

**Tuen Mun 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	L03 – Siu Tsui L04 – On Ting	1	This representation supports the demarcation proposals for these two DCCAs.	The supporting view is noted.
2	L03 – Siu Tsui L04 – On Ting L13 – Hanford	6	<p>All six representations object to the delineation of four blocks of Siu Lun Court from L03 to L04 on the grounds that the community integrity and residents' sense of belonging will not be preserved.</p> <p>One representation:</p> <p>(a) queries why Siu Lun Court in L03 has to be split into two parts and at the same time the whole Tsui Ning Garden has to be transferred from L13 to L03;</p> <p>(b) suggests to keep the entire Siu Lun Court in L03 together with Tsui Ning Garden, whereby the resultant population will still be within the permissible deviation limits;</p> <p>(c) opines that the interests of Siu Lun Court's residents might be affected because Siu Lun Court will be served by two DC members</p>	<p>The representations are not accepted because:</p> <p>(i) The aim of our proposals is to relieve the population overflow in L12 (existing L15 Sam Shing) (+61.65%) and L13 (existing L16 Tsui Fook) (+30.75%) by making adjustment to the adjacent DCCAs, ie L03 and L04;</p> <p>(ii) suggestion (b) is not viable since the resultant population of L03 (22,148) will exceed the upper permissible deviation limit (+28.81%), if both the entire Siu Lun Court and Tsui Ning Garden remain in the same DCCA (ie L03);</p> <p>(iii) reason (c) is not considered valid;</p> <p>(iv) according to the figures provided by the AHSG, the population of L04 will only be 15,306 as at 30 June 2003, and can absorb the population overflow from L03; and</p> <p>(v) there is a representation supporting our proposals for L03 and L04 (see item 1).</p>

<i>Item no.</i>	<i>DCCAs concerned</i>	<i>No. of representations</i>	<i>Representations</i>	<i>EAC's views</i>
			<p>who might have different working styles and political views; and</p> <p>(d) opines that the existing boundary of L04 should be kept unchanged because the population of L04 will increase to 20,000 upon full occupation of the On Ting Estate in 2003.</p>	
3	<p>L05 – Yau Oi South</p> <p>L06 – Yau Oi North</p> <p>L20 – Lung Mun</p>	1	This representation supports the demarcation proposals for these three DCCAs.	The supporting view is noted.
4	<p>L07 – Tsui Hing</p> <p>L08 – Shan King</p> <p>L09 – King Hing</p> <p>L10 – Hing Tsak</p>	5	<p>All five representations object to the delineation of L08, L09 and L10.</p> <p>(a) Three of the representations propose to delineate King Fu House, King Kwai House, King Lok House, King Wah House, King On House, King Wing House and King Yip House of Shan King Estate into L08.</p> <p>(b) Four of the representations object to including Hing Wai House of Tai Hing Estate in L10 and</p>	<p>(i) For proposals (a) and (b), the representations are accepted, because the reasons given are considered valid, with the following taken into consideration: the resultant population of L08 (21,535) will exceed the population quota (+25.25%) while the population deviation of L09 (19,082) will improve (+10.98%).</p> <p>(ii) For proposal (c), the representation is not accepted, because it will unnecessarily affect the existing boundary of L07, the population of which is within the permissible deviation limits.</p> <p>(iii) For proposal (d), the</p>

<i>Item no.</i>	<i>DCCAs concerned</i>	<i>No. of representations</i>	<i>Representations</i>	<i>EAC's views</i>
			<p>propose to delineate King Mei House and King Lai House of Shan King Estate and Hing Cheung House, Hing Shing House, Hing Tai House and Hing Wai House of Tai Hing Estate into L09.</p> <p>The existing boundary of L10 should be maintained because Hing Wai House had all along been in L09 (existing L10 Tai Hing South); and L10 had fulfilled the population requirement.</p> <p>(c) One representation further suggests transferring Chelsea Heights from L07 to L09.</p> <p>(d) One representation proposes to maintain the existing boundary for L10 and transfer King Lai House of Shan King Estate from L09 to L08 in order to even out the population of L08 and L09.</p>	<p>representation is not accepted because the resultant population of L08 (21,667) will have a higher deviation limit (+26.01%) than that under proposals (a) and (b).</p>
5	L08 – Shan King L20 – Lung Mun	1	<p>This representation objects to the delineation of L20 and proposes transferring Yeung Siu Hang Village from L20 to L08 because:</p> <p>(a) the Yeung Siu Hang Village is geographically</p>	<p>The representation is not accepted because, as considered together with the accepted proposals in item 4 above, the resultant population of L08 (22,544) will far exceed the upper permissible deviation limit (+31.12%).</p> <p>Also, we have received one</p>

<i>Item no.</i>	<i>DCCAs concerned</i>	<i>No. of representations</i>	<i>Representations</i>	<i>EAC's views</i>
			<p>separated from the rest of the buildings in L20;</p> <p>(b) there are no local ties and community links with Lung Mun Oasis in L20; and</p> <p>(c) there are close ties in terms of transportation and community facilities with Shan King Estate in L08, which is adjacent to the village.</p>	<p>representation in support of the demarcation proposals for L20 (see item 3).</p> <p>We have also taken into consideration that Yeung Siu Hang Village has once been grouped with Shan King Estate in the 1994 demarcation exercise (ie L19 – Yeung King), and has been transferred to L20 (existing L23 – Lung Mun) since 1999.</p>
6	L11 – San Hui	1	Two polling stations should be designated for L11.	The location of polling stations is not a consideration in delineating DCCAs. Nevertheless, the REO will bear this point in mind when identifying polling stations for L11.
7	L14 – Siu Sun	5	All five representations the demarcation proposals for this DCCA.	The supporting views are noted.
8	L15 – Yuet Wu L16 – Siu Hei L19 – Lok Tsui	2	Both representations propose to merge L15, L16 and L19 into two DCCAs and move the villages near Lung Kwu Tan and San Shek Wan Sun Tsuen to the former Shan King South as these villages have once been included in that DCCA before.	The representations are not accepted because it will affect the existing boundaries of L15 and L16, which should not be changed since the populations in L15 and L16 are within the permissible deviation limits. The existing community integrity will also be unnecessarily affected.
9	L17 – Wu King	4	All four representations support the demarcation proposals for this DCCA.	The supporting views are noted.
10	L18 – Butterfly	1	The representation supports the demarcation proposals for this DCCA.	The supporting view is noted.

<i>Item no.</i>	<i>DCCAs concerned</i>	<i>No. of representations</i>	<i>Representations</i>	<i>EAC's views</i>
11	L22 – Leung King L24 – Po Tin L25 – Kin Sang	6	All six representations support the demarcation proposals for these three DCCAs.	The supporting views are noted.
12	L22 – Leung King L24 – Po Tin L25 – Kin Sang	1	This representation proposes to disband L24 and move Po Tin Interim Housing to the adjacent L22 and L25 because of the high mobility of the Po Tin residents. As a result, it will not be necessary to combine Shan King North and Tai Hing South.	The representation is not accepted because the proposed merging of L22, L24 and L25 to form two new DCCAs will only result in huge population deviations from the population quota as the population forecast of L22 is 16,174; L24: 22,072; L25: 18,527.
13	L27 – Prime View L29 – Tuen Mun Rural	1	The representation objects to the delineation of L27 and proposes the whole To Yuen Wai Chuen be transferred from L27 to L29 to maintain the community integrity and local ties among To Yuen Wai Chuen and other villages in the rural area in L29.	The representation is accepted , because the reason given is considered valid, though the resultant population of L29 will be 21,510, which will slightly exceed the upper permissible deviation limit (+25.10%).

Tuen Mun 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>
14	L03 – Siu Tsui L04 – On Ting L13 – Hanford	2	(a) Two representations are the same as item 2. (b) One of the representations further suggests to delineate Siu Lun Court into L13 if (a) above is not considered viable by the EAC. (The proposer claims that she would submit her detailed proposals in writing later.)	For (a), see item 2. For (b), the proposer has not submitted the details of her proposal in writing. Therefore further consideration is not feasible.
15	L09 – King Hing L10 – Hing Tsak	1	Same as item 4(a) and (b).	See item 4(a) and (b).
16	L14 – Siu Sun	1	Same as item 7.	See item 7.
17	L22 – Leung King L24 – Po Tin	1	This representation supports the demarcation proposals for these two DCCAs.	The supporting view is noted.