

ANTIQUITIES ADVISORY BOARD

Minutes of the 199th Meeting
on Thursday, 8 December 2022 at 2:00 pm
at Conference Room, Hong Kong Heritage Discovery Centre
Kowloon Park, Haiphong Road, Tsim Sha Tsui, Kowloon

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

In Attendance: Development Bureau

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 Mike TANG*
Engineer (Heritage Conservation) 3 [E(HC)3]

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]

Mr Ray MA*
Curator (Archaeology) [C(Arch)]

Miss Fiona TSANG*
Curator (Historical Buildings) 1 [C(HB)1]

Mr WONG Nai Kwan
Assistant Curator I (Building Survey) 1 [ACI(BS)1]

Architectural Services Department

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

Planning Department

Miss Winnie LAU
Assistant Director of Planning / Metro [AD/M]

(Note: Government officers 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

2. The Chairman welcomed Members and government representatives to the meeting.

Item 1 Confirmation of Minutes of the 198th Meeting held on 8 September 2022 (Board Minutes AAB/7/2021-22)

3. The minutes of the 198th Meeting held on 8 September 2022 were confirmed with the following amendment to paragraph 16 proposed by Prof Phyllis LI:

“16. Prof Phyllis LI suggested clarifying the house lots of each individual item as there might be implications on their future alterations,

additions or demolitions (e.g. when determining the architectural structure (e.g. walls) and architectural style of the compound). She recalled that the area of Tai Long had once been covered by a “Development Permission Area Plan” and under the prevailing Outline Zoning Plan, hence permission from the Town Planning Board was required for any alteration or addition works in the area. As such, it would be better to make the house lots clear for future planning of heritage conservation. ES(AM) explained that information on the house lots of the individual items had been obtained. As the grading was administrative in nature, it would not affect the ownership, usage, management and development rights of the buildings / structures graded. However, AMO would provide technical advice from the heritage conservation perspective when necessary with a view to preserving the heritage value of the items as far as possible. The Chairman added that owners of graded historic buildings were eligible to apply for grants up to HK\$2 million for each successful application under the Financial Assistance for Maintenance Scheme on Built Heritage (“FAS”) to carry out maintenance works.

Item 2 Matters Arising and Progress Report (Board Paper AAB/27/2021-22)

4. With the aid of powerpoint, ES(AM) briefed Members on the progress of the major heritage conservation issues and activities from 1 August 2022 to 15 November 2022, including major preservation, restoration and maintenance of historic buildings projects, archaeological work, and educational and publicity activities detailed in the Board paper.

5. The Chairman took the opportunity to thank Mr Christopher LAW for delivering a sharing session at the “HKU Heritage Sights & Sites” on 11 November 2022, as well as Prof CHU Hoi-shan, Miss Theresa YEUNG and Mr Tony IP for being the moderators in the “Greater Bay Area Built Heritage Summit” (the “Summit”) held on 9 and 10 November 2022. Besides, he expressed gratitude to the National Cultural Heritage Administration (“NCHA”) for its support and other collaborating parties for their professional advice given to the Summit, and appreciated the tremendous efforts made by CHO and AMO, which contributed to the great success of the inaugural Summit.

6. Prof Phyllis LI echoed, adding that the Summit could strengthen exchange, enhance professional knowledge and broaden participants' horizons on heritage conservation among cities of the Greater Bay Area ("GBA"). She also highlighted that the memorandum of understanding signed among DEVB, the Department of Culture and Tourism of Guangdong Province and the Cultural Affairs Bureau of Macao SAR Government during the Summit, and the framework agreement subsequently signed by DEVB and NCHA could further foster future collaborations on heritage conservation among cities of GBA and enhance Hong Kong's heritage conservation work to the national level. She looked forward to having more exchanges and site visits with other cities of GBA which would in return be beneficial to Hong Kong's heritage conservation work.

Progress Update of the Central Police Station Compound Revitalisation Project

7. The Chairman invited CAS(W)2 to brief Members on the latest development of the Married Inspectors' Quarters, i.e. Block 4, of the Central Police Station ("CPS") Compound (now revitalised and operated as "Tai Kwun – Centre for Heritage and Arts").

8. CAS(W)2 reported that The Hong Kong Jockey Club ("HKJC") had prepared a technical update on Block 4 at Annex A of the paper on Progress Report (Board Paper AAB/27/2021-22). He recapped that subsequent to the partial collapse of Block 4 on 29 May 2016, HKJC proposed eight preliminary recovery options to the Antiquities Advisory Board (the "Board") in September 2016. Among these recovery options, HKJC submitted three shortlisted recovery options to the Board in September 2017. Taking Members' comments on the recovery options into account, HKJC proposed a hybrid option featuring "reconstruction" and "adaptation" as the recovery plan of Block 4 in September 2018 with the support by the Board. Since then, HKJC had embarked on further studies with the engagement of international masonry and timber structure specialists to carry out detailed inspections of the building fabrics of Block 4. It was revealed that the condition of the brickwork and timber structure of the building was worse than anticipated. Given the poor and weak condition, HKJC had drawn up an updated recovery plan for Block 4, which was reported to and supported by the Board in December 2019, to include a series of structural strengthening measures, among others, with a view to ensuring safety of workers, staff and members of the public during the construction works (the "Updated Recovery Plan").

9. CAS(W)2 went on to brief Members that HKJC had then commenced preparatory work for the Updated Recovery Plan for Block 4. However, parts of the extant building fabrics were found in weak condition when removing the parts collapsed, and some movements of the building were observed. Subsequently, HKJC engaged overseas masonry specialists and structural engineers (the “Team”) to reappraise the condition of Block 4. Findings revealed that Block 4’s condition was worse than was previously known when the Updated Recovery Plan was drawn up in 2019. The Team advised that there would be an undue risk if the Updated Recovery Plan was to be implemented. Having taken the Team’s advice and public safety into consideration, HKJC decided to terminate the implementation of the Updated Recovery Plan in June 2021. HKJC was currently exploring possible heritage conservation plans for Block 4 with public safety as the principal consideration.

10. CAS(W)2 further said that according to HKJC’s latest technical update, given the underlying risks attached to Block 4, HKJC considered prudently that it was required to remove parts of the extant building fabrics of Block 4 under a “strictly necessary” principle to make the building safe and to safeguard public safety. HKJC was studying two new options, i.e. (i) “conserve-as-found” and (ii) “new building” for Block 4 and would continue to carry out testing and investigation on the condition of the building during the course of the removal works for drawing up the new recovery plan for Block 4. HKJC would further consult the Board on the new recovery plan in due course. CAS(W)2 said that the Government appreciated the considerable efforts and resources devoted by HKJC to revitalise the CPS Compound. HKJC had recently submitted a consultation paper on the latest condition of Block 4 to DEVB. DEVB had then sought comments from relevant government departments, including the Architectural Services Department and the Buildings Department (“BD”). The departments consulted agreed to HKJC’s view that safeguarding public safety was the top priority, and that removal of the unsafe portions of Block 4 under the “strictly necessary” principle to ensure the safety of workers, staff and members of the public in the course of the construction works and in future operation of Block 4 was appropriate. Besides, the Government had requested HKJC to further reappraise the condition of Block 4, study and draw up the new recovery plan, and retain and preserve the historic fabrics with heritage value of Block 4 as much as practicable. To carry forward the removal of the parts of the extant building fabrics which were strictly necessary, HKJC would submit applications for statutory approvals by relevant bureaux / departments such as AMO and BD.

11. In response to Prof Phyllis LI's enquiry on the two new options, i.e. (i) "conserve-as-found" and (ii) "new building", the Chairman explained that the technical update in the Board paper was to inform the Board that safety concerns had emerged during the preparatory work for the Updated Recovery Plan for Block 4. HKJC would further share with Members the details of the new recovery plan once ready. Thus, Members could comment on the new recovery plan when available.

12. Prof CHING May-bo reckoned that Block 4 was in poor and weak condition as observed during the site inspection by the Board in 2019. She enquired about the historic fabrics (which were of heritage value) that would be retained. CAS(W)2 replied that according to HKJC's technical update, HKJC would try its very best to safely retain the historic fabrics of Block 4 (e.g. some outer walls and the masonry wall foundation) as far as practicable. Nevertheless, the precise extent of the historic fabrics that could be safely retained would be subject to inspections and testing in the course of removal works. CHO and AMO would work closely with HKJC on the matter.

13. The Chairman agreed that public safety was of the utmost importance. As Block 4 was one of the historic buildings in the CPS Compound clustering by three declared monuments (namely the former Central Police Station, Central Magistracy and Victoria Prison), he asked CHO and AMO to continue to provide technical advice to HKJC in the course of removal works of those extant building fabrics of Block 4 which were strictly necessary. Also, he wished that HKJC would share with the Board the finalised new recovery plan as well as the long term heritage conversation and revitalisation plans in due course.

14. Mr HO Kui-yip echoed and wished that HKJC would update the Board on the building fabrics to be removed so that the Board could give feedback.

15. Prof Phyllis LI further asked about the extent of the building fabrics that had to been removed. CAS(W)2 replied that HKJC was required to submit building plans to BD and permit application to AMO in accordance with Buildings Ordinance (Cap. 123) and Antiquities and Monuments Ordinance (Cap. 53) respectively, listing out the proposed work details and methodology, the strengthening work and the safety measures, for approval before commencement. Thus, the Government would be kept informed of the construction progress on Block 4.

16. With no further view, the Chairman concluded that the Board had noted the latest development of Block 4.

Item 3 Heritage Impact Assessment in respect of Site Formation and Infrastructures Works for Public Housing Development at Cha Kwo Ling Village, Kowloon East – Investigation, Design and Construction (Board Paper AAB/28/2021-22)

17. The Chairman welcomed the following representatives of the Civil Engineering and Development Department (“CEDD”), the Hong Kong Housing Society (“HKHS”), and the project and heritage consultant (the “Project Team”) to the meeting to present the heritage impact assessment (“HIA”) of the proposed works on the site formation and infrastructure works for the public housing development at Cha Kwo Ling Village (the “Project Site”), Kowloon East (the “Project”), where two graded buildings were located within or close to the Project Site:

- (i) Mr Peter POON
Senior Engineer / 2 (South), CEDD
- (ii) Mr Patrick LAI
Associate, AECOM Asia Company Limited
- (iii) Mr Markus LI
General Manager (Planning & Development), HKHS

18. Before discussion, Mr LEE Ping-kuen declared that he worked at AECOM Asia Company Limited but he did not know about the Project and had no involvement in it. Prof Phyllis LI also declared that she was a member of HKHS but she did not know about the Project and had no direct involvement in it as well. Miss Theresa YEUNG declared that she was a member of both HKHS and its Supervisory Board. She said that all public housing development projects submitted to HKHS, including the one which would be discussed at the meeting, would go through HKHS’s Supervisory Board. However, she had no direct involvement in the Project. The Chairman advised the three Members could continue to join the discussion as they had no direct involvement in the Project.

19. With the aid of powerpoint, Mr Peter POON introduced to Members the background and the scope of the Project. Mr Patrick LAI showed Members the locations of the 11 cultural heritage resources identified within the HIA area, in particular, Law Mansion on Nos. 50A, 51 and 51A Cha Kwo Ling Road (Grade 3) which was located within the project site, and Tin Hau Temple on Cha Kwo Ling Road (Grade 3) which was within 50 metres from the Project Site, and elaborated on their historical, contextual and architectural significance. He further explained the proposed works and the possible impacts on the two buildings, among others, and the proposed mitigation measures.

(Dr Jane LEE left the meeting at 15:08)

20. In response to Prof CHU Hoi-shan's enquiries on the future operation of Cha Kwo Ling Villagers Fraternity Association (the "Association") sitting on No. 40 Cha Kwo Ling Road, and the treatment on the four buildings, namely No. 212 Cha Kwo Ling Road, former Si Shan Public School, Nos. 95 and 95A Cha Kwo Ling Road, and No. 40 Cha Kwo Ling Road, among the 11 cultural heritage resources identified, Mr Peter POON replied that the Association acknowledged that its building might not be able to be preserved *in-situ* and therefore, it had requested for the provision of other space in the Project Site for future operation, subject to further discussion with HKHS. As for the treatment of the four buildings enquired, they would be demolished for development purpose.

21. Considering that the Project Site was of some heritage value given those cultural heritage resources identified, Miss Theresa YEUNG enquired if there would be any display of information boards or photos of the to-be-demolished buildings / structures in the future public housing for showing their integrated story to the public, which might also be good for establishing a linkage between the cultural heritage resources and the vicinity, thus forming a "point-line-plane" cluster. Mr Peter POON replied that fabrics with heritage value would first be preserved. They would then be relocated and temporarily stored in a storeroom within the development site. Upon handover of the construction site of the Project to HKHS for housing development, HKHS would consider how those fabrics would be displayed in the housing design. Mr Markus LI supplemented that another HIA in respect of the interpretation arrangement of those salvaged fabrics would be conducted in the detailed design stage of the Project for AMO's comment later. The initial plan was to provide an interpretation area for displaying the dragon boat *Hop Yi Lung* in the 900-square meter "buffer area", where it would be next to Tin Hau Temple on Cha Kwo Ling Road and would be open to the public, and would have other cultural heritage resources displayed in

the non-domestic portion of the Project Site. He added that a 20-meter wide visual corridor would be provided in front of Law Mansion from Cha Kwo Ling Road for the public to appreciate Law Mansion and enjoy the promenade view of Cha Kwo Ling from within. Besides, there would be a 10-meter set back around Law Mansion so as to facilitate the public to appreciate it.

22. Prof Phyllis LI highlighted the historical significance of the two boundary stones identified within the Project Site and suggested salvaging and re-erecting them at an approximate location (e.g. the nearby area where slope works would be carried out). Mr Peter POON thanked for the suggestion and said that the Project Team would further work with HKHS with a view to re-erecting the two boundary stones in an appropriate way. Mr Markus LI added that, alternatively, the two boundary stones could be considered to be displayed near Law Mansion so as to link them up with the quarrying business of the Law clansmen and the Cha Kwo Ling Village, subject to further detailed design of the proposed housing development. Members would be further consulted on the detailed planning in another HIA in respect of the interpretation arrangement of the salvaged fabrics which would be submitted to the Board later.

23. Mr HO Kui-yip suggested that apart from photos or three-dimensional scanning models, conventional models of Cha Kwo Ling Village together with some artefacts (e.g. the two boundary stones identified within the Project Site) could be displayed in the future interpretation area to reflect the land profile and the ambience of the village as well as presenting the overall story of the place. Mr Peter POON thanked for the suggestion and would take it into consideration.

24. Prof CHU Hoi-shan suggested the Project Team to further emphasize the relationship between Law Mansion and Cha Kwo Ling Granite Quarry in the next HIA as this could explain the development of the squatters in the old days. He considered that the Project Site still served as a place for studying culture, tradition and history. Furthermore, he suggested elaborating further on how members of the public could appreciate Law Mansion and Tin Hau Temple (e.g. what should be the optimal distance to appreciate the two buildings and what are the details worth appreciating, etc.) so as to add value to their visiting experiences. Mr Markus LI replied that the Project Team would take the comments into account when preparing the next HIA. Besides, he reiterated that there would be a 10-meter set back around Law Mansion to facilitate better appreciation by the public. Thus, the elevations of Law Mansion would be seen more clearly after the completion of the Project as compared with its existing setting among the cluster of squatters.

25. In response to Prof CHING May-bo's enquiries on the Stones of Fertility and the dragon boat *Hop Yi Lung*, Mr Peter POON replied that the Association fully acknowledged that the latter should be well preserved and displayed to the public upon completion of the Project. Regarding the Stones of Fertility, Mr Markus LI responded that they would be displayed together with the dragon boat in the "buffer area", a non-building area forming part of the landscape, where it would be open for public enjoyment.

26. With no further views from Members, the Chairman concluded that the Board endorsed the HIA report and the proposed mitigation measures, and further consultation with the Board regarding the Project was not required. He wished that the Project Team would take Members' comments on the interpretation arrangement of the cultural heritage resources into account in the detailed design stage of the Project.

Item 4 Assessment of Historic Buildings (Board Paper AAB/29/2021-22)

Confirmation of Proposed Grading for New Items

27. ES(AM) recapped that the Board had endorsed the proposed grading or no grading of the following 26 items at the meeting on 8 September 2022:

- (i) Wellington Street Public Toilet, Junction of Wellington Street and Queen's Road Central, Central, Hong Kong, Proposed Grade 2 (Serial No. N392);
- (ii) Lee Ancestral Hall, No. 13 Lin Au, Tai Po, New Territories, Proposed Grade 3 (Serial No. N395);
- (iii) No. 9 Kat On Street, Wan Chai, Hong Kong, Proposed Grade 3 (Serial No. N391);
- (iv) 17 items of Tai Long, Sai Kung, New Territories, including:
 - (a) Nos. 13, 14 & 15 Tai Long, Proposed Grade 3 (Serial No. N398);
 - (b) Building Remains Near the Hillslope, Tai Long, Proposed No Grading (Serial No. N399);
 - (c) Nos. 18A, 18B & 18C Tai Long, Proposed Grade 3 (Serial No. N400);

- (d) Yuk Ying School and Kitchen, No. 18D and Latrine at the Side of No. 18E Tai Long, Proposed Grade 3 (Serial No. N401);
 - (e) Structure near No. 18A, Tai Long, Proposed No Grading (Serial No. N402);
 - (f) Structures near No. 30A, Tai Long, Proposed No Grading (Serial No. N403);
 - (g) No. 26A Tai Long, Proposed No Grading (Serial No. N405);
 - (h) No. 27 Tai Long, Proposed Grade 3 (Serial No. N406);
 - (i) No. 28 Tai Long, Proposed No Grading (Serial No. N407);
 - (j) No. 29 Tai Long, Proposed Grade 3 (Serial No. N408);
 - (k) No. 30 Tai Long, Proposed Grade 3 (Serial No. N409);
 - (l) No. 30A Tai Long, Proposed Grade 2 (Serial No. N410);
 - (m) No. 30B and Structure Nearby, Tai Long, Proposed No Grading (Serial No. N411);
 - (n) No. 31 Tai Long, Proposed Grade 3 (Serial No. N412);
 - (o) Nos. 32 & 33 Tai Long, Proposed Grade 2 (Serial No. N413);
 - (p) Nos. 34, 35, 36, 37 & 38 Tai Long, Proposed Grade 2 (Serial No. N414);
 - (q) No. 39 and Buildings and Structures Nearby, Tai Long, Proposed No Grading (Serial No. N415); and
- (v) six items of Ham Tin, Sai Kung, New Territories, including:
- (a) Nos. 5 & 6 Ham Tin, Proposed Grade 3 (Serial No. N416);
 - (b) Nos. 7 & 8 Ham Tin, Proposed Grade 3 (Serial No. N417);
 - (c) No. 9 Ham Tin, Proposed Grade 3 (Serial No. N418);
 - (d) Nos. 10, 11 & 12 Ham Tin, Proposed Grade 2 (Serial No. N419);
 - (e) Nos. 14 & 15 Ham Tin, Proposed Grade 2 (Serial No. N420); and
 - (f) Nos. 16 & 17 Ham Tin, Proposed Grade 3 (Serial No. N421).

28. ES(AM) reported that a one-month public consultation on the proposed grading or no grading of the above 26 items had been conducted from 23 September to 23 October 2022. During the public consultation period, three written submissions were received in which two were related to No. 9 Kat On Street and one was on Tai Long. In early December 2022, after the public consultation period, two more written submissions were received, one of which related to Tai Long and Ham Tin and the other on Tai Long only. All five written submissions had been provided to Members before the meeting.

29. ES(AM) further shared with Members the views of the written submissions. Regarding the two written submissions on No. 9 Kat On Street, one was from the owners of 2/F and 3/F of the building and received on 11 October 2022 and the other from the owner of G/F of the building and received on 21 October 2022. Both submissions objected to the proposed grading of No. 9 Kat On Street. The owners were of the view that the building had no heritage value as it had undergone many alterations over the years with no architectural features retained except the arched doorway on G/F. Moreover, the owners considered that according a grading to the building was undesirable as it would render difficulty to sell their premises and affect their daily lives. In view of the owners' claim regarding the alterations to the building, AMO had emailed the owners requesting for a site visit to inspect the interiors of the building. While the owner of 2/F and 3/F had declined the request, no response had been received from the owner of G/F. The independent Historic Buildings Assessment Panel (the "Assessment Panel"), after reviewing the written submissions, maintained the proposed grading of No. 9 Kat On Street as the objections did not provide any new information on the heritage value of the building.

30. With regard to Tai Long and Ham Tin, the submission of 13 October 2022 from one of the owners of the village houses at Nos. 34, 35, 36, 37 & 38 Tai Long (Serial No. N414) expressed no comment on the respective proposed grading. As for the other two written submissions received on 1 December 2022 from an owner of the village houses in Tai Long and Ham Tin, and the village representative of Tai Long respectively, the submission from the owner relayed that they had been repairing and conserving some of its village houses and structures proactively. The owner objected to grade its properties in Tai Long and Ham Tin, saying that the grading would hinder its rights to develop its private properties, and applications would be required for reconstruction or repairs works. With regard to the submission from the village representative of Tai Long, he commented that the village houses of Tai Long and Ham Tin were built of mud bricks, timber and rubbles. He was worried that upon grading the village houses, necessary approvals had to be obtained from AMO for carrying out maintenance and repairs work of the houses, which might cause delay in the repairs and result in the collapse of the houses. The Assessment Panel, after reviewing all written submissions, maintained the proposed grading or no grading of the items listed under paragraphs 27(iv) and 27(v) as the objections did not provide new information on the heritage value of the items.

31. ES(AM) reported an update on Nos. 34, 35, 36, 37 & 38 Tai Long (Serial No. N414). ES(AM) said that the Planning Department (“PlanD”) conducted site inspection in Tai Long on 12 October 2022, and noticed that part of the roof and the rear wall of Nos. 35 and 36 Tai Long had collapsed. PlanD had reminded the people at the site not to undertake unauthorized development under the Town Planning Ordinance (Cap. 131). Subsequently, PlanD issued a letter to the owner of No. 35 Tai Long on 17 November 2022, reminding that if there would be works involving demolition, alteration and/or modification works of the building, permission from the Town Planning Board was required. The relevant owner was also requested to consult AMO before the commencement of the works. Besides, ES(AM) added that the group value of the row of houses at Nos. 34, 35, 36, 37 & 38 Tai Long was comparatively high among the six assessment criteria, i.e. (i) historical interest; (ii) architectural merit; (iii) social value and local interest; (iv) group value; (v) authenticity; and (vi) rarity. Appropriate maintenance and repair works would enable Nos. 35 and 36 Tai Long to reinstate their appearance. The Assessment Panel also noted the aforesaid condition of the village houses and had no further comment on the proposed grading of Nos. 34, 35, 36, 37 & 38 Tai Long, hence maintained the proposed grading of the item.

32. In response to the village representative’s view above, Mr HO Kui-yip wished AMO to clarify if owners were required to make applications to AMO for maintenance or repair works. ES(AM) replied that the grading was administrative in nature, owners were not required to seek approval from AMO for carrying out maintenance or repair works but were welcomed to consult AMO for technical advice. C for H supplemented that the grading would not affect the management of graded buildings. On the contrary, upon grading, owners could apply for subsidies under FAS to carry out maintenance works for preserving their buildings. Mr HO Kui-yip further enquired whether AMO or BD could take any emergency measures to help prevent Nos. 35 and 36 Tai Long, under private ownership, from further deterioration in view of the potential risk of collapse, ES(AM) responded that BD and PlanD were following up with the owners of Nos. 35 and 36 Tai Long about the issue, and reiterated that the owners could apply for FAS to carry out maintenance works upon grading and they could seek technical advice from AMO for the repairs.

33. With no further view, Members agreed to confirm the respective proposed grading or no grading for the 26 items listed under paragraph 27.

Confirmation of Proposed Grading

34. 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 yet been confirmed due to reasons such as objections, views or enquiries 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. Among these items, two items pending confirmation of proposed grading were:

- (i) Tai Long, Sai Kung, New Territories, Proposed Grade 2 (Serial No. 403);
and
- (ii) Ham Tin, Sai Kung, New Territories, Proposed Grade 2 (Serial No. 501).

35. C(HB)2 recapped that the village setting and the environs of the village were taken into account when assessing the heritage value of the entire villages of Tai Long and Ham Tin in 2009. In order to identify and ascertain the heritage values of the individual buildings or structures of the two villages, the Board agreed at its meeting on 8 September 2022 to assess the buildings or structures thereat individually and to confirm the overall grading of the two villages at this meeting. The Assessment Panel inspected the two villages earlier and maintained the proposed grading of the two villages. In early November 2022, letters were issued to the village representative and owners of the village houses informing them that the proposed overall grading of the two villages would be considered and confirmed by the Board at this meeting. As reported earlier, two written submissions were received on 1 December 2022 from an owner of the village houses and the village representative of Tai Long respectively.

36. With the aid of powerpoint, C(HB)2 further briefed Members on the heritage values, the current condition and the proposed grading of Tai Long and Ham Tin.

37. As the Board had a thorough discussion on the individual buildings and structures of Tai Long and Ham Tin at the previous meeting, Members had no further comment and the Board confirmed the proposed Grade 2 status for Tai Long, Sai Kung, New Territories (Serial No. N403), and Ham Tin, Sai Kung, New Territories, (Serial No. 501) respectively.

Review of Grading

38. The Chairman recapped that the Board discussed and requested the Assessment Panel to review the proposed grading of items (i) to (iii) listed below at its meeting on 8 September 2022. Besides, he briefed that the Board would also review the grading of item (iv) below at the meeting:

- (i) Nos. 22 to 26 and Structures Nearby, Tai Long, Sai Kung, New Territories, Proposed No Grading (Serial No. N404);
- (ii) New and Ancillary Buildings and Structures, Ham Tin, Sai Kung, New Territories, Proposed No Grading (Serial No. N422);
- (iii) Chiu Lo, DD6 Lot 1218 (near Hon Ka Road), Kam Shan, Tai Po, New Territories, Proposed Grade 2 (Serial No. N394) and
- (iv) No. 190 Nathan Road, Tsim Sha Tsui, Kowloon, Proposed Grade 1 (Serial No. 653).

Nos. 22 to 26 and Structures Nearby, Tai Long, Sai Kung, New Territories, Proposed No Grading (Serial No. N404) and New and Ancillary Buildings and Structures, Ham Tin, Sai Kung, New Territories, Proposed No Grading (Serial No. N422)

39. With the aid of powerpoint, C(HB)2 summarised Members' views on Nos. 22 to 26 and structures nearby, Tai Long ("N404"), and the new and ancillary buildings and structures, Ham Tin ("N422"), from the previous meeting. Regarding N404, Members opined that the remaining elevation of the item might help retain the village setting and ambience and hence enhance the group value of the entire village of Tai Long. Members also considered that giving the item a grading might enable it to be preserved and adaptively reused. As for N422, Members considered that the item was worth grading in order to retain the overall ambience of the entire village of Ham Tin and reflect the living of the village in the past. The Assessment Panel had noted and deliberated on Members' views. Considering that a significant part of N404 had collapsed, the Assessment Panel maintained the assessment of the item as no grading. Besides, the Assessment Panel, after deliberating the heritage value of N422 in accordance with the six assessment criteria, also maintained the assessment of it as no grading.

40. Members had no comment and the Board endorsed no grading for Nos. 22 to 26 and structures nearby, Tai Long, New Territories (Serial No. N404), and the new and ancillary buildings and structures, Ham Tin, Sai Kung, New Territories (Serial No. N422) respectively.

Chiu Lo, DD6 Lot 1218 (near Hon Ka Road), Kam Shan, Tai Po, New Territories, Proposed Grade 2 (Serial No. N394)

41. With the aid of powerpoint, C(HB)2 summarised Members' comments on Chiu Lo from the previous meeting that Chiu Lo was of high authenticity with its historic ambience retained, and warranted a Grade 1 status and invited the Assessment Panel to review the proposed grading for the building. The Assessment Panel, after reviewing the heritage value of Chiu Lo, however maintained the proposed Grade 2 status of the building. C(HB)2 further recapped the heritage value and the current condition of Chiu Lo, and shared with Members the new information obtained in respect of the rarity of Chiu Lo. The opening of the British section of Kowloon-Canton Railway in 1910 had brought convenience to people to travel to and from the New Territories including Tai Po at that time, thus attracting more people to acquire properties along the rail line. For instance, a building of a blend of Chinese and Western architectural styles was built in the 1920s near Chiu Lo and was reputed to be owned by Sir Robert HO TUNG. Besides, some of the businessmen who travelled frequently between Hong Kong and Guangzhou established Sing Kung Cho Tong (香港省躬草堂), a Taoism venue providing medical services at a low price, and built the grand hall and some small buildings in 1932. Furthermore, the owner of the winery Wing Lee Wai (永利威) purchased a piece of land in Shek Ku Lung (石鼓壟) near Kam Shan of Tai Po in the 1930s and built the Pun Chun Yuen (半春園) to worship Buddha. It was similar to Chiu Lo in terms of the time and locations of the land purchased, i.e. both bought land in Tai Po in the 1930s for constructing buildings. Conclusively speaking, Chiu Lo was a good example to testify the history of Hong Kong businessmen to develop in Tai Po between the 1920s and 1930s. On the other hand, given the strategic location of Chiu Lo, the building was used by the Japanese army to observe the Tai Po train station during the Japanese Occupation. As recalled by the second owner of Chiu Lo, his mother had mentioned to him that some Japanese army had once stayed in the guest room on the upper floor of the annex building of Chiu Lo for monitoring the then Tai Po Market Railway Station and the railway. The Assessment Panel after deliberating all new information above, however, still maintained the proposed grading of Chiu Lo as proposed Grade 2 as the new information was considered not significant to warrant the upgrading of the proposed grading.

42. The Chairman said that although some Members were not able to attend the meeting, their comments on Chiu Lo were detailed under paragraphs 46 to 58 of the previous meeting minutes. Besides, the Assessment Panel had taken Members' comments into consideration when reviewing the heritage value of Chiu Lo after the previous Board meeting. Thus, Members were invited to decide on the status of the grading at this meeting after deliberating on the Assessment Panel's views on the review.

43. Prof CHING May-bo wished to upgrade the proposed grading of Chiu Lo to Grade 1, considering that the linkage between the building and the then Tai Po Market Railway Station could reflect the development of Hong Kong in the old days, from the commencement of the lease of the New Territories, the operation of the first railway in Hong Kong in 1910, the opening of the then Tai Po Market Railway Station in 1913, and the residential development in Tai Po in the 1930s. She elaborated that the son of Chiu Lo's first owner commuted to school on Hong Kong Island everyday which reflected how the railway had enhanced the connection between Tai Po and the urban area. Secondly, Chiu Lo was undoubtedly of high authenticity and architectural merit, and was a kind of Western-style building with Shanghai art deco style resembling the houses in Xiguan (西關) of Guangzhou and hence its local interest was not only confined to Hong Kong. Since similar kind of buildings were diminishing in mainland China, it would be good to demonstrate Hong Kong's vision of preserving such kind of buildings to the other cities in the Greater Bay Area if Chiu Lo would be preserved. Furthermore, in view that different generations of the AU's family had lived in Chiu Lo and was still in use by the AU's family, it was worth telling this sentimental value in the heritage conservation work as such continuity of ownership was not commonly seen in other historic buildings. Ms Alice YIP echoed and supported according Chiu Lo a Grade 1 status.

44. Prof Phyllis LI opined that a higher grading should be given to Chiu Lo, highlighting that the suburb development and the settlement history of people in Tai Po in the early days should be manifested as they could not be easily reflected in other places. She added that Chiu Lo was also of high authenticity and the historic ambience in its vicinity was nice.

45. Dr LAM Weng-cheong shared Members' views. He enquired if there were similar type of buildings which were accorded with Grade 2 status. C(HB)2 replied that there was one building of similar age located near Chiu Lo but its heritage value had yet to be assessed. Besides, most of the graded buildings in Tai Po were temples and buildings built by the Government to meet operational

needs.

46. Ms Salome SEE shared Prof CHING May-bo's view, adding that the interiors (e.g. the window frames and terrazzo staircase) of Chiu Lo were more authentic as compared with those of No. 190 Nathan Road in Tsim Sha Tsui (a proposed Grade 1 building to be discussed later). Hence, she viewed that Chiu Lo should warrant a Grade 1 status.

47. Mr HO Kui-yip opined that Chiu Lo should deserve a Grade 1 status in view of its close linkage with the then Tai Po Market Railway Station and intact condition. Moreover, he stressed the importance of Chiu Lo in the context of Tai Po as it situated in the centre of Tai Po and the building witnessed the historical development of the place.

48. Mr Christopher LAW commented that the design of Chiu Lo, a villa, was of very high standard, and pointed out the outstanding architectural merits of the building. Moreover, he remarked that Chiu Lo was a well-designed architecture and it was rare to see such a villa in Hong Kong. Thus, he supported a Grade 1 status for Chiu Lo from the architectural perspective.

49. After deliberation, the Chairman said that most of the Members opined the proposed grading of Chiu Lo should be upgraded to Grade 1. He suggested Members to indicate their preferences by means of voting. Among the attending Members, all supported upgrading the proposed grading of Chiu Lo from Grade 2 to Grade 1. He concluded that the proposed Grade 1 status for Chiu Lo, DD6 Lot 1218 (near Hon Ka Road), Kam Shan, Tai Po, New Territories (Serial No. N394) was endorsed.

No. 190 Nathan Road, Tsim Sha Tsui, Kowloon, Proposed Grade 1 (Serial No. 653)

50. The Chairman thanked Members for attending the site visit to No. 190 Nathan Road on 5 December 2022.

51. C(HB)2 briefed that No. 190 Nathan Road was accorded Grade 3 by the Board on 6 September 2018. On 7 June 2022, Walk in Hong Kong which represented a group of heritage advocates submitted a heritage appraisal report on the building to the Board, appealing for a review of the grading of the building. After scrutinising the report, AMO considered that the report had provided reliable information which had not been taken into account when the building was graded.

Thus, AMO had carried out further research on the building in accordance with the established grading mechanism and reported the findings to the Assessment Panel. The Assessment Panel had inspected the building on-site and discussed its heritage value. The Assessment Panel recommended to adjust the grading of the building from Grade 3 to proposed Grade 1.

52. With the aid of video and powerpoint, C(HB)2 briefed Members on the heritage values, the current condition and the proposed grading of No. 190 Nathan Road.

53. The Chairman thanked all heritage advocates and members of the public for providing information on No. 190 Nathan Road. In response to his enquiry on the heritage appraisal report on the building submitted by Walk in Hong Kong, C(HB)2 confirmed that the report had provided new and reliable information enriching mainly the historical value of the building among the six assessment criteria.

54. Mr LEE Ping-kuen had reservation in the proposed Grade 1 status for No. 190 Nathan Road in view of the large extent of alterations that had been made to the building's interior.

55. Mr HO Kui-yip commented that the authenticity of the interior of No. 190 Nathan Road had been severely affected by extensive refurbishment and replacement of modern structures (e.g. staircases). The current archways on the ground floor of the building were not authentic as compared with those in the 1950s. He viewed that it would be more appropriate to adjust the grading of the building to proposed Grade 2 given that the new information on the association between the building and the Japanese Occupation could enrich the historical value of the building to some extent.

56. Prof CHU Hoi-shan enquired if there were any other architectural drawings and floor plans which could show the internal settings and elevations of No. 190 Nathan Road during the 1930s. C(HB)2 replied that the earliest floor plan available was the survey record prepared during the Japanese Occupation period. The Chairman asked if there were any remaining building structure components of the 1930s inside the building. ES(AM) circulated to Members the abovementioned record which reflected the complete change of the internal layout nowadays (e.g. all partitions had been removed). The verandahs with balustrades facing Nathan Road were now enclosed and became part of the retail shop.

57. Ms Salome SEE appreciated the façades of No. 190 Nathan Road and opined that the building, sitting in a prime location, was of historical value. Nonetheless, she shared Members' views that she had reservation in the proposed Grade 1 status for the building given the interior was altered.

58. Ms Alice YIP expressed that No. 190 Nathan Road was not worth a proposed Grade 1 status in terms of its architecture and authenticity. However, she reckoned that the building could form group value with the declared monuments and Grade 1 buildings nearby. It would be good to link these historic buildings up to tell people the history, e.g. the people's living during the Japanese Occupation.

59. Prof CHING May-bo considered that the new information was mainly the stories of the owner's family members instead of the building itself. Hence, it would be more appropriate to adjust the grading to proposed Grade 2 instead of proposed Grade 1 for the building.

60. Mr Christopher LAW highlighted the beauty of No. 190 Nathan Road and its art deco elements as captured in the photo taken in the 1950s. At that time, planters were built at the verandahs facing Nathan Road and ornamented arcades built underneath while the side elevation was of a streamline design. The building had manifested the old elegance of Nathan Road during the period. Although it was disappointing that the building's interior had gone through extensive alterations, he considered it worth proposing a higher grading for the building given its historical stories behind. He wished that the old elegance of the building could be reinstated by interested parties someday.

61. Prof CHU Hoi-shan opined that No. 190 Nathan Road was an architecture under Western influence. He considered that there was no direct correlation between art deco and the functional layout of the building. As seen from the survey record circulated, the original function of the building had been lost as compared with its existing layout. However, he shared Mr Christopher LAW's view, adding that a number of art deco buildings were diminishing in Hong Kong nowadays. He appreciated the exteriors of the building, in particular those on the first to third floors which were lined up and of the same design, and advised to further investigate to what extent did the exterior design of No. 190 Nathan Road enhance the vista along the Nathan Road.

62. The Chairman concluded that Members generally shared the view that the new information on No. 190 Nathan Road, as examined by AMO and the

Assessment Panel, could enhance the historical value of the building, yet Members had reservation as to whether the proposed grading should be adjusted to a proposed Grade 2 or a proposed Grade 1 status from its original Grade 3 status. Hence, he suggested a review of the heritage value of the building by the Assessment Panel. He wished that the Assessment Panel would take note of Members' comments, particularly in relation to the art deco architectural merit and the association between the building and Nathan Road. The proposed grading would be discussed further at the next meeting.

New Item for Grading Assessment

Historic Structures at the Former Chiu Chow Pak Yap Cemetery, Pok Fu Lam, Hong Kong, Proposed Grade 2 (Serial No. N423)

63. The Chairman thanked Members for joining the site visit to the historic structures at the former Chiu Chow Pak Yap Cemetery in Pok Fu Lam on 1 December 2022. He also took the opportunity to thank CEDD for the efforts made in preserving the historic structures.

64. With the aid of video and powerpoint, C(HB)2 briefed Members on the heritage value, the current condition and the proposed grading of the item.

65. In response to Prof Phyllis LI's enquiry on the proposed grading boundary, ES(AM) replied that the boundary plan was prepared by AMO's land surveyors who had surveyed and recorded the historic structures on site accurately.

66. With no further view, the Board endorsed the grading of the historic structures at the former Chiu Chow Pak Yap Cemetery, Pok Fu Lam, Hong Kong (Serial No. N423) as proposed Grade 2.

Item 4 Any Other Business

Conservation of Archaeological Heritage of Nga Tsin Wai

67. The Chairman welcomed the following representatives of the Urban Renewal Authority ("URA") and the heritage consultants to the meeting to share the updates on the conservation plan of the Nga Tsin Wai Village redevelopment project (the "Project"):

- (i) Mr Eric POON
Executive Director (Commercial), URA
- (ii) Mr Christopher WONG
General Manager, Planning and Design Division, URA
- (iii) Mr Tony LAM
Senior Director, AGC Design Limited
- (iv) Ms Julie Van Den BERGH
Director, Archaeological Assessments Limited

68. Before presentation, ES(AM) briefed that the Board had discussed the conservation issues of Nga Tsin Wai Village in 1994, 1999 and 2000. The Board had accorded both the Tin Hau Temple and the entrance gate, with the inscriptions 「慶有餘」 on its stone lintel with a Grade 3 status, and suggested preserving the central axis from the entrance gate to the temple. In 2007, URA had presented to the Board a conservation plan of the Project, and had then initiated conducting excavation work thereafter.

69. With the aid of powerpoint, Ms Julie Van Den BERGH first shared with Members the process and the major findings of the archaeological impact assessment (“AIA”) as well as the recommendations. In gist, the archaeological fieldwork had been conducted in three phases. Major archaeological findings included the foundation remains of four corner watchtowers and the northern and southern enclosure wall which likely partially dated to the early eighteenth century, as well as a moat and the residential layout with narrow lanes inside the village. Also, numerous artefacts dated to the Ming-Qing dynasty had been unearthed.

70. Mr Christopher WONG went on to brief Members on the background and the latest progress of the Project. The Project, jointly carried out by URA and some joint-venture developers, had been being implemented since 2005 in response to the decrepit condition of the village as appealed by Wong Tai Sin District Council and the residents of the village. The Board had been consulted on the Project’s conservation plan in 2007, which included a proposed conservation park with the central axis therein and the preservation of Tin Hau Temple, the entrance gate and eight village houses. The Project would have residential blocks developed in the north and south sides of the conservation park. Over the years, URA had been working closely with AMO with a view to assessing comprehensively the impact of the Project on the archaeological relics of Nga Tsin

Wai before commencing the redevelopment work. The excavation area had been extended twice in 2018 and 2020 for the purpose. In October 2022, the Government approved the preliminary land lease clauses of the Project and thus the redevelopment work would be carried out according to the conservation plan. In the course of the redevelopment work, rescue excavation work as agreed by AMO would be conducted, and further conservation plans which covered the preservation proposal of those relics mentioned in the AIA as well as Tin Hau Temple, the entrance gate and the eight village houses would be submitted to the Government including AMO. URA would continue to work closely with AMO for the Project. Upon completion of the Project, the conservation park, which would be open for public enjoyment, would be managed and operated by URA.

71. Lastly, Mr Tony LAM introduced to Members the updates on the conservation plan of the Project. With the numerous archaeological discoveries, the conservation concept design of the Project had been refined to enhance the educational value of Nga Tsin Wai Village as well as the appreciation by the public. The current conservation approach was to strike a balance between the AIA and the redevelopment need. To achieve this, in consultation with AMO, the conservation park would be enlarged and the foundation remains of the walls and watchtowers would be preserved *in-situ* for interpretation and educational purpose. Besides, the ambience of “Wai” (walled village) would be further enhanced with the heritage relics and landscape features integrated, thus enriching the public’s experience for understanding the intangible cultural heritage of the former “Wai” through guided tours, interactive games and display of information boards and the heritage relics (e.g. the entrance gate and the foundation remains of the walls) inside or outside the park. In doing so, the display of the heritage relics could also manifest the historical and social values of Nga Tsin Wai, and educate the public about the construction of the structural foundation of walled village, which was of engineering values. Last but not least, an open space had been reserved in front of Tin Hau Temple for festive celebrations in future such as Tin Hau birthday and *Jiu* Festival.

72. The Chairman enquired about the timeline for completion of the Project. Mr Eric POON expected that a series of redevelopment work would commence in mid-2023 aiming at completing the Project by 2030.

73. Mr HO Kui-yip asked about the treatment on the eight village houses in the Project, adding that air-conditioning would not be favorable to the preservation of this kind of old houses in the long run. Mr Christopher WONG explained that the eight village houses were in poor condition. URA had engaged structural

engineers to monitor their condition, and restore them to their original appearance as far as practicable with minimal alterations. He hoped to pass on the cultural custom so as to recreate the village ambience in the future. Mr Eric POON supplemented that the eight village houses were under the ownership of URA, thus they would be well maintained by URA.

74. The Chairman thanked the representatives of URA and the Project's heritage consultants for sharing the latest development of the Project and their efforts made in the related archaeological excavations. He wished that they could continue to work closely with AMO for the Project.

Vote of Thanks to All Members

75. Taking the opportunity of the last meeting of the current term, the Chairman thanked all Members for their support and invaluable advice given in the past two years.

76. There being no other business, the meeting was adjourned at 5:38 p.m..

Antiquities and Monuments Office

March 2023

Ref: AMO/22-3/1