

Appendix III - N

**North 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	2	<p>The representations support:</p> <p>(a) the demarcation proposals for all DCCAs in North District; and</p> <p>(b) the principle to maintain the existing boundaries of DCCAs unaltered as far as possible so as to minimise possible confusion to the electors.</p>	The supporting views are noted.
2	All DCCAs	3	<p>Same as item 1 above. The representations also support the creation of a new DCCA of N09 Ching Ho.</p>	The supporting views are noted.
3	All DCCAs	1	<p>The representation supports the demarcation proposals for all DCCAs in North District because the EAC has paid regard to the community integrity of the DCCAs and the populations thereof are within the permissible range.</p>	The supporting view is noted.

<i>Item no.</i>	<i>DCCAs concerned</i>	<i>No. of Representations</i>	<i>Representations</i>	<i>EAC's views</i>
4	N09 – Ching Ho N10 – Yu Tai	1	The representation supports the demarcation proposals for N09 and N10 because it can cope with the increased population of Ching Ho Estate by forming a new DCCA of N09 and keep the changes made to N10 to the minimum.	The supporting view is noted.
5	N10 – Yu Tai	1	The representation supports the demarcation proposal for N10 because no changes are made to Venice Garden which could facilitate the residents thereof to vote and focus their efforts on affairs in the DCCA.	The supporting view is noted.
6	N12 – Shek Wu Hui	2	The representations support the demarcation proposal for N12 because no changes are made to its boundary which can preserve its community integrity and avoid causing confusion to the voters on the polling day.	The supporting views are noted.
7	N01 – Luen Wo Hui N02 – Fanling Town N16 – Tin Ping East	1	The representation proposes to move Belair Monte from N16 to either N01 or N02 because: (a) Belair Monte is geographically close to buildings in N01 and N02 and therefore has close community ties with them; and (b) Belair Monte is located far away from the Tin Ping	The representation is not accepted because: (a) the proposal will affect the boundaries of N01 and N02, the populations of which fall within the permissible range and it is not necessary to change their boundaries; (b) even if Belair Monte (with a population of 4,390) is allowed to be moved to N01 or N02, the resultant populations of N01 and N02 would greatly exceed the upper permissible limit as follows:

<i>Item no.</i>	<i>DCCAs concerned</i>	<i>No. of Representations</i>	<i>Representations</i>	<i>EAC's views</i>
			Estate in N16.	<p>N01: (25,030, +44.83%) N02: (24,653, +42.65%);</p> <p>The EAC has further explored the possibility to address the resultant overflow of population in N01 and N02 and the findings are as follows:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> (i) as the population overflowed in N01 is large, it is not possible to keep its population within the permissible range by moving all the rural villages and low-rise residential developments at the western part of N01 (which are separated from the cluster of residential developments in N01 by the Fan Leng Lau Road such as Ling Shan Tsuen and Fanling Garden) to N02 or N16. However, moving more buildings in N01 at the eastern side of Fan Leng Lau Road will greatly disrupt the community integrity of N01; and (ii) to address the overflow of population in N02, consequential adjustment to the boundary of N03 is required. Hence, this arrangement will necessitate changes to the boundaries of two unaltered DCCAs of N02 and N03; (c) the eastern part of N02 which adjoins Belair Monte is an industrial zone without any population; and hence it is considered that there is no improvement on community considerations can be achieved if Belair Monte is moved to N02; and

<i>Item no.</i>	<i>DCCAs concerned</i>	<i>No. of Representations</i>	<i>Representations</i>	<i>EAC's views</i>
				<p>(d) there are supporting views on the demarcation proposals for N01, N02 and N16. (See items 1-3.)</p> <p>After careful consideration of the factors mentioned above, the EAC is of the view that the demarcation proposal for N16 is the most viable one.</p>
8	<p>N01 – Luen Wo Hui</p> <p>N02 – Fanling Town</p> <p>N16 – Tin Ping East</p>	1	<p>The representation proposes to move Belair Monte from N16 to either N01 or N02 in order to preserve the community identity because:</p> <p>(a) it was included in N02 before 2003; and</p> <p>(b) it is linked up with the adjacent residential developments in N01 namely Regentville and Grand Regentville by a footbridge.</p>	See item 7.
9	<p>N01 – Luen Wo Hui</p> <p>N02 – Fanling Town</p> <p>N16 – Tin Ping East</p>	1	<p>The representation proposes to move Belair Monte from N16 to either N01 or N02 in order to preserve the community identity because Belair Monte is located far away from the Tin Ping Estate in N16.</p>	See item 7.
10	N01 – Luen Wo Hui	1	The representation proposes:	The representation is not accepted because:

<i>Item no.</i>	<i>DCCAs concerned</i>	<i>No. of Representations</i>	<i>Representations</i>	<i>EAC's views</i>
	N02 – Fanling Town N03 – Cheung Wah N13 – Tin Ping West N16 – Tin Ping East		<p>(a) to move Belair Monte from N16 to N01 as it is a high rise private residential development similar to the adjacent buildings in N01 such as Regentville, Grand Regentville, Wing Fok Centre, Wing Fai Centre and Union Plaza;</p> <p>(b) to move Woodland Crest from N13 to N16 to cover the decrease in population of N16 arising from proposal (a) above as both Woodland Crest and Noble Hill in N16 were built by the same developer; and</p> <p>(c) to move Cheung Wah Estate from N03 to N02 and to move Fanling Town Center, Fanling Centre, Wong Kong Shan, Avon Park and Dawning Views from N02 to N03 so that N03 includes only private residential developments. Moreover, issues affecting Dawning Views are not concerns to residents of Fan Leng Lau as they are separated by</p>	<p><u>Proposal (a)</u> see item 7.</p> <p><u>Proposal (b)</u> as proposals (a) and (b) are inter-related and proposal (a) is not viable, proposal (b) will not be pursued.</p> <p><u>Proposal (c)</u></p> <p>(i) the populations of N02 and N03 fall within the permissible range and it is not necessary to change their boundaries; and</p> <p>(ii) there are supporting views on demarcation proposals for N02 and N03. (See items 1-3.)</p>

<i>Item no.</i>	<i>DCCAs concerned</i>	<i>No. of Representations</i>	<i>Representations</i>	<i>EAC's views</i>
			the Fanling Highway.	
11	N01 – Luen Wo Hui N16 – Tin Ping East	1	<p>The representation proposes to move Belair Monte from N16 to N01; and Wing Fok Centre from N01 to N16 because:</p> <p>(a) compared with Belair Monte, Wing Fok Centre and Wing Fai Centre are geographically closer to buildings in N16;</p> <p>(b) as Belair Monte is linked up to Wing Fai Centre by a footbridge, it is more appropriate to only move Wing Fok Centre, which falls on a separate area, to N16; and</p> <p>(c) Belair Monte and Wing Fok Centre have the same number of households.</p>	See item 7. Also, the EAC does not see any notable improvement on community integrity and preservation of local ties of N01 and N16 if the proposal is implemented.
12	N01 – Luen Wo Hui N16 – Tin Ping East	1	The representation proposes to move Belair Monte from N16 to N01 because Wing Fok Centre and Wing Fai Centre in N01 are adjacent to Belair Monte and all these are residential developments located at the south of Ma Sik Road.	See item 7.

<i>Item no.</i>	<i>DCCAs concerned</i>	<i>No. of Representations</i>	<i>Representations</i>	<i>EAC's views</i>
13	N02 – Fanling Town N04 – Wah Do N06 – Yan Shing	1	The representation proposes: (a) to move Avon Park and Dawning Views from N02 to either N04 or N06 because it is difficult for the existing DC member of N02 to serve a DCCA with such a large area; and (b) to group Fanling Town Center, Fanling Centre, Avon Park and Dawning Views into a new DCCA.	The representation is not accepted because: <u>Proposal (a)</u> (i) the resultant population of N04 and N06 would greatly exceed the upper permissible limit as follows: N04: (27,935, +61.64%) N06: (30,230, +74.92%); (ii) the proposal will affect the boundaries of N04 and N06, the populations of which fall within the permissible range and it is not necessary to change their boundaries; and (iii) it is impracticable to move Avon Park and Dawning Views to N06 as they are in N02 which does not have common boundary with N06 and is separated by N04, N05 and N17. <u>Proposal (b)</u> The proposal would involve the addition of an elected District Council seat for the North District which is outside EAC's jurisdiction.
14	N07 – Shing Fuk N09 – Ching Ho	1	The representation proposes to move Belair Villa, Camellia Court and Glamour Garden from N09 to N07 because: (a) in the past, residents of Ching Ho Estate cooperated closely with Kai Leng in matters relating to their common benefits such as	The representation is not accepted because: (a) the proposal will affect the boundary of N07, the population of N07 falls within the permissible range and it is not necessary to change its boundary; and (b) there are supporting views on demarcation proposals for N07 and N09.(See items 1-4).

<i>Item no.</i>	<i>DCCAs concerned</i>	<i>No. of Representations</i>	<i>Representations</i>	<i>EAC's views</i>
			<p>provision of public facilities;</p> <p>(b) there is, however, no communication between Ching Ho Estate and the private residential developments namely Belair Villa, Camellia Court and Glamour Garden as they are located far away from Ching Ho Estate; and</p> <p>(c) given that Ching Ho Estate is a public housing estate whilst Belair Villa, Camellia Court and Glamour Garden are private residential developments, their residents may have different needs for public services and divergent views on district affairs.</p>	
15	<p>N08 – Sheung Shui Rural</p> <p>N09 – Ching Ho</p> <p>N10 – Yu Tai</p> <p>N11 – Choi</p>	1	<p>The representation:</p> <p>(a) proposes to use Po Kin Road as the boundary to demarcate N09 and N10;</p> <p>(b) suggests that some residential developments in N10 near the Long Valley should be</p>	<p>The representation is not accepted because:</p> <p><u>Proposal (a)</u> the resultant population of N09 (24,761) would exceed the upper permissible limit (+43.28%).</p> <p><u>Proposal (b)</u> the resultant population of N08 (21,658) would exceed the upper permissible limit (+25.32%).</p>

<i>Item no.</i>	<i>DCCAs concerned</i>	<i>No. of Representations</i>	<i>Representations</i>	<i>EAC's views</i>
	Yuen N12 – Shek Wu Hui		<p>moved to N08 as they have closer community ties with the villages in the Long Valley;</p> <p>(c) considers that Yuk Po Court should be moved from N12 to N11 as it has closer community tie with Choi Yuen Estate in N11; and</p> <p>(d) proposes to rename N10 as “Ching Po” or “Sheung Shui South”.</p>	<p><u>Proposal (c)</u></p> <p>(i) the resultant population of N11 (22,409) would exceed the upper permissible limit (+29.67%); and</p> <p>(ii) the proposal will affect the boundaries of N11 and N12, the population of which are within the permissible range and it is not necessary to change their boundaries.</p> <p>There are supporting views on the demarcation proposals for N08, N09, N10, N11 and N12. (See items 1-6.)</p> <p><u>Proposal (d)</u> it is not necessary to rename N10 as the present name reflects the major residential developments of Royal Green and Tai Ping Estate in the DCCA.</p>
16	N10 – Yu Tai N12 – Shek Wu Hui	3	<p>The representations consider that Yuk Po Court should be moved from N12 to N10 because:</p> <p>(a) it will bring about a more even distribution of populations of the two DCCAs concerned;</p> <p>(b) Yuk Po Court is geographically separated from the buildings in N12 by a railway line but it is separated from N10 only by a footbridge; and</p>	<p>The representations are not accepted because:</p> <p>(a) the population of N12 falls within the permissible range and it is not necessary to change its boundary; and</p> <p>(b) there are supporting views on the demarcation proposals for N10 and N12. (See items 1-6.)</p>

<i>Item no.</i>	<i>DCCAs concerned</i>	<i>No. of Representations</i>	<i>Representations</i>	<i>EAC's views</i>
			(c) Yuk Po Court was grouped with Choi Po Court and Tai Ping Estate in the same DCCA before 2007 and hence the local residents are more adapted to the previous demarcation and the elected District Council member can better serve the residents there.	
17	N10 – Yu Tai N12 – Shek Wu Hui	1	The representation proposes to move Yuk Po Court from N12 to N10 and to rename N10 as “Yu Tai Yuk” because: (a) it will bring about a more even distribution of populations of the two DCCAs concerned; (b) Yuk Po Court is geographically separated from the buildings in N12 by a railway line; and (c) Yuk Po Court and buildings in N10 were included in the same DCCA before and hence it had closer community ties with N10 than N12.	See item 16.

North District
Oral Representations Received at the Public Forum on 14 December 2010

<i>Item no.</i>	<i>DCCAs concerned</i>	<i>No. of Representations</i>	<i>Representations</i>	<i>EAC's views</i>
18	N01 – Luen Wo Hui N16 – Tin Ping East	3	<p>The representations propose to move Belair Monte from N16 to N01 and move Wing Fok Centre from N01 to N16 because:</p> <p>(a) compared with Belair Monte, Wing Fok Centre is geographically closer to Ting Ping Estate in N16; and</p> <p>(b) Belair Monte and Wing Fok Centre have the same number of households.</p>	See item 11.
19	N01 – Luen Wo Hui N16 – Tin Ping East	1	<p>Same as item 11.</p> <p>The additional reason given for moving Belair Monte from N16 to N01 and moving Wing Fok Centre from N01 to N16 is that as Belair Monte is a private residential development, together with public housing estate (Ting Ping Estate) and Home Ownership Scheme (HOS) residential development (On Shing Court), there are three types of residential development in N16. With different resident profiles, it would be difficult to reach consensus on issues relating to community affairs. On</p>	<p>See item 11.</p> <p>The additional reason is not considered valid as even moving out Belair Monte from N16, there are still other private residential developments in the DCCA such as Noble Hill.</p>

<i>Item no.</i>	<i>DCCAs concerned</i>	<i>No. of Representations</i>	<i>Representations</i>	<i>EAC's views</i>
			the other hand, Wing Fok Centre is HOS development which is the same as On Shing Court.	
20	N07 – Shing Fuk N09 – Ching Ho	1	Same as item 14.	See item 14.
21	N09 – Ching Ho	1	The representation proposes to increase one more District Council elected seat to cope with the large number of population in Ching Ho Estate.	The representation is not accepted because one new DCCA i.e. N09 Ching Ho has already been formed to cope with the increased population in the Ching Ho Estate and the population of N09 where Ching Ho Estate is located falls within the permissible range.
22	N10 – Yu Tai N12 – Shek Wu Hui	1	Same as item 16.	See item 16.
23	N10 – Yu Tai N12 – Shek Wu Hui	1	The representation proposes to move Yuk Po Court from N12 to N10 because: (a) the residents of Yuk Po Court frequent Choi Yuen Estate and Tai Ping Estate; and (b) it would be more convenient for residents of Yuk Po Court to get assistance from District Council member of N10.	See item 16.