Abstract: Any study of industrial heritage redevelopment should consider the conflicts inherent in the preservation process, and especially the role of the local community. An invested community can help preserve its own heritage, and balance policy formulated to create rapid development without any community involvement. This paper employs qualitative data collected at Taigucang Wharf, a former industrial zone in Guangzhou, China, to analyse the role of the local community in the restoration of this industrial heritage site as a tourist attraction. The findings show that once the site was completed, the role of community shifted from bystanders to benefit recipients, and subsequently advocates of the heritage restoration process. Tourism plays an important role in balancing the demands of preservation and development.
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Introduction

A nuanced understanding of industrial heritage redevelopment must in addition to architecture and urban planning perspectives, also consider the role of community (see for example Cowen 1990; Samuel 1994; Stamp 1987; Urry 2002; Landorf 2009, 2011; Oevermann et al. 2016). The local community often exercises a strong voice in regard to industrial heritage reuse projects (Urry 2002), and may even themselves determine whether a particular site will be restored or passed over. The support of the local community is very important for broad public acceptance of the heritage project (Alfrey and Putnam 1992; Dicks 2003; Landorf 2009; Waterton and Smith 2010; Herrle et al. 2013).
There are two important aspects of community participation in industrial heritage redevelopment. The first concerns the community’s attitude toward tourism remodeling, which many studies indicate has a critical impact on the redevelopment process, especially in its initial phases. For example, the local community of Oberschöneweide, in Berlin, actively participated in the development process in a number of ways because they valued their industrial heritage (Oevermann et al. 2016). The second concerns the importance of integrated community development, since very often, state-led tourism projects emphasize economic growth at the expense of social well-being (Tweed and Sutherland 2007; Yung et al. 2013).

The deindustrialization of cities and towns in China has generated a large number of industrial heritage sites, many of which are being reused for business purposes (Wang 2008). However, only very limited community participation has occurred in the Chinese redevelopment process (Zhang and Xia 2008). This study has subsequently chosen to focus on the role of community in Chinese industrial heritage tourism development, through a case study of the Taigucang Wharf project.

**Literature Review**

**Conflict in the Industrial Heritage Redevelopment Process**

‘Industrial heritage’ broadly refers to the ruins or remains of industrial facilities and associated infrastructure, and also other miscellaneous sites associated with industry (TICCIH 2003), which are created, inherited, and held by the public. Because of growing de-industrialization, declining links with traditional processing and manufacturing systems and know-how, and the rise in computerized and automated production techniques, more and more people are interested in industrial heritage (Beaudet and Lundgren 1996; Xie 2006). As a result, the phenomenon of heritage redevelopment is now ubiquitous in cities throughout the world.

Many redevelopment projects were initiated in the early 1980’s, during a period of steady industrial decline that triggered a series of social problems such as unemployment and deteriorating economies. Europe provides over 30 years of experience in projects dealing with the recent industrial past.
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(Saurí-Pujol and Llurdés-Coit 1995; Hospers 2002; Kift 2011; Oevermann et al. 2016). With a view to solving these social problems, industrial structures and old buildings were often knocked down or rebuilt for new commercial projects (Chang et al. 1996; Tan et al. 2014; Mine 2013; Yung et al. 2013).

Despite this, there were calls for industrial heritage restoration for educational purposes (Alfrey and Putnam 1992), and local heritage trusts endeavored to protect and preserve historical buildings and spaces associated with the recent industrial past (Stamp 1987; Urry 2002; Herrle et al. 2013; Yung et al. 2013). Conflict of various kinds is therefore inherent in the redevelopment process, born usually of a clash between two approaches. These are a) the restoration and adaptation of disused industrial sites as museums and visitor centers, and b) their demolition or adaptation to commercial ends, such as hotels and residential districts (Chang et al. 1996; Kirkwood 2007; Xing et al. 2007; Yıldırım and Turan 2012.).

Often the state, driven primarily by economic motives, is the only investor in the development of tourism facilities (Dicks 2000). The aim is to promote economic growth and regional development, and improve the employment rate (Edwards and Coit 1996; Hampton 2005; Ruiz Ballesteros and Hernandez Ramirez 2007; Saurí-Pujol and Llurdés-Coit 1995; Dahles 2001). As Edwards and Coit (1996) indicate, narrow understandings of the concept of heritage among both the general public and state agencies, can lead to a lack of sufficient awareness and insufficient interest for governments to actively and efficiently preserve heritage sites. However, as Li (2002) demonstrates, in instances where the local community values its industrial heritage, governments can meet fierce and effective opposition from heritage conservationists.

Community interest and awareness is important for heritage preservation. Community attitudes; the emotional ties locals have to sites; is an important determining factor in successful heritage conservation (Edwards and Coit 1996). The community often has its own ideas and positions on heritage identification and preservation, and will actively participate in it when awareness is publically promoted (Lee et al. 2010; Alfrey and Putnam 1992; Urry 2002). Shan (2008) provides an example in New York City, whose municipal government had planned to demolish much of the Manhattan Soho neighborhood’s original architecture, including a large number of factories and warehouses. However, when faced with strong public opposition,
it finally agreed to preserve the area, which set a precedent for the “Soho mode” of historical and cultural protection and reuse. In contrast to this, the National Historic Jeep Museum in Toledo, Ohio suffers from low community interest or support, and the Jeep industry infrastructure was not seen worthy of preservation (Xie 2006).

**Industrial Heritage and Tourism**

Heritage tourism has grown rapidly worldwide due to increased education and income, technological advances, and increasing tourist interest in sites with cultural and natural significance (Timothy and Boyd 2003; Aas et al. 2005; Su et al. 2016). If planned and managed properly, tourism can finance heritage preservation (Nuryanti 1999; Tunbridge 2007; Su et al. 2016). Industrial heritage tourism, which encourages the creation of a site in which imaginative, authentic, sustainable, and participative engagement is facilitated, can also function in preservation of that heritage (Xie 2006).

In addition to heritage preservation, it is also hoped that the associated regeneration will revitalize the local economy (Edwards and Coit 1996). The emergence of industrial tourism is considered by many to be a blessing for the host community because of these benefits. Leaders of economically struggling communities use their cultural and architectural heritage to attract small business investment and tourism development (McNulty 1985). Some communities also demand compensation from the profits of reusing land for heritage tourism development (Lee et al. 2010), and they also benefit from tourist consumption and employment opportunities (Hampton 2005).

Government and local business interests can also benefit from industrial heritage tourism. While the restructuring of regional industries and factory closures may occasion the temporary disuse of former industrial sites, redevelopment and reutilization which aims to develop tourism (Saurí-Pujol and Llurdes-Coit 1995) and to stimulate local and transitional economies (Ruiz Ballesteros and Hernandez Ramirez 2007) achieves the same goals for governments. At the same time, businesses interests are eager to benefit from heritage tourism, and can seek financial support for heritage tourism development from the central government, whom are also involved in the redevelopment of heritage sites (Lee et al. 2010).
Tourism has important functions in industrial heritage redevelopment in that it necessitates efficient preservation (Xie 2006), and engenders new economic activities resulting in the regeneration and revitalization of urban cores (Law 1993). After more than a decade of uncertainty as to the direction of urban revitalization policy, the value of tourism development in this regard was categorically recognized in Europe (Jansen-Verbeke 1999). In the following years, the region’s governments adopted heritage protection policies (Cowen 1990), restoring old buildings and reemploying them for housing, offices, recreation facilities, or tourism sites (Dicks 2000). In Britain and Germany, the will of communities to maintain and restore local buildings was a crucial factor in bringing about policies for the protection of industrial heritage and the growth of tourism redevelopment (Li 2002).

**Industrial Heritage Tourism in China**

Widespread economic restructuring and deindustrialization have stimulated the growth of urban heritage tourism in both developed and developing nations (Chang et al. 1996). With urban development and economic transformation in China, cities have adopted a development strategy that pushes the old factories in industrial areas to adopt “quitting the manufacturing industry to develop the service sector” strategies. Those industrial sites that were originally located in the city center, along the roads and riversides of urban core areas, were gradually transferred to peripheral districts, leaving behind a high volume of industrial buildings with huge potential appreciation (Li and Wang 2007). On-site transformation of old plants into commercial, industrial or creative parks, hotels or other tourism projects is an important part of government strategy (Wang 2008).

There are obvious differences between China and the western world with regards to industrial redevelopment (Li 2002), in particular concerning community roles. This paper draws ideas from the literature in both contexts. Tourism combines development and preservation, while the community often takes the role of heritage protector. It is important to examine the nature of community roles that relate to industrial heritage tourism development.
Research Methods

The remainder of this paper is based on a case study of a typical industrial heritage tourism development project in China: the Guangzhou Taigucang Wharf redevelopment. The research was undertaken in the form of archival reading, interviews and participant observation, with a view to examining the redevelopment process, its outcomes, and the role of the community.

The objective of the reading portion of the research was to gather information on the present condition of Taigucang Wharf, mainly from planning data, and almost thirty major news stories produced during the redevelopment. This information covers each stage of the redevelopment and its aspects, including stakeholder roles and behavior. Three major plans are examined: the “Planning for Taigucang Wharf and Pier Transformation and Renovation”, approved by the Guangzhou Urban Planning Bureau in 2009, the “New Urban Planning for Guangzhou White Swan Pond Area” promulgated by the Guangzhou Urban Planning Bureau on June 17th 2011, and the “Guangzhou Pearl River Landscape Renovation Master Plan” which was adopted by Guangzhou Municipality on February 25th 2006. Other relevant data were gleaned from auxiliary materials and news reports, and an internet search was conducted to access major news stories.

The fieldwork was carried out from May, 2013 until July, 2014. Through interviews with community residents and business operators, we are able to verify and cross-reference the process of redevelopment. The interviews also sought to gauge the attitude and perceptions of the community, and the nature of the local community’s role(s) throughout all stages of the redevelopment process since its inception. Observation in public spaces was also undertaken to this end. 17 interviews were conducted with 10 local residents, 3 operators, and 4 tourists. Each interview lasted 15 minutes or more.

Introduction to Taigucang Wharf, GZ China

Taikoo Pier and Warehouse are located at Gexin Road 124, Haizhu District, Guangzhou, on the east coast of the South Pearl River. Guangzhou Port Group Co. Ltd. is the developer and the Guangzhou Port Group Business Development Co., Ltd. is responsible for operations. The property is managed by the Guangzhou Port Haiyin Property Management Co. Ltd. Taikoo Pier
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and Warehouse have a complicated history. The former British company Swire Pacific built them between 1904 and 1908, and they were managed by the Swire Shipping Agent for the Far East Black Chimney Company. On February 24, 1953, Guangzhou Military Control Commission was ordered to requisition Taikoo Pier and Warehouse, which were nationalized and since then have been managed by the Guangzhou Port and Guangzhou Port Group Management. The Guangzhou Port Group evolved from the Guangzhou Port Authority in 2004, in accordance with the requirements of modern enterprise restructuring and the establishment of a legal, state-owned limited liability company, mainly engaged in warehouse and port-related business.

Guangzhou Port has undergone several changes in port management from 1949 to the present. From 1978 to 1987, the Guangzhou Port (Management) Bureau was directly under the leadership of Guangdong Province Shipping Administration Bureau, and was owned by the Guangdong Maritime Bureau after the revocation of the Guangdong Shipping Administration in January 1973. In July 1984, Guangzhou Port Authority was delegated to Guangzhou City, and renamed the Guangzhou Port Management Authority. In September of the same year, the administrative level of Guangzhou Port Management Authority changed from a ‘division’ to a ‘department’. In December 1987, the Guangzhou Huangpu Port Authority was merged and incorporated into the Guangzhou Port Authority. Guangzhou Port is directly under the Ministry of Transportation, which handles both the administration and business affairs. Since February 2004, the Guangzhou Port Authority has been divided into a new Guangzhou Port Authority and the Guangzhou Port Group Co. Ltd. The former is responsible for navigation and transportation administration; the latter, in accordance with the requirements of modern enterprise system reform, is authorized by the municipal government of Guangzhou to manage the port operations.¹

The redevelopment of Taigucang Wharf’s industrial heritage was undertaken within the context of Chinese urban development. A plan to “improve the center area” was implemented in the urban areas of Guangzhou. The plan optimized the industrial structure and spatial layout of the site. Taigucang Wharf was transformed into a ‘creative garden’; an example of in situ industrial heritage tourism redevelopment. The transformation of this building was part of the ‘threelfold reform strategy’ (old towns, old factories, and old villages) and dovetails with the overall city development strategy. It was carried out by the
Ministry of Land and Natural Resources and Guangdong province with the aim of promoting economic and intensive land use.

Taigucang Wharf is owned and controlled by large state-owned enterprises and has a fairly weak connection with the workers there, and the nearby community. The wharf is separated from the surrounding community by closed walls, and the latter is no longer the main stakeholder associated with the space. According to the new urban plan, in 2007 the Guangzhou Port Group set up a special business development department to take charge of the transformation and reutilization of Taigucang Wharf. The surrounding community was not involved in any stage of the redevelopment process. After the heritage site fell under the purview of the Guangzhou Port Group, the community had hardly had any contact with Taigucang Wharf. Their opinions were not sought, and they did not participate in the redevelopment process.

Taigucang Wharf Redevelopment Process

Beginning Stage - the Government Promotion

The redevelopment of Taigucang Wharf is dependent on the Guangzhou government and led by the Guangzhou Port Group. On December 5, 2003, Zhang Guangning, the Mayor of Guangzhou, began to take an interest in the Taigucang Wharf. The result was an affirmation of its historical and cultural value, and a stated commitment to preserve, develop, and exploit the Taigucang Wharf for the future. The Mayor asked that the old building be preserved and proposed improvements and support facilities. In 2005, Taigucang Wharf was designated by the Guangzhou Government as a municipal-level conservation unit, and the Guangzhou Port Group began the redevelopment work. An elderly resident reported, “...but at the time I lived there, there was no mention of this matter.”

Promotion Stage - the Government and the Media Effort

Plans for the redevelopment were included in the “Planning for Taigucang Wharf and Pier Transformation and Renovation”, the “New Urban Planning for Guangzhou White Swan Pond Area”, the “Guangzhou Pearl River Landscape Renovation Master Plan” and other specific and regional plans. The Guangzhou Port Group began the renovation in 2007. Eventually, the Business
Development Company, a subsidiary of the Guangzhou Port Group, took over the restructuring development of the site. After three years, with funding from the Guangzhou municipal government, various walls had been repaired and surrounding roads had been extended. Against the background of the 2010 Asian Games, the government vigorously promoted urban development and invested in measures to improve the environment and the infrastructure near Taigucang Wharf. Restaurants, hotels, travel, and entertainment facilities were also constructed.

At the same time, the media began to report on the development of Taigucang Wharf. These reports can be divided into three types. The first type was political propaganda for the Guangzhou municipal government, promoting the redevelopment of Taigucang Wharf. It emphasized official government actions, and helped the government to advance the process with stories such as “Taikoo Warehouse transformation not only retains its rich cultural heritage and historical style, but is also developing cultural and creative industries,” and “Taigucang Wharf is an exemplar of moving or abandoning the second industry to develop the tertiary industry, and of the ‘threelfold reform’ (urban development) strategies.” In the second type of story, reporters gave updates on the Taigucang Wharf, including regular round-ups of development activities and also visitor reactions. Thirdly, there were stories that attempted to encourage nostalgia for the industrial and artistic heritage of Taigucang Wharf, through phrases such as “Change to 798 Art Factory” (The most famous industrial heritage redevelopment case in China); “How an old wharf became a romantic site”; and “Read the old memories here in the dilapidated brick.”

Community residents said that it was the news reports that first drew their attention to the development: “If it were not for the news, perhaps I would just pass by and only glance at it, and I would not know anything (about the Taigucang Wharf).” The common attitude was exemplified by the following statement: “The government should do its job. Anyway, this project is a government project, and it is a government matter.” The government-led actions drew only a small amount of attention from the community at this stage.
Action Stage – Redevelopment and Restoration

Driven by the efforts of the government, the Guangzhou Port Group and the Trade Co. Ltd. of Guangzhou Port Group, Taigucang Wharf became a commercial center with a theater, a wine merchant, and several catering and beverage businesses. Interviews with some investors revealed that they chose this place because “The government is vigorously promoting the Taigucang Wharf project as a worthwhile development, that has excellent conditions for business” (Investor 1), and “The atmosphere is very nostalgic, and work here feels good. I believe that this sense of nostalgia will also attract a lot of people” (Investor 2).

Although the Taigucang Wharf is still in the initial investment stage and does not attract many visitors, the wine exhibition and other attractions are drawing some tourists, and this is generating some confidence among the residents. One resident said; “I feel good now about Taigucang Wharf, there are so many companies that have come in, even more will be better, and the main theater attracts many people.” The Taigucang Wharf improves the appearance of the surrounding infrastructure, and attracts a relatively high number of tourists interested in its history and wishing to photograph the site. One respondent said; “Taigucang Wharf has witnessed a century of history.” Other tourists come for the theater, which attracts visitors with the marketing of low-price tickets. Taigucang Wharf also provides riverside leisure recreation trails and a cinema.

The media continues to write follow-up reports on the redevelopment, and promote the site’s image as a center of arts and culture. At the same however, the Guangzhou Daily report on local residents’ opposition to the construction of the Taikoo Yacht Club was restricted to a short column. Although the media can help the community to participate and express their views, it is more often a means of attracting attention to the government developments, and in general is supportive of the redevelopment process.

The Role of the Community in the Taigucang Wharf Redevelopment Process

The three plans for the wharf’s redevelopment are progressing under the Guangzhou government’s direction, which employs a centralized, top-down
approach to the project. The community’s views are rarely considered, and aside from a handful of peripheral stories in the press regarding partial opposition, they have had no effect on the redevelopment process\textsuperscript{12}. The Government’s chosen operator assumes the initial investment, the project’s development direction, and operations management; the community does not participate in these processes and decisions at all.

Community participation is limited to the expression of views in newspapers. Moreover, when asked about the opposition to the yacht club that had been reported, most of the residents interviewed claimed they had no knowledge of this, or even any particular interest. Responses included;

\begin{quote}
The government is doing something that the government should and will do, so why should we care so much? We do believe the government has its reason for doing things, I believe in the government, and The government will not listen, exposure in the media will have no influence on building the yacht club.
\end{quote}

The original pier and its surrounding warehouse buildings are now enclosed by walls, so residents have no direct contact with the pier. This spatial exclusion results in a lack of interest and participation. A young person who lived near the wall said that;

\begin{quote}
I wanted to go in when I was a child, but could not because of the enclosure.
\end{quote}

The attitude of most residents tends toward the view that wharf is not a part of their community. A shop owner interviewee in the community said;

\begin{quote}
Taigucang Wharf was cut off by a fence, and entrance was forbidden. We just knew that it was a warehouse, but did not know exactly what it was like inside. How could we know? Everything belongs to the terminal, and we could not see inside, even if we wanted to. So we did not even know what it was like a few years ago. Anyway, what belongs to the terminal is their matter.
\end{quote}
With rapid urban development in Guangzhou, new housing has updated the original neighborhood. In recent years, upscale residential communities such as Fuze Park, Golden Bay, Modern R & F, Guangda Garden, Swan Bay, and the Sea Jin Rong Bay are rapidly expanding. These estates have controlled access, separating them from the wider community and from each other. They are also isolated from the Taigucang Wharf. In addition, it was found that the many Taikoo terminal workers resident in the Danwei house, near the Guangzhou Port Group, had limited contact with the Taigucang Wharf and a generally indifferent attitude to the site. Thus, overall, the community’s role in this redevelopment is little more than that of bystanders. They have hardly any connection with the warehouse and pier because the warehouse workers and their descendants no longer live in the area. The surrounding residential estates are gated communities, who regard the redevelopment with apathy. Before the renovations began there was a complete separation between the community and the site, therefore no emotional bond linking the site with the community.

Once the Taigucang Wharf restoration process was finished and the infrastructure was complete, the landscape was enhanced, the facilities were improved, and the businesses were opened. This met with the satisfaction of the community residents, and brought about an enhanced recognition of the site as an example of industrial heritage. This process was consolidated through the frequent supportive press articles. The following respective quotes demonstrate the passive support of the local communities:

It is convenient, now (the Taikoo Pier and Warehouse) are very pretty. The riverside landscape is very nice, the surroundings are quiet, and these buildings (the Taigucang Wharf) are very beautiful. In the evening you can come for a walk, take the children out and play. This is very nice. The government is doing a very good job, if it were not for the government this place would not change and become so beautiful and The paper has said that and I think so too!

It can be concluded this government-led process of redevelopment has brought about additional land and real estate benefits for the surrounding communities. Although not directly involved in the industrial heritage redevelopment process, the community enjoys improved traffic conditions, additional facilities, and
an increase in land and housing prices. These incidental economic benefits improve the community, even in the absence of heritage considerations. Thus, although they were not directly involved in the heritage redevelopment, the community has remained relatively satisfied with the project. In this case, the decisive factor in community satisfaction has not been involvement or participation, but instead strongly supportive media campaigns and immediate material benefits.

The media promoted the redevelopment process throughout, printing many positive stories and reports, with headlines and titles such as “Go to Taigucang to free your mind” in Information Times on September 18 2015; “Taigucang Wharf Project complete, whilst there are no advances in the upgrading and reconstruction of Canton tower Wharf” in New Express on October 13 2015; and “The road and roundabout serving Taigucang Wharf is finished” in Guangzhou Daily on May 12 2016. This mix of political propaganda and lifestyle features have constructed a positive atmosphere and a distinct ‘sense of place’ for the wharf, and had a significant effect on the attitudes of residents in the surrounding communities. In short, the media has helped the government to promote the project and its legitimacy, and shape public opinion in regard to it, and thus must be acknowledged as an important factor in the relationship between this site of industrial heritage and its community.

Summary and discussion

The findings of this study indicate that the local government is a major motivating factor in heritage restoration and redevelopment projects, and dominates the planning, investment and construction processes, whilst the local community by and large remains absent and aloof. However, despite this lack of community involvement and participation, once the project was approaching completion the community lost its indifference and came out in vocal support of it. We hope that this case study can supplement and expand existing theory and practices in regard to the community role in similar heritage projects.

Heritage redevelopment projects have a broad social foundation, and community awareness has been part of heritage protection and redevelopment from the beginning of the movement (Stamp 1987). Although heritage redevelopment has gradually emerged as an important factor in strategies of
economic recovery in China, it still lacks a firm social foundation (Zhang and Xia 2008). The social and historical significance of the heritage site in question affects community perceptions of the development project (Saurí-Pujol and Llurdes-Coit 1995). On the other hand, the economic significance of the site’s development as a site of heritage tourism is equally affective in terms of stakeholder participation at all levels (Edwards and Coit 1996; McNulty 1985; Xie 2006; Lee et al. 2010). In summary, industrial heritage tourism generates economic benefits, and these will ultimately affect the community’s perception and attitude to participation in the development process (Xie 2006).

The findings of this paper indicate that in China, the redevelopment of industrial heritage fits with industrial transformation and urban renewal strategies. As a result, the government has become a major promoter of heritage preservation for the purposes of tourism. In China’s social organization, the government maintains a high degree of centralized authority, and has usually been the driving force behind the heritage redevelopment process. The community is usually absent from this process and plays only the roles of bystander and benefit recipient, which is in contrast with current research findings in western countries (Edwards and Coit 1996; Landorf 2009; Waterton and Smith 2010; Herrle et al. 2013).

This case study of Taigucang Wharf demonstrates that in industrial heritage redevelopment, the role of the community varies due to a range of macro and micro social factors (such as the dominant role of government and local people’s attachment to industrial heritage). The role of community in the redevelopment process is not necessarily decisive (although it can be an influencing factor), even though relevant theories and studies have asserted that communities cannot be ignored as an important force (Cowen 1990; Samuel 1994; Stamp 1987; Urry 2002; Landorf 2009, 2011; Oevermann et al. 2016). Tourism is however an important factor in this process. Tourism balances the economic output and heritage preservation pressure, and community attitudes can change positively upon the manifestation of the concrete benefits that tourism redevelopment can quickly bring about.

The research also indicates that the media plays an important role in the industrial heritage redevelopment process and has a profound influence at all stages. It facilitates the construction of the local community’s identification with its industrial heritage, and its support for tourism-based development.
In the case of Taigucang Wharf, the media creation of a sense of positive nostalgia around the project in tandem with its material development has taken root in the community, and led to comparisons with the very successful 798 Factory in Beijing.
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1. All details are from the planning of government, especially from the three: “Planning for Taigucang Wharf and Pier Transformation and Renovation”, “New Urban Planning for Guangzhou White Swan Pond Area” and “Guangzhou Pearl River Landscape Renovation Master Plan”.

2. The same as Endnote 1.

3. From Guangzhou Municipality No. 67 announcement in 2008: “the 7th batch of Guangzhou’s culture relic protection site”.

4. From “Planning for Taigucang Wharf and Pier Transformation and Renovation”, “New Urban Planning for Guangzhou White Swan Pond Area” and “Guangzhou Pearl River Landscape Renovation Master Plan”.

5. From “hundreds years Taikoo warehouse: the earliest industrial heritage mark in Guangzhou” in *Guangzhou Daily* on October 11th 2014.

7. From “Taigucang, an old wharf to be the “798” in Guangzhou” in Guangzhou Daily on May 6th 2008.


11. The report was published on February 4th, 2010.


13. From the “Planning for Taigucang Wharf and Pier Transformation and Renovation”.
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