

For information

**Legislative Council Panel on Home Affairs
The Queen's Pier**

Purpose

This paper sets out the supplementary information requested by Members at the special meeting of the Panel on Home Affairs (“HA Panel”) on 1 June 2007.

Background

2. During the discussion of LC Paper No. CB(2)2026/06-07(01) “The Queen's Pier” at the special meeting of HA Panel on 1 June, individual Members requested the Administration to provide the following supplementary information –

- (a) a copy of the submission made by the Antiquities and Monuments Office (“AMO”) to the Secretary for Home Affairs (“SHA”) regarding the Queen's Pier on 22 May 2007 [*paragraph 19 of the draft minutes of the special meeting*];
- (b) the criteria for assessing whether a building is qualified to be declared as a monument under the Antiquities and Monuments Ordinance (Cap. 53) (“A&M Ordinance”) [*paragraph 41 of the draft minutes of the special meeting*]; and
- (c) information on the assessment made for the 63 monuments (historical buildings) [*paragraph 42 of the draft minutes of the special meeting*].

Supplementary information

AMO's submission to SHA

3. We appreciate Members' interest in the deliberations leading to SHA's considered decision that Queen's Pier would not be declared a monument and have therefore provided comprehensive written information *vide* LC Paper No. CB(2)2026/06-07(01) "The Queen's Pier" and verbal replies to Members' questions at the PWSC meeting on 23 May 2007 and the subsequent special meeting of HA Panel on 1 June. There is no question of the Administration denying Members of essential information. It should be clear from the information already provided that SHA in exercising his discretion on whether he should seek to declare Queen's Pier as monument is acting in accordance with the relevant provisions in the A&M Ordinance and in an accountable and impartial manner. The Member's request for a copy of the internal submission from the AMO on the matter seemed to suggest that SHA is acting otherwise.

4. To meet the Member's request whilst upholding the Administration's established convention not to disclose classified internal documents or correspondences, we have as an exceptional measure reproduced the body of the submission made by AMO to SHA on 22 May¹. This is at Annex A. Members would note from the reproduction that the substance and arguments contained therein have largely been repeated (including both headings and contents) in LC Paper No. CB(2)2026/06-07(01) "The Queen's Pier" submitted to Members before the special meeting on 1 June.

5. As shown from the reproduction of the submission, the AA's decision of not declaring the Queen's Pier as a monument was made on the basis that it does not possess the requisite historical, archeological or palaeontological significance so as to be qualified to be declared a monument under the A&M Ordinance and is entirely on the basis of the professional advice of AMO. Criticisms that AA has made his decision

¹ In the light of AAB's decision at its meeting on 9 May 2007 to accord Grade I historical building status to the Pier, and in response to calls from some quarters of the public for declaring the Pier as a monument under the Ordinance (including a letter from the Hong Kong Institute of Architects to the Chairman of Antiquities Advisory Board ("AAB") and a letter to SHA from Heritage Watch), SHA instructed AMO to review the position and to make recommendation on whether AMO's previous position that the Pier should not be declared to be a monument was still valid.

on the basis of other considerations such as the urgency of the project, the preservation options for Queen's Pier, or political pressure and expediency are simply not substantiated.

6. Members may also wish to note that –

- (a) In line with the usual practice on matters under the Antiquities and Monuments Ordinance, the submission to SHA in his capacity as the Antiquities Authority (“AA”) was made by the Executive Secretary (Antiquities and Monuments), a Chief Curator by rank, and was routed through the Director of Leisure and Cultural Services (“LCSD”) (as the AMO is within LCSD) and the Permanent Secretary for Home Affairs (who supports SHA in overseeing the Home Affairs portfolio). Both had indicated support for the recommendation of AMO;
- (b) As SHA has clearly informed Members at the special HA Panel meeting on 1 June, he has personally considered all relevant information and documents put before him in arriving at his decision. A full list of those documents enclosed with AMO submission to SHA is at Annex B. The fact that we could not reproduce those enclosures is because many of them contain personal data of third parties, such as minutes of closed-door meetings of AAB containing views attributed to individual members, and should not be disclosed without the parties' consent. However, where the enclosures are already in the public domain, we have indicated in Annex B where these could be accessed.
- (c) The original submission was compiled in English only for SHA's consideration. The Chinese version attached to this paper is a subsequent translation of the original submission specially arranged for Members' reference.

Criteria for assessing monuments

7. Under section 3(1) of the A&M Ordinance, the AA, may, after

consultation with the Antiquities Advisory Board and with the approval of the Chief Executive, by notice in the Gazette, declare any places, buildings, sites or structures (“building(s)”), which the AA considers to be of public interest by reason of its historical, archaeological or palaeontological significance, to be a monument. The criteria accordingly are the historical, archaeological and palaeontological significance of the building concerned.

8. Factors that are taken into account in assessing the historical significance of a building include the age of such building, its importance to the political, social, economic, military or cultural history of Hong Kong, association with significant historical events or important historical figures and architectural merits. For archaeological significance, factors that are taken into account include the uniqueness and representativeness of ancient structures recovered by archaeological investigation/excavation. As for palaeontological significance, the AMO will take into account factors including the rarity and completeness of extinct species to demonstrate the geological history of Hong Kong. The assessment is not done by way of a check-list but is based on a holistic approach. Using the historical buildings which have been declared as monuments as a yardstick, it is plain that the threshold of historical, archaeological or palaeontological significance qualifying a building as a monument is very high indeed.

Information on the assessment made for the 63 monuments

9. In view of the fact that many of the 63 monuments were declared quite some time ago, we have been able to trace from old records the reasons supporting the declaration of 18 monuments (Annex C) within the time allowed before the Finance Committee meeting on 8 June. We believe that this should give Members a fair idea of the factors considered. We will continue to work on the remaining cases and let Members have the information as soon as possible.

Advice sought

10. Members are invited to note the contents of the paper.

Home Affairs Bureau
June 2007

CONFIDENTIAL**L/M****The Queen's Pier****Problem**

We have received calls in the community that following the Antiquities Advisory Board (AAB)'s decision to accord Grade I historical building status to Queen's Pier (hereinafter called "the Pier") on 9 May 2007, the Pier should be declared as a monument under the Antiquities and Monuments Ordinance (Cap. 53) (hereinafter called "A&M Ordinance") or that the statutory process leading to such declaration should commence (e.g. the letter of 11 May 2007 from the Hong Kong Institute of Architects (HKIA) to the AAB Chairman).

2. As the executive arm¹ of the Antiquities Authority (AA), we prepare this L/M and make recommendation to facilitate your consideration (in your capacity as the AA) of whether the Pier should be declared as a monument under the A&M Ordinance.

Recommendation and advice sought

3. It is recommended that you as the AA endorse the view that the Pier does not possess the requisite historical, archaeological or palaeontological significance for it to be declared as a monument and **decide** that it is not to be declared a monument under the A&M

¹ AMO is the executive arm of AA dealing with matters, amongst others, relating to preservation of any place, building, site or structure, which is of historical, archaeological or palaeontological value. A section of this office also provides secretariat support to the AAB.

CONFIDENTIAL

Ordinance.

Justifications

Previous historical value assessment of the Pier

4. We have been involved in the assessment of the historical significance of the Pier since 2000 when we participated in consultations on the Central Reclamation Phase III (CRIII) project in our capacity as the Antiquities and Monuments Office (AMO). As you know, under the A&M Ordinance and in line with our usual practice, if any place, building, site or structure ("building") is of sufficient historical, archaeological or palaeontological significance that would merit a monument status, we would initiate the statutory process with a view to seeking your ultimate decision to have the relevant building declared a proposed monument under section 2A(1) or monument under section 3(1).

5. In the case of the Pier, it has no archaeological or palaeontological significance and we have all along taken the view that while it possesses certain historical significance, it falls short of the requirements for it to be declared as a monument. Therefore, no action to declare the Pier as a proposed monument or monument has been contemplated. Neither have you expressed to us any particular view on its historical significance. As part of the above-mentioned consultations over CRIII, we commissioned the "Survey Report of Historical Buildings and Structures within the Project Area of the Central Reclamation Phase III" (Annex A) (hereinafter referred to as "2001 Survey Report") as set out below and AAB had meetings discussing the findings of the 2001 Survey Report and the mitigation measures relating to buildings having historical interests within the project area. As regards the Pier's historical significance, we have all along considered that its overall historical significance is not sufficiently strong to warrant its declaration as a monument under the A&M Ordinance. However, as it bears a testimony to the colonial rule of Hong Kong with some association with important historical events, i.e. the arrival of new Governors, we considered that the Pier should be preserved in the way appropriate to its

historical value.

6. In arriving at the above conclusion, we had taken into account the following considerations:

(a) The "2001 Survey Report" commissioned by AMO in November 2000 which provided a search of all existing pre-1950 and selected post-1950 buildings and structures having historical interest within the project area. The Pier was given a brief reference which said that "[n]ot only has the pier been used by the public since its construction in 1961, it was the landing pier for new Governors after arriving at the Kai Tak Airport. They then made their oath to serve as Governors of Hong Kong at the City Hall Concert Hall." (para. 4.3.1 of the 2001 Survey Report).

(b) On the impacts on items of historical interest, the 2001 Survey Report gave *separate* assessments in respect of – (i) Star Ferry Pier; (ii) the City Hall Complex; and (iii) the Pier and Edinburgh Place. The assessment in respect of the Pier is reproduced below –

"The pier and Edinburgh Place are not merely an ordinary public pier and public open space for community use. They have been for many years two of the very few open spots suitable for breathing the sea air comfortably in Central and viewing the beautiful harbour. To a certain degree, they performed some civic and political functions in the colonial period of post-war Hong Kong after their completion in 1961. Their demolition for reclamation would scrap forever the concrete link to a brief past of local development." (para 5.3.1 of the 2001 Survey Report).

(c) On recommendation, the 2001 Survey Report said that the relocation of Star Ferry to Piers 4-7 was entirely not welcome and consideration should be taken to relocate the clock tower, if not the whole pier building, to a new home suitably in harmony with its surroundings and that the whole City Hall Complex should be kept intact. However, the 2001 Survey Report made no particular recommendation on Queen's Pier (para. 6 of the 2001 Survey

CONFIDENTIAL

- Report).
- (d) The 2001 Survey Report was released in February 2001 and discussed by AAB at its meeting on 13 March 2002 (**Annex B**) when the former Territory Development Department (TDD) and the Planning Department (PlanD) consulted AAB on the impact of CR III and the Wan Chai Development Phase II on the affected historical buildings and structures. After studying the findings of the 2001 Survey Report and the mitigation measures put forward by the former TDD and PlanD, AAB raised no objection to the demolition of the Pier and the relocation of the marine function of the Pier to a new pier while some AAB members recognized that the Pier was of some historical significance and asked the Government for preservation of it. AAB also noted the mitigation measure proposed in TDD's and PlanD's joint paper that a detailed photographic and cartographic record would be undertaken and a commemorative plaque would be erected at the existing site.
- (e) At a meeting on 12 December 2006 (**Annex C**), in response to news reports on AAB's stance on the demolition of Star Ferry Pier, AAB reviewed the discussion paper and minutes regarding the demolition plan of Star Ferry Pier and the Pier in 2002 (**Annex B**) which recorded that AAB did not raise any objection to the demolition of both piers. AAB concluded in the meeting that it raised no objection to recommendations contained in the Survey Report.

Review of assessment of the historical significance of the Pier

7. Despite our position in paragraph 5 above, we agreed (upon receipt of the request from HKIA to AAB (**Annex D**) and in response to LegCo Members' concern) that further research on the historical significance of the Pier be conducted (**Annex E**) and AAB be invited to assess its historical grading. During the meeting on 9 May 2007, AAB accorded the Grade I historical building status to the Pier which is defined as "Buildings of outstanding merit, which every effort should be made to

preserve if possible”.

8. In the light of the grading accorded to the Pier by AAB and the calls from the public for declaring the Pier as a monument under the A&M Ordinance, you have instructed us to review the position we have all along taken (see paragraph 5) and to make recommendation to you whether our position that the Pier should not be declared as a monument still stands. We set out our assessment below for your consideration.

Historical significance

9. The Pier was built in 1953-54 following the demolition of the first Queen's Pier (completed in 1925) to make way for the reclamation of Victoria Harbour in the 1950s. Apart from its use as a public pier, the Pier was a landing place for the Governors of Hong Kong and the Royal family upon their arrival in and departure from the colony until 1997. Though there is no dispute that it has some historical value, we remain of the view based upon the reasons set out below and taking into account matters set out in paragraphs 10-11 that such value is not of such significance that warrants the Pier to be declared a monument under the A&M Ordinance –

- (a) The Pier only testifies to about 44 of the 156 years of the colonial rule, which is a much shorter duration when compared with other century-old buildings also reflecting the colonial history. Currently, all the declared monuments are pre-war buildings.
- (b) In terms of association with the arrival of new Governors in the colonial period, the historical significance of a place of “landing” is clearly considerably less than say, the place for “oath taking” which formally marked the beginning of governorship and which was the core procedure for establishing a Governor's terms of office. In this connection, the present LegCo Building (former Supreme Court) and City Hall where the Governors took their oath of office are considered more historically significant than the Pier.
- (c) There are other pre-war historical buildings which are testimonies

CONFIDENTIAL

of the colonial authority but with greater historical significance than the Pier. The very outstanding exemplars which have been declared as monuments include the Government House, Former Central Police Station Compound, Former Central Magistracy, Flagstaff House, and Old Supreme Court. There are also buildings of greater historical merit, which were only accorded a grading but not declared as monuments. They include but are not limited to the Former Explosives Magazine of the Old Victoria Barracks (a Grade I building, built between 1843 and 1874), five of the barrack blocks of the Old Lyemun Barracks Compound (Grade I buildings, built in 1880s-1890s) and five barrack buildings of the Old Victoria Barracks Compound (Grade II buildings, built in early 1900s) and the Old South Kowloon District Court (a Grade II building, built in 1936), just to name a few. These buildings command a much higher representation in the colonial administration than the Pier.

- (d) In considering whether a historical building should be declared as a monument for the purpose of reconstructing the history of the colonial administration in Hong Kong, we have adopted a holistic approach by considering aspects including its relationship to colonial administration, and its contributions in areas such as economic, religious, educational and medical developments of the colony. The historical significance of the Pier as a ceremonial pier is relatively peripheral in this broad historical context.

Architectural merits

- (e) The architectural style of the Pier is modern utilitarian. The simple and functional design reflects the typical modernist architecture of the 1950s and 1960s. The architectural merits of the Pier, in terms of design, plan forms, decoration and craftsmanship, in the architectural development of Hong Kong are rather limited. There are quite a number of post-war Government buildings, which are of similar architectural style but with greater historical significance such as City Hall Complex, former North Kowloon Magistracy, former Western Magistracy, Central

Government Offices, etc. They are neither graded buildings nor declared monuments under the A&M Ordinance.

The grading system

10. The grading system is an administrative scheme for facilitating our consideration on whether a particular building should be preserved and/or be declared as monument under the A&M Ordinance. It is an internal mechanism of the AAB with no statutory basis. Not all Grade I buildings would ultimately be declared as monuments under the A&M Ordinance and there is no automatic linkage between graded buildings and monuments. Some declared monuments did not go through a grading process. Most Grade I buildings have not been subsequently declared monuments. Of the 607 historical buildings graded by the AAB up to 2007, 151 buildings have been accorded with Grade I historical building status and out of these 151 Grade I buildings, only 28 buildings have been declared as monuments. In other words, a total of 123 Grade I buildings are not declared as monuments. Though there is no specific requirement under the scheme on how the relevant historical buildings (once graded) should be preserved, we have all along taken administrative measures to ensure that buildings (which are graded) would be protected from unnecessary damage, removal, interference or demolition. The actual preservation arrangement for any graded historical building would have to depend on such factors as the structure, condition and features of individual building, as well as the technical feasibility.

Threshold for declaring a building as a monument

11. Before considering whether a building would be declared as a monument, all relevant circumstances relating to such building should be taken into account. All along, only those buildings that are considered to be of public interest by reason of its significant historical, archaeological or palaeontological value have been declared as monuments under the A&M Ordinance. Using the historical buildings which have been declared as monuments as a yardstick, it is plain that the threshold of historical, archaeological or palaeontological significance qualifying a building as a monument is very high indeed. Up to now,

CONFIDENTIAL

only a total of 63 historical buildings have been declared as monuments, all of which are pre-war buildings. Any new monument to be declared must be of comparable significance.

12. In making the above re-assessment, the following matters have also been taken into account –

- (a) Views presented in submissions and requests from professional organizations, heritage groups and other concerned parties for preserving the Pier from January 2007 onwards (see copies of relevant letters and written submissions at Annexes D, F & G)

Ever since the time surrounding the demolition of the Star Ferry in December 2006, the Government has received a series of requests from concerned groups for preserving the Pier. The major arguments are submitted by HKIA and are summarized below –

- (i) The Queen's Pier as a site of historical significance – the Pier was the landing and departure place for the past Governors and the Royal Family. Together with the Edinburgh Place where the welcome and farewell ceremonies for the Governors and the Royal Family were held, the Pier encapsulates both the beginning and the end of colonial rule.
- (ii) The Queen's Pier as an integral part of the Edinburgh Place and the City Hall Complex – The Queen's Pier was purposely positioned to be aligned with the City Hall to accentuate a ceremonial axis. The integrity of this spatial relationship should not be destroyed. While recognizing the current system of declaring monuments limits its scope of statutory protection to pre-war buildings, modern and near-modern architecture that does not possess a long history, but is of high cultural heritage value, such as the Pier, should also be considered as a monument.

Arguments on the following are also received –

- (iii) The Queen's Pier, City Hall and Edinburgh Place together with the "former" Star Ferry Pier area as an important cultural landmark and public open space enjoyed by many Hong Kong people – the Pier is a popular meeting place and embodies the "collective memory" of local people (e.g. it was the place where the cross-harbour swimming was held).
 - (iv) Inadequate public consultation on the preservation of Queen's Pier – It was suggested that Government should be sensitive and responsive to the changing community interests and that not until a comprehensive public consultation exercise was held on the preservation of the Pier, it should be kept intact and should not be removed to make way for the reclamation works.
- (b) Deliberations of the AAB in conducting the grading exercise for the Pier

At its meeting on 9 May 2007, AAB deliberated on the grading of the Pier on the basis of submissions and presentations by about 10 organizations at the public hearing session immediately preceding this meeting (*see copy of submissions at Annex G*), our research report on the heritage assessment of the Pier (*Annex E*), as well as the Historic Building Grading Form devised by us which comprises seven categories of criteria – historical interest, architectural merit, group value, social value and local interest, authenticity, and rarity. A summary of the major points raised during the discussion is as follows –

- (i) Some members were of the view that the Pier had greater historical value than some declared monuments in Central and Western District as the landing pier for six Governors of Hong Kong, which symbolized the starting point of colonial rule. The demolition of Star Ferry Pier enhanced the historical merits of Queen's Pier. Others felt that the historical significance of Queen's Pier at a particular point in time was not as great as

CONFIDENTIAL

Star Ferry Pier, which had been used as a public pier for the general community; or Government House, which had been the residence of Governors for a much longer time.

- (ii) Some members considered that the architectural characteristics of Queen's Pier, typical of the modernist architecture of the 1950s and the 1960s, were reflected in the integrated planning and design of the cluster comprising Queen's Pier, Edinburgh Place and City Hall. Hence, it had some architectural merit and group value as a part of the building complex with historical interest.
- (iii) Some members opined that Queen's Pier, as a governmental ceremonial pier for Governors, was important as a symbolic or visual landmark of the British colonial rule and community activity ground after the Star Ferry Pier Incident. The Pier had great social value and was of local interest. Others considered that its social value and function were not as great as other public piers such as Star Ferry Pier or Blake Pier from the community's usage point of view. Some also opined that the Pier was not associated with any significant historical event.
- (iv) Some members felt that the demolition of Blake Pier in the 1950s and Star Ferry Pier recently tended to enhance Queen's Pier's rarity.
- (v) Some members considered Queen's Pier authentic, as no significant alteration had been made to the Pier apart from routine maintenance and minor repairs.

As can be seen, members have differing views on the historical significance of the Pier. This is also reflected in the voting result on the grading status of the Pier.

(c) AAB's voting results on grading of the Pier

- (i) Based on the result of 12 voting for Grade I, 10 for Grade II and

3 for Grade III, the AAB Chairman concluded that the Pier should be accorded a Grade I historical building status. *Over half* of the AAB members present did not support according the Pier with Grade I status: taken all the voting results together, in fact those members not in favour of a Grade I status exceed those in favour by one. The voting results and the above summary of their views expressed indicate that AAB members held different opinions on the historical significance of the Pier.

- (ii) By way of comparison, in the deliberations of the AAB on the grading of Mei Ho House (美荷樓) and Yu Yuen (娛苑), members unanimously gave the buildings Grade I status. It is uncommon that members' views were so diverse. The different views on the Pier indicate that not all members agreed to the historical significance of the Pier. Some members considered that the historical significance of the Pier should be evaluated by taking its group/association value with the Edinburgh Place and City Hall into account. For them, the historical value of the Pier would be significantly lower if its value were to be assessed individually.

Conclusion

13. On the basis of the above justifications, it is our recommendation that our position in paragraph 5 should be affirmed, i.e. the Pier is not qualified to be declared as a monument under the A&M Ordinance. Our justifications for such recommendation in paragraphs 9-11 and all relevant papers and submissions made by the public and professional bodies concerned referred to in paragraph 12 are attached for your consideration. Unless you have any contrary views to our above recommendation, it would not appear necessary for us to seek further advice from the AAB (insofar as the Pier is concerned) in view of the information, views, analysis and advice set out above, and given that your power under section 3 of the A&M Ordinance is not to be invoked.

CONFIDENTIAL

22 May 2007

**A list the enclosures to the submission made
by AMO to SHA on 22 May 2007**

- The “Survey Report of Historical Buildings and Structures within the Project Area of the Central Reclamation Phase III”¹;
- Relevant paper and minutes of AAB meeting held on 13 March 2002 (Board Paper AAB/37/2001-02 and Board Minutes AAB/3/2001-02) and minutes of AAB meeting on 12 December 2006 (Board Minutes AAB/10/2005-06);
- Submissions (in the form of letters and emails) made by the public, such as professional organizations and concern groups, regarding the Queen’s Pier received since January 2007 –
 1. Letter from the Hong Kong Institute of Architects on 28 February 2007;
 2. Email from “本土行動” on 5 March 2007;
 3. Letter from a named individual on 5 March 2007;
 4. Letter from the Conservancy Association on 5 March 2007;
 5. Letter from the Conservancy Association on 16 March 2007;
 6. Email from 可持續發展公民議會、中西區關注組、共創我們的海港區、專上學生聯會、本土行動、社區文化關注 on 2 April 2007;
 7. Letter from another named individual on 8 May 2007;
 8. Letter from “一群納稅人” on 10 May 2007;

¹ As an enclosure to the AAB paper No. AAB/16/2007-08, the full version of the report can be found at the AMO’s website - http://www.epd.gov.hk/eia/register/report/eiareport/eia_0552001/report/vol2/eia_0552001appendix_w.pdf

9. Letter from the Hong Kong Institute of Architects on 11 May 2007;
 10. Letter from “一群中產的納稅人” on 15 May 2007;
 11. Letter from Society for Protection of the Harbour on 15 May 2007;
 12. Email from yet another named individual on 16 May 2007;
 13. Letter from Heritage Watch on 16 May 2007; and
 14. Letter from “皇后碼頭評級關注組” on 21 May 2007.
- Submissions and presentations by organizations at the public hearing session immediately preceding the AAB meeting on 9 May 2007 –
 1. 本土行動;
 2. The Hong Kong Institute of Architects;
 3. Hong Kong Civic Association;
 4. Heritage Watch;
 5. Designing Hong Kong; and
 6. Dragon Garden Charitable Trust.
 - AMO’s research on the historical significance of the Pier as tasked by the AAB on 6 March 2007².

² As an enclosure to the AAB paper No. AAB/16/2007-08, the full version of the AMO’s research can be found at the AMO’s website - http://www.amo.gov.hk/form/AAB_Paper129_queen_annexc_e.pdf

List of Historical Buildings Declared as Monuments from 1997 to 2006

| Item No. | Name | Address | Year of Construction | Year of Declaration | Historical Significance |
|----------|--|---|----------------------|---------------------|---|
| 1 | Entrance Tower and Enclosing Walls of Lo Wai, Lung Yeuk Tau, Fanling | Lung Yeuk Tau, Fanling, New Territories | c.1200s | 1997 | The Tang clan first settled in Kam Tin and later branched out to Lung Yeuk Tau. The Tangs had since established eleven villages which are commonly known as "Five wais and Six tsuens" (i.e. five walled villages and six villages). Lo Wai which literally means an old walled village, was the first walled village established by the Tang lineage in the area. Although the wall was partly rebuilt with the entrance tower relocated, part of the original enclosing wall and the original layout of the village houses are still intact. The importance of Lo Wai also rests with its close proximity to the group of traditional vernacular architecture in Lung Yeuk Tau, enhancing the group value of the historical buildings in the area. |
| 2 | Tang Chung Ling Ancestral Hall, Lung Yeuk Tau, Fanling | Lung Yeuk Tau, Fanling, New Territories | 1525 | 1997 | Tang Chung Ling Ancestral Hall is one of the largest ancestral halls in Hong Kong. The Tang clan branched out from Kam Tin and settled in Lung Yeuk Tau in the 13th century. The Tangs had since then established the "Five wais and Six tsuens". Tang Chung Ling Ancestral Hall was reputed to have been built in 1525 in honour of the founding ancestor, Tang Chung-ling (1302-1387) and has since then been the main ancestral hall of the Lung Yeuk Tau Tangs. The Lung Yeuk Tau Tangs have much stronger claims to the Song royal family than their fellow clansmen elsewhere in Hong Kong. According to their genealogical records, the princess of the Southern Song (1127-1279) was married to an ancestor of the lineage. The eldest son of the royal couple and his descendants later migrated and settled in Lung Yeuk Tau. This explains why soul tablets of the royal couple are still being worshipped at the Tang Chung |

| Item No. | Name | Address | Year of Construction | Year of Declaration | Historical Significance |
|----------|--|--|----------------------|---------------------|---|
| | | | | | Ling Ancestral Hall. The ancestral hall remains in use in the traditional manner, as a place of worship of ancestors, holding of festival celebrations, ceremonies and meetings of the Tang clan. |
| 3 | Cheung Shan Monastery, Ping Che, Fanling | Wo Keng Shan, Ping Che, Fanling, New Territories | 1789 | 1998 | Situated at Miu Keng in Ping Che, the Cheung Shan Monastery was probably first constructed in 1789 as a joint effort of six villages in Ta Kwu Ling area, namely Loi Tung, Man Uk Pin, and the alliance of Ping Yuen Hap Heung which consisted of Ping Yeung, Nga Yiu Ha, Wo Keng Shan and Ping Che. The Buddha, Kwun Yum and Tei Chong Wong (a Bodhisattva) were worshipped in the temple. The building was formerly named Cheung Sang Nunnary as these characters were inscribed on a bronze bell cast in the 54th year of Qianlong reign (1789). Since Miu Keng was a halfway point of the route to Shenzhen via Sha Tau Kok in the past, the monastery was once a resting place to provide services, including free tea to wayfarers. The position of the monastery was also of major strategic and political significance since Miu Keng was the only passage to Shenzhen. The foundation of this monastery was the result of the alliance seeking to enhance their local leverage and status. |
| 4 | King Law Ka Shuk, Tai Po Tau Tsuen, Tai Po | No. 17 Tai Po Tau Tsuen, Tai Po, New Territories | 1368-1644 | 1998 | According to the Tangs, King Law Ka Shuk was built by the thirteenth generation ancestors in the Ming dynasty, Tang Yuen-wan, Tang Mui-kei and Tang Nim-fung, to commemorate their tenth generation ancestor, Tang King-law. The Tang clan which branched out from Kam Tin, Yuen Long, settled in Tai Po Tau in the 13th century. The stone plaque above the main entrance engraved with the calligraphy written by the famous artist and calligraphist, Tang Yi Nga. It is interesting to note that Tang Yung |

| Item No. | Name | Address | Year of Construction | Year of Declaration | Historical Significance |
|----------|---|--|----------------------|---------------------|---|
| | | | | | Kang, father of Tang Yi Nga, was the Hon Lam Yuen Shue Kat Sz in the third year of Tongzhi reign (1864) of the Qing dynasty. A wooden plaque engraved with “Lau Kwong Tong” hanging at the middle hall was written by Wu Hong Man of the Kuomintang. Bok Bok Chai was practiced in the building and there was a maximum of 40 students at one time. The building also served as a venue for holding ancestral worship in spring and autumn equinoxes, lantern raising ceremony and wedding banquets, etc. The ancestral hall was used to accommodate the Kai Chi School until it was relocated nearby in 1953. |
| 5 | Cheung Ancestral Hall, Shan Ha Tsuen, Yuen Long | No. 209 Shan Ha Tsuen, Ping Shan, Yuen Long, New Territories | 1815 | 1999 | The Cheung clan, originated from Dongguan of Guangdong Province, first settled in Shan Ha Tsuen during the Shunzhi reign (1644-1661) of the Qing dynasty. Cheung Ancestral Hall was built in the twentieth year of Jiaqing reign (1815) by the twenty-second generation ancestors of the Cheung clan. The ancestral hall is used as a centre for communal gatherings and a place for ancestral worship. The soul tablet of Cheung Gau-ling, a Prime Minister in the Tang dynasty, is placed on the top level of the altar, who was regarded as the ancestor of the Cheung clan in Shan Ha Tsuen. The building was also used as Wah Fung School for educating members of the clan from the 1930s to 1950s. With the completion of the new Wah Fung School at Lam Hau Tsuen in 1958, the chamber at the entrance hall was subsequently converted into the temporary village committee office for ten years. |
| 6 | Fan Sin Temple, Sheung Wun Yiu, Tai Po | Sheung Wun Yiu, Tai Po, New Territories | 1736-1795 | 1999 | Fan Sin Temple is the main temple of the villages of Sheung Wun Yiu and Ha Wun Yiu, which was probably built about 200 years ago. The temple, which has strong association with the porcelain industry of the area, was constructed by the Ma clan to worship the three brothers surnamed Fan who |

| Item No. | Name | Address | Year of Construction | Year of Declaration | Historical Significance |
|----------|--|--|----------------------|---------------------|---|
| | | | | | are revered collectively as Fan Tai Sin Sze, the patron saint of potters. According to genealogical records of the Ma clan of Wun Yiu and the archaeological investigation, the kiln in Sheung Wun Yin was probably established not later than the early 16th century and was managed by the Man and Tse clans from Jiangxi province. In the 13th year of the Kangxi reign, Ma Choi-yeun together with other clan members who originated from Changle county of the Guangdong province, settle in Wun Yiu and later purchased the kilns from the Mans. Wun Yiu is the only site in South China which features the entire process of ceramic production. |
| 7 | North and West Blocks of St. Joseph's College, Kennedy Road, Central | No. 7 Kennedy Road, Central, Hong Kong | 1920-1925 | 2000 | St. Joseph's College is one of the missionary schools which has contributed significantly to local education over a hundred years. It was originally St. Saviour's College, which was opened by the Roman Catholic Church in 1846. In 1875, six La Salle Brothers took over the school and renamed it as St. Joseph's College. An earthquake in 1918 caused severe damage to the premises. Consequently, the College was relocated to the present site, i.e. 7 Kennedy Road. The Classroom Block, i.e. the present North Block and the Science Block or the Chapel Block, i.e. the present West Block were opened in 1920 and 1925 respectively. The former is a four-storey building flanked by two clock towers at both ends and has verandahs on one side whereas the latter is also a four-storey structure with a turret on top. The North and West Blocks are currently the only existing pre-war buildings of the College. |
| 8 | Waglan Lighthouse, Waglan Island | Waglan Island, Hong Kong | 1893 | 2000 | Waglan Lighthouse commenced operation in 1893. When first opened, it was equipped with an up-to-date light, burning mineral oil with rotating apparatus floating on |

| Item No. | Name | Address | Year of Construction | Year of Declaration | Historical Significance |
|----------|--|---|----------------------|---------------------|---|
| | | | | | mercury. Waglan light was one of the only two pieces of modern equipment introduced and installed in Asian waters at that time. It not only serves as a navigation aid, but also the place where weather information at the eastern corner of the territory is collected and fed to the Hong Kong Observatory. |
| 9 | Tang Lung Chau Lighthouse (commonly known as Kap Sing Lighthouse) | Tang Lung Chau, Kap Shui Mun, Hong Kong | 1912 | 2000 | Tang Lung Chau Lighthouse was put into service on 29 April 1912. It is a skeletal steel tower of 11.8 metres high with a white lantern on top. The steel tower and light apparatus were obtained from England. The adjoining brick light keeper's house had a bedroom, a kitchen, a latrine and a store room. Rainwater was collected from the roof and diverted into an underground tank for use as there was no spring or fresh water supply on the island. The lighthouse is now unmanned and automated. |
| 10 | Tang Ancestral Hall, Ping Shan, Yuen Long | Hang Mei Tsuen, Ping Shan, Yuen Long, New Territories | c.1300s | 2001 | The Tang Ancestral Hall, being the main ancestral hall of Ping Shan Tangs, was constructed by Tang Fung-shun, the fifth generation ancestor of the Tang clan, about 700 years ago. The magnificent three-hall and two-courtyard ancestral hall is one of the finest examples and most significant ancestral halls in Hong Kong. The elevated red sandstone pathway in the front courtyard indicates that the clan had held some high-ranking positions in the Imperial Government in the past. The building is still used regularly for worshipping purposes and celebrations of traditional festivals and ceremonies, as well as a meeting place for the clan. |
| 11 | Tsui Sing Lau Pagoda, Ping Shan, Yuen Long | Sheung Cheung Wai, Ping Shan, Yuen Long, New | 1368-1398 | 2001 | The Tsui Sing Lau Pagoda is the only ancient pagoda in Hong Kong. According to the genealogy of the Tang clan of Ping Shan, the pagoda was built by Tang Yin-tung, the |

| Item No. | Name | Address | Year of Construction | Year of Declaration | Historical Significance |
|----------|---|---|----------------------|---------------------|--|
| | | Territories | | | seventh generation ancestor, around 600 years ago. The pagoda was built to improve fengshui of the locality and to prevent flooding disasters. Furthermore, its auspicious location was believed to be able to ensure success for clan members in the Imperial Civil Service Examination. A statue of Fui Sing (Champion Star) believed to be a deity in control of success and failure in examinations is worshipped on the top floor. |
| 12 | Yu Kiu Ancestral Hall, Ping Shan, Yuen Long | Hang Mei Tsuen, Ping Shan, Yuen Long, New Territories | Early 16th C | 2001 | Yu Kiu Ancestral Hall was constructed in the early 16th century by two eleventh generation brothers: Tang Sai-yin and Tang Sai-chiu. Apart from serving as an ancestral hall, the building was occupied by Tat Tak Primary School from 1931 to 1961 for teaching the youngsters. It comprises three halls and two internal courtyards. The last major renovation of the building probably took place during the Guangxu reign (1875-1908) of Qing dynasty as indicated by the engraved characters on the stone plaque above the main entrance. Most of the original structure and decorative features of the building remain intact. |
| 13 | Tin Hau Temple, Lung Yeuk Tau, Fanling | Lung Yeuk Tau, Fanling, New Territories | c.1500 | 2002 | According to village elders, the Tin Hau Temple in Lung Yeuk Tau is believed to be constructed around the middle of the Ming dynasty. The oldest relics surviving in the temple are the two cast iron bells displayed at the side bay of the main hall cast in 1695 and 1700 respectively, which were offered to Tin Hau for her blessing. The main hall of the temple is devoted to the worship of Tin Hau and her guards, Chin Lee Ngan (Thousand-Li Eye) and Shun Fung Yee (God of Favourable Wind Ear). It underwent large-scale renovations in 1913 and 1981 respectively. The Tin Hau Temple, together with the adjacent Tang Chung Ling Ancestral Hall and Lo Wai, comprises a significant heritage |

| Item No. | Name | Address | Year of Construction | Year of Declaration | Historical Significance |
|-----------------|--|--|-----------------------------|----------------------------|--|
| | | | | | complex in Lung Yeuk Tau. |
| 14 | Hung Shing Temple, Kau Sai Chau, Sai Kung | Kau Sai Chau, Sai Kung, New Territories | Before 1899 | 2002 | The Hung Shing Temple on Kau Sai Chau, Sai Kung was built by the fishermen before 1899 to honour Hung Shing, Choi Pak Sing Kwan and Shui Sin Yeuh. Historic relics of the temple include a cloud gong, a bronze bell, an offering table and a model dragon boat of some one hundred years ago. Above the main entrance are two Shiwan ceramic panels of approximately the same period of the temple. The recent restoration of the temple in 2000 was recognized as an Outstanding Project of the UNESCO Asia-Pacific Heritage 2000 Awards for Cultural Heritage Conservation. |
| 15 | Hau Ku Shek Ancestral Hall, Ho Sheung Heung, Sheung Shui | Ho Sheung Heung, Sheung Shui, New Territories | 1762 | 2003 | According to the genealogy of the Haus, the fifth generation of the Hau clan first settled in Ho Sheung Heung in the 12th century. The Hau Ku Shek Ancestral Hall was erected in 1762 to honour the seventeenth generation ancestor, Hau Ku-shek. The ancestral hall has a special significance to the Haus since Ho Sheung Heung is the founding place of the Hau clan in Hong Kong. The soul tablets on the altar show that some members of the clan were officials of the Qing dynasty and were successful in the Imperial Civil Examination. The rear hall of the ancestral hall was once used as a school until the establishment of Ho Kai School in the village in 1953. It is the first ancestral hall of the Hau clan, as one of the "Five Major Local Clans" declared as historical building in Hong Kong. |
| 16 | Morrison Building, Hoh Fok Tong Centre, Tuen Mun | Hoh Fuk Tong Centre, Tuen Mun, New Territories | 1936 | 2004 | Morrison Building of Hoh Fuk Tong Centre was built in 1936 by General Cai Tingjie, who led the Nineteenth Corps against the Japanese invasion in 1930s. The building was used as school premises of the Dade Institute between 1946 |

| Item No. | Name | Address | Year of Construction | Year of Declaration | Historical Significance |
|----------|--|--|----------------------|---------------------|--|
| | | | | | <p>and 1949. It was used for tertiary education founded under the directive of Chinese leaders Zhou Enlai and Dong Biwu. Many eminent Chinese scholars of the time lectured at the institute, nurturing a group of young intellectuals. The Institute bears witness to the unique role played by Hong Kong in the history of modern China and the establishment of the People's Republic of China. After the closure of Dade Institute, the London Missionary Society, now the Council for World Mission, bought the campus and lent it to the Church of Christ in China since 1950. Morrison Building is the most historically significant building on the Hoh Fuk Centre. It is an imposing 2-storey building built in Shanghai plaster rendering. The front elevation is built in the Art Deco style of architectural popular in the 1930s. Internally the building has many interesting architectural features including 1930s style period windows and doors, original floor tiling and a very fine timber staircase with revel posts and wrought iron balustrading in Art Deco style. Most of the doors and windows appear to be original and alterations minimal.</p> |
| 17 | Cape D'Aguilar Lighthouse, D'Aguilar Peninsula | Cape D'Aguilar, D'Aguilar Peninsula, Hong Kong | 1875 | 2005 | <p>Cape D'Aguilar Lighthouse is the first lighthouse established in Hong Kong. It came into operation on 16 April 1875. The existing structure is a round stone tower, 9.7 metres high and white in colour. The tower base, the arched doorway and the circular staircase are of fine masonry. It had once played an important role in the maritime history of Hong Kong. At present, there are only five pre-war lighthouses still survived. Two of the five lighthouses are on Green Island while the other three are at Cape D'Aguilar, Waglan Island and Tang Lung Chau respectively.</p> |

| Item No. | Name | Address | Year of Construction | Year of Declaration | Historical Significance |
|----------|----------------------|---|----------------------|---------------------|--|
| 18 | Leung Ancestral Hall | No. 62 Yuen Kong Tsuen, Pat Heung, Yuen Long, New Territories | 17 th -18th C | 2006 | <p>Originated from Banshi of Dongguan, Leung Tai-shing of the Leung clan established the Yuen Kong Tsuen in Pat Heung in the early 18th century. The Leung Ancestral Hall was built by the Leungs about 200 years ago for ancestral worship. The ancestral hall is a typical Qing vernacular building constructed of green bricks with two halls and an open courtyard in-between. Wood carvings, plaster mouldings and murals of auspicious motifs of the ancestral hall are well preserved. It is a typical example of ancestral halls serving Hakka clans in the territory. Today, the Leung Ancestral Hall is still actively used by the clansmen for launching rites and meetings for clan affairs.</p> |