

Appendix II - K

**Tsuen Wan District
Summaries of Written/Oral Representations**

<i>Item No.</i>	<i>DCCAs</i>	<i>No.*</i>		<i>Representations</i>	<i>EAC's views</i>
		<i>W</i>	<i>O</i>		
1	K01 – Tak Wah K02 – Yeung Uk Road K03 – Hoi Bun K11 – Tsuen Wan West	1	-	Objects to the delineation proposal for the newly created K11 (Tsuen Wan West) because the area of the DCCA is quite large and it would be difficult for the coming DC member to take care of the residents in two far ends. The new DCCA should not cover Phase 3 of Belvedere Garden, Bayview Garden and Serenade Cove. Instead, it should cover The Dynasty, City Point and Waterside Plaza, together with Chelsea Court and H Cube of K02 (Yeung Uk Road) and be named as “Tsuen Wan Central”.	This proposal is not accepted because: (i) the projected population of K02 (Yeung Uk Road) will fall within the statutory permissible range. According to the established working principles, adjustment to its existing boundary is not required; and (ii) the delineation proposal must be based on objective data of population distribution. Arrangements on district administration matters are not the relevant factors of consideration.
2	K01 – Tak Wah K03 – Hoi Bun K11 – Tsuen Wan West	-	1	Objects to merging Phase 3 of Belvedere Garden, Bayview Garden and Serenade Cove together with The Dynasty and City Point to form the newly created K11 (Tsuen Wan West) because The Dynasty and City Point do not use the community facilities of Phase 3 of Belvedere Garden. Proposes to retain The Dynasty and City Point in K01 (Tak Wah) and K03 (Hoi Bun) respectively and to name the newly created K11 as “Lai Hing” because the new DCCA would cover Phase 3 of Belvedere Garden and Bayview Garden.	This proposal is not accepted because: (i) if The Dynasty is to be retained in K01 (Tak Wah), the projected population of the DCCA (22,305) will exceed the statutory permissible upper limit (+31.48%); and (ii) if the City Point is to be retained in K03 (Hoi Bun), the projected population of the DCCA (22,390) will exceed the statutory permissible upper limit (+31.99%).

* W: Number of written representation
O: Number of oral representation

Item No.	DCCAs	No. *		Representations	EAC's views
		W	O		
3	K01 – Tak Wah K04 – Clague Garden K10 – Ting Sham K11 – Tsuen Wan West K12 – Tsuen Wan Rural	1	-	<p>(a) Proposes that the Lido Garden of K12 (Tsuen Wan Rural) and the Bellagio should be put together in K10 (Ting Sham) because the Lido Garden is close to the Bellagio. If the projected population of K10 (Ting Sham) would exceed the statutory permissible range after the proposed change, the excess population (i.e. the area from Ting Kau to Yau Kom Tau) could be incorporated into the newly created K11 (Tsuen Wan West).</p> <p>(b) Considers that it would be more desirable to transfer the population which originally belonged to K01 (Tak Wah), to K04 (Clague Garden) than to K11 (Tsuen Wan West) because delineating the boundary along the Tsuen Wan Road would make the constituency boundary clearer. Besides, it would allow K11 (Tsuen Wan West) to have capacity to absorb the excess population of K10 (Ting Sham) resulting from the proposed adjustment in item (a) above.</p>	<p><u>Items (a) and (b)</u> These proposals are not accepted because:</p> <p>(i) the projected population of K04 (Clague Garden) will fall within the statutory permissible range. According to the established working principles, adjustment to its existing boundary is not required. The number of affected DCCAs under the proposal made in the representation will be more than that in the EAC's provisional recommendations;</p> <p>(ii) there is no objective information to support that because of local ties, the Lido Garden and the Bellagio should be put in the same DCCA; and</p> <p>(iii) after the proposed adjustment, the projected population of K10 (Ting Sham), K11 (Tsuen Wan West) and K12 (Tsuen Wan Rural) will further deviate from the population quota. Proposals made in the representation : K10: 20,894, +23.17% K11: 19,094, +12.56% K12: 14,890, -12.23% Provisional recommendations : K10: 18,540, +9.29% K11: 18,672, +10.07% K12: 18,896, +11.39%</p>

<i>Item No.</i>	<i>DCCAs</i>	<i>No.*</i>		<i>Representations</i>	<i>EAC's views</i>
		<i>W</i>	<i>O</i>		
				(c) Considers that the name of K10 (Ting Sham) is vague. Proposes to name the DCCA as "Ting Kau" or "Sham Tseng".	<u>Item (c)</u> This proposal is not accepted because neither "Ting Kau" nor "Sham Tseng" can fully reflect the area covered by the DCCA.
4	K04 – Clague Garden K08 – Allway K10 – Ting Sham K11 – Tsuen Wan West K13 – Ma Wan K14 – Luk Yeung K15 – Lei Muk Shue East K17 – Shek Wai Kok K18 – Cheung Shek	1	-	(a) Proposes to put the Tsuen Wan West development project in K04 (Clague Garden) because the project is close to K04 (Clague Garden) but not K11 (Tsuen Wan West). Besides, the project would be ready for occupation in the latter half of 2015. Its impact on population would be minimal. In this connection, it is proposed that the newly created K11 (Tsuen Wan West) be named as "Shing King" to reflect the major housing estates in the DCCA.	<u>Item (a)</u> Please see item (3)(i).
				(b) Proposes to name K10 (Ting Sham) as "Sham Ting" to reflect that the majority of population is in Sham Tseng.	<u>Item (b)</u> This proposal is not accepted because there is no apparent difference between the proposed name made in the representation "Sham Ting" and the name "Ting Sham" made in the provisional recommendation.
				(c) Taking into account the development of North Lantau, proposes to put K13 (Ma Wan) in the Islands District in 2019.	<u>Item (c)</u> This proposal involves alteration of the district boundary, which does not fall under the purview of the EAC. The EAC has referred this view to the HAD for consideration.

Item No.	DCCAs	No. *		Representations	EAC's views
		W	O		
				<p>(d) Considering that the residents in villages along Route Twisk (i.e. Kwong Pan Tin Tsuen, Kwong Pan Tin San Tsuen and Pak Tin Pa San Tsuen) would need to pass through Tsuen Kam Interchange in K14 (Luk Yeung) to go to other places in Tsuen Wan and that K08 (Allway) has a relatively larger population, it is proposed to transfer the abovementioned villages to K14 (Luk Yeung).</p>	<p><u>Items (d) and (e)</u> These proposals are not accepted because the projected population of K08 (Allway), K14 (Luk Yeung) and K18 (Cheung Shek) will fall within the statutory permissible range. According to the established working principles, adjustment to their existing boundaries is not required.</p>
				<p>(e) The area around Sam Dip Tam in K14 (Luk Yeung) and the villages in K18 (Cheung Shek) share the use of Lo Wai Road and have close community ties. Proposes to transfer the abovementioned areas to K18 (Cheung Shek) so as to increase the population of the DCCA.</p>	
				<p>(f) Proposes to transfer the villages along Kwok Shui Road (i.e. Kwan Mun Hau Tsuen, Yeung Uk Tsuen and Ho Pui Tsuen, etc.) from K15 (Lei Muk Shue East) to K17 (Shek Wai Kok) so as to reduce the difference in population in the relevant DCCAs.</p>	<p><u>Item (f)</u> This proposal is not accepted because :</p> <p>(i) the provisional recommendations have put the whole Lei Muk Shue (I) Estate in one DCCA; and</p> <p>(ii) since 1999 DC, the villages along Kwok Shui Road have been delineated in K15 (Lei Muk Shue East). Besides, the villages are distinctly separated from K17 (Shek Wai Kok) by hill slopes and the Tsuen Wan Water Treatment Works.</p>

<i>Item No.</i>	<i>DCCAs</i>	<i>No.*</i>		<i>Representations</i>	<i>EAC's views</i>
		<i>W</i>	<i>O</i>		
				(g) Other than those mentioned above, supports the delineation proposals for all DCCAs.	<u>Item (g)</u> The supporting view is noted.
5	K10 – Ting Sham K12 – Tsuen Wan Rural	1	-	Supports the delineation proposals for K10 (Ting Sham) and K12 (Tsuen Wan Rural) and considers that the proposals have taken into account the geographical location and the population distribution.	The supporting view is noted.
6	K13 – Ma Wan	1	-	<p>Proposes that Park Island should be under Kwai Tsing DC but not Tsuen Wan DC because:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ● Ma Wan has a closer transport link with the Kwai Tsing District than the Tsuen Wan District. Residential bus service between Ma Wan and Tsing Yi runs approximately every 8 minutes while that between Ma Wan and Kwai Fong Metroplaza runs approximately every 12 minutes. On the contrary, the village bus service between Ma Wan and Tsuen Wan runs every 30 minutes and the ferry service is also infrequent; and ● Ma Wan is under the jurisdiction of Tsing Yi Police Region. <p>Taking into account that the rural representatives of Ma Wan Village would object to transferring the DCCA to the Kwai Tsing DC, the above proposal uses Pak Lam Road as the boundary and only proposes to transfer Park Island to the Kwai Tsing DC.</p>	Please see item 4(c).

Item No.	DCCAs	No. *		Representations	EAC's views
		W	O		
7	K15 – Lei Muk Shue East K16 – Lei Muk Shue West	44	-	<p>Object to transferring Fung Shue House from K15 (Lei Muk Shue East) to K16 (Lei Muk Shue West). In general, the reasons are summarised as follows:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> the residents of Fung Shue House often use the facilities of K15 (Lei Muk Shue East); and Fung Shue House is used to be in K15 (Lei Muk Shue East). The polling station at the community hall has been used by the residents of Fung Shue House for many years. Transferring Fung Shue House to K16 (Lei Muk Shue West) would cause inconvenience and confusion to electors. <p>Out of the representations, 11 in number further propose to transfer Lok Shue House from K15 (Lei Muk Shue East) to K16 (Lei Muk Shue West). The major reasons are summarised as follows:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> the polling station of K16 (Lei Muk Shue West) is designated at Lei Muk Shue Catholic Primary School. It would be inconvenient for residents of Fung Shue House, who are elderly or with mobility difficulty to go there to vote; many children of the residents of Lok Shue House attend primary schools in K16 (Lei Muk Shue West) and they always use the facilities of the Upper Estate (i.e. K16 (Lei Muk Shue West)). They have a sense of belonging towards the Upper Estate; 	<p>These proposals are not accepted because:</p> <p>(i) please see item 4(f)(i);</p> <p>(ii) there is no objective information and justification to prove that delineating Lok Shue House in K16 (Lei Muk Shue West) is clearly better than the provisional recommendations in terms of preserving the community identity and local ties;</p> <p>(iii) the delineation proposal must be based on objective data of population distribution. Arrangements on polling station are not the relevant factors of consideration. The EAC has referred these views to the REO for follow-up; and</p> <p>(iv) since 1999 DC, the villages along Ho Pui Tsuen / Kwok Shui Road has been delineated in K15 (Lei Muk Shue East). These villages are linked with K15 (Lei Muk Shue East) by Wo Yi Hop Road. On the contrary, there are no clear links between these villages and K16 (Lei Muk Shue West) and they are separated by hills in Sheung Kwai Chung.</p>

<i>Item No.</i>	<i>DCCAs</i>	<i>No.*</i>		<i>Representations</i>	<i>EAC's views</i>
		<i>W</i>	<i>O</i>		
				<ul style="list-style-type: none"> in terms of geographical location, comparatively speaking, Lok Shue House is nearer to K16 (Lei Muk Shue West) than Fung Shue House; and the population of Lok Shue House and Fung Shue House is more or less the same. There is not much difference between the transferal of Fung Shue House (as proposed in the provisional recommendations) or Lok Shue House from K15 (Lei Muk Shue East) to K16 (Lei Muk Shue West). <p>Out of the representations, six in number further propose to transfer the villages along Ho Pui Tsuen / Kwok Shui Road from K15 (Lei Muk Shue East) to K16 (Lei Muk Shue West) because even if the villages along Kwok Shui Road are transferred to K16 (Lei Muk Shue West), the residents would still use the same polling station and it would not cause any inconvenience to them. Moreover, the proposal would help solve the inconvenience brought to the residents of Fung Shue House under the provisional recommendations.</p> <p>One of the representations proposes to transfer Lok Shue House or villages along Ho Pui Tsuen / Kwok Shui Road from K15 (Lei Muk Shue East) to K16 (Lei Muk Shue West).</p>	
8	K15 – Lei Muk Shue East	1	-	(a) Objects to transferring Fung Shue House from K15 (Lei Muk Shue East) to K16 (Lei Muk Shue West) because	Please see item 7(i) to (iii).

<i>Item No.</i>	<i>DCCAs</i>	<i>No.*</i>		<i>Representations</i>	<i>EAC's views</i>
		<i>W</i>	<i>O</i>		
	K16 – Lei Muk Shue West K17 – Shek Wai Kok			<p>Fung Shue House has been in K15 (Lei Muk Shue East) since its occupation and the residents of Fung Shue House would use the facilities next to Wing Shue House of K15 (Lei Muk Shue East). Moreover, the polling station of K15 (Lei Muk Shue East) is more convenient to the residents of Fung Shue House, who are elderly and with mobility difficulty. It is proposed to transfer Lok Shue House from K15 (Lei Muk Shue East) to K16 (Lei Muk Shue West) because more residents of Lok Shue House are young people and young parents would bring their children to the primary schools in K16 (Lei Muk Shue West). Besides, they always use the facilities of K16 (Lei Muk Shue West).</p>	
				<p>(b) Objects to delineating Wo Yi Hop Lane Village in K17 (Shek Wai Kok) because it would cause inconvenience to the villagers, and proposes to transfer the Village to the adjacent K15 (Lei Muk Shue East).</p>	<p><u>Item (b)</u> This proposal is not accepted because:</p> <p>(i) the projected population of K17 (Shek Wai Kok) will fall within the statutory permissible range. According to the established working principles, adjustment to its existing boundary is not required; and</p> <p>(ii) based on the 2011 original constituency boundary, the projected population of K15 (Lei Muk Shue East) (21,694) will exceed the statutory permissible upper limit (+27.88%). The proposal made in the representation will make the projected population further</p>

<i>Item No.</i>	<i>DCCAs</i>	<i>No.*</i>		<i>Representations</i>	<i>EAC's views</i>
		<i>W</i>	<i>O</i>		
					deviate from the statutory permissible upper limit.
9	K15 – Lei Muk Shue East K17 – Shek Wai Kok	6	-	<p>Object to delineating Wo Yi Hop Lane Village in K17 (Shek Wai Kok) because:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ● it would be very inconvenient to the villagers. Besides, Wo Yi Hop Lane Village and Shek Wai Kok are quite far apart. The villagers have to take transportation to reach Shek Wai Kok; and ● there is a certain difficulty for the villagers to seek help from the DC member. <p>Proposes to transfer Wo Yi Hop Lane Village to the adjacent K15 (Lei Muk Shue East).</p>	Please see item 8(b).