

**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	1	<p>The representation:</p> <p>(a) proposes to:</p> <p>(i) move Castello from R34 to R35 because it is closer to R35 than the remaining parts of R34, and R35 has a population that falls below the lower permissible limit;</p> <p>(ii) move Ah Kung Kok Fishermen Village from R33 to R34 since the village is far away from the rest of R33 but closer to R34; and</p> <p>(b) supports the demarcation proposals for other DCCAs in the district.</p>	<p><u>Proposal (a)</u></p> <p>The proposal is <b>not accepted</b> because:</p> <p>(i) it would affect the unaltered boundaries of R33 and R34 where no change is necessary as their populations are within the permissible range;</p> <p>(ii) R35 is recommended to retain its existing boundary with a population (12,950) exceeding the lower permissible limit (-25.07%) as altering the boundary of R35 to include more population from adjacent DCCAs will undermine the established ties in these DCCAs; and</p> <p>(iii) there are supporting views on the demarcation proposals for R33, R34 and R35 (see item 2); and</p> <p><u>Item (b)</u></p> <p>The supporting view is noted.</p>
2	All DCCAs	1	<p>The representation:</p> <p>(a) opposes the demarcation proposals for R09 and R10 because moving Shan Ha Wai, Tsok Pok Hang San Tsuen, Fui Yiu Ha New Village and Sha Tin Wai from R10 to R09 will undermine the community integrity of the DCCAs concerned;</p>	<p><u>Item (a)</u></p> <p>The view expressed is <b>not accepted</b> because:</p> <p>(i) if the existing boundaries of R09 and R10 are maintained, the population of R09 (12,126) will fall below the lower permissible limit (-29.83%); and</p> <p>(ii) there are supporting views on the demarcation proposals for R09 and R10 (see items 1 and 5).</p>

<i>Item no.</i>	<i>DCCAs concerned</i>	<i>No. of representations</i>	<i>Representations</i>	<i>EAC's views</i>
			<p>(b) supports the demarcation proposals for all other DCCAs in the district as the EAC has paid regard to the community integrity of these DCCAs and the population of them are all within the permissible range; and</p> <p>(c) elaborates on the reasons for supporting the EAC's demarcation proposal for R34 which are the same as those given in item 14.</p>	<p><u>Items (b) and (c)</u> The supporting view is noted.</p>
3	R04 – City One  R05 – Yue Shing	1	The representation considers the demarcation proposals for R04 and R05 inappropriate as they spilt City One into 2 DCCAs, and proposes to group the entire City One into one DCCA so that only one DC member will serve the whole estate, thus enabling better communication and cooperation with the residents.	The representation is <b>not accepted</b> as the resultant population of the proposed DCCA (24,674) would exceed the upper permissible limit (+42.77%).
4	R07 – Sha Kok  R09 – Jat Min  R10 – Chun Fung	2	<p>The representations object to the proposal to include Sha Tin Wai, Fui Yiu Ha New Village, Tsok Pok Hang Tsuen and Tsang Tai Uk in R09. Taking into consideration geographical features and population distribution, it proposes to:</p> <p>(a) move Sha Tin Wai and Fui Yiu Ha New Village from R09 to R07; and</p>	<p><u>Proposal (a)</u> The proposal is <b>not accepted</b> as:</p> <p>(i) it would affect the unaltered boundaries of R07, the population of which is within the permissible range and a change in its boundary is not necessary; and</p> <p>(ii) there are supporting views on the demarcation proposal for R09 (see items 1 and 5);</p>

<i>Item no.</i>	<i>DCCAs concerned</i>	<i>No. of representations</i>	<i>Representations</i>	<i>EAC's views</i>
			<p>(b) move Tsok Pok Hang Tsuen and Tsang Tai Uk to R09 because:</p> <p>(i) Sha Tin Wai and Fui Yiu Ha New Village are far away from Jat Min Chuen but adjacent to Pok Hong Estate; and</p> <p>(ii) notwithstanding (i) that Sha Tin Wai and Fui Yiu Ha New Village is closer to Pok Hong Estate in R08 geographically, they are recommended to be moved to R07 instead as Pok Hong Estate has a higher population than R09.</p>	<p><u>Proposal (b)</u> The proposal is in line with the EAC's demarcation proposal. The supporting view is noted.</p>
5	R10 – Chun Fung	2	<p>These representations support the demarcation proposal for R10 that the four villages, Fui Yiu Ha New Village, Sha Tin Wai, Tsok Pok Hang Sun Tsuen and Shan Ha Wai, should not be included in R10 but moved to other adjoining DCCA, either R08 or R09, because their connection with Chun Shek Estate, Fung Shing Court and Sha Tin Tau of R10 is weak.</p> <p>One representation further elaborates that:</p> <p>(a) Fui Yiu Ha New Village, Sha Tin Wai,</p>	<p>The views expressed in the representations are in line with the EAC's demarcation proposal. The supporting views are noted.</p>

<i>Item no.</i>	<i>DCCAs concerned</i>	<i>No. of representations</i>	<i>Representations</i>	<i>EAC's views</i>
			<p>Tsok Pok Hang Sun Tsuen and Shan Ha Wai are far away from the remaining parts of R10 but closer to Pok Hong Estate in R08 and Jat Ming Chuen in R09 geographically, and therefore should not be included in into R10; and</p> <p>(b) Chun Shek Estate, Fung Shing Court and Sha Tin Tau of R10 have already established close ties and community identity and hence should form a DCCA on its own.</p>	
6	<p>R13 – Hin Ka</p> <p>R14 – Lower Shing Mun</p> <p>R15 – Keng Hau</p> <p>R17 – Sun Chui</p> <p>R18 – Tai Wai</p>	1	<p>The representation proposes to:</p> <p>(a) move the low-density residential blocks along Keng Hau Road and Hin Tin Estate from R14 and R15 respectively to R13 to even out the population distribution of the DCCAs; and</p> <p>(b) move a cluster of buildings located at Tsuen Nam Road, Tai Wai from R17 back to R18 to preserve the community integrity of R18.</p>	<p><u>Proposal (a)</u> The proposal is <b>not accepted</b> because:</p> <p>(i) it will affect the boundary of R13, the population of which is within the permissible range, and a change in its boundary is not necessary; and</p> <p>(ii) there are supporting views for the demarcation proposal for R13 (see items 1 and 2).</p> <p><u>Proposal (b)</u> The proposal is <b>not accepted</b> because the resultant population of R18 (21,662) will exceed the upper permissible limit (+25.34%).</p>

<i>Item no.</i>	<i>DCCAs concerned</i>	<i>No. of representations</i>	<i>Representations</i>	<i>EAC's views</i>
7	R14 – Lower Shing Mun R17 – Sun Chui R18 – Tai Wai R19 – Chung Tin	2	<p>The representation opposes the demarcation proposals for R14, R17, R18 and R19 as the EAC has not paid regard to community identity and the preservation of local ties and physical features and development of the relevant area as required by the law and proposes to:</p> <p>(a) put Mei Lok House, Mei Ting House and Mei Moon House of Mei Tin Estate in R19 because they do not have direct and convenient access to R14;</p> <p>(b) as the population of R19 will exceed the permissible limit if (a) is adopted, move Mei Chung Court from R19 to R18 because Mei Chung Court has a closer local ties with R18;</p> <p>(c) as the population of R18 will exceed the permissible range if (b) is adopted, move Tai Wai Village in R18, as well as Grandeur Garden and Grandway Garden in R17 to R14 in order to preserve the local ties between Tai Wai Village and Tai Wai New Village which belong to one single village originally; and</p>	<p>The representation is <b>not accepted</b> because the proposals (a), (b) and (c) will cause the population of R18 (22,910) to exceed the upper permissible limit (+32.57%).</p> <p>In drawing up the demarcation proposals, the EAC has adhered closely to the statutory criteria and its working principles which include factors such as community identity, the preservation of local ties and physical features and development of the relevant areas.</p>

<i>Item no.</i>	<i>DCCAs concerned</i>	<i>No. of representations</i>	<i>Representations</i>	<i>EAC's views</i>
			(d) move the buildings that lie on the east of the railway lines, such as Carado Garden, to R17 because their ties with R17 is stronger than R14.	
8	R17 – Sun Chui	1	The representation proposes to rename R17 from “Sun Chui” to “Chui Ka” (翠嘉) to reflect that Grandway Garden and Grandeur Garden are put together with Sun Chui Estate in R17.	The representation is <b>accepted</b> in view of the valid reason given.
9	R21 – Fo Tan	1	The representation supports the demarcation proposal for R21, which includes The Palazzo because this helps preserve the community identity and local ties in the DCCA.	The supporting view is noted.
10	R21 – Fo Tan R22 – Chun Ma	2	The representations oppose the move of Jockey Club Staff Quarters to R22, and proposes to:  (a) retain the Staff Quarters in R21 because:  (i) there is no geographical similarity between the Staff Quarters and R22;  (ii) the residents of the Staff Quarters do not share any ties with residents of R22 as they are not connected with direct	In view of the fact that the Jockey Club Staff Quarters has maintained a close connection with R21, it is considered appropriate to retain the Jockey Club Staff Quarters in R21. The proposal is <b>accepted with modifications</b> by:  (i) moving Jockey Club Staff Quarters from R22 to R21; and  (ii) moving Kau To Shan residential developments from R21 to R22 so that the population of R22 will fall within the permissible range; and  (iii) keeping the three indigenous villages, namely Ma Liu, Lok Lo Ha and Wo Liu Hang which are of the same ancestry, in R21 to help preserve their community

<i>Item no.</i>	<i>DCCAs concerned</i>	<i>No. of representations</i>	<i>Representations</i>	<i>EAC's views</i>
			<p>transport access and they need to walk 15 to 20 minutes to travel between the two areas;</p> <p>(iii) if the Staff Quarters is included in R22 while the polling stations are designated at the Chinese University of Hong Kong and Royal Ascot, the residents' desire to vote will be severely hampered as the polling stations are too far away;</p> <p>(iv) the residents of the Staff Quarters share the use of the community facilities and transport network with other large residential developments like Jubilee Garden and The Palazzo in R21;</p> <p>(v) the Staff Quarters has closer connection with R21 as the majority of its residents use the access roads connecting to MTR Fo Tan Station or The Palazzo for public transport; and</p> <p>(vi) the Staff Quarters had all along been</p>	<p>identity and close ties.</p> <p>The resultant populations of the new R21 and R22 are 16,982 (-1.74%) and 13,972 (-19.15%) respectively, which fall within the permissible range.</p>

<i>Item no.</i>	<i>DCCAs concerned</i>	<i>No. of representations</i>	<i>Representations</i>	<i>EAC's views</i>
			<p>included in R21 and it is difficult for the residents to adapt to the change if the Staff Quarters is moved to another DCCA; and</p> <p>(b) if boundary alteration is necessary because of change in population:</p> <p>(i) move residential developments at Kau To Shan to R22 as they share closer community ties with R22 and Kau To Shan was a part of the then Chun Ma DCCA in 1999; and</p> <p>(ii) move Lok Lo Ha to R22 as it is closer to Royal Ascot and residents of these two areas share close ties, use the same transport and community facilities, and have common service needs.</p>	



<i>Item no.</i>	<i>DCCAs concerned</i>	<i>No. of representations</i>	<i>Representations</i>	<i>EAC's views</i>
11	R21 – Fo Tan  R22 – Chun Ma	1	<p>The representation:</p> <p>(a) supports the inclusion of The Palazzo in R21 to preserve the community identity; and</p> <p>(b) opposes the move of Jockey Club Staff Quarters to R22 because:</p> <p>(i) it is not reasonable to put the Staff Quarters in R22 in terms of their physical features and the shape of the relevant DCCA;</p> <p>(ii) it is difficult for the residents of the Staff Quarters to adapt to the change as they have all along belonged to R21 in previous demarcation exercises; and</p> <p>(iii) the residents have closer connection with R21 as they often use the community and transport facilities in R21; and</p> <p>(c) proposes to retain Jockey Club Staff Quarters in R21 since the population of R21 still falls within the permissible range.</p>	<p><u>Item (a)</u> The supporting view is noted.</p> <p><u>Items (b) &amp; (c)</u> The representation is <b>accepted</b>. A revised proposal for R21 and R22 is recommended by the EAC. See item 10.</p>

<i>Item no.</i>	<i>DCCAs concerned</i>	<i>No. of representations</i>	<i>Representations</i>	<i>EAC's views</i>
12	R28 – Kam Ying R29 – Yiu On R32 – Tai Shui Hang	1	The representation suggests that Ma On Shan Tsuen be moved from R32 to R29 in view of its geographical features and transport link with R29 in order to facilitate the residents of the Ma On Shan Tsuen to cast their votes at polling station in R29.	The representation is <b>not accepted</b> because:  (i) it would affect the unaltered boundaries of R28 and R29, the populations of which are within the permissible range and no change in their boundaries is necessary; and  (ii) there are supporting views for the demarcation proposals of R28, R29 and R32 (see items 1 and 2).  The REO will take note of the representation when identifying venues for setting up a polling station for electors of R32.
13	R30 – Heng On	2	The representations propose to put Kam On Court and Heng On Estate together in the same DCCA as both housing estates share the use of some community facilities.	The proposals are same as the EAC's demarcation proposal. The supporting views are noted.
14	R34 – Bik Woo R35 – Kwong Hong	1	The representation objects to the suggestion (same as item 21) that Shek Kwu Lung be moved from R35 into R34 because:  (a) residents of Shek Kwu Lung use the community facilities of R35 instead of those of R34;  (b) Shek Kwu Lung maintains closer ties and community identity with the community of R35 and the DC member of R35 is familiar with the needs of the	The view expressed in the representation is in line with the EAC's demarcation proposal. Please also see item 21.

<i>Item no.</i>	<i>DCCAs concerned</i>	<i>No. of representations</i>	<i>Representations</i>	<i>EAC's views</i>
			<p>residents in Shek Kwu Lung;</p> <p>(c) the increase of population in R34 arising from the transfer of Shek Kwu Lung will put heavy burden on the DC member of R34; and</p> <p>(d) there is no need to change the boundary of R35, the population of which is around 13,000.</p>	

**Sha Tin 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>
15	R13 – Hin Ka  R14 – Lower Shing Mun  R15 – Keng Hau	1	The representation:  (a) proposes to move Hin Tin from R15 to R13 to even out the population in the DCCAs;  (b) considers it appropriate for the EAC to take into account future developments in the district (e.g. Sha Tin to Central Link) when delineate the boundaries of DCCAs; and  (c) suggests that the public be consulted on the location of polling stations.	<u>Item (a)</u> The proposal is <b>not accepted</b> because:  (i) it would affect the unaltered boundary of R13, the population of which is within the permissible range and a change in its boundary is not necessary; and  (ii) there are supporting views for the demarcation proposals for R13, R14 and R15 (see items 1 and 2).  <u>Item (b)</u> For this demarcation exercise, the EAC must adhere to the population projection as at 30 June 2011. Any development beyond this cut off date will not be considered.  <u>Item (c)</u> The suggestion is beyond the scope of this exercise and has been forwarded to the REO for reference.
16	R21 – Fo Tan  R22 – Chun Ma	1	Same as item 11.	Please see item 11.
17	R21 – Fo Tan  R22 – Chun Ma	1	The representation:  (a) opposes to move Jockey Club Staff Quarters to R22 and suggests that it should be retained in R21 because:  (i) the Staff Quarters have long been	The representation is <b>accepted</b> . A revised proposal for R21 and R22 is recommended by the EAC. Please see item 10.

<i>Item no.</i>	<i>DCCAs concerned</i>	<i>No. of representations</i>	<i>Representations</i>	<i>EAC's views</i>
			<p>included in R21;</p> <p>(ii) most of the residents of the Staff Quarters uses the Fo Tan Station in R21 via a footbridge or through The Palazzo or Jubilee Garden;</p> <p>(iii) the residents hence have stronger ties with R21; and</p> <p>(b) further proposes to move the residential developments in Kau To Shan to R22, in order to alleviate the population shortfall of R22, because:</p> <p>(i) the area was included in Chun Ma before 2003 and it was convenient for the residents of Kau To Shan to use the polling station at The Chinese University of Hong Kong in R22; and</p> <p>(ii) the area is geographically closer to The Chinese University of Hong Kong and Royal Ascot in R22.</p>	
18	R28 – Kam Ying  R29 – Yiu On	1	<p>The representation proposes to:</p> <p>(a) move Ma On Shan Tsuen from R32 to R29 as both areas are</p>	<p><u>Proposal (a)</u> The proposal is <b>not accepted</b> because:</p> <p>(i) it would affect the unaltered boundaries of R28 and R29, the population of which are within</p>

<i>Item no.</i>	<i>DCCAs concerned</i>	<i>No. of representations</i>	<i>Representations</i>	<i>EAC's views</i>
	R32 – Tai Shui Hang		<p>connected to the DCCA through a shuttle bus service and hence:</p> <p>(i) the residents of Ma On Shan Tsuen establish a close local ties with R29;</p> <p>(ii) it will be more convenient for the residents of Ma On Shan Tsuen to cast their votes; and</p> <p>(b) rename R32 as “富欣”.</p>	<p>the permissible range and no change in their boundaries is necessary; and</p> <p>(ii) there are supporting views for the demarcation proposals for R28, R29 and R32 (see items 1 and 2).</p> <p><u>Proposal (b)</u> The proposal is <b>not accepted</b> as the name recommended by the EAC can reflect the unique physical features of the DCCA.</p>
19	R29 – Yiu On  R31 – On Tai  R32 – Tai Shui Hang	1	<p>The representation:</p> <p>(a) supports the demarcation proposal for R31; and</p> <p>(b) puts up another proposal on R29 and R32 which is the same as that set out in item 12.</p>	<p><u>Item (a)</u> The supporting view is noted.</p> <p><u>Item (b)</u> Please see item 12.</p>
20	R30 – Heng On	1	Same as item 13.	Please see item 13.
21	R33 – Yu Yan  R34 – Bik Woo  R35 – Kwong Hong	1	<p>The representation proposes to:</p> <p>(a) move Tai Shek Kwu and Shek Mun from R35 to R34 because:</p> <p>(i) they have closer connection with R34;</p> <p>(ii) the area is separated from the rest of R35 as it is located downhill; and</p>	<p><u>Proposal (a)</u> The proposal is <b>not accepted</b> because:</p> <p>(i) it would affect the unaltered boundary of R34, the population of which is within the permissible range and no change in its boundary is necessary; and</p> <p>(ii) there is supporting view on demarcation proposal for R34 (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>
			<p>(b) move A Kung Kok Shan Road from R35 to R33 because it has closer ties with R33 and it will be more convenient for the DC member of R33 to serve the residents living at A Kung Kok Shan Road.</p> <p>The population shortfall of R35 caused by the aforesaid proposals will be compensated as there will be population intake following the residential developments in the DCCA in the future.</p>	<p><u>Proposal (b)</u> The proposal is <b>not accepted</b> because:</p> <p>(i) it would affect the unaltered boundaries of R33 and R35 where no change in their boundaries is necessary; and</p> <p>(ii) there are supporting views on the demarcation proposals for R33 and R35 (see item 2).</p> <p>For this demarcation exercise, EAC must adhere to the population projection as at 30 June 2011. Any development beyond this cut off date will not be considered.</p>