

**Sha Tin District  
Summaries of Written Representations**

<i>Item no.</i>	<i>DCCAs concerned</i>	<i>No. of representations</i>	<i>Representations</i>	<i>EAC's views</i>
1	R10 – Chun Shing	4	The representations propose this DCCA be renamed as Chun Fung, since it is more appropriate to use the first Chinese character of the two major estates in the DCCA, namely Chun Shek Estate and Fung Shing Court.	These representations are <b>accepted</b> .
2	R10 – Chun Shing R11 – Sun Tin Wai	1	<p>The representation proposes to transfer Sha Tin Tau New Village from R10 to R11 because:</p> <p>(a) the Village had all along belonged to Sun Tin Wai (R11) before it was transferred to Tsang Tai Uk (formerly R30) in the 1994 District Boards Election;</p> <p>(b) the Village has close ties with Sun Tin Wai Estate in R11, and also shares the community facilities. Geographically, the Village is closer to Sun Tin Wai Estate in R11 than Chun Shek Estate and Fung Shing Court in R10; and</p> <p>(c) the polling station in R11 is nearer to the residents of the Village than the one in R10 is.</p>	<p>The same representation was made in the last demarcation exercise. It was not accepted by the EAC at that time on the grounds that the boundaries of the existing R30 and R31 were the same as those in the 1994 District Boards Election and the population in R30 and that of R31 were within the permissible limits.</p> <p>However, under the current EAC proposal, in view of the fact that the existing R10 and R30 are under-populated, they together with R31 would be merged with R31 to form 2 new DCCAs, ie R10 and R11, in order to keep the population within the permissible limits. Hence, this representation is <b>accepted</b> because:</p> <p>(i) R10 and R11 are new DCCAs in the EAC provisional recommendations;</p> <p>(ii) the local ties of the Village with San Tin Wai Estate would be preserved; and</p> <p>(iii) the resultant population would not exceed the permissible limits:</p>

<i>Item no.</i>	<i>DCCAs concerned</i>	<i>No. of representations</i>	<i>Representations</i>	<i>EAC's views</i>
				R10: 18,331 (+6.61%) R11: 19,636 (+14.20%) However, the location of polling stations is not a consideration in delineating DCCAs.
3	R12 – Chui Tin  R16 – Tin Sum	1	The representation proposes to transfer Worldwide Garden from R12 to R16 because: (a) geographically, Worldwide Garden is closer to Lung Hang Estate in R16 than to Golden Lion Garden and Sun Chui Estate in R12; and (b) Worldwide Garden has closer community ties with Lung Hang Estate and Tin Sam in R16.	The representation is <b>not accepted</b> because: (i) no substantial reason in support of improvement in community homogeneity has been presented; and (ii) Worldwide Garden is more related to R12, which consists mainly of private residential developments, HOS blocks and public housing estates, rather than R16, which consists mainly of public housing estates and rural villages.
4	R13 – Hin Ka	1	The representation supports the demarcation proposals for this DCCA.	The supporting view is noted.
5	R14 – Mei Tin  R18 – Tai Wai  R19 – Chung Shing	2	These representations propose that (a) Granville Garden and Park View Garden in R19 be retained as geographically they are more related to Mei Chung Court in R19; and (b) Mei Wai House of Mei Lam Estate be transferred from R19 to R18 to preserve community integrity.	These representations are considered in conjunction with those under items 6 and 7 since they should be considered together since the buildings concerned are all covered in the three items. The representations are all <b>accepted</b> because: (i) the arguments in support of the representation in terms of local geography and community setting are considered valid; (ii) the resultant population would not exceed the upper permissible limit: R14: 17,299 (+0.61%) R18: 18,491 (+7.54%) R19: 20,444 (+18.90%) (iii) the existing boundary of R14 will remain unchanged; and

<i>Item no.</i>	<i>DCCAs concerned</i>	<i>No. of representations</i>	<i>Representations</i>	<i>EAC's views</i>
6	R14 – Mei Tin  R19 – Chung Shing	2	These representations propose to retain the 1999 DCCA boundaries for Lower Shing Mun in the former R14 in order to include Granville Garden and Park View Garden in the proposed R19 as they have close ties with Mei Chung Court in terms of local geography and community setting.	(iv) better population deviation percentages would be achieved in R14, ie from 20,895 (+21.52%) to 17,299 (+0.61%) and R18, ie from 15,528 (-9.69%) to 18,491 (+7.54%); while having considered that the boundary of R18 would be affected and the population deviation would be greater in R19, ie from 19,811 (+15.22%) to 20,444 (+18.90%).
7	R18 – Tai Wai  R19 – Chung Shing	4	These representations propose to transfer Mei Wai House of Mei Lam Estate from R19 to R18 because of community integrity.	
8	R14 – Mei Tin  R19 – Chung Shing	1	The representation objects to combining Lower Shing Mun in the former R14 with Mei Tin in the former R34 to form a new DCCA (R19) because: (a) the low population in Lower Shing Mun is only a temporary phenomenon as it would grow following the recovery of economy; (b) two future developments are expected to be completed between 2005 and 2007 in Lower Shing Mun, including 7 public housing estates in Area 4C38A and 5 blocks of private housing in Heung Fan Liu, which would accommodate some 20,000 people altogether; (c) the community	The representation is <b>not accepted</b> because: (i) the resultant population of Lower Shing Mun would be 11,127, which exceeds the population quota (-35.29%); and (ii) the EAC has to rely on the population forecasts provided by the AHSG for the conduct of this exercise.

<i>Item no.</i>	<i>DCCAs concerned</i>	<i>No. of representations</i>	<i>Representations</i>	<i>EAC's views</i>
			characteristics and integrity would be hampered; and (d) relocating Granville Garden and Park View Garden from R19 to R14 would hamper the unity of community.	
9	R26 – Lee On  R27 – Fu Lung	4	These representations object to transferring Kam Lung Court from R26 to R27 because: (a) Kam Lung Court is sharing common facilities with Lee On Estate in R26; and (b) the separation of Kam Lung Court from Lee On Estate would hamper the community identity since they have been in the same DCCA since 1994.	These representations are <b>not accepted</b> because: (i) the resultant population of R26 would be 24,137, which far exceeds the upper permissible limit (+40.38%); and (ii) there are supporting views for the proposals for R27 (see item 10).
10	R27 – Fu Lung	2	These representations support the demarcation proposals for this DCCA.	The supporting views are noted.
11	R28 – Kam Ying	1	The representation supports the delineation of Phases I & II of Kam Ying Court within the same DCCA.	The supporting view is noted.
12	R28 – Kam Ying	1	The representation supports the delineation of Phases II & III of Sunshine City within R28.	The supporting view is noted.
13	R28 – Kam Ying  R31 – On Tai	1	The representation objects to the delineation of R28 and proposes to re-delineate Kam Ying Court and Park Balvedere in R28 and Ma On Shan Tsuen in R31 into one DCCA because of geographical, traffic and	The representation is <b>not accepted</b> because: (i) Ma On Shan Tsuen is geographically separated from Kam Ying Court and Park Balvedere, and including this Village in R28 would physically split R31;

<i>Item no.</i>	<i>DCCAs concerned</i>	<i>No. of representations</i>	<i>Representations</i>	<i>EAC's views</i>
			community link. Kam Ying Court, Park Balvedere and Ma On Shan Tsuen would become more remote from Sunshine City following the commissioning of Ma On Shan Railway.	(ii) no substantial reason in support of bringing about improvements in geographical and community link are presented, and the Ma On Shan Railway would not affect the proximity of Kam Ying Court, Park Balvedere and Ma On Shan Tsuen with Sunshine City, as they will all be located on the same side of the railway; and (iii) there is a representation supporting the proposal for R28 (see item 12).
14	R30 – Heng On	1	The representation supports the delineation of the whole of Heng On Estate within the same DCCA.	The supporting view is noted.
15	R33 – Yu Chui	3	These representations propose this DCCA be renamed as Yu Yan or Chui Yan so as to reflect the names of the two major estates, namely Yu Chui Court and Prima Villa.	The proposed new name of Yu Yan is <b>accepted</b> .

**Sha Tin District**  
**Oral Representations received at the Public Forum on 24 January 2003**

<i>Item no.</i>	<i>DCCAs concerned</i>	<i>No. of representations</i>	<i>Representations</i>	<i>EAC's views</i>
16	R27 – Fu Lung	1	The representation (a) supports the EAC proposals (same as item 10); and (b) proposes that more conveniently located polling stations should be arranged to facilitate electors (including the disabled) in Kam Lung Court and Saddle Ridge Garden.	For (a), see item 10. For (b), the EAC will consider any suggestion from the public on the locations of polling stations.
17	R28 – Kam Ying	1	The representation (a) supports the demarcation proposals for this DCCA; and (b) proposes that more conveniently located polling stations should be arranged to facilitate electors in Sunshine City, Kam Ying Court and Park Balvedere.	For (a), the supporting view is noted. For (b), the EAC will consider any suggestion from the public on the locations of the polling stations.
18	R30 – Heng On	1	The representation supports the demarcation proposals for this DCCA.	The supporting view is noted.
19	R35 – Kwong Hong	1	The representation supports the demarcation proposals for this DCCA.	The supporting view is noted.