

Urgent   Return receipt   Expand Group   Restricted   Prevent Copy

Submission Number:  
TPB/R/S/TW/38-S002

From: [REDACTED]  
Sent: 2025-01-11 星期六 16:47:42  
To: tpbpd/PLAND <tpbpd@pland.gov.hk>  
Cc: [REDACTED]  
Subject: S/TW/38 提出意見

Reference number: 241223-184019-08612

Tel#: [REDACTED]

Name: Mr. Wong Chi Kit

我是荃灣環宇海灣的居民，網上見到規劃署建議將環宇海灣隔離的露天停車場由自動停車場改建為私人住宅，我提出強烈反對因為樓的距離實在太近好像一道屏風擋在我們面前，原本天橋的噪音問題政府都沒能解決現在還要興建握手樓，你讓我們環宇的居民怎樣生活？

原本荃灣西都已經非常擠擁，興建多一個住宅又多2千人，交通配套怎樣處理？等車都等唔到…你你們有沒有考慮過當地居民的感受？況且除咗諮詢我哋的意見之外，其實如果真的落成新的樓宇，那些新的居民一樣會投訴，這樣差的生活質素政府怎能叫市民接受？又話民生無小事，你們怎樣處理這些民生事呢？

正如習近平主席所講政府有責任要讓市民有個幸福的居住環境，希望香港政府可以做到，我們也可能寫信去中央政府申訴我們的辛酸，希望政府不要只為利益而見縫插針式興建樓宇，引起民憤，而罔顧我們小市民的感受，所以請求城市規劃委員會不要通過停車場改為興建私人住宅的項目，我強烈反對這個項目，謝謝。

Wong Chi Kit

從 CK 的 iPhone 傳送

---

**From:** [REDACTED]  
**Sent:** 2025-01-14 星期二 09:16:04  
**To:** tpbpd/PLAND <tpbpd@pland.gov.hk>  
**Cc:** [REDACTED]  
**Subject:** Re: S/TW/38 提出意見

Resend:

>  
> Reference number: 241223-184019-08612  
> [REDACTED]  
> Name: Mr. Wong Chi Kit  
> [REDACTED]

>  
> 我是荃灣環宇海灣的居民，網上見到規劃署建議將環宇海灣隔離的露天停車場由自動停車場改建為私人住宅，我提出強烈反對因為樓的距離實在太近好像一道屏風擋在我們面前，原本天橋的噪音問題政府都沒能解決現在還要興建握手樓，你讓我們環宇的居民怎樣生活？  
> 原本荃灣西都已經非常擠擁，興建多一個住宅又多2千人，交通配套怎樣處理？等車都等唔到…你你們有沒有考慮過當地居民的感受？況且除咗諮詢我咁的意見之外，其實如果真的落成新的樓宇，那些新的居民一樣會投訴，這樣差的生活質素政府怎能叫市民接受？又話民生無小事，你們怎樣處理這些民生事呢？  
> 正如習近平主席所講政府有責任要讓市民有個幸福的居住環境，希望香港政府可以做到，我們也可能寫信去中央政府申訴我們的辛酸，希望政府不要只為利益而見縫插針式興建樓宇，引起民憤，而罔顧我們小市民的感受，所以請求城市規劃委員會不要通過停車場改為興建私人住宅的項目，我強烈反對這個項目，謝謝。

>  
> Wong Chi Kit  
>  
> 從 CK 的 iPhone 傳送

From: [REDACTED]  
Sent: 2025-01-12 星期日 15:50:03  
To: tpbpd/PLAND <tpbpd@pland.gov.hk>  
Subject: 荃灣分區計劃大綱 S/TW/37 建議

敬啟者

本人就住於荃灣永順街 48 號環宇海灣已近九年了, 對這環境設施都甚表滿意. 曾經聽聞政府會將德士古道一幅露天停車場改建為政府機構, 本人明白土地短缺, 物盡其用無可厚非. 但最近得知當局計將計劃改變為住宅項目, 可或興建 790 個住宅單位, 居民大約 2133 人口, 這改變將令本區人口密度增加, 令屏風樓效應加劇, 噪音增加, 也使我單位景觀受阻, 這絕不是我想見到的結果. 假若在我購買這物業前知道前方會興建住宅單位而不是政府設施, 我將不會購買此單位, 現在的改變我覺得有欺騙成份.

最近數年附近新建數個大型居苑已經增加了不少荃灣西區人口, 如果這改變實行將會使我們這一群生活在荃灣西區的老街坊不便, 當局在更改規劃用途前有沒有向荃灣西區居民查詢意見, 看看能不能達到共識.

我明白社區改變一定向前不能停步, 但可否考慮一下居民設身立場不以擾民為主, 我不介意興建政府機構或社區設施, 這對我方原居民影響不大, 但數座大廈住宅我們實在不能接受, 敬希當局能給予考慮.

荃灣永順街環宇海灣業主  
陸冠文 [REDACTED]

## 就圖則作出申述

## Representation Relating to Plan

Submission Number:

TPR/R/S/TW/38-S004

參考編號

Reference Number:

250112-122437-62234

提交限期

Deadline for submission:

06/02/2025

提交日期及時間

Date and time of submission:

12/01/2025 12:24:37

「申述人」全名

Full Name of "Representer":

先生 Mr. HAU KWOK WA

「獲授權代理人」全名

Full Name of "Authorized Agent":

與申述相關的圖則

Plan to which the representation relates:

S/TW/38

申述詳情

Details of the Representation:

有關事項 Subject Matters	你支持還是反對有關事項? Are you supporting or opposing the subject matter?	理由 Reason
S/TW/38	反對 Oppose	<p>尊敬的城規會:</p> <p>我是住在荃灣環宇海灣的居民，關於近期城規會提議將現有露天停車場位置由原本規劃的自動停車場改建為私人住宅的計劃，我們表示強烈的反對，以下是表示反對計劃的幾個主要理由：</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. 基礎設施壓力：新的建築物會令現有的基礎設施帶來額外壓力，例如供水、電力、污水處理系統可能無法承受新增的人口負擔</li> <li>2. 環境影響：這建築計劃會對附近居民造成空氣影響，因為距離環宇海灣太近只是一橋之隔影響空氣流通，建築施工期的噪音和污染將嚴重影響附近居民生活，使居民生活變得辛苦困難</li> <li>3. 交通擁堵：新增的建築物將會導致交通更加擁堵，增加居民的通勤時間</li> </ol>

和交通壓力

4. 應該用來服務市民：這塊地原本規劃是政府機構及社區用地所以政府就應該用來服務市民改善民生善用這塊地，做實事服務市民，大家才會覺得政府是個值得信賴的好政府，希望香港特區政府能帶領我們香港市民越來越好，多謝各位!

對圖則是否有任何擬議修訂? 如有的話，請註明詳情。

**Any proposed amendments to the plan? If yes, please specify the details.**

NIL

## 就圖則作出申述

## Representation Relating to Plan

Submission Number:

TPB/R/S/TW/38-S005

參考編號

Reference Number:

250113-121201-14780

提交限期

Deadline for submission:

06/02/2025

提交日期及時間

Date and time of submission:

13/01/2025 12:12:01

「申述人」全名

Full Name of "Representer":

機構 Organization City Point

「獲授權代理人」全名

Full Name of "Authorized Agent":

與申述相關的圖則

Plan to which the representation relates:

S/TW/38

申述詳情

Details of the Representation:

有關事項 Subject Matters	你支持還是反對有關事項? Are you supporting or opposing the subject matter?	理由 Reason
Item A	反對 Oppose	<p>The site consists of only small part of the GIC zone, the amendment of the zoning for such small area confuses the public like "why this part of the GIC zone?" and "why only 1 building?". We do think there are other vacant lands with higher potential and more flexible settings as a potential residential development site.</p> <p>We suggest the government to rezone other areas to RA zone which have higher development potential and less site constraints.</p> <p>Converting GIC zone to RA zone means a loss of GIC site in the Tsuen Wan district. The demand for GIC facilities in Tsuen Wan is always greater than its supply, we do not see any strong evidence to sacrifice the GIC zone for a RA zone.</p>

Moreover, this zone is very close to the highly trafficked Tsuen Wan Road and at the junction of the busy Texaco Road and Ma Tau Pa Road with many heavy vehicles passing by (including buses and goods vehicles). I doubt if the road traffic noise criteria can be met without any at-receiver noise mitigation measures. Strange layout design or orientation might also be required.

According to the approved EIA report "Widening of Tsuen Wan Road and the Associated Junction Improvement Works"(AEIAR-253/2023), the proposed semi-enclosure at this section of the Tsuen Wan Road is only protecting City Point on the other side of the road. Given the increasing traffic of Tsuen Wan Road in the future, it is believed that this site will be subject to adverse traffic noise impact without any proper at-receiver noise mitigation measures and reduce its potential as a residential development site.

It is noted that this site will consist of a home care services for frail elderly persons and a 30- residential special child care centre. Given the close proximity to the busy roads like Texaco road and Tsuen Wan Road, adverse traffic noise impact is anticipated without any mitigation measures to these facilities which require openable window for ventilation.

Without the support of a quantitative air quality impact assessment, 10m setback is required for the air sensitive uses (e.g. openable window for air ventilation, fresh air intake points) from Texaco Road (District Distributor) with reference to Chapter 9 of HKPSG. This again lower/restrict the potential of the site as a residential development site with a home care services for frail elderly persons and a 30- residential special child care centre. It also comes to a question that if it is worth to carry out a comprehensive air quality impact assessment for such small site in the future in terms of time cost and monetary

cost of the government. The start emission of the nearby vehicle carparks (heavy/non-heavy vehicles) will also pose adverse air quality impact to the air sensitive uses at the site unless those carparks are all converted to GIC facilities following the OZP.

Noting that the proposed building height of the site will be 150mPD which will be similar to those for City Point. This implies potential visual impact and air ventilation impact is anticipated for the residents living in Block 1 and Block 2 of City Point.

To conclude, this site has various site constraints for its development potential as a RA zone, leading to a loss of GIC zone at Tsuen Wan and posing visual and air ventilation impacts to the nearby City Point. We suggest the government to rezone other areas to RA zone which have higher development potential and less site constraints.

對圖則是否有任何擬議修訂? 如有的話, 請註明詳情。

**Any proposed amendments to the plan? If yes, please specify the details.**