

Appendix III - M

**Yuen Long 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	M01 – Fung Lin	1	The representation supports the existing demarcation proposal for M01 and objects to a proposal raised by a member of the public at the Public Forum suggesting to move the Sereno Verde from M07 into M01.	The supporting view is noted.
2	M01 – Fung Lin M06 – Fung Cheung M07 – Shap Pat Heung North M08 – Shap Pat Heung South	3	The representations object to retaining the Sereno Verde (a newly built development) within M07 and suggests that it should be moved to M06 because: (a) Sereno Verde is different from the rural villages in M07 in terms of living habits and culture; and (b) it will produce a better population distribution if the Sereno Verde is included in M06.	The representations are not accepted because: (i) Sereno Verde is surrounded by a cluster of villages and the villages have to be moved as well if Sereno Verde is moved to M06. Under such circumstances, the resultant population of M06 would far exceed the upper permissible limit (24,668, +42.80%); and (ii) there are supporting views for the demarcation proposals for M06 and M07 (see items 3 and 4).
3	M06 – Fung Cheung	1	The representation objects to moving the Sereno Verde to M06 and supports the demarcation proposal for M06.	The supporting view is noted.
4	M07 – Shap Pat Heung North	2	The representations support the demarcation proposal for M07.	The supporting views are noted.
5	M16 – Yuet Yan M17 – Fu Yan	1	The representation (a) supports the demarcation proposal for M20;	(i) The supporting view of (a) is noted. (ii) The view of (b)(i) and (ii) are noted.

<i>Item no.</i>	<i>DCCAs concerned</i>	<i>No. of representations</i>	<i>Representations</i>	<i>EAC's views</i>
	M20 – Wang King		<p>(b)(i) opines that one of the four blocks of public housing at Tin Shui Wai Area 103, which is under construction, is located on the boundaries of both M16 and M17;</p> <p>(b)(ii) seven blocks of public housing under construction at Tin Shui Wai Areas 103 and 104 are demarcated into 3 DCCAs which is confusing; and</p> <p>(c) suggests that all four blocks of public housing at Area 103 should be grouped within the same DCCA to preserve community integrity.</p>	(iii) The view of (c) is accepted and all the four blocks of public housing at Area 103 would be grouped in M16. Under such arrangement, the resultant population of M16 and M17 would remain the same as the four blocks in question do not have any population as at 30 June 2007.
6	M17 – Fu Yan	1	The representation suggests that Yan Yi House of Tin Yan Estate should be moved from M16 back to M17 in order to preserve community integrity.	The representation is not accepted because the purpose of re-delineating M17 is to alleviate the population quota overflow (+42.79%) of the adjacent M20 by moving four blocks of Tin Yat Estate from M20 to M17. So that the resultant population of M17 would not exceed the upper permissible limit, it is necessary to include Yan Yi House, Yan Ying House and Yan Sui House of Tin Yan Estate in M16.
7	M20 – Wang King	2	The representations support the demarcation proposal for M20.	The supporting views are noted.
8	M22 – Kingswood South	6	The representations suggest retaining Kingswood Ginza in M22 in order to preserve community integrity and local ties.	The representations are not accepted because the resultant population of M22 would be 22,211, which exceeds the upper permissible limit (+28.57%).

<i>Item no.</i>	<i>DCCAs concerned</i>	<i>No. of representations</i>	<i>Representations</i>	<i>EAC's views</i>
9	M22 – Kingswood South M24 – Tsz Yau	1	The representation objects to moving Tin Lai Court into M22 and opines that it should be moved to M24 as the Court has closer ties with Tin Tsz Estate in terms of geographical link and community setting.	The representation is not accepted as the population of M24 has already exceeded the upper permissible limit (22,457, +30.00%) under the current proposal.

Yuen Long 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>
10	M06 – Fung Cheung M07 – Shap Pat Heung North	1	Same as item 2.	See item 2.
11	M07 – Shap Pat Heung North	1	Same as item 4.	See item 4.
12	M22 – Kingswood South	1	Same as item 8.	See item 8.
13	M27 – Kam Tin M28 – Pat Heung North M29 – Pat Heung South	1	The representation (a) opines that the location of the polling station in M29, ie Pat Heung Central Primary School, is far away from the eastern part of this DCCA; (b) suggests relocating the polling station of M29 in Yuen Kong Public School for the electors' convenience; and (c) opines that the number of Yuen Long DC elected member seats should be reduced as the population of some DCCAs are below the lower permissible limit.	(i) Opinion of (a) and (b) are noted. (ii) For (c), the subject is outside EAC's jurisdiction.

<i>Item no.</i>	<i>DCCAs concerned</i>	<i>No. of representations</i>	<i>Representations</i>	<i>EAC's views</i>
14	Number of elected seats	1	The number of Yuen Long DC elected seats should be increased due to rapid growth in population.	The subject is outside EAC's jurisdiction.
15	—	1	The representation opines that the demarcation exercise is for administrative purpose and it would not hamper the community or rural cultures.	The view is noted.
16	M16 – Yuet Yan M17 – Fu Yan	1 (Received on 23 August, 2006)	<p>The representation opines that:</p> <p>(a) under the EAC's proposal, the DC member of M17 will have difficulty in serving residents therein. As the member's office can only be set up at either Tin Yan Estate or Tin Yat Estate, while Tin Fu Court is a cluster of private residential buildings, it will cause inconvenience to the residents of the other estate in seeking assistance from the DC member;</p> <p>(b) the consultation period should be extended so that the public is given sufficient time to collect views; and</p> <p>(c) instead of organizing a forum for receiving oral representations in Sha Tin, the EAC may co-ordinate with the HAD to hold forums in each DC so that residents of every district can express</p>	<p><u>Item (a)</u> See item 6.</p> <p><u>Item (b)</u> The representation is not accepted because the consultation period has been announced to the public and the EAC is under a tight schedule to complete the demarcation exercise. Over the years, it has been EAC's practice to hold one month consultation on its demarcation proposal or guidelines for various elections. This is in line with Government's guidelines on the consultation of public opinion and is generally accepted by the public.</p> <p><u>Item (c)</u> The view is noted.</p>

<i>Item no.</i>	<i>DCCAs concerned</i>	<i>No. of representations</i>	<i>Representations</i>	<i>EAC's views</i>
			views at their convenience and DC members' views can be thoroughly considered.	