

Appendix III - L

**Tuen Mun District
Summaries of Written Representations**

<i>Item no.</i>	<i>DCCAs concerned</i>	<i>No. of representations</i>	<i>Representations</i>	<i>EAC's views</i>
1	L05 – Yau Oi South L06 – Yau Oi North L13 – Hanford	1	This representation proposes to move Goodview Garden, the Sea Crest, Myloft, Ching Chung Hau Po Woon Secondary School, NLSI Peace Evangelical Secondary School and a recreational park, which were proposed to be moved from L13 to L06 in the provisional recommendations, to L05 instead, because: (a) the population of L05 is expected to exceed the lower permissible limit by the 2011 DC Election and; (b) such move will lead to a more even distribution of population in L05 and L06 and minimize the disturbance to residents in the future.	The representation is not accepted because: (i) it would affect the existing boundary of L05, the population (14,655, -15.17%) of which is within the permissible range; and (ii) the population figures used in this demarcation exercise is projected as at 30 June 2007, any developments beyond this date will not be taken into consideration.
2	L06 – Yau Oi North L13 – Hanford	5	(a) The five representations object to the move of a cluster of private residential buildings including Nerine Cove and the Sea Crest, currently in L13, to L06 because: (i) the demographic features, styles of living, residents' needs and modes of management of private buildings in	The representations are partially accepted . The re-delineation of L06 and L13 aims at alleviating the population shortfall of L06 (12,305, -28.77%) and overflow of L13 (25,619, +48.30%). It is agreed that only Goodview Garden and Oceania Heights will be moved from L13 to L06 and Nerine Cove and the Sea Crest are retained in L13, as the resultant population of L06 and L13 are still within the

<i>Item no.</i>	<i>DCCAs concerned</i>	<i>No. of representations</i>	<i>Representations</i>	<i>EAC's views</i>
			<p>L13 are different from that of public rental housing in L06;</p> <p>(ii) two of the representations expressed concern that the resources to be allocated by the DC member concerned to the DCCA would be affected;</p> <p>(iii) one representation pointed out that the DC member of L13 currently in office has better understanding of the management of private buildings in the area; and</p> <p>(iv) one representation noted that some boundaries of the DCCAs of which the populations exceed the lower permissible limit are allowed to remain unchanged.</p> <p>(b) Three of the representations consider that moving only Goodview Garden to L06 is acceptable.</p>	<p>permissible range as follows:</p> <p>L06: 16,541 (-4.25%) L13: 21,383 (+23.78%)</p> <p>The suggestion of moving only Goodview Garden to L06 is not acceptable because the population of L13 will still exceed the upper permissible limit (22,861, +32.34%).</p>
3	L06 – Yau Oi North L13 – Hanford	1	<p>The representation objects to the move of the four private residential developments from L13 to L06 because:</p> <p>(a) the inclusion would affect the demographic feature and community</p>	See item 2.

<i>Item no.</i>	<i>DCCAs concerned</i>	<i>No. of representations</i>	<i>Representations</i>	<i>EAC's views</i>
			<p>integrity of L06;</p> <p>(b) the population would be within the permissible range after some vacant flats are occupied; and</p> <p>(c) it is desirable to allow the population of L06 falling short of the lower permissible limit.</p>	
4	L14 – Fu Sun L18 – Butterfly	1	The representation supports the demarcation proposals for L14 and L18 as Siu Shan Court has closer community ties with Butterfly Estate.	The supporting view is noted.
5	L14 – Fu Sun L18 – Butterfly	4	<p>The four representations object to moving Siu Shan Court from L14 to L18 because:</p> <p>(a) Butterfly Estate itself has been formed as a DCCA since 1994;</p> <p>(b) according to the Housing Authority, the population of Butterfly Estate (12,733) is slightly deviated from the lower permissible limit and it is still under-estimated;</p> <p>(c) the population of the Estate will meet the lower permissible limit when all units are being occupied;</p> <p>(d) there is no community ties between Siu Shan Court and Butterfly</p>	<p>The representations are not accepted because:</p> <p>(i) the EAC has to rely on the population forecast provided by AHSB for the demarcation exercise;</p> <p>(ii) according to the figure provided by AHSB, the boundary of L18 has to be re-delineated because its population exceeds the lower permissible limit (12,409, -28.17%); and</p> <p>(iii) there are five representations supporting the move of the whole Siu Shan Court from L14 to L18 (see items 4, 10(c) and 13).</p>

<i>Item no.</i>	<i>DCCAs concerned</i>	<i>No. of representations</i>	<i>Representations</i>	<i>EAC's views</i>
			Estate as the housing types and residents' needs are different. The move will hamper the community integrity and harmony of Butterfly Estate.	
6	L14 – Fu Sun L20 – Lung Mun	2	The representations propose to move Glorious Garden Block 1 to 6 from L20 to L14 for enhancing community integrity and avoiding confusion of the residents.	The representations are not accepted because it would affect the existing boundary of L20, the population (19,446, +12.57%) of which is within the permissible range.
7	L24 – Po Tin L29 – Tuen Mun Rural	1	The representation proposes to keep the existing boundary of L29 unchanged because: (a) the population of L29 would remain within the permissible range if not counting the population forecast of the Sherwood, which has no imminent plan for occupation; (b) even if the population of L29 would exceed the upper permissible limit after the flats of the Sherwood are occupied, L29 should be allowed to remain unchanged as there is a DCCA of other district in the New Territories West which exceeds the upper permissible limit by 49%; and (c) keeping the existing boundary of L29 unchanged would help	The representation is not accepted because: (i) according to the figure provided by AHSG, the population of L24 and L29 will far exceed the lower or upper permissible limit (L24:9,349, -45.88%; L29: 26,353, +52.55%) if the existing boundary of L29 is maintained; and (ii) the aim of re-delineating the boundaries of L24 and L29 is to bring the population of both DCCAs within the permissible range.

<i>Item no.</i>	<i>DCCAs concerned</i>	<i>No. of representations</i>	<i>Representations</i>	<i>EAC's views</i>
			maintain the community integrity of rural area.	
8	L24 – Po Tin L29 – Tuen Mun Rural	2	<p>The representations propose to keep the existing boundary of L29 unchanged in order to preserve its tradition, culture and community integrity.</p> <p>One representation considered that:</p> <p>(a) the development of rural area would be hindered under the EAC's proposal; and</p> <p>(b) sense of belongings of the residents living in private residential buildings like Po Wah Garden in L29 has been well-established and it is unnecessary to make any changes.</p>	See item 7.
9	L24 – Po Tin L29 – Tuen Mun Rural	2	<p>The representations propose to keep the existing boundary of L24 unchanged because:</p> <p>(a) the ways of living, needs and community development of the Po Tin Estate and the villages in L29 are different;</p> <p>(b) putting different types of housing in L24 would affect the utilization of resources by the DC member; and</p>	See item 7.

<i>Item no.</i>	<i>DCCAs concerned</i>	<i>No. of representations</i>	<i>Representations</i>	<i>EAC's views</i>
			(c) the population of Po Tin Estate will be increased as around 2,000 units will be occupied in the future.	
10	L03 – Siu Tsui L04 – On Ting L14 – Fu Sun L15 – Yuet Wu L16 – Siu Hei L18 – Butterfly L20 – Lung Mun	3	The three representations all suggest the following for community integrity and the residents' interests: (a) <u>L03 Siu Tsui</u> <u>L04 On Ting</u> L03 should include Siu Lun Court and Tsui Ning Garden while L04 should consist solely of On Ting Estate. (b) <u>L14 Fu Sun</u> <u>L20 Lung Mun</u> Same as item 6. (c) <u>L15 Yuet Wu</u> <u>L16 Siu Hei</u> <u>L18 Butterfly</u> All representations support the demarcation proposals for these three DCCAs.	<u>Item (a)</u> It is not accepted because the resultant population of L03 would exceed the upper permissible limit (22,167, +28.32%). <u>Item (b)</u> See item 6. <u>Item (c)</u> The supporting views are noted.
11	L05 – Yau Oi South L06 – Yau Oi North L13 – Hanford L14 – Fu Sun	1	The representation proposes to keep the existing boundaries of L05, L06, L13, L14, L18, L24 and L29, and the name of L14 unchanged. Reasons given are: (a) <u>L05 Yau Oi South</u> The population falls within the permissible range. (b) <u>L06 Yau Oi North</u> The population would be within the	<u>L05 Yau Oi South</u> The boundary of L05 remains unchanged under the EAC's proposal. <u>L06 Yau Oi North and L13 Hanford</u> See item 2. <u>L14 Fu Sun and L18 Butterfly</u> See items 4, 5, 10(c) and 13. <u>L24 Po Tin and L29 Tuen Mun Rural</u> See item 7.

<i>Item no.</i>	<i>DCCAs concerned</i>	<i>No. of representations</i>	<i>Representations</i>	<i>EAC's views</i>
	L18 – Butterfly L24 – Po Tin L29 – Tuen Mun Rural		<p>permissible range after some vacant flats are occupied.</p> <p>(c) <u>L13 Hanford</u> <u>L14 Fu Sun</u> <u>L18 Butterfly</u> Similar to the practices in other districts, it is also desirable to allow the population of L13 and L18 falling short of or exceeding the permissible limits. Thus, the boundary and name of L14 can remain unchanged.</p> <p>(d) <u>L24 Po Tin</u> <u>L29 Tuen Mun Rural</u> Same as items 7 and 9(c).</p>	

Tuen Mun District
Oral Representations Received at the Public Forum on 16 August 2006

<i>Item no.</i>	<i>DCCAs concerned</i>	<i>No. of representations</i>	<i>Representations</i>	<i>EAC's views</i>
12	L06 – Yau Oi North L13 – Hanford	2	(a) Same as item 2(a)(i). (b) One representation expressed concern that community development of L13 will be hindered after moving some private buildings from L13 to L06. (c) One representation queries if the population figure is still an appropriate statutory criteria for delineating DCCA boundaries.	<u>Items (a) and (b)</u> See item 2. <u>Item (c)</u> The view is noted.
13	L14 – Fu Sun L18 – Butterfly	1	The representation supports the move of Siu Shan Court from L14 to L18 because it has closer community ties with L18 and the population of L18 is expected to drop continuously.	The supporting view is noted.
14	L14 – Fu Sun L18 – Butterfly	3	Same as item 5. One representation added that it would cause difficulty to the DC member for coping with the needs of the two residential areas which are of different natures.	See item 5.

<i>Item no.</i>	<i>DCCAs concerned</i>	<i>No. of representations</i>	<i>Representations</i>	<i>EAC's views</i>
15	L14 – Fu Sun L18 – Butterfly	1	The representation suggests moving several blocks of Siu Shan Court which are near to Butterfly Estate from L14 to L18 for easier management and minimizing conflicts between the residents if the lower permissible limit has to be met.	The representation is not accepted because the community integrity of Siu Shan Court will be hampered.
16	L24 – Po Tin L29 – Tuen Mun Rural	1	Same as item 9. The representation queries that temporary residents of Po Tin Estate are not counted.	See item 7.