

**Appendix II - M**

**Yuen Long 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	-	Proposes to establish the Tin Shui Wai DC.	The proposal made in the representation involves the change of administrative district, which does not fall under the purview of the EAC. The EAC has referred this view to the Government for consideration.
2	All DCCAs	1	-	(a) Supports the provisional recommendations on all DCCAs of the Yuen Long District (except items 2(b) to (d) as mentioned below).	<u>Item (a)</u> The supporting view is noted.
				(b) Holds reservation on the provisional recommendations on M02 (Yuen Long Centre), M07 (Nam Ping), M08 (Pek Long) and M09 (Yuen Long Tung Tau).	<u>Item (b)</u> The view is noted.
				(c) Proposes to rename M09 (Yuen Long Tung Tau) as "Tai Kiu & Tung Tau" to avoid causing confusion to people outside the District.	<u>Item (c)</u> This proposal is <b>not accepted</b> because the DCCA name in the provisional recommendations can appropriately reflect the location of the DCCA. Besides, the name proposed in the representation is not obviously better than that in the provisional recommendations.

\* 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>		
				<p>(d) Objects to the provisional recommendations on the transfer of three blocks of Lynwood Court to M22 (Kingswood South). Considers that M22 (Kingswood South) and M27 (Kingswood North) are too far away from each other. Proposes to maintain the original boundary of M22 (Kingswood South) and adopts the following to solve the problem of excessive population in M27 (Kingswood North):</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>transfers Lynwood Court to M26 (Chung Pak) and then transfers Chung Pik House and Chung Shui House of Tin Chung Court from M26 (Chung Pak) to M25 (Chung Wah). If the population of M26 (Chung Pak) will exceed the statutory permissible upper limit after the adjustments, transfers Chung Ki House and Chung Wa House of Tin Chung Court to M25 (Chung Wah).</li> <li>if the population of M26 (Chung Pak) will still exceed the statutory permissible upper limit after the above adjustments, then</li> </ul>	<p><u>Item (d)</u> This proposal is <b>not accepted</b> because the number of affected DCCAs under the proposal made in the representation will be three more than that in the provisional recommendations. The affected population under the proposal will be larger, too.</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>proposes to adjust the boundaries of the following DCCAs concurrently:</p> <p><u>M23 (Shui Oi)</u> includes the original area and Shui Kwok House and Shui Chuen House of Tin Shui Estate.</p> <p><u>M24 (Shui Wah)</u> transfers Shui Kwok House and Shui Chuen House of Tin Shui Estate to M23 (Shui Oi), and absorbs Tin Wah Estate in M25 (Chung Wah).</p> <p><u>M25 (Chung Wah)</u> includes Tin Chung Court. Changes the name of the DCCA to "Tin Chung".</p> <p><u>M26 (Chung Pak)</u> includes Central Park Towers, Lynwood Court of Kingswood Villas and Kingswood Ginza. Changes the name of the DCCA to "Pak Lai".</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>if the above proposals are not feasible, proposes to transfer Blocks 1 to 3 of Lynwood Court together with Kingswood Ginza to M26 (Chung Pak).</li> </ul>	

Item No.	DCCAs	No. *		Representations	EAC's Views
		W	O		
				(e) Although the populations of M28 (Yuet Yan), M29 (Ching King), M30 (Fu Yan), M31 (Yat Chak), M32 (Tin Heng) and M33 (Wang Yat) meet the population requirements, based on the total population of the District, the total number of seats for these DCCAs should be one less than the existing number of elected seats. Taking into account the future developments of Areas 112 and 115 in Tin Shui Wai, proposes to create one elected seat for the above DCCAs in the delineation exercise for the 2023 DC Ordinary Election so as to cater for the community needs of Tin Shui Wai.	<u>Item (e)</u> In drawing up the delineation recommendations, the EAC must strictly adhere to the statutory criteria under the EACO and its working principles. The delineation should be made on the basis of the projected populations, existing DCCA boundaries and relevant local factors. The EAC will continue to adhere to the above in future delineation exercises.
3	M01 – Fung Nin  M02 – Yuen Long Centre  M03 – Fung Cheung  M04 – Yuen Lung	1	-	(a) Considers that Grand YOHO should be transferred from M10 (Shap Pat Heung North) to M04 (Yuen Lung) so that same type of residential buildings can be put in the same DCCA to comply with the statutory criterion regarding the preservation of community identities. In addition, proposes to transfer the area in the north of Fung Yau Street North in M04 (Yuen Lung) to M03 (Fung Cheung) because:	<u>Items (a) to (d)</u> These proposals are <b>not accepted</b> because:  (i) the number of affected DCCAs under the proposal made in the representation will be six more than that in the provisional recommendations. The affected populations under the proposal will be larger, too; and  (ii) the delineation recommendations must be based on objective

<i>Item No.</i>	<i>DCCAs</i>	<i>No. *</i>		<i>Representations</i>	<i>EAC's Views</i>
		<i>W</i>	<i>O</i>		
	M07 – Nam Ping  M08 – Pek Long  M09 – Yuen Long Tung Tau  M10 – Shap Pat Heung North  M29 – Ching King  M31 – Yat Chak  M32 – Tin Heng  M33 – Wang Yat			<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• in the delineation exercise for the 2015 DC Ordinary Election, the construction of Grand YOHO had not yet completed. Hence, the delineation of the area concerned would not have any impact on the DCCA. However, Grand YOHO is now completed for intake; and</li> <li>• Grand YOHO, YOHO Town and YOHO Midtown are under the same residential project of the same developer. The latter two are now in M04 (Yuen Lung) which has a relatively low population. Therefore, Grand YOHO should also be transferred to M04 (Yuen Lung).</li> </ul>	data of population distribution. Developer of an estate and land use planning of an area are not the relevant factors of consideration.
				(b) After the proposed adjustments in item 3(a), to transfer both the buildings, such as The Parcville, separated by Tung Tau Industrial Area and Kwan Lok Sun Tsuen to M10 (Shap Pat Heung North) so as to ease the problem of relatively high populations in M08 (Pek Long) and M02 (Yuen Long Centre).	

<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) Points out that many DCCAs in Tin Shui Wai, i.e. M29 (Ching King), M31 (Yat Chak), M32 (Tin Heng), M33 (Wang Yat), etc., have a relatively high population. They are more in need of a new DCCA to improve the problem of excessive population than M02 (Yuen Long Centre), M07 (Nam Ping) and M08 (Pek Long). Therefore, the EAC should create a new DCCA at the above locations in Tin Shui Wai.</p>	
				<p>(d) if a new DCCA will be created at the location of Shap Pat Heung, the EAC should also consider transferring part of the area in the south of Ma Tong Road in M01 (Fung Nin) to other DCCAs in Shap Pat Heung. Reasons are as follows:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• the boundary of M01 (Fung Nin) has never stretched beyond Ma Tong Road from 1994 to 2011;</li> <li>• due to the increase of population in Shap Pat Heung, M01 (Fung Nin) has absorbed part of the area in the south of Ma Tong Road since 2011. However, according to the outline zoning plan,</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>the areas in the south and north of Ma Tong Road are clearly having different planning intentions. While the south of Ma Tong Road is mainly zoned for “Village Type Development”, the north of Ma Tong Road is zoned for high-density residential (Group A) buildings; and</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• after the above adjustments, M01 (Fung Nin) and M03 (Fung Cheung) will have room to absorb part of the area in the south of Yuen Long Main Road in M02 (Yuen Long Centre) in order to further ease the situation of having a relatively high population in M02 (Yuen Long Centre).</li> </ul>	
4	<p>M03 – Fung Cheung</p> <p>M04 – Yuen Lung</p> <p>M10 – Shap Pat Heung North</p>	1	-	<p>Proposes to transfer Grand YOHO to M04 (Yuen Lung) and transfer the single buildings outside the area of the YOHO Mall from M04 (Yuen Lung) to M03 (Fung Cheung).</p>	<p>This proposal is <b>not accepted</b> because the number of affected DCCAs under the proposal made in the representation will be one more than that in the provisional recommendations. The affected population under the proposal will be larger, too.</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>		
5	M04 – Yuen Lung  M10 – Shap Pat Heung North  M11 – Shap Pat Heung East  M37 – Kam Tin	1	-	<p>Objects to the provisional recommendations on the new DCCA M10 (Shap Pat Heung North). Proposes to:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>merge Long Shin Estate, Shek Tong Tsuen and Tung Shing Lei in M11 (Shap Pat Heung East) with Park YOHO and Riva in M37 (Kam Tin) to form a new DCCA; and</li> <li>transfer Grand YOHO to M04 (Yuen Lung) so as to group YOHO Town, YOHO Midtown and Sun Yuen Long Centre, which are similar by nature and connected to one another, into the same DCCA in order to highlight the community integrity.</li> </ul> <p>The representation considers that the above proposal can maintain the status of M11 (Shap Pat Heung East) and M37 (Kam Tin) for comprising mainly indigenous inhabitants and inhabitants of villages, preserving community integrity, and avoiding to split M11 (Shap Pat Heung East) into two DCCAs. It can also preserve the community ties between Grand YOHO and YOHO Town, YOHO Midtown and Sun Yuen Long Centre, which are connected by footbridge.</p>	<p>This proposal is <b>not accepted</b> because:</p> <p>(i) according to the proposal made in the representation, the respective populations of the new DCCA and M37 (Kam Tin) will be below the statutory permissible lower limit, which are:</p> <p>New DCCA: 12 214, -26.42%</p> <p>M37: 12 393, -25.34%; and</p> <p>(ii) the number of affected DCCAs under the proposal made in the representation will be one more than that in the provisional recommendations. The affected population under the proposal will be larger, too.</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>		
6	M02 – Yuen Long Centre M04 – Yuen Lung M08 – Pek Long M09 – Yuen Long Tung Tau	1	-	<p>Objects to the provisional recommendations on the transfer of the private buildings originally belong to M08 (Pek Long) to M09 (Yuen Long Tung Tau) because the area is a residential area and there is no change on its population and structure. Proposes to:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>transfer only the area around Yuen Long On Ning Road in M02 (Yuen Long Centre) to the new DCCA M09 (Yuen Long Tung Tau); or</li> <li>split M04 (Yuen Lung) into two DCCAs.</li> </ul>	<p>This proposal is <b>not accepted</b> because:</p> <p>(i) the population quota for the 2019 DC Ordinary Election is 16 599, and the statutory permissible range is between 12 449 and 20 749. The population of M04 (Yuen Lung) is 13 761, which is not sufficient for the creation of two DCCAs; and</p> <p>(ii) according to the proposal made in the representation, the population of M09 (Yuen Long Tung Tau) will be about 7 725 only, which will be below the statutory permissible lower limit (-53.46%).</p>
7	M08 – Pek Long M09 – Yuen Long Tung Tau	-	1	Supports the provisional recommendations.	The supporting view is noted.
8	M11 – Shap Pat Heung East M12 – Shap Pat Heung West	2	-	Point out that the population of M11 (Shap Pat Heung East) will be less than that of M12 (Shap Pat Heung West) by about 5 600, and no large housing estates will be completed in M11 (Shap Pat Heung East). On the contrary, there will be population intakes arising from the completion of a large number of small houses in M12	This proposal is <b>not accepted</b> because the affected area under the proposal made in the representations will be larger than that in the provisional recommendations. The affected population will be larger, too.

<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>(Shap Pat Heung West) in a short period of time so there will be a continuous increase of the population in the DCCA. In view of the above, propose to transfer Hung Tso Tin Tsuen, Shui Tsiu Lo Wai and Nam Hang Tsuen which belong to the same clan in M12 (Shap Pat Heung West) to M11 (Shap Pat Heung East).</p> <p>The representations consider that the proposal has the following advantages:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• balances the populations of M11 (Shap Pat Heung East) and M12 (Shap Pat Heung West);</li> <li>• facilitates management and handling of residents' complaints;</li> <li>• will not break the local ties; and</li> <li>• ties in with the rural development in Yuen Long in future.</li> </ul>	
9	<p>M13 – Ping Shan South</p> <p>M14 – Hung Fuk</p> <p>M16 – Ping Shan Central</p>	1	-	<p>Considers that the provisional recommendations of putting Hung Fuk Estate alone in the new DCCA M14 (Hung Fuk) has overestimated the population intake in Hung Fuk Estate next year. Proposes to transfer part of the area in the adjacent M13 (Ping Shan South) to M14 (Hung Fuk) so as to balance the populations of M13 (Ping Shan South), M14</p>	<p>This proposal is <b>not accepted</b> because:</p> <p>(i) the affected area under the proposal made in the representation will be larger than that in the provisional recommendations. The affected population will be larger, too; and</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>		
				(Hung Fuk) and M16 (Ping Shan Central).	(ii) the projected population figures as at 30 June 2019 are used for the delineation exercise for the 2019 DC Ordinary Election. As in the past, the projected population figures are provided by the AHSg, set up specially for the purpose of the delineation exercise under the Working Group on Population Distribution Projection in the PlanD. The current population distribution projections are derived by using scientific and systematic methodology based on the results of the 2016 population by-census carried out by the C&SD as well as the up-to-date official data kept by the relevant government departments. Members of the AHSg are all professional departments which all along have been responsible for territory-wide population census and projections on population distribution. They possess the most up-to-date information on the population and land and housing development, and the data are highly-accepted generally. The EAC has all along relied on the statistical figures provided by the AHSg, which are the only

<i>Item No.</i>	<i>DCCAs</i>	<i>No. *</i>		<i>Representations</i>	<i>EAC's Views</i>
		<i>W</i>	<i>O</i>		
					data available for the delineation exercise.
10	M14 – Hung Fuk  M16 – Ping Shan Central	2	-	<p>Object to the provisional recommendations on the transfer of the permitted burial ground (No. YL54) for the indigenous inhabitants in Shek Po Tsuen, Fui Sha Wai, Hung Uk Tsuen and Kiu Tau Wai of Ping Shan in M16 (Ping Shan Central) to M14 (Hung Fuk). Reasons are as follows:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• from a historical perspective, the burial ground has all along been within the village boundaries of Hung Uk Tsuen in M16 (Ping Shan Central). From the aspects of historical connection, networking, culture and lifestyle, the burial ground has an inseparable relationship with the village;</li> <li>• from a humanistic perspective, Hung Fuk Estate is a newly completed public housing estate while the burial ground has been the funeral area for the indigenous inhabitants of Hung Uk Tsuen for hundred years. There is no relationship between the burial ground and the residents of Hung Fuk Estate. To transfer the burial ground for indigenous inhabitants to M14 (Hung Fuk) will increase the</li> </ul>	These representations are <b>accepted</b> . As confirmed with the LandsD, the area mentioned by the representations is the burial ground of Shek Po Tsuen, Fui Sha Wai, Hung Uk Tsuen and Kiu Tau Wai in M16 (Ping Shan Central). In view of this, the EAC agrees to make a technical adjustment to the boundaries of the DCCAs concerned to transfer the burial ground (No. YL54) to M16 (Ping Shan Central) according to the proposal made in the representations. The adjustment does not involve any population.

<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>chance of conflicts between the indigenous inhabitants and residents of the public housing estate; and</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>as for the geographical setting, Hung Tin Road has eight traffic lanes (dual carriageway with traffic southbound and northbound for both flyover and at-grade road). Hung Tin Road happens to separate Hung Uk Tsuen from Hung Fuk Estate, where residents and villagers live in two separate areas with different cultures. If the burial ground is transferred to another DCCA in future, residents of that DCCA may put forth development and zoning proposals or even request removing or relocating the burial ground. This will seriously jeopardise and deprive the traditional rights and interests of the indigenous inhabitants of Hung Uk Tsuen.</li> </ul>	
11	M14 – Hung Fuk  M16 – Ping Shan Central  M17 – Shing Yan	1	-	<p>Objects to the provisional recommendations on the new DCCA M17 (Shing Yan) since Tin Shui Court is included in “Tin Shui Wai Outline Zoning Plan” while Ping Yan Court is not. The delineation of M17 (Shing Yan) is therefore unable to preserve the local ties of the places concerned and will impede the infrastructure planning of Tin Shui Wai or</p>	<p>These proposal are <b>accepted</b> because:</p> <p>(i) based on the 2015 original DCCA boundary, the population of M18 (Tin Shing) (21 055) will exceed the statutory permissible upper limit (+26.84%);</p> <p>(ii) according to the proposal,</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>		
	M18 – Tin Shing M31 – Yat Chak M32 – Tin Heng M33 – Wang Yat			<p>Ping Shan, and the future Hung Shui Kiu New Development Area, etc. Proposes to:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>maintain the original boundary of M18 (Tin Shing); and</li> <li>include Ping Yan Court and Hung Fuk Estate in the same DCCA as they are geographically close and both under Ping Shan and the future Hung Shui Kiu New Development Area. Changes the name of the DCCA to “Hung Yan”.</li> <li>in addition, as the populations of M31 (Yat Chak) and M32 (Tin Heng) are close to the statutory permissible upper limit, create a new DCCA in the relevant areas. Details are as follows:   <u>New DCCA “Tin Heng”</u> includes most of Tin Heng Estate.   <u>M31 (Yat Chak)</u> includes Tin Yat Estate and part of Tin Chak Estate.   <u>M32 (Tin Heng)</u> includes a small part of Tin Heng Estate and half of Tin Chak Estate. Changes the name of the DCCA to “Heng Chak”.</li> </ul> <p>or</p>	<p>the population of the DCCA “Hung Yan” (21 017) (area including Ping Yan Court, Hung Fuk Estate as well as Kiu Tau Wai, Shek Po Tsuen and Hung Uk Tsuen in between) will exceed the statutory permissible upper limit (+26.62%);</p> <p>(iii) the populations of M31 (Yat Chak), M32 (Tin Heng) and M33 (Wang Yat) will fall within the statutory permissible range. According to the established working principles, adjustments to their existing boundaries are not required; and</p> <p>(iv) the delineation recommendations must be based on objective data of the population distribution. Local development in future is not the relevant factor 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>taking into account the local ties, split M31 (Yat Chak), M32 (Tin Heng) and M33 (Wang Yat) into four DCCAs. Details are as follows:   <u>New DCCA</u>  includes most of Tin Heng Estate.   <u>M31 (Yat Chak)</u>  includes Tin Yat Estate.   <u>M32 (Tin Heng)</u>  includes a small part of Tin Heng Estate and Tin Chak Estate.   <u>M33 (Wang Yat)</u>  includes Grandeur Terrace.</li> </ul>	
12	M17 – Shing Yan  M18 – Tin Shing	22	1	Support the provisional recommendations.	The supporting view is noted.
13	M16 – Ping Shan Central  M17 – Shing Yan  M18 – Tin Shing	1279 <sup>^</sup>	3	(a) Object to splitting Tin Shing Court into M18 (Tin Shing) and M17 (Shing Yan) and request retaining the whole Tin Shing Court in M18 (Tin Shing). Reasons are summarised as follows: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Tin Shing Court has been occupied for 18</li> </ul>	<u>Item (a)</u> This proposal is <b>not accepted</b> . In each DC delineation exercise, the EAC will review the boundaries of the DCCAs which were allowed to deviate from the permissible range in the past. If there are changes in the objective circumstances of those DCCAs allowed to depart from the permissible

<sup>^</sup> Of which, 1 272 are template letters and one representation contains 1 756 signatures from the public.

<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>years and its owners' corporation ("OC") has been established for more than 10 years. The housing estate has become an entity with its own community identities and local ties. Splitting Tin Shing Court into two DCCAs will cause confusion to the residents, create division and lead to conflicts and arguments. This will affect the OC's management, waste local resources and increase the administrative burden of the housing estate;</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• one DC member in M18 (Tin Shing) is enough in terms of the provision of community services and resources. There is no need to increase the number of elected seats in the area. The resources should be deployed to meet the needs of other DCCAs;</li> <li>• retaining the whole of Tin Shing Court in the same DCCA will allow the DC member to play the role as a bridge between residents and the Government;</li> <li>• Ping Yan Court should</li> </ul>	<p>range in the past, such as the addition of new seats within the administrative districts or there is room for adjustment in the adjacent DCCAs, the EAC will appropriately adjust their boundaries in light of the actual situations. Only under special circumstances, having regard to the community identities, traditional close local ties or unique geographical environment, consider it necessary to depart from strict adherence to the requirement of the statutory permissible range, the EAC will propose the population of a DCCA be allowed to depart from the permissible range according to the statutory criteria.</p> <p>Given the statutory permissible upper limit, it is not uncommon to divide a large-scale public or private housing estate into different DCCAs. Actually, such situation happened in the past DC delineation exercises. In 2015, the population of M18 (Tin Shing) exceeded the statutory permissible upper limit, however, having considered that there was no new DCCA and no suitable option for adjustments, the EAC allowed the population of M18 (Tin Shing) to depart from the statutory permissible range.</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>have a dedicated DC member who will be responsible for helping residents learn about and adapt to the community life; and</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>it is generally regarded that West Rail Tin Shui Wai Station divides Tin Shui Wai in the north from Yuen Long in the south. As M17 (Shing Yan) straddles both the northern and southern areas, residents of Ping Yan Court will not be able to identify whether they are residents of Tin Shui Wai or Yuen Long.</li> </ul>	<p>For the present delineation exercise, taking into account that the new DCCA M17 (Shing Yan) has enough room to absorb part of the population of adjacent M18 (Tin Shing) to solve the latter's problem of having a population in excess of the statutory permissible upper limit, the EAC proposed to transfer five blocks of buildings in M18 (Tin Shing) to M17 (Shing Yan).</p> <p>Besides, according to the proposal made in the representations, the populations of both M17 (Shing Yan) and M18 (Tin Shing) will deviate from the statutory permissible range, which are:</p> <p>M17: 6 126, -63.09% M18: 21 055, +26.84%</p> <p>Regarding the other issues as mentioned in the representations, the delineation recommendations must be based on objective data of the population distribution. Arrangements on district administration matters or community services provided by DC members are not the relevant factors of consideration.</p>
				(b) One representation states that the population of M18 (Tin Shing) has always exceeded the statutory permissible upper limit.	<p><u>Item (b)</u> This proposal is <b>not accepted</b> because based on the 2015 original DCCA boundary, the population of M18 (Tin Shing)</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>		
				To avoid splitting Tin Shing Court, proposes to put the whole Tin Shing Court and Ping Yan Court in M18 (Tin Shing) so that the DC member concerned could serve the residents of both Tin Shing Court and Ping Yan Court.	(21 055) has exceeded the statutory permissible upper limit (+26.84%). Delineating Ping Yan Court to M18 (Tin Shing) will make the population of the DCCA further exceed from the statutory permissible upper limit.
				(c) One representation states that the details of the provisional recommendations have been made known to a political party which has started distributing promotional leaflets in the area of the new DCCA before the provisional recommendations were made public. The representation queries the source of information of that political party.	<u>Item (c)</u> Throughout the whole process of drawing up the provisional recommendations, confidentiality is preserved, including the consultation with the DOs and communication with other working partners. Before the provisional recommendations are made public, the EAC would not consult any members of the local community, nor would it disclose any details of the delineation to any organisations or individuals beyond its working partners. The EAC believes that all parties taking part in the exercise will abide by the principle of confidentiality and will not divulge the information to any other parties. Follow-up actions would be taken seriously if the EAC receives any complaint supported by substantive evidence.
				(d) One representation proposes to transfer the villages in the area of Kiu Tau Wai in M16 (Ping Shan	<u>Item (d)</u> This proposal is <b>not accepted</b> because according to the proposal, the population of

<i>Item No.</i>	<i>DCCAs</i>	<i>No. *</i>		<i>Representations</i>	<i>EAC's Views</i>
		<i>W</i>	<i>O</i>		
				Central) to M17 (Shing Yan) so as to preserve the ties between M17 (Shing Yan) and its surrounding areas.	M17 (Shing Yan) (6 484) will be below the statutory permissible lower limit (-60.94%).
14	M19 – Tin Yiu M20 – Yiu Yau M21 – Tsz Yau	1	-	In order to balance the populations of the DCCAs and for the sake of long-term management of the housing estates, as well as to allow the public to identify the geographical locations of M19 (Tin Yiu), M20 (Yiu Yau) and M21 (Tsz Yau) more easily, proposes to: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• transfer Yau Tai House of Tin Yau Court in M20 (Yiu Yau) to M21 (Tsz Yau) and change the name of the DCCA to “Tin Yiu North”; and</li> <li>• transfer Yiu Lung House of Tin Yiu Estate in M19 (Tin Yiu) to M20 (Yiu Yau) and change the name of the DCCA to “Tin Yiu South”.</li> </ul>	This proposal is <b>not accepted</b> because the populations of M19 (Tin Yiu), M20 (Yiu Yau) and M21 (Tsz Yau) will fall within the statutory permissible range. According to the established working principles, adjustments to their existing boundaries are not required.
15	M22 – Kingswood South M27 – Kingswood North	884 <sup>#</sup>	-	Object to the provisional recommendations on the transfer of Blocks 1 to 3 of Lynwood Court and Fortune Kingswood to M22 (Kingswood South). Request maintaining the original boundaries of M22 (Kingswood South) and M27 (Kingswood North). Reasons are summarised as follows:	This proposal is <b>accepted</b> . In reviewing the boundaries of the DCCAs, it is a statutory requirement that the EAC has to examine the existing boundaries of DCCAs on the basis of the population of individual DCCAs in the year in which the relevant election would be held, and appropriately adjust the

<sup>#</sup> Of which, 873 are template letters.

<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>the environments and populations of the housing estates in M22 (Kingswood South) and M27 (Kingswood North) basically do not have much changes. Since the residents started to move-in in the 1990s, these two DCCAs have become two independent and inseparable communities of their own. The provisional recommendations will break the community integrities of the housing estates in M22 (Kingswood South) and M27 (Kingswood North);</li> <li>since 1999, all buildings of the housing estates in M22 (Kingswood South) and M27 (Kingswood North) have been delineated in their respective DCCAs;</li> <li>Lynwood Court is a unified and inseparable housing estate. Each block has ties with one another;</li> <li>in order to balance the populations of the DCCAs, the EAC has adopted an impersonalised approach failing to assess the actual environment and ignoring the interests of the residents. The EAC should reduce the inconvenience caused to the residents arising from boundary adjustments;</li> </ul>	<p>boundaries of those DCCAs with projected population exceeding the permissible upper or lower limits with a view to ensuring that their projected populations will fall within the statutory permissible range.</p> <p>In the 2015 DC delineation exercise, the EAC's provisional recommendations proposed to allow the population of M27 (Kingswood North) (23 223) to exceed the statutory permissible upper limit (+36.90%). During the then public consultation period, the EAC received a number of representations expressing that the EAC should adjust the boundaries of the DCCA or create a new DCCA in the area concerned in accordance with the statutory criteria. However, taking into account the community integrity and geographical factors, the EAC considered that as no apparently acceptable option was given, it did not accept the views made in the representations at that time.</p> <p>In drawing up the provisional recommendations in the present delineation exercise, in response to the representations received in the last exercise as mentioned above, the EAC reviewed the situation in M27 (Kingswood North) afresh. Having considered that</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>• Sherwood Court, Chestwood Court, Locwood Court in M22 (Kingswood South) are geographically very far away from Maywood Court, Lynwood Court, Kenswood Court in M27 (Kingswood North). It takes approximately 20 minutes of walking. Besides, they are separated by the large Tin Shui Wai Park. It takes 30 minutes for the residents of Blocks 1 to 3 of Lynwood Court in M27 (Kingswood North) to get to the polling station in M22 (Kingswood South). This will reduce residents' desire to vote significantly;</li> <li>• Lynwood Court of Kingswood Villas comprises 10 blocks of residential properties and 416 parking spaces. In accordance with the Deed of Mutual Covenant of the housing estate, each block should have two representatives to participate in the work of the owners' committee. Therefore, each block has ties with one another. In addition, splitting a housing estate that only has 10 blocks of residential buildings into two different DCCAs will not only cause confusion to the administration and management of the housing</li> </ul>	<p>community integrity is not the sole and absolute factor of consideration and the buildings in M27 (Kingswood North) and M22 (Kingswood South) are all under Kingswood Villa, the EAC proposed to transfer some buildings in M27 (Kingswood North) to M22 (Kingswood South) so that the population of M27 (Kingswood North) will fall within the statutory permissible range.</p> <p>During the present public consultation period, the EAC received a large number of representations stating that M22 (Kingswood South) and M27 (Kingswood North) are separated by the large Tin Shui Wai Park. After site visit, the EAC notes that the area of Tin Shui Wai Park is rather large separating M22 (Kingswood South) and M27 (Kingswood North) into two independent DCCAs. After careful consideration of the extent of geographical barriers and in the absence of other feasible alternatives, the EAC agrees to the proposal made in the representations to keep the original boundaries of M22 (Kingswood South) and M27 (Kingswood North) unchanged, and allow the population of M27 (Kingswood North) (22 036) to exceed the statutory permissible upper limit (+32.75%).</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>estate, but also to the residents who will find it hard to reflect their views on livelihood matters to their respective DC members;</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>the EAC cannot adjust the DCCA boundaries solely for strict compliance with the statutory permissible range without taking heed of the demands of the residents in the southern and northern DCCAs of Kingswood Villas in respect of the issues on traffic, park and leisure facilities in their respective DCCAs, e.g. currently they have different bus and light rail routes;</li> <li>the transfer of Blocks 1 to 3 of Lynwood Court in M27 (Kingswood North) to M22 (Kingswood South) will cause confusion to the administration and management of the housing estate and local residents as well as divide the residents. This will be unfavourable to the development of a harmonious community and will make it difficult for the residents to identify their respective DC members. As a result, the residents' wishes cannot be properly reflected to the DC;</li> <li>there are only around 2 000 units in Lynwood Court.</li> </ul>	<p>According to the proposal made in the representations, the respective populations of M22 (Kingswood South) and M27 (Kingswood North) are:</p> <p>M22: 16 712, +0.68% M27: 22 036, +32.75%</p> <p>Regarding the other issues as mentioned in the representations, the delineation recommendations must be based on objective data of the 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>If they are served by two DC members, it will result in a waste of resources. In addition, when there are conflicts, the DC member of M22 (Kingswood South) will inevitably first take care of the interests of the residents of Sherwood Court, Chestwood Court and Locwood Court at the expense of the needs of the minority group of residents in Blocks 1 to 3 of Lynwood Court.</p> <p>Furthermore, if the elected DC members of M22 (Kingswood South) and M27 (Kingswood North) have different political stances or ideas, it will inevitably lead to polarisation of Lynwood Court and bring the residents into a political dilemma; and</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• query that the provisional recommendations may have political consideration and criticise that compared with the DC members, tasking the EAC to deal with the delineation exercise is like “laymen regulating professionals”.</li> </ul>	
16	M22 – Kingswood South  M26 – Chung Pak	1	-	Objects to the transfer of Blocks 1 to 3 of Lynwood Court to M22 (Kingswood South) which are separated by Tin Shui Wai Park. Considers that the population of M27	Please see item 15.

<i>Item No.</i>	<i>DCCAs</i>	<i>No. *</i>		<i>Representations</i>	<i>EAC's Views</i>
		<i>W</i>	<i>O</i>		
	M27 – Kingswood North			(Kingswood North) should be allowed to exceed the statutory permissible upper limit. If there is a need for re-delineation, proposes to transfer Blocks 1 to 3 of Lynwood Court to M26 (Chung Pak) which has a certain number of private housing estates.	
17	M22 – Kingswood South M23 – Shui Oi M24 – Shui Wah M25 – Chung Wah M26 – Chung Pak M27 – Kingswood North	2	-	<p>Point out that a number of public and private residential buildings have been completed one by one in Tin Shui Wai and the populations of the relevant residential projects after completion may not match with the figures in the delineation exercise. Besides, the EAC's working principle of giving priority to that with the least adjustments would not solve the problem of splitting residential estates but would further divide the DCCAs.</p> <p>One representation objects to the provisional recommendations on the transfer of three blocks of Lynwood Court to M22 (Kingswood South) and considers that M22 (Kingswood South) is separated from M27 (Kingswood North) by the large Tin Shui Wai Park. The representation proposes to re-delineate the boundaries of the following DCCAs and change their names:</p>	<p>This proposals is <b>not accepted</b> because:</p> <p>(i) in drawing up the delineation recommendations, the EAC must strictly adhere to the statutory criteria under the EACO and its working principles. The delineation should be made on the basis of the projected populations, existing DCCA boundaries and relevant local factors. The EAC will continue to adhere to the above in future delineation exercises.</p> <p>(ii) the number of affected DCCAs under the proposal made in the representations will be four more than that in the provisional recommendations. The affected population under the proposal will be larger, too.</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><u>M22 (Kingswood South)</u> includes Tin Oi Court, Locwood Court and Sherwood Court.</p> <p><u>M23 (Shui Oi)</u> includes most part of Tin Shui Estate. Changes the name of the DCCA to "Tin Shui".</p> <p>Another representation specifically proposes to transfer Shui Kwok House and Shui Chuen House of Tin Shui Estate in M24 (Shui Wah) to M23 (Shui Oi).</p> <p><u>M24 (Shui Wah)</u> includes Tin Wah Estate and a small part of the buildings of Tin Shui Estate.</p> <p><u>M25 (Chung Wah)</u> includes Tin Chung Court. Changes the name of the DCCA to "Tin Chung".</p> <p><u>M26 (Chung Pak)</u> includes Lynwood Court, Chestwood Court, Central Park Towers, Central Park Towers II, Harbour Plaza Resort City and Tin Shui Wai Park. Changes the name of the DCCA to "Ga Pak" or "Kingswood Central".</p> <p><u>M27 (Kingswood North)</u> includes Maywood Court and Kenswood Court.</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>		
18	M23 – Shui Oi  M24 – Shui Wah	1	-	<p>Proposes to transfer Shui Sum House of Tin Shui Estate in M23 (Shui Oi) to M24 (Shui Wah) because:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• the polling station at T.W.G.Hs. Yiu Dak Chi Memorial Primary School in M24 (Shui Wah) is more convenient to electors and will raise their desire to vote; and</li> <li>• the population distribution in M23 (Shui Oi) and M24 (Shui Wah) is unjust. While there are nine buildings in M23 (Shui Oi), there are only seven buildings in M24 (Shui Wah).</li> </ul>	<p>This proposal is <b>not accepted</b> because:</p> <p>(i) the populations of M23 (Shui Oi) and M24 (Shui Wah) will fall within the statutory permissible range. According to the established working principles, adjustments to their existing boundaries are not required; and</p> <p>(ii) the delineation recommendations must be based on objective data of the population distribution. Arrangement on polling stations is not the relevant factor of consideration. The EAC has referred this view to the REO for consideration.</p>
19	M35 – Fairview Park  M36 – San Tin  M38 – Pat Heung North  M39 – Pat Heung South	-	1	<p>States that the boundaries of two sets of DCCAs, namely M35 (Fairview Park) and M36 (San Tin), as well as M38 (Pat Heung North) and M39 (Pat Heung South), are undesirable because both have a piece of farmland sticking out.</p>	<p>This representation is <b>not accepted</b> because the delineation of these two sets of DCCAs is based on their boundaries as Existing Villages. The area between M35 (Fairview Park) and M36 (San Tin) involves the Existing Village of Wo Shang Wai while that between M38 (Pat Heung North) and M39 (Pat Heung South) involves the Existing Village of Ng Ka Tsuen.</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>		
20	M36 – San Tin  M37 – Kam Tin	2 <sup>%</sup>	-	<p>Object to the transfer of Mo Fan Heung in M37 (Kam Tin) to M36 (San Tin). Request retaining Mo Fan Heung in M37 (Kam Tin). Reasons are as follows:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Mo Fan Heung is one of the villages under the purview of the Kam Tin Rural Committee. It does not have any regular ties with San Tin;</li> <li>• Mo Fan Heung, Wah Shing Tsuen, Fung Kat Heung and Wing Kei Tsuen in Kam Tin have formed the “Four Villages Association” since 1973 to work for the shared interests of the four villages. If Mo Fan Heung is transferred from Kam Tin to M36 (San Tin), it is worried that the elected DC member will put more efforts for the interests of San Tin, especially for the minor works in the area. Besides, community problems may also be politicised;</li> <li>• since the establishment of the DC, the six rural committees of Yuen Long have had their respective DCCAs and each rural committee has its own village boundary. There</li> </ul>	<p>This proposal is <b>accepted</b>. In accordance with the EACO, apart from taking into account the projected population, the EAC must also have regard to the other statutory factors, including community identities, preservation of local ties and physical features (such as the size, shape, accessibility and development) of the area concerned.</p> <p>In drawing up the provisional recommendations, the EAC noted that Mo Fan Heung is geographically contiguous to M36 (San Tin). Therefore, the EAC proposed to transfer Mo Fan Heung from M37 (Kam Tin) to M36 (San Tin) so that the population of M37 (Kam Tin) will fall within the statutory permissible range.</p> <p>Taking into account the fact provided by the representations that Mo Fan Heung is under the purview of the Kam Tin Rural Committee and they have traditional village ties, the EAC considers not appropriate to transfer the village to a DCCA which is under the purview of another rural committee. Given there is no other feasible alternative option, the EAC agrees to retain Mo Fan Heung in M37 (Kam Tin) and allows the population of M37 (Kam</p>

<sup>%</sup> Of which, one representation contains 164 signatures from the public.

<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>has not been a cross-village representation among them. Historically, Mo Fan Heung has been included in Kam Tin;</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Mo Fan Heung has always belonged to Kam Tin. Mo Fan Heung Residents Association has always maintained close ties with the Kam Tin Rural Committee and the elected DC member of M37 (Kam Tin) to make collaborative efforts in improving the environment of the area and helping villagers to solve a lot of local problems in the area. If the matters of Mo Fan Heung are handled by a DC member outside Kam Tin, different views or unnecessary arguments and conflicts may easily arise when handling rural affairs and the residents' interests may even be undermined;</li> <li>• current registered address of the residents concerned is Kam Tin Mo Fan Heung. They may be required to change their registered address due to the change of their DCCA, which will cause inconvenience to them;</li> <li>• most of the eligible electors of Mo Fan Heung are elderlies who are unable to go to M36 (San Tin) to vote</li> </ul>	<p>Tin) to slightly exceed the statutory permissible upper limit.</p> <p>According to the proposal made in the representations, the respective populations of M36 (San Tin) and M37 (Kam Tin) are:</p> <p>M36: 19 617, +18.18% M37: 20 792, +25.26%</p> <p>Regarding the other issues as mentioned in the representations, the delineation recommendations must be based on objective data of the 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>in the election; and</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>as for geographical consideration, Mo Fan Heung, Wah Shing Tsuen and Fung Kat Heung are all located in the east of San Tin Highway. Incoming traffic to the villages has to pass through Fung Kat Heung Road. The geographical connection among the villages has greatly facilitated their frequent contacts and built up an integrated village community. If Mo Fan Heung is detached from the DCCA "Kam Tin", it will not only break the community integrity, but also greatly undermine the local ties among the areas.</li> </ul>	
21	<p>M38 – Pat Heung North</p> <p>M39 – Pat Heung South</p>	3	-	<p>Support the transfer of Ng Ka Tsuen to M38 (Pat Heung North) because:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>it helps balance the ever-increasing population of M39 (Pat Heung South); and</li> <li>the provisional recommendations can run through the southern and northern parts of Pat Heung, enabling the DC to collect more accurately views of the residents concerned on the policies, e.g. transport that will affect the whole of Pat Heung.</li> </ul>	The supporting view is noted.

Item No.	DCCAs	No. *		Representations	EAC's Views
		W	O		
22	M38 – Pat Heung North  M39 – Pat Heung South	2	-	<p>Object to the transfer of Ng Ka Tsuen and Kong Ha Wai to M38 (Pat Heung North) because:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• M38 (Pat Heung North) and M39 (Pat Heung South) have all along been clearly delineated by Kam Tin River. The provisional recommendations will cause confusion to the villagers of Ng Ka Tsuen and Kong Ha Wai in M38 (Pat Heung North) and reduce their desire to vote;</li> <li>• the entire section of Kam Sheung Road running from Ng Ka Tsuen to Sheung Tsuen is the main road in Pat Heung South. Village representatives and villagers in the area along Kam Sheung Road running from Ng Ka Tsuen to Sheung Tsuen unanimously request widening Kam Sheung Road. If Ng Ka Tsuen is transferred to M38 (Pat Heung North), it will weaken their grounds for the request;</li> <li>• the population of M39 (Pat Heung South) in 2019 is 20 545, which still will not exceed the statutory limits (i.e. within <math>\pm 25\%</math> deviation from the population quota of 16 599);</li> <li>• the need for re-delineation</li> </ul>	<p>These representations are <b>not accepted</b> because:</p> <p>(i) according to the proposal made in the representations, the population of M39 (Pat Heung South) (21 132) will exceed the statutory permissible upper limit (+27.31%);</p> <p>(ii) the projected population figures as at 30 June 2019 are used for the delineation exercise for the 2019 DC Ordinary Election. As in the past, the projected population figures are provided by the AHSB, set up specially for the purpose of the delineation exercise under the Working Group on Population Distribution Projection in the PlanD. The current population distribution projections are derived by using scientific and systematic methodology based on the results of the 2016 population by-census carried out by the C&amp;SD as well as the up-to-date official data kept by the relevant government departments. Members of the AHSB are all professional departments which all along have been responsible for territory-wide population</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>is queried as there are no additional elected seats and the populations of both the southern and northern parts of the area have not become closer after re-delineation; and</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• after the land resumption incident in 2017, Ng Ka Tsuen has remained vacant. The accuracy of the relevant population figures is doubtful.</li> </ul>	<p>census and projections on population distribution. They possess the most up-to-date information on the population and land and housing development, and the data are highly-accepted generally. The EAC has all along relied on the statistical figures provided by the AHSG, which are the only data available for the delineation exercise;</p> <p>(iii) the delineation recommendations must be based on objective data of the population distribution. Arrangement on district administration matters is not the relevant factor of consideration; and</p> <p>(iv) there is a view supporting the provisional recommendations (please see item 21).</p>