

**Appendix II - L**

**Tuen Mun 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	All DCCAs	1	-	Supports the provisional recommendations on all DCCAs in the district as they are in line with the EAC's statutory criteria and working principles.	The supporting view is noted.
2	L01 – Tuen Mun Town Centre  L11 – San Hui	1	-	(a) Proposes to keep the existing boundary of L11 (San Hui) unchanged.	<u>Item (a)</u> This proposal is <b>not accepted</b> because if the existing boundary of L11 (San Hui) remains unchanged, the projected population of L01 (Tuen Mun Town Centre) (21,597) will exceed the statutory permissible upper limit (+27.31%).
				(b) Proposes to transfer Luk Yuen Street, eastern part of SKH St. Simon's Lui Ming Choi Secondary School, but excluding the area of Yan Oi Town Square, from L01 (Tuen Mun Town Centre) to L11 (San Hui) because: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>● the population of L11 (San Hui) is less than that of L01 (Tuen Mun Town Centre) but L11 (San Hui) has around 30 single standalone buildings, three housing estates, and also villages/squatter areas. Its daily management and district administration are more complicated than those of L01 (Tuen Mun Town Centre), therefore many cases would have to be handled. The workload of the DC member in that</li> </ul>	<u>Item (b)</u> This proposal is <b>not accepted</b> because: <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>(i) according to the EAC's provisional recommendation, the projected population of L01 (Tuen Mun Town Centre) could be adjusted to 19,539 (+15.18%). After the proposed adjustment, its projected population (20,977) will further deviate from the population quota (+23.66%), compared with the provisional recommendation;</li> <li>(ii) the proposal made in the representation is not clearly better in preserving community identities and local ties; and</li> <li>(iii) the delineation proposal must be based on objective data of the population distribution.</li> </ol>

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

<i>Item No.</i>	<i>DCCAs</i>	<i>No.*</i>		<i>Representations</i>	<i>EAC's views</i>
		<i>W</i>	<i>O</i>		
				<p>DCCA and government departments would be increased eventually; and</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Century Gateway is a newly completed estate and not fully occupied. Therefore, the share of population for L01 (Tuen Mun Town Centre) is the same as San Fat Estate before.</li> </ul>	<p>Arrangements on district administration matters are not the relevant factors of consideration.</p>
				<p>(c) Proposes to rename L11 (San Hui) as "Town Centre North" which was used in 1997 for easy identification by members of the public.</p>	<p><u>Item (c)</u> This proposal is <b>not accepted</b> because the current name has been used since 1999. The majority of the public are used to this name and change of the DCCA name may cause confusion to the public.</p>
				<p>(d) Proposes to change the polling station from Tam Lee Lai Fun Memorial Secondary School to Lui Ming Choi Secondary School because the recent location of the polling station of L11 (San Hui) is very inconvenient. Change of the location of polling station could facilitate the residents of the area of Heung Sze Wui Road (in particular the elderly) to vote, which could improve the problem of low turnout in L11 (San Hui).</p>	<p><u>Items (d) and (e)</u> The delineation proposal must be based on objective data of the population distribution. Arrangements on polling station are not the relevant factors of consideration. The EAC has referred this view on polling station arrangements to the REO for follow-up.</p>
				<p>(e) Proposes to change the polling station for the areas of Hung Kiu, Heung Tsuen, Hoh Fuk Tong and Yan Oi Tong Circuit in L11(San Hui) to Tseng Choi Street Community Hall.</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>		
3	L01 – Tuen Mun Town Centre  L11 – San Hui	1	-	Proposes to transfer the area along Ho Pong Street to Luk Yuen Street, the buildings near Ming Ngai Street and Lui Ming Choi Secondary School to L11 (San Hui) because the population still substantially exceeds the statutory population quota after re-delineation of boundaries. The population of L01 (Tuen Mun Town Centre) and L11 (San Hui) are 19,539 (+15.18%) and 18,899 (+11.41%) respectively. As a result, the residents of the two DCCAs could not obtain sufficient local support and their views could not be reflected effectively.	This proposal is <b>not accepted</b> because:  (i) according to the EAC's provisional recommendation, the projected population of L01 (Tuen Mun Town Centre) could be adjusted to 19,539 (+15.18%). After the proposed adjustment, the projected population (20,433) will further deviate from the population quota (+20.45%), compared with the provisional recommendation;  (ii) the proposal made in the representation is not clearly better in preserving community identities and local ties; and  (iii) the delineation proposal must be based on objective data of the population distribution. Arrangements on district administration matters are not the relevant factors of consideration.
4	L01 – Tuen Mun Town Centre  L11 – San Hui  L12 – Sam Shing  L29 – Tuen Mun Rural	1	-	(a) Objects to the provisional recommendation on the transfer of the above-mentioned area to L11 (San Hui), separating the ties between the area and Tuen Mun Town Centre. Proposes to keep the population between Luk Yuen Street and the DCCA boundary in L01 (Tuen Mun Town Centre).	<u>Item (a)</u> This proposal is <b>not accepted</b> because:  (i) according to the EAC's provisional recommendation, the projected population of L01 (Tuen Mun Town Centre) could be adjusted to 19,539 (+15.18%). After the proposed adjustment, the projected population (20,065) will further deviate from the population quota (+18.28%), compared with the provisional recommendation; and

Item No.	DCCAs	No.*		Representations	EAC's views
		W	O		
					(ii) the proposal made in the representation is not clearly better in preserving community identities and local ties.
				(b) Proposes to transfer the marine population from L12 (Sam Shing) to L11 (San Hui) because the population of L12 (Sam Shing) exceeds the statutory permissible upper limit by 80 persons while L11 (San Hui) (18,000) still has the capacity to absorb the marine population in L12 (Sam Shing).	<u>Item (b)</u> This proposal is <b>not accepted</b> because there is Hanford Garden, which belongs to L13 (Hanford), separating the marine population of L12 (Sam Ching) from L11 (San Hui). Transferring the marine population in L12 (Sam Shing) to L11 (San Hui) is not feasible.
				(c) Objects to the provisional recommendation on L29 (Tuen Mun Rural) because the population of L29 (Tuen Mun Rural) still exceeds the statutory permissible upper limit.	<u>Item (c)</u> This representation is <b>not accepted</b> because based on the 2011 original constituency boundary, the projected population of L29 (Tuen Mun Rural) in 2015 will substantially exceed the statutory permissible upper limit. Therefore, the EAC proposes that Botania Villa, Fuk Hang Tsuen, Fu Tei Sheung Tsuen and Fu Tei Ha Tsuen located within the original boundary of the DCCA be transferred to the adjacent L28 (Fu Tai). Although the projected population still slightly exceeds the statutory permissible upper limit (+28.00%), taking into account the community integrity and local ties, the EAC considers that the population of the DCCA be allowed to deviate slightly from the statutory permissible range is suitable.
5	L02 – Siu Chi  L03 – Siu Tsui	12	-	Proposes to transfer four buildings of Siu Lun Court (Fai Lun House, Ngan Lun House, Po Lun House and Wah Lun House) from L04 (On Ting) to L03 (Siu Tsui); to transfer several blocks of Yau Oi	This proposal is <b>not accepted</b> because:  (i) the projected population of L02 (Siu Chi), L03 (Siu Tsui), L04 (On Ting), L05 (Yau Oi

<i>Item No.</i>	<i>DCCAs</i>	<i>No.*</i>		<i>Representations</i>	<i>EAC's views</i>
		<i>W</i>	<i>O</i>		
	L04 – On Ting  L05 – Yau Oi South  L06 – Yau Oi North			<p>Estate from L06 (Yau Oi North) to L05 (Yau Oi South); to transfer Siu On Court from L02 (Siu Chi) to L04 (On Ting); to transfer Nerine Cove and The Sea Crest from L03 (Siu Tsui) to L06 (Yau Oi North) because:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>● separating Siu Lun Court into two DCCAs would lead to serious misunderstanding and conflicts among residents in different blocks, and the residents would find it difficult to adapt because two DC members are serving the same housing estate; confusion arisen in the previous election, electors of Wah Lun House in L04 (On Ting) originally wanted to support the candidate who served L03 (Siu Tsui) but could not do so when casting their votes;</li> <li>● the Home Ownership Scheme buildings of Siu Lun Court and Tsui Ning Garden are closer in terms of the way of living and geographical location and they are not so close in every aspect with Nerine Cove. As a result, the DC member would find it difficult to provide service to electors from different types of housing;</li> <li>● relatively speaking, Nerine Cove, The Sea Crest and Oceania Heights are private housing. After the transfer of Oceania Heights to L06 (Yau Oi North), the residents of Nerine Cove and Oceania Heights would face the same situation as Siu Lun Court's residents, i.e. not knowing who their DC member is;</li> </ul>	<p>South) and L06 (Yau Oi North) will fall within the statutory permissible range. According to the established working principles, adjustment to their existing boundaries is not required; and</p> <p>(ii) the delineation proposal must be based on objective data of the population distribution. Arrangements on district administration matters are not the relevant factors of consideration.</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"> <li>to preserve community identities and local ties, the residents have always requested to put all the buildings in Siu Lun Court in the same DCCA and in the 1999 DC Election, Siu Lun Court was included in one DCCA; and</li> <li>after re-delineation, the new boundaries could make the population of the DCCAs fall within the statutory permissible range.</li> </ul>	
6	L07 – Tsui Hing L08 – Shan King L09 – King Hing L10 – Hing Tsak L27 – Prime View L28 – Fu Tai	1	-	<p>(a) Proposes to transfer King Mei House and King Lai House from L09 (King Hing) to L08 (Shan King) to preserve the community integrity of Shan King Estate.</p> <p>(b) Proposes to transfer Hing Ping House, Hing Yiu House and Hing Fai House from L10 (Hing Tsak) to L09 (King Hing) to preserve the community integrity of Tai Hing Estate.</p> <p>(c) Proposes to rename L09 (King Hing) as “Tai Hing”.</p>	<p><u>Item (a)</u> This proposal is <b>not accepted</b> because the projected population of L08 (Shan King) and L09 (King Hing) will fall within the statutory permissible range. According to the established working principles, adjustment to their existing boundaries is not required.</p> <p><u>Item (b)</u> This proposal is <b>not accepted</b> because the projected population of L09 (King Hing) and L10 (Hing Tsak) will fall within the statutory permissible range. According to the established working principles, adjustment to their existing boundaries is not required.</p> <p><u>Item (c)</u> This proposal is <b>not accepted</b> because the current name has been used since 2003 and the majority of the public are used to this name. Change of the DCCA name may cause confusion to the public.</p>

Item No.	DCCAs	No.*		Representations	EAC's views
		W	O		
				(d) Proposes to transfer Chelsea Heights from L07 (Tsui Hing) to L10 (Hing Tsak).	<u>Item (d)</u> This proposal is <b>not accepted</b> because the projected population of L07 (Tsui Hing) and L10 (Hing Tsak) will fall within the statutory permissible range. According to the established working principles, adjustment to their existing boundaries is not required.
				(e) Proposes to rename L10 (Hing Tsak) as "Cheuk Tsak".	<u>Item (e)</u> This proposal is <b>not accepted</b> because the current name has been used since 1999 and the majority of the public are used to this name. Change of the DCCA name may cause confusion to the public.
				(f) Proposes to transfer Lingnan University, Fu Tei Tsuen Village Office, South Hillcrest and Beneville from L27 (Prime View) to L28 (Fu Tai) because it could facilitate the DC member of the DCCA to maintain community ties and his/her liaison work.	<u>Item (f)</u> This proposal is <b>not accepted</b> because:  (i) the projected population of L27 (Prime View) 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 the population distribution. Arrangements on district administration matters are not the relevant factors of consideration.
7	L08 – Shan King	-	1	(a) Same as item 6(a).	<u>Item (a)</u> Please see item 6(a).
	L09 – King Hing L10 – Hing Tsak			(b) Proposes to transfer all buildings from Hing Cheung House to Hing Tai House from L09 (King Hing) to L10 (Hing Tsak) to preserve the	<u>Item (b)</u> This proposal is <b>not accepted</b> because the projected population of L09 (Hing Tsak) and L10 (Hing Tsak) will fall within the statutory

<i>Item No.</i>	<i>DCCAs</i>	<i>No.*</i>		<i>Representations</i>	<i>EAC's views</i>
		<i>W</i>	<i>O</i>		
				community integrity of Tai Hing Estate.	permissible range. According to the established working principles, adjustment to their existing boundaries is not required.
8	L08 – Shan King  L20 – Lung Mun	1	-	Proposes to transfer Yeung Siu Hang Tsuen from L20 (Lung Mun) to L08 (Shan King) because: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Yeung Siu Hang Tsuen's residents have closer community ties with L08 (Shan King). It also belonged to the DCCA of Shan King in Tuen Mun DC Election previously; and</li> <li>• Yeung Siu Hang Tsuen is too far away from L20 (Lung Mun) geographically. The villagers would find it difficult to seek community services.</li> </ul>	This proposal is <b>not accepted</b> because: <p>(i) the projected population of L08 (Shan King) 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) the delineation proposal must be based on objective data of the population distribution. Arrangements on district administration matters are not the relevant factors of consideration.</p>
9	L11 – San Hui  L28 – Fu Tai  L29 – Tuen Mun Rural	1	-	(a) Proposes to transfer Botania Villa from L28 (Fu Tai) to L29 (Tuen Mun Rural) because: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• regarding the geographical location, Botania Villa is separated from L28 (Fu Tai) by Yuen Long Highway and they do not have close ties. However, To Yuen Wai and Tuen Mun San Tsuen, which are nearer to Fu Tai Estate, are not included in L28 (Fu Tai);</li> <li>• Botania Villa and The Sherwood have a relatively larger population in the area and are geographically closer to each other. The residents of these two</li> </ul>	<u>Item (a)</u> This proposal is <b>not accepted</b> because: <p>(i) according to EAC's provisional recommendations, the projected population of L29 (Tuen Mun Rural) could be adjusted to 21,714 (+28.00%). After the proposed adjustment, its projected population (23,470) will further deviate from the population quota (+38.35%), compared with the provisional recommendation;</p> <p>(ii) the delineation proposal must be based on objective data of the population distribution. Arrangements on district administration matters are not</p>



Item No.	DCCAs	No.*		Representations	EAC's views
		W	O		
				<p>estates both use Lam Tei Main Street as the main access. If these two estates are separated and included in two DCCAs, there would be two different DC members to provide community support and the communication channel would be split, resulting in communication problems which seriously undermine the local ties and liaison work;</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>● Botania Villa was developed 10 years earlier than The Sherwood and Greenview. It was the main settlement area of indigenous villagers in the area and has close ties with the villagers in the vicinity; and</li> <li>● more housing estates would be completed in Lam Tei gradually and the population would increase. The representation proposes that when considering the overall future development of the area, the interests of Botania Villa's residents should not be ignored.</li> </ul>	<p>the relevant factors of consideration;</p> <p>(iii) although there are certain local ties between the area mentioned in the representation and part of L29 (Tuen Mun Rural), the EAC considers that adjustment to the constituency boundaries is required because the population will substantially exceed the permissible range based on the 2011 original constituency boundaries;</p> <p>(iv) geographically, although Tuen Mun San Tsuen and To Yuen Wai are nearer to L28 (Fu Tai) than Botania Villa, these two villages have clansman relationship with other villages in L29 (Tuen Mun Rural). Therefore, it was inappropriate to transfer these two villages to L28 (Fu Tai); and</p> <p>(v) the EAC must adhere to the Administration's population forecast as at 30 June 2015 in delineating the constituency boundaries. Future development after the cut-off date will not be considered.</p>
				<p>(b) Objects to separating Fuk Hang Tsuen into two DCCAs, contrary to the expectation of the residents of that DCCA in respect of the natural features. Also, if Botania Villa, The Sherwood and other areas adjacent to Fuk Hang Tsuen Road are put in the same DCCA, it would facilitate the residents to work together for the improvement works of Fuk</p>	<p><u>Item (b)</u> According to the EAC's provisional recommendation, the whole Fuk Hang Tsuen should be put in L28 (Fu Tai), so the representation is <b>accepted</b> by the EAC. Based on the village boundary of Fuk Hang Tsuen, the proposed boundaries of L28 (Fu Tai) and L29 (Tuen Mun Rural) will be adjusted. Regarding the other matters raised in the</p>

Item No.	DCCAs	No.*		Representations	EAC's views
		W	O		
				<p>Hang Tsuen Road by participating in the local consultation exercise.</p> <p>(c) Proposes to transfer Lam Tei Quarry from L11(San Hui) to L29 (Tuen Mun Rural) because Lam Tei's residents have been annoyed by the heavy trucks in the Quarry. They have repeatedly reflected the problem and complained to the Quarry but the problem is still unresolved. The district consultation work used to be taken up by the DC member of San Hui on behalf of Lam Tei's residents to reflect their local views to the government. The DC member and residents of San Hui could never understand the nuisance caused by the Quarry to Lam Tei's residents.</p>	<p>representation, involving the arrangements on district administration matters, they are not the relevant factors of consideration in delineating constituencies.</p> <p><u>Item (c)</u> This proposal is <b>not accepted</b> because:</p> <p>(i) the EAC must adhere to the Administration's population forecast as at 30 June 2015 in delineating the constituency boundaries. The Lam Tei Quarry mentioned in the representation has no population; and</p> <p>(ii) the delineation proposal must be based on objective data of the population distribution. Arrangements on district administration matters are not the relevant factors of consideration.</p>
10	L14 – Fu Sun	1	-	Supports the provisional recommendation on L14 (Fu Sun) because combining the 12 blocks of Glorious Garden and Sun Tuen Mun Centre into a DCCA could preserve community integrity and harmony.	The supporting view is noted.
11	L24 – Po Tin  L26 – Siu Hong	1	-	Proposes to transfer Kei Lun Wai from L24 (Po Tin) to L26 (Siu Hong) because the population of L24 (Po Tin) mainly comes from Po Tin Estate and Kei Lun Wai's residents always use the community facilities and transport provided by Siu Hong Court. Also, geographically, the area is nearer to L26 (Siu Hong) and rather remote from L24 (Po Tin).	<p>This proposal is <b>not accepted</b> because:</p> <p>(i) the projected population of L24 (Po Tin) and L26 (Siu Hong) will fall within the statutory permissible range. According to the established working principles, adjustment to their existing boundaries is not required;</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>		
				As a result, Kei Lun Wai's residents find it easier to seek assistance from the DC member in L26 (Siu Hong). Moreover, new public housing would be built in Area 54 of Tuen Mun which would make it more inappropriate to put Kei Lun Wai in L24 (Po Tin).	<p>(ii) the delineation proposal must be based on objective data of the population distribution. Arrangements on district administration matters are not the relevant factors of consideration; and</p> <p>(iii) the EAC must adhere to the Administration's population forecast as at 30 June 2015 in delineating the constituency boundaries. Future development after the cut-off date will not be considered.</p>
12	L28 – Fu Tai  L29 – Tuen Mun Rural	1	-	Proposes to transfer Fuk Hang Tsuen (Upper/ Lower) from L28 (Fu Tai) to L29 (Tuen Mun Rural) because Fuk Hang Tsuen is a rural community and the DC member of L28 (Fu Tai) would not understand the rural culture and daily life of the villagers. This would cause difficulties in assisting the villagers. Fuk Hang Tsuen's electors are used to going to L29 (Tuen Mun Rural) to cast their votes and seek community services.	<p>This proposal is <b>not accepted</b> because:</p> <p>(i) according to the EAC's provisional recommendation, the projected population of L29 (Tuen Mun Rural) could be adjusted to 21,714 (+28.00%). After the proposed adjustment based on the representation, the projected population (22,135) will further deviate from the population quota (+30.48%), compared with the provisional recommendation;</p> <p>(ii) the delineation proposal must be based on objective data of the population distribution. Arrangements on district administration matters are not the relevant factors of consideration; and</p> <p>(iii) although there are certain local ties between the area mentioned in the representation and part of L29 (Tuen Mun Rural), the EAC considers that adjustment to the constituency</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>		
					boundaries is required because the population will substantially exceed the permissible range based on the 2011 original constituency boundaries.
13	L28 – Fu Tai  L29 – Tuen Mun Rural	1	-	Proposes to transfer Fu Tei Sheung Tsuen and Fu Tei Ha Tsuen from L28 (Fu Tai) to L29 (Tuen Mun Rural) because Fu Tei Sheung Tsuen and Fu Tei Ha Tsuen are rural communities and the DC member of L28 (Fu Tai) would not understand the rural culture and daily life of the villagers. This would cause difficulties in assisting the villagers. The electors of Fu Tei Sheung Tsuen and Fu Tei Ha Tsuen are used to going to L29 (Tuen Mun Rural) to vote and seek community services.	<p>This proposal is <b>not accepted</b> because:</p> <p>(i) according to the EAC's provisional recommendation, the projected population of L29 (Tuen Mun Rural) could be adjusted to 21,714 (+28.00%). After the proposed adjustment, the projected population (21,755) will further deviate from the population quota (+28.24%), compared with the provisional recommendation;</p> <p>(ii) the delineation proposal must be based on objective data of the population distribution. Arrangements on district administration matters are not the relevant factors of consideration; and</p> <p>(iii) although there are certain local ties between the area mentioned in the representation and the part of L29 (Tuen Mun Rural), the EAC considers that adjustment to the constituency boundaries is required because the population will substantially exceed the permissible range based on the 2011 original constituency boundaries.</p>