

ANTIQUITIES ADVISORY BOARD

Minutes of the 193rd Meeting
on Thursday, 10 June 2021 at 2:30 pm
at Conference Room, Hong Kong Heritage Discovery Centre,
Kowloon Park, Haiphong Road, Tsim Sha Tsui, Kowloon

Present: Mr SO Cheung-tak, Douglas, JP (Chairman)
Ms CHEUNG Tih-lin, Vanessa
Prof CHING May-bo
Prof CHU Hoi-shan
Mr HO Kui-yip, JP
Mr IP Chung-man, Tony
Dr LAM Weng-cheong
Mr LAU Man-pong, Peter
Mr LAW Kin-chung, Christopher, JP
Dr LEE Ching-yee, Jane, JP
Mr LEE Ping-kuen, JP
Prof LI Chi-miu, Phyllis, BBS
Mr LIANG Ronald
Ms SEE Sau-mei, Salome
Mr SHUM Ho-kit, JP
Mr TSANG Chiu-tong, Brian
Prof YAU Chi-on
Miss YEUNG Wing-shan, Theresa
Ms YIP Ka-ming, Alice

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

Absent with Apologies: Mr Edward YUEN Siu-bun

In Attendance: Development Bureau

Ms Angela LEE
Deputy Secretary for Development (Works) 1
[DS(W)1]

Mr Ivanhoe CHANG
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]

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

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

Mr Ken AU*
Senior Information Officer (Development) 2
[SIO(DEV)2]

Miss Latetia LEE*
Information Officer (Development) 2 [IO(DEV)2]

Antiquities and Monuments Office

Ms Susanna SIU

Executive Secretary (Antiquities and Monuments)
[ES(AM)]

Mr Albert YUE*

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

Ms Teresa LEUNG*

Senior Architect (Antiquities & Monuments) 2
[SA(AM)2]

Ms Rebecca CHEUNG

Curator (Historical Buildings) 2 [C(HB)2]

Ms Jeremy HUI

Curator (Historical Buildings) 3 [C(HB)3]

Mr Ray MA

Curator (Archaeology) [C(Arch)]

Miss Fiona TSANG*

Curator (Historical Buildings) 1 [C(HB)1]

Miss LEE Chui-mei

Assistant Curator I (Building Survey) 2 [ACI(BS)2]

Miss Pauline POON

Assistant Curator I (Building Survey) 1 [ACI(BS)1]

Miss Celia SHUM

Assistant Curator I (Archaeological Preservation) 2
[ACI(AP)2]

Architectural Services Department

Mr Alan SIN

Assistant Director (Property Services) [AD(PS)]

Ms Liny LAU*

Senior Maintenance Surveyor / Heritage [SMS/H]

Planning Department

Ms April KUN

Assistant Director of Planning / Metro [AD/M]

(Note: Government officers seated in the Activity Room 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 192nd Meeting held on 11 March 2021 (Board Minutes AAB/1/2021-22)

2. The minutes of the 192nd Meeting held on 11 March 2021 were confirmed without amendment.

**Item 2 Matters Arising and Progress Report
(Board Paper AAB/6/2021-22)**

3. ES(AM) briefed Members on the progress of major heritage conservation issues and activities from 1 February 2021 to 15 May 2021, including the proposed declaration of three Grade 1 historic buildings as monuments, preservation, restoration and maintenance of historic buildings and structures,

archaeological work, and educational and publicity activities detailed in the Board paper. She added that the Antiquities and Monuments Office (“AMO”) had been in collaboration with Hong Kong Cable Television Limited to film a series of TV episodes of “Wish” (《小事大意義》—「尋找歷史足印」) since March 2021 to help promote historic buildings and archaeology. Five episodes on the restoration of Duddell Street Steps and Gas Lamps in Central and Tat Tak Communal Hall in Yuen Long (both declared monuments), the stories and architectures of Confucius Hall in Causeway Bay and Bonham Road Government Primary School in Sai Ying Pun (both Grade 1) as well as Hip Tin Temple of Cheung Shue Tan in Tai Po (Grade 3) had been recently broadcast. Prof CHU Hoi-shan talked about the architectural merits of Confucian Hall in the programme. With the kind assistance of Prof CHING May-bo and Prof YAU Chi-on, a series of episodes featuring the history and heritage of Tai Po had also been filmed, among which, one had been broadcast earlier while the five were coming up. ES(AM) took the opportunity to thank the two Members for their participation and efforts in the filming, particularly their professional advice on selecting the historic buildings and archaeological sites in Tai Po with a view to promoting the history and heritage of the place in respect of its (i) trade and transport; (ii) ancestral halls and walled villages; (iii) temples and community; and (iv) administration of the New Territories.

4. Prof YAU Chi-on expressed his gratitude for the professionalism of AMO colleagues in the course of the research and filming work. He highlighted that various heritage items, such as temples, schools and churches, along Causeway Bay and Tai Hang were also worth filming for future episodes. Featured buildings might include Lin Fa Temple (a declared monument) and “Hung Shing Yi Hok” at No. 12 School Street (Grade 3, being revitalised into Tai Hang Fire Dragon Heritage Centre under Batch IV of the Revitalising Historic Buildings Through Partnership Scheme of the Development Bureau (“DEVB”)) in Tai Hang, as well as Tin Hau Temple (a declared monument), Hong Kong Red Swastika Society Building (Grade 2) and Po Leung Kuk Main Building (Grade 2) in Causeway Bay. The Chairman echoed and stressed the importance of the “point-line-plane” approach for reflecting the linkage between the heritage and the district.

5. Further to the progress update on the preparatory work for the assessment of post-1950 buildings at the last meeting, Prof Phyllis LI suggested expediting the relevant work. ES(AM) responded that the task force set up for handling the post-1950 buildings had been doing in-depth research on the subject

and obtaining and compiling pertinent information on assessment and conservation approaches on post-war buildings in consultation with various international heritage organisations. As there were some post-1950 buildings on the “List of New Items for Grading Assessment”, the task force was also conducting research on those items. AMO would report the progress to the Board and seek Members’ comments in due course. The Chairman remarked that there were over 40 post-1950 buildings on the “List of New Items for Grading Assessment” which have yet to be graded. He opined that the Board would continue to handle these items on the list, hoping to gain experience and to review whether the assessment criteria currently used for pre-1950 buildings would be applicable to post-1950 buildings in the course of grading assessment.

6. The Chairman remarked that there were recently media reports on several heritage related incidents. At the invitation of the Chairman, C for H, ES(AM) and C(Arch) briefed Members the background and updated the latest development of the following three cases respectively:

No. 190 Nathan Road, Tsim Sha Tsui, Kowloon, Grade 3

7. C for H said that No. 190 Nathan Road (the “Building”), a five-storey building under art deco and neo-classical influence, was accorded a Grade 3 status by the Board on 6 September 2018. In February 2021, the Commissioner for Heritage’s Office (“CHO”) and AMO were alerted under the internal monitoring mechanism that the owner of the Building had submitted a demolition plan to the Buildings Department (“BD”). CHO and AMO had proactively contacted the owner to introduce possible economic incentives that the Government would provide to private owners to encourage them to preserve their historic buildings. CHO and AMO would continue to liaise closely with the owner on possible “preservation-cum-development” proposals.

8. In response to Dr Jane Lee’s enquiry about the owner’s preliminary view, C for H replied that the owner would need more time for consideration.

9. Mr HO Kui-yip enquired if the owner owned any other buildings in the adjacent to the Building which could be jointly considered for preservation cum development options. C for H replied that it was understood that the owner did not have full ownership of the adjacent buildings.

10. Prof CHING May-bo enquired to what extent the Building had been altered, ES(AM) replied that most of the partition walls inside the Building had been altered to suit its current commercial use.

11. Mr Christopher LAW asked about the future gross floor area (“GFA”) comparing to the current GFA, commenting that the revenue brought by the demolition and redevelopment of the Building might be a concern by the owner. It was thus worth comparing both GFAs to facilitate the discussion on the economic incentives for preservation. C for H explained that the relevant development parameters of the lot had been shared with the owner and discussion with the owner on possible “preservation-cum-development” proposals was still underway.

Stanley Post Office, No. 2 Wong Ma Kok Road, Stanley, Hong Kong, Grade 2

12. ES(AM) reported that the Stanley Post Office (the “Post Office”), which had been in operation since 1937, was the oldest post office still in service in Hong Kong. In the evening of 5 May 2021, a bus ran into the Post Office causing damage to the building. AMO, Hongkong Post and the Architectural Services Department (“ArchSD”) conducted a site inspection in the next morning. According to ArchSD, while part of the wooden roof was damaged during the incident, the integrity of the roof structure had been maintained. Subsequent to temporary strengthening works carried out by ArchSD, the Post Office resumed operation. Besides, AMO had provided technical advice from the heritage conservation perspective on the maintenance proposal prepared by ArchSD. ArchSD was currently preparing the works tender. The repair works was expected to commence in September / October 2021 and last about two months.

13. In response to Ms Alice YIP’s enquiry about the party responsible for the repairing cost of the Post Office, ES(AM) replied that ArchSD would look into the matter.

14. Mr LEE Ping-kuen asked if it would be hard to source and replace the damaged wooden materials. ES(AM) replied that so far AMO had not come across such problem in the course of the repairing and maintenance work.

Lung Tsun Stone Bridge Preservation Corridor at Kai Tak

15. C(Arch) reported that the Finance Committee of the Legislative Council approved the funding proposal on the *in-situ* preservation of the Lung Tsun Stone Bridge (“LTSB”) remnants and the construction of LTSB Preservation Corridor at Kai Tak (the “LTSB Project”) on 26 March 2021. The construction of the LTSB Project, led by ArchSD, commenced in April 2021 and was targeted for completion in around four years. Upon completion of the LTSB Project, the preservation corridor would be managed by the Leisure and Cultural Services Department (“LCSD”). To introduce to the public the history and archaeological work of the LTSB as well as its relationship with the cultural heritage nearby, different means of media, such as old photos, three-dimensional models and interactive multimedia displays, would be used in the display areas and the interpretation facilities along both sides of the preservation corridor. According to the recommendation from the heritage impact assessment in respect of the LTSB Project, a qualified archaeologist would be appointed by ArchSD to apply for a licence in accordance with the Antiquities and Monuments Ordinance (Cap. 53) for conducting archaeological watching brief and archaeological excavation. AMO would report the progress of the archaeological work to the Board at suitable juncture and seek the Board’s comments if necessary.

16. Prof Phyllis LI emphasised the importance of the integration of the design concept of the LTSB Project with the developments in Kai Tak in the neighbourhood. CAS(W)2 explained that appropriate conditions would be included in the relevant lease of the development projects in the neighbourhood to suit the LTSB Project. For instance, underground walkways and exits to be connected to the preservation corridor.

17. Dr LAM Weng-cheong enquired how the preservation corridor could link up LTSB with Kowloon Walled City so as to reflect their historical relationship especially in association with the Kowloon Walled City Park. He also asked about the scope of the archaeological work to be conducted under the LTSB Project. C for H replied that the preservation corridor and Kowloon Walled City Park were both managed / would be managed by LCSD. He understood that LCSD was planning to organise related activities to link up the historical significance of LTSB and Kowloon Walled City upon completion of the LTSB Project. In addition, enhancement works with historical elements would also be conducted at Shek Ku Lung Road Playground located between the preservation corridor and Kowloon Walled City to connect the old town to the new

development area. ES(AM) supplemented that further archaeological work would be carried out around the wall foundation of the Pavilion for Greeting Officials after removal of the concrete above. Also, as remnants of LTSB had been backfilled, the archaeologist would have to remove the fill for further archaeological work. The heritage consultant and the archaeologist of the LTSB Project would work closely on the archaeological work.

18. In response to Prof CHING May-bo's enquiry, ES(AM) said that the remnants excavated would be preserved and displayed without reconstructing the missing parts. C(Arch) added that full archaeological excavation of LTSB had been carried out between 2011 and 2012 to expose the extent of LTSB. The excavations revealed the archaeological significance of the historic site in Kowloon City.

19. Prof Phyllis LI suggested taking the opportunity of the full Tuen Ma Line commissioning to promote heritage education and share more about the concept of the LTSB Project with the public. Ms Vanessa CHEUNG echoed, adding that the design of the LTSB Project should enable dialogues with the public and the private developments in the neighbourhood so that the history of LTSB could be meaningfully portrayed and narrated. C for H thanked for the suggestions and shared with Members that the heritage consultant of the LTSB Project would explore ways and make use of new technology to enrich visitors' experience in appreciating this historical place. AMO would provide technical advice.

20. Mr HO Kui-yip enquired on the government department responsible for overseeing the LTSB Project and wished that a platform could be made available for exchange of views to further enhance the design of the LTSB Project. CAS(W)2 replied that the policy bureau of the LTSB Project was CHO of DEVB, while ArchSD was the works agent and LCSD was the client department. LCSD would also be responsible for the management of the preservation corridor upon completion. AMO would provide technical advice to ArchSD from the heritage conservation perspective. ES(AM) supplemented that LCSD had committed to seek AMO's comments on the display and heritage interpretation of the LTSB Project. Members' comments would be conveyed. She assured that AMO would work closely with LCSD and ArchSD on the LTSB Project, and report the progress to the Board and seek Members' comments at suitable juncture.

21. Mr Tony IP recalled that the “Design Ideas Competition for Preservation Corridor for Lung Tsun Stone Bridge Remnants” (the “Competition”), a public competition, was held earlier. He enquired the relationship between the Competition and the current LTSB Project as well as the successfulness of the Competition. CAS(W)2 explained that the current design concept of the LTSB Project was derived from that of the Competition’s winner with suitable modifications taking into account the construction cost.

22. Mr Ronald LIANG shared with Members on the approach adopted by some overseas countries in respect of the interpretation of historical significance of long bridges. Permanent graphics with explanation would be installed at suitable points of long bridges to explain their construction and history so as to allow public’s appreciation of their design and heritage values. He asked whether such approach would be adopted in the design of the preservation corridor. C for H replied that the heritage consultant of the LTSB Project would work towards this approach. For instance, various means of interpretation would be used along the corridor such as displaying of photographs and physical exhibits with the use of advanced technology (e.g. virtual reality and augmented reality).

23. To conclude, the Chairman asked AMO to take note of Members’ views above, in particular with regard to the means of display and interpretation of the historic significance of the LTSB Project and the linkage between LTSB and its vicinity, as well as the heritage education for the public. He welcomed further progress updates on the LTSB Project by AMO when necessary.

Item 3 Assessment of Historic Buildings (Board Paper AAB/7/2021-22)

Confirmation of Proposed Grading for New Items

24. ES(AM) recapped that the Board had endorsed the proposed grading of the following three items at the meeting on 11 March 2021:

- (i) Steps of Pound Lane, Sai Ying Pun, Hong Kong, Proposed Grade 2 (Serial No. N27);
- (ii) Ex-Sham Shui Po Service Reservoir (“Ex-SSP SR”) (commonly known as Mission Hill Service Reservoir / Woh Chai Shan Service Reservoir), Sham Shui Po, Kowloon, Proposed Grade 1 (Serial No. N367); and

- (iii) Ex-Yaumati Service Reservoir (“Ex-YMT SR”), King's Park, Yau Ma Tei, Kowloon, Proposed Grade 1 (Serial No. N368).

In line with the established practice, a one-month public consultation on the proposed grading of the above three items was conducted from 15 March to 15 April 2021.

25. ES(AM) reported that no submission had been received for Steps of Pound Lane, while 12 written submissions with 14 views on Ex-SSP SR and Ex-YMT SR were received during the public consultation. The submissions had been provided to Members before the meeting. The views received were summarised as below:

- (i) six supported the proposed grading of Ex-SSP SR, including two mentioning that the group value of the item should be assessed from the Kowloon’s waterworks system / typological perspective instead of from the geographical perspective;
- (ii) one objected to the proposed grading of Ex-SSP SR considering that the old construction might bring about safety concern, and the abandoned service reservoir had no collective memory and thus not worth grading;
- (iii) five had no indication of support or objection to the proposed grading of Ex-SSP SR but were mainly suggestions / comments on the revitalisation works to be conducted such as the construction materials to be used, the design and future usage of Ex-SSP SR, the concern on safety etc.; and
- (iv) two supported the proposed grading of Ex-YMT SR, including one mentioning that the group value of the item should be assessed from the typological perspective instead of from the geographical perspective.

ES(AM) remarked that AMO concurred that typology perspective should be taken into account when making assessment. The findings on the significance on typology had been elaborated under “rarity” in the heritage appraisals of Ex-SSP SR and Ex-YMT SR, while “group value” in the heritage appraisals mainly described the findings in terms of their geographical significance.

Steps of Pound Lane, Sai Ying Pun, Hong Kong, Proposed Grade 2 (Serial No. N27)

26. Members had no comment and agreed to confirm the proposed Grade 2 status for Steps of Pound Lane, Sai Ying Pun, Hong Kong (Serial No. N27).

Ex-Sham Shui Po Service Reservoir (commonly known as Mission Hill Service Reservoir / Woh Chai Shan Service Reservoir), Sham Shui Po, Kowloon, Proposed Grade 1 (Serial No. N367)

27. Dr Jane LEE noted that many of the submissions received were from local residents. She hoped that local engagement would be involved in the revitalisation of Ex-SSP SR to enhance the community's recognition for the future conservation of the service reservoir.

28. With no further view, Members agreed to confirm the proposed Grade 1 status for Ex-SSP SR.

Ex-Yaumati Service Reservoir, King's Park, Yau Ma Tei, Kowloon, Proposed Grade 1 (Serial No. N368)

29. Members had no comment and agreed to confirm the proposed Grade 1 status for Ex-YMT SR.

Confirmation of Proposed Grading for Items with Objections

30. 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 Grade 3 status for Nos. 30-31 Sun Chun Street, Tai Hang, Causeway Bay, Hong Kong (Serial No. 753) (the "Item"). The objection letter and reply in respect of the Item had been provided to Members before the meeting.

Nos. 30-31 Sun Chun Street, Tai Hang, Causeway Bay, Hong Kong, Proposed Grade 3 (Serial No. 753)

31. C(HB)2 reported that the then owners objected to the proposed Grade 3 status of the Item as they were concerned that the grading might impact on their privacy and hinder future development plan. They also considered that the interior of the Item had no historical value and thus was not worth grading. The independent Historic Buildings Assessment Panel (the “Assessment Panel”), after reviewing the written objection provided by the then owners, maintained the proposed grading of the Item as no new information on the heritage value of the Item was provided. Furthermore, the ownership of the Item had been changed. The current owner had no objection to the proposed grading of the Item and expressed interest in applying for FAS to maintain the historic building.

32. With the aid of powerpoint, C(HB)2 briefed Members on the heritage value and the latest condition of the Item.

33. Members had no comment and agreed to confirm the proposed Grade 3 status for the Item.

New Items for Grading Assessment

34. The Chairman thanked Members for attending the site visits to Albany Fresh Water Service Reservoir (“AFWSR”) on 29 January 2021; Peak Fresh Water Service Reservoir (“PFWSR”) on 30 and 31 March 2021; and Mount Gough Fresh Water Service Reservoir (“MGFWSR”) and Shek Kip Mei Health Centre (the “Health Centre”) on 27 May 2021.

(i) *Albany Fresh Water Service Reservoir, Magazine Gap Road, Mid-levels, Hong Kong, Proposed Grade 1 (Serial No. N371)*

(ii) *Albany Fresh Water Pumping Station, Magazine Gap Road, Mid-levels, Hong Kong, Proposed Grade 3 (Serial No. N385)*

(iii) *Peak Fresh Water Service Reservoir, Mount Austin Road, The Peak, Hong Kong, Proposed Grade 1 (Serial No. N369)*

(iv) *Mount Gough Fresh Water Service Reservoir, Pollock's Path, The Peak, Hong Kong, Proposed Grade 1 (Serial No. N370)*

35. The Chairman welcomed Mr CHAN Tze-ho, retired Chief Engineer of Civil Engineering and Development Department and Mr WONG Hei-nok, Senior

Engineer of Water Supplies Department (“WSD”) to the meeting to brief Members on items (i) to (iv).

36. With the aid of video clips and powerpoint, C(HB)2, Mr CHAN Tsz-ho and Mr WONG Hei-nok briefed Members on the historical development, heritage value, architectural merit and the proposed grading of the four items.

37. In response to Mr Peter LAU Man-pong’s enquiry on the grading boundary of AFWSR, Mr WONG Hei-nok explained that the area where the filter beds were located did not fall into the proposed grading boundary, on grounds that the filter beds had been removed in early days and that area had become a recreational land which no longer performed any water treatment function for AFWSR since then.

38. Mr HO Kui-yip supported the proposed grading of AFWSR. He suggested that in assessing the group value of service reservoirs, it would be more complete to take into account their respective related waterworks facilities or systems rather than only the geographical group value associated with the historic structures in the vicinity. As for Albany Fresh Water Pumping Station (“AFWPS”), although its exterior looked simple, he considered that its construction design was smart and functional. The high windows facilitated good ventilation and prevented water from leaking into the walls from the top. The overall interior layout was complete in which its water distribution system, lifting equipment and corbels were all in good condition. Having considered that AFWPS demonstrated the technological change of water pumps of the past, and was a significant milestone in the water supply system, he opined that it would worth a higher grading status than Grade 3.

39. The Chairman agreed with Mr HO Kui-yip’s view on the assessment basis in respect of the group value of service reservoirs, similar to the comments on Ex-SSP SR received during public consultation as mentioned in paragraph 25(i) above. He suggested to elaborate more in the heritage appraisals of AFWSR, PFWSR and MGFWSR.

40. ES(AM) said that apart from the geographical perspective, AMO had taken into account the similar types of structures when assessing the group value of the three service reservoirs. A macro-assessment of the roles played by them in the overall water supply system of the Hong Kong Island had been conducted with WSD.

41. Prof CHING May-bo shared the view of Mr HO Kui-yip that the interior of AFWPS was of high historical value. She highlighted the importance of preserving the components inside AFWPS during recurrent maintenance and avoiding replacement of the components by modern ones with lower cost.

42. Mr SHUM Ho-kit said that the three service reservoirs were built in different years and locations. Their construction materials and architectural styles varied from each other and each had its own characteristics. Given the three service reservoirs had a longer history than Ex-SSP SR and Ex-YMT SR, they should also merit the same Grade 1 status. He further suggested WSD to explore the feasibility of setting up a museum, similar to the nature of the H₂OPE Centre in Tin Shui Wai which was a new public education centre to promote water conservation, and to introduce the history of the century-old service reservoirs which were not accessible by the public. The Chairman thanked him for the suggestion, adding that the three service reservoirs were still in operation and were classified as confined spaces which could only be accessed by people with a valid licence to confined spaces.

43. In response to Mr Christopher LAW's enquiry on the heritage value of Severn Road Fresh Water Pumping Station, Mr CHAN Tsz-ho explained the role of this water pumping station in the water supply network. As it was a submersible pumping station, more time would be required for an in-depth research.

44. Mr Tony IP supported the proposed grading of the three service reservoirs and remarked that there might be a need to review the historical significance of other infrastructures as well apart from the water supply system, such as the sewerage system and the power distribution system, so that their functional merits could be properly recorded. Besides, he wished that more educational work could be done to alert the public to the safety issue given the access restriction of the items which were confined space, while exploring ways for their appreciation by the public. Lastly, as the Board had already assessed the grading of the five century-old service reservoirs, he enquired if there were any other service reservoirs built between early to mid-twentieth century which warranted grading in the future.

45. In response to Mr Tony IP's comments, the Chairman shared with Members that WSD had launched a 360-degree virtual tour of Ex-SSP SR earlier to enable and facilitate the appreciation of the service reservoir by the public

through electronic devices. Regarding service reservoirs built after early twentieth century, Mr WONG Hei-nok replied that they were built by more mature and improved technology. The brick works commonly used in the past had been gradually replaced by concrete. He quoted the example of Western Fresh Water and Salt Water Pumping Station which was entirely built of concrete in 1918. As waterworks installations spanned the whole Hong Kong territory, a great deal of preparatory work in researching relevant information had to be done before grading assessment on the heritage value of different service reservoirs could be carried out.

46. Prof CHU Hoi-shan opined that the grading assessment of the three service reservoirs on the Hong Kong Island gave a complete picture on the water supply system in the City of Victoria, suggesting that the water supply system should be assessed together with relevant historical maps in order to understand further the change in settlement as well as the number of households. As service reservoirs had no direct interface with the public, he trusted that the then architects would have never expected that there would be visitors visiting them, thus he appreciated the honest expression of the components inside. Lastly, he shared the same view of Mr HO Kui-yip that AFWPS might worth a higher grading status than Grade 3, taking into consideration the high authenticity of its interior layout.

47. Dr LAM Weng-cheong considered that the proposed grading of the three service reservoirs were appropriate and thanked AMO and WSD for arranging site visits to them within a short period of time. As for AFWPS, he enquired if there were any other similar pumping stations being graded or would be graded later for reference. Although he agreed to the proposed Grade 3 status for AFWPS, he considered that there were rooms for discussion on how the core historical value of AFWPS could further be elaborated, taking into account its functional and mechanical significance.

48. Prof YAU Chi-on echoed and quoted the example of the former Pumping Station of WSD in Shanghai Street, Yau Ma Tei (Grade 1). Although the architectural appearance of AFWPS was simple, he considered that its interior layout was functional and suggested to consider upgrading its proposed grading to reflect its historical value and functional significance. He shared with Members the “Water Exhibition” organised by The Conservancy Association Centre for Heritage in 2020 which mentioned service reservoirs, and encouraged Members to view the exhibition online. Besides, he supported the proposed grading of the three items.

49. Ms Vanessa CHEUNG supported the proposed grading of the three service reservoirs. In regard to that of AFWPS, she enquired about the possibility of grading the whole waterworks system, including the AFWPS, as Grade 1 on the basis of its group value instead of grading the AFWPS individually grading it to manifest its functional value. In addition, she pointed out that preservation of utilities system (such as the waterworks system) was one of the reasons to zone country parks nowadays. Hence, it would be meaningful to explain to the public the rationale behind the required zoning as well as for the public's better understanding on the city's development.

50. Dr Jane LEE enquired if it would be possible to launch virtual tours for other service reservoirs, similar to that of Ex-SSP SR, to facilitate appreciation by the public. Besides, she suggested engaging members of the public in the promotional activities in relation to the service reservoirs, as well as uploading the presentations on the service reservoirs by Mr CHAN Tsz-ho and Mr WONG Hei-nok on the internet to educate the public the long history of the water supply system. Miss Theresa YEUNG shared the same view, adding that live tour could also be an option apart from virtual tour to let the public discover our living heritage.

51. Mr LEE Ping-kuen supported the proposed grading of the three service reservoirs. He thanked AMO and WSD for the elaboration on the five century-old service reservoirs which allowed the public to understand the enormous work done in the past to support our daily lives, and was proud of all the engineers involved as well as the professional knowledge of Mr CHAN Tsz-ho and Mr WONG Hei-nok.

52. Prof Phyllis Li commented that service reservoirs were built out of the need arising from the city's development. She therefore suggested AMO and WSD to review the whole network of the old service reservoirs, including masonry bridges and dams, with a view to comparing the historical value of different water supply systems in different times. Such review might serve as useful reference when the Board considered declaring some of the graded service reservoirs as monuments in future. Also, she considered it important to let the public understand the access restriction to service reservoirs to avoid unnecessary incidents and agreed on using virtual means to facilitate the public to appreciate them. She highlighted that service reservoirs were good stories in illustrating the urban development and engineering innovation in the past through which public awareness on climate change, promotion of carbon neutrality, total water management and water conservation could be enhanced as the service reservoirs

carried historical meaning on prudent water resources management.

53. C(HB)2 shared that AMO and WSD had been working closely together on the grading assessment of waterworks installations. So far, 41 of them had been declared as monuments, in which 10, 24 and 10 were accorded Grade 1, Grade 2 and Grade 3 status respectively, including some pumping stations. Mr CHAN Tsz-ho was pleased to see Members' interest in service reservoirs. He also explained that the pumps currently installed in AFWPS were not the original ones installed in 1939.

54. After deliberation, the Chairman concluded that Members unanimously supported the proposed grading of the three service reservoirs. With no further view, Members agreed to endorse the proposed Grade 1 status for them. As for AFWPS, in view of Members' views above, the Chairman suggested a review of the heritage value of AFWPS by the Assessment Panel, particularly in relation to its group value and its role played in the water supply system and history. The proposed grading of AFWPS would be discussed further at the next meeting.

(v) ***Shek Kip Mei Health Centre, No. 2 Berwick Street, Sham Shui Po, Kowloon, Proposed Nil Grade (Serial No. N376)***

55. With the aid of powerpoint, C(HB)3 briefed Members on the historical background, construction, usage and the current condition of the Health Centre. The Assessment Panel, after assessing the heritage value of the Health Centre, proposed a Nil Grade status for it.

56. Prof Phyllis LI considered that the Health Centre warranted a grading in view of its historical value in the overall local context of Shek Kip Mei as it witnessed the community's development for over half a century after the Shek Kip Mei Fire of 1953 and had close ties with Mei Ho House (the remaining building of the former Shek Kip Mei Estate) and Ex-SSP SR. Apart from playing an important role in the area of medical and health care in the past, it also had significant social value as it was initiated by the Shamshuipo Kaifong Welfare Association. On the other hand, the simple appearance of the Health Centre reflected the functional constructional value of the past. The alterations undergone could be repaired and fixed up to manifest the original beauty of the building.

57. ES(AM) explained that the Assessment Panel had conducted a site inspection to the Health Centre, assessed all related information, and reviewed its heritage value with reference to other similar buildings. Considering that the community's emphasis on the Health Centre was more on the provision of its services rather than the building itself, and the internal alterations and refurbishment had diminished the authenticity of the building, the Assessment Panel proposed a Nil Grade status for the Health Centre. Prof Phyllis LI responded that the community had a close tie with the services provided by the Health Centre up till then, which made it a living heritage distinguishable from other post-1950 old clinics. Dr LAM Weng-cheong echoed, adding that the historical value of the Health Centre in the overall local context of Shek Kip Mei should be recognised as it witnessed the demographical change of the community.

58. Prof CHU Hoi-shan supported the proposed Nil Grade status of the Health Centre. He noted from an old photo that the elevation of the Health Centre possessed modernist and functional expression when first built in 1957. However, it was different from what he had seen in the later years. He was disappointed with its current plain elevation which had no obvious exposing features, unlike other post-1950 buildings also with modernist design such as the General Out-Patient Clinic at Central District Health Centre and Hong Kong City Hall (Grade 1), both in Central. Also, he would expect more details on the handrails and skirting of the staircases. Considering that the two-storey building did not show any change in volume, the architectural value of the Health Centre was relatively low. In addition, he observed during the site visit that there were not many patients using the services of the Health Centre and it was obsolete.

59. Mr Tony IP shared with Members that he once received medical service in the Health Centre during his childhood. He viewed that the historical meaning of the Health Centre associated more with the provision of its services rather than the building itself. Besides, the interior had been completely altered, e.g. many windows designed for natural ventilation had been replaced by glass for installation of air-conditioning. He wondered whether the Health Centre should be physically preserved for adaptive reuse for other purposes, or the provision of healthcare services should be maintained to cater for the community's need. It would be worthwhile to explore ways to record the role and the contribution of the Health Centre so that the public could understand its historical value.

60. Miss Theresa YEUNG said that architectural value was one of the major considerations out of the six established assessment criteria when grading historic

buildings. She had recently visited some other historic buildings and found that those functional ones usually involved public interest or collective memory. To keep pace with the changing era, she suggested transforming or redeveloping the Health Centre so as to inherit its medical and healthcare functions to serve Shek Kip Mei's community. She stressed that heritage conservation did not necessarily entail grading of historic buildings. She suggested that it would suffice to preserve the character-defining elements ("CDE") of the Health Centre given its low architectural value and the population density in Shek Kip Mei. In addition, she believed that it would be reasonable to preserve the CDE of the building in the re-development and allow it to continue its mission to serve the bigger community with more medical services demanded nowadays.

61. Ms Alice YIP considered that architectural merit should receive higher weighting among the six established assessment criteria when grading historical buildings and added that heritage conservation should also attain sustainable development.

62. Mr LEE Ping-kuen shared with Members his story of a broken rattan chair which carried lots of family's memory, highlighting that such memory in fact could be recorded by texts or films for viewing anytime later. By the same token, as the provision of services at the Health Centre could be performed by other clinics or hospitals, it would be possible to vacate the space for other usage given its low architectural value. Besides, he was concerned that there would be certain restrictions on the redevelopment of the Health Centre to serve the community once it has been graded and therefore, he supported the proposed Nil Grade status.

63. Mr SHUM Ho-kit declared that he was a member of the Steering Committee on Primary Healthcare Development, and had involvement in work relating to land planning for development of healthcare services. He supported the proposed Nil Grade status for the Health Centre. He opined that old clinics, in particular the low block ones, with no architectural merit should be used for redevelopment given the growing medical needs. Besides, he expressed concern over the restriction on further re-development of the Health Centre that might be brought about if it was accorded a grading status, and suggested preserving its CDE for display in the new building.

64. Mr HO Kui-yip considered that although the Health Centre had some architectural style, it was not the only surviving building of its type in Hong Kong. Moreover, the interior alterations had hidden its original atmosphere of the past.

He supported the proposed Nil Grade status. He suggested to properly record the Health Centre's historical significance by texts or other means.

65. The Chairman concluded that Members generally supported the proposed Nil Grade status for the Health Centre, yet suggesting preserving its CDE or recording its historical significance by texts or other means in case there were redevelopment plans in the future so as to showcase its contributions and role played in Sham Shui Po over the years. With no further view, Members agreed to endorse the proposed Nil Grade status for the Health Centre.

Item 4 Any Other Business

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

Antiquities and Monuments Office

September 2021

Ref: AMO/22-3/1