

ANTIQUITIES ADVISORY BOARD

Minutes of the 196th Meeting
on Thursday, 10 March 2022 at 2:30 pm
Online via Video Conferencing

Present: Mr SO Cheung-tak, Douglas, BBS, JP (Chairman)
Ms CHEUNG Tih-lin, Vanessa
Prof CHING May-bo
Prof CHU Hoi-shan
Mr HO Kui-yip, MH, JP
Mr IP Chung-man, Tony
Dr LAM Weng-cheong
Mr LAU Man-pong, Peter
Dr LEE Ching-yee, Jane, JP
Mr LEE Ping-kuen, JP
Prof LI Chi-miu, Phyllis, BBS
Ms SEE Sau-mei, Salome
Mr SHUM Ho-kit, BBS, 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 LAW Kin-chung, Christopher, JP
Mr LIANG Ronald
Mr YUEN Siu-bun, Edward

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]

Miss Clarissa WAN
Assistant Secretary (Heritage Conservation) 3
[AS(HC)3]

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

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

Miss Beatrice WONG
Curator (Historical Buildings) 3 [C(HB)3]

Architectural Services Department

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

Ms Liny LAU
Senior Maintenance Surveyor / Heritage [SMS/H]

Leisure and Cultural Services Department

Ms Esa LEUNG
Assistant Director (Heritage & Museum) [AD(H&M)]

Planning Department

Ms April KUN
Assistant Director of Planning / Metro [AD/M]

Opening Remarks

The Chairman welcomed Members and government representatives to the meeting conducted by video conferencing in view of the current situation of the COVID-19 pandemic.

Item 1 Confirmation of Minutes of the 195th Meeting held on 9 December 2021 (Board Minutes AAB/4/2021-22)

2. The minutes of the 195th Meeting held on 9 December 2021 were confirmed without amendment.

**Item 2 Matters Arising and Progress Report
(Board Paper AAB/17/2021-22)**

3. ES(AM) briefed Members on the progress of the major heritage conservation issues and activities from 1 November 2021 to 15 February 2022, including major preservation, restoration and maintenance of historic buildings projects, archaeological work, and educational and publicity activities detailed in the Board paper. She added that the proposal of declaring three Grade 1 historic buildings as monuments would be discussed under agenda item 3 (i.e. Board paper AAB/18/2021-22).

**Item 3 Declaration of Three Historic Buildings as Monuments
(Board Paper AAB/18/2021-22)**

4. The Chairman said that having regard to the current situation of the COVID-19 pandemic and the need for social distancing, the site visits originally scheduled for 3 and 4 March 2022 to the three items proposed for declaration as monuments as well as the three new items proposed for grading had been cancelled. To facilitate Members' discussion, videos and photos in respect of these items would be presented during the meeting. The three items proposed for declaration as monuments were as follows:

- (i) Jamia Mosque, No. 30 Shelley Street, Central, Hong Kong, Grade 1 (Serial No. 53);
- (ii) Lui Seng Chun, No. 119 Lai Chi Kok Road, Mong Kok, Kowloon, Grade 1 (Serial No. 58); and
- (iii) Hong Kong City Hall, Edinburgh Place, Central, Hong Kong, Grade 1 (Serial No. 52).

5. The Chairman added that the three items above were selected from the pool of Grade 1 historic buildings, indicating that they had reached the "high threshold" for consideration of declaration as monuments for statutory protection.

6. Before discussion, the Chairman took the opportunity to thank The Incorporated Trustees of the Islamic Community Fund of Hong Kong (the "Trustees") (the management organisation of Jamia Mosque), the Hong Kong Baptist University (the operating organisation of the revitalised Lui Seng Chun),

as well as the Home Affairs Bureau and the Leisure and Cultural Services Department (“LCSD”) (the policy bureau and the management department of Hong Kong City Hall respectively) for their support for the study and the intended declaration of the three items.

7. At the Chairman’s invitation, C(HB)2 briefed Members on the heritage values of the three items with the aid of videos and powerpoint slides.

Jamia Mosque, No. 30 Shelley Street, Central, Hong Kong, Grade 1 (Serial No. 53)

8. In response to the Chairman’s enquiry, C(HB)2 replied that Jamia Mosque would be the first mosque declared as monument in Hong Kong upon declaration.

9. Mr LEE Ping-kuen and Mr Tony IP supported the proposed declaration. Mr Tony IP considered that Jamia Mosque had rich architectural merit but the public might not have chance to visit it as it was a religious place. He asked if there would be any means (e.g. online videos) to let the public understand the history and the architectural characteristics of the mosque, particularly its interiors. Besides, he enquired about the proposed monument boundary and opined that the environs of the mosque also made up the uniqueness of the building.

10. Prof Phyllis LI supported the proposed declaration. She mentioned that there were different long-established religious places in the vicinity of Jamia Mosque, representing the co-existence of different religions and illustrating religious freedom in Hong Kong. Besides, she noticed the vacant site adjacent to Jamia Mosque and enquired whether there was any development plan which might affect the ambience of Jamia Mosque.

11. Prof YAU Chi-on and Mr Brian TSANG supported the proposed declaration. They were pleased to see religious inclusion demonstrated through the declaration of Jamia Mosque as declared monument. As mainly Chinese temples and Christian churches had been declared in the past, the declaration of Jamia Mosque could represent cultural diversity and co-existence of different religions in Hong Kong.

12. Mr SHUM Ho-kit echoed, adding that Jamia Mosque was worth declaring as monument in view of its historical significance and architectural appearance. Furthermore, Jamia Mosque was of high social value particularly

for the ethnic minorities (i.e. the Muslim community) as it was the mosque in Hong Kong built for their worship, making it a valuable place for the local Muslims. In response to his enquiry on the nationality of Mr MA Chik Ting who presented the *mimber* placed by the side of the *mihrab* of Jamia Mosque, C(HB)2 replied that Mr MA Chik Ting was a local resident as proclaimed in the inscriptions inscribed on the *mimber*.

13. Mr HO Kui-yip supported the proposed declaration. Considering that the surroundings of Jamia Mosque, which were envired by greenery and fence walls with no other developments, had blended in as a contextual compound of the mosque, he suggested expanding the proposed monument boundary. In addition, he wished that the maintenance plan for the featuring old metal spiral staircase at the corner of the entrance portico should be put in place as the staircase might deteriorate easily and quickly in light of the unavailability of the required workmanship nowadays.

14. Ms Salome SEE shared with the views of Mr SHUM Ho-kit and Mr Tony IP in regard to the social value of Jamia Mosque and the possible means to promote declared monuments. She suggested taking videos of Jamia Mosque and interviewing the worshippers so that the mosque could be livelily interpreted to the public.

15. Mr Brian TSANG said that prayers were held five times a day in Jamia Mosque and the usage of the mosque was higher than other religious places. He wished that the praying arrangements of Jamia Mosque could be made clear to the public in the videos in order not to disturb the holding of religious events while visiting the mosque as well as to show respect for the religion. The Chairman echoed, suggesting the Antiquities and Monuments Office (“AMO”) to further discuss the filming of Jamia Mosque with the Trustees, and also to make use of “HK Heritage LIVE 活歷。香港”, the Instagram platform of the Commissioner for Heritage’s Office (Instagram name: @hkheritagelive), for appropriate promotion.

16. ES(AM) thanked Members for their comments and suggestions. She explained that Jamia Mosque was open to the public. With regard to the promotion of Jamia Mosque as a monument, with the support of the Trustees, AMO had taken full photographic recording as well as video recording of the mosque and planned to upload the videos online after editing and upon declaration of Jamia Mosque as monument. AMO would further liaise with the Trustees to plan and organise guided tours for the public. As for the metal spiral staircase, it

fell within the proposed monument boundary and AMO would pay special attention to its maintenance. In order to provide statutory protection to the mosque building which was of heritage significance as early as possible, the proposed monument boundary was agreed by the Trustees. Regarding the vacant site adjacent to Jamia Mosque, there had been a planning application for development as quarters use of Jamia Mosque but the planning permission had already lapsed.

Lui Seng Chun, No. 119 Lai Chi Kok Road, Mong Kok, Kowloon, Grade 1 (Serial No. 58)

17. Ms Salome SEE supported the proposed declaration. She shared with Members that she had visited the revitalised Lui Seng Chun when she was a member of the Advisory Committee on Revitalisation of Historic Buildings. She commented that Lui Seng Chun was very elegant and all its characteristics had been retained after revitalisation. The building had fully utilised its land as reflected from its architectural form. Also, the addition of fire safety provisions (e.g. the staircase as fire escape route) was in harmony with the building architecturally. She highlighted that the donation of Lui Seng Chun on a totally non-remunerated basis by the LUI family to the Government for preservation and public enjoyment further added value to Lui Seng Chun, making it worth being declared as monument.

18. Prof CHING May-bo shared the same view. She considered that the monument declaration of Lui Seng Chun could manifest its social value. Besides, she suggested that differentiating the old furniture and fixtures preserved with the new for proper recording and elaboration in the display would be useful. ES(AM) responded that the suggestion would be followed up. Mr Peter LAU shared with Members that the couplet shown in the powerpoint was written by a calligrapher of the Hong Kong Baptist University and was new.

19. Mr Tony IP supported the proposed declaration. He opined that Lui Seng Chun, being the first *tong lau* (literally Chinese-style building) to be declared as monument, could serve as a good example for educating and promoting to the public on the transformation of the building from an old privately-owned *tong lau* to a declared monument through successful revitalisation. Moreover, he emphasised the social significance of *tong lau* to the social development and people's livelihood, thus wishing that the social value of Lui Seng Chun could be livelily reflected upon its declaration as monument.

20. Prof CHU Hoi-shan supported the proposed declaration. He stressed the significance of the “timeline” of Lui Seng Chun. Firstly, the distinctive character-defining elements of Lui Seng Chun should be differentiated from the new elements so as to preserve the former in the context of heritage conservation. Secondly, the new additions, such as fixtures for meeting the present building regulations, would be of historical value decades later. Thirdly, the donation of Lui Seng Chun by the LUI family to the Government had imprinted the social significance on the history of the building.

21. Prof Phyllis LI supported the proposed declaration. She opined that it was rare to see private owners donating their properties to the Government. The revitalisation of Lui Seng Chun, now being a Chinese medicine and healthcare centre, was able to follow pertinently its original function as a Chinese medicine shop, amplifying the historical ambience for the building. From the urban planning perspective, Lui Seng Chun was a distinctive landmark sitting on a wedge-shaped site. Being the first *tong lau* for monument declaration, Lui Seng Chun was charming with distinctive architectural features (e.g. the deep verandahs above the arcades). With all these characters, Lui Seng Chun should be declared as monument in order to demonstrate it as a successful joint effort of the owner and the Government on heritage conservation. The Chairman echoed, adding that Lui Seng Chun was designed by a foreigner.

22. Mr Brian TSANG shared the views of Members. He considered that Lui Seng Chun was an impressive building. It was in European style and had housed a Chinese medicine business in the old days. It was currently serving the neighbourhood as a Chinese medicine and healthcare centre operated by the Hong Kong Baptist University. He suggested focusing on such a strong contrast between Chinese and Western elements in future promotional work of Lui Seng Chun, as well as promoting the building through different means and channels in order to reach the young generation for deepening their understanding of the historical value of the building.

23. Ms Vanessa CHEUNG supported the proposed declaration. She viewed that Lui Seng Chun was eye-catching and sublimely revitalised, wishing that further promotion could be carried out in creative and impressive ways to promote its social mission.

24. In response to Members’ comments and suggestions above, ES(AM) shared with Members that a conservation management plan had been done before the revitalisation of Lui Seng Chun to study various aspects of the building from

the heritage conservation perspective, including assessing its historical and social values and identifying its character-defining elements. Since heritage value of the building would evolve, the conservation management plan would be reviewed at suitable junctures. AMO would take Members' suggestions into account when planning future promotional work of Lui Seng Chun to attract more visitors and reach out to the young generation.

Hong Kong City Hall, Edinburgh Place, Central, Hong Kong, Grade 1 (Serial No. 52)

25. In response to the Chairman's enquiry, C(HB)2 replied that the Hong Kong City Hall would be the youngest monument in Hong Kong upon declaration.

26. Miss Theresa YEUNG supported the proposed declaration. She opined that the Hong Kong City Hall was the pioneer of modern architecture in Hong Kong. Through monument declaration, not only could the architectural merit of the building be manifested but it could also display Hong Kong's determination to conserve historic buildings of different ages. Moreover, the building had great social value, carrying fond collective memory of Hong Kong people as the place was a cultural and arts complex housing Marriage Registry, library, concert hall and theatre. Most importantly, it had been serving as a common place for public enjoyment from all walks of life since the early days, bringing about social integration. Upon its declaration, the popularity of the City Gallery, which was converted from the building's annex and devoted to showcase the vision for the city's planning projects, would also be enhanced. Besides, it also reflected the significant group value of the clusters of declared monuments and graded buildings in Central, the central business district of Hong Kong. It would also demonstrate how Hong Kong had been making every effort to conserve cultural and arts heritage and preserving collective memory along with its commercial and financial development.

27. Mr LEE Ping-ken supported the proposed declaration. He agreed that the Hong Kong City Hall was an important carrier for the collective memory for Hong Kong people. It was a well-known landmark and a popular place for registrations of marriage.

28. Prof CHING May-bo supported the proposed declaration, considering that the Hong Kong City Hall had testified the social development in Hong Kong during the post-war period. She wished that the public, especially the young generation, could be reminded of the significance of the building and its social

value through monument declaration. In addition, she suggested replaying the audio files of the opening ceremony of the Hong Kong City Hall in future promotional activities to rekindle the memories of this place and the past times.

29. Ms Alice YIP supported the proposed declaration. She shared with Members her marriage registration in the Hong Kong City Hall and used to bring her sons to visit the public library located in the building. She recalled that many exhibitions such as flower shows and book fairs had been held there. It would be opportune to declare the building as monument in celebration of its 60th anniversary in 2022, and suggested making a special programme or organising an exhibition for recording and displaying the history and collective memory of the place to all generations of the public.

30. Prof Phyllis LI supported the proposed declaration. She highlighted the historical significance of the Hong Kong City Hall as it was designated in the urban plan in the old days as a civic precinct to provide cultural facilities and quality public space for public enjoyment. She further emphasised the importance of appreciating the Hong Kong City Hall from the “point-line-plane” perspective, i.e. from the flagpoles at its entrance, to the nearby Edinburgh Place, Statue Square and the demolished Queen's Pier, which were inter-related and connected with the building. In terms of architectural and group values, the Hong Kong City Hall was situated in a cluster of representative modern architectural buildings (e.g. Statue Square, Edinburgh Place, Murray Building, Bank of China Building (Grade 1), the former Central Government Offices (where Main Wing, East Wing and West Wing were all Grade 1 buildings) etc.), embracing the social and historical developments in the past. She wished that there would be a better positioning of the Hong Kong City Hall upon monument declaration for enhancement of utilisation and long-term sustainability vis-à-vis the various newly-built cultural and arts facilities which were larger in scale and with contemporary designs, such as the West Kowloon Cultural District, the Hong Kong Museum of Art and the Hong Kong Museum of History.

31. ES(AM) took the opportunity to thank LCSD for providing valuable information of the Hong Kong City Hall in the course of AMO's research work. She shared with Members that the Radio Television Hong Kong recently broadcast the audio recording of the inauguration concerts held at the Concert Hall of the building on 4 and 5 March 2022. AMO would continue to work with LCSD to deepen its research work (e.g. to curate more stories behind the scene and conduct interviews with visitors and the public), and would further study the historic buildings in Central from the “point-line-plane” perspective with a view to

enhancing the public's understanding of the building, tapping on the celebration of its 60th anniversary in 2022.

32. With no further view from Members, the intended declaration of Jamia Mosque (Serial No. 53), Lui Seng Chun (Serial No. 58), and Hong Kong City Hall (Serial No. 52) as monuments under section 3(1) of the Antiquities and Monuments Ordinance (Cap. 53) was recommended by the Board.

Item 4 Assessment of Historic Buildings (Board Paper AAB/19/2021-22)

Confirmation of Proposed Grading for New Items

33. ES(AM) recapped that the Board had endorsed the proposed grading of the following two items at the meeting on 9 December 2021:

- (i) No. 95 Kat Hing Back Street, Tai O, Lantau Island, Proposed Grade 2 (Serial No. N387); and
- (ii) Staff Quarters of the Old Tai Po District Office North, No. 20 Wan Tau Kok Lane, Tai Po, New Territories, Proposed Grade 2 (Serial No. N381).

34. ES(AM) reported that in line with the established practice, a one-month public consultation on the proposed grading of the above two items had been conducted from 16 December 2021 to 16 January 2022, and no written submission had been received on the proposed grading status of the two items.

35. Members had no comment and the Board confirmed the grading of No. 95 Kat Hing Back Street (Serial No. N387), and Staff Quarters of the Old Tai Po District Office North (Serial No. N381), both as Grade 2.

Confirmation of Grading

36. ES(AM) briefed Members that among the 1,444 buildings considered by the Board in 2009, the proposed grading of some of them had yet been confirmed due to reasons such as objections or views received during the public consultation earlier, proposed redevelopment or planning application related to the buildings. 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 two items:

- (i) Nos. 405 & 407 Shek O Village, Shek O, Hong Kong, Proposed Grade 3 (Serial No. 878); and
- (ii) Central Market, No. 80 Des Voeux Road Central, Central, Hong Kong, Proposed Grade 3 (Serial No. 599).

Nos. 405 & 407 Shek O Village, Shek O, Hong Kong, Proposed Grade 3 (Serial No. 878)

37. C(HB)2 reported that the proposed grading of the building at Nos. 405 & 407 Shek O Village was endorsed by the Board in March 2009. The owner requested the Board in 2011 to withhold the confirmation of the proposed grading, and submitted written objections to the proposed grading to the Board in December 2020 and February 2021. AMO had provided written replies to the owner's representative in response to the objections. The relevant objection letters and replies on Nos. 405 & 407 Shek O Village had been provided to the independent Historic Buildings Assessment Panel (the "Assessment Panel") and Members before the meeting. No further submission was received from the owner's representative.

38. C(HB)2 further explained that the owner objected to the proposed Grade 3 status as it considered that the building was not worth grading, and worried that the grading might affect its legitimate rights and interests of the building. AMO had explained to the owner, supplemented with the heritage appraisal and photos of the building, that the heritage value of the building was assessed in accordance with the six established assessment criteria, i.e. (i) historical interest; (ii) architectural merit; (iii) group value; (iv) social value and local interest; (v) authenticity; and (vi) rarity. The grading system was administrative in nature aiming to provide an objective basis for assessing the heritage value of historic buildings as well as setting out the need for heritage conservation, and the grading would not affect the ownership, usage, management and development rights of the buildings graded. The Assessment Panel, after reviewing the written objections, maintained the proposed grading of Nos. 405 & 407 Shek O Village as Grade 3 as the objection letters did not provide any new information on the heritage value of the building.

39. With the aid of powerpoint, C(HB)2 briefed Members on the heritage value and the latest condition of Nos. 405 & 407 Shek O Village.

40. Mr SHUM Ho-kit supported confirming the grading of Nos. 405 & 407 Shek O Village. He shared with Members that he had visited the building before and considered it having historical and architectural values. Besides, he opined that many village houses in the New Territories and on Hong Kong Island had been accorded with at least Grade 3 status. As such, he viewed that the proposed grading for Nos. 405 & 407 Shek O Village was appropriate. On the other hand, having gone through the correspondences between the owner's representative and AMO, he considered that the objections by the owner were mainly procedural in nature with no new historical information on the buildings provided. The objections reflected a common misunderstanding on the grading system by the public although the Board or AMO had repeatedly explained that the grading would not affect the property rights of the owners of the buildings graded. The Chairman and Dr Jane LEE echoed.

41. Mr HO Kui-yip supported the confirmation of the grading of Nos. 405 & 407 Shek O Village. He expressed that the owner might worry that the grading status would impose extra responsibility (e.g. the buildings had to be open for public to visit upon grading) on the owner apart from affecting his property rights. Although maintenance works were conducted at Nos. 405 & 407 Shek O Village in recent years, there might be some parts that needed repairs. He suggested that the benefits of the grading status (e.g. the eligibility for applying for funding under the Financial Assistance for Maintenance Scheme on Built Heritage to maintain the buildings graded) could be highlighted to the owner so as to clarify his misconception on grading and to ease his concern.

42. With no further view, the Board confirmed the grading of Nos. 405 & 407 Shek O Village (Serial No. 878) as Grade 3.

Central Market, No. 80 Des Voeux Road Central, Central, Hong Kong, Proposed Grade 3 (Serial No. 599)

43. C(HB)2 reported that the proposed grading of the Central Market was endorsed by the Board in March 2009. Following that, a four-month public consultation was conducted in the same year and the relevant information had been uploaded to the AMO's website. During the public consultation, public views had been received requesting to review the proposed grading considering that the design of the Central Market was influenced by the modern architectural style, hence it was an important historic building. The relevant objection letters and replies from AMO had been provided to the Assessment Panel and Members before the meeting.

44. C(HB)2 further said that the Central Market ceased operation in March 2003 and was reopened after revitalisation in August 2021. It was currently a hub of retail shops, food outlets and community space for cultural and arts exhibitions and performances. The Assessment Panel, after reviewing the written objections and visiting the revitalised Central Market with the assistance of the Urban Renewal Authority, maintained the proposed grading of the building as the objections did not provide any new information on the heritage value of the market.

45. With the aid of powerpoint, C(HB)2 explained that the proposed grading boundary of the Central Market had been slightly adjusted in light of the demolition of the public lavatory originally located at the junction of Jubilee Street and Queen's Road Central and the Assessment Panel agreed to the adjustment. She further briefed Members on the heritage value and the latest condition of the building.

46. The Chairman mentioned that the Board had visited the revitalised Central Market on 24 August 2021, so he believed that Members were aware of the latest condition of the market.

47. Mr LEE Ping-kuen supported the confirmation of the grading of the Central Market.

48. In response to Prof CHU Hoi-shan's enquiry, C(HB)2 replied that the adjusted grading boundary of the Central Market did include the newly-built glass curtain walls located at the two corners of the façade facing towards Des Voeux Road Central.

49. With no further view, the Board confirmed the grading of the Central Market (Serial No. 599) as Grade 3.

New Items for Grading Assessment

Ex-Lamma Police Post, Hung Shing Yeh Wan, Lamma Island, Proposed Nil Grade (Serial No. N375)

50. The Chairman recapped that the originally proposed Grade 3 status of Ex-Lamma Police Post (the "Police Post") was discussed by the Board on 9 December 2021. The Board requested the Assessment Panel to review the proposed grading of the Police Post. The Assessment Panel, after reviewing the

assessment as well as the views collected in the community, adjusted the proposed grading of the Police Post to proposed Nil Grade.

51. With the aid of powerpoint, C(HB)3 recapped the heritage value and the current condition of the Police Post, as well as summarised Members views on the proposed grading expressed in the previous meeting. She further shared with Members the research work and the follow up actions taken by AMO since the last meeting, and the local views on the Police Post obtained through interviewing the Chairman of Lamma Island (North) Rural Committee, representatives of Yung Shue Long Village, Tai Yuen Village and Lamma Island Wai Chow Clansmen Association Limited in July 2021, as well as 40 residents of Yung Shue Wan, Hung Shing Yeh Wan and Sok Kwu Wan on 22 January and 18 February 2022. All the findings had been reported to the Assessment Panel which, after reviewing and deliberating the findings, proposed to adjust the grading status for the Police Post from proposed Grade 3 to proposed Nil Grade.

52. The Chairman thanked AMO for the detailed follow up actions which had addressed Members' comments and concerns expressed at the previous meeting.

53. Members had no comment and the Board endorsed the proposed Nil Grade status for Ex-Lamma Police Post (Serial No. N375).

Zetland Hall, No. 1 Kennedy Road, Central, Hong Kong, Proposed Grade 1 (Serial No. N42)

54. The Chairman briefed that as some related information on Zetland Hall had come to the attention of AMO after the issuance of the agenda and papers of this meeting which required further analysis, the grading proposal of Zetland Hall would be deferred.

Stone House, Central Kwai Chung Park, San Kwai Street, Kwai Chung, New Territories, Proposed Grade 2 (Serial No. N356)

55. With the aid of video and powerpoint, C(HB)3 briefed Members on the heritage value, the current condition and the proposed grading of the Stone House.

56. Ms Salome SEE supported the proposed grading and commended the outlook of the Stone House, emanating a feel of Cantonese dramas filmed in the old days. She was amazed to know that there had been such a dairy farm in the

Central Kwai Chung Park in the old days.

57. Mr HO Kui-yip echoed and supported the proposed grading as it would be a good opportunity to let the public realise the once existence of the two dairy farms in the district as well as the solitude of the Stone House. In addition, he said that the two-storey Stone House was maintained in good condition with characteristics, but suggested removing the pergola which covered the flat roof terrace of the building upon grading in order to reflect the authenticity of the “open-frame system” of the roof terrace.

58. Mr Tony IP supported the proposed grading. Taking the historical significance of the building into account, he enquired the possibility of revitalising the Stone House, viewing that the building could be put into more meaningful use. Also, he asked if the Stone House had any connection with the Tsung Tsin Mission of Hong Kong and the Basel Mission nowadays in view of their linkage in the past.

59. Regarding the flat roof terrace of the Stone House, ES(AM) responded that as the Stone House was being managed by LCSD, AMO would explore with LCSD to see if any follow up maintenance works could be carried out. As for the connection points between the Stone House and the two religious associations, AMO had conducted oral history interviews with the TSANG family (who had run the former Shui Fung Dairy Farm) earlier, and would continue to trace their linkage to enrich the historical value of the building.

60. Mr SHUM Ho-kit shared Mr Tony IP’s views regarding the current (as a park office of LCSD) and future uses of the Stone House. Besides, he suggested enhancing public education of the history of the building as visitors might not be aware of its history and not be able to visit the interior of the building. ES(AM) replied that AMO would follow up with LCSD to explore ways (e.g. uploading the video on the Stone House to AMO’s website, installing QR code check points onsite etc.) to let visitors know more about the heritage value of the building. The Chairman supported, wishing that the heritage value of historic buildings which were not open for the public could be livelily interpreted to the public upon grading.

61. With no further view, the Board endorsed the proposed Grade 2 status for the Stone House (Serial No. N356).

Ex-Kowloon Docks Memorial School, No. 2 Tsing Chau Street, Hung Hom, Kowloon, Proposed Nil Grade (Serial No. N390)

62. With the aid of video and powerpoint, C(HB)2 briefed Members on the heritage value, the current condition and the proposed grading of Ex-Kowloon Docks Memorial School.

63. Members had no comment and the Board endorsed the proposed Nil Grade status for Ex-Kowloon Docks Memorial School (Serial No. N390).

Item 5 Any Other Business

64. There being no other business, the meeting was adjourned at 5:57 pm.

Antiquities and Monuments Office
June 2022

Ref: AMO/22-3/1