

附錄 B

**古物古蹟辦事處(古蹟辦)就薄扶林道128號(大宅)的文物價值
及相關事宜撰寫的文件及評估報告**

附件 1: 古蹟辦於 2004 年就考慮應否把該大宅宣布列為暫定古蹟所
撰寫的文物評估報告(原文為英文)

附件 2: 古蹟辦於 2008 年就考慮應否撤回該大宅為暫定古蹟地位所
撰寫的文物評估報告(原文為英文)

History and Architecture of the "Jessville" at 128 Pok Fu Lam Road, Hong Kong

Situated at No. 128 Pok Fu Lam Road, Jessville was erected on a site which is above Pok Fu Lam Road and mostly hidden by great old trees. The old house was built in 1931, surviving almost unaltered and surrounded by reasonably well-kept grounds. The main building is a European style house with an annex in the Chinese vernacular at the back. In the front of the house, there is a garden with a fountain erected in the centre.

Historical Appraisal

2. Jessville was erected in 1931 after the lot was purchased by William Ngar Tse Thomas Tam (Tam Ngar Tse 譚雅士 or 譚夏士) on 2 September 1929. Since then, Thomas Tam lived in the house until his death in 1979. Afterwards, the house was inherited by Jessie Tam (杜佩珍) and William Nixon Thomas Ching Tam (譚正) as joint-tenants. In 1991, the house was sold to Samsbury Investments Limited. It is surmised that the name of the house, Jessville, was given after completion of the house in 1931, named after Jessie Tam, the wife of Thomas Tam.
3. Thomas Tam bought the present lot covering an area of 6,215 square meters at the price of \$20,070 by Public Auction held on 2 September 1929. According to lands records, only one European house could be erected on the steep lot. Historically, many Europeans had sought sites in the area of Pok Fu Lam to erect their summer resorts or villas during the early colonial period of Hong Kong. Like many others, Thomas Tam bought the present site of Jessville to erect a residence for himself, surrounded by greenery, a garden and hidden by trees. Jessville is a rare surviving example bearing testimony to the westerners' lifestyle in the earlier days of Hong Kong.
4. Thomas Tam was a prominent figure in Hong Kong and his family has occupied Jessville for more than six decades. Thomas Tam was made a Justice of Peace (J.P.) in 1933 and was appointed an unofficial member of the Legislative Council 1939-1941. He also served on the Chinese Rehabilitation Committee (香港善後處理委員會) and the Chinese Co-operative Council (香港華民各界協議會) during the period of Japanese Occupation (1941-1945). Thomas Tam was also

elected as Chairman of Po Leung Kok Board (香港保良局) in 1936-1937 and an Executive Member of Aberdeen Trade School (香港工業學校) in 1955.

5. With donation from the Jessie and Thomas Tam Foundation (譚雅士杜佩珍基金會), two life-care organizations have been erected recently. They are, namely, Jessie and Thomas Tam Centre (安家舍) and the Society for the Promotion of Hospice Care (善寧會). Jessie and Thomas Tam Centre was inaugurated by the Mrs. Betty Tung (董趙洪聘) and William Nixon Thomas Ching Tam (譚正), the son of Thomas Tam, in 1997.

6. Jessville has a certain social and cultural value. Its previous owner, Thomas Tam, was a well-known celebrity at that time. It is physically close to Old Alberose which was erected in 1924 with typical Victorian features. Jessville earns some merits for reflecting European upper-class lifestyle in early twentieth century, which was an integral part of the history of Hong Kong. Jessville is a rare surviving example of European-type houses on Pok Fu Lam Road.

Architectural Appraisal

7. Jessville is a Classical Revival residence of Italian Renaissance style with certain modern Art Deco influences. Application of reinforced concrete reflects the transition in architecture of that time. It is a two storied building. The building plan is rather simple, composed of rectangular rooms in a standard orthogonal grid pattern. It faces the main sea view, southwest, so that the main entrance patio and verandah is designed on that elevation. An axis of strong symmetry is applied in the building design except an annex at the rear on northwest side.

8. This building is built with a reinforced concrete structure filled by brickwork panels and finished by terrazzo externally. Basically the roof is estimated to be a flat reinforced concrete structure. Original timber carved windows and doors still survive in good condition. Window shutters and top ventilation windows are adopted to facilitate ventilation and shading that reflects the building technology of that time.

9. Tuscan columns feature on the verandah and the entrance patio. Heavy Roman pediments are designed at the middle on the main elevation. A dome or cupola is situated in the middle of the roof.

Entablatures of cornice and frieze of expressive dentils extends around the whole building at roof level. Ornamental balustrades run along the verandah. Besides these Italianate Renaissance features, geometrical decorations on corner columns and friezes and geometrical pediments are certain Art Deco influences found on this building.

10. No observable significant alteration was found on the external facade. The building has been kept in a consistent design that probably is the original design. This place is a typical example of a modern colonial version of Italianate Renaissance architecture of medium size and consistent design of a wealthy family's residence in the pre-war period.

11. Jessville has a nice green hilly environment and a sea view. Pok Fu Lam Road is mainly made up of greenery and low density high-grade residence including some buildings of pre-modern style which matches the heritage quality of Jessville. Certain heritage buildings including Old Alberose at 132B Pok Fu Lam Road, Bethanie at 139 Pok Fu Lam Road, and Douglas Castle (the present University Hall) are in the neighborhood.

Review of Assessment of the Heritage value of the Building at 128 Pok Fu Lam Road (Jessville)

Introduction

The proposed monument declaration of the Building at 128 Pok Fu Lam Road ("the Building") under section 2A of the Antiquities and Monuments Ordinance ("the Ordinance") will lapse after 19 April 2008. As the executive arm of the Antiquities Authority ("the Authority"), the Antiquities and Monuments Office ("the AMO") has prepared this assessment report to facilitate the Authority's consideration as to whether the Building should be declared as a monument under section 3 of the Ordinance.

Conclusion of Assessment

2. We have completed the comprehensive assessment of the heritage value of the Building and it is our recommendation that, although the Building is of some heritage value, it is not up to the threshold that justifies its declaration to be a monument under the Ordinance.

Details

3. Before the declaration of the Building as a proposed monument, the AMO had not been able to gain access to the Building as its owner refused to grant such. The AMO's requests for a direct dialogue with the Building's owner had also been turned down. Because of these, the AMO's previous assessment on its architectural value was restricted to the external appearance of the Building as viewed from a distance and that on its general heritage value was based on information available to the AMO at the time. In the past few months, the AMO has successfully gained access to the Building with the consent of the Building's owner and has been able to obtain new information through on-site inspections. The Building's owner has also provided new information about the Building and its previous owner, Mr Thomas Tam, in the course of his petition to CE against the proposed monument declaration. The AMO has therefore been able to carry out a comprehensive assessment of the heritage value of the Building. As directed by the Authority, we have also compared the heritage value of the Building with that of the other historic buildings of similar use that have been declared as monuments.

A detailed historical and architectural account on the Building is at Annex A and the heritage assessment of the Building is at Annex B for your consideration. Taking into account all relevant factors, it is the AMO's professional view that, while the Building possesses some heritage value, it is not up to the threshold that justifies its declaration as a monument. We therefore do not recommend that the Building be declared as a monument under the Ordinance.

Threshold for declaring a building as a monument

4. All along, only 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 Ordinance. Using the historical buildings of similar use 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. At present, a total of five historical buildings built for residential use have been declared as monuments in Hong Kong, namely Flagstaff House, Island House, Government House, Morrison Building and University Hall. Two of these five declared monuments are private residences, i.e. Morrison Building and University Hall. Using those two private historic residences which have been declared as monuments as a yardstick, it is clear that the threshold of historical, archaeological or palaeontological significance qualifying a building as a monument is very high. On the basis of our comprehensive assessment of the heritage value of the Building, while we acknowledge that the Building possesses some heritage value, we consider that on the whole its overall heritage value is not significant enough to justify its declaration as a monument under the Ordinance.

Historical value of the Building

5. The Building is closely related to a social figure, Mr. Thomas Tam, who was involved in the social development of Hong Kong. He was a barrister and a person of social standing in Hong Kong from the 1930s to 1950s. He had served at different levels of the crown magistracies and was appointed a judge of the Central Magistracy in 1947. However, Mr. Thomas Tam's influence in the society was short-lived and he was much less well known when compared to other important social figures of Hong Kong at the time, such as Sir Shouson Chow (周壽臣, 1861-1959) or Sir Robert Hotung (何東, 1862-1956) – who were often referred to as “the two grand old men of Hong Kong”. Whilst Sir

Shouson Chow was the first Chinese member of the Executive Council, Sir Robert Hotung was the first Chinese allowed to live on Victoria Peak which was once restricted to Europeans under the Hill District Reservation Ordinance of 1904.

6. In terms of his record of appointments and public service, Mr Thomas Tam was perhaps most notable as Chairman of the Board of Directors of Po Leung Kuk (1936-37), President of the Rotary Club of Hong Kong (1936-37) and Unofficial Member of the Legislative Council (1939-41). Compared with other local elites of his times who were trained in western professions such as law and medicine – for example, Sir Tsun-nin Chau (周竣年, 1893-1971), Dr Li Shu-fan (李樹芬, 1885-1966) and Sir Man-kam Lo (羅文錦, 1893-1959), Mr. Thomas Tam was socially less active and influential given his short period of public service. His contribution to and standing in the society were not so significant as have left him in the memory of the people of Hong Kong. Today, the name of Mr Thomas Tam is not quite well-known to the community. It does not seem that his role and status in the history of Hong Kong was so significant that would attach any additional historical value to the Building. His role and status in the history of Hong Kong was not so significant as should justify the declaration of his residence as a monument.

7. The Building is noteworthy as the residence of a historical figure who had a record of public service. However, neither the building nor its owner is well remembered by Hong Kong people. In comparison with other declared residential buildings such as the University Hall¹ and the Morrison Building², the historical significance

¹ University Hall in Pokfulam is a charming edifice in a blend of Tudor and Gothic architectural styles. It was built in about 1861 by a Scottish business, Douglas Lapraik as his headquarters and residence and named after him as "Douglas Castle". The French Mission later bought the Castle in 1894 and renamed it Nazareth House. In 1953, the French Mission gave up the building which was then acquired by the University of Hong Kong in 1954. Since 1956 the building has been used by the University as a hall of residence for male students and renamed as "University Hall". The exterior of the University Hall was declared as a monument in 1995.

² The Morrison Building in Hoh Fuk Tong Centre, Tuen Mun was originally part of a villa built in 1936 by General Cai Tingjie (蔡廷鍇將軍) (1892-1968), who led the Nineteen Corps (十九路軍) against the Japanese invasion. The architectural characteristics of the building are rather unique. It is designed in Art Deco style and rendered with Shanghai plaster, and has a Chinese-style roof-top structure with green glazed Chinese tiled hipped roof decorated with dragon shaped ornaments at four corners. The design of Morrison Building represents a harmonious blend of Chinese and Western styles. It had later been used for tertiary education by the Dade Institute (達德學院), founded under the directive of Chinese leaders Zhou Enlai (周恩來) and Dong Biwu (董必武), from 1946 to 1949. Many eminent

of the Building is clearly inferior. It also does not possess strong association with significant historical events of much importance in the historical development of Hong Kong. The historical significance of the Building is limited to the lifetime of its owner. In fact, the existence of the Building is not known to many including those frequenting the area.

Architectural value of the Building

8. The Building is a two-storey European house worthy as an epitome of the Classical Revival residence of Italian Renaissance style with interesting Art Deco influences. The two rooftop structures, i.e. a dome or cupola and a small pavilion in contrasting Chinese style, situating on the flat roof of the building also illustrate the Western and Chinese influences to its architectural design. The site visits revealed that there has not been any major alteration or addition to both the interior and exterior of the Building. Its authenticity is enhanced by the little changes made to the garden, the ornate fountain and the greenery in the immediate environ. However, on close inspection, the dome and the pavilion are of ordinary workmanship and their architectural merits are not extraordinary. The interior décor, which has been revealed to the AMO for the first time, is not of extraordinary style. The AMO is of the view that while the Building is an example demonstrating the eclecticism in the local architectural design during the early 20th century, it is not an extraordinary one.

9. The architectural merits of the few residential buildings that have been declared as monuments mentioned in para.4 above are significantly higher than those of the Building. The University Hall (originally known as "Douglas Castle", a residence of a Scottish merchant built in 1861-67) also in Pokfulam, for instance, is a piece of architecture in a blend of Tudor and Gothic architectural styles. Not only its age, but also the distinctive appearance of University Hall are more popularly known to Hong Kong people than those of the Building. The Flagstaff House, Government House and Island House are outstanding examples of 19th and 20th colonial architecture in Hong Kong with very high architectural values in light of their design, decoration, construction materials and craftsmanship, demonstrating Hong Kong's appreciation of its colonial legacy and its built heritage. The Morrison Building, apart from its historical significance in the shape

Chinese scholars of the time lectured at the institute, nurturing a group of young intellectuals. The building 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. The Morrison Building was declared a monument in 2004.

of China's modern history, is also of important architectural value with its harmonious blend of Chinese and Western types. The Building is not on par with these declared monuments in terms of architectural and aesthetic merits taking its exterior and interior details into account.

10. Historical Residences at landmark locations like Kom Tong Hall (甘棠第), Lui Seng Chun (雷生春) and King Yin Lei (景賢里) are well cherished by the community as part of their cultural landscape and social memory. The Building, in contrast, does not arouse similar public sentiment because it is physically segregated from its neighbourhood, being built on a raised and obscure platform above Pok Fu Lam Road and not known to the public at large. In fact, the Building is not visible from the road level of Pok Fu Lam Road.

11. In terms of architectural style, the Building is one of the seven examples of Italian Renaissance style in Hong Kong as identified by the AMO. Among these 7 buildings, two have been declared as monuments (the Hung Hing Ying Building and Main Building of the University of Hong Kong) while the others have been graded. Though the Building is a rare surviving example of European-style mansions in the Southern District of Hong Kong, the AMO does not see any sufficient ground to put the Building at a higher standing than the other finer examples that have been declared as monuments. A list of the seven Italian Renaissance style buildings in Hong Kong is at Annex C.

Archaeological and palaeontological values of the site

12. The AMO has carried out on-site inspections to ascertain the archaeological and palaeontological potential of the site, and confirm that the site does not possess any archaeological or palaeontological interest, i.e. possessing antiquities or relics as defined under the Ordinance.

Background

13. The Building was declared as a proposed monument on 20 April 2007. The purposes of the proposed monument declaration are to give the Building temporary statutory protection from demolition, damage or disturbance for 12 months and to allow time for the Authority to consider in a comprehensive manner whether it should be declared as a monument. The proposed monument declaration was made when there was a threat of the Building being demolished because its owner filed an

application to the Buildings Department on 26 March 2007 for consent to commence the demolition works. Following its declaration as a proposed monument, the AMO has been able to gain access to the Building with the owner's consent to carry out on-site inspections. The new information about the Building that the AMO has obtained through the on-site inspections and the new information about the Building and its previous owner, Mr Thomas Tam, provided by the owner in the course of his petition to CE against the proposed monument declaration have facilitated the AMO's comprehensive assessment of the heritage value of the Building.

Antiquities and Monuments Office
Leisure and Cultural Services Department
January 2008

Page 1 of Annex A

**A Historical and Architectural Account of the
Building at 128 Pok Fu Lam Road, Hong Kong**

HISTORY

The building at 128 Pok Fu Lam Road (the Building), constructed in around 1931, is a private residence known as “Jessville”, named after the Jessie Tam (譚杜佩珍), the wife of Mr William Ngar Tse Thomas Tam (譚雅士), more popularly known as Mr Thomas Tam.

The Lot

2. Mr Thomas Tam purchased the lot at the price of \$20,070 by Public Auction held on 2 September 1929. According to the land lease, only one European house could be built on the street lot. The Building surrounding with a private garden is situated on a grassy platform that has been cut from the steep sloping hillside and facing the sea.

3. Historically, many Europeans had sought sites in the area of Pok Fu Lam to build their summer resorts or villas during the early colonial period of Hong Kong, such as the Old Alberose at 132B Pok Fu Lam Road, Douglas Castle (the present University Hall) at 144 Pok Fu Lam Road. Mr Thomas Tam bought the site at 128 Pok Fu Lam Road to erect a residence for his family.

The Building and its Owner

4. The Building was the private residence of Mr William Ngar Tse Thomas Tam, a notable figure of the Chinese elite class in Hong Kong in the mid-20th century. Being a barrister, Mr Thomas Tam had served at different levels of the crown magistracies and was appointed the judge of the Central Magistracy in 1947. He was the Chairman of Po Leung Kuk Board and the President of the Rotary Club of Hong Kong in 1936 – 1937, Unofficial Member of the Legislative Council in 1939 –1941 and the Member of the Court of University of Hong Kong in 1954. He also served on the Chinese Rehabilitation Committee (香港善後處理委員會) and the Chinese Co-operative Council (香港華民各界協議會) during the period of Japanese Occupation (1941-45). Moreover, he was also enthusiastic in charity and a number of charitable organizations including Jessie and Thomas Tam Centre (安家舍) and the

Page 2 of Annex A

Society for the Promotion of Hospice Care (善寧會) were founded under his auspices.

5. Mr Thomas Tam lived in the Building since it was completed until he moved to another flat in 1971. After his death in 1976, the Building was passed on to his wife Mrs Jessie Tam and his son Mr William Nixon Thomas Ching Tam (譚正). In 1991, the house was sold to Samsbury Investments Limited.

ARCHITECTURE

Layout of the Site

6. With an area of about 6,440m², the site is accessible from Pok Fu Lam Road up a steep and winding single-lane private road. The site comprises a mansion (the Building) with an ancillary rear wing (for accommodating the servant quarters and the garage), a garden, an access road and the surrounding hilly slopes.

7. Situated on a greenery platform that has been cut from the steeply sloping hillside, the Building faces the sea view of East Lamma Channel to its southwest. An axis of strong symmetry is applied in the building design except an ancillary wing accommodating servant quarters and a garage at the rear on northwest side.

8. The servant quarters together with the garage form an almost independent two-storey ancillary wing at the rear of the Building. It is constructed in a plain and functional manner, much simpler than the main house and with no obvious decorations.

9. It is believed that the garden was built at the same time with the Building. The garden is considered to be an integral part in the overall architectural design of the complex reflecting the taste and lifestyle of the Tam family. The most notable soft landscape features are the tall Norfolk Island Pines, lime and lemon trees close to the Building. The individual craftsmanship of the few hard landscaping features are a notable attraction to the site, including the ornate fountain and the unusual design of the metal boundary fence depicting a combination of dogs, birds and other animals.

Page 3 of Annex A

10. Part of the garden area has been disturbed by the preparation work of the proposed hoarding. Metal fence has been set up along the lawn to the west of the Building and some garden furniture have also been dismantled and removed to make way for the proposed hoarding work.

Exterior of the Building

11. The Building is a two-storey European house with a total floor area of about 1,380m² and is constructed with a reinforced concrete structure filled by brickwork panels and finished by terrazzo externally. Original timber carved windows and doors still survive in good condition. Window shutters and top ventilation windows are adopted to facilitate ventilation and shading which is a typical colonial adaptation of the European architecture to the sub-tropical climate of Hong Kong.

12. The Building is an epitome of the Classical Revival residence of Italian Renaissance style with some Art Decor influences. Tuscan columns feature on the verandah and the entrance patio. Heavy Roman pediments are designed at the middle on the main elevation. Apart from the classical details around the main entrance, Art Décor decorations can also be found on the façade of the Building. These art décors are, however, not of much detail and are not of distinctive workmanship. The two rooftop structures, i.e. a Baroque style dome or cupola with pinnacle on its top and a small pavilion in contrasting Chinese style, situating on the flat roof of the Building also illustrate the eclecticism in its architectural design which was commonly found in local pre-War residential buildings.

Interior of the Building

13. Entering the house through the imposing entrance hall, there are the storey-high Classical white alabaster columns on both side, together with the matching square-shaded piers. The columns continue the theme of the Classical Doric Order already seen on the external of the Building. At the end of the entrance hall is the music room. The dining room and the lounge are situated at the both side of the entrance hall.

14. Although the architect and interior designer of the Building are not yet known, it is likely that the owner had provided much of his own input into the layout of the Building, as some features are not typical

Page 4 of Annex A

in an European mansion, such as the hall on the first floor and the wide entrance hall and music room.

15. The period light fittings, ornamental balustrades around the light well above the hall on the first floor, decorations on the timber staircase and the stained glass fanlights of the doors in the lounge are certain Art Décor influences found inside the Building.

16. There is no major notable alteration or addition to both the interior and exterior of the Building since its vacation in the past decades. The authenticity is enhanced by the little changes made to the garden, the ornate fountain and the greenery in the immediate environ.

**Heritage Assessment of the Building
at 128 Pok Fu Lam Road, Hong Kong**

1. Historical Value

The Building is the private residence and was a living reminder of Mr. Thomas Tam, a social figure of the Chinese elite class in Hong Kong in the mid-20th century. His influence as a social leader was rooted in different spectra of the community, illustrated by the many social positions he led, such as the Chairman of Po Leung Kuk Board in 1936-1937, Unofficial Member of the Legislative Council in 1939-1941 and Member of the Court of University of Hong Kong in 1954.

Mr. Thomas Tam's influence in the society was short-lived. He was socially less active and influential than many other social figures in the history of Hong Kong in the past 70 years. His contribution to and prominence in the society were not so significant as have left a long lasting memory among the people of Hong Kong.

The Building does not possess strong association with significant events of much importance in the history of Hong Kong in comparison with some other former private residential buildings such as University Hall and Morrison Building that have been declared as monuments. The historical value of the Building was limited to the lifetime of Mr Thomas Tam.

2. Architectural Value

The Building is an epitome of the Classical Revival residence of Italian Renaissance style with Art Deco variations. Application of reinforced concrete reflects the transition in architecture of the inter-war period. Window shutters and top ventilation windows are adopted to facilitate ventilation and shading which is a typical colonial adaptation of the European architecture to the sub-tropical climate of Hong Kong. The Building is regarded as an example demonstrating the eclecticism in the local architectural design during the early 20th century in Hong Kong, but not an extraordinary one.

3. Authenticity

There does not appear to be any major alteration or addition to either the exterior or the interior of the Building. The authenticity is enhanced by the little changes made to the garden, the ornate fountain and the greenery in the immediate environ. All these elements combine to give a vivid picture of the European lifestyle in one of the richest areas of the territory in the mid-20th century.

4. Rarity

The Building is one of few examples of European-style mansions in the Southern District. Credits must be added to the relatively undeveloped surrounding, albeit small in area, which embraces the mansion with tranquil and pleasant greenery. The building is also one of the few examples featuring a Chinese small pavilion on the roof of a European architecture. However, the design of this roof-top structure cannot be regarded as a distinctive one in comparison with other examples.

In terms of architectural style, the Building is one of the seven examples of Italian Renaissance style in Hong Kong identified by the AMO. Among these seven buildings, two have been declared as monuments (Hung Hing Ying Building and Main Building of the University of Hong Kong) while others have been graded.

5. Integrity

The Building is an important component of an integral architectural and historic complex in the Southern District. It is physically close to a number of heritage buildings including the Old Alberose at 132B Pok Fu Lam Road, the Bethanie at 139 Pok Fu Lam Road, the Old Dairy Farm Cowshed Compound at 141 Pok Fu Lam Road, and the University Hall (formerly the Douglas Castle), which come together to illustrate the history of the area.

6. Social Value

The Building physically stands on a site which once marked the dramatic difference in living conditions and styles between upper class on top of

Page 3 of Annex B

the hill and the common grass roots down in the Sheung Wan area. The Building can illustrate the history of social development and urbanization of Hong Kong in the early to mid-20th century. However, the Building in fact does not arouse public sentiment, unlike Kom Tong Hall (甘棠第), Lui Seng Chun (雷生春) and King Yin Lei (景賢里), as it is physically segregated from its neighbourhood, being built on a raised and obscure platform above Pok Fu Lam Road and rarely visited by the public. In its vicinity, University Hall is significantly more popularly known to Hong Kong people than the Building not only due to its age, but also in terms of distinctive appearance.

Annex C

**List of Declared Monuments and Graded Historical Buildings
with Italian Renaissance Style**

| Item No. | Name and Address (名稱及地址) | Grading | Sub-style | Year of Construction |
|------------------------------------|---|----------|--|--|
| Declared Monuments | | | | |
| 1. | The Exterior of the Main Building, The University of Hong Kong 香港薄扶林薄扶林道 香港大學本部大樓外部 | Monument | Italian Renaissance | Built in 1910-1912. Declared as a monument in 1984. |
| 2. | The Exterior of Hung Hing Ying Building, The University of Hong Kong, Pokfulam Road, Pokfulam, Hong Kong 香港薄扶林薄扶林道 香港大學孔慶燊樓外部 | Monument | Italian Renaissance with Baroque features | Built in 1912. Declared as a monument in 1995. |
| Graded Historical Buildings | | | | |
| 1. | Facade of Old Mental Hospital (Facade), No. 2 High Street, Sai Ying Pun, H.K. 香港西營盤高街 2 號 舊精神病院正立面 | I | Facade : resembles Florentine style, Italian Renaissance | Built in 1892 |
| 2. | Ohel Leah Synagogue, No. 70 Robinson Road, Mid-levels, H.K. 香港半山羅便臣道 70 號 猶太教莉亞堂 | I | Classical, Italian Renaissance with Baroque features | Built in 1901 |
| 3. | Sacred Heart Chapel, No. 36A Caine Road, Central, H.K. 香港中環堅道 36 號 聖心教堂 | II | Italian Renaissance | Built in 1907 |
| 4. | Shing Kwong Church, Church of Christ in China, No. 7 Eastern Hospital Road, Causeway Bay, H.K. 香港銅鑼灣東院道 7 號 中華基督教會聖光堂 | III | Italian Renaissance (front block) -- Georgian features (rear hall) | Built in 1927 |
| 5. | No. 64 Kennedy Road, Wan Chai, H.K. 香港灣仔堅尼地道 64 號 | III | Italian Renaissance | Built in c. 1924 |