

WITHIN THE FOUR SEAS ALL MEN ARE BROTHERS

四海一家

Chinatown Gates, Haymarket

Heritage Assessment Report

Prepared for City of Sydney

June 2023

Acknowledgement of Country

We respect and acknowledge the First Nations of the lands and waterways on which we live and work, their rich cultural heritage and their deep connection to Country, and we acknowledge their Elders past and present. We are committed to truth-telling and to engaging with First Nations to support the protection of their culture and heritage. We strongly advocate social, cultural and political justice and support the Uluru Statement from the Heart.

Cultural warning

Aboriginal and Torres Strait Islander readers are advised that this document may contain images or names of First Nations people who have since passed away.

Report register

The following report register documents the development of this report, in accordance with GML’s Quality Management System.

| Job No. | Issue No. | Notes/Description | Issue Date |
|---------|-----------|----------------------|--------------|
| 22-0275 | 1 | Draft Report | January 2023 |
| 22-0275 | 2 | Final Report | March 2023 |
| 22-0275 | 3 | Revised Final Report | June 2023 |

Quality management

The report has been reviewed and approved for issue in accordance with the GML quality management policy and procedures.

It aligns with best-practice heritage conservation and management, *The Burra Charter: the Australia ICOMOS Charter for Places of Cultural Significance, 2013* and heritage and environmental legislation and guidelines relevant to the subject place.

Right to use

GML grants to the client for this project, and the client’s successors in title, an irrevocable royalty-free right to reproduce or use the material from this report, except where such use infringes the copyright or moral rights of GML or third parties.

Copyright

© GML Heritage Pty Ltd 2023

This report has been produced for the client as an internal document. Except as allowed under the *Copyright Act 1968* (Cth), no part may be copied, transmitted, published, or otherwise dealt with in any form without permission in writing from GML Heritage and the owners of copyright in images or other matter in that part of the document.

Pre-existing copyright in images and other matter is acknowledged where appropriate. Although a reasonable effort has been made to obtain permission to reproduce copyright material, GML Heritage does not warrant that permission has been obtained in all cases.

Source of images is GML unless otherwise stated.

Cover image

Chinatown Gates. (Source: © GML)

Contents

| | | |
|----------|--|-----------|
| 1 | Introduction | 1 |
| 1.1 | Background | 1 |
| 1.2 | Identification of the subject site..... | 1 |
| 1.3 | Heritage context..... | 3 |
| 1.3.1 | Heritage listings in the vicinity | 3 |
| 1.4 | Methodology..... | 4 |
| 1.5 | Terminology | 4 |
| 1.6 | Limitations | 5 |
| 1.7 | Authorship and acknowledgements | 6 |
| 1.8 | Endnotes | 6 |
| 2 | Statutory context..... | 7 |
| 2.1 | Introduction | 7 |
| 2.2 | Heritage Act 1977 | 7 |
| 2.3 | Environmental Planning and Assessment Act 1979 | 7 |
| 2.4 | Sydney Local Environmental Plan 2012 | 7 |
| 3 | Historical overview..... | 9 |
| 3.1 | Introduction | 9 |
| 3.2 | Aboriginal history..... | 9 |
| 3.3 | John Dickson’s grant and Dixon Street..... | 12 |
| 3.4 | The Chinese history of Sydney and Haymarket | 16 |
| 3.5 | Plans for Sydney’s Chinatown | 20 |
| 3.6 | The Chinese damen, Dixon Street..... | 32 |
| 3.6.1 | Chinatown’s redevelopment | 39 |
| 3.6.2 | Original construction drawings | 40 |
| 3.7 | Henry Tsang, architect..... | 44 |
| 3.8 | Endnotes | 45 |
| 4 | Physical description | 48 |
| 4.1 | Site and setting | 48 |
| 4.1.1 | Physical description | 48 |
| 4.1.2 | Site photographs..... | 51 |

| | | |
|----------|--|-----------|
| 4.2 | Views and Vistas..... | 62 |
| 4.3 | Integrity | 66 |
| 4.4 | Summary condition assessment..... | 66 |
| 5 | Assessment of significance | 68 |
| 5.1 | NSW heritage assessment guidelines | 68 |
| 5.2 | Historical themes..... | 71 |
| 5.3 | Comparative analysis..... | 74 |
| 5.3.1 | Conclusion | 81 |
| 5.4 | Assessment against standard criteria..... | 82 |
| 5.4.1 | Criterion A (Historical significance)..... | 82 |
| 5.4.2 | Criterion B (Associative significance) | 83 |
| 5.4.3 | Criterion C (Aesthetic significance) | 84 |
| 5.4.4 | Criterion D (Social significance) | 85 |
| 5.4.5 | Criterion E (Research potential) | 86 |
| 5.4.6 | Criterion F (Rarity) | 87 |
| 5.4.7 | Criterion G (Representativeness)..... | 88 |
| 5.5 | Significant components | 89 |
| 5.6 | Summary Statement of Significance..... | 93 |
| 5.7 | Proposed Curtilage | 95 |
| 6 | Conclusions and recommendations | 97 |
| 6.1 | Conclusions..... | 97 |
| 6.2 | Recommendations | 97 |
| 6.2.1 | Recommended heritage listing | 97 |
| 6.2.2 | Recommended management | 97 |
| 6.2.3 | Recommended proposed actions..... | 98 |

1 Introduction

1.1 Background

City of Sydney Council (Council) engaged GML Heritage Pty Ltd (GML) to provide a heritage assessment of the Chinatown Gates at Dixon Street, Haymarket. The assessment has been prepared to determine whether the Chinatown Gates meet the threshold for listing as a heritage item.

The approach, methodology, assessment procedures, criteria and recommendations of the report are in accordance with the *Australia ICOMOS Charter for Places of Cultural Significance, 2013* (the Burra Charter) and the guideline 'Assessing Heritage Significance' prepared by the Heritage Division of the Office of the Environment and Heritage (now Heritage NSW) and contained in the *NSW Heritage Manual*.

1.2 Identification of the subject site

The subject site is in Dixon Street, Haymarket, in the Sydney local government area (LGA) (Figure 1.1). It includes two gates at the north and south ends of Dixon Street. The two gates are separated by a pedestrian route, that is designated as a shared zone (Figure 1.2). The north gate is south of the intersection of Factory Street and Dixon Street (and south of Goulburn Street). The south gate is north of the junction of Hay Street and Dixon Street. The subject site is located on a public thoroughfare and has no lot number.

The gates of the subject site have been referred to as archways or ceremonial gateways based on the supporting description. GML refers to the structure of the Chinatown Gates as 'gates' throughout the report.




Figure 1.1 Map (not to scale) of the surrounding area. The subject site is circled in red. (Source: Google Maps with GML overlay)




Figure 1.2 Location of the north and south gates (outlined in red). (Source: Google Maps with GML overlay)

1.3 Heritage context

The subject site is not listed as an item on the *Sydney Local Environmental Plan 2012* (Sydney LEP), Schedule 5 Environmental Heritage, nor is it located within a heritage conservation area.

1.3.1 Heritage listings in the vicinity

Table 1.1 provides a list of heritage items located in the vicinity of the subject site and listed on the Sydney LEP.

Table 1.1 Heritage items and heritage conservation areas in the vicinity of the subject site.
(Source: Sydney LEP)

| Item Name | Address | Significance | Item No. |
|---|-------------------------------|--------------|----------|
| Former "Sydney Trades Hall" including interiors | 4–10 Goulburn Street, Sydney | State | I1802 |
| "Former Kwong War Chong & Co building, including interiors and contents of 84 Dixon Street" | 82–84 Dixon Street, Haymarket | Local | I2293 |
| Former John Bridge Woolstore facades | 68 Harbour Street, Haymarket | State | I852 |
| "Covent Garden hotel including interior" | 102–108 Hay Street, Haymarket | Local | I853 |
| Former Burlington Hotel including interior | 431–439 Sussex Street | Local | I865 |



Figure 1.3 Heritage items in the vicinity of the Chinatown Gates. The subject site is marked in red. (Source: Sydney LEP 2012 with GML overlay)

1.4 Methodology

This heritage assessment report uses methodology and terminology consistent with the *NSW Heritage Manual* guidelines, including 'Assessing Heritage Significance', and the guidelines of the Burra Charter.

1.5 Terminology

The terminology used in this report is consistent with the *NSW Heritage Manual* and the Burra Charter.

- ◀ **Place** means site, area, land, landscape, building or other work, group of buildings or other works, and may include components, contents, spaces and views.
- ◀ **Cultural significance** means aesthetic, historic, scientific, social or spiritual value for past, present or future generations. Cultural significance is embodied in the place itself, its fabric, setting, use, associations, meanings, records, related places and related objects. Places may have a range of values for different individuals or groups.
- ◀ **Fabric** means all the physical material of the place including components, fixtures, contents and objects.

- ◁ **Conservation** means all the processes of looking after a place so to retain its cultural significance.
- ◁ **Maintenance** means the continuous protective care of the fabric and setting of a place, and is to be distinguished from repair. Repair involves restoration or reconstruction.
- ◁ **Preservation** means maintaining the fabric of a place in its existing state and retarding deterioration.
- ◁ **Restoration** means returning the existing fabric of a place to a known earlier state by removing accretions or by reassembling existing components without the introduction of new material.
- ◁ **Reconstruction** means returning the place to a known earlier state and is distinguished from restoration by the introduction of new material into the fabric.
- ◁ **Adaptation** means modifying a place to suit the existing use or a proposed use.
- ◁ **Use** means the functions of a place, as well as the activities and practices that may occur at the place.
- ◁ **Compatible use** means a use which respects the cultural significance of a place. Such a use involves no, or minimal, impact on cultural significance.
- ◁ **Curtilage** is defined as the area of land surrounding an item that is required to retain its heritage significance. The nature and extent of the curtilage will vary and can include but is not limited to lot boundaries and visual catchments.
- ◁ **Setting** means the area around a place, which may include the visual catchment.
- ◁ **Related place** means a place that contributes to the cultural significance of another place.¹

1.6 Limitations

The authors of this report are not conversant in Chinese, either oral or written. The authors relied on the assistance provided by Henry Tsang, Architect of the Chinatown Gates, in interpreting the Chinese inscriptions on the gates, including the names of benefactors inscribed on the marble panels.

Access to the north and south Chinatown Gates to investigate the physical condition of the structures was undertaken using a platform lift. This physical investigation method enabled close inspection of most areas of the structures.

This heritage assessment does not include consultation with urban designers or landscape architects to address the public domain issues of the shared zone of Dixon Street.

1.7 Authorship and acknowledgements

This report has been prepared by Adiba Rahman, Heritage Consultant. Lynette Gurr, Senior Associate, reviewed the report and provided input. The historical overview was prepared by Léonie Masson, Associate and Historian. The report includes a condition assessment report prepared by International Conservation Services (ICS) members Richard Silink (Head of Conservation, Objects and Outdoor Heritage), Dr Wendy Reade and Matthew Gatt (conservation builder).

GML would like to acknowledge Henry Tsang, Architect of the Chinatown Gates, for his valuable insights and his input into the preparation of this report. GML would also like to acknowledge members of the community, King Fong (Public Relations Consultant and ex-Secretary of Dixon St Beautification Committee) for sharing his personal collection of historic photographs of the Chinatown Gates, Stanley Yee (Dixon St Beautification Committee member and owner of Empress Garden Restaurant), Arthur Yip (ex-treasurer of the Dixon St Beautification Committee) and XueQuin Ye (Architect from Guangdong China, expert on traditional Chinese Architecture) for their valuable insights into the construction of the gates.

1.8 Endnotes

¹ Australia ICOMOS Inc, *The Burra Charter: the Australia ICOMOS Charter for Places of Cultural Significance 2013*, Australia ICOMOS Inc, Burwood, VIC

2 Statutory context

2.1 Introduction

In NSW, items of heritage significance are afforded statutory protection under the following New South Wales Acts:

- < *Heritage Act 1977* (Heritage Act); and
- < *Environmental Planning and Assessment Act 1979* (EPA Act).

2.2 Heritage Act 1977

The Heritage Act is a statutory tool designed to conserve the state's environmental heritage. It is used to regulate the impacts of development on the state's heritage assets. The Heritage Act describes a heritage item as 'a place, building, work, relic, moveable object or precinct'.

The subject site is not listed on the State Heritage Register (SHR). There are no items listed on the SHR in the immediate vicinity.

2.3 Environmental Planning and Assessment Act 1979

The EPA Act is administered by the NSW Department of Planning and Environment and provides for environmental planning instruments to be made to guide the process of development and land use. The EPA Act also provides for the protection of local heritage items and conservation areas through listing on Local Environmental Plans (LEPs) and State Environmental Planning Policies (SEPPs), which provide local councils with the framework required to make planning decisions.

2.4 Sydney Local Environmental Plan 2012

The *Sydney Local Environmental Plan 2012* (Sydney LEP) is the principal environmental planning instrument applying to the land. Schedule 5 of the LEP identifies heritage items and heritage conservation areas. The objectives of Clause 5.10 are as follows:

- (a) to conserve the environmental heritage of the City of Sydney,
- (b) to conserve the heritage significance of heritage items and heritage conservation areas, including associated fabric, settings and views,
- (c) to conserve archaeological sites,

(d) to conserve Aboriginal objects and Aboriginal places of heritage significance.

The subject site is not currently listed as a heritage item, nor is it within a heritage conservation area, in the Sydney LEP.

3 Historical overview

3.1 Introduction

This section provides an overview of the historical background of the subject site. Some of the contextual history of the area is drawn from GML 2019, *Chinese Garden of Friendship, Darling Harbour—Conservation Management Plan*. The history of Dixon Street and the gates is based on primary research from the City of Sydney Archives and secondary source commentary in contemporary newspapers and documents.

3.2 Aboriginal history

The Chinatown Gates in Dixon Street are within the traditional land of the Gadigal (or Cadigal) people, fronting the southern area of Darling Harbour, which was known by the Gadigal as Tumbalong.

Sydney Harbour and its coves form a large, flooded river valley. This valley was slowly inundated by rising sea levels as the last glacial period ended, which began around 11,700 years before present (BP). Some 5000 years BP the water levels stabilised at around current levels, forming the harbour as it was in 1788. Most of the archaeological evidence of occupation for the Sydney CBD and its immediate surrounds dates from this period onwards. However, evidence of Aboriginal campsites and tool making in Sydney's west dating back to roughly 30,000 years BP suggests that people would have lived across the Sydney region much earlier than the available archaeology suggests, given that many sites would now be below sea level.¹ In her book *Sydney's Aboriginal Past*, archaeologist Val Attenbrow noted there were approximately 4,300 identified Aboriginal sites across the Sydney Basin in 2002, more than half of which were midden or open campsites. There is evidence in the vicinity of the south eastern foreshores of Darling Harbour of Aboriginal occupation and use of the surrounding areas in the years before and after European arrival. Shell middens once ran along the shorelines of the bay; in 1818, government orders forbade the removal of shells without official permission, as they were reserved for the making of lime for government buildings² (Figure 3.1).

The head of Darling Harbour was fed by two freshwater streams: one that ran down from what is now George Street, along Hay Street, and the other coming in from the south. These streams formed a small estuarine swamp, with exposed mud flats at low tide, probably the source of at least some of the shells in the surrounding middens (Figure 3.2). Behind this mud flat was a mix of open grassland and Sydney dry sclerophyll forest, providing food and shelter resources for local people. While no archaeological deposits have been found in Dixon Street, midden sites in The Rocks and around Walsh Bay

excavated in the 1980s, and artefact scatters around Broadway to the south of the area excavated in the 2000s, show that the broader area was occupied for a period of at least 3,000 years BP.³

The arrival of the First Fleet devastated Aboriginal society around Sydney Harbour and the broader region. Conflict between convicts and soldiers and Aboriginal people began the first months after the Europeans arrived. An outbreak of smallpox in 1789 devastated the community, and had a fatality rate of more than 50 per cent among the Aboriginal population.⁴ Aboriginal people were forced to reorganise themselves in the wake of this tragedy, reoccupying their traditional land in new groupings of survivors. The areas around Darling Harbour remained important places for Aboriginal people, used for fishing on the harbour and as camping grounds, and some people still lived in a semi-traditional way along the Pyrmont peninsula opposite the growing town into the 1830s.⁵ One of the first European views of Darling Harbour produced as an engraving in 1813 shows an Aboriginal camp site on the shores close to the site of the present-day Chinese Garden, and Aboriginal fishing canoes on the water behind. Despite presenting a stylised view of the place, the engraving likely represents the types of activities that continued in this area until the major industrialisation of the later 1820s and 1830s (Figure 3.3).



Figure 3.1 Detail of Captain John Hunter's 1788 survey of Port Jackson showing the fledgling settlement at Sydney Cove and the long, wide cove that the British first named Long Cove and then, later, Cockle Bay. Approximate location of Dixon Street circled. (Source: State Library of NSW [SLNSW])



Figure 3.2 Detail of Charles Lesueur’s Plan De La Ville De Sydney, 1802, showing the head of Darling Harbour, and two streams that run across a mud flat and estuary before entering the harbour itself. The plan also shows the steep shoreline along the eastern shore. The combination of the mud flat and steep shore restricted European development in this part of the city. Note the cluster of huts around the Brickfields, which is close to present-day George Street and Goulburn Street. (Source: SLNSW)




Figure 3.3 John Eyre’s *A Native Camp, near Cockle Bay NSW and a View of Parramatta River*, 1813. Although it is a stylised and slightly cartoonish depiction, this view shows the shoreline and low-lying areas around the head of Cockle Bay and depicts Aboriginal people in and around the foreshore of the bay and fishing on the water. (Source: SLNSW)

3.3 John Dickson’s grant and Dixon Street

In 1813, newly arrived engineer John Dickson was granted 15 acres at the head of Cockle Bay, on which he built a new flour mill, and installed Australia’s first steam engine in 1815.⁶ Dickson’s grant included all the land on which the future Dixon Street would be formed. Dickson built a small dam across the head of the bay to trap fresh water running in a stream down from the ridge above (under what is now Hay Street) for his engine. The mill stood at the bottom of Goulburn Street, near the corner of Harbour Street and Pier Street, opposite the present Chinese Garden of Friendship.




Figure 3.4 1833 City Block Plan showing John Dickson's land at the head of Darling Harbour. The wall of his dam extended from the shore to capture fresh water for his steam engine. Dickson Street West and the north end of Dickson Street East (present Dixon Street) are shown adjoining Dickson's mill. (Source: City of Sydney Archives)

In 1821, James Blanch built an iron foundry near Dickson's Mill and by 1823, a second flour mill had been erected farther to the north, between Liverpool Street and Bathurst Street. Purchased in 1827 by Dickson's former apprentice Thomas Barker, this mill, known as Barker's Mill, continued operating on the site until 1894. Dickson returned to England in 1834 and left Barker in charge of his affairs in Sydney, including the operation of Dickson's former mill.⁷ Dickson's mill buildings were leased and used by a series of industrialists throughout the nineteenth century, including soap makers, salting works, the establishment of Toohey's brewery and finally Simon Zollner's galvanising factory. The mill buildings were eventually demolished in 1932–1937 for the widening of Harbour Street, the construction of a council depot and the extension of the city markets⁸

In 1826, the name 'Cockle Bay', dating from the pre-industrial years of the European town, was officially changed to Darling Harbour after the then Governor Ralph Darling. Wharves sprang up to service the mills, in turn attracting more industrial development to the harbour and southern head of Cockle Bay, making it Sydney's first major industrial

precinct. By 1839 Sussex Street, which then ran along the waterline of Darling Harbour for most of its length, had eight flour mills, several patent slip yards and ship-building yards, a dozen large wharves, as well as warehouses, stores and yards.⁹ Clustered in the surrounding streets and lanes were a growing number of cottages for the workers, making the area one of Sydney's most densely populated neighbourhoods.

The present Dixon Street, sometimes labelled Dixon Street East, is widely believed to be named after John Dickson, who established the colony's first steam mill at the foot of Goulburn Street near Darling Harbour in 1813. An alternative theory is that the street is named for Robert Dixon, land surveyor (1800–1858), who lived in the Haymarket area. Some early newspaper reports and maps favour 'Dickson Street' but Dixon is the accepted spelling for the street by the 1860s.

The 1833 City of Sydney Survey Plan (Figure 3.4) shows buildings on the then-named Dickson Street West heading southward in the vicinity of the original high water mark of Darling Harbour. It also indicates the line of Dickson Street East (present Dixon Street), including the kink in the road close to Liverpool Street.

The Trigonometrical Survey of the City of Sydney in 1865 (Figure 3.5) shows the line of Dixon Street (East) extending northwards from Hay Street. Some development had by then taken place along both sides of the street yet large areas were shown as vacant land, particularly along the southwestern end towards Hay Street.

By 1870, Dixon Street appears to have been a thriving residential area. The *Sands Directory* lists a large number of residents of varying occupations such as watchmaker, drayman, cab proprietor, engineer, baker, musician, bricklayer, candlemaker, boilermaker, bookseller, tailor, painter, grocer, blacksmith and bootmaker. Richard Sim's steam flour mill and at least one hotel (Hand and Heart Inn) were also noted in the neighbourhood.

Industry attracted industry to the area, with the proximity of the wharves an added incentive. Factories, shops and cottages were built in the vicinity to cater to the working and residential population along the waterfront. Increasing development in Dixon Street led to drains being installed there in 1870, though an inspection in 1877 reported that it 'appeared to be the dirtiest street in the locality'.¹⁰ By comparison Dove's Plans of Sydney in 1880 (Figure 3.6) show the form of development in the southern end of Dixon Street including three hotels (Engineer's Hotel, Native Rose Hotel and British Hotel). Buildings were generally one or two storey brick structures, consisting of dwellings, factories and yards. By 1900, Dixon Street was a bustling residential and industrial precinct that included at least one furniture manufacturer, shoeing forge, coachworks, National Flour Mills, safe maker, fuel merchants and City Marble Works.



Figure 3.5 Detail of the 1865 Trigonometrical Survey of City of Sydney (Section T) showing the section of Dixon and Sussex streets between Goulburn and Hay streets. Hay Street is the road shown at the southern end of Dixon Street in this view. (Source: City of Sydney Archives)



Figure 3.6 Detail of Dove's Plans of Sydney (Map 42), 1880, showing development in Dixon Street between Goulburn and Hay streets including vacant land and yards. Hay Street is the road shown at the southern end of Dixon Street in this view. (Source: City of Sydney Archives)

3.4 The Chinese history of Sydney and Haymarket

Australia's ties with China were established as early as May 1788 when three ships of the First Fleet, *Lady Penrhyn*, *Charlotte* and *Scarborough*, sailed from Sydney to Canton, China, under contract to the East India Company to collect a cargo of tea.¹¹

In the period before 1848, 18 Chinese settlers immigrated to Australia. The first among this group of emigrants was a carpenter named Ahuto, who arrived as a free settler in 1803. Another early free settler was Cantonese-born Mak Sai Ying, who arrived in Sydney in 1818. He took up land at Parramatta, anglicised his name to John Shying and in 1823 married Sarah Thompson at St John's, Parramatta.¹² By 1829 he was granted the licence of the Lion Inn in Parramatta.¹³ Newspapers refer to him variously as 'the Chinaman' at Parramatta¹⁴ and 'John Shying (Chinaman), Church-Street, Parramatta'.¹⁵

Arrivals of Chinese labourers steadily increased in the 1820s and 1830s, though their numbers remained low. Some labourers came free or were brought into Sydney by merchants who then employed them on their estates and farms. The Macarthurs at Elizabeth Farm employed three Chinese workers in the early 1820s, namely a carpenter, a cook and a servant.¹⁶ One newspaper reported the arrival of a Chinese carpenter in December 1827 on the brig, *Nimrod*¹⁷; some Chinese carpenters and furniture makers were operating in the city by the late 1820s.

Arrival numbers increased again following the end of convict transportation in 1840, when the importation of Chinese workers was seen as a way to circumvent the labour shortage, although some viewed the indenture system under which they were brought to Sydney as a form of bondage.

The increased traffic in men as labour, mainly from 13 counties around Kwantung (present Guangdong) and Fukien (present Fujian), was facilitated by the opening up of five new Chinese treaty ports following China's loss to Great Britain in the First Opium War (1839–1842) and to a lesser degree China's loss to Great Britain and France in the Second Opium War (1856–1860).

In 1848 the first shipload of 121 Chinese contract labourers arrived in Sydney aboard the barque, *Nimrod* from Amoy. Half of the labourers remained in the city and the rest were sent to farms in northern Queensland. These labourers were engaged on five-yearly indentures for 2.5 dollars a month and rations. Another 981 had arrived by 1851, and 1000 more before April 1852; however, the journey was often perilous and conditions were appalling, with high rates of death and disease aboard the ships.¹⁸

The first wave of arrivals who made it to Sydney were in fact destined for rural areas, but a few stayed in the town and formed a small community. Many returned to their homeland at the end of their indenture.

The discovery of gold in NSW in 1851, closely followed by Victoria, rapidly transformed the nature of Chinese migration to these colonies. The news of gold in the Central West saw European workers leave farms and city businesses in droves to try their luck on the goldfields. Chinese workers in NSW soon joined them, and by early 1852 the word had spread to China, and Chinese businessmen in Hong Kong arranged passage to Australia. Most of these Chinese miner migrants came from Canton (now Guangzhou) in southern China. Although most of the earliest arrivals went on to the goldfields of Victoria, by 1861 there were 12,988 Chinese people in NSW.¹⁹

In the second half of the nineteenth century Sydney's Chinatown developed as an inner-city concentration of temples, schools, businesses, lodgings, cafes/restaurants, clubs and societies, and fresh food stores. The Lin Yik Tong (Chinese Commercial Association) was formed in 1892 to advocate for Sydney's merchant-class Chinese and included representatives from eight Chinese firms in the city. The Tong did not admit smaller traders and lower-class Chinese people. Meanwhile, some shopkeepers set up specific county/clan shops to serve their fellow clansmen; hence the range of similar grocery stores and other businesses in the Haymarket area.

Sections of the Chinese community also founded county associations that only admitted members with certain county or district loyalties. One example was the Chung Shan Society, established in about 1875. During the 1880s, Sydney Chinese from the 16 counties in Guangdong Province established their own societies, while in 1898 the See Yap founded their own county association. Australian-born Chinese responded in kind, establishing the Sino-Australian Association and the Australian Chinese Association to further their interests.

Although only 189 Chinese people were recorded in Sydney in the 1861 census, this number had risen to 336 by 1871, to 900 by 1878 and up to 1,321 by 1881. This rapid increase, combined with anti-Chinese sentiment, precipitated a new *Immigration Act* in 1881 (the second such Act; the first had been passed in 1861 but repealed in 1867). Most of the Chinese community worked in shops or restaurants, or ran boarding houses catering to Chinese migrants. The emerging community was clustered around Lower George Street, The Rocks, and the streets near Circular Quay, where at least five Chinese furniture-making factories were located.²⁰

While the more established and successful businesses were to be found around The Rocks, by the 1890s, a fledgling community began to establish itself at the southern end of the city around Haymarket, particularly in Goulburn, Pitt and Campbell streets close to the Belmore markets. Chinese market gardeners stayed in this part of the city when attending to market business. Several lodging houses around Goulburn Street were some of the earliest places occupied by Chinese people, including market gardeners. Cheap rent and larger sites than those at The Rocks also enticed some of those furniture businesses to open workshops around Haymarket, which in turn attracted grocery stores,

cook-shops, butcheries, gambling houses and more lodging houses; some even moved into converted factory sites and stables.²¹ By the mid-1880s, Wexford Street, which ran from Elizabeth Street to Goulburn Street (what is now Wentworth Avenue), was almost exclusively a Chinese neighbourhood.

The Chinese population in Australia declined after 1896, falling from 37,533 in 1880 to 23,000 at the outset of the Chinese Revolution in 1911. The Commonwealth *Immigration Restriction Act 1901* (otherwise known as the 'White Australia' Policy) was in part responsible for the shrinking population. However, by this date there was a tight-knit, culturally homogenous Chinese community in Sydney, linked by a range of organisations and shops, a common language, and country ties.

Some members of the community continued to live in The Rocks, but by 1900 most of the Chinese population living in the city area were based in and around Surry Hills and the Belmore Markets. The Chinese community of Surry Hills was gradually displaced from 1906 when the 'slum' houses in the Wexford Street area were resumed and Wentworth Avenue was constructed. According to Shirley Fitzgerald in *Red Tape Gold Scissors*, an estimated 724 people had their houses demolished during this first stage of 'slum clearance'.²² The third 'Chinatown' developed around the Hay Street Markets in Dixon Street and adjoining streets.

A City of Sydney Council survey found that 86 per cent of Sydney's Chinese population, about 1,440 people, were living in and around Haymarket,²³ although some of these were transients alternating between the city and their gardens on the city's southern fringes around Alexandria and Botany.²⁴ Two Chinese temples were established—at Glebe and Alexandria—by the late nineteenth century and are listed on the State Heritage Inventory.

By 1910 Chinese began to buy into the area, instead of renting. Dixon Street became a Chinese cultural centre with restaurants and grocery stores as well as the Tong headquarters. For instance, in 1909 the City approved plans by Evan Evans for a pair of three-storey stores at 82–84 Dixon Street, prepared for Lee Chun. These stores were occupied in 1910 by the firm of Kwong War Chong, tea merchants, and other Chinese organisations. The Ignis et Agua survey plan from 1907 (Figure 3.7) indicates the emerging presence of Chinese businesspeople and trades in Dixon Street including Wing Sang fruiterer at the corner of Hay Street, Chinese stores (8 and 88), McCormack's Buildings (56–62), Chinese stores (50 and 54), *Tung Wah* Chinese newspaper (52) and Goon Lee Shing & Company (37).



Figure 3.7 Detail of Structural Plans of the City of Sydney [Ignis et Aqua] Series Sheet 2 Vol 1, c1907, with later annotations. The plan shows buildings in Dixon Street between Goulburn and Hay streets occupied by Chinese people. (Source: SLNSW)

'Newcomer' Chinese from the 1950s altered the structure of Australia's Chinese community. Haymarket was the traditional heartland of the Chinese community in Sydney but from the 1970s Chinese free migrants arrived from mainland China, Hong Kong, Taiwan, Singapore, Malaysia, and Indo-Chinese countries such as Cambodia.

Unlike most of their predecessors, who had arrived in the country as indentured labourers, the new immigrants were more educated, white-collar and professional people, often arriving as skilled workers. After the 1989 Tiananmen Square protest, the Australian Government granted 42,000 permanent visas for Chinese students.

This new influx of Chinese migration accelerated decentralisation, as the inner-city Chinatown at Haymarket ceased to be the primary residential and business location of choice for more recent Chinese migrants and 'ethnoburbs' came to be established in Burwood, Hurstville, Kogarah, Ashfield, Auburn, Strathfield, Parramatta, Ryde and Chatswood. Meanwhile, many younger Chinese professional workers and students prefer to live in the inner city, leading to a growth in the Chinese-born population in the City of Sydney during the 2010s.

Chinatown and adjoining areas in Sydney have also been subject to investment and property development by companies in China. This has included high-rise apartments such as The Quay and Greenland Centre; large numbers of apartments have been sold to local and overseas Chinese buyers. Other developers followed such as Grocon with the Park Apartments in 1996.

3.5 Plans for Sydney's Chinatown

As early as 1961 the Council discussed forming Dixon Street into Sydney's Chinatown. The Town Clerk's Minute Paper of 17 March described the Chinese occupation of Dixon Street, identifying several restaurants on both sides of the street between Goulburn and Hay streets and 'a very considerable amount of industrial and commercial usage ... and the ownership of the premises is quite numerous'.²⁵ The difficult question of closing Dixon Street was discussed; closing the street during normal daytime business hours was viewed as impracticable as this would adversely impact all the business operating in the street.²⁶




Figure 3.8 City of Sydney City Engineer's Department, 'Dixon Street Sydney From Hay St to Goulburn St: Proposed "Chinese Centre" Details', February 1961. (Source: City of Sydney Archives)

Rather than close the street, the Town Clerk indicated that improvement of the existing street lighting in Dixon Street was the preferred solution and directed the City Engineer to install additional public street lighting in Dixon Street.²⁷ The question of closing and developing Dixon Street as a 'Chinese Centre' was submitted to the Works Committee and the City Planning and Improvements Committee. The initial suggestion to close Dixon Street to traffic between Hay and Goulburn streets and erect 'Oriental-type street lights' appears to have come from Alderman J Thom.²⁸ The plan was to install public street lighting and re-pave the footpaths in Dixon Street to promote it as a tourist destination similar to San Francisco's Chinatown. The Finance Committee resolved to discuss the proposals with members of the Chinese community, and the resolution was minuted as follows:

That an approach be made to that section of the Chinese Community of Sydney interested in the business activities of Dixon Street, Sydney, with a view to ascertaining whether such Community would be interested in the appointment of a small number of representatives to discuss with representatives of the Council the question of the general improvement of the Dixon Street area and its possible future development as a Chinese Centre.²⁹

By 1971 the *Sydney Morning Herald* described Sydney's Chinatown as 'mainly a working area as most Chinese have been absorbed into the suburbs' and 'only the very old and the very new arrivals from China still come to Dixon Street'.³⁰ It was still a thriving area with good, cheap Chinese restaurants around Hay Street and Dixon Street, and a range of shops selling household objects and foodstuffs in the mixed/grocer shops, but fewer younger Chinese people were taking up traditional market gardens, fruit and vegetable wholesaling and restaurants.

As the last vestiges of the White Australia Policy were being removed in the 1970s, a resurgence in Chinatown began. The establishment of the Dixon Street Chinese Committee by the Council, with sponsorship from the Chinese Consul (Taiwan) and chaired by Henry Ming Lai, pushed the regeneration of Dixon Street as a centrepiece to the broader Chinatown area.

The Committee did not consider Dixon Street to be the Chinatown of Sydney for a raft of reasons. The principal reason offered was that Dixon Street was 'too small in size and limited in its activity'³¹ compared to equivalent Chinatowns in America. Further, if Dixon Street was established as Chinatown, several shops in Campbell Street, nightclubs in Goulburn Street and banks in George Street catering to the Chinese community would be excluded. Thirdly, not all the properties in Dixon Street were owned by Chinese people and non-Chinese property owners may object to the proposed Chinatown.³²

The relocation of the markets to Flemington also generated a redevelopment. As early as 1971, the Council had considered the redevelopment of Darling Harbour in its strategic planning, including consideration of Chinatown and a new Chinese Garden. In 1973, the City of Sydney approved 'the development of a Chinatown in the city markets area'³³ by

Chinatown Development Company Pty Ltd, a consortium of Sydney businessmen, but wanted the centre to encompass the new Paddy’s Market development. The consortium’s 1975 plan (Figure 3.10) depicts a walled Oriental village, a theatre and a floating restaurant in a miniature lake.




Figure 3.9 Architect’s vision of Chinatown redevelopment, 1975, by John Brindley and Dominic. (Source: *Sydney Morning Herald*, 10 July 1975, ‘Chinatown. One Man’s Vision’, as reproduced in Bogle, M 2010, *History of the Chinatown Gateways*)

Meanwhile the Dixon Street Chinese Committee made several recommendations for beautifying Dixon Street between Goulburn and Little Hay streets following discussions with the Deputy Mayor to improve Dixon Street as a tourist attraction, establish a focal point for the Chinese community and encourage future Chinatown developments. The following items were considered necessary:

- < re-surfacing/re-paving Dixon Street;
- < providing a letter box of Chinese design;
- < providing a telephone booth of Chinese design;
- < providing six litter bins of Chinese design;
- < providing outdoor lighting of Chinese design;
- < removing parking meters and establishing a loading zone between Goulburn and Little Hay streets; and
- < erecting a portico near the Goulburn Street end.




Figure 3.10 Proposed street furniture of Chinese design, 1971/1972. (Source: City of Sydney Archives)




Figure 3.11 Plan of proposed beautification of Dixon Street by Dixon Street Chinese Committee, 1971. (Source: City of Sydney Archives)

In May 1972, the Dixon Street Chinese Committee agreed to lobby the building owners in Dixon Street to bear the cost of improving the building façades, providing banners and shop signs, and decorative materials imported directly from the Republic of China. The Committee hoped that the Council would provide the litter bins, outdoor lighting, re-paving/surfacing of Dixon Street and erect the portico over the footpath, which would be decorated and embellished by the Committee.

The portico, as originally proposed, was to be of steel construction formed by two rigid steel frames made up of 6" x 6" x 3/8" square pipes, and welded at the corners. Two 8" x 4" rolled steel joists span the opening, and triangular frames of 2" x 2" x 1/4" angles are welded on the cross beams. The steel frame was built to support a Chinese tile roof, which was to be manufactured in Taiwan and imported to Sydney. Detailed costings for the various street furniture and portico were prepared by the City Engineer, with the portico estimated to cost \$1,500 including provision of concrete footings and fabrication and erection of the steel structure, as shown in the perspective plan (Figure 3.13). The overall cost to implement the plan submitted by the Dixon Street Chinese Committee, outlined in its progress report of May 1972, was \$8,960. The Council approved the recommendations of the Works Committee to provide the necessary funds in the revenue estimates for the current year (1972) and to proceed to implement the works including the portico.

The lanterns and brackets and wiring for lighting was completed by August 1973, litter bins were purchased and additional funding was set aside to cover the higher cost of the work to date. However, there was no progress on the portico; the Chairman of the Dixon Street Chinese Committee reported that the Committee had located only one supplier of

decorative tiles and ornaments in Taiwan, who had not replied to requests to design 'arches; which could be used with their tiles etc'. Ming Lau asked the Council to 'design some arches which would be suitable to the surrounds of Dixon Street'.³⁴ The Chairman of the City Development Committee reported to the Council that the archway was designed and approved by the Council and the Committee only required the supply of tiles.³⁵




Figure 3.12 Plan of design of proposed portico, Chinatown, 1972. (Source: City of Sydney Archives)



Figure 3.13 Dixon Street before pedestrianisation, pre-1977. (Source: The China–Australia Heritage Corridor)



Figure 3.14 Dixon Street, Haymarket, 1979.
(Source: City of Sydney Archives)



Figure 3.15 Dixon Street, Haymarket, 1979.
(Source: City of Sydney Archives)



Figure 3.16 Chinese-style lanterns on Dixon Street buildings, 1979. (Source: City of Sydney Archives)



Figure 3.17 Chinese-style lanterns on Dixon Street buildings, 1979. (Source: City of Sydney Archives)



Figure 3.18 Chinese-style lanterns on Dixon Street buildings, 1979. (Source: City of Sydney Archives)

In November 1975 the Dixon Street Chinese Committee notified the Council that 'it could see no value' in erecting the arch at present as the Council was considering proposals by Gus Hoeming (Chinatown Development Co Pty Ltd) for the comprehensive redevelopment of the Chinatown area (including Paddy's Markets); Dixon Street would form stage two of that plan.




Figure 3.19 Artist’s impression of how Dixon Street looking north from Little Hay Street may look, June 1972. (Source: City of Sydney Archives, File 2808/72)



Figure 3.20 Artist concept of decorative lighting in Dixon Street at night. (Source: City of Sydney Archives, File 2808/72)




Figure 3.21 Artist rendering of proposed decorative lighting in Dixon Street at dusk. (Source: City of Sydney Archives, File 2808/72)




Figure 3.22 Artist's impression of Sydney's new-look Dixon Street. (Source: *Sydney Morning Herald*, 5 June 1977)

3.6 The Chinese damen, Dixon Street

In 1978 the Council instituted a trial closure of Dixon Street (between Goulburn and Hay streets) to traffic for the Chinese Moon Festival commencing in September that year. Alderman Andrew Briger, Chairman of the Council's 'Sharing the Streets' committee, hoped the move would encourage the local Chinese community to provide permanent banners and similar decorations, and install Chinese-style lanterns in surrounding streets to accent the Chinatown atmosphere. The committee 'would like to see a Chinese ceremonial arch at one end'.³⁶ It was decided that the Council would undertake the work, and the Chinese community would be asked to contribute part of the estimated \$30,000 cost.

The six-month trial closure scheme was backed by the Chinese community, 'who plan to show their approval by putting up the money for the two elaborately tiled Chinese gates planned for both ends of Dixon Street'.³⁷ In the *Sydney Morning Herald* account of the Council's pedestrian scheme for Dixon Street, Briger (who was also Chairman of the City Planning Committee) commented that 'a rough idea of how the gates will look can be gauged from the scaffolding which will be erected and draped with the colourful cloth for the moon festival'.³⁸

The proposed \$20,000 ceremonial gateway to complement the trial closure and pedestrianisation of Dixon Street was to include a 5-metre-high gate at the north end of the pedestrian area, glazed in imported Chinese tiles. The Dixon Street Chinese Committee also had plans to erect another gate at the southern end of the street if the six-month trial closure, beginning in September, proved successful. The Council approved the trial closure in April 1978, to commence on 16 September, with provision made for delivery and service vehicles to access the street.³⁹



Figure 3.23 Chinatown excursion conducted by King Fong with students of Killarney Heights Primary School, 1979. The background shows a temporary timber ceremonial archway which was replaced with a permanent archway in early 1980. (Source: King Fong)

The trial road closure proved successful, despite some unhappy shop keepers, and the Council proceeded to a permanent closure of this section of Dixon Street in 1979 to coincide with the Festival of the Moon and allow for landscaping by the City of Sydney. The Dixon Street Chinese Committee passed a resolution in March 1979 to 'continue the Dixon Street closure and beautification scheme in conjunction with the Council on a permanent basis' with a budget of \$30,000 to beautify the two ceremonial archways.⁴⁰ . The Council established a Dixon Street Working Party and engaged Henry Tsang and Lee as honorary architects. Simultaneously, the Dixon Street Chinese Committee retained architect Henry Tsang, of Tsang & Lee Associate Architects, to design the ceremonial arches. According to Henry Tsang and Lee:

The design of the plaza and its structures shall be of Chinese origin. The essential material [and] craftsmen where possible be of oriental origin.⁴¹

Further, there would be ceremonial archways located at both ends of Dixon Street.

The archways symbolise that the Chinese population is making Sydney their permanent home—putting down their roots here.⁴²

Two representatives of the Dixon Street Chinese Committee travelled to Hong Kong and Taiwan in 1979 to source ornamental materials for the archways—glazed roof tiles, sculptured roof framing, sculptured hand-painted decorative timber beams and column reliefs and hand sculptures, marble column cladding and column bases. They also investigated possible local contractors and craftsmen to travel to Australia to complete the archways in situ. The Committee set aside \$45,000 to provide the materials and authorised the Council to proceed with construction of the base.

Both archways, covered with glazed ceramic tiles, will stand on four columns in traditional Chinese style and will be inscribed with proverbs in Chinese characters (with English translation) proclaiming messages of friendship and the brotherhood of man.⁴³

The contract for the beautification and cladding of the archways and pavilions was awarded to Yen Sung Lin of Sung Lee Pty Ltd of Harris Street, Ultimo, and Taipei, Taiwan. The Dixon Street Chinese Committee was responsible for arranging the return entry visa to Australia for the owner of Sung Lee Pty Ltd and temporary visas for four specialist craftsmen employed by the firm to enter Australia to complete the cladding and decoration of the archways.



Figure 3.24 Dixon Street Chinese Committee, 1980. (Source: King Fong)

In October 1979 Council accepted a tender from Lockyer Constructions Pty Ltd for \$246,422 for street landscaping and streetscape works to pedestrianise Dixon Street. The Council supervised the erection of the structural skeleton of the two gates, carried out street paving and other work in Dixon Street as part of the Chinatown pedestrian precinct scheme. Tsang was also responsible for designing the entire Dixon Street

Beautification Project. Incidentally, Henry Tsang also translated the name Dixon in Chinese, meaning 'understand virtue and trust'.⁴⁴

Delays to shipping of the decorative materials for the archways stalled progress on the Dixon Street Beautification Project and the expected date of completion became uncertain. In a progress report to the Council in April 1980, Henry Tsang explained that the tiles and roof framing for the archways and seating pavilions had arrived in Sydney that month but awaited clearance from customs. The contractor was unable to arrange visas for his tradesmen to leave Taiwan so 'he will have to use local tradesmen'.⁴⁵ Construction of the groundwork and archways' skeletons exceeded the Council's budget for several reasons including (but not limited to) the cost of four 'temple lions' from Taiwan doubling, services requirements in the vicinity of the sites, unforeseen preparatory work required prior to commencement of construction, and painting, lighting and provision of scaffolding.

On 15 October 1980, the Lord Mayor, Nelson Meers, officially opened the Dixon Street pedestrian mall, complete with the Chinese 'damen' (primary arch) and supporting arches, at either end. The construction of the mall cost the Council about \$300,000 and the Chinese community another \$70,000.⁴⁶



Figure 3.25 Official opening of the Dixon Street pedestrian mall, 1980. (Source: City of Sydney Archives)



Figure 3.26 North Gate after the completion of the official ceremony on 15 August 1980. (Source: King Fong)

The Dixon Street Chinese Committee approached the Council in 1981, seeking to donate the archways to the city. The Dixon Street Chinese Committee suggested 12 September 1981, Chinese Moon Festival, as a suitable date for a dedication ceremony. Council representatives generally supported the handover because the archways and seating pavilion were located in the roadway area owned by the Council. In return the Council would seek information and advice from the Dixon Street Chinese Committee on replacement materials and investigate the possibility of the Dixon Street Chinese Committee adding names of financial benefactors to the marble panels.



Figure 3.27 Celebrations of the Moon Festival on Dixon Street, 1981 (Source: King Fong)

The dedication ceremony was delayed until 17 April 1982. At this ceremony, Stanley Wong, Chairman of the Dixon Street Chinese Committee, on behalf of the Chinese community, handed over the archways and seating pavilions to the City of Sydney, represented by Lord Mayor Doug Sutherland.



Figure 3.28 Delivery van in Dixon Street pedestrian mall, December 1982. (Source: City of Sydney Archives)



Figure 3.29 Lion statue flanking the north archway in Dixon Street, December 1982. (Source: City of Sydney Archives)



Figure 3.30 Chinese-style decoration in Dixon Street, 1980s. (Source: The China–Australia Heritage Corridor webpage)

The gates are based on the traditional Chinese post-and-lintel system with a hipped roof. The gates are an icon of Dixon Street, Sydney, yet they share common features with similar gates that are used in the branding of Chinatowns in cities world-wide.⁴⁷

3.6.1 Chinatown’s redevelopment



Figure 3.31 Architect Henry Tsang at the announcement for the Design for the Future plan to redevelop Chinatown, 19 July 1991. (Source: City of Sydney Archives)



Figure 3.32 Lord Mayor Jeremy Bingham announcing the Design for the Future plan to redevelop Chinatown, 19 July 1991. (Source: City of Sydney Archives)

On 19 July 1991, the Lord Mayor Jeremy Bingham in conjunction with architect Henry Tsang, announced the redevelopment of the Chinatown precinct (Figure 3.28 and Figure 3.29). By this date, only the gates and lions remained of the 1980 Dixon Street pedestrianised works. The brick plinths to the lion statues were later reconstructed in granite as part of the Dixon Street paving upgrades⁴⁸. This was in line with Chinatown needing to be upgraded and modernised in line with visitor needs.

3.6.2 Original construction drawings




Figure 3.33 Dixon Street, North Gate footing, E3-366/10A, dated 1979. (Source: City of Sydney Archives)




Figure 3.34 Dixon Street, South Gate footing, E3-366/11, dated 1979. (Source: City of Sydney Archives)




Figure 3.35 Dixon Street, Proposed Ceremonial Gateways to Chinatown at Dixon Street, Footing Amendment, E3-366/8A, dated 1979. (Source: City of Sydney Archives)




Figure 3.36 Dixon Street, Proposed Ceremonial Gateways to Chinatown at Dixon Street, Elevations, Sections and Footings, detail. E3-366/6, dated 1979. (Source: City of Sydney Archives)




Figure 3.37 Dixon Street, Proposed Ceremonial Gateways to Chinatown at Dixon Street, Precast column sections and details and steel work sections and details. E3-366/7, dated 1979. (Source: City of Sydney Archives)

3.7 Henry Tsang, architect

Henry Shiu-Lung Tsang was born on 6 November 1943 in Jiangxi province, China. He was the eldest son of a general in the Chinese Nationalist Army.

His family fled to Hong Kong in 1949 and he arrived in Australia in 1961 as a student via the United States. He was educated at Tak Sing Primary School, Wah Yan Jesuit College in Hong Kong, Vaucluse Boys' High School, the University of NSW (B Arch, 1969) and the University of Sydney (Graduate Diploma in Building Science, 1974).

He commenced practice as an architect in 1970 and established Tsang & Lee Architects Pty Ltd in 1979. He was head consultant for the Darling Harbour Chinese Garden and served in an honorary capacity on various projects such as the Dixon Street Chinatown Mall and the Cabramatta Mall Oriental Plaza.

1991 was a significant year in Tsang's life. In this year he was awarded the Medal of the Order of Australia for his contribution to the ethnic community and was elected an

Alderman of the City of Sydney, being the first person of Asian origin to sit on the Council. He was elected Deputy Lord Mayor. During his years on the Council he served on several committees including the Planning Committee (1991–1992) and Cultural and City Services Committee (1993–1994), and as Deputy Chairman of the Finance Committee (1993–1994). He served two terms from 1991 to 1999 as the Deputy Lord Mayor.

Henry Tsang was elected to the NSW Legislative Council in 1999 and served until 2009.⁴⁹

On 9 November and 24 November, GML interviewed Henry Tsang to learn more about his role in the design and construction of the Chinatown Gates.

3.8 Endnotes

- ¹ Attenbrow, V 2010, *Sydney's Aboriginal Past: Investigating the archaeological and historical records*, second edition, UNSW Press, p 153.
- ² *Sydney Gazette and NSW Advertiser*, 7 November 1818, p 1.
- ³ Comber, J, *Aboriginal Cultural Heritage Assessment, Darling Walk, Darling Harbour*, prepared for Sydney Harbour Foreshore Authority, July 2008, p 15.
- ⁴ Irish, P 2017, *Hidden in Plain View: The Aboriginal People of Coastal Sydney*, NewSouth Publishing, Sydney, p 20.
- ⁵ Johnson, W and Parris, R 2008, *A History of Sydney's Darling Harbour*, Sydney Harbour Foreshore Authority, Sydney, p 12.
- ⁶ Johnson, W and Parris, R 2008, *A History of Sydney's Darling Harbour*, Sydney Harbour Foreshore Authority, Sydney, p 23.
- ⁷ Johnson, W and Parris, R 2008, *A History of Sydney's Darling Harbour*, Sydney Harbour Foreshore Authority, Sydney, p 25.
- ⁸ Godden Mackay, Little Pier Street Precinct, Archaeological Excavations: Volume 2, Main Report, prepared for the Darling Harbour Authority, October 1992, p 29.
- ⁹ Macle hose, J 1977, *Picture of Sydney and Stranger's guide in NSW for 1839*, facsimile edition, Royal Australian Historical Society, Sydney, p 60.
- ¹⁰ 'Streets in the City', *The Sydney Morning Herald*, 9 January 1877, p 6, Trove, National Library of Australia, viewed 14 November 2022 <<http://nla.gov.au/nla.news-article13386274>>.
- ¹¹ Cavanagh, AK 1989, 'The Return of the First Fleet Ships', *The Great Circle*, vol 11, No 2, 1989, p 1.
- ¹² 'Mak Sai Ying aka John Shying', Parramatta History and Heritage, City of Parramatta Research & Collections, viewed 10 January 2023 <<https://historyandheritage.cityofparramatta.nsw.gov.au/people/mak-sai-ying-aka-john-shying>>
- ¹³ Fitzgerald, S 1997, *Red Tape, Gold scissors: The story of Sydney's Chinese*, State Library of New South Wales Press, Sydney, p 28.
- ¹⁴ 'Police Report', *Sydney Gazette and New South Wales Advertiser*, 17 February 1825, p 3, Trove, National Library of Australia, viewed 10 January 2023 <<http://nla.gov.au/nla.news-article2183752>>.
- ¹⁵ 'Classified Advertising', *Sydney Gazette and New South Wales Advertiser*, 26 February 1829, p 3, Trove, National Library of Australia, viewed 20 July 2022 <<http://nla.gov.au/nla.news-article2191901>>.
- ¹⁶ Fitzgerald, S 1997, *Red Tape, Gold scissors: The story of Sydney's Chinese*, State Library of New South Wales Press, Sydney, p 30.

- 17 'Shipping Intelligence', *The Sydney Gazette and New South Wales Advertiser*, 31 December 1827, p 2, Trove, National Library of Australia, viewed. Web. 10 January 2023 <<http://nla.gov.au/nla.news-article2189676>>.
- 18 Fitzgerald, S 1997, *Red Tape, Gold scissors: The story of Sydney's Chinese*, State Library of New South Wales Press, Sydney, p 19.
- 19 *Census of the Colony of New South Wales taken on the 7th April 1861*, NSW Government Printer, 1862.
- 20 Fitzgerald, S 2008, 'Chinese', Dictionary of Sydney <<https://dictionaryofsydney.org/entry/chinese>>.
- 21 Fitzgerald, S 1997, *Red Tape, Gold scissors: The story of Sydney's Chinese*, State Library of New South Wales Press, Sydney, p 89.
- 22 Fitzgerald, S 1997, *Red Tape, Gold scissors: The story of Sydney's Chinese*, State Library of New South Wales Press, Sydney, p 157.
- 23 Fitzgerald, S 1997, *Red Tape, Gold scissors: The story of Sydney's Chinese*, State Library of New South Wales Press, Sydney, p 120.
- 24 Fitzgerald, S 1997, *Red Tape, Gold scissors: The story of Sydney's Chinese*, State Library of New South Wales Press, Sydney, p 92.
- 25 Minute Paper, Town Clerk's No. 5430/60, 17 March 1961, City of Sydney Archives.
- 26 Minute Paper, Town Clerk's No. 5430/60, 17 March 1961, City of Sydney Archives.
- 27 Public lighting schemes such as proposed in Dixon Street were known as 'white-way' lighting involving decorative street lamps aligned along a length of a street or boulevard.
- 28 'Council plans a "China Town"', *The Sydney Morning Herald*, 11 April 1961, p 7, Sydney Morning Herald Archive, State Library of NSW, viewed 9 September 2022.
- 29 981/61, 5430/60, Dixon Street, Sydney, Minute 9a and b, City of Sydney Archives.
- 30 'Which way for our Chinese? Australian wins the cultural tug o' war', *The Sydney Morning Herald*, 19 August 1971, p 20, Sydney Morning Herald Archive, State Library of NSW, viewed 14 November 2022.
- 31 Dixon Street Chinese Community, 'A proposal for the beautification of Dixon Street, Sydney, November 1971, City of Sydney Archives, File 2808/72.
- 32 A proposal for the beautification of Dixon Street, Sydney, undated, Dixon Street Chinese Committee, City of Sydney Archives...
- 33 'Plan for Oriental Centre supported', *Sydney Morning Herald*, 20 March 1973, as quoted in Bogle, M 2010, *History of the Chinatown Gateways: Dixon Street, Sydney*, report prepared for City of Sydney, p 3.
- 34 2808/72 DTCC.A, 7 February 1974, City of Sydney Archives.
- 35 2808/72, Chairman City Development Committee, 25 February 1974, City of Sydney Archives.
- 36 'Banners, lanterns, archway to give new look to Sydney's Chinatown', *Sydney Morning Herald*, 5 June 1977, State Library of NSW, Sydney Morning Herald Archive 1955–1995.
- 37 'Banners, lanterns, archway to give new look to Sydney's Chinatown', *Sydney Morning Herald*, 5 June 1977, State Library of NSW, Sydney Morning Herald Archive 1955–1995.
- 38 'Dixon Street is the latest gain in the battle for a greener Sydney', *Sydney Morning Herald*, 23 July 1978, State Library of NSW, Sydney Morning Herald Archive 1955–1995.
- 39 'Chinatown dresses up for pedestrians, no cars after dark', *Sydney Morning Herald*, 12 April 1978, State Library of NSW, Sydney Morning Herald Archive 1955–1995.
- 40 Correspondence, The Dixon Street Chinese Committee, 15 March 1979, City of Sydney Archives 39/09/0026.
- 41 Tsang, Henry, *Proposed Dixon Street pedestrian plaza, prepared for Council's City Planning Committee*, June 1979, City of Sydney Archives, 39/90/2006.

- ⁴² Tsang, Henry, Proposed Dixon Street pedestrian plaza, prepared for Council’s City Planning Committee, June 1979, City of Sydney Archives, 39/90/2006.
- ⁴³ ‘Good luck arches in Chinatown’, *Southern News*, 9 October 1979, p 8, City of Sydney Archives.
- ⁴⁴ Interview with Henry Tsang, 24 November 2022, GML.
- ⁴⁵ Dixon Street Progress Report, Meeting Minutes, 21 April 1980, City of Sydney Archives, 39/09/0026.
- ⁴⁶ ‘Chinatown mall opening’, *Sydney Morning Herald*, 25 July 1980, State Library of NSW, Sydney Morning Herald Archive.
- ⁴⁷ Bogle, M 2010 *History of the Chinatown Gateways: Dixon Street, Sydney*, report prepared for City of Sydney, p10.
- ⁴⁸ Henry Tsang, King Fong and members of the committee and Chinese community at the time of construction of the temporary gates and the urbanisation of Dixon Street, Meeting Minutes from 17 February 2023.
- ⁴⁹ Sydney’s Alderman Henry Shiu-Ling Tsang, City of Sydney, viewed 8 December 2022 <<https://www.sydneyaldermen.com.au/alderman/henry-tsang/>>

4 Physical description

4.1 Site and setting

The subject site comprises two gates that mark the northern and southern entries to the Dixon Street precinct—an area known as Chinatown. The southern extent of Dixon Street is a north–south orientated pedestrian thoroughfare designated as a shared zone, and flanked with restaurants, cafes and shops along both sides of the walkway. The north gateway is close to the Factory Street junction. The southern gateway is near the junction of Hay Street and Dixon Street, and north of Paddy’s Market. The entrance gates are symmetrical and identical (with differing panels). Each gate has a pair of lions ‘guarding’ its entry.

4.1.1 Physical description

The Chinatown Gates were designed in a traditional Chinese style with detailed ornamentation. The structure of the gates traditionally called *paifang* (or *pailou* in *Cantonese*) provide a ceremonial entrance into the Dixon Street precinct. Each entrance is symmetrical with three bays: a larger central (primary) gate with an upper roof (traditionally called *damen*) between two smaller (secondary) gates or traditional arches with a lower roof. The gates were constructed using a post-and-lintel system of steel, timber and reinforced concrete. They are topped with traditional pagoda-style hipped roofs.

The main structure of the gates include a marble plinth and concrete frame. Concrete columns clad in marble form the base. The gates stand on four square concrete columns/piers with decorative panels including signage spanning between them.

Each gate has five decorative panels visible on its elevation. The upper panel of the primary gate (Panel A) is in an open timber lattice framed with a central coloured-glass sign with gold gilded timber lettering in English. The second upper panel (Panel B) is in a plywood-clad box with structural steel support and includes surface-fixed decorative timber mouldings and fibreglass. Panel B has gold gilded timber lettering in Chinese. Panel C is a decorative painted timber lattice brace attached to the inner face of each column.

Two decorative panels (Panel D and Panel E) are located on the lower portion of the gates and comprise plywood-clad box with structural steel support. Each has a decorative paint finish and surface-fixed decorative timber/cast mouldings and painted fiberglass.

The upper and lower roofs are traditional cantilevered pagoda-style curved hipped roofs with double eaves and no guttering. Elements include timber beams supported by

stepped brackets, curved timber rafters with a plywood soffit and fascia, and green glazed traditional Chinese roof tiles with decorative and ornamental motifs. Symbolic figures including dragons, lions and chickens featured in ceramic tiled elements on the ridge cappings to the roof.

A time capsule with various items inside including a gold coin, sand/earth from China, and newspaper article, was buried at the base of the north gates at the time of construction. Its exact location is understood to be at the base of the male lion (on the west). This information has been relayed by Henry Tsang and King Fong, members of the committee and Chinese community who were present at the time of the construction of the gates.

Restoration works to the gates were previously undertaken in 2011 by Bellmont Engineers. Works comprised minor modifications and maintenance upgrades including paint and protective coating application to concrete and timber elements and replacement of roof tiles, signage and character boards.




Figure 4.1 Elevation, Plan and Sections—Chinatown Ceremonial Gates Dixon Street, Haymarket, ICS dated December 2022.

Four lion statues—two at each entrance—are integral to the design of the gates. In the original design the lions were to be constructed of granite. Due to cost constraints, the four lions were cast in concrete and painted; only the plinth is granite. Two lion statues sit sentry at each gate. At both gates, the lion to the right rests its left paw on a sphere while the lion to the left plays with a cub using its right paw. Traditionally the lion to the right would have the sphere in its mouth. Henry Tsang relayed that this design was not implemented at the time of construction due to budgetary constraints.

The Chinatown Gates use the colours of green, red and gold. At the top of both gates inspirational proverbs about friendship and goodwill are inscribed in Chinese characters, along with English translations.

The north entrance reads: 'Understand virtue and trust' and 'Continue the past into the future'. The south entrance reads: 'Within the four seas all men are brothers' and 'Towards Australian and Chinese friendship'.

The Chinatown Gates form entries to the Dixon Street Chinatown precinct at the northern and southern ends. The shared zone along Dixon Street, between the two gates, is finished with granite flagstone paving and flanked with shops and restaurants on its east and west. A row of mature trees planted on both ends provides shade along the route. Street lighting has been installed and aligns with the height of the lower roof of the gates.

4.1.2 Site photographs

The following photographs were taken by GML on 24 August and 22 November 2022.

North gate



Figure 4.2 North elevation (image taken from the north).




Figure 4.3 South elevation (image taken from the south).



Figure 4.4 Panels A and B on north elevation with inscription in English above and Chinese below: 'Understand virtue and trust'. Decorative lattice brace C beneath panel B.



Figure 4.5 Panels A and B on south elevation with inscription in English above and Chinese below: 'Continue the past into the future'.



Figure 4.6 Underside of the curved timber rafters and stepped brackets of the west gateway, showing the lower and upper roof of the north elevation.




Figure 4.7 Upper and lower roofs of the east gateway of the north elevation.



Figure 4.8 Fibreglass decorative moulding fixed to the panel E at the western bay of the secondary gate is distorted.



Figure 4.9 Decorative moulded panels E and E' featuring motifs in fibreglass at the western bay.



Figure 4.10 Deteriorated plywood of panels D and E on the **eastern bay**.



Figure 4.11 Underside of curved timber rafters and plywood soffit on the lower roof.



Figure 4.12 Gateway marble plaques fixed to the reinforced concrete frame on the eastern bay.



Figure 4.13 Gateway plaques on the column of the western bay.



Figure 4.14 Symbolic ceramic capping tile figures on the hip of the lower roof—eastern bay.



Figure 4.15 Symbolic ceramic capping tile figures on the hip of the lower—western bay.



Figure 4.16 Evidence of plywood delaminating from the underside of the curved upper roof of the eastern bay.



Figure 4.17 Underside of upper roof on the western bay with deteriorated, delaminating plywood soffit.



Figure 4.18 Missing/broken ceramic tile on the lower roof—western bay.



Figure 4.19 Missing/broken ceramic tile on the upper roof above the main beam.



Figure 4.20 Lion to the west holding a sphere.




Figure 4.21 Chipped concrete on the lion to the west.



Figure 4.22 Lion to the east holding a cub.



Figure 4.23 Plaque inscribed with the names of donors attached to the painted concrete frame—western bay.



Figure 4.24 Plaque inscribed with the names of donors attached to the painted concrete frame—eastern bay.



Figure 4.25 Chipped marble plaque.



Figure 4.26 Broken marble plinth.



Figure 4.27 Chipped marble plinth.

South gate



Figure 4.28 South elevation, viewed from Dixon Street (image taken facing north).




Figure 4.29 North elevation (image taken facing south with Paddy's Markets in the background).



Figure 4.30 Decorative panels A and B on south elevation with inscription: 'Within the four seas all men are brothers'.



Figure 4.31 Decorative panels A and B on north elevation with inscription: 'Towards Australian and Chinese Friendship'.



Figure 4.32 Lion guarding the eastern bay. Decorative panels D and E featured in the background.



Figure 4.33 Peeling plyboard beneath decorative panel D.



Figure 4.34 View of curved rafters and exposed roof structure of lower roof.



Figure 4.35 Plaque and decorative panels De and E beneath the lower roof on the eastern bay.



Figure 4.36 Marble plaque and plinth with inscribed plaque at the western bay.



Figure 4.37 Roof tiles in fair condition. Note parts of the decorative ceramic figures are broken.



Figure 4.38 Upper decorative panel A with signage sagging (image taken from the north).



Figure 4.39 Decorative panels including timber lattice C on the western bay of the north elevation.



Figure 4.40 Symbolic ceramic features on the roof at the eastern bay of the south elevation.



Figure 4.41 Some broken tiles on the eastern bay.



Figure 4.42 Tiles of the western side of roof.



Figure 4.43 Underside of roof timber rafters are in moderate to good condition.



Figure 4.44 View of the underside of the upper and lower roofs showing delaminating plywood soffit.




Figure 4.45 Timber bracket on the inner concrete column.



Figure 4.46 View of the exposed roof structure and decorative lattice brace C.



Figure 4.47 Delaminating plywood on the lower decorative panel D.



Figure 4.48 Deteriorated timber rafter and damaged plywood soffit.




Figure 4.49 Lion standing guard on the western bay, holding a cub.



Figure 4.50 Lion standing guard on the eastern bay, holding a sphere.



Figure 4.51 Poor condition of the painted concrete lion.



Figure 4.52 Chipped marble plinth.

4.2 Views and Vistas

As landmarks to the Dixon Street precinct, the Chinatown gates contribute to the panoramic views of the immediate vicinity, north from across Hay Street and south from across Goulburn Street.

The significant primary views associated with the Chinatown Gates are to and from the entry to each gate—the side of the welcoming lions. In addition, there are views to the north gate and south gate entries from nearby intersections and the public domain.

Although both the north and south gates are visible from the intersection of Little Hay Street and Dixon Street, and within the Dixon Street shared path, views to the gates from this point are interrupted by street furniture and tree plantings within this corridor. The following location map and images show the principal and secondary views and vistas of significance associated with the Chinatown Gates.



Figure 4.53 Location map showing main views to and from the Chinatown Gates. (Source: NearMaps with GML overlay)




Figure 4.54 VIEW 1: View looking northwest from the corner of Hay Street and Thomas Street to the south gate.



Figure 4.55 VIEW 2: View looking north from outside Paddy's Market to the south gate.



Figure 4.56 VIEW 4: View looking southeast from the south gate (left of image) of the entrance to Paddy's Market (right of image) and Covent Garden Hotel, a local heritage item.



Figure 4.57 VIEW 3: View looking north to the south gate from the intersection of Dixon Street and Hay Street.




Figure 4.58 VIEW 5: View of the sculptural floating 'wok' above the intersection of Dixon Street and Little Hay Street. Views to the north and south gates are distant and disrupted by tree plantings when viewed from this point.



Figure 4.59 VIEW 6: Distant view of the south gate from the intersection of Dixon Street and Little Hay Street.



Figure 4.60 VIEW 7: View of the north gate from the intersection between Dixon Street and Little Hay Street.



Figure 4.61 VIEW 8: View south to the north gate from the intersection of Factory Street and Dixon Street.



Figure 4.62 Internal (secondary) view from the shared zone between the gates, facing south featuring north elevation of the south gate.



Figure 4.63 Internal (secondary) view from the shared zone between the gates facing north featuring street furniture including outdoor table and chairs. Image taken viewing north with south elevation of the north gate.

4.3 Integrity

The Chinatown Gates have moderate to high integrity.

The setting of the gates, and their locations in Dixon Street marking the gateway to the Chinatown precinct, has made them landmarks when viewed from the public domain. The principal elevations of both the north and south gates, though showing deterioration due to weathering, are structurally intact.

Previous restoration works included minor alterations and maintenance upgrades including painting and replacement using like-for-like elements including roof tiles and plywood sheeting. A detailed scope of restoration works in 2011 undertaken by Bellmont Engineers included a structural assessment, replacement of roof tiles, application of protective coating to both concrete and timber elements and the replacement of signage and character boards. However, the integrity of the gates remains high: the structure is intact with its original footings and fabric.

4.4 Summary condition assessment

GML together with ICS conducted a non-invasive condition assessment of the Chinatown Gates on 22 November 2022. The inspection was undertaken at ground level and at high level using an Elevated Work Platform (EWP). This section provides a summary of the assessment.

Overall, the gates have been maintained and refurbished since their construction. The overall condition varies from fair to moderate. Observations common to both gates include:

- ◀ The marble plinth features soiling at ground level. Cracks and chips are evident on the marble panels.
- ◀ The concrete frame is structurally in good condition. There are no evident signs of cracking or deterioration.
- ◀ The timber beams and plywood clad brackets are in fair condition. No fabric was removed during the inspection. There are no apparent cracks or damage.
- ◀ The timber rafters are in good condition. The upper surface of some rafters may portray signs of water penetration.
- ◀ Plywood soffit, fascia and timber tile battens are generally in fair to poor condition. The plywood soffit shows evident signs of water damage and delamination. The timber elements of the north gate, being more exposed to the sun, are more deteriorated than those of the south gate.
- ◀ Roof tiles, include decorative tiled elements, are in fair to poor condition. There are a few broken tiles on the roof, and there is more damage to the north gate than the

south gate. Possible causes are falling tree branches and inclement weather. The tiles feature heavy soiling to the glazing. Cementitious pointing between tiles is also in poor to fair condition, eroded due to water egress.

- ◁ The decorative panels in general are in fair to poor condition. UV damage, water penetration and general weathering resulted to the delamination of plywood and veneers. Features include loss of timber lettering, moulding and missing portions within the decorative elements. Layers of plywood are delaminated beneath the fibreglass carvings in the lower panels.
- ◁ The granite bases of the lion statues are chipped at the base. Possible causes include skateboarding collisions.

At the south gate:

- ◁ There is more evidence of deterioration on the western bay.
- ◁ A large roof tile on the western bay of the north gate is missing and was noted to be on the roof of the neighbouring building. It was possibly knocked off during a severe weather event.
- ◁ The main sign on the decorative panel B appears to be sagging, possibly from weight and age.

At the north gate:

- ◁ The eastern column features stainless steel hooks screwed into the concrete. The marble plaque on the eastern column feature additional engravings (the names of benefactors) which were carved into the previously engraved marble.
- ◁ The lion on the west is severely damaged and has a cracked skull.

5 Assessment of significance

5.1 NSW heritage assessment guidelines

The *NSW Heritage Manual* guidelines, prepared by the NSW Heritage Office and Department of Urban Affairs and Planning (July 2001), provide the framework for the assessment and the Statement of Significance of this report. These guidelines incorporate the five types of cultural heritage value identified in the Burra Charter into a specially structured framework, which is the format required by heritage authorities in New South Wales.

Under these guidelines, items (or ‘places’ in Burra Charter terminology) are assessed in accordance with a specific set of criteria, as set out below. An item is significant in terms of a particular criterion if the kinds of attributes listed in the inclusion guidelines help to describe it. Similarly, the item is not significant in terms of that particular criterion if the kinds of attributes listed in the exclusion guidelines help to describe it. The inclusion and exclusion guidelines are checklists only—they do not cancel each other out. The exclusion guidelines should not be applied in isolation from the inclusion guidelines, but should be used to help review and qualify the conclusions reached about the item’s significance.

The criteria for assessment established by the NSW Heritage Council in accordance with the *Heritage Act 1977* (NSW) (Heritage Act) are set out below.

Criterion (a) An item is important in the course, or pattern, of NSW’s cultural or natural history (or the cultural or natural history of the local area)

| Guidelines for Inclusion | Guidelines for Exclusion |
|--|---|
| <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ◁ shows evidence of a significant human activity; ◁ is associated with a significant activity or historical phase; or ◁ maintains or shows the continuity of a historical process or activity. | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ◁ has incidental or unsubstantiated connections with historically important activities or processes; ◁ provides evidence of activities or processes that are of dubious historical importance; or ◁ has been so altered that it can no longer provide evidence of a particular association. |

Criterion (b) An item has strong or special association with the life or works of a person, or group of persons, of importance in NSW’s cultural or natural history (or the cultural or natural history of the local area)

| Guidelines for Inclusion | Guidelines for Exclusion |
|--|---|
| <ul style="list-style-type: none"> < shows evidence of a significant human occupation; or < is associated with a significant event, person, or group of persons. | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> < has incidental or unsubstantiated connections with historically important persons or events; < provides evidence of people or events that are of dubious historical importance; or < has been so altered that it can no longer provide evidence of a particular association. |

Criterion (c) An item is important in demonstrating aesthetic characteristics and/or a high degree of creative or technical achievement in NSW (or the local area)

| Guidelines for Inclusion | Guidelines for Exclusion |
|---|---|
| <ul style="list-style-type: none"> < shows or is associated with creative or technical innovation or achievement; < is the inspiration for a creative or technical innovation or achievement; < is aesthetically distinctive; < has landmark qualities; or < exemplifies a particular taste, style or technology. | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> < is not a major work by an important designer or artist; < has lost its design or technical integrity; < its positive visual or sensory appeal or landmark and scenic qualities have been more than temporarily degraded; or < has only a loose association with a creative or technical achievement. |

Criterion (d) An item has strong or special association with a particular community or cultural group in NSW (or the local area) for social, cultural or spiritual reasons

| Guidelines for Inclusion | Guidelines for Exclusion |
|---|--|
| <ul style="list-style-type: none"> < is important for its associations with an identifiable group; or < is important to a community’s sense of place. | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> < is only important to the community for amenity reasons; or < is related only in preference to a proposed alternative. |

Criterion (e) An item has potential to yield information that will contribute to an understanding of NSW’s cultural or natural history (or the cultural or natural history of the local area)

| Guidelines for Inclusion | Guidelines for Exclusion |
|--|---|
| <ul style="list-style-type: none"> < has the potential to yield new or further substantial scientific and/or archaeological information; < is an important benchmark or reference site or type; or < provides evidence of past human cultures that is unavailable elsewhere. | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> < the knowledge gained would be irrelevant to research on science, human history or culture; < has little archaeological or research potential; or < only contains information that is readily available from other resources or archaeological sites. |

Criterion (f) An item possesses uncommon, rare or endangered aspects of NSW’s cultural or natural history (or the cultural or natural history of the local area)

| Guidelines for Inclusion | Guidelines for Exclusion |
|--|--|
| <ul style="list-style-type: none"> < provides evidence of a defunct custom, way of life or process; < demonstrates a process, custom or other human activity that is in danger of being lost; < shows unusually accurate evidence of a significant human activity; < is the only example of its type; < demonstrates designs or techniques of exceptional interest; or < shows rare evidence of a significant human activity important to a community. | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> < is not rare; or < is numerous but under threat. |

Criterion (g) An item is important in demonstrating the principal characteristics of a class of NSW’s cultural or natural places; or cultural or natural environments (or a class of the local area’s cultural or natural places; or cultural or natural environments)

| Guidelines for Inclusion | Guidelines for Exclusion |
|--|---|
| <ul style="list-style-type: none"> < is a fine example of its type; < has the principal characteristics of an important class or group of items; < has attributes typical of a particular way of life, philosophy, custom, significant process, design, technique or activity; | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> < is a poor example of its type; < does not include or has lost the range of characteristics of a type; or < does not represent well the characteristics that make up a significant variation of a type. |

| Guidelines for Inclusion | Guidelines for Exclusion |
|--|--------------------------|
| <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ◁ is a significant variation to a class of items; ◁ is part of a group which collectively illustrates a representative type; ◁ is outstanding because of its setting condition or size; or ◁ is outstanding because of its integrity or the esteem in which it is held. | |

To apply the assessment criteria, both the nature and degree of significance for the place need to be identified. This is because items vary in the extent to which they embody or reflect key values and in the relative importance of their evidence or associations.

The assessment also needs to relate the item’s values to its relevant geographical and social context, usually identified as either local or state contexts. Items may have both local and state significance for different values/criteria.

5.2 Historical themes

The *NSW Heritage Manual* identifies 36 historical themes relevant to NSW within which the heritage values of the place or item can be examined. These themes are correlated with nine national themes and are meant to facilitate understanding of the historical context of the heritage item.

Table 5.1 identifies the relevant Australian and New South Wales historic themes represented at the site.

Table 5.1 Significance of the Dixon Street precinct including the Chinatown Gates in relation to Australian and NSW historic themes.

| Australian historical themes | NSW historic themes | Representation of historic themes at Chinatown Gates and Dixon Street precinct |
|------------------------------|---------------------|---|
| Peopling Australia | Ethnic influences | <p>The Chinatown Gates were erected in 1979/1980 as a joint project by the City of Sydney and the Dixon Street Chinese Committee, which represented Sydney’s Chinese community.</p> <p>Dixon Street, Haymarket, was a special hub of Chinese culture with a range of buildings owned by members of the Chinese community. It was a thriving area with good quality, affordable Chinese restaurants around Hay Street and Dixon Street and a</p> |

| Australian historical themes | NSW historic themes | Representation of historic themes at Chinatown Gates and Dixon Street precinct |
|------------------------------|---------------------|---|
| | | <p>range of shops selling groceries, and household objects.</p> <p>Dixon Street is the centre of Sydney’s third Chinatown, which formed progressively after the closure of the Belmore Markets and establishment of the Hay Street Markets.</p> |
| People Australia | Migration | <p>The first Chinese immigrants arrived in Australia from 1818 including labourers, carpenters and furniture makers. The number of Chinese labourers increased from 1848 to supply the shortfall in labour following the cessation of convict transportation.</p> <p>The discovery of gold in NSW in 1851, and later in Victoria, led to a large influx of Chinese miner migrants from Canton (now Guangzhou) in southern China. By 1861 there were 13,000 Chinese people in NSW. Some of these people drifted back to Sydney and settled initially around Lower George Street, The Rocks, and other streets near Circular Quay.</p> <p>A second Chinatown developed around the Belmore Markets and Surry Hills from 1869 as Chinese people established businesses including hotels and lodging houses catering to the visiting market gardeners who sold their produce to the Belmore Markets. By 1881 the Chinese population in Sydney numbered 1,321.</p> <p>Restrictive immigration Acts, particularly the <i>Immigration Restriction Act 1901</i> (Cth), led to a decline in the Chinese population as fewer immigrants arrived. The original migrants and their families continued to cluster together in the inner city. A new (and the third) Chinatown was established around Dixon and Hay streets in the 1920s.</p> <p>The Chinatown Gates, constructed in 1979–80, provide a tangible link to the history of Chinese migration to Australia from 1818 and the formation of a cohesive community of Chinese-born residents in the City of Sydney to the present day.</p> |

| Australian historical themes | NSW historic themes | Representation of historic themes at Chinatown Gates and Dixon Street precinct |
|--|-----------------------------|--|
| Development local, regional and national economies | Events | <p>Since being erected in 1979–80 the Chinatown Gates and the Dixon Street pedestrian mall have provided a focal point for celebrations and significant events in the Chinese calendar.</p> <p>The Lunar New Year festival is celebrated in Dixon Street annually and the gates form the backdrop and entry point for this celebration of Chinese culture.</p> |
| Building settlements, towns and cities | Towns, suburbs and villages | <p>Dixon Street was formed as a north–south roadway by the 1850s, although the southern end was not as developed as the section north of Goulburn Street. The street contained a range of buildings, including cottages, shops, hotels and factory sites. The mix of light industrial and commercial occupation took over the length of the street in the twentieth century. Chinese merchants began to purchase sites in the street and erect new buildings with shopfronts at ground level.</p> <p>In 1978 the City of Sydney, with the backing of the Chinese community, trialled a six-month closure of Dixon Street between Hay and Goulburn streets. The street was permanently closed and re-landscaped as a pedestrian mall the following year. The construction of the gates, and a range of other civic projects, took place at this time to establish a ‘Chinatown’ and revive the fortunes of the area substantially occupied by a range of Chinese businesses.</p> <p>The precinct was renewed in 1991 and afterward all that remained of the original beautification works were the two gates and the lions.</p> |
| Developing Australia’s cultural life | Creative endeavour | <p>The Chinatown Gates were designed by honorary consultant architect, Henry Tsang. Henry drew inspiration from his Chinese heritage; he was born in China in 1943, and moved to Hong Kong with his family in 1949 before coming to Australia as a teenager in 1961. He was educated in Sydney and became an architect in 1970.</p> |

| Australian historical themes | NSW historic themes | Representation of historic themes at Chinatown Gates and Dixon Street precinct |
|------------------------------|---------------------|---|
| | | <p>He established the firm of Tsang & Lee Architects in 1979.</p> <p>The Dixon Street Chinese Committee retained Tsang and his partner to design two gates as the centrepiece of the new Dixon Street pedestrian mall established in 1979. The Council erected the footings and structure of the gates. The Dixon Street Chinese Committee funded the decoration of the gates and adjoining lion sculptures and plinths on the outside of the gates. Tsang sourced the ceramic tiles and other decorative elements from Taiwan. Together with the Committee, Tsang also helped to employ crafts people from Taiwan to complete the gates.</p> |

5.3 Comparative analysis

This comparative analysis has been undertaken based on Chinese ceremonial gates of a similar architectural style that are part of, or in close vicinity of, an associated heritage-listed item. The following examples have been sourced from comparable heritage-listed properties on the NSW Heritage Management System (HMS) database:

- < Sze Yup Temple & Joss House, Glebe;
- < Yiu Ming Temple, Alexandria; and
- < the Chinese Garden of Friendship, Darling Harbour.

The site has also been compared with other Chinese gates in Australia that are specifically ceremonial entryways to the local Chinatown. However, these examples are not listed for their heritage values and have been assessed using historical information and photographs available on websites. They include:

- < Facing Heaven Archway, Chinatown Plaza, Melbourne; and
- < Perth Chinatown Archway, Perth.

Sze Yup Temple & Joss House, Victoria Road (2 Edward Street), Glebe, NSW



Sze Yup Temple & Joss House. (Source: Verena Ong / NSW Heritage HMS)

Date of construction

1898 (complex)
1983 (for the gates)

Architect

Local builder

Listings

SHR #00267

Statement of Significance

The Sze Yup Temple is an item of State heritage significance as a rare and intact example of a Chinese temple in Australia. It is one of only two remaining places of worship for ethnic Chinese in New South Wales that predates the 1960s. It is one of four early (pre-World War 1) Chinese temples that remain active in Australia, the others being located at Alexandria, (Sydney), in South Melbourne and at Breakfast Creek, Brisbane. The Sze Yup Temple has been continuously used by the Chinese community since it was built, and is a focus for the identity of the Sze Yup community in NSW and for those involved with traditional Chinese culture and belief. This tradition, (sic.) intact temple is considered to be of both local and international significance.

The Chinese community in Australia was instrumental, but unacknowledged, in the development of 19th Century Australian mining, agricultural, pastoral and furniture-making industries, and later in the growth of Australian import-export industries. In many parts of Australia in the 19th Century, Chinese at times exceeded numbers of European residents, leading to unique friendships and hostilities, particularly as economic-based competition.

The Temple and its extensive grounds reflect the architectural forms and landscaping of the Sze Yup County in Guangdong Province, China. The building form reflects that of

Sze Yup Temple & Joss House, Victoria Road (2 Edward Street), Glebe, NSW

many 'village' temples of this area. The Glebe Temple successfully adapted local materials and construction techniques, and its fabric is in excellent condition.

The Temple and grounds demonstrate elements of the belief system of 'feng shui' in the location, forms and orientation of built and landscape elements, and in the extended visual curtilage of the site to Rozelle Bay and Balmain in the north-west.

The Temple is dedicated to Guan Di (Kwan Ti), a virtuous and revered military figure of the Three Kingdoms Period (AD 220– AD 280). Guan Di is worshipped widely throughout the Chinese diaspora. The Temple is well-known for its accumulated 'good luck'.

The 1898 central hall accommodated the Guan Di shrine, and the 1903 eastern and western halls respectively accommodate an ancestral hall, and a hall dedicated to Cai Bai Xing (Choi Buk Sing), the popular god of wealth. Families with memorial plaques in the Ancestral Hall, or those donating funds or images to the place retain a close connection with the Temple.

The Temple and grounds provide a venue for large community celebrations through the year, as well as serving the needs of individual worshippers. Over time a number of Chinese organizations maintaining traditional Chinese cultural activities such as martial arts and lion dances, use the place for practice and performance, supporting the Temple's ongoing role as a community focus for the local Chinese community. (Mark Singer 1983)

Discussion

Sze Yup Temple & Joss House is an item of state significance for its rarity and intactness. It is one of the only ethnic Chinese temples in Australia from pre-World War I that has been in continuous use and is especially important to the Sze Yup community in NSW. The building is a representation of 'village' temples of the Sze Yup county in Guangdong, China, and is directly associated with the Sze Yup community in Australia.

A traditional gateway marks its entrance from Victoria Road, Glebe. It is a traditional *paifang* with a hipped roof on four columns and two lion statues standing guard at the entrance. Features include ceramic roof tiles with symbolic motifs on the ridge lines and marble plaques with inscriptions on the piers. These features are similar to the Chinatown Gates at Dixon Street.

The overall site of the Sze Yup Temple demonstrates the feng shui of the location, form and orientation. This is similarly reflected in the Chinatown Gates at Dixon Street, which were also erected according to calculations of feng shui. Like Chinatown, the Sze Yup temple is a place for events and traditional Chinese cultural activities. The temple gateway marks a ceremonial entranceway to the temple, as the Chinatown Gates form the gateway to the Chinatown / Dixon Street precinct.

The main difference between the two sites is that the building elements for the temple were constructed of local materials and construction techniques whereas the elements for the Chinatown Gates, though traditional, were imported from Taiwan and constructed with Taiwanese labour and artistry. Sze Yup Temple is a both a religious and ceremonial place; in contrast, Chinatown serves ceremonial functions but is predominantly a place for commerce and recreation, including dining and entertainment.

Yiu Ming Temple, Alexandria, NSW



Yiu Ming Temple. (Source: Stewart Watters/NSW Heritage HMS)

Date of construction

1870s (complex)

Architect

Unknown

Listings

SHR #01297

Statement of Significance

The temple is of historical, architectural, religious and social significance to a section of Sydney's Chinese community. The Yiu Ming is one of the oldest and largest Chinese Societies. For approximately 130 years, the temple and its community and environment have provided practical assistance and spiritual support for community members seeking to establish themselves in Australia.

Architecturally, the building is significant for its blending of traditional design, local materials and Federation detailing. The building has not been significantly modified since construction. The most significant modifications, following recent fire damage, replicated original form and materials as much as possible. The elaborate fittings of the temple provide evidence of community commitment to the temple and also demonstrate the skill of Chinese artisans at the beginning of the 20th century.

As many village temples in China no longer exist, this fine, intact example is considered to be of both local and international significance.

Discussion

Yiu Ming Temple, Alexandria, is an item of state significance for its historical and social significance to the Yiu Ming community in Sydney. The building is constructed in local materials to a traditional design apart from Federation detailing. A traditional *paifang* gateway marks its

Yiu Ming Temple, Alexandria, NSW

entrance. Like the Chinatown Gates, the gateway has a hipped roof on four columns with common features including ceramic roof tiles with symbolic motifs on the ridge lines.

The temple is representative of Chinese craftsmanship in its traditional design and use of local materials. Decorative features used throughout the temple provide evidence of community commitment. This is similar to the Chinatown Gates, which were also established with the strong support of the local Chinese community and societies of Chinatown.

The main difference between the two items is the materials used: the Yiu Ming Temple gateway is a brick structure whereas the Chinatown Gates are of reinforced concrete with timber elements. Also, the plaques on the Chinatown Gates are marble and fibreglass; in contrast, the plaques of the Yiu Ming Temple gateway are fibreglass.

Chinese Garden of Friendship, Sydney



Gateway to the entrance pavilion at the Chinese Garden of Friendship. (Source: NSW Heritage HMS)

Date of construction

1986–1988

Architect

Guangzhou Garden Planning & Building Design Inst; Tsang & Lee; Edmund Bull & Corkery

Listings

SHR #02017

Statement of Significance

The Chinese Garden of Friendship is state significant as an outstanding exemplar of a community-based, overseas Chinese garden of the type found in Australasia, North America and Europe constructed in the late twentieth and early twenty-first century. It was the first Southern or Cantonese style garden in New South Wales developed

Chinese Garden of Friendship, Sydney

cooperatively between Sydney's Chinese communities and public authorities in New South Wales and Guangdong.

The Garden demonstrates living traditions of over a thousand years in formal garden design and making in China and long continuities of particularly Southern, formal garden design and horticultural practices. It transcends boundaries between Cantonese cultural sensibilities within Sydney's urban context. Its *penjing* collection of miniature landscapes, cultivated in Sydney, diverse in their use of indigenous plant species such as the Port Jackson fig as well as species from China. The collection's cross-cultural significance is enhanced by geometric timber tracery screens and open-sided pavilions copied from historic Sydney models as a conscious expression of Chinoiserie. They provided a degree of popular familiarity and receptivity to Chinese gardens that hailed the construction of this garden.

The Garden is a unifying element tying the larger scale of the new Darling Harbour and older, more intimate spaces of Haymarket's streets and lanes. The continuing development of Sydney's Chinese communities are reflected in its Southern Chinese design and artisanship, in conjunction with Sydney and New South Wales' materials and construction. The Garden provides continuity to a landscape rooted in the ever-more sophisticated Haymarket Chinatown of which it is now a distinct quarter.

The Garden symbolises the welcoming of Australian-Chinese communities into New South Wales and Australian society. It represents the successful collaboration of Cantonese and Sydney designers, technicians and tradesmen and the transfer of traditional skills and techniques. It is a unique example of cross-cultural exchange in the construction of built and landscape forms that clearly demonstrate the rich heritage of Guangdong and Southern China translated into a new and unique garden enjoyed by the whole community.

Discussion

The Chinese Garden of Friendship is an item of state significance and is the first Cantonese style garden in NSW. The garden contains various pavilions and distinctly designed landscape spaces including entrance gates for each space. The gateway to the entrance pavilion is the point of discussion for this analysis. The Garden as a whole links Darling Harbour and Haymarket. It is an extension to Chinatown, for which the Dixon Street precinct is the gateway. The gateway to the entrance pavilion is the entrance to the Garden just as the Dixon Street gates form the entrance to Chinatown.

The Chinese Garden of Friendship was developed by Sydney's Chinese communities as well as public authorities in NSW and Guangdong. The Chinatown Gates, in comparison, were constructed in a joint collaboration between Sydney's Chinese communities and the local council, the City of Sydney. The Garden symbolises the notion of friendship and brotherhood across the nations. The Chinatown Gates at Dixon Street also represent a mark of friendship and goodwill across Chinese and Australian communities.

There are some differences between the styles of the two gates. The roof of the entrance pavilion to the Garden is ornamented in a South Chinese style with more prominent curved ends. The roofs of the three components of the gate are connected. In comparison, the roofs of the Chinatown Gates are simpler in form yet include symbolic motifs and features on their ridge

Chinese Garden of Friendship, Sydney

lines; the central arch on each of the two gates has a distinctive higher roof, with two smaller roofs for the side arches. Both the gateway to the entrance pavilion at the Garden and the Chinatown Gates have a pair of lion statues guarding the entrance. However, the former gateway is approached via a series of marble stairs that lead into the complex, whereas the Chinatown Gates are on street level. Both the gates are of a traditional Chinese design. The materials and labour for the Chinatown Gates were imported from Taiwan, however, in contrast; locally sourced materials were used for the gateway to the Garden.

Facing Heaven Archway, Chinatown Plaza, 104–106 Little Bourke Street, Melbourne, Vic.

Date of construction

1985

Architect

Unknown

Historical significance

Not listed

Historical summary

The Facing Heaven Archway was a gift from Jiangsu Province, Victoria’s sister state, in 1985 to celebrate Victoria’s 150th anniversary. It is a traditional Chinese gateway made of wood and topped with a terracotta tiled roof. It is a replica of the Lingxing Gate in Nanjing, which is the capital of Jiangsu Province.

Discussion

One of five key arches of Melbourne’s Chinatown Precinct, the Facing Heaven Archway is situated at the entrance to Cohen Place, Chinatown Square and the Museum of Chinese Australian History. It is a ceremonial gateway to the precinct, similar to the Dixon Street gates forming the gateway for the Dixon Street precinct.

The Facing Heaven Archway was made in China using traditional handmade techniques and materials and assembled on site by local Chinese craftspeople. In contrast, the Chinatown Gates in Dixon Street were constructed with traditionally crafted elements from Taiwan with Taiwanese labour.

The Facing Heaven Archway is a single gate and landmark to Melbourne’s Chinatown. The other four arches of the precinct are markers to the thoroughfare of the precinct and are different in style. In contrast, the Dixon Street gates are in a pair. Together they form a landmark, marking two entrances to Sydney’s Chinatown and the Dixon Street precinct.

The gateways are also designed in distinctively different styles. Although both archways are of traditional Chinese design, the Facing Heaven Archway is a replica of the existing Lingxing Gate in Nanjing, marked by prominent red and gold features, whereas the Chinatown Gates’ design is Tang influenced and includes a prominence of emerald green in its roof ceramic features, along with the usage of gold and red. Like the Chinatown Gates, the Facing Heaven Archway has a pair of lions guarding the entrance. The two Haymarket Gates establish a linear path along one street, the Melbourne-based Chinatown Gates form a series of gateway of differing styles located within various laneway entries to the precinct.

Perth Chinatown Archway, Perth

Date of construction

1980s

Architect

Unknown

Historical significance

Not listed

Historical summary

The Chinese presence in Western Australia dates back to the 1840s. In the 1980s, more than a century after Chinese people's arrival in the region, an archway was constructed to commemorate their presence. This archway stands on Roe Street in the inner-city suburb of Northbridge and marks the official Chinatown in Perth. Unlike other archways that mark the entrances of Chinatowns, the Perth Chinatown Archway was constructed as part of a commercial establishment and leads to a complex of shops. It also does not bear the inscription of the city's Chinatown (i.e. Perth Chinatown) unlike most Chinatown archways.

Discussion

The Perth and Sydney Chinatown Gates were constructed around the same time. They were both constructed to commemorate the migration and presence of Chinese communities and form a landmark to their respective Chinatowns. The gates and archway are similar in style. Common features include marble bases for the four columns, traditional hipped roofs and green ceramic roof tiles with symbolic motifs and elements. The Perth Chinatown Archway exhibits simpler plaques and is less ornate in comparison to the Dixon Street gates. Both gates have a pair of lions at the entrance. The gateways also share the same colour theme.

The Perth Chinatown Archway was constructed as part of a commercial establishment, as an entrance to a complex of shops. In contrast, the Dixon Street gates mark a ceremonial entrance to the pedestrianised Dixon Street precinct—itsself a gateway to the wider Chinatown—which is not restricted to shops but also a hub for tourism, dining and entertainment.

International examples were also studied to understand the significance of the Chinatown Gates but have not been included as part of this assessment. Notable examples that are similar to the Dixon Street Chinatown Gates in Sydney include: the Liverpool Chinatown Gateway in Liverpool, UK; the San Francisco Chinatown Gateway (or Dragon Gate) in San Francisco, USA; and the Montreal Chinatown Gates in Montreal, Canada. All of these examples, like those of Dixon Street, mark an established gateway to the Chinatown of their respective city.

5.3.1 Conclusion

The heritage-listed items of this comparative assessment each include a Chinese ceremonial gate and have been assessed as having rare, historical and social significance at a state level. The items within the assessment that are not heritage listed have been selected as gateways to a local Chinatown precinct. The analysis of both the heritage listed and non-listed items demonstrates that these properties share several similarities with the Chinatown Gates at Dixon Street.

- ◁ The gates were all constructed around the same time as the subject site, in the 1980s.
- ◁ They are symmetrical in form and reflect stylistic and architectural characteristics of the Chinese tradition encompassing the traditional methods of feng shui.
- ◁ They were designed in a specific ornamental *paifang* style depicting traditional villages or palaces and have been constructed with materials and craftsmanship of Chinese origin imported from China or neighbouring countries.
- ◁ The gates are ceremonial entryways to either an item (temple or garden) or a street/precinct. They are all gateways to community facilities and place makers for community events.
- ◁ The gates denote a symbol of friendship between the Chinese and local/Australian communities.
- ◁ They represent the Chinese community and historical migration patterns in their respective areas, in that local Chinese organisations and community members were involved in their installation and provided funds for their construction.
- ◁ Across all examples, the original elements are largely intact. The elements that were deteriorated from weathering or fire have been reinstated to match the original.

5.4 Assessment against standard criteria

This section sets out an assessment of the heritage significance of the Chinatown Gates in accordance with the standard criteria established in the NSW Heritage Office guidelines (Section 5.1 of this report). The evaluation includes consideration of the original and subsequent layering of fabric, uses, associations and meanings of the Chinatown Gates, as well as its relationship to both the immediate and wider setting.

5.4.1 Criterion A (Historical significance)

An item is important in the course, or pattern, of NSW’s cultural or natural history (or the cultural or natural history of the local area)

| Guidelines for Inclusion | Guidelines for Exclusion |
|--|---|
| <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ◁ shows evidence of a significant human activity; ◁ is associated with a significant activity or historical phase; or ◁ maintains or shows the continuity of a historical process or activity. | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ◁ has incidental or unsubstantiated connections with historically important activities or processes; ◁ provides evidence of activities or processes that are of dubious historical importance; or ◁ has been so altered that it can no longer provide evidence of a particular association. |

The Chinatown in Dixon Street, Haymarket was the third Chinatown to develop in Sydney. The state listed temples in Glebe and Alexandria that developed in the late nineteenth century triggered the growth of Chinatown. Early Chinese settlements were also located in The Rocks and Surry Hills.

By the early twentieth century, Chinese people began to buy into the area and Dixon Street became a Chinese cultural centre dotted with restaurants and grocery stores.

In the 1970s, Dixon Street became an arrival destination for migrants from China and Chinese communities from other Asian countries. In the late twentieth century, Dixon Street, Haymarket, became a popular area for tourists and businesses to visit. The Haymarket Chinatown precinct continues to be a booming commercial and business hub.

Haymarket’s Chinatown is the only surviving original Chinatown in the Sydney CBD. The earliest Chinese settlements in the CBD were in The Rocks and Surry Hills. However, these locations were displaced and their residents dispersed when the areas were developed. The Chinatown Gates form a landmark to the Dixon Street, Haymarket precinct and are recognisable as landmarks to Sydneysiders, and visitors from regional NSW and other states.

The Chinatown Gates, located at the northern and southern ends of Dixon Street, Haymarket, have cultural significance at a local level and significance to the Sydney community and further afield.

The Chinatown Gates do not have cultural significance at a state level under this criterion.

5.4.2 Criterion B (Associative significance)

An item has strong or special association with the life or works of a person, or group of persons, of importance in NSW’s cultural or natural history (or the cultural or natural history of the local area)

| Guidelines for Inclusion | Guidelines for Exclusion |
|---|---|
| <ul style="list-style-type: none"> < shows evidence of a significant human occupation; or < is associated with a significant event, person, or group of persons. | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> < has incidental or unsubstantiated connections with historically important persons or events; < provides evidence of people or events that are of dubious historical importance; or < has been so altered that it can no longer provide evidence of a particular association. |

Chinatown in Haymarket has associations with early Chinese migrants. It was established in the early twentieth century as a cultural centre with restaurants and grocery stores. It is associated with several prominent Chinese organisations and societies including the Tong headquarters, Kwong War Chong, Wing Sang fruiterer, *Tung Wah* Chinese newspaper, Goon Lee Shing & Company and various other stores and companies. It is associated with some of the early Chinese investors and migrants in Sydney who developed Chinatown to the commercial and business hub that it is today.

Chinatown has historic associations with arrivals of Chinese and Asian migrants in the late twentieth and early twenty-first century.

The Chinatown Gates form the ceremonial entrance to the Dixon Street precinct of Haymarket Chinatown.

The Chinatown Gates have associations with the Dixon Street Chinese Committee established by the City of Sydney Council with sponsorship from the Chinese Consul (Taiwan).

The Chinatown Gates have associations with the architectural practice of Tsang & Lee Architects, the designers of the gates. Henry Tsang of Tsang & Lee Architects is well-known in the local Chinese community for his role as counsellor on the City of Sydney Council and his role within state politics as a member of the Labor Party. He is well known and respected in the Chinese community for having designed the state heritage listed Chinese Garden of Friendship. Henry Tsang is recognised for having co-ordinated and consulted with stakeholders within the Chinese community and government bodies.

The Chinatown Gates have cultural significance at a local level under this criterion. They do not reach the threshold for state significance.

5.4.3 Criterion C (Aesthetic significance)

An item is important in demonstrating aesthetic characteristics and/or a high degree of creative or technical achievement in NSW (or the local area)

| Guidelines for Inclusion | Guidelines for Exclusion |
|--|--|
| <ul style="list-style-type: none"> < shows or is associated with creative or technical innovation or achievement; < is the inspiration for a creative or technical innovation or achievement; < is aesthetically distinctive; < has landmark qualities; or < exemplifies a particular taste, style or technology. | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> < is not a major work by an important designer or artist; < has lost its design or technical integrity; < its positive visual or sensory appeal or landmark and scenic qualities have been more than temporarily degraded; or < has only a loose association with a creative or technical achievement. |

The Chinatown Gates were designed in a traditional Chinese *paifang* form with elaborate symbolic ornamentation. They demonstrate the typology of a modest traditional Chinese ceremonial gateway, and display several architectural features typical of their style. These features include the traditional pagoda-style roof with exposed timber rafters, traditional half-rounded, glazed ceramic tiles, symbolic ceramic figurines, engraved gold leaf signage panels in the Chinese script and a pair of concrete lion statues seated on plinths, guarding the outside of each gate.

Tsang & Lee Architects designed the Chinatown Gates. Although Henry Tsang of Tsang & Lee Architects is a prominent architect within the Chinese community, the designer of the state listed Chinese Garden of Friendship, the gates are not exemplary examples of his body of architectural work. The Chinatown Gates to Dixon Street follow traditional gateway forms, using standard materials and adopt a formulaic design.

The Chinatown Gates have landmark qualities within the context of Haymarket and the southern end of the Sydney CBD. Significant views to the Chinatown gates include views to the south elevation of the south gate from Hay Street and its setting; and the view to the north elevation of the north gate from its setting and the intersection at Goulburn Street and Dixon Street. The Chinatown Gates are markers within the urban streetscape and structures that are well recognised by the local community.

The Chinatown Gates are in good condition and have a high degree of integrity and intactness.

The Chinatown Gates has cultural significance at a local level under this criterion. They do not reach the threshold for state significance.

5.4.4 Criterion D (Social significance)

An item has strong or special association with a particular community or cultural group in NSW (or the local area) for social, cultural or spiritual reasons

| Guidelines for Inclusion | Guidelines for Exclusion |
|--|--|
| <ul style="list-style-type: none"> < is important for its associations with an identifiable group; or < is important to a community's sense of place. | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> < is only important to the community for amenity reasons; or < is related only in preference to a proposed alternative. |

The Chinatown Gates are traditional ceremonial structures. The structures serve as a gateway to the Dixon Street precinct and Chinatown and link the pedestrian mall between the gates.

The gates have particular importance to the local Chinese and Taiwanese communities, who were involved in their design and construction.

The gates form a symbol of friendship and unity across all Chinese, Australian-Chinese and local communities. The gates are important to the sense of place of Chinatown and are landmarks or place makers for traditional events.

The Chinese community worked in collaboration with Council to design the gates and were responsible for raising the finances to construct the gate structures and install the lions. The names of members of the Chinese community who were the benefactors responsible for the idea to construct the Chinatown Gates and played a role in that idea coming to fruition have been recognised on the panels mounted on the north Chinatown gate. The Chinese communities have a strong association with these gates, Dixon Street and Haymarket’s Chinatown.

Whilst no survey was undertaken to understand the degree of association the general public has with the Chinatown Gates, it is generally understood that they are landmarks and symbols of Chinatown. These gates have become meeting points and are recognised as symbols of Chinatown.

The Chinatown Gates meet the criterion for social significance at a local level. They do not reach the threshold for state significance.

5.4.5 Criterion E (Research potential)

An item has potential to yield information that will contribute to an understanding of NSW’s cultural or natural history (or the cultural or natural history of the local area)

| Guidelines for Inclusion | Guidelines for Exclusion |
|--|--|
| <ul style="list-style-type: none"> < has the potential to yield new or further substantial scientific and/or archaeological information; < is an important benchmark or reference site or type; or < provides evidence of past human cultures that is unavailable elsewhere. | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> < the knowledge gained would be irrelevant to research on science, human history or culture; < has little archaeological or research potential; or < only contains information that is readily available from other resources or archaeological sites. |

The Chinatown Gates are located within a former roadway and no former development was located on this site. The Chinatown Gates are unlikely to yield any otherwise unknown information that could contribute to the understanding of the local area. An assessment of the subject site’s archaeological potential is beyond the scope of this assessment.

The Chinatown Gates do not use any new technology in their construction and are unlikely to provide new information about these traditional Chinese structures.

The Chinatown Gates do not meet the criterion for research potential at a local or state level.

5.4.6 Criterion F (Rarity)

An item possesses uncommon, rare or endangered aspects of NSW’s cultural or natural history (or the cultural or natural history of the local area)

| Guidelines for Inclusion | Guidelines for Exclusion |
|---|--|
| <ul style="list-style-type: none"> < provides evidence of a defunct custom, way of life or process; < demonstrates a process, custom or other human activity that is in danger of being lost; < shows unusually accurate evidence of a significant human activity; < is the only example of its type; < demonstrates designs or techniques of exceptional interest; or < shows rare evidence of a significant human activity important to a community. | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> < is not rare; or < is numerous but under threat. |

The Chinatown Gates at Dixon Street were designed as *paifang* and built using traditional design methodologies, materials and craftsmanship.

The gates demonstrate features that are seen in most traditional Chinese ceremonial archways/gates, which are designed to be ceremonial entrances to a complex or a public place that is important to the community for religious or cultural purposes. Their construction is usually directly associated with a particular Chinese society or group. The Chinatown Gates at Dixon Street mark the entrance to the Dixon Street precinct and form a gateway into Chinatown. There are numerous gates designed using the traditional Chinese style within Sydney. However, these gates do not specifically represent an entry into a Chinatown. The Haymarket Chinatown Gates are rare examples of Chinese gateways within Sydney marking an entrance into Chinatown.

However, with the emergence of other smaller ethnoburbs within wider NSW, future gates are likely to be installed. Currently there are makeshift and more contemporary gates at places like Cabramatta and Burwood. The symbolism of the gates to define a Chinatown is therefore not rare at a state level.

The Chinatown Gates meets the criterion for rarity at a local level.

The Chinatown Gates do not meet the criterion for rarity at a state level.

5.4.7 Criterion G (Representativeness)

An item is important in demonstrating the principal characteristics of a class of NSW’s cultural or natural places; or cultural or natural environments (or a class of the local area’s cultural or natural places; or cultural or natural environments)

| Guidelines for Inclusion | Guidelines for Exclusion |
|--|---|
| <ul style="list-style-type: none"> < is a fine example of its type; < has the principal characteristics of an important class or group of items; < has attributes typical of a particular way of life, philosophy, custom, significant process, design, technique or activity; < is a significant variation to a class of items; < is part of a group which collectively illustrates a representative type; < is outstanding because of its setting condition or size; or < is outstanding because of its integrity or the esteem in which it is held. | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> < is a poor example of its type; < does not include or has lost the range of characteristics of a type; or < does not represent well the characteristics that make up a significant variation of a type. |

The Chinatown Gates are an intact example of a Chinese gateway. They mark the northern and southern entrances to Chinatown’s Dixon Street, and, other than maintenance and minor additions, have not been altered since their original construction in 1979–80. The gates were designed using traditional Chinese methodologies and symbolic ornamentation. They were constructed with the support of local Chinese communities and involved Taiwanese labour, craftsmanship and materials.

Situated at the northern and southern intersections of Dixon Street, the gates form a landmark to the Chinatown precinct in Haymarket. They are a gateway to the only surviving Sydney Chinatown; the earliest Chinese settlements in The Rocks and Surry Hills were displaced and their residents dispersed.

The Chinatown Gates represent a mark of friendship between the Chinese and Australian communities. Together, the gates form a landmark to the Dixon Street precinct, and Chinatown more broadly, and are a place maker for traditional Chinese events.

However, Haymarket’s Chinatown is not the only place that marks the migration of the Chinese population in Sydney. The Dixon Street Haymarket gates form a small group of Chinese gateways found throughout Sydney at Chinese ceremonial and cultural centres. These include the Sze Yup Temple & Joss House, Glebe, Yiu Ming Temple, Alexandria, and the Chinese Garden of Friendship, Darling Harbour, all of which are heritage items.

Whilst these gateway structures are associated with temples and cultural places, they are not identifiable as Chinatowns.

There are numerous 'ethnoburbs' around Sydney and NSW. Over the years, Sydney suburb of Chinese migration have developed in Burwood, Campsie, Ashfield, Auburn, Cabramatta, Marrickville, Chatswood, Eastwood, Parramatta, Hurstville, Kingsford, Wollri Creek, Zetland and around Mascot railway station. However, these locations do not have symbolic gateways. The 'ethnoburbs' represent a change in demographics when ethnic communities have moved into the suburbs, rather than remaining within the city centre.

Numerous Chinatowns with symbolic gateways are in other Australian cities, including Melbourne and Perth. These gateways were comparable in design to those at Haymarket, and were constructed during the 1970s and 1980s, at a time when Chinatowns were being constructed in various cities around the world.

The Chinatown Gates meet the criterion for representativeness at a local level.

They do not reach the threshold for state significance.

5.5 Significant components

Different components of a place or item may make various relative contributions to its heritage value and the level of significance. Loss of integrity and intactness of components of the place or item may also diminish or affect its significance. Assessing the relative contribution of an item or its components to the overall significance of the place provides a useful framework that helps when making decisions about the conservation of and/or changes to the place.

The following table sets out terms used to describe the grades of significance for different components of the item, as per the 'Assessing Heritage Significance' guidelines. An additional category of 'None' has been included for elements that neither relate to the subject site's heritage values nor detract from its potential significance.

Overall the Chinatown Gates have a high grading of significance at the local area. All components of the gates and fabric contribute to this assessment.

Table 5.2 Standard gradings of significance.

| Grading | Justification | Appropriate Treatment |
|-------------|--|--|
| Exceptional | Rare or outstanding element that makes a direct contribution to an item's local or state significance. | Preservation, restoration, reconstruction. Adaptation and/or interpretation where significant elements and/or fabric are altered or missing. |
| High | High degree of original fabric. Demonstrates a key element of | As for Exceptional (above) with greater allowance for adaptation where this is in accordance with |

| Grading | Justification | Appropriate Treatment |
|-----------|--|--|
| | the item’s significance. Alterations do not detract from significance. | overall significance, intactness/integrity and use. |
| Moderate | The element makes an important contribution to the significance/heritage value of the listing as a whole. Without this element the significance of the listing may be diminished. Altered or modified elements do not detract from significance. | Retention and conservation where possible. Adaptation and/or alteration permissible. Removal possible subject to assessment. |
| Little | The element makes a contribution to the significance/heritage values of the listing as a whole. Without this element the significance of the listing may not be diminished, provided mitigation measures are implemented. Alterations detract from significance. | As for Moderate (above) with fewer constraints on removal. |
| Intrusive | The element detracts, or has the potential to detract, from the significance of the listing. | Remove/modify to reduce adverse impacts. |

Significant elements within the Dixon Street precinct between the Chinatown Gates are illustrated in Figure 5.1 and described in Table 5.3 below.



Figure 5.1 Location of Chinatown gate elements—Image of south gate.

Table 5.3 sets out the grading of significance of each element.

Table 5.3 Significance gradings of elements within the subject site.

| Element | Comment | Grading of Significance |
|--|--|-------------------------|
| Overall form and design | Shape providing representation of traditional Chinese gateway | High |
| 1. Marble plinth | 20mm white/light grey marble plaques with inscriptions on the lower portion of the concrete plinth and base of both gates. Chipped and deteriorated in segments. | Moderate |
| 2. Concrete frame | Reinforced concrete structural frame with paint finish. | High |
| 3. Bracket supports for beams (stepped) | Stepped plywood-clad steel brackets supporting the timber beams of the upper and lower roofs. | High |

| Element | Comment | Grading of Significance |
|--|---|-------------------------|
| 4. Timber beams | Structural beams to the upper and lower roofs. | High |
| 5. Timber rafters (curved) | Curved 75mm × 75mm timber rafters with paint finish. | High |
| Plywood soffit | Curved 4–6mm soffit lining fixed to upper surface of curved rafters with paint finish. | Moderate |
| Fascia | Plywood fascia with paint finish. | Moderate |
| Tile battens and support | Timber battens with upper secondary layer of 4–6mm curved ply. | Little |
| 6. Tiles (roof) | Green glazed traditional ornamental Chinese ceramic tiles. | High |
| 7. Decorative tiled elements | Green glazed traditional ornamental Chinese ridge capping ceramic tiles including figurines of dragon heads, lions and chickens. | High |
| 8. Decorative panel to upper section A | Timber lattice framed with central coloured glass sign with gilded timber lettering/inscription | High |
| 9. Decorative panel to upper section B | Plywood-clad box with structural steel support, decorative paint finish, surface-fixed decorative timber and fibreglass mouldings and gold gilded timber lettering. | High |
| 10. Decorative lattice brace C | Painted timber lattice | High |
| 11. Decorative panel to lower section D | Plywood-clad box with structural steel support, decorative paint finish, surface-fixed decorative timber/cast mouldings (4small, 1 large per side) | High |
| 12. Decorative panel to lower section E | Plywood-clad box with structural steel support, decorative paint finish, surface-fixed decorative timber/cast mouldings (4small, 1 large per side) | High |
| 13. Chinese script on plaques (marble) | Gilded inscriptions into marble plaques clad over the concrete columns | Moderate |

| Element | Comment | Grading of Significance |
|---|--|-------------------------|
| 14. Chinese script on plaques (timber) | Gold leaf/gilded inscriptions on timber blocks/moulding on the decorative panels. | High |
| Marble inscription plaques—donors' names | Engravings on plaques at the north gates. | Moderate |
| 15. Lion statues | Painted concrete statues on granite base —material form (current condition). Originally the design intent included granite lions which was not undertaken for budgetary constraints. The current materiality of the concrete lions is not significant. | Little |
| | Symbolic tradition of pair of Lions guarding outside entry. The statues are an integral part of the design of the Chinatown Gates. A pair of lions guard each of the entrances to the Gates. | High |

5.6 Summary Statement of Significance

The Chinatown Gates, located at Dixon Street, Haymarket, and constructed in 1979-80, have historic significance for being a traditional Chinese ceremonial *paifang* / gateway that marks the entrance to Sydney's Chinatown. The pair of gates, located at the northern and southern ends of Dixon Street, were designed using traditional Chinese design and ornamentation. The Chinatown Gates have **local** significance for historic, associative, aesthetic, social, rarity and representative attributes.

Haymarket has historic significance for being the only surviving Chinatown in Sydney, after the earliest Chinese settlements in The Rocks and Surry Hills having been developed and their residents dispersed. In the early 20th century, Haymarket developed as the district in Sydney where the Chinese communities lived and operated businesses.

Chinatown Gates, designed by Tsang & Lee Architects (including architect Henry Tsang) and constructed by the City of Sydney Council with contributions from the Dixon Street Chinese Committee, symbolise the development of Sydney's first 'Chinatown', mark the entrance to Sydney's first official Chinatown, formalised in the late-1970s.

The Chinatown Gates are aesthetically distinctive as entrances into 'Chinatown'. Significant views to include the view of the south elevation of the south gate from across Paddy's Market and the view of the north elevation of the north gate from the intersection at Goulburn Street and Dixon Street. They are structures with landmark qualities and are well recognised by the local community.

The Chinatown Gates have social significance association with the local Chinese businesses and communities who supported the project financially and professionally. They collectively used their design skills and organised resources including Taiwanese traditional construction skills and materials. The construction materials and labour were sourced from Taiwan and the Chinese Consul in Taiwan sponsored the development of the gates.

The Chinatown Gates symbolise the establishment of 'friendship' between the Chinese and Australian communities. They are a landmark to the Chinatown precinct, place maker for traditional Chinese events, a meeting place and place of recreation for Australian Chinese, Australians and tourists interested in partaking in Chinese culture.

The Chinatown Gates are representative for belonging to a small group of Chinese ceremonial gates in Sydney. The gates have features common in traditional Chinese *paifang* including traditional pagoda style roof with exposed timber rafters, glazed ceramic tiles, symbolic features, engraved gold leaf signs in the Chinese script and lion statues at the gates. The gates represent Chinatowns that were established worldwide in the 1980s and are rare in NSW for being the only landmarks associated with a formalised Chinatown.

5.7 Proposed Curtilage

The Chinatown Gates have landmark qualities within the context of Haymarket, located at the southern end of the Sydney CBD.

Significant views to the Chinatown gates have been described above and include the view to the south elevation of the south gate from across Paddy’s Market and the view of the north elevation of the north gate from the intersection at Goulburn Street and Dixon Street. These are the principal entries, or welcome points, to the shared path of Dixon Street. The gates are markers within the streetscape and structures that are well recognised by the local community. Refer to Figure 4.53 in Section 4.2 for details on the significant views and vistas.

The curtilage is not contained only within the footprint on each gate. The proposed heritage curtilage for each gate takes into consideration the setting, including gathering and welcome zones associated with the symbolism of each gate entry. The heritage curtilage for the Chinatown Gates is featured in the figures below.



Figure 5.2 Approximate location of north gate (in blue) and outline of proposed curtilage (in yellow). (Source: NearMaps with GML overlay)




Figure 5.3 Approximate location of south gate (in blue) and outline of proposed curtilage (in yellow). (Source: NearMaps with GML overlay)

To establish an individual heritage curtilage for each gate, the dimensions of the gates, together with its setting, have been utilised.

The maximum height of each gate measures approximately 7.2m from the ground plane. This dimension has been taken into consideration when determining the proposed curtilage.

Chinatown Gate—north gate

The proposed curtilage for the north gate has been determined as follows:

- ◀ 15m (approximately twice the height of the gate) north from the edge of the plinth of the lions;
- ◀ 7.2m south from the base of the gate; and
- ◀ The curtilage to the east and west of the gates is to extend to the lot boundary of the adjoining allotments along Dixon Street.

Chinatown Gate—south gate

The proposed curtilage for the south gate has been determined as follows:

- ◀ 7.2m north from the base of the gate,
- ◀ Approximately 13.5m south from the plinth of the lions to the Hay Street kerb,
- ◀ The curtilage to the east and west of the gates is to extend to the lot boundary of the adjoining allotments along Dixon Street.

6 Conclusions and recommendations

6.1 Conclusions

This report has assessed the heritage significance of the Chinatown Gates at Dixon Street, Haymarket, located within the Sydney LGA, based on historical research, investigation of the subject site, a comparative analysis against similar locally listed items, and an assessment of its local context. It includes a detailed assessment of the subject site against the SHR significance assessment criteria to determine the significance of the place to the Sydney LGA.

The report concludes that the Chinatown Gates at Dixon Street meets the threshold for local heritage significance. The Chinatown Gates at Dixon Street is of local heritage significance for historic, associative, social, rare and representative attributes.

6.2 Recommendations

6.2.1 Recommended heritage listing

The construction of the gates on Dixon Street symbolise the importance of this space as the centre of Chinatown. It is recommended that the Chinatown Gates located at Dixon Street, near the intersection of Hay Street and Goulbourn Street, be added to the heritage schedule of the Sydney LEP as an individual item of local heritage significance. The proposed listing will be submitted to Council as a Heritage Inventory Sheet.

6.2.2 Recommended management

- ◁ The Chinatown Gates be nominated for listing as a heritage item of local significance on the Sydney LEP.
- ◁ Consideration should be given to undertaking a heritage assessment of the Dixon Street shared zone located between the gates to determine whether this precinct has heritage significance.
- ◁ The Chinatown Gates and its significant elements should be managed in accordance with the Sydney LEP and the Burra Charter principles.
- ◁ An experienced heritage architect/consultant should be consulted for any future development to the site.
- ◁ All future proposals for modifications to the Chinatown Gates should respect the existing form, character and spatial quality of the Dixon Street precinct and greater Chinatown.

- ◁ It is recommended that the proposed heritage curtilage for each gate (discussed in Section 5.7) be adopted for the Chinatown Gates.
- ◁ The Burra Charter principle of 'doing as much as necessary but as little as possible' should be applied to future repair and construction works.
- ◁ Where repair works are undertaken to original fabric, replacement materials should match the existing, unless there are sound reasons that ensure the longevity of the Chinatown Gates.
- ◁ There should be no substantial additions or alterations to the item except to retain its existing form and character. Future development is to be carried out in accordance with a conservation management document and following community consultation.
- ◁ A statement of heritage impact (SHI) should be prepared by an experienced heritage consultant/architect as part of any proposed future development. This should involve an assessment of the impact of future works on the heritage significance of the item against the relevant heritage provisions of the Sydney LEP and in accordance with the NSW Department of Planning and Environment guidelines for 'Statements of Heritage Impact'.
- ◁ It is recommended further studies be undertaken into the urban setting of Dixon Street, including a fine grain study of the area with a coordinated public domain approach.

6.2.3 Recommended proposed actions

- ◁ Implement the management guidelines in Section 6.2.2 for any future development and conservation works.
- ◁ Implement the proposed actions indicated in the Chinatown Gates Condition Assessment report prepared by GML and ICS.
- ◁ Provide effective bird-proofing to the roof of the gates. The current preventative measures to the gates are ineffective.
- ◁ Upgrade existing lighting with a sympathetic and functional lighting design system. The subject site is a symbolic landmark gateway for social activities such as the Lunar Year celebrations for both locals and tourists.
- ◁ Upgrades to lighting should be considered and implemented as part of future works.
- ◁ Additional fixings on the Chinese gates for temporary banners, etc, should be managed in a wholistic way to eliminate damage to the structure.
- ◁ The history of the Chinatown Gates is not provided at the site. To enable the general public, students and tourists, to better understand and appreciate the history of the gates, interpretation should be provided as part of future works.
- ◁ Originally it was intended the lions be constructed in granite. Due to budgetary constraints at the time of the construction of the gates, the lions were made of concrete. The lions are in a deteriorated condition and have a negative visual impact on the gate entrances. There is a desire within the Chinese community to replace the

concrete lions with granite lions in accordance with the original design intent. There is an opportunity for granite lions to be installed as part of future upgrade and refurbishment works to the gates.

- ◀ Originally the plinths on which the lion statues are mounted were constructed in brickwork. The plinths were reconstructed in granite as part of the Dixon Street paving upgrade works. Where necessary, refurbishment works should be undertaken to these granite plinths.