

**SCHEUDLE OF AMENDMENT TO
THE DRAFT SAI YING PUN & SHEUNG WAN OUTLINE ZONING PLAN NO. S/H3/32
MADE BY THE TOWN PLANNING BOARD
UNDER THE TOWN PLANNING ORDINANCE (Chapter 131)**

I. Amendments to Matters shown on the Plan

- Item A1 – Incorporation of the area covered by the approved Urban Renewal Authority Staunton Street/Wing Lee Street Development Scheme Plan No. S/H3/URA1/4 into the Plan.
- Item A2 – Zoning of the site at 4-10 Shing Wong Street, 16 Wa In Fong West and a portion of Wa In Fong West as “Other Specified Uses” (“OU”) annotated “Cultural, Community, Commercial and Open Space Uses” with stipulation of building height restriction of 4 storeys.
- Item A3 – Zoning of the sites at 60-66 Staunton Street, 88-90 Staunton Street, 2-2A Shing Wong Street, 2-10 Wa In Fong West, and a portion of Chung Wo Lane and Wa In Fong West as “OU” annotated “Residential, Institutional and Commercial Uses” with stipulation of building height restriction of 4 storeys.
- Item A4 – Rezoning of the site at 1-12 Wing Lee Street and 17-19 Shing Wong Street from “Comprehensive Development Area” (“CDA”) to “OU” annotated “Residential, Institutional and Commercial Uses” with stipulation of building height restriction of 4 storeys.
- Item A5 – Zoning of the sites at 8 and 13 Wa In Fong East, 4-6 Chung Wo Lane, Chung Wo Lane Sitting-out Area, the Government land adjacent to 6 Chung Wo Lane, and a portion of Chung Wo Lane and Wa In Fong East as “Residential (Group C)” (“R(C)”).
- Item A6 – Zoning of a strip of land near 13 Wa In Fong East as “Residential (Group A)25” (“R(A)25”) with stipulation of building height restriction of 150mPD.
- Item A7 – Zoning of a strip of land near Chung Wo Lane as “R(A)” with stipulation of building height restriction of 150mPD.
- Item B – Rezoning of the site comprising the Centre Point at 72 Staunton Street from “R(C)” and “R(A)” to “R(A)25” with stipulation of building height restriction of 150mPD.
- Item C1 – Rezoning of the site at 1-7 Tak Sing Lane from “Open Space” (“O”), “R(A)8” and area shown as ‘Pedestrian Precinct/Street’ (‘PPS’) to “R(A)24” with stipulation of building height restriction of 120mPD.
- Item C2 – Rezoning of Tak Sing Lane from “O” to area shown as ‘PPS’.

- Item C3 – Rezoning of a strip of land adjacent to Goodwill Garden at 83 Third Street from “R(A)8” to area shown as ‘PPS’.
- Item C4 – Rezoning of a portion of the site comprising Goodwill Garden at 83 Third Street from area shown as ‘PPS’ to “R(A)8” with stipulation of building height restriction of 120mPD.

II. Amendments to the Notes of the Plan

- (a) Incorporation in the Remarks of the Notes for the “R(A)” zone the requirement for provision of a 24-hour public passageway within the “R(A)24” zone.
- (b) Incorporation in the Remarks of the Notes for the “R(A)” zone the gross floor area restriction and requirement for provision of a public open space within the “R(A)25” zone.
- (c) Deletion of the set of the Notes for the “CDA” zone.
- (d) Incorporation of a new set of Notes for the “OU” annotated “Cultural, Community, Commercial and Open Space Uses”.
- (e) Incorporation of a new set of Notes for the “OU” annotated “Residential, Institutional and Commercial Uses”.

Town Planning Board

9 August 2019

List of Representers

In respect of the Draft Sai Ying Pun & Sheung Wan Outline Zoning Plan No. S/H3/33

Representation No.	Name of 'Representer'
TPB/R/S/H3/33-1	Urban Renewal Authority
TPB/R/S/H3/33-2	Chan Tai Man
TPB/R/S/H3/33-3	Central & Western Concern Group
TPB/R/S/H3/33-4	John Batten
TPB/R/S/H3/33-5	Friends of the 30 Houses Neighbourhood
TPB/R/S/H3/33-6	Ng Hoi Chi
TPB/R/S/H3/33-7	Esther P W van Wijck
TPB/R/S/H3/33-8	Mary Mulvihill
TPB/R/S/H3/33-9	Lee Cheuk Hei
TPB/R/S/H3/33-10	伍凱欣
TPB/R/S/H3/33-11	Expert Charter Limited
TPB/R/S/H3/33-12	Union Loyal Development Limited
TPB/R/S/H3/33-13	Sze Wai Sin
TPB/R/S/H3/33-14	Tse Kwong Yuen
TPB/R/S/H3/33-15	Mak Yee Ching
TPB/R/S/H3/33-16	Ma Ling
TPB/R/S/H3/33-17	Chow Wan Sze
TPB/R/S/H3/33-18	Fung Tak Ming
TPB/R/S/H3/33-19	Yuen Lee Yan
TPB/R/S/H3/33-20	Fung Tak Lam
TPB/R/S/H3/33-21	Mok Lai Ngor
TPB/R/S/H3/33-22	Wong Hei Man
TPB/R/S/H3/33-23	Wong Kar Wing Clara
TPB/R/S/H3/33-24	Cheung Kai Yin
TPB/R/S/H3/33-25	Ho Wai Chong
TPB/R/S/H3/33-26	Law Yiu Sabrina
TPB/R/S/H3/33-27	余燊茂
TPB/R/S/H3/33-28	余立鳴
TPB/R/S/H3/33-29	余如鳳
TPB/R/S/H3/33-30	Sin Wai Wah
TPB/R/S/H3/33-31	Yu Chi Ying
TPB/R/S/H3/33-32	Chan Man Wa
TPB/R/S/H3/33-33	Chun Wai Ka

Representation No.	Name of 'Representer'
TPB/R/S/H3/33-34	Chun Wing Ting Christine
TPB/R/S/H3/33-35	Chun Chun Ming
TPB/R/S/H3/33-36	梁愛華
TPB/R/S/H3/33-37	Ho Chi Shing
TPB/R/S/H3/33-38	Chan Tsui Hung
TPB/R/S/H3/33-39	Leung Kin Kwan
TPB/R/S/H3/33-40	梁玉傑
TPB/R/S/H3/33-41	梁學強
TPB/R/S/H3/33-42	Wu Ngai Yan Rosalind
TPB/R/S/H3/33-43	Yu Chi Ching
TPB/R/S/H3/33-44	Yu Tak Shun
TPB/R/S/H3/33-45	Chow Siu Lin
TPB/R/S/H3/33-46	Tsang Ching Nam
TPB/R/S/H3/33-47	Li Kin Lun
TPB/R/S/H3/33-48	Chow Kin Keung
TPB/R/S/H3/33-49	Chow Ngan Foon
TPB/R/S/H3/33-50	Chow Fu
TPB/R/S/H3/33-51	Tam Chi Wan
TPB/R/S/H3/33-52	Tam Chung Wai
TPB/R/S/H3/33-53	李海文
TPB/R/S/H3/33-54	史千里
TPB/R/S/H3/33-55	周敏琦
TPB/R/S/H3/33-56	Lam Ka Man
TPB/R/S/H3/33-57	李偉鈞

List of Commenters

In respect of the Draft Sai Ying Pun & Sheung Wan Outline Zoning Plan No. S/H3/33

Comment No.	Name of 'Commenter'
TPB/R/S/H3/33-C1	Central & Western Concern Group
TPB/R/S/H3/33-C2	The Friends of the 30 Houses Neighborhood
TPB/R/S/H3/33-C3	Mary Mulvihill
TPB/R/S/H3/33-C4	李一叶
TPB/R/S/H3/33-C5	Melanie Marie Juliette Comptdaer
TPB/R/S/H3/33-C6	Mak Kau
TPB/R/S/H3/33-C7	Mohamad Ghamlouch
TPB/R/S/H3/33-C8	Emilia Meredith Mason
TPB/R/S/H3/33-C9	Stefano Tronci
TPB/R/S/H3/33-C10	Christina Monique Themar
TPB/R/S/H3/33-C11	Damitha Tilanka Weerakoon
TPB/R/S/H3/33-C12	Alice Yeh
TPB/R/S/H3/33-C13	Andrea Pietrucci
TPB/R/S/H3/33-C14	Dahlmann, Sven Cristoph
TPB/R/S/H3/33-C15	Camille Aurelier Nathalie Roche
TPB/R/S/H3/33-C16	Alison Jane Quodling
TPB/R/S/H3/33-C17	Cheng Tan Fai
TPB/R/S/H3/33-C18	Fu Hiu Chi
TPB/R/S/H3/33-C19	Nguyen Thi-kim-hanh
TPB/R/S/H3/33-C20	Karin Chow
TPB/R/S/H3/33-C21	Rodriguez, Dervin H.
TPB/R/S/H3/33-C22	Travis Huggins
TPB/R/S/H3/33-C23	LI Mei Yu
TPB/R/S/H3/33-C24	Tse Kwong Yuen
TPB/R/S/H3/33-C25	Leung Chung Ching Edwin Wong Fung San Hanny

**Summary of Representations
in respect of the Draft Sai Ying Pun & Sheung Wan Outline Zoning Plan (OZP) (S/H3/33)**

Representation No. (TPB/R/S/H3/33-)	Representer	Subject of Representation	Representer's Proposals
1	Urban Renewal Authority (URA)	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Amendment Item A1 is in line with the direction of URA for the area. • The relaxation in the building height (BH) restriction of 4-6 Chung Wo Lane to 12 storeys is not in line with the current height profile. • The BH restriction of 4 storeys imposed on some of the existing buildings which are up to 6 storeys in height is not justified. • The existing streets and lane pattern in the area has a strong historical background and should be respected. They should be rezoned as 'Pedestrian Precinct'. • URA will formulate the detailed proposal of the Community Hub based on the outcome of the Community Making Study. • URA will preserve the existing trees as far as possible subject to further discussion with the local communities, findings of the tree survey and future design of the Community Hub. 	To designate Wa In Fong East, Wa In Fong West and Chung Wo Lane as an area shown as 'Pedestrian Precinct/Street' ('PPS').
2	Chan Tai Man	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Support Amendment Item A1. • Provide more housing and space in the district. 	
3	Central & Western Concern Group	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Support Amendment Item A1. • Oppose Amendment Items A2 to A7. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • To state the special character and heritage values of the historic 30 Houses Neighbourhood in the

Representation No. (TPB/R/S/H3/33-)	Representer	Subject of Representation	Representer's Proposals
4	John Batten	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> The H19 area (i.e. area covered by Amendment Items A2 to A7) lies at the heart of a neighbourhood known as '30 Houses' which has a rich history and has retained the old Chinese tenements built along the stepped streets. (R3) 	<p>Notes of the OZP.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> To designate the area covered by Amendment Items A1 to A4 as "Other Specified Uses" ("OU") annotated "Historic Neighbourhood" (R3, R4)
5	Friends of the 30 Houses Neighbourhood	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Both the community and the Government recognise the historical significance and heritage values of the neighbourhood. (R3, R5) 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> To designate Wa In Fong East, Wa In Fong West and Chung Wo Lane as an area shown as 'PPS'.
6	Ng Hoi Chi	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Welcome the Government's decision to conserve and revitalise the historic 30 Houses neighbourhood (the former H19 area). (R3, R5) 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> To stipulate the BH restrictions of the area covered by Amendment Items A3 to A5 as existing BH.
7	Esther P W van Wijck	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> The BH restrictions for the area covered by Amendment Items A2 to A5 are too simplistic and did not recognise the neighbourhood character and individual building qualities. The heritage value of the network of lanes, stepped streets, terraces and open space should be recognised, and protected from any development/elevated over-street development. There are no guidelines to ensure that any new construction and landscaping would not be detrimental to the historical fabric of the area. Given the heritage, cultural, social, landscape and architectural value of the area, a comprehensive "area conservation" approach is needed. (R5) A comprehensive "area conservation" approach should be implemented which includes preservation of existing tenement buildings, appropriate planning controls, retention 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> To designate Amendment Item A5 as "OU" annotated "Residential, Institutional and Commercial Uses" zone. (R3, R4) To stipulate the BH restriction of 3 storeys and include the requirements of provision of at least 135m² of at-grade open space and preservation of existing trees for Amendment Item A2. To designate Amendment Items A6 and A7 and the public sitting-out area of Amendment Item A5 to "Open Space" ("O").

Representation No. (TPB/R/S/H3/33-)	Representer	Subject of Representation	Representer's Proposals
		<p>of important urban fabric (i.e. stepped streets, terraces, lanes, open space, mature trees), and designation of a "historic neighbourhood" status. (R3, R5)</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The adjacent PMQ and the H19 area present a unique heritage precinct and must be sensibly preserved. (R4) • This OZP amendment is one of the rare cases where town planning is used for conserving Hong Kong's heritage. (R5) • The heritage value of the 30 Houses neighbourhood has not been properly established before the OZP is amended. (R5) • While a conservation policy should be formulated by referring to the recommendation and best practices laid out in international charters, the OZP amendment is to control the land use, BH and building design to safeguard the heritage value of 30 Houses neighbourhood. (R5) • Change of use may require current building regulations to be applied which will generally lead to significant loss of heritage value and should therefore be avoided. (R5 to R7) • New uses should be limited to commercial and some institutional uses on the ground floor and residential use on the upper floors. (R5 to R7) • a Heritage Impact Assessment should be conducted or a Conservation Management Plan (CMP) should be prepared to guide the development in the area (R3, R4), in particular for the new building for Amendment Item A2 (R5 to R7). 	

Representation No. (TPB/R/S/H3/33-)	Representer	Subject of Representation	Representer's Proposals
8	Mary Mulvihill	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The OZP should require cautious changes in landscape design and other services provided by various government departments to follow policy or design guidelines from the CMP. (R5 to R7) • Support Amendment Items A1 to A4 in principle, while the planning intention has to be considered with regard to the overall planning for the area. • Oppose Amendment Items B, C1, C2, C3 and C4 • Support the views from R5 regarding Amendment Items A2 to A7. • The open space provision requirement under Amendment Item A2 is insufficient, while there is a deficit of local open space in the area. • No justification to further increase the BH restriction of the development under Amendment Item B, and the promised stepping height profile is abandoned. • Application No. Y/H3/6 (which relates to Amendment Items C1, C2, C3 and C4) has previously attracted many objections. • Amendment Items C1 and C2 are surrounded by tall buildings, and development of an open space can mitigate the wall effect and address the deficit of open space in the area. 	
9	Lee Cheuk Hei	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Oppose Amendment Items A2 to A7. • Disagree with rezoning the Government land and open space covered by Amendment Item A5 to "Residential (Group C)" 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • To stipulate the BH restrictions of the area covered by Amendment Items A2 to A4 as existing BH.

Representation No. (TPB/R/S/H3/33-)	Representer	Subject of Representation	Representer's Proposals
10	伍凱欣	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> The tenement buildings in the area are very precious. The area has a rich history and is not suitable for high density development, it should be retained as its original landscape. The proposed amendments will destroy the landscape of the area. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> BH restriction of Amendment Item B should be the same as the existing BH The network of steps and lanes covered by Amendment Items A2 to A7 should be designated as area shown as 'PPS'.
11	Expert Charter Limited	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Oppose Amendment Items A2 to A7. There are a number of historical structures and monuments in the area. To set up a 'historical hub' and preserve open space. Oppose the BH restriction of Amendment Item A4 The need to impose a BH restriction of 4 storeys is not properly demonstrated. The proposed BH restriction cannot effectively preserve the historical ambience and character of the area. The proposed BH restriction is inflexible and too stringent, which frustrates the urban renewal and revitalisation of Wing Lee Street by the private sector, and does not maximise the land use efficiency. The proposed BH restriction caters to the URA, while deprived development rights of other private owners under the Buildings Ordinance. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> To relax the BH restriction of Amendment A4 to 160mPD or to remove the BHR entirely. To incorporate a clause in the Explanatory Statement of the OZP to retain the existing façade of the tenement buildings. To stipulate a tower setback line of 2m from Wing Lee Street.
12	Union Development Limited Loyal		

Representation No. (TPB/R/S/H3/33-)	Representer	Subject of Representation	Representer's Proposals
		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • It is more appropriate to adopt Principal Datum when imposing BH restriction for this area as it allows greater flexibility for lot owners. • Relaxation of BH restriction and preservation of existing façade of the tenement buildings enable owners to maximise the development potential, while preserving the heritage landscape and ambience of the area. • Relaxation of BH restriction will not cause any adverse visual and air ventilation impacts. • The representers' proposal will benefit the public in terms of providing incentives for urban renewal and revitalisation in the district, encouraging urban renewal by private owners and providing design flexibility to accommodate development potential while conserving the urban fabric and minimising the perceivable changes at the pedestrian level. 	
13 to 24	Individuals (See Annex II)	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Oppose Amendment Item C1. • The development density in the area is very high. The open space should be preserved to ensure the living quality of the residents nearby. (R13, R14, R17 to R23) • Further development will cause adverse impact on air ventilation, health, safety, privacy and living quality. (R15, R16, R23) • Infill development will affect the quality of life and living environment in the area. (R15, R16, R23, R24) 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • To preserve the open space use (R13, R14, R17 to R23)

Representation No. (TPB/R/S/H3/33-)	Representer	Subject of Representation	Representer's Proposals
		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The proposed OZP amendment has defeated the original planning intention of zoning the site as "O" to control the living density. (R24) • Government should resume the land for open space use. (R24) 	
25 to 30	Individuals (See Annex II)	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Oppose Amendment Items C1 and C2 • The development density in the area is very high. The open space should be preserved to ensure the living quality of the residents nearby. (R25, R27 to R29) • Population density is too high in the area and more space is needed to ensure the quality of life. (R26) • Affect the foundation of other buildings. (R30) 	To preserve the open space use. (R25, R27 to R29)
31 to 36	Individuals (See Annex II)	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Oppose Amendment Items C1 and C4 • The development density in the area is very high. The open space should be preserved to ensure the living quality of the residents nearby. (R31, R33 to R36) • Further development will cause adverse impact on air ventilation, light penetration, health, safety and living quality. (R32 to R35) • There are already a lot of residential developments in the area and the open space should be preserved. (R31) 	To preserve the open space use. (R31, R33 to R36)
37 to 41	Individuals	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Oppose Amendment Items C1 to C3. 	To preserve the open space use.

Representation No. (TPB/R/S/H3/33-)	Representer	Subject of Representation	Representer's Proposals
	(See Annex II)	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The development density in the area is very high. The open space should be preserved to ensure the living quality of the residents nearby. (R38 to R41) • Further development will cause adverse impacts on health, safety and living quality. (R37) • Retaining the open space can maintain the air ventilation in the neighbourhood. (R38) 	(R38 to R41)
42 to 47	Individuals (See Annex II)	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Oppose Amendment Items C1, C2 and C4. • The development density in the area is very high. The open space should be preserved to ensure the living quality of the residents nearby. (R42, R43) • Future development will be too close to the nearby buildings. (R44 to R46) • There is limited road capacity to support more residential developments. (R47) 	To preserve the open space use. (R42, R43)

Representation No. (TPB/R/S/H3/33-)	Representer	Subject of Representation	Representer's Proposals
48 to 57	Individuals (See Annex II)	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Oppose Amendment Items C1 to C4 • The development density in the area is very high. The open space should be preserved to ensure the living quality of the residents nearby. (R48 to R52, 57) • Further development will cause adverse impact on air ventilation, health, safety, solar penetration and living quality. (R53 to R56) • There has been a shortage of open space in the Central and Western district, rezoning the site from "O" for residential use will further increase the shortage and lower the living quality of the residents nearby. (R56, R57) • There are too many infill developments in Sai Ying Pun. (R57) 	To preserve the open space use. (R48 to R52)

**Summary of Comments
in respect of the Draft Sai Ying Pun & Sheung Wan Outline Zoning Plan (OZP) (S/H3/33)**

Comment No. (TPB/R/S/H3/33-C)	Commenter	Related Representation	Gist of Comments
1	Central & Western Concern Group (R3)	R1 R11 and R12	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Agree with the representation that the building height (BH) restrictions should be the existing BH, Wa In Fong East, Wa In Fong West and Chung Wo Lane to be designated as an area shown as 'Pedestrian Precinct/Street' ('PPS'). • The existing open space and trees should be retained for public benefits and enjoyment. • Oppose relaxation the BH restriction to 160mPD or removal of BH restriction. • The proposed height is too high and will make the buildings unacceptably dense and uncomfortable. • Air ventilation will be adversely affected.
2	The Friends of the 30 Houses Neighborhood (R5)	R1 R11 and R12	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The representation lacks details, specificity and justifications for all the proposed OZP amendments. • URA should consider all OZP amendments from a heritage conservation and community-making points of view. • Oppose the representation as it is in conflict with the government policy to preserve the character of neighbourhood and severely threatens the heritage value of the neighbourhood. • Retaining of existing facades is a poor method of heritage conservation that has to be avoided.
3	Mary Mulvihill (R8)	Nil	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • There are strong public objections to the amendments. • The community wants to preserve the historic and cultural elements of the area. • There is an urgent need for open space in this district

Comment No. (TPB/R/S/H3/33-C)	Commenter	Related Representation	Gist of Comments
4	李一叶	R1	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Oppose the representation. • High-density development will destroy historical buildings and cultural environment, and cause poor light penetration, noise, and traffic nuisance in the neighbourhood.
5	Melanie Marie Juliette Comptdaer	R2	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Oppose the representation. • The buildings are part of the Hong Kong heritage.
6	Mak Kau	R13 to R57	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Oppose rezoning the site from “Open Space” (“O”) to “Residential (Group A)” or any other uses.
7 to 24	Individuals (see Annex III)	R24	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Oppose rezoning the site and/or demolishing the existing building. • The existing low-rise buildings are of rich history and local culture which should be retained and preserved. (C8, C9, C12, C14, C17, C20) • The urban fabric of streets and lanes in the area should be respected (C17). • The high-rise building in the small site will have negative effects on the foundations of the surrounding buildings (C8, C21) • Further development will cause noise, pollution and adverse impacts on light penetration, traffic, visual quality and living quality. (C9, C10, C14, C18, C22, C23) • Tak Sing Lane is a relief from the high-rise buildings in the area. (C11) • The site could be used for organic community garden. (C16) • The development density in the area is very high. The open space should be preserved to ensure the living quality of the residents nearby. (C17, C24)

Comment No. (TPB/R/S/H3/33-C)	Commenter	Related Representation	Gist of Comments
25	Leung Chung Ching Edwin & Wong Fung San Hanny	R13 to R24, R37 to R41	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The site is a unique place which gives quality of living, tranquillity and community to Sai Ying Pun. (C19) • More open space is needed among tall buildings and the existing buildings should be preserved to maintain housing diversity in the area. (C22)
			<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The “O” zoning of the site is outdated and jeopardised the development rights of the land owners as there had been no program for implementing the open space by the government. • The argument of “a severe shortage of local open space” was not a strong reason to retain the site for open space use as it is the government’s duty to develop open space on suitable and available government land. • The proposed 24-hour public access and open space for public use in the future development could benefit the public.
		R8, R25 to R30, R42 to R47, R48 to R57	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • As demonstrated in the Air Ventilation Assessment submitted in support of the S12A application (No. Y/H3/6), the proposed development has no adverse air ventilation impact on the local area. • Regarding the concerns on the impacts on health, safety, light penetration, living quality and foundation, the approval of the general building plans obtained for the proposed development has confirmed the proposed development is feasible under the Buildings Ordinance.
		R42 to R47	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • As justified in the S12A application, given the proposed development is of limited scale and is in close proximity to the Sai Ying Pun MTR Station, there will be no provision of parking facilities, and additional pedestrian and vehicular flows generated is limited.