

Appendix III - R

**Sha Tin 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	All DCCAs	3	The representations support the demarcation proposals for all DCCAs in the district.	The supporting views are noted.
2	R01 – Sha Tin Town Centre R02 – Lek Yuen R19 – Chung Tin	1	<p>The representation suggests to move Pristine Villa from R19 to R01, instead of to R02 because:</p> <p>(a) it is closely related to R01 in terms of similar community facilities and private residential developments;</p> <p>(b) residents of Pristine Villa can easily reach R01 on the polling day by village bus or walking;</p> <p>(c) as Pristine Villa is close to R01, it would be convenient for the DC member to serve the needs of residents there;</p> <p>(d) if the same DC member can serve the Sha Tin / Tai Wai areas and the Pristine Villa, problems relating to them may be easily resolved;</p> <p>(e) if the population quota exceeds the permissible limit upon the proposed transfer, Man Lai Court could be moved from R01 to the adjacent Tai Wai</p>	<p>The representation is accepted because:</p> <p>(i) although Pristine Villa is separated from R01 by Shing Mun Tunnel Road, it is closer to R01 than R02 in terms of geographical, community and traffic link; and</p> <p>(ii) the resultant population of R01 and R02 would be within the permissible limits:</p> <p>R01: 20,317(+17.61%) R02: 13,825(-19.97%)</p>

<i>Item no.</i>	<i>DCCAs concerned</i>	<i>No. of representations</i>	<i>Representations</i>	<i>EAC's views</i>
			<p>area to address the over-population problem;</p> <p>(f) the population in Tung Lo Wan area will increase drastically after 2007 because of future developments; and</p> <p>(g) the parking facility in R02 is insufficient which may cause the electors to abstain from voting.</p>	
3	R02 – Lek Yuen R03 – Wo Che Estate	7	These representations propose to move King Wo House of Wo Che Estate from R02 to R03 because the separation of King Wo House from the rest of Wo Che Estate would affect the community integrity and the sense of belongings for the residents.	The representations are not accepted because: (i) King Wo House, together with 4 schools, 1 police station and 2 disciplined services quarters, are geographically separated from the rest of Wo Che Estate by Fung Shun Street; (ii) King Wo House has been included in R02 since 1994; and (iii) it would affect the existing boundary of R03, which should not be changed since the population in R03 is within the permissible limits.
4	R02 – Lek Yuen R14 – Lower Shing Mun R17 – Sun Chui R18 – Tai Wai	4	These representations object to the proposed groupings of R02, R14, R18 and R19 and propose to: <u>Proposal (a)</u> (i) maintain the 2003 DCCA boundary for R02; (ii) maintain the 2003 DCCA boundary for	Proposal (a) is not accepted because: (i) Mei Tin Estate (with a population of around 9,500) is geographically more related to R19 and has all along been included in R19; (ii) Carado Garden is geographically separated from R17 by Tin Sam area in R16; (iii) there are supporting views for

<i>Item no.</i>	<i>DCCAs concerned</i>	<i>No. of representations</i>	<i>Representations</i>	<i>EAC's views</i>
	R19 – Chung Tin		<p>R19 but to move Mei Tin Estate from R19 to R14;</p> <p>(iii) maintain the 2003 DCCA boundary for R18; and</p> <p>(iv) move Carado Garden from R14 to R17</p> <p>in order to even out the population in the DCCAs concerned and to reduce changes to the boundaries concerned to preserve community integrity and local ties;</p> <p><u>Proposal (b)</u></p> <p>(i) maintain the 2003 DCCA boundary for R02;</p> <p>(ii) maintain the 2003 DCCA boundary for R19 but to move Mei Tin Estate from R19 to R18;</p> <p>(iii) move back Mei Shing Court from R18 to R19; and</p> <p>(iv) move Tai Wai Village and the adjacent private buildings from R18 to R14</p> <p>in order to even out the population of R14 and R18, to preserve the community integrity and local ties of R02 and R19 and to avoid splitting the private residential developments in Tai Wai town centre into two</p>	<p>the demarcation proposals for R02, R14, R17, R18 and R19 (see items 1, 5, 8, 9, 10, 15 and 29);</p> <p>(iv) the proposal will cause substantial changes to the existing boundaries of Mei Tin as well as Lower Shing Mun and affect a large number of electors. With the population distribution and geographical factors taken into consideration, it would be more appropriate to retain Mei Tin Estate in R19; and</p> <p>(v) the unaltered boundary of R17 will need to be changed.</p> <p>Proposal (b) is not accepted because:</p> <p>(i) the resultant population of R14 (22,580) would exceed the upper permissible limit (+30.71%);</p> <p>(ii) Mei Tin Estate (with a population of around 9,500) is geographically more related to R19 and has all along been included in R19; and</p> <p>(iii) there are supporting views for the demarcation proposals for R02, R14, R18 and R19 (see items 1, 5, 9, 10, 15 and 29).</p>

<i>Item no.</i>	<i>DCCAs concerned</i>	<i>No. of representations</i>	<i>Representations</i>	<i>EAC's views</i>
			different DCCAs for community integrity reason.	
5	R02 – Lek Yuen R14 – Lower Shing Mun R18 – Tai Wai R19 – Chung Tin	1	The representation supports the demarcation proposals for these four DCCAs.	The supporting view is noted.
6	R02 – Lek Yuen R18 – Tai Wai R19 – Chung Tin	2	<p>These representations object to move Pristine Villa and Tung Lo Wan from R19 to R02 and propose to move Pristine Villa from R02 to R18 because:</p> <p>(a) Pristine Villa is too far away from R02, causing much inconvenience to the electors;</p> <p>(b) Pristine Villa is closely related to R18 in terms of geographical link and community ties;</p> <p>(c) the DC member of R02 has no knowledge of the interests of the residents in Pristine Villa; and</p> <p>(d) two new developments are expected to start in Tung Lo Wan whereby a new DCCA should be formed there to</p>	<p>The representations are not accepted because:</p> <p>(i) the resultant population of R18 (23,720) would exceed the upper permissible limit (+37.31%); and</p> <p>(ii) the EAC has to rely on the population forecasts provided by the AHSG for the conduct of this exercise and it is necessary to use the same set of population data with the same basis and same cut-off date in projecting the population for all DCCAs.</p> <p>It should however be noted that a modified proposal is accepted (see item 2).</p>

<i>Item no.</i>	<i>DCCAs concerned</i>	<i>No. of representations</i>	<i>Representations</i>	<i>EAC's views</i>
			cope with the increasing population.	
7	R02 – Lek Yuen R19 – Chung Tin	1	The representation objects to move Pristine Villa, Tung Lo Wan and Yau Oi Tsuen from R19 to R02 because: (a) Pristine Villa, Tung Lo Wan and Yau Oi Tsuen are adjacent to the development in R18 but far away from R02, thus causing much inconvenience for the residents to seek the assistance of the DC member at R02; and (b) Pristine Villa, Tung Lo Wan and Yau Oi Tsuen are different from R02 in terms of geographical link and community ties.	The representation is not accepted because the resultant population of R19 (22,975) will exceed the upper permissible limit (+33.00%) if Pristine Villa, Tung Lo Wan and Yau Oi Tsuen are to be retained in R19. It should however be noted that a modified proposal is accepted (see item 2).
8	R12 – Chui Tin R17 – Sun Chui	1	The representation supports the demarcation proposals for R12 and R17.	The supporting view is noted.
9	R14 – Lower Shing Mun	1	The representation supports the demarcation proposals for R14.	The supporting view is noted.
10	R14 – Lower Shing Mun	1	The representation supports the inclusion of Carado Garden in R14.	The supporting view is noted.
11	R14 – Lower Shing Mun R18 –	1	The representation objects to separate Tai Wai Village in R18 and Tai Wai New Village in R14 into two DCCAs because: (a) they belong to the same	The suggestion is not accepted because: (i) both villages are geographically separated from each other by blocks of private buildings and Tai Po Road;

<i>Item no.</i>	<i>DCCAs concerned</i>	<i>No. of representations</i>	<i>Representations</i>	<i>EAC's views</i>
	Tai Wai		village office “村公所”; and (b) strong community ties exist between these villages.	(ii) Tai Wai Village and Tai Wai New Village have all along been included in two DCCAs; and (iii) there are supporting views for demarcation proposals for R14 and R18 (see items 1, 5, 9 and 15).
12	R15 – Keng Hau	1	The representation suggests to rename R15 as “Hin Keng” because: (a) Hin Keng Estate can reflect the identity of the DCCA; (b) Hin Keng, instead of Keng Hau, is indicated on government signboards; (c) the name of Hin Keng Estate is shown on buses and minibuses; and (d) Keng Hau is not the name of a place, and is therefore not representative.	The representation is not accepted because the location of Hin Keng Estate covers both R15 (Keng Hau) and R13 (Hin Ka) (five blocks in R15 and four blocks in R13). The Chinese name of R13 has already reflected the Chinese characters of Hin Keng Estate and Ka Tin Court (ie “Hin” and “Ka”). Further reflection of Hin Keng Estate in R15 would cause confusion.
13	R16 – Tin Sum	1	The representation supports the demarcation proposals for R16.	The supporting view is noted.
14	R17 – Sun Chui	1	The representation suggests to use Shatin Tsung Tsin Secondary School, instead of G.C.C.I.T.K.D. Cheong Wong Wai Primary School, as the polling station for R17 because the former is more convenient to the elderly and disabled.	The REO will take note of the representation when identifying the venue for the polling station in R17.

<i>Item no.</i>	<i>DCCAs concerned</i>	<i>No. of representations</i>	<i>Representations</i>	<i>EAC's views</i>
15	R18 – Tai Wai	2	These representations support the inclusion of May Shing Court in R18.	These supporting views are noted.
16	R25 – Sunshine City R28 – Kam Ying	1	<p>The representation suggests to:</p> <p>(a) move Sunshine City Phases 1 to 3 from R28 to R25; and</p> <p>(b) move Fu Fai Garden and Fok On Garden from R25 to R28</p> <p>because:</p> <p>(i) the whole of Sunshine City (Phases 1 to 5) should be kept intact within one DCCA to preserve community integrity; and</p> <p>(ii) with the above changes, R25 will comprise private residential buildings while R28 will consist of public housing estates and Home Ownership Scheme / Sandwich Class Housing Scheme estates. Such groupings can facilitate the DC member to serve residents with similar needs.</p>	<p>The representation is not accepted because:</p> <p>(i) if Sunshine city Phases 1 to 3 are moved from R28 to R25, it will not be possible to move Fu Fai Garden and Fok On Garden from R25 to R28 because they will be geographically separated from R28 by Sunshine City Phases 1 to 3; and</p> <p>(ii) it would affect the unaltered boundaries of R25 and R28.</p>
17	R28 – Kam Ying	2	These representations support the demarcation proposals for R28.	The supporting views are noted.
18	R33 – Yu Yan R34 – Bik Woo	1	<p>The representation proposes to:</p> <p>(a) move Fa Sam Hang Tsuen from R33 to R35 because:</p> <p>(i) it is closely related</p>	<p>Proposal (a) is accepted because:</p> <p>(i) Fa Sam Hang Tsuen is geographically closer to the villages in R35 and it is isolated from the other villages in R33 at a far distance. The community</p>

<i>Item no.</i>	<i>DCCAs concerned</i>	<i>No. of representations</i>	<i>Representations</i>	<i>EAC's views</i>
	R35 – Kwong Hong		<p>to R35 in terms of geographical link and community ties as the Fa Sam Hang Tsuen (in R33) and Wong Nai Tau Tsuen and Tai Che Tsuen (in R35) have the same village representative and share the use of the same community facilities and resources such as market, transportation network etc; and</p> <p>(ii) the population of the villages concerned will continue to grow in the future based on present developments; and</p> <p>(b) move Shek Mun and A Kung Kok from R35 to R34 as they are related to each other in terms of community setting, geographical link and transportation network.</p>	<p>integrity of the nearby villages can be improved by moving it to R35; and</p> <p>(ii) the resultant population of R33 and R35 are within the permissible limits:</p> <p>R33: 13,271(-23.18%) R35: 13,164(-23.80%)</p> <p>Proposal (b) is not accepted because:</p> <p>(i) it would affect the unaltered boundary of R34; and</p> <p>(ii) Tate's Cairn Highway geographically separates Shek Mun and A Kung Kok from R34.</p>
19	R33 – Yu Yan R35 – Kwong Hong	1	Same as item 18(a).	See item 18.
20	Number of elected seats	1	The number of DC members in Sha Tin District should be increased to cope with the	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>
			growth in population.	
21	Demarcation of boundaries	1	The representation suggests that community integrity should be the prime consideration in delineation of boundaries and the EAC should listen to the views of the residents and adhere to the majority views.	The points are noted for review.
22	Voting System	1	The representation suggests that the uncontested candidates should also be voted by electors to ensure that he has the support of not less than 35% of the electors.	The subject is outside EAC's jurisdiction.

Sha Tin 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>
23	R02 – Lek Yuen R14 – Lower Shing Mun R17 – Sun Chui R18 – Tai Wai R19 – Chung Tin	2	Same as item 4.	See item 4.
24	R02 – Lek Yuen R14 – Lower Shing Mun R18 – Tai Wai R19 – Chung Tin	2	Same as item 5.	See item 5.
25	R02 – Lek Yuen R19 – Chung Tin	2	Same as item 7.	See item 7.
26	R14 – Lower Shing	1	The representation objects to rename R14 as Lower Shing Mun as the name is	The representation is not accepted because the revised name can better reflect the identity of this DCCA.

<i>Item no.</i>	<i>DCCAs concerned</i>	<i>No. of representations</i>	<i>Representations</i>	<i>EAC's views</i>
	Mun		not appropriate.	
27	R15 – Keng Hau	1	Same as item 12.	See item 12.
28	R18 – Tai Wai	1	Same as item 15.	See item 15.
29	R19 – Chung Tin	1	The representation supports the demarcation proposals for R19.	The supporting view is noted.
30	R21 – Fo Tan	1	The representation supports the demarcation proposals for R21.	The supporting view is noted.
31	R33 – Yu Yan R35 – Kwong Hong	1	Same as item 18(a).	See item 18.
32	Demarcation of boundaries	1	The representation suggests that the electors of the affected DCCAs should be notified of the proposed delineation individually.	The representation is not accepted because the maps showing the proposed boundaries of the DCCAs and a booklet on the boundary descriptions are available for public inspection at the REO, DOs, post offices and public housing estates and public libraries. They are also available on website. The electors of the affected DCCAs should have easy access to the proposed boundaries.
33	District boundary	1	The representation suggests to move Kwun Yam Shan from R33 to Wong Tai Sin District.	The demarcation of district boundaries is outside EAC's jurisdiction.
34	Number of elected seats	4	The number of seats for DC members in Sha Tin District should be increased to cope with the growth in population.	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>
35	Voting System	1	Same as item 22.	See item 22.