

Appendix II - R

Sha Tin 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	-	(a) Supports the provisional recommendations on R01 (Sha Tin Town Centre), R02 (Lek Yuen), R03 (Wo Che Estate), R04 (City One), R05 (Yue Shing), R06 (Wong Uk), R22 (Sui Wo), R25 (Hoi Nam), R26 (Chung On), R27 (Kam To), R28 (Ma On Shan Town Centre), R29 (Wu Kai Sha), R30 (Lee On), R31 (Fu Lung), R32 (Kam Ying), R33 (Yiu On), R34 (Heng On), R35 (Tai Shui Hang) and R36 (On Tai).	<u>Item (a)</u> The supporting view is noted.
				(b) Objects to the provisional recommendations on R07 (Sha Kok) and holds reservation on the provisional recommendations on R08 (Pok Hong), R09 (Shui Chuen O) and R10 (Jat Chuen). Considers that despite the populations of the above DCCAs will fall within the statutory permissible range, it is relatively undesirable to split Shui Chuen O Estate into two DCCAs.	<u>Item (b)</u> This representation is not accepted because if the entire Shui Chuen O Estate is delineated into one DCCA, the population of the DCCA (29 387) will exceed the statutory permissible upper limit (+77.04%).

* 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>		
				(c) Holds reservation on the provisional recommendations on R11 (Chun Fung), R12 (Sun Tin Wai), R13 (Chui Tin), R14 (Hin Ka), R17 (Keng Hau), R20 (Tai Wai), R38 (Di Yee) and R39 (Bik Woo).	<u>Item (c)</u> The view is noted.
				(d) Holds reservation on the provisional recommendations on R16 (Wan Shing), R18 (Tin Sum) and R19 (Chui Ka). Proposes to maintain the boundary of R19 (Chui Ka) and transfer Carado Garden from R16 (Wan Shing) to R18 (Tin Sum). It is because Carado Garden is further away from Festival City in R16 (Wan Shing) geographically, on the contrary, it shares to use Tin Sam Street with Lung Hang Estate and Tin Sam Tsuen in R18 (Tin Sum) and they belong to the same community. The representation considers that the proposal can even out the populations of the above DCCAs and improve the shape of R18 (Tin Sum).	<u>Item (d)</u> This proposal is not accepted because: (i) the affected population under the proposal made in the representation (6 077) will be larger than that in the provisional recommendations (2 154) by 3 923; (ii) according to the provisional recommendations, the population of R19 (Chui Ka) will become 18 417 after absorbing Holford Gardens from R16 (Wan Shing), deviating from the population quota by +10.95%. However, according to the proposal made in the representation, the population of R18 (Tin Sum) will substantially increase to 20 404 after absorbing Carado Garden from R16 (Wan Shing), deviating from the population quota by +22.92%. Comparatively speaking, the provisional recommendations are more desirable; and

<i>Item No.</i>	<i>DCCAs</i>	<i>No.*</i>		<i>Representations</i>	<i>EAC's Views</i>
		<i>W</i>	<i>O</i>		
					(iii) although the shape of a DCCA is a relevant factor of consideration, it is confined by population distribution to a certain extent and is not a prime factor of consideration.
				(e) Holds reservation on the provisional recommendations on R15 (Lower Shing Mun) and R21 (Chung Tin). Proposes to transfer Mei Chuen House of Mei Tin Estate from R21 (Chung Tin) to R15 (Lower Shing Mun) in order to maintain the community characteristics of Mei Tin Estate provided that the populations of these DCCAs will fall within the statutory permissible range.	<p><u>Item (e)</u> This proposal is not accepted because:</p> <p>(i) the populations of R15 (Lower Shing Mun) and R21 (Chung Tin) 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) according to the proposal made in the representation, the population of R15 (Lower Shing Mun) (21 755) will exceed the statutory permissible upper limit (+31.06%).</p>
				(f) Objects to the provisional recommendations on R23 (Fo Tan) and R24 (Chun Ma). Proposes to transfer Dragons Range from R23 (Fo Tan) to R24 (Chun Ma) as the population of R23 (Fo Tan) is relatively larger. Also, there are local ties between Dragons Range and R24 (Chun Ma) since Lai Ping Road is the only access to Dragons Range.	<p><u>Item (f)</u> This proposal is not accepted because:</p> <p>(i) 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; 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>		
					(ii) 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 local ties.
				<p>(g) Holds reservation on the provisional recommendations on R37 (Yu Yan), R40 (Kwong Hong) and R41 (Kwong Yuen). Proposes:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> to transfer Mui Tsz Lam and Ah Kung Kok Fishermen Village from R37 (Yu Yan) to R40 (Kwong Hong) because the residents of these two places need to use the roads in R35 (Tai Shui Hang), R39 (Bik Woo) or R40 (Kwong Hong) for access and their community ties with R37 (Yu Yan) are not strong. It is therefore more reasonable to transfer them to R40 (Kwong Hong); and to transfer To Shek, Chap Wai Kon, Ngau Pei Sha, Siu Lek Yuen and Kwun Yam Shan Village, etc. from R37 (Yu Yan) to R41 (Kwong Yuen). It is 	<p><u>Item (g)</u> This proposal is not accepted because the population of R37 (Yu Yan) will fall within the statutory permissible range. According to the established working principles, adjustment to its existing boundary 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>		
				because the above areas, together with R41 (Kwong Yuen), are all affected by the traffic at Tate's Cairn Tunnel, and the proposal can even out the populations of the above five DCCAs.	
2	R01 – Sha Tin Town Centre R11 – Chun Fung R12 – Sun Tin Wai R13 – Chui Tin R15 – Lower Shing Mun R16 – Wan Shing R18 – Tin Sum R19 – Chui Ka R20 – Tai Wai	1	-	<p>Since the buildings of Sun Chui Estate and Mei Tin Estate are delineated into different DCCAs, and R19 (Chui Ka) straddles across the areas separated by the rail line of MTR Tai Wai Station, it is proposed:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • to transfer Mei Chuen House of Mei Tin Estate from R21 (Chung Tin) to R15 (Lower Shing Mun) and absorb the entire Tung Lo Wan Hill located in R01 (Sha Tin Town Centre); • that R15 (Lower Shing Mun) only includes Mei Tin Estate and Mei Ying Court and that the areas surrounding Tai Wai New Village, Sha Tin Heights and Tai Po Road in the DCCA be transferred to R19 (Chui Ka); • that R20 (Tai Wai) only includes May Shing Court and Mei Lam Estate, that the area surrounding Tai Wai Village in the DCCA be transferred to R19 (Chui Ka) and to rename R20 (Tai Wai) as “Mei Lam”; 	<p>This proposal is not accepted because:</p> <p>(i) the number of affected DCCAs under the proposal made in the representation will be eight more than that in the provisional recommendations. The affected population under the proposal will be larger, too; and</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>

<i>Item No.</i>	<i>DCCAs</i>	<i>No.*</i>		<i>Representations</i>	<i>EAC's Views</i>
		<i>W</i>	<i>O</i>		
	R21 – Chung Tin			<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • that R19 (Chui Ka) also absorbs Holford Gardens from R16 (Wan Shing), that Sun Chui Estate in the DCCA be transferred to R13 (Chui Tin) and to rename R19 (Chui Ka) as “Tai Wai”; • that R13 (Chui Tin) only includes the entire Sun Chui Estate, and that King Tin Court in the DCCA be transferred to R18 (Tin Sum), and to transfer Golden Lion Garden Stage II to R11 (Chun Fung) and World-Wide Gardens to other DCCAs; and • to transfer Fung Shing Court, Sha Tin Tau Village and Sha Tin Tau New Village from R11 (Chun Fung) to R12 (Sun Tin Wai) and absorb the area surrounding Chui Tin Street from R12 (Sun Tin Wai) and Golden Lion Garden Stage II from R13 (Chui Tin) and to rename R11 (Chun Fung) as “Che Kung Miu”. 	

<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	R01 – Sha Tin Town Centre R11 – Chun Fung R19 – Chui Ka R20 – Tai Wai R26 – Chung On R27 – Kam To R28 – Ma On Shan Town Centre R30 – Lee On R31 – Fu Lung R32 – Kam Ying R33 – Yiu On R34 – Heng On R35 – Tai Shui Hang	1	-	<p>Proposes:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> to transfer The Riverpark from R11 (Chun Fung) to R01 (Sha Tin Town Centre); to transfer Grandway Garden, Grandeur Garden and residential buildings surrounding the area between Tsuen Nam Road and Chik Fuk Street from R19 (Chui Ka) to R20 (Tai Wai) and rename R19 (Chui Ka) as “Sun Chui”; to transfer Vista Paradiso and Oceanaire from R26 (Chung On) to R35 (Tai Shui Hang) and also to transfer Ma On Shan Recreation Ground and Sports Ground in the DCCA to R34 (Heng On); to transfer The Waterside and Marbella from R27 (Kam To) to R28 (Ma On Shan Town Centre) and rename R27 (Kam To) as “Kam Fung”; to transfer Kam Lung Court from R31 (Fu Lung) to R30 (Lee On) and rename R31 (Fu Lung) as “Fu Po”; and to transfer On Luk Street Park from R32 (Kam Ying) to R33 (Yiu On). 	<p>This proposal is not accepted because:</p> <p>(i) if Vista Paradiso and Oceanaire are to be transferred from R26 (Chung On) to R35 (Tai Shui Hang), the population of R35 (Tai Shui Hang) (29 153) will exceed the statutory permissible upper limit (+75.63%). Besides, as Ma On Shan Recreation Ground and Sports Ground located in R26 (Chung On) have no population, there is no need to adjust the boundaries; and</p> <p>(ii) the populations of R01 (Sha Tin Town Centre), R11 (Chun Fung), R20 (Tai Wai), R27 (Kam To), R28 (Ma On Shan Town Centre), R30 (Lee On), R31 (Fu Lung), R32 (Kam Ying) and R33 (Yiu On) 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>		
4	R07 – Sha Kok R08 – Pok Hong R09 – Shui Chuen O R10 – Jat Chuen	1	-	<p>In the light of increasing population in the foreseeable future, proposes to create two new DCCAs at Shui Chuen O Estate. Details are as follows:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • the DCCA Jat Min comprises Jat Min Chuen, Yue Shing Court and Tsang Tai Uk; • the DCCA Sha Kok comprises Sha Kok Estate, Sha Tin Wai and Fui Yiu Ha New Village; • the DCCA Pok Hong comprises Pok Hong Estate and Tsok Pok Hang San Tsuen; and • Shui Chuen O Estate is split into two DCCAs, each including nine blocks. 	<p>This proposal is not accepted because:</p> <p>(i) 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; and</p> <p>(ii) the delineation recommendations are made on the basis of overall consideration from a macro perspective. No special emphasis to any DCCA will be given. It is proposed in the representation to create two new DCCAs at Shui Chuen O Estate. In view of the needs to create new DCCAs in other locations of the Sha Tin District so that their populations will be brought within the statutory permissible range, the proposal to create two new DCCAs at Shui Chuen O Estate is therefore not desirable.</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	R07 – Sha Kok R08 – Pok Hong R09 – Shui Chuen O R13 – Chui Tin R14 – Hin Ka R15 – Lower Shing Mun R16 – Wan Shing R17 – Keng Hau R18 – Tin Sum R19 – Chui Ka R21 – Chung Tin	5 [^]	1	<p>(a) Propose :</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> to transfer Holford Gardens from R16 (Wan Shing) to R15 (Lower Shing Mun); and to transfer Mei Ying Court and some of the buildings of Mei Tin Estate or Mei Chi House of Mei Tin Estate from R15 (Lower Shing Mun) to R21 (Chung Tin). <p>Reasons are summarised as follows:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> it is expected that the property development atop MTR Tai Wai Station in R19 (Chui Ka) will be completed in 2022 or 2023, at which time the population of the DCCA concerned will substantially increase and exceed the statutory permissible upper limit. Hence, a re-delineation will be required; in the future, it is likely that Holford Gardens needs to be transferred to other DCCAs again as a result of the substantial increase in the population of R19 (Chui Ka). Frequently transferring Holford Gardens to different DCCAs is unfair to the residents there; and 	<p><u>Item (a)</u> This proposal is not accepted because:</p> <p>(i) the number of affected DCCAs under the proposal made in the representations will be one more than that in the provisional recommendations. The affected population under the proposal will be larger, too;</p> <p>(ii) after receiving the representations, the EAC conducted a site visit and noticed that Holford Gardens located in R16 (Wan Shing) is geographically closer to Grandeur Garden and Grandway Garden located in R19 (Chui Ka), being only separated by Mei Tin Road and connected by crossing facilities such as lifts and footbridges. On the contrary, there is longer distance from Holford Gardens to R15 (Lower Shing Mun). Therefore, geographically, it is more desirable to transfer Holford Gardens to R19 (Chui Ka);</p> <p>(iii) according to the projected population in 2019, R19 (Chui Ka) has more capacity than R15 (Lower</p>

[^]Of which, one representation contains 1 544 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>		
	R22 – Sui Wo R23 – Fo Tan R25 – Hoi Nam R26 – Chung On R27 – Kam To R37 – Yu Yan R40 – Kwong Hong R41 – Kwong Yuen			<ul style="list-style-type: none"> the proposal can bring the population of R21 (Chung Tin) closer to the population quota. <p>Three representations consider that:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> there are other DCCAs in Tai Wai (e.g. R13 (Chui Tin), R14 (Hin Ka), R18 (Tin Sum) and R21 (Chung Tin)) that have a smaller population than R19 (Chui Ka); and the population of R19 (Chui Ka) is the closest to the population quota. There is no urgent need to adjust its existing boundary. <p>Two representations consider that:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Mei Chuen House of Mei Tin Estate is currently in R21 (Chung Tin). Transferring the adjacent Mei Chi House and Mei Ying Court to R21 (Chung Tin) is more appropriate in geographical terms (such as the sharing of community facilities); there will not be any completion of large-scale residential projects in R15 (Lower Shing Mun) and R21 (Chung Tin) in the future. Hence, there will not be a substantial increase in population; and 	<p>Shing Mun) to absorb the excess population of R16 (Wan Shing);</p> <p>(iv) it is an established practice that the delineation exercise for a DC ordinary election should be conducted on the basis of the latest projected population figures as at 30 June of the election year. Developments thereafter will not be taken into consideration;</p> <p>(v) Holford Gardens has not been transferred multiple times. Holford Gardens originally belonged to R15 (Lower Shing Mun). Until 2015, as the populations of that DCCA and two adjacent DCCAs exceeded the statutory permissible upper limit, a new DCCA Wan Shing was created at the location of Holford Gardens, Festival City and Carado Garden. Grandeur Garden and Grandway Garden, which are in R19 (Chui Ka) that absorbs Holford Gardens under the provisional recommendations, belonged to the same DCCA as Holford Gardens in 1999, 2003 and 2007;</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"> • the population of R15 (Lower Shing Mun) can be maintained at a similar level. <p>Two representations consider that it is unreasonable not to accept the representations concerned based on geographical factors. It is because the distance between A Kung Kok and Yu Chui Court in R37 (Yu Yan) is far apart and both places have no community ties at all yet they are still in the same DCCA.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • One of the representations states that the geographical barrier between the surrounding area of Lower Shing Mun connecting Sha Tin Heights and Mei Tin Estate and Tai Wai New Village in R15 (Lower Shing Mun) is greater, whereas Holford Gardens and Lower Shing Mun are a single entity. The proposal can better meet the statutory criteria for delineation. • One of the representations states that the same proposal was made in a representation with regard to the DCCA boundaries for the 2015 DC Election. At the time, the EAC refused to accept the representation concerned and pointed out that Holford Gardens, Festival City and Carado Garden are located in the town centre of Tai Wai 	<p>(vi) the representation received with regard to the DCCA boundaries for the 2015 DC Election as mentioned in the present representation referred to the transfer of Holford Gardens to R21 (Chung Tin), instead of to R15 (Lower Shing Mun). Therefore, it is different from this representation. Furthermore, the EAC's view at that time, i.e. Holford Gardens is geographically separated from R15 (Lower Shing Mun) and R21 (Chung Tin), remains valid; and</p> <p>(vii) the composition of each DCCA is determined by its own unique features. It is not appropriate to make comparison solely based on one factor.</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>using common community facilities. Taking into consideration the geographical and community factors, the cluster of residential buildings belongs to a relatively independent society with community integrity. They are geographically separated from Tai Wai New Village of R15 (Lower Shing Mun). However, it was pointed out in the representation that there was no direct access between Mei Tin Estate and Tai Wai New Village in R15 (Lower Shing Mun) as the two places were separated by a crematorium and a funeral parlour. Therefore, geographical factors should not be the reason for the refusal of the representation.</p> <p>One representation considers that:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • there are no obvious links between Holford Gardens and R19 (Chui Ka) in terms of physical features and local ties. In addition, Tai Wai Market cannot serve as a connecting facility between both places as this relatively large public facility is used by residents of various areas in Tai Wai. Hence, this cannot be the reason to transfer Holford Gardens to R19 (Chui Ka); 	

<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"> • Holford Gardens originally belonged to R15 (Lower Shing Mun). Residents do not need to re-adapt to the DCCA and its public facilities; • the proposal made in the representations can stabilise the populations of the adjacent DCCAs and no re-delineation will therefore be needed in the future; and • similar to the practice used in delineating the surrounding area of Tai Wai in the past, Mei Tin Road is used as the separator in delineating the DCCAs near R19 (Chui Ka). The proposal can better reflect the geographical characteristics of the community. 	
				<p>(b) One representation considers that the populations of some DCCAs in the Sha Tin District are closed to the statutory permissible upper limit or lower limit and that the populations of adjacent DCCAs are not effectively distributed. Proposes that changes should be made to the boundaries of these DCCAs to even out their populations. They include:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • R07 (Sha Kok), R08 (Pok Hong) and R09 (Shui Chuen O); 	<p><u>Item (b)</u> The view is noted. In drawing up the provisional recommendations, the EAC has strictly adhered to the statutory criteria under the EACO and its working principles. The recommendations were made on the basis of the projected populations, existing DCCA boundaries and relevant local factors.</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"> • R14 (Hin Ka) and R17 (Keng Hau); • R22 (Sui Wo) and R23 (Fo Tan); • R25 (Hoi Nam), R26 (Chung On) and R27 (Kam To); and • R40 (Kwong Hong) and R41 (Kwong Yuen). 	
6	R08 – Pok Hong R09 – Shui Chuen O R10 – Jat Chuen	1	-	Holds no objection to the provisional recommendations.	The view is noted.
7	R08 – Pok Hong R09 – Shui Chuen O R10 – Jat Chuen	1	1	(a) Query the projected population of R08 (Pok Hong) as stated in the provisional recommendations. It is because the population of R08 (Pok Hong) decreases instead of increases after the transfer of four villages to it under the provisional recommendations. The representations consider that miscalculation of population will affect the decision on delineation. The information provided in the representation is as follows:	<u>Item (a)</u> 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

<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"> • according to the paper of the Development and Housing Committee of the Sha Tin DC— Population of Public Housing Estates and Private Sector Participation Scheme Courts in Sha Tin (as at 1 June 2018), the population of Pok Hong Estate is 16 615 in total; and • according to the Summaries of DCCA boundaries of DC Elections in 2011 and 2015, the projected populations of R08 (Pok Hong) were 17 186 and 16 341 respectively. 	<p>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 data available for the delineation exercise.</p>
				<p>(b) Propose to set up a polling station at Shui Chuen O Estate in the 2019 DC Election because the arrangement of setting up two polling stations at Pok Hong Estate for electors of Pok Hong Estate and Shui Chuen O Estate respectively to cast their votes in the 2018 LegCo By-election gave rise to misunderstanding and chaos. Also due to the absence of sufficient directions on the polling day, some electors went to a wrong polling station and as a result were unable to vote.</p>	<p><u>Item (b)</u> The EAC has referred the relevant view concerning the arrangement on polling station to the REO for 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>One representation also proposes to set up a polling station at kindergartens, schools or social welfare organisations. If there are no indoor venues at Shui Chuen O Estate suitable for setting up a polling station, may consider setting up an outdoor polling station.</p>	
				<p>(c) One representation objects to the transfer of Sha Tin Wai, Sha Tin Wai New Village, Fui Yiu Ha and Tse Uk Village to R08 (Pok Hong) and proposes to retain them in R10 (Jat Chuen) instead. It is because:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • delineation of DCCA boundaries should be conducted under the principle of affecting the least number of DCCAs; • Sha Tin Wai, Sha Tin Wai New Village, Fui Yiu Ha and Tse Uk Village originally belonged to the DCCA Jat Min in 2015 and they should continue to be included in R10 (Jat Chuen); and • since 2011, Sha Tin Wai, Sha Tin Wai New Village, Fui Yiu Ha and Tse Uk Village together with Tsok Pok Hang San Tsuen and Tsang Tai Uk 	<p><u>Item (c)</u> This proposal is not accepted because according to the proposal made in the representation, the population of R10 (Jat Chuen) (21 592) will exceed the statutory permissible upper limit (+30.08%).</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>		
				have been delineated into the same DCCA. On the premise that electors' views and community integrity are to be honoured, the above places should continue to be included in R10 (Jat Chuen).	
8	R08 – Pok Hong R09 – Shui Chuen O R10 – Jat Chuen R14 – Hin Ka R15 – Lower Shing Mun R16 – Wan Shing R17 – Keng Hau R18 – Tin Sum R19 – Chui Ka	1	-	<p>(a) Proposes:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> to transfer one block of Shek Mun Estate Phase 2 from R38 (Di Yee) to R39 (Bik Woo) and the remaining two blocks to R37 (Yu Yan); to transfer Ah Kung Kok Fishermen Village from R37 (Yu Yan) and Greenhill Villa from R38 (Di Yee) to R40 (Kwong Hong); and to transfer Kwong Lam Court from R40 (Kwong Hong) to R41 (Kwong Yuen). <p>It is because:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> the populations of R38 (Di Yee) and R39 (Bik Woo) are only about 16 000 while those of R40 (Kwong Hong) and R41 (Kwong Yuen) are only about 13 000. The situation therein are completely different from that at Shui Chuen 	<p><u>Item (a)</u> This proposal is not accepted because:</p> <p>(i) the number of affected DCCAs under the proposal made in the representation will be two more than that in the provisional recommendations;</p> <p>(ii) based on the 2015 original DCCA boundary, the populations of R39 (Bik Woo) and R40 (Kwong Hong) will exceed the statutory permissible upper limit, hence, the EAC proposed to create the new DCCA R38 (Di Yee) in-between the above two DCCAs so that the populations of the DCCAs concerned would fall within the statutory permissible range. The provisional recommendations do not affect other DCCAs of which the populations will fall within the statutory permissible range; 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>		
	R20 – Tai Wai			<p>O Estate and the area near Tai Wai where their populations are increasing. Hence, disagrees with the creation of the new DCCA R38 (Di Yee) at the proposed location;</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • there are no ties between the area in the south of MTR City One Station and Ah Kung Kok Fishermen Village in R37 (Yu Yan); • the proposal made in the representation can release one DCCA for the creation of a new DCCA at Shui Chuen O Estate (item (b) below) or the area near Tai Wai (item (d) below) to solve the problem of population exceeding the permissible upper limit; and • the populations of the above four DCCAs will be adjusted to fall within the range from 16 000 to 19 000 after the proposed adjustments, which are more desirable than the provisional recommendations. 	(iii) please see items 4(ii) and 8(d)(ii).
	R21 – Chung Tin				
	R22 – Sui Wo				
	R23 – Fo Tan				
	R37 – Yu Yan				
	R38 – Di Yee				
	R39 – Bik Woo				
	R40 – Kwong Hong				
	R41 – Kwong Yuen				

<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>(b) To best comply with the EAC's working principles, population figures and statutory requirements, proposes that:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • the boundary of R08 (Pok Hong) remains unchanged; • R10 (Jat Chuen) shall comprise buildings under the DCCA Jat Min in the last term (excluding Shui Chuen O Estate) and maintain its original name "Jat Min"; and • Shui Chuen O Estate be split into two DCCAs. <p>It is because:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • it is estimated that the population of Shui Chuen O Estate, after its completion, will be as high as 30 000. The creation of R09 (Shui Chuen O) with a population of up to some 20 000, and the substantial increase of the population of and the changes made to R10 (Jat Chuen) as made in the provisional recommendations are neither in line with the statutory criteria nor the working principles; and 	<p><u>Item (b)</u> This proposal is not accepted because:</p> <p>(i) please see item 4(ii); and</p> <p>(ii) the delineation recommendations must be based on objective data of population distribution. Community services provided by DC members 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"> Jat Min Chuen is far away from Shui Chuen O Estate and it will be difficult for a DC member to take care of the needs of two estates. Including one of the phases of Shui Chuen O Estate in R10 (Jat Chuen) will make it difficult for the residents to seek assistance. This will also increase the burden on the DC member of R09 (Shui Chuen O) and cause unfairness. 	
				(c) Proposes to transfer the area surrounding Hin Tin from R17 (Keng Hau) to R14 (Hin Ka) for the purposes of evening out the populations of the two DCCAs and greater fairness.	<u>Item (c)</u> This proposal is not accepted because the populations of R14 (Hin Ka) and R17 (Keng Hau) will fall within the statutory permissible range. According to the established working principles, adjustments to their existing boundaries are not required.
				(d) Proposes: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> to transfer May Shing Court from R20 (Tai Wai) to R21 (Chung Tin); to transfer Mei Chuen House of Mei Tin Estate from R21 (Chung Tin) to R15 (Lower Shing Mun); to form a new DCCA by comprising buildings 	<u>Item (d)</u> This proposal is not accepted because: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> (i) the number of affected DCCAs under the proposal made in the representation will be four more than that in the provisional recommendations. The affected population under the proposal 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>surrounding Sha Tin Heights in R15 (Lower Shing Mun) together with Holford Gardens in R16 (Wan Shing), Grandeur Garden, Grandway Garden and buildings in the north of MTR Tai Wai Station in R19 (Chui Ka); and</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> to transfer Tin Sam from R18 (Tin Sum) to R19 (Chui Ka) and to form a DCCA by absorbing Carado Garden in R16 (Wan Shing) and Lung Hang Estate in R18 (Tin Sum). <p>It is because:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> the aggregate population of R15 (Lower Shing Mun), R16 (Wan Shing), R19 (Chui Ka) and R20 (Tai Wai) amounts to 78 000 and therefore a new DCCA should be created at this location; and only one block (Mei Chuen House) of Mei Tin Estate is included in R21 (Chung Tin) and it is not in line with the principle of community integrity. 	<p>(ii) the delineation recommendations are made on the basis of overall consideration from a macro perspective. No special emphasis to any DCCA will be given. It is proposed in the representation to create a new DCCA at the relevant location. However, among the DCCAs as mentioned in the representation, only R16 (Wan Shing) has a population exceeding the statutory permissible upper limit. In view of the needs to create new DCCAs in other locations of the Sha Tin District so that their populations will be brought within the statutory permissible range, the proposal to create a new DCCA at this location is therefore not desirable; and</p> <p>(iii) 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>

<i>Item No.</i>	<i>DCCAs</i>	<i>No.*</i>		<i>Representations</i>	<i>EAC's Views</i>
		<i>W</i>	<i>O</i>		
				(e) To even out the populations of these two DCCAs and having regard to the possibility of over-estimating or under-estimating the populations of certain areas, proposes to transfer Pat Tsz Wo Village and Wo Liu Hang together with buildings closer to the side of Wo Liu Hang Road from R23 (Fo Tan) to R22 (Sui Wo).	<p><u>Item (e)</u> This proposal is not accepted because:</p> <p>(i) the affected population under the proposal made in the representation (1 651) will be larger than that in the provisional recommendations (717) by 934; and</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 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</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>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>
9	R09 – Shui Chuen O R10 – Jat Chuen	-	1	<p>Proposes that Shui Chuen O Estate Phase 1 be retained in R10 (Jat Chuen) and that the new DCCA R09 (Shui Chuen O) comprises Shui Chuen O Estate Phases 2, 3 and 4 because:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • in the past two LegCo Election and By-election, residents of Shui Chuen O Estate Phase 1 belonged to R10 (Jat Chuen). Maintaining such delineation can avoid confusion amongst residents with regard to their respective DCCAs; • residents of Shui Chuen O Estate Phase 1 are well used to seeking help from the DC member of R10 (Jat Chuen); and • Shui Chuen O Estate is built on hillsides, of which Phases 	<p>This proposal is not accepted because:</p> <p>(i) if Shui Chuen O Estate Phases 2, 3 and 4 be delineated into the same DCCA, the population of the DCCA (21 402) will exceed the statutory permissible upper limit (+28.94%);</p> <p>(ii) after receiving the representation, the EAC conducted a site visit and noticed that Shui Chuen O Estate Phase 1 is located in the centre of the Estate. Comparatively speaking, Shui Chuen O Estate Phase 2 is nearer to the lifts which connect it to the area down the hill and is closer to R10 (Jat Chuen) geographically; 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>		
				1 and 4 are located up the hill. There are escalators and footbridges connecting Phases 4 and 2, which is located down the hill. Hence, the delineation of Shui Chuen O Estate Phases 2, 3 and 4 in the same DCCA will make it more convenient for residents to seek help and for the DC member to provide services.	(iii) the delineation recommendations must be based on objective data of population distribution. Community services provided by DC members is not the relevant factor of consideration.
10	R09 – Shui Chuen O R10 – Jat Chuen	6 [#]	1	(a) Propose to set up a polling station at Shui Chuen O Estate. Six representations state that in the 2018 LegCo By-election, residents of Shui Chuen O Estate had to go downhill to vote at the polling station, thus causing inconvenience to them (especially the elderly).	<u>Item (a)</u> The EAC has referred the relevant view concerning the arrangement on polling station to the REO for consideration.
				(b) Six representations object to the provisional recommendations on including Shui Chuen O Estate Phases 1, 3 and 4 in the same DCCA, and propose to include Shui Chuen O Estate Phases 2, 3 and 4 in the same DCCA. Reasons are summarised as follows: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • five representations state that Shui Chuen O Estate Phases 2, 3 and 4 have more in common in terms of the geographical 	<u>Item (b)</u> This proposal is not accepted because: <p>(i) please see item 9(i) and (ii); and</p> <p>(ii) there is no sufficient objective information and justification to prove that the provisional recommendations will affect the community integrity as mentioned in the representation.</p>

[#]All 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>		
				<p>environment. Their social and humanistic qualities are highly similar;</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • one representation states that residents of Shui Chuen O Estate Phases 2, 3 and 4 moved in at about the same time; and • one representation states that during the 2018 LegCo By-election, residents of Shui Chuen O Estate Phase 1 belonged to R10 (Jat Chuen) and those of Phases 2, 3 and 4 belonged to another DCCA. The provisional recommendations will affect community integrity. 	
11	R09 – Shui Chuen O R10 – Jat Chuen	31%	-	<p>Propose to set up a polling station at Shui Chuen O Estate each for R09 (Shui Chuen O) and R10 (Jat Chuen) respectively.</p> <p>30 representations consider that:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • according to the last DC Ordinary Election, arrangements were made for residents of Shui Chuen O Estate to vote at the Hong Kong Girl Guides Association Pok Hong Camp 	The EAC has referred the relevant view concerning the arrangement on polling station to the REO for consideration.

[%]Of which, 30 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>		
				<p>Site. As Shui Chuen O is built on hillsides, going to the polling station mainly involves walking on steep roads, making it extremely inconvenient for the residents; and</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> it is observed that venues such as community halls, sports centres, schools, etc. are mainly acquired for use as polling stations in other DCCAs. Even though the relevant facilities cannot be found in the vicinity of Belair Gardens, a polling station can still be set up at a covered corridor. There are currently three kindergartens, two offices of the HD and one relatively large plaza at Shui Chuen O Estate. It is hoped to make good use of these venues to set up polling stations so as to bring convenience to residents of Shui Chuen O Estate. <p>One representation considers that:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> in the 2018 LegCo By-election, arrangements were made for electors of Shui Chuen O Estate to vote at the polling station at The Salvation Army Tin Ka Ping School in Pok Hong Estate, causing inconvenience to the electors. Arrangements that involve cross-DCCA voting are unreasonable; and 	

<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"> there are three kindergartens, three offices of the HD and an open space with a covered walkway at Shui Chuen O Estate. Consideration can be given to choosing two of the venues as polling stations. 	
12	R10 – Jat Chuen	1	-	<p>Objects to the provisional recommendations because:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Shui Chuen O Estate and Jat Min Chuen in R10 (Jat Chuen) are located up and down the hill respectively, making them geographically separated; the two estates are separated by R07 (Sha Kok) and R08 (Pok Hong), which will have a considerable bearing on the distribution of community resources and the continuity of services provided by the elected DC member; Jat Min Chuen is an old estate while Shui Chuen O Estate is a new housing estate. Hence, electors have different community needs. The provisional recommendations will break community harmony; and it takes time for residents to go to the DC member's office to seek help. 	<p>This representation is not accepted because:</p> <p>(i) 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, Jat Min Chuen and Shui Chuen O Estate originally belonged to the same DCCA; and</p> <p>(ii) 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>		
13	R12 – Sun Tin Wai R13 – Chui Tin R19 – Chui Ka	1	-	<p>Proposes to transfer Golden Lion Garden Stage I from R12 (Sun Tin Wai) to R13 (Chui Tin) or R19 (Chui Ka) because:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • residents of Golden Lion Garden Stage I pass by Sun Chui Estate, meet with the DC member of the DCCA and use the facilities there every day; • the office of current DC member of R12 (Sun Tin Wai) is set up at Sun Tin Wai Estate up the hill, which causes inconvenience to residents of Golden Lion Garden Stage I to go there to seek help. On the contrary, the office of the person who provides services to residents of Golden Lion Garden Stage I is located in the adjacent DCCA; and • residents of Golden Lion Garden Stage I are required to vote at the polling station at Sun Tin Wai Estate. This will affect their desire to vote. 	<p>This proposal is not accepted because:</p> <p>(i) the population of R12 (Sun Tin Wai) 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 recommendations must be based on objective data of population distribution. Community services provided by DC members and arrangement on polling station are not the relevant factors of consideration. The EAC has referred the relevant view concerning the arrangement on polling station to the REO for 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>		
14	R14 – Hin Ka R16 – Wan Shing R18 – Tin Sum R19 – Chui Ka	1	-	<p>Objects to the transfer of Holford Gardens from R16 (Wan Shing) to R19 (Chui Ka), and proposes to transfer it to R14 (Hin Ka) or R18 (Tin Sum) because:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Holford Gardens have been delineated into different DCCAs multiple times, rendering residents without a fixed DCCA; • the population of R19 (Chui Ka) is larger than those of adjacent R14 (Hin Ka), R18 (Tin Sum), etc. It is expected that the property development atop MTR Tai Wai Station will be completed in the near future. Its population will leave the adjacent DCCAs further behind; and • the provisional recommendations will increase the workload and pressure of DC member of R19 (Chui Ka). 	<p>This proposal is not accepted because:</p> <p>(i) R14 (Hin Ka) and R16 (Wan Shing) are not adjacent to each other. They are separated by R17 (Keng Hau). It is not feasible to transfer the excess population of R16 (Wan Shing) to R14 (Hin Ka);</p> <p>(ii) Holford Gardens in R16 (Wan Shing) and R18 (Tin Sum) are separated by Festival City. It is not desirable to transfer it to R18 (Tin Sum);</p> <p>(iii) the delineation recommendations must be based on objective data of population distribution. Community services provided by DC members is not the relevant factor of consideration; and</p> <p>(iv) please see item 5(a)(v).</p>
15	R14 – Hin Ka R17 – Keng Hau	1	-	<p>Taking into account community integrity, proposes that R14 (Hin Ka) and R17 (Keng Hau) be re-delineated, details are as follows:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • one of the DCCAs comprises Hin Pui House, Hin Tak House, Hin Yeung House, Hin Hing House, Hin Yau House, Hin Wan House, Hin Fu House and Hin Kwai 	<p>This proposal is not accepted because the populations of R14 (Hin Ka) and R17 (Keng Hau) 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>		
				<p>House of Hin Keng Estate and renamed as "Hin Keng"; and</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> the other DCCA comprises Sheung Keng Hau Village, Ha Keng Hau Village, Hin Tin Village, Ka Tin Court, Ka Shun Court, Ka Keng Court, Hin Yiu Estate, Hill Paramount, Parc Royale and Julimount Garden and renamed as "Ka Keng". 	
16	<p>R15 – Lower Shing Mun</p> <p>R16 – Wan Shing</p> <p>R19 – Chui Ka</p> <p>R21 – Chung Tin</p>	1	-	<p>It is expected that the population of R19 (Chui Ka) will substantially increase after the completion of the property development atop MTR Tai Wai Station in the DCCA. To avoid transferring Holford Gardens to another DCCA again in the next term and causing inconvenience to residents there, proposes:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> to transfer Holford Gardens from R16 (Wan Shing) to R15 (Lower Shing Mun); and to transfer Mei Ying Court from R15 (Lower Shing Mun) to R21 (Chung Tin) which is formed mainly by Home Ownership Scheme estates. 	<p>This proposal is not accepted because:</p> <p>(i) according to the proposal made in the representation, the population of R15 (Lower Shing Mun) (21 159) will exceed the statutory permissible upper limit (+27.47%);</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; and</p> <p>(iii) please see item 5(a)(iii) and (iv).</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>		
17	R16 – Wan Shing R18 – Tin Sum R19 – Chui Ka	1	1	Propose to transfer Carado Garden from R16 (Wan Shing) to R18 (Tin Sum) instead of transferring Holford Gardens to R19 (Chui Ka). One representation considers that the population of R18 (Tin Sum) is relatively low and thus will be closer to the population quota after the proposed adjustment compared to that in the provisional recommendations. One representation considers that the provisional recommendations will shatter several communities and proposes to rename R16 (Wan Shing) as “Tai Wai South” after the proposed adjustment.	Please see item 1(d).
18	R22 – Sui Wo R23 – Fo Tan	1	-	To even out the population of these two DCCAs, proposes to transfer Man Hang and The Grandville from R23 (Fo Tan) to R22 (Sui Wo).	This proposal is not accepted because: (i) the affected population under the proposal made in the representation (2 149) will be larger than that in the provisional recommendations (717) by 1 432; and (ii) The Grandville in R23 (Fo Tan) is situated on a hill, which is geographically far apart from the main housing estates in R22 (Sui Wo).

Item No.	DCCAs	No. *		Representations	EAC's Views
		W	O		
19	R22 – Sui Wo R23 – Fo Tan	91 ^{&}	-	<p>(a) Propose to retain villages namely Kwai Tei New Village, Kwai Tei Village, Fo Tan Kuk San Tsuen and Wong Chuk Yeung, etc. in R23 (Fo Tan). Reasons are summarised as follows:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> villages in Fo Tan District share common culture and history. Sha Tin has already been divided into “Nine Yeuk” (九約) according to geographical locations and inter-village ties, of which the “Fo Tan Yeuk” (火灘(火炭)約) includes villages such as Wong Chuk Yeung, Pat Tsz Wo, Lok Lo Ha and Wo Liu Hang. The provisional recommendations will break the historical heritage, community identities and local ties of villages in Fo Tan. <p>90 representations consider that:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> residents of villages such as Wong Chuk Yeung together with Pat Tsz Wo, Lok Lo Ha and Wo Liu Hang share common concerns, mainly about the overall planning of the villages such as construction of village houses, burglaries in villages, problems of hill roads and cleaning, which are different from R22 (Sui Wo) residents' concerns about 	<p><u>Items (a) and (b)</u> These proposals are not accepted because:</p> <p>(i) if villages namely Kwai Tei New Village, Kwai Tei Village, Fo Tan Kuk San Tsuen and Wong Chuk Yeung, etc. are retained in R23 (Fo Tan) or according to the proposal (b) made in the representation, the populations of R22 (Sui Wo) and R23 (Fo Tan) will deviate from the statutory permissible range:</p> <p style="padding-left: 40px;">R22: 12 153, -26.78% R23: 21 237, +27.94%</p> <p>(ii) Sha Tin has been divided into nine “Yeuk”s (約) in the past. “Yeuk” (約) is an alliance of nearby villages. In fact, the villages included in some “Yeuk”s (約) have been delineated into different DCCAs from the first DC.</p> <p>The villages included in the “Fo Tan Yeuk” (火灘約) as mentioned in the representations are originally distributed in various DCCAs in 2015, namely R22 (Sui Wo), R23 (Fo Tan) and R24 (Chun Ma). It is also the case for villages of other “Yeuk”s in the Sha Tin</p>

[&]All 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>		
				<p>local affairs. It will be difficult for the DC member of that DCCA to take care of their needs which will in turn harm villagers' interests; and</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> having the same DC member to serve residents of various villages can address to their needs more effectively. <p>47 representations state that:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> the villages usually organise community events together. If these villages are delineated into different DCCAs, it will increase the difficulty to organise community events in the future; and the villages have always looked after one another and established unique local ties. The villages reflect views on village issues to the Government and DC members on each other's behalf. <p>43 representations state that villagers have already cultivated a strong sense of belonging to Fo Tan and have good relationship with villagers of various villages.</p> <p>One representation considers that:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> the main types of housing in R22 (Sui Wo) are Home Ownership Scheme estates 	<p>District (e.g. San Tin and Tin Sam, which are under "Tin Sam Yeuk" (田心約), belong to R12 (Sun Tin Wai) and R18 (Tin Sum) respectively).</p> <p>The EAC considers that although the villages included in these "Yeuk"s (約) are located in different DCCAs, their villages issues are all handled by the Sha Tin Rural Committee;</p> <p>(iii) 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> <p>(iv) 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, R23 (Fo Tan) comprises of not only villages, but also some private housing estates; and</p> <p>(v) it is an established practice that the delineation exercise for a DC ordinary election should be</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>and private housing, while that of the area surrounding Kwai Tei New Village is village houses. Transferring these villages to R22 (Sui Wo) under the provisional recommendations will make these residents of villages become the minority who will easily be neglected. On the contrary, there are still villages such as Pat Tsz Wo, Lok Lo Ha and Wo Liu Hang in R23 (Fo Tan). Retaining the area surrounding Kwai Tei New Village in R23 (Fo Tan) will be good for villagers to raise the same requests and protect their interests; and</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> delineating various villages into different DCCAs will disperse the policy support provided by DC members and the Government and disable the effective deployment of resources. 	<p>conducted on the basis of the latest projected population figures as at 30 June of the election year. Developments thereafter will not be taken into consideration.</p>
				<p>(b) One representation further proposes to transfer the areas in the southwest of Fo Tan Road, San Chuk Street and Wo Sheung Tun Street, i.e. the areas surrounding Wo Sheung Tun Street subsidised sale flats development project and Fo Tan public housing project, from R23 (Fo Tan) to R22 (Sui Wo).</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	R23 – Fo Tan	1	-	Holds no objection to the provisional recommendations.	The view is noted.
21	R23 – Fo Tan R24 – Chun Ma	1	-	Proposes to transfer the upper Kau To Shan development area along Lai Ping Road from R23 (Fo Tan) to R24 (Chun Ma). It is because the population of R23 (Fo Tan) is relatively high while that of R24 (Chun Ma) is relatively low. If there is a reversal of population flow of the two DCCAs after the proposed adjustment, proposes that the traditional lower Kau To Shan along Kau To Shan Road be transferred to R23 (Fo Tan).	This proposal is not accepted 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.
22	R25 – Hoi Nam	1	1	Support the provisional recommendations.	The supporting views are noted.
23	R25 – Hoi Nam R26 – Chung On	2	1	Object to the transfer of the private housing estates from R26 (Chung On) to R25 (Hoi Nam) and propose to maintain the boundary of R26 (Chung On). Reasons are summarised as follows: • two representations consider that Oceanaire has been transferred to different DCCAs for every term of election since intake, driving its residents to seek assistance from different DC members in different terms. This neither shows any care about the feelings of Oceanaire's residents, nor is	This proposal is not accepted because: (i) according to the proposal made in the representations, the population of R26 (Chung On) (21 655) will exceed the statutory permissible upper limit (+30.46%), while that of the new DCCA R25 (Hoi Nam) (7 111) will be below the statutory permissible lower limit (-57.16%); (ii) based on the 2015 original DCCA boundary, the populations of R26 (Chung

<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 line with the principle of community integrity;</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • one representation states that Oceanaire is linked with Baycrest, Vista Paradiso and Chung On Estate, while MTR Heng On Station of Ma On Shan Line is in the centre of the housing estates and there are walkways between these housing estates for direct access. Therefore, the claim that Oceanaire is far away from these housing estates is not true, and the EAC should have considered this during the last term. In addition, the newly-built The Met. Bliss in R26 (Chung On) is a housing estate of small flats with a population of only about 300, hence it is not justified to replace Oceanaire and Baycrest with The Met. Bliss; and • one representation considers that the increase of population in Sha Tin is confined to certain areas while the population and development characteristics of R26 (Chung On) are relatively steady. 	<p>On) and R36 (On Tai) will exceed the statutory permissible upper limit, hence, the EAC needs to create the new DCCA R25 (Hoi Nam) in-between the two DCCAs so that the populations of the DCCAs concerned will fall within the statutory permissible range, and Oceanaire is located in-between the two DCCAs;</p> <p>(iii) Oceanaire has not been transferred multiple times. Oceanaire was built on a site originally belonged to R36 (On Tai) and hence belonged to it after its completion. In 2015, when the population of R36 (On Tai) exceeded the statutory permissible upper limit, Oceanaire was transferred to R26 (Chung On); and</p> <p>(iv) geographically, there are walkways for the residents of Oceanaire to go to other areas in R26 (Chung On). However, comparatively speaking, Oceanaire is even closer to the housing estates located in R25 (Hoi Nam).</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>		
24	R25 – Hoi Nam R26 – Chung On	-	1	States that Oceanaire has been transferred to different DCCAs for many times and there are no new housing estates or buildings nearby. Enquires about the reason(s) for the creation of new DCCA R25 (Hoi Nam).	Please see item 23(ii) and (iii).
25	R25 – Hoi Nam R26 – Chung On R27 – Kam To R28 – Ma On Shan Town Centre R29 – Wu Kai Sha R36 – On Tai	1	-	<p>The populations of R25 (Hoi Nam) and R36 (On Tai) in the provisional recommendations are obviously relatively low and it is proposed that:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Sausalito be retained in R36 (On Tai); • R27 (Kam To) should only include Kam Fung Court and be renamed as “Kam Fung”; • Vista Paradiso be transferred from R26 (Chung On) to the new DCCA R25 (Hoi Nam) and that the DCCA should absorb those parts other than Kam Fung Court of R27 (Kam To) and part of the buildings in R28 (Ma On Shan Town Centre) such as Fok On Garden; and • Villa Athena be transferred from R29 (Wu Kai Sha) to R28 (Ma On Shan Town Centre), so as to relieve the situation of R29 (Wu Kai Sha) which has a relatively high population. 	This proposal is not accepted 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.

<i>Item No.</i>	<i>DCCAs</i>	<i>No.*</i>		<i>Representations</i>	<i>EAC's Views</i>
		<i>W</i>	<i>O</i>		
26	R25 – Hoi Nam R26 – Chung On R29 – Wu Kai Sha R36 – On Tai	1	-	Queries why the EAC only recommended the creation of new DCCA R25 (Hoi Nam) in R26 (Chung On) and R36 (On Tai) rather than making adjustment to the boundary of R29 (Wu Kai Sha). The representation considers that R29 (Wu Kai Sha), comprising five private housing estates with a projected population already close to the statutory permissible upper limit, is the DCCA with the largest population in the Sha Tin District. It is expected that, upon intake of the new housing estate St. Barths in the second quarter of 2019, the projected population of the DCCA will exceed the statutory permissible upper limit.	This representation is not accepted because: (i) the population of R29 (Wu Kai Sha) will fall within the statutory permissible range. According to the established working principles, adjustment to its existing boundary is not required; (ii) it is an established practice that the delineation exercise for a DC ordinary election should be conducted on the basis of the latest projected population figures as at 30 June of the election year. Developments thereafter will not be taken into consideration; and (iii) based on the 2015 original DCCA boundary, the populations of R26 (Chung On) and R36 (On Tai) will exceed the statutory permissible upper limit, hence, the EAC needed to create the new DCCA R25 (Hoi Nam) in-between the two DCCAs so that the populations of the DCCAs concerned will be brought within the statutory permissible range.

<i>Item No.</i>	<i>DCCAs</i>	<i>No.*</i>		<i>Representations</i>	<i>EAC's Views</i>
		<i>W</i>	<i>O</i>		
27	R29 – Wu Kai Sha	1	-	(a) States that R29 (Wu Kai Sha) is the DCCA with the largest population in the Sha Tin District and its population is close to the statutory permissible upper limit. It is expected that, upon intake of the new housing estate St. Barths in the DCCA in the first half of 2019 and given that the population has not been included in R29 (Wu Kai Sha), the population of the DCCA will exceed the statutory permissible upper limit. The representation queries that the EAC does not intend to strictly adhere to the statutory criteria (a) and (b).	<u>Item (a)</u> Please see item 26.
				(b) Despite that the population of R29 (Wu Kai Sha) is nearly 8 000 more than those of some other DCCAs, the delineation of its DCCA boundary is still considered reasonable taking into account factors of community identity and local ties.	<u>Item (b)</u> The view is noted.
				(c) Considers that the EAC must uphold and adhere to the principle of “factors with political implications are not taken into consideration”, and that the election must be conducted in a fair and impartial manner.	<u>Item (c)</u> The delineation recommendations must be based on objective data of population distribution. Political factors will not be taken into consideration.

<i>Item No.</i>	<i>DCCAs</i>	<i>No.*</i>		<i>Representations</i>	<i>EAC's Views</i>
		<i>W</i>	<i>O</i>		
28	R36 – On Tai	1	-	States that the English name of R36 (On Tai) is the same as that of J11 (On Tai) in the Kwun Tong District.	As the current name for R36 (On Tai) has been in use since 2003 and the majority of the public are used to this name, changing the name may cause confusion amongst the public. Therefore, the DCCA R36 will retain its current name “On Tai” “鞍泰”. In respect of the new DCCA J11 (On Tai) in the Kwun Tong District, to avoid confusion, EAC will recommend renaming the DCCA as “觀塘安泰” and “Kwun Tong On Tai” in English.
29	R37 – Yu Yan R38 – Di Yee R39 – Bik Woo R40 – Kwong Hong	1	-	<p>Proposes that:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> the new DCCA be composed of Greenhill Villa, Shek Mun Estate Phases 1 and 2; the Castello be retained in R40 (Kwong Hong); and the areas of A Kung Kok and A Kung Kok Shan be transferred from R37 (Yu Yan) and R40 (Kwong Hong) to R39 (Bik Woo). <p>It is because:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> the shape of the new DCCA R38 (Di Yee) looks strange and local ties within the DCCA are questionable; the delineation is considered unreasonable as Shek Mun Estate Phase 1 and the private housing estates 	<p>This proposal is not accepted because:</p> <p>(i) please see item 8(a)(ii);</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. Besides, A Kung Kok in R37 (Yu Yan) and A Kung Kok Shan in R40 (Kwong Hong) are located far away from adjacent main housing estates. Taking geographical factor into consideration, the proposal made in the representation on transferring the above areas to R39 (Bik Woo) is not obviously desirable;</p> <p>(iii) Shek Mun Estate Phase 1 and Garden Vista, Pictorial</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>located at the riverfront are delineated into the same DCCA even with the Shek Mun Industrial Area in between, while Shek Mun Estate Phase 2 is delineated into another DCCA; and</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • A Kung Kok and A Kung Kok Shan are far away from R37 (Yu Yan) and R40 (Kwong Hong) but are, on the contrary, adjacent to R39 (Bik Woo). This proposal can also address the problem of under-population after the proposed adjustments stated in the representation. 	<p>Garden as well as Ravana Garden located at the riverside in R39 (Bik Woo) have been delineated into the same DCCA since 2011. On the contrary, Shek Mun Estate Phase 2 is a newly-built housing estate. Hence, 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 local ties; and</p> <p>(iv) although the shape of a DCCA is a relevant factor of consideration, it is confined by population distribution to a certain extent and is not a prime factor of consideration.</p>
30	R38 – Di Yee	2	-	Support the provisional recommendations.	The supporting views are noted.