C(HB)2 replied that the “four-generation” classification was mainly derived from the evolving building form of tenement houses in accordance with the development of statutory requirements under the Buildings Ordinance. For instance, a tenement house of back-to-back style was regarded as the “first generation” and that of verandah-type was referred as the later generation. Nonetheless, grading assessment of the heritage value of

tenement house was primarily based on the six criteria mentioned earlier.

62. Members had no further view on the proposed grading and agreed to endorse the proposed Grade 3 status for No. 24 Nga Tsin Long Road, Kowloon City, Kowloon (Serial No. N334).

Item 6 Any Other Business

63. There being no other business, the meeting was adjourned at 6:15 pm.

Antiquities and Monuments Office
December 2020

Ref: AMO/22-3/1