

**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 of the Tuen Mun District.	The supporting view is noted.
2	L01– Tuen Mun Town Centre	1	-	Holds no objection to the provisional recommendations.	The view is noted.
3	L01 – Tuen Mun Town Centre  L02 – Siu Chi  L03 – On Ting  L04 – Siu Tsui  L05 – Yau Oi South  L06 – Yau Oi North	1	-	(a) Proposes to re-delineate the DCCAs of the Tuen Mun District so as to improve the population deviation and community integrity of Tuen Mun Town Centre and southeastern part of Tuen Mun. Details are as follows: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• transfers Villa Tiara from L01 (Tuen Mun Town Centre) to L02 (Siu Chi);</li> <li>• transfers Siu On Court from L02 (Siu Chi) to L03 (On Ting) and then transfers Siu Lun Court from the latter to L04 (Siu Tsui);</li> <li>• transfers Oceania Heights from L06 (Yau Oi North) to L04 (Siu</li> </ul>	<u>Item (a)</u> This proposal is <b>not accepted</b> because:  (i) according to the proposal made in the representation, the population of L02 (Siu Chi) (21 669) will exceed the statutory permissible upper limit (+30.54%); and  (ii) the populations of L02 (Siu Chi), L03 (On Ting), L04 (Siu Tsui), L05 (Yau Oi South) and L06 (Yau Oi North) will fall within the statutory permissible range. According to the established working principles, adjustments to their existing boundaries are not required.

\* W: Number of written representations.

O : Number of 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>		
	L07 – Tsui Hing L08 – Shan King L09 – King Hing L10 – Hing Tsak L11 – San Hui			<p>Tsui) so that the latter will comprise the entire Siu Lun Court, Oceania Heights and Nerine Cove; and</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>adjusts the boundaries of L05 (Yau Oi South) and L06 (Yau Oi North) so that these two DCCAs will comprise Tsui Ning Garden in L04 (Siu Tsui), part of Yau Oi Estate in L05 (Yau Oi South), part of Yau Oi Estate in L06 (Yau Oi North) and Goodview Garden.</li> </ul>	
	L15 – Yuet Wu L16 – Siu Hei L17 – Wu King L20 – Lok Tsui L21 – Lung Mun			<p>(b) Objects to the provisional recommendations on dividing Shan King Estate into L08 (Shan King) and L09 (King Hing), and Tai Hing Estate into L09 (King Hing) and L10 (Hing Tsak). Considers that re-delineation of the DCCAs concerned can rectify the above situation and the problem of having a relatively large population in L11 (San Hui). Details of the proposals are as follows:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>deletes L16 (Siu Hei) so as to free up a DCCA for the creation of a new DCCA in the area of Tai Hing Estate. The name of the new DCCA is “Tai Hing”;</li> </ul>	<p><u>Item (b)</u> This proposal is <b>not accepted</b> because the populations of L07 (Tsui Hing), L08 (Shan King), L09 (King Hing), L10 (Hing Tsak), L15 (Yuet Wu), L16 (Siu Hei), L17 (Wu King), L20 (Lok Tsui) and L21 (Lung Mun) will fall within the statutory permissible range. According to the established working principles, adjustments to their existing boundaries are 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>		
				<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• transfers Siu Hei Court and Miami Beach Towers from L16 (Siu Hei) to L17 (Wu King) and L20 (Lok Tsui) respectively, and Marina Garden to L15 (Yuet Wu);</li> <li>• transfers the area in the west of Lung Mun Road in L20 (Lok Tsui) (including Lung Kwu Tan), and the areas in the north of Wong Chu Road and in the west of Lung Mun Road in L21 (Lung Mun) to L08 (Shan King);</li> <li>• transfers some of the buildings in L08 (Shan King) to L09 (King Hing) so that the latter will only include Shan King Estate and renames it as “Shan King North”. For L08 (Shan King), renames it as “Shan King South &amp; Castle Peak”; and</li> <li>• transfers Chelsea Heights in L07 (Tsui Hing) and the area of Choy Yee Bridge in L11 (San Hui) to L10 (Hing Tsak). Renames L10 (Hing Tsak) as “Choy Yee Bridge”.</li> </ul>	

<i>Item No.</i>	<i>DCCAs</i>	<i>No. *</i>		<i>Representations</i>	<i>EAC's Views</i>
		<i>W</i>	<i>O</i>		
4	L01 – Tuen Mun Town Centre L11 – San Hui L15 – Yuet Wu L16 – Siu Hei L17 – Wu King	1	-	<p>(a) Objects to the transfer of the area of Ming Ngai Street to L11 (San Hui), and requests that the original boundary of L01 (Tuen Mun Town Centre) be remained unchanged. Reasons are as follows:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• people living in Ming Ngai Street, Lee Yuen Mansion and Mai Kei Building are long-time residents who have developed strong emotional bonds with L01 (Tuen Mun Town Centre);</li> <li>• in terms of district and street management, transferring the street to L11 (San Hui) is strange and incongruous;</li> <li>• retaining the street in L01 (Tuen Mun Town Centre) will not have any impact on the population distribution of Tuen Mun Town Centre as the population therein is not large. In addition, even if there is an increase in the population of L01 (Tuen Mun Town Centre), it will only increase the workload of the DC member concerned but will have</li> </ul>	<p><u>Item (a)</u> This proposal is <b>not accepted</b> because:</p> <p>(i) based on the 2015 original DCCA boundary, the population of L01 (Tuen Mun Town Centre) (20 982) will exceed the statutory permissible upper limit (+26.41%). In order to maintain the population of the DCCA within the statutory permissible range, some buildings in the DCCA must be transferred to the adjacent DCCA; and</p> <p>(ii) the delineation recommendations must be based on objective data of population distribution. Arrangements on district administration matters or community services provided by DC members 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>		
				<p>no impact on the entire Tuen Mun District; and</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>the delineation criteria disregard the overall planning of the area and the wishes of the residents. Delineation of DCCAs should not be decided rigidly on the basis of population quota, but the district as a whole.</li> </ul>	
				(b) The total population of the three DCCAs, namely L15 (Yuet Wu), L16 (Siu Hei) and L17 (Wu King) is 39 406. They should be grouped into two DCCAs.	<p><u>Item (b)</u> This proposal is <b>not accepted</b> because the populations of L15 (Yuet Wu), L16 (Siu Hei) and L17 (Wu King) will fall within the statutory permissible range. According to the established working principles, adjustments to their existing boundaries are not required.</p>
5	L02 – Siu Chi L03 – On Ting L04 – Siu Tsui L05 – Yau Oi South L06 – Yau Oi North	1	-	<p>To ensure local integrity and from a long term perspective, proposes to:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>transfer Siu On Court from L02 (Siu Chi), where the population is higher than the population quota by about 20%, to L03 (On Ting);</li> <li>transfer part of Siu Lun Court from L03 (On Ting) to L04 (Siu Tsui);</li> <li>transfer Tsui Ning Garden from L04 (Siu Tsui) to L06 (Yau Oi North); and</li> </ul>	<p>This proposal is <b>not accepted</b> because the populations of L02 (Siu Chi), L03 (On Ting), L04 (Siu Tsui), L05 (Yau Oi South) and L06 (Yau Oi North) will fall within the statutory permissible range. According to the established working principles, adjustments to their existing boundaries are 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>		
				<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>transfer Oi Ming House and Oi Hei House from L06 (Yau Oi North) to L05 (Yau Oi South).</li> </ul>	
6	L07 – Tsui Hing  L12– So Kwun Wat  L25 – Po Tin  L28 – Yan Tin	1	-	Supports the provisional recommendations.	The supporting view is noted.
7	L12 – So Kwun Wat  L28 – Yan Tin	-	1	Agrees to create new DCCAs in the areas of So Kwun Wat and Yan Tin Estate.	The supporting view is noted.
8	L12 – So Kwun Wat	7	-	(a) One representation supports the provisional recommendations on L14 (Hanford).	<u>Item (a)</u> The supporting view is noted.
	L13 – Sam Shing  L14 – Hanford			(b) Three representations propose to transfer Aegean Coast from L14 (Hanford) to L12 (So Kwun Wat) as Aegean Coast is geographically situated in So Kwun Wat.	<u>Item (b)</u> These proposals are <b>not accepted</b> because according to the proposal made in the representations, the population of L14 (Hanford) (10 095) will be below the statutory permissible lower limit (-39.18%).

<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>(c) One representation proposes to transfer The Bloomsway from L12 (So Kwun Wat) to L14 (Hanford) as the housing estate is geographically closer to L14 (Hanford). If the proposal will result in an insufficient population in L12 (So Kwun Wat), then transfer Aegean Coast from L14 (Hanford) to L12 (So Kwun Wat).</p>	<p><u>Item (c)</u> This proposal is <b>not accepted</b> because if The Bloomsway is transferred from L12 (So Kwun Wat) to L14 (Hanford), the population of L12 (So Kwun Wat) (11 561) will be below the statutory permissible lower limit (-30.35%). If Aegean Coast is also transferred from L14 (Hanford) to L12 (So Kwun Wat), the population of L14 (Hanford) (12 362) will be below the statutory permissible lower limit (-25.53%).</p>
				<p>(d) One representation proposes to transfer four villages (i.e. Tai Lam Chung Tsuen, Luen On San Tsuen, Tai Lam Wong Uk and Tai Lam Wu Uk) from L13 (Sam Shing) to L12 (So Kwun Wat). Reasons are as follows:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• makes the populations of L12 (So Kwun Wat) and L13 (Sam Shing) to be closer to the population quota, which helps improve population distribution;</li> <li>• Siu Lam Tsuen, So Kwun Wat Tsuen and Nim Wan Tsuen in L12 (So Kwun Wat) as well as Tai Lam Chung Tsuen and Luen On San Tsuen in L13 (Sam Shing) are all under Tuen Mun Rural Committee.</li> </ul>	<p><u>Item (d)</u> This proposal is <b>not accepted</b> because there is no sufficient objective information and justification to prove that the proposal made in the representation is obviously better than the provisional recommendations in terms of preserving community identities and local ties.</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>		
				<p>Thus, their residents have similar backgrounds and concerns. The proposal can achieve community integrity and cater for the unique needs of the community;</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• geographically, Tai Lam Chung Tsuen, Luen On San Tsuen, Tai Lam Wong Uk and Tai Lam Wu Uk as well as So Kwun Wat and Siu Lam, are all located in the north of Castle Peak Road – Tai Lam. Therefore, designating Castle Peak Road – Tai Lam as the DCCA boundary can better tie in with the geographical environment and the physical features of the area;</li> <li>• Tai Lam Chung and Siu Lam belonged to the same DCCA in the past. Residents nearby have similar concerns. Hence, the proposal can preserve the original community ties; and</li> <li>• the proposal only involves changes to two existing DCCAs and has no impact on the major housing estates in the area.</li> </ul>	



<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>(e) One representation objects to the provisional recommendations on L12 (So Kwun Wat), L13 (Sam Shing) and L14 (Hanford). To even out the populations of these DCCAs and reduce the impact on L14 (Hanford), as well as to take into consideration the preservation of community integrity and local ties, proposes to:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• retain the area of Tsing Ying Road (i.e. The Bloomsway and Harrow International School Hong Kong) in L14 (Hanford) so that community integrity and local ties can be preserved. The Bloomsway is close to Seaview Garden and Palm Beach in L14 (Hanford). On the contrary, it is separated from the area of Avignon in L12 (So Kwun Wat) by a small hill and Harrow International School Hong Kong, and therefore there is lack of ties; and</li> <li>• transfer Tai Lam Chung and the villages and residential buildings in the area of Tsing Fat Street in L13 (Sam Shing) to L12 (So Kwun Wat). As L12 (So</li> </ul>	<p><u>Item (e)</u> This proposal is <b>not accepted</b> because:</p> <p>(i) there is no sufficient objective information and justification to prove that the proposal made in the representation is obviously better than the provisional recommendations in terms of preserving community identities and local ties; and</p> <p>(ii) the delineation recommendations must be based on objective data of population distribution. Arrangements on district administration matters or community services provided by DC members 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>		
				<p>Kwun Wat) has many villages, transferring the above villages and residential buildings to L12 (So Kwun Wat) will enable the DC member concerned to focus on the village affairs in the area. In addition, as Tai Lam and Siu Lam are close to each other, and both located in the marginal region of the southeastern Tuen Mun, the integration of both places into one DCCA can preserve community integrity and local ties.</p>	
				<p>(f) One representation considers that following the development of the southeastern part of Tuen Mun, the nature of Sam Shing Estate and other low-rise private residential buildings and the rural area in L13 (Sam Shing) are not similar, and proposes to:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• transfer The Bloomsway and Harrow International School Hong Kong from L12 (So Kwun Wat) to L14 (Hanford);</li> <li>• transfer Sam Shing Estate from L13 (Sam Shing) to L14 (Hanford), and Tai Lam Chung to L12 (So Kwun Wat); and</li> <li>• transfer Aegean Coast</li> </ul>	<p><u>Item (f)</u> This proposal is <b>not accepted</b> because the delineation recommendations must be based on the population distribution and relevant local factors. It is inevitable that a DCCA is composed of more than one community. Besides, the proposal made in the representation is not obviously better than the provisional recommendations.</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>		
				from L14 (Hanford) to L13 (Sam Shing). Rename the latter as "Gold Coast".	
9	L25 – Po Tin  L28 – Yan Tin	10	-	<p>(a) Object to the creation of a new DCCA comprising Yan Tin Estate and other villages. Reasons are summarised as follows:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• the provisional recommendations have not taken into account the different needs of residents in the public housing estates and villages;</li> <li>• forming a DCCA solely for Yan Tin Estate can effectively safeguard the interests of residents, preserve community harmony and give appropriate assistance to the residents;</li> <li>• the residents of Yan Tin Estate will jeopardise the tranquil environment of Tze Tin Tsuen;</li> <li>• the residents of Tze Tin Tsuen do not like being in the same DCCA with outsiders;</li> <li>• the delineation of DCCAs should not be carried out only on the basis of population size,</li> </ul>	<p><u>Items (a) to (c)</u> These proposals are <b>not accepted</b> because:</p> <p>(i) upon receipt of the representations, the EAC conducted site visit and noted that Yan Tin Estate and other villages are very close to each other;</p> <p>(ii) the delineation recommendations must be based on the population distribution and relevant local factors. It is inevitable that a DCCA is composed of more than one community;</p> <p>(iii) arrangements on district administration matters or community services provided by DC members are not the relevant factors of consideration for delineation; and</p> <p>(iv) the EACO stipulates that the EAC is responsible for drawing up the provisional recommendations and to consult the public thereafter. During the consultation period, members of the public can express their views on the</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>		
				<p>but also community integrity and identity;</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• switching DCCAs causes confusion to the residents; and</li> <li>• before formulating the provisional recommendations, the EAC did not consult the residents who are now forced to accept them.</li> </ul>	<p>provisional recommendations through different means. The EAC will consider every representation received during the consultation period objectively before making the final recommendations.</p>
				(b) Nine representations suggest Yan Tin Estate forming an independent DCCA.	
				<p>(c) One representation agrees to transfer Hanison Garden, Grand Villa, San Hing Tsuen, Villa Pinada and Yan Tin Estate to L28 (Yan Tin) but suggests that Tze Tin Tsuen be transferred to L25 (Po Tin) because according to the provisional recommendations, the population of L28 (Yan Tin) is slightly higher than the population quota while that of L25 (Po Tin) is lower than the population quota by 7.04%. Transferring Tze Tin Tsuen to L25 (Po Tin) will bring about a more balanced population distribution between L25 (Po Tin) and L28 (Yan Tin). In addition, Tze Tin Tsuen has always belonged to L25 (Po</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>		
				Tin). Minimising changes to the DCCA can maintain its stability and facilitate residents' adoption.	
10	L25 – Po Tin L28 – Yan Tin	1	-	Agrees to the provisional recommendations in principle and suggests transferring Kei Lun Wai from L25 (Po Tin) to L28 (Yan Tin) because Kei Lun Wai is geographically closer to Yan Tin Estate than Po Tin Estate. Besides, this can also facilitate the provision of services by DC members.	This proposal is <b>not accepted</b> because the delineation recommendations must be based on objective data of population distribution. Arrangements on district administration matters or community services provided by DC members are not the relevant factors of consideration.
11	L25 – Po Tin L28 – Yan Tin L29 – Tuen Mun Rural	1	-	Agrees to create a new DCCA in the area of Yan Tin Estate. In order to even out the populations of L25 (Po Tin), L28 (Yan Tin) and L29 (Tuen Mun Rural), proposes to: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• transfer Villa Pinada from L28 (Yan Tin) to L25 (Po Tin); and</li> <li>• transfer the area of Tuen Tsz Wai from L29 (Tuen Mun Rural) to L28 (Yan Tin).</li> </ul>	This proposal is <b>not accepted</b> because the population of L29 (Tuen Mun Rural) will fall within the statutory permissible range. According to the established working principles, adjustment to its existing boundary is not required.
12	L28 – Yan Tin L29 – Tuen Mun Rural L30 – Fu Tai	2	-	(a) One representation proposes to re-delineate the boundaries of L28 (Yan Tin), L29 (Tuen Mun Rural), L30 (Fu Tai) and L31 (Prime View) so that community integrity is preserved, small communities are not isolated and the population distribution of each DCCA	<u>Items (a) and (b)</u> These proposals are <b>not accepted</b> because the populations of L29 (Tuen Mun Rural), L30 (Fu Tai) and L31 (Prime View) will fall within the statutory permissible range. According to the established working principles, adjustments to their existing boundaries are not required.

<i>Item No.</i>	<i>DCCAs</i>	<i>No.*</i>		<i>Representations</i>	<i>EAC's Views</i>
		<i>W</i>	<i>O</i>		
	L31 – Prime View			<p>is more balanced. Details are as follows:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• transfers Napa Valley, Beneville and South Hill Crest from L31 (Prime View) to L30 (Fu Tai);</li> <li>• transfers Botania Villa and Fuk Hang Tsuen from L30 (Fu Tai) to L29 (Tuen Mun Rural); and</li> <li>• transfers Tuen Tsz Wai and Tsing Chuen Wai from L29 (Tuen Mun Rural) to L28 (Yan Tin).</li> </ul>	
				<p>(b) One representation considers that Fu Tai Estate in L30 (Fu Tai) is not closely connected with the rural area in the DCCA. Proposes to transfer the villages of L29 (Tuen Mun Rural) to L28 (Yan Tin) so that L29 (Tuen Mun Rural) has room to absorb the villages of L30 (Fu Tai).</p>	