

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), R10 (Chun Fung), R11 (Sun Tin Wai), R12 (Chui Tin), R13 (Hin Ka), R14 (Lower Shing Mun), R15 (Wan Shing), R16 (Keng Hau), R17 (Tin Sum), R18 (Chui Ka), R19 (Tai Wai), R20 (Chung Tin), R21 (Sui Wo), R22 (Fo Tan), R23 (Chun Ma), R24 (Chung On), R25 (Kam To), R26 (Ma On Shan Town Centre), R27 (On Lung), R28 (Fu Nga), R29 (Wu Kai Sha), R30 (Kam Ying), R31 (Yiu On), R32 (Heng On), R33 (On Tai) and R34 (Tai Shui Hang) as they are in line with the EAC's statutory criteria and working principles.	<u>Item (a)</u> The supporting view is noted.
				(b) Holds reservation on the provisional recommendations on the 2015 constituency delineation for R35 (Yu Yan), R36 (Bik Woo), R37 (Kwong Hong) and R38 (Kwong Yuen). Proposes to transfer Mui Tsz Lam and Ah Kung Kok Fishermen Village from R35 (Yu Yan) to R36 (Bik Woo) because:	<u>Item (b)</u> This representation is not accepted because the projected population of R35 (Yu Yan) will fall within the statutory permissible range. According to the established working principles, adjustment to its existing boundary is not required.

* W: Number of written representation

O: Number of oral representation

<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 abovementioned proposal could achieve a more balanced population distribution for R35 (Yu Yan), R36 (Bik Woo), R37 (Kwong Hong) and R38 (Kwong Yuen); ● the residents of the above-mentioned villages use the roads in R36 (Bik Woo) or R34 (Tai Shui Hang) for daily access; and ● without sufficient community ties between the abovementioned villages and R35 (Yu Yan), it is considered desirable to transfer these villages to R36 (Bik Woo). 	
				(c) Same as item 5.	<u>Item (c)</u> Please see item 5.
2	R01– Sha Tin Town Centre R02– Lek Yuen R24– Chung On R25– Kam To R26– Ma On Shan Town Centre R30– Kam Ying	1	-	(a) Proposes: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> (i) to comprise R24 (Chung On) with Vista Paradiso, Oceanaire and Kam On Court; (ii) to transfer Chung On Estate from R24 (Chung On) to R25 (Kam To); and (iii) to transfer Marbella and The Waterside from R25 (Kam To) to R26 (Ma On Shan Town Centre) or R30 (Kam Ying). 	<u>Item (a)</u> This proposal is not accepted because: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> (i) after the proposed adjustment, the projected population of R25 (Kam To) (26,739) will exceed the statutory permissible range (+57.62%); (ii) overall speaking, the representation will affect R25 (Kam To) and R30 (Kam Ying). The projected population of the abovementioned DCCAs will fall within the statutory permissible range. According to the established working principles, adjustment to their existing boundaries is not

<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>required. Therefore, the number of affected DCCAs under the proposal made in the representation will be more than that in the EAC's provisional recommendations; and</p> <p>(iii) there is a view supporting the delineation proposals for R24 (Chung On), R25 (Kam To), R26 (Ma On Shan Town Centre) and R30 (Kam Ying) (please see item 1(a)).</p>
				<p>(b) Proposes to transfer the excess population from R01 (Sha Tin Town Centre) to R02 (Lek Yuen).</p>	<p><u>Item (b)</u> This proposal is not accepted because:</p> <p>(i) based on the 2011 original constituency boundaries, the projected population of R01 (Sha Tin Town Centre), R14 (Lower Shing Mun) and R20 (Chung Tin) will exceed the statutory permissible upper limit, thus the EAC proposes to create a new constituency R15 (Wan Shing) and re-delineate the boundaries of the abovementioned DCCAs by keeping the number of affected DCCAs to a minimum, so that the population of the relevant DCCAs can be maintained within the statutory permissible range;</p> <p>(ii) the proposal made in the representation will affect R02 (Lek Yuen). The projected population of the DCCA will fall within the statutory permissible range. According to the established</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>working principles, adjustment to its existing boundary is not required; and</p> <p>(iii) there is a view supporting the delineation proposals for R01 (Sha Tin Town Centre) and R02 (Lek Yuen) (please see item 1(a)).</p>
3	R01– Sha Tin Town Centre R20– Chung Tin	1	-	<p>Objects to transferring Peak One and Tung Lo Wan from R01 (Sha Tin Town Centre) to R20 (Chung Tin) as such proposal would disrupt the community integrity of R01 (Sha Tin Town Centre). Proposes to maintain the boundary of R01 (Sha Tin Town Centre) because:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ● Peak One and Pristine Villa in R01 (Sha Tin Town Centre) belong to the same type of housing estate, they are developed by the same developer and the residents therein belong to the same social strata; ● Peak One, Pristine Villa, The Great Hill and Tung Lo Wan are low-rise housing estates and have been integrated as a community. They are different from the Home Ownership Scheme housing, public housing and squatters. If all of them were included in R20 (Chung Tin), it would create a problem of mis-match; and ● the residents of Peak One, Pristine Villa, The Great Hill and Tung Lo Wan share the community and transportation facilities. 	<p>This proposal is not accepted because:</p> <p>(i) if the boundary of R01 (Sha Tin Town Centre) remains unchanged, the projected population (22,091) of R01 (Sha Tin Town Centre) will exceed the statutory permissible upper limit (+30.22%);</p> <p>(ii) although it is likely that local ties exist between Peak One and Tung Lo Wan with the estates in R01 (Sha Tin Town Centre), no convincing information is available to support that such an area cannot be transferred to R20 (Chung Tin). Moreover, taking into account the population distribution and geographical factors, it is unavoidable to have a DCCA composed of more than one community; and</p> <p>(iii) there is a view supporting the delineation proposals for R01 (Sha Tin Town Centre) and R20 (Chung Tin) (please see item 1(a)).</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	R02– Lek Yuen	-	1	(a) Proposes to transfer Yau Oi Tsuen from R02 (Lek Yuen) to R20 (Chung Tin) because: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> the residents of Yau Oi Tsuen need to use Tung Lo Wan Hill Road as access and have less links with other areas (e.g. Lek Yuen Estate, Fung Wo Estate, Sheung Wo Che Village and Ha Wo Che Village, etc) of R02 (Lek Yuen); and Yau Oi Tsuen is closer to the areas in R20 (Chung Tin) and such would strengthen ties between villagers. 	<u>Item (a)</u> This proposal is not accepted because: (i) please see item 2(b); and (ii) there is a view supporting the delineation proposals for R02 (Lek Yuen) and R20 (Chung Tin) (please see item 1(a)).	
	R07– Sha Kok			(b) Same as item 5(a)(i).	<u>Item (b)</u> Please see item 5.	
	R08– Pok Hong			(c) Same as items 31(a) and (b).	<u>Item (c)</u> Please see item 31.	
	R09– Jat Min					
	R20– Chung Tin					
	R27– On Lung					
	R28– Fu Nga					
	R29– Wu Kai Sha					
5	R07– Sha Kok	4	2	(a) Propose: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> to transfer Yue Shing Court from R09 (Jat Min) to R07 (Sha Kok); to maintain the original boundary of R08 (Pok Hong); and to retain Sha Tin Wai, Sha Tin Wai New Village, Fui Yiu Ha New Village, Tse Uk Village and the areas in the north of Pok Chuen Street in R09 (Jat Min). <p>The reasons are summarised as follows:</p>	<u>Items (a) to (d)</u> According to the 2011 constituency boundary, R09 (Jat Min) will exceed the statutory permissible upper limit in 2015. The EAC's provisional recommendation proposes to transfer the northern area of the DCCA comprising 4 villages (namely Sha Tin Wai, Sha Tin Wai New Village, Fui Yiu Ha New Village and Tse Uk Village) to R08 (Pok Hong) for maintaining the population within the statutory permissible range. There are representations saying that the residents of the abovementioned 4 villages use Shui Chuen Au Street for accessing	
	R08– Pok Hong					
	R09– Jat Min					

<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"> ● for showing respect to residents of various communities; ● for simultaneous development of Yue Shing Court and Sha Kok Estate; ● for the share use of community facilities of Yue Shing Court and Sha Kok Estate; ● previously Yue Shing Court and Sha Kok Estate had been included in the same DCCA; ● the population of R07 (Sha Kok) is relatively low, thus if incorporating the population of Yue Shing Court (over 1,000 persons), the projected population of the DCCAs concerned would be closer to the population quota; ● Yue Shing Court which is currently included in R09 (Jat Min) had previously been included in R07 (Sha Kok); ● the population of R09 (Jat Min) exceeds the population quota by 19.01%, while the population of R07 (Sha Kok) falls short of the population quota by 11.24%, so it is unreasonable to transfer Sha Tin Wai, Sha Tin Wai New Village, Fui Yiu Ha New Village and Tse Uk Village to R08 (Pok Hong) which is 	<p>the villages, thus geographically there exists some local ties between the villages and R09 (Jat Min). Also, Fui Yiu Ha New Village, Sha Tin Wai and Tse Uk Village, as well as Shan Ha Wai and Tsok Pok Hang San Tsuen within R09 (Jat Min) are indigenous villages, having common concerns associated with the style of living and culture, thus the provisional recommendations will disrupt the local ties.</p> <p>The EAC understands the situation as raised by the representations, but also notes the presence of the ties between the abovementioned 4 villages and Pok Hong Estate of R08 (Pok Hong) in terms of daily life. Therefore, the EAC does not agree that there are clearly strong justifications to prove that the provisional recommendations will disrupt the local ties of the relevant areas.</p> <p>There are proposals made by the representations concerning the proposed transfer of Yue Shing Court from R09 (Jat Min) to R07 (Sha Kok) for maintaining the population of the R09 (Jat Min) within the statutory permissible range and replacing the proposal contained in the provisional recommendations. The EAC accepts that such proposed transfer is comparatively desirable, because:</p> <p>based on the provisional recommendation, the population of R07 (Sha Kok), R08 (Pok Hong) and R09 (Jat Min) will be as follows:</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>near the population quota;</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> the abovementioned proposals could achieve a balanced population distribution among R07 (Sha Kok), R08 (Pok Hong) and R09 (Jat Min); in anticipation of the completion of Phase I of Shui Chuen O Estate very soon, there would be an increase in the population in R09 (Jat Min). The abovementioned proposals could even out the population distribution and it could save effort in respect of future re-delineation of the boundaries again; geographically, Yue Shing Court is adjacent to Sha Kok Estate, having similar living style and social needs with inseparable local ties between them; without community facilities in Yue Shing Court, most of the residents use the community facilities of Sha Kok Estate, thus Sha Kok Estate becomes part of the daily life of the residents of Yue Shing Court; Yue Shing Court and Sha Kok Estate have shared significant portion of community facilities, reflecting the close community ties between the two estates; 	<p>R07: 15,057, -11.24% [boundary unchanged] R08: 18,247, +7.56% R09: 20,189, +19.01%</p> <p>After the proposed adjustment, the projected population of the DCCAs will be as follows:</p> <p>R07: 16,543, -2.48% R08: 16,341, -3.67% [boundary unchanged] R09: 20,609, +21.49%</p> <p>Although the number of DCCAs affected by the representations and that of the EAC's provisional recommendations are both two in total, overall speaking, the projected population after re-delineation of boundaries will be much closer to the population quota.</p> <p>Geographically, Yue Shing Court and Sha Kok Estate are relatively close to each other, the proposals made by the representations will not affect the community ties between these areas. On the contrary, the local residents raised different views on the effect on the villages in the northern area of R08 (Pok Hong) under the provisional recommendation.</p> <p>Besides, the delineation proposal must be based on objective data of the population distribution. Arrangements on district administration matters 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>		
				<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ● integration of Yue Shing Court and Sha Kok Estate would ensure that the community resources and facilities are put into more effective uses, enhance management efficiency and also improve district administration works; ● the abovementioned proposal could reduce the impact on only one housing estate rather than 4 villages, significantly reducing the areas being affected; ● the abovementioned proposal could help solving the excess population for R09 (Jat Min) in 2015; ● since 1999 DC Election, Fui Yiu Ha New Village, Tse Uk Village, Shan Ha Wai (Tsang Tai Uk), Sha Tin Wai and Tsok Pok Hang San Tsuen have been delineated in the same DCCA and these villages have already established close local ties for 15 years; ● by transferring Sha Tin Wai, Sha Tin Wai New Village, Fui Yiu Ha New Village and Tse Uk Village to R08 (Pok Hong), it would adversely affect the community ties established for many years and cause negative impact on the community integrity; 	

<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"> ● Sha Tin Wai, Sha Tin Wai New Village, Fui Yiu Ha New Village and Tse Uk Village are all New Territories indigenous villages and each has its own unique tradition and community features, and villagers have common concerns. Therefore, the villages should be retained in the same DCCA for the preservation of their community identity; ● it may even out the population deviation from the population quota between R07 (Sha Kok) and R09 (Jat Min); ● geographically, Sha Tin Wai, Sha Tin Wai New Village, Fui Yiu Ha New Village and Tse Uk Village are in the neighbourhood of Tsok Pok Hang San Tsuen in R09 (Jat Min); and ● the residents of Sha Tin Wai, Sha Tin Wai New Village, Fui Yiu Ha New Village, Tse Uk Village and Tsok Pok Hang San Tsuen share the use of the community facilities. 	
				<p>(b) Object to the provisional recommendation on R07 (Sha Kok).</p> <p>(c) Object to transferring Sha Tin Wai, Sha Tin Wai New Village, Fui Yiu Ha New Village and Tse Uk Village to R08 (Pok Hong).</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>(d) Object to the delineation proposal for R09 (Jat Min).</p> <p>The reasons are summarised as follows:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ● a DCCA has all along been delineated solely for Pok Hong Estate with a view to preserving community integrity; ● the residents of Sha Tin Wai, Sha Tin Wai New Village, Fui Yiu Ha New Village and Tse Uk Village are using Shui Chuen Au Street as their daily access, thus the provisional recommendation would disrupt the community ties; ● the DC member of R08 (Pok Hong) is unable to take care of the needs of residents of Pok Hong Estate and the four villages because the residents of the public housing estates and villages have different community needs; ● Shui Chuen O Estate is located far away from Jat Min Chuen that creates difficulties for the DC member of R09 (Jat Min) to effectively perform district administration duties; and ● it will contravene the EAC's underlining principle of preservation of community integrity. 	

<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	R07– Sha Kok	1	-	(a) Proposes to retain Sha Tin Wai, Sha Tin Wai New Village, Fui Yiu Ha New Village and Tse Uk Village in R09 (Jat Min), allowing its population to slightly exceed the statutory permissible upper limit because its deviation of 0.26% could be regarded as a reasonable level when compared to the population of the adjacent DCCAs.	<u>Item (a)</u> This proposal is not accepted because if the original boundary of R09 (Jat Min) is maintained, the projected population (22,095) will exceed the statutory permissible upper limit (+30.25%).
	R08– Pok Hong			(b) Same as item 5(a)(ii).	<u>Item (b)</u> Please see item 5.
	R09– Jat Min			(c) Same as item 31(a).	<u>Item (c)</u> Please see item 31.
7	R27– On Lung	1	-		
	R28 – Fu Nga				
	R29 – Wu Kai Sha				
8	R07– Sha Kok	1	-	(a) Same as items 5(a)(i) and (iii).	<u>Item (a)</u> Please see item 5.
	R08– Pok Hong			(b) Same as item 39.	<u>Item (b)</u> Please see item 39.
	R09– Jat Min				
	R34– Tai Shui Hang				
	R35– Yu Yan				
8	R08– Pok Hong	1	-	Proposes to transfer Shui Chuen O Estate to R08 (Pok Hong) instead of R09 (Jat Min) because:	This proposal is not accepted because:
	R09– Jat Min			<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ● the geographical location of Phase I of Shui Chuen O Estate is relatively close to Pok Hong Estate; ● Shui Chuen O Estate has better local ties with Pok Hong Estate than Jat Min Chuen; and 	(i) after the proposed adjustment, the projected population of R08 (Pok Hong) and R09 (Jat Min) will deviate from the statutory permissible range: R08: 25,835, +52.29% R09: 12,601, -25.72%

<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"> if the abovementioned proposal results in the population of R09 (Jat Min) deviating from the statutory permissible range, it proposes to transfer the adjacent residential buildings to R09 (Jat Min) to even out the population distribution. 	(ii) R09 (Jat Min) and the adjacent constituency are separated by Shing Mun River or hillside, it is considered not appropriate to transfer the residential area of the adjacent constituency to R09 (Jat Min).
9	R08– Pok Hong R09– Jat Min	2	-	Propose to form R09 (Jat Min) by Shui Chuen O Estate, Sha Tin Wai, Sha Tin Wai New Village and Fui Yiu Ha New Village because the local ties between these estates and villages are relatively strong.	This proposal is not accepted because if adopting the proposal to combine the proposed areas into one constituency, the projected population (9,375) will fall below the statutory permissible lower limit (-44.74%). Besides, the DCCA's existing boundary should be taken into consideration in delineating the DCCA boundary.
10	R08– Pok Hong	1	-	(a) Same as items 5(c) and (d).	<u>Item (a)</u> Please see item 5.
	R09– Jat Min			(b) Same as item 9.	<u>Item (b)</u> Please see item 9.
11	R08– Pok Hong R09– Jat Min	1	-	Holds skeptical view that the delineation proposals for R08 (Pok Hong) and R09 (Jat Min) involve political consideration.	The delineation proposal must be based on objective data of population distribution. The political factor will not be taken into consideration.
12	R08– Pok Hong R09– Jat Min	1	-	<p>Proposes to combine Shui Chuen O Estate and Tsok Pok Hang San Tsuen of R09 (Jat Min), together with Sha Tin Wai, Sha Tin Wai New Village and Fui Yiu Ha New Village of R08 (Pok Hong) for the formation of a DCCA because:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> the community ties of the abovementioned estates and villages would be maintained intact; and the DC member would be able 	<p>This proposal is not accepted because:</p> <p>(i) if adopting the proposal to combine the areas into one constituency, the projected population of the constituency (9,780) will be below the statutory permissible lower limit (-42.35%); and</p> <p>(ii) the delineation proposal must be based on objective data of the population distribution.</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 render better support to the estates and villages.	<p>The arrangements on district administration matters are not the relevant factors of consideration.</p> <p>Besides, the DCCA's existing boundary should be taken into consideration in delineating the DCCA boundary.</p>
13	R08– Pok Hong R09– Jat Min R35– Yu Yan	2	-	<p>Propose to combine Shui Chuen O Estate, Sha Tin Wai, Sha Tin Wai New Village, Fui Yiu Ha New Village and To Shek Village, etc for the formation of a DCCA because:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ● geographically, Shui Chuen O Estate is located nearer to Pok Hong Estate; ● including Shui Chuen O Estate in R09 (Jat Min) would disrupt the integrity of the DCCA; and ● Shui Chuen O Estate, Sha Tin Wai, Sha Tin Wai New Village, Fui Yiu Ha New Village and To Shek Village, etc have stronger local ties with each other. 	<p>This proposal is not accepted, because if adopting the proposal to combine the areas into one constituency, the projected population of the constituency (10,318) will fall below the statutory permissible lower limit (-39.18%). Besides, the DCCA's existing boundary should be taken into consideration in delineating the DCCA boundary.</p>
14	R09– Jat Min	1	-	<p>Proposes to delineate Shui Chuen O Estate of R09 (Jat Min) as an individual DCCA so that it would be in line with the principle of preservation of community integrity.</p>	<p>This proposal is not accepted because if re-delineating a constituency solely for Shui Chuen O Estate, the projected population of the constituency (7,588) will fall below the statutory permissible lower limit (-55.27%).</p>
15	R09– Jat Min	1	-	<p>Proposes to delineate the whole Jat Min Chuen within a DCCA.</p>	<p>The view is noted as it is in line with the EAC's provisional recommendation on its delineation.</p>
16	R10– Chun Fung	1	-	<p>Supports the delineation proposal for R10 (Chun Fung) because:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ● The Riverpark is close to Chun Shek Estate, Fung Shing Court 	<p>The supporting view is noted.</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 Sha Tin Tau. Therefore, it is desirable to transfer The Riverpark to R10 (Chun Fung); and</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> the population and the activities of residents of R10 (Chun Fung) are mainly in The Riverpark, Chun Shek Estate, Fung Shing Court and Sha Tin Tau. Their local ties are close. Therefore, it is appropriate to put the above four housing estates and villages in the same DCCA. 	
17	R12– Chui Tin R13– Hin Ka R16– Keng Hau	1	-	<p>(a) Proposes to combine Golden Lion Garden Stage II, King Tin Court, Sun Chun House, Sun Hok House and Sun Kit House of Sun Chui Estate to form R12 (Chui Tin) in order to preserve the community integrity and local ties.</p> <p>(b) Proposes to combine Hin Hing House, Hin Pui House, Hin Tak House, Hin Yeung House, Hin Fu House, Hin Kwai House, Hin Wan House and Hin Yau House to form R13 (Hin Ka). The projected population of the above buildings is 21,552. Although the projected population would slightly exceed the statutory permissible upper limit, taking into account the community integrity and local ties, the population is proposed to be allowed to exceed the statutory permissible upper limit.</p> <p>(c) Proposes to combine Ha Keng Hau, Hill Paramount, Ka Tin Court, Hin Tin, Hin Yiu Estate, Julimount Garden, Ka Keng</p>	<p><u>Items (a) to (c)</u> This proposal is not accepted because:</p> <p>(i) the projected population of R12 (Chui Tin), R13 (Hin Ka) and R16 (Keng Hau) will fall within the statutory permissible range. According to the established working principles, adjustment to their existing boundaries is not required; and</p> <p>(ii) there is a view supporting the delineation proposals for R12 (Chui Tin), R13 (Hin Ka) and R16 (Keng Hau) (please see item 1(a)).</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>		
				Court, Parc Royale, Sheung Keng Hau and World-Wide Gardens to form R16 (Keng Hau).	
18	R14– Lower Shing Mun R15– Wan Shing R20– Chung Tin	1	-	<p>Proposes:</p> <p>(i) to transfer Tai Wai New Village of R14 (Lower Shing Mun) and Holford Gardens of R15 (Wan Shing) to R20 (Chung Tin); and</p> <p>(ii) to transfer Mei Chuen House of Mei Tin Estate from R20 (Chung Tin) to R14 (Lower Shing Mun) because:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ● the population of R20 (Chung Tin) would be closer to the population quota; ● the population of R15 (Wan Shing) is diminishing. It could facilitate the DC member concerned to take better care of the residents; and ● for preserving the community integrity of R14 (Lower Shing Mun). 	<p>This proposal is not accepted because:</p> <p>(i) after the proposed adjustment, the projected population of R15 (Wan Shing) will be nearer to the population quota. However, Holford Gardens, Festival City and Carado Garden are located in the town centre of Tai Wai 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. On the contrary, they are geographically separated from Tai Wai New Village of R14 (Lower Shing Mun) and the adjacent areas under R20 (Chung Tin). Therefore, the EAC considers it desirable to include Holford Gardens in R15 (Wan Shing);</p> <p>(ii) there is a view supporting the delineation proposals for R14 (Lower Shing Mun), R15 (Wan Shing) and R20 (Chung Tin) (please see item 1(a));and</p> <p>(iii) the delineation proposal must be based on objective data of the population distribution. Arrangements on district administration matters 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>		
19	R14– Lower Shing Mun R15– Wan Shing R20– Chung Tin	-	2	<p>Support the provisional recommendations on R14 (Lower Shing Mun), R15 (Wan Shing) and R20 (Chung Tin) because:</p> <p>one representation considers that:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ● the population of the DCCAs concerned could be evenly distributed. Besides, major part of Mei Tin Estate would be transferred to R14 (Lower Shing Mun) for better integrity; <p>another representation considers that:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ● the population is increasing substantially because tenants are moving into Festival City, thus the creation of the new DCCA R15 (Wan Shing) is supported; ● in delineating the boundaries, the EAC has taken into account the population distribution, geographical location and local ties of the DCCAs. Besides, the population of the three DCCAs concerned would not exceed the statutory permissible range, thus the proposal is considered appropriate; and ● the provisional recommendations have taken into account the population increase brought by the newly completed buildings (e.g. a Home Ownership Scheme building in Pik Tin Street and more than 10 private residential buildings in Heung Fan Liu Street). 	The supporting views are noted.

<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	R14– Lower Shing Mun R20– Chung Tin	-	1	(a) Objects to the name of R20 (Chung Tin) because only one block (Mei Chuen House) in Mei Tin Estate is included in that DCCA and the name could not fully reflect the major estates or buildings in R20 (Chung Tin).	<u>Item (a)</u> This proposal is not accepted because the DCCA name has been used since 2007 and the majority of the public are used to this name. The change of the DCCA name may cause confusion to the public.
				(b) Proposes to delineate the whole Mei Tin Estate within a DCCA.	<u>Item (b)</u> This proposal is not accepted because: (i) if R14 (Lower Shing Mun) includes the whole Mei Tin Estate, the projected population of R14 (Lower Shing Mun) and R20 (Chung Tin) will deviate from the statutory permissible range: R14: 21,584, +27.23% R20: 12,141, -28.43% (ii) if R20 (Chung Tin) includes the whole Mei Tin Estate, the projected population of R14 (Lower Shing Mun) and R20 (Chung Tin) will deviate from the statutory permissible range: R14: 3,035, -82.11% R20: 30,690, +80.91% (iii) there is a view supporting the delineation proposals for R14 (Lower Shing Mun) and R20 (Chung Tin) (please see item 1(a)).
21	R15– Wan Shing	-	1	Proposes to rename R15 (Wan Shing) as “Wan Hoi Shing” (雲海城), which is more representative, because Carado Garden (雲疊花	This proposal is not accepted , because the DCCA name has reflected the main housing estates, such as Carado Garden and Festival City I in the DCCA.

<i>Item No.</i>	<i>DCCAs</i>	<i>No. *</i>		<i>Representations</i>	<i>EAC's views</i>
		<i>W</i>	<i>O</i>		
				園), Holford Gardens (海福花園) and Festival City (名城) are the main housing estates of the DCCA.	
22	R15– Wan Shing	-	1	(a) Supports the delineation proposals for the creation of two new DCCAs of R15 (Wan Shing) and R29 (Wu Kai Sha).	<u>Item (a)</u> The supporting view is noted.
	R27– On Lung			(b) Same as items 31(c) to (e).	<u>Item (b)</u> Please see item 31.
	R28– Fu Nga			(c) Same as item 39.	<u>Item (c)</u> Please see item 39.
	R29– Wu Kai Sha				
	R34– Tai Shui Hang				
	R35– Yu Yan				
23	R18– Chui Ka	-	1	Proposes to add a polling station in Tai Wai in R18 (Chui Ka) because the polling station in Sun Chui Estate is quite far for the electors living in Tai Wai.	Arrangements on polling station are not the relevant factors of consideration. The EAC has referred this view on polling station arrangements to the REO for follow-up.
24	R20– Chung Tin	1	-	Proposes to change the name of R20 (Chung Tin) as “Chung Fung”.	This proposal is not accepted , because the DCCA name has been used since 2007 and the majority of the public are used to this name. The change of the DCCA name may cause confusion to the public.
25	R21– Sui Wo	1	-	Proposes to retain Fo Tan Village in R22 (Fo Tan).	This proposal is not accepted because: (i) if Fo Tan Village is retained in R22 (Fo Tan), the projected population of R21 (Sui Wo) (12,712) will fall below the statutory permissible lower limit (-25.06%); and
	R22– Fo Tan				

<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 a view supporting the delineation proposals for R21 (Sui Wo) and R22 (Fo Tan) (please see item 1(a)).
26	R24– Chung On R25– Kam To R26– Ma On Shan Town Centre R27– On Lung R28 – Fu Nga R29 – Wu Kai Sha R30– Kam Ying R31 – Yiu On R32 – Heng On R33 – On Tai R34 – Tai Shui Hang	1	-	(a) Supports transferring Kam Hay Court to R31 (Yiu On) because Kam Hay Court is adjacent to Yiu On Estate and both belong to the same community. (b) Raises no objection to transferring Oceanaire to R24 (Chung On) for achieving a balanced population distribution. However, the transportation network and community facilities are shared by the residents among Oceanaire, Ocean View and La Costa, thus combining these housing estates into one DCCA is desirable. Hopes that the delineation in future would maintain a balance between population distribution and community integrity. (c) Supports the delineation proposals for R25 (Kam To), R30 (Kam Ying), R32 (Heng On) and R34 (Tai Shui Hang) because community integrity could be preserved by maintaining their boundaries. (d) Same as items 31(c) to (e).	(ii) there is a view supporting the delineation proposals for R21 (Sui Wo) and R22 (Fo Tan) (please see item 1(a)). <u>Items (a) to (c)</u> The supporting views are noted. <u>Item (d)</u> Please see item 31.

<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	R24– Chung On R27– On Lung R28 – Fu Nga R29 – Wu Kai Sha R31 – Yiu On R33 – On Tai R34 – Tai Shui Hang R35 – Yu Yan	-	1	(a) Objects to transferring Oceanaire from R33 (On Tai) to R24 (Chung On) and proposes to retain Oceanaire in R33 (On Tai) because the local issues concerned by the residents of Oceanaire are more closely related to R33 (On Tai) (e.g. the site development of Po Tai Street and reclamation of Ma Liu Shui).	<p><u>Item (a)</u> This proposal is not accepted because:</p> <p>(i) if Oceanaire is retained in R33 (On Tai), the projected population (24,996) will substantially exceed the statutory permissible upper limit (+47.35%);</p> <p>(ii) the EAC must adhere to the statutory criteria in a practical and viable manner for ensuring that the population of each DCCA will not deviate from the population quota by more than 25%. Although according to the provisional recommendation, the projected population (21,661) of R33 (On Tai) will still slightly exceed the statutory permissible upper limit (+27.69%), taking into account the community integrity, population factors and local ties, the EAC allows its population to slightly exceed the statutory permissible upper limit;</p> <p>(iii) the delineation proposal must be based on objective data of the population distribution. Arrangements on district administration matters are not the relevant factor of consideration; and</p> <p>(iv) there is a view supporting the delineation proposals for R24 (Chung On) and R33 (On Tai) (please see item 1(a)).</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>		
				(b) Supports transferring Kam Hay Court from R24 (Chung On) to R31 (Yiu On) because the residents of Kam Hay Court mainly use the community facilities of Yiu On Estate.	<u>Item (b)</u> The supporting view is noted.
				(c) Proposes to revise the code of the following DCCAs: R27 – Wu Kai Sha R28 – On Lung R29 – Fu Nga	<u>Item (c)</u> This proposal is not accepted because the allocating codes to DCCA is merely for the sake of identification of locations of the DCCAs on the constituency boundary maps and is not directly related to the review and naming of constituency boundaries. Changing the DCCA codes used in the provisional recommendations may also cause confusion to the public. In addition, the DCCA codes used in the provisional recommendations have been allocated in a clockwise direction on the boundary maps to make the DCCAs with consecutive numbers contiguous to each other as far as possible so that it is easier to locate them.
				(d) Proposes to retain the original name “Lee On” for R27 (On Lung) because Lee On Estate is the major estate in the DCCA.	<u>Item (d)</u> Please see item 31.
				(e) Same as items 31(c) and (e).	<u>Item (e)</u> Please see item 31.
				(f) Same as item 39.	<u>Item (f)</u> Please see item 39.
28	R25– Kam To R26– Ma On Shan Town	1	-	(a) Supports the delineation proposals for R25 (Kam To) and R26 (Ma On Shan Town Centre).	<u>Item (a)</u> The supporting view is noted.

<i>Item No.</i>	<i>DCCAs</i>	<i>No. *</i>		<i>Representations</i>	<i>EAC's views</i>
		<i>W</i>	<i>O</i>		
	Centre R27– On Lung R28– Fu Nga R29 – Wu Kai Sha			(b) Same as items 31(b) to (d).	<u>Item (b)</u> Please see item 31.
29	R26 – Ma On Shan Town Centre R27 – On Lung R28 – Fu Nga R29 – Wu Kai Sha	-	1	(a) Same as items 31(a), (f) and (g).	<u>Item (a)</u> Please see item 31.
				(b) Supports transferring Villa Athena to other DCCA and the creation of a new DCCA in the area of Wu Kai Sha because the projected population of R26 (Ma On Shan Town Centre) and R28 (Fu Nga) would exceed the statutory permissible upper limit in 2015.	<u>Item (b)</u> The supporting view is noted.
30	R26– Ma On Shan Town Centre R27– On Lung R28– Fu Nga R29 – Wu Kai Sha	2	-	(a) Support the provisional recommendation on R26 (Ma On Shan Town Centre).	<u>Item (a)</u> The supporting view is noted.
				(b) One representation is same as items 31(a).	<u>Items (b) and (c)</u> Please see item 31.
				(c) Another representation is same as items 31(c) to (e).	
31	R27– On Lung R28– Fu Nga R29 –	466	12	(a) Propose: (i) to form R27 by Lee On Estate and Monte Vista; (ii) to form R28 by Kam Lung Court and Saddle	<u>Items (a) to (h)</u> The representers concerned have provided their opinions and various information from the viewpoint of local people's daily life and district's future development, focusing on the aspects 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>		
	Wu Kai Sha			<p>Ridge Garden;</p> <p>(iii) to form R29 by Lake Silver, Double Cove, Wu Kai Sha Village, Cheung Kang Village and Villa Athena.</p> <p>The reasons are summarised as follows:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ● the projected population of the DCCAs would be maintained within the statutory permissible range, reducing its deviation from the population quota when comparing with the EAC's proposal; ● after transferring Kam Lung Court to R28, the population of that DCCA and the population quota would only differ by 10 persons (0.06%); ● after transferring Monte Vista to R27, the population of that DCCA would fall short of the population quota by 4.49% only; ● the adjustments to the original constituency boundary of the abovementioned DCCAs are less than those of the EAC's proposals; ● the adjustments to DCCAs and the impact on electors could be reduced (e.g. the original names of R27 and 	<p>community integrity and local ties.</p> <p>Admittedly, based on various community development factors, there exists more or less established linkage between various housing estates in the area and the residents living therein, but the EAC considers it without a comparatively clear and concrete linkage among them. In these circumstances, solely relying on the factors of community integrity and local ties in concluding delineation of the DCCAs' boundary is not convincing and may be controversial. Based on the above considerations, the EAC considers it desirable and proper to adopt the existing boundary as the basis for recommending the re-delineation of boundary of the DCCAs, having regard to the principle of keeping the number of affected DCCAs to a minimum and referring to the population distribution among DCCAs. After detailed consideration, the EAC's revision to the provisional recommendation are appended below, by adopting the following approaches for re-delineation of the boundary of the DCCAs concerned:</p> <p>(i) to group Lee On Estate and Monte Vista in the DCCA R27;</p> <p>(ii) to group Kam Lung Court and Saddle Ridge Garden in the DCCA R28; and</p> <p>(iii) to group Villa Athena, Lake Silver, Wu Kai Sha and Double Cove in the DCCA</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>R28 would remain, i.e. 'Lee On' and 'Fu Lung', without the need to change their names). Hence, the residents of these DCCAs could adapt to the changes easily without confusion. It is in line with the delineation principle 'keeping the number of affected DCCAs to a minimum';</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> the delineation of the above proposals is straightforward and affects less major estates. Hence, the community integrity and local ties of the original R27 and R28 could be maintained; the electors of Lee On Estate and Monte Vista are used to casting their votes in the same polling station; the residents of Lee On Estate and Monte Vista share the community facilities; both Saddle Ridge Garden and Kam Lung Court are the Home Ownership Scheme estates and were occupied in the same year, having the same housing and population characteristics, encountering similar housing problems. Hence, their residents interact and communicate frequently with each other; 	<p>R29.</p> <p>The above re-delineation will solve the excess population of R26 (Ma On Shan Town Centre), R27 (On Lung) and R28 (Fu Nga) based on the projected population of the DCCAs in 2015, and to certain extent, it will further take care of the present major constituent housing estates.</p> <p>Under the provisional recommendation, the projected population of R27 (On Lung), R28 (Fu Nga) and R29 (Wu Kai Sha) will be as follows:</p> <p>R27: 15,675, -7.60% R28: 16,330, -3.74% R29: 17,674, +4.19%</p> <p>After the proposed adjustment, the projected population are as follows:</p> <p>R27: 16,354, -3.60% R28: 16,979, +0.09% R29: 16,346, -3.64%</p> <p>The abovementioned proposal would affect the same DCCAs R27, R28 and R29, which is the same as the provisional recommendation, and the projected population would be closer to the population quota.</p> <p>Arrangements on the polling station are not the relevant factors of consideration. The EAC has referred these views on the polling station arrangements to the REO for follow-up.</p> <p>The delineation proposal must be based on objective data of the</p>

<i>Item No.</i>	<i>DCCAs</i>	<i>No. *</i>		<i>Representations</i>	<i>EAC's views</i>
		<i>W</i>	<i>O</i>		
				<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ● if Villa Athena is transferred to R28, the residents of Villa Athena would have to walk across Sai Sha Road, requiring passage of 101 steps and 200 meters to reach Saddle Ridge Garden, which would affect their desire to vote; ● the residents of Saddle Ridge Garden and Kam Lung Court have been using the same bus stops to go to Ma On Shan and the urban for a long time; ● changing the location of the polling station would affect the voting habit and desire of the residents of Kam Lung Court and Monte Vista; ● Kam Lung Court and Saddle Ridge Garden have been put into the same DCCA for three consecutive elections, the same arrangement applies to Lee On Estate and Monte Vista. The community identities and close local ties have already been established between these housing estates; ● the residents of Kam Lung Court and Saddle Ridge Garden have close ties in daily life; ● Kam Lung Court and 	<p>population distribution, while arrangements on district administration matters are not the relevant factors of consideration.</p> <p>The EAC must adhere to the Administration's population forecast as at 30 June 2015 in delineating the constituency. The future development after the cut-off date will not be taken into consideration.</p> <p>After having adopted the above re-delineation proposal, the original name of "Lee On" and "Fu Lung" will continue for R27 (On Lung) and R28 (Fu Nga) respectively because:</p> <p>(i) the names of "Lee On" and "Fu Lung" have been separately adopted since 1999 and 2003 respectively, the retention of such names for the DCCAs may avoid confusion to the public; and</p> <p>(ii) the names of the above-mentioned DCCAs may also reflect the major housing estates included in the area.</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>Saddle Ridge Garden have already been included in the same DCCA for 12 years. The DC member of that DCCA is very familiar with the local affairs;</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ● transferring Kam Lung Court to new DCCA would make the residents of that DCCA difficult to adapt to constituency change; ● transferring Villa Athena to R29 could alleviate the population shortage due to incomplete occupation of Double Cove; ● Villa Athea is close to Wu Kai Sha Village. They share the community facilities and transportation in Sai Sha Road, having close community ties; ● Villa Athena and Monte Vista are both private housing estates. Hence, the above proposal of transferring Villa Athena to R29, rather than Monte Vista, could preserve the community identities of R29 as it has room for accommodating the future change of population; ● Monte Vista has developed community ties with the existing DCCA for 12 years. Transferring Monte 	

<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>Vista to R29 and absorbing Kam Lung Court would affect the boundary of two DCCAs, thus such arrangement is incomprehensible;</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ● the provisional recommendation would disrupt the community integrity for the reason that the existing R27 and R28 have a history of 16 years. The DC members of the two DCCAs have been serving the DCCA for many years and understand the needs of the citizens. After re-delineation of the boundaries of the above two DCCAs, the relevant DC members would have to adapt to the changes, their services would be affected; ● Villa Athena belongs to a high-class housing estate, which is different from Saddle Ridge Garden. Barrier exists between the two estates so it would be difficult to organize inclusive activities for these two estates; ● there are considerable numbers of housing estates in Ma On Shan (e.g. Lee On Estate, Kam Lung Court, Saddle Ridge Garden, Monte Vista and Lake Silver etc.) using the facilities of Lee On Shopping Centre, thus it 	

<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>could not be regarded as a factor of consideration supporting the transfer of Kam Lung Court to R27 (On Lung);</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ● the residents of Villa Athena and Wu Kai Sha Village have close community ties and common concerns; ● Villa Athena and Wu Kai Sha Youth Village have unique historical connection; ● Lake Silver, Double Cove, Wu Kai Sha Village, Cheung Kang Village and Villa Athena are close to the coastal area of Wu Kai Sha with common concerns of local affairs (e.g. reclamation of Wu Kai Sha); ● Villa Athena is geographically closer to Wu Kai Sha Village than Saddle Ridge Garden; ● the residents of Villa Athena, Lake Silver, Wu Kai Sha and Double Cove share public facilities, e.g. Wu Kai Sha MTR Station; and ● the above proposal could make the delineation of the area of Wu Kai Sha more unified. 	

<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) Support the provisional recommendation on the creation of a new DCCA R29 (Wu Kai Sha).</p> <p>(c) Support to form R27 (On Lung) by Kam Lung Court and Lee On Estate.</p> <p>(d) Support to form R28 (Fu Nga) by Villa Athena and Saddle Ridge Garden.</p> <p>(e) Support to form R29 (Wu Kai Sha) by Wu Kai Sha, Double Cove, Monte Vista and Lake Silver.</p> <p>The reasons are summarised as follows:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ● the EAC has taken into account the population distribution of all DCCAs, and adaptation period should be provided to the residents of the affected DCCAs; ● it is beneficial for monitoring district affairs; ● Villa Athena and Saddle Ridge Garden are just separated by a road and they share the same section of road network; ● Double Cove, Monte Vista and Lake Silver adjoin the Wu Kai Sha public transport interchange area. The residents of the above-mentioned estates belong to the same income group; 	

<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"> ● Lee On Estate and Kam Lung Court are originally the properties of Housing Authority; ● Kam Lung Court adjoins Lee On Estate; ● Kam Lung Court and Lee On Estate share the leisure area and community facilities (e.g. Lee On Shopping Centre and Lee On Community Centre); ● Kam Lung Court is far away from Saddle Ridge Garden; ● the current-term DC member has never been to Kam Lung Court for work; ● it could facilitate better community planning and overall development; ● Kam Lung Court and Lee On Estate have close community ties (e.g. participating in community activities together); ● the recommendations could strengthen the community integrity of the two DCCAs; and ● creating R29 (Wu Kai Sha) as a new DCCA could accommodate future population growth and development to cater for massive areas to be developed in Wu Kai Sha later. 	

<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>(f) Object to the delineation proposal for R27 (On Lung).</p> <p>(g) Object to the delineation proposal for R28 (Fu Nga).</p> <p>(h) Object to the delineation proposal for R29 (Wu Kai Sha).</p> <p>The reasons are summarised as follows:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ● Kam Lung Court and Saddle Ridge Garden have been included in the same DCCA for 12 years. The two estates have close community ties; ● the residents of Kam Lung Court and Saddle Ridge Garden use the same polling station; ● the residents of Villa Athena have to go to the polling station of Saddle Ridge Garden via 101 steps and extra 200 meters walking distance. This would affect the citizens' desire to vote; ● Lee On Estate and Monte Vista have been included in the same DCCA for 12 years; ● adjustment to the constituency boundaries would be minimised by keeping Lee On Estate and Monte Vista in the same DCCA; 	

<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"> ● keeping Lee On Estate and Monte Vista in the same DCCA would make the population closer to the population quota; ● according to the 2011 Population Census, the population of Monte Vista is 5,286, Lake Silver 6,149 and Wu Kai Sha Village 1,500. The projected population of Double Cove would be 9,000 upon full occupation, while the dormitory of City University of Hong Kong would accommodate 4,000 persons. The projected population of the 'Comprehensive Development Area' of Whitehead Headland in Ma On Shan is about 500, and that of the Government Land at Yiu Sha Road of Ma On Shan is about 1,710, making the total projected population at 28,145. Therefore, the EAC's proposal would make the future population of R29 (Wu Kai Sha) overloaded and necessitate re-delineation in future; ● the original boundaries of R27 and R28 will have a 16-year history by 2015. The DC members of these DCCAs have established certain reputation, acquired full knowledge of the geographical surroundings and are capable of meeting the 	

<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>people's needs. The new proposal would waste efforts of the DC members and demand starting their work afresh. Moreover, the DC members working in a new DCCA undoubtedly would require adaptation period and extra time and efforts for familiarisation;</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ● the residents of these DCCAs have affection and reliance on the DC members who have served them for a long time, so it is hard for them without the existing DC members who would no longer serve them; ● the EAC's proposed delineation would cause unnecessary changes. Future re-delineation would be required, by taking into further consideration the increase of the projected population of R29 (Wu Kai Sha); ● Kam Lung Court and Saddle Ridge Garden have been included in the same DCCA since 2003. It is considered that community relations have been established between the two estates. Consensus on traffic and community issues could be easily attained; and ● the residents of Saddle Ridge Garden and Kam Lung Court invite each 	

<i>Item No.</i>	<i>DCCAs</i>	<i>No. *</i>		<i>Representations</i>	<i>EAC's views</i>
		<i>W</i>	<i>O</i>		
				other to attend their residents' meetings and New Year Spring Reception, indicating good community ties of these estates. The provisional recommendation would split the original DCCA into three. It would be obviously harmful to residents' welfare and disadvantageous to the DC in implementation of public administration issues.	
32	R27– On Lung	-	1	(a) Same as items 31(c) and (d).	<u>Item (a)</u> Please see item 31.
	R28– Fu Nga			(b) Same as item 39.	<u>Item (b)</u> Please see item 39.
	R29 – Wu Kai Sha				
	R34 – Tai Shui Hang				
	R35 – Yu Yan				
33	R27– On Lung	1	-	(a) Same as items 31(a), (b) and (f) to (h).	<u>Item (a)</u> Please see item 31.
	R28 – Fu Nga R29 – Wu Kai Sha			(b) Proposes that if R29 is composed of Double Cove, Lake Silver, Villa Athena and Wu Kai Sha Village, the polling station may be set up in the Village Office of the Wu Kai Sha Village because: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> the Village Office of the Wu Kai Sha Village is in the middle of Villa Athena, 	<u>Items (b) and (c)</u> The delineation proposal must be based on objective data of the population distribution. Arrangements on polling station are not the relevant factors of consideration. The EAC has referred this view on the polling station arrangements to the REO for follow-up.

<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>Double Cove and Lake Silver for encouraging and enhancing the voting desire of the villagers of the aging Wu Kai Sha Village; and</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> the walking distance between the Village Office of the Wu Kai Sha Village and Villa Athena is less than 5 minutes, while that of Double Cove and Wu Kai Sha Village is just a road apart; and 	
				(c) Proposes that if R29 is composed of Double Cove, Lake Silver, Villa Athena and Wu Kai Sha Village, the polling station may also be set up in Wu Kai Sha Station.	
34	R27 – On Lung R28 – Fu Nga R29 – Wu Kai Sha	-	1	(a) Same as items 31(a) and (b).	<u>Item (a)</u> Please see item 31.
				(b) Considers that the projected population of the development area in the vicinity of Wu Kai Sha (Comprehensive Development Areas (1), (2) and (3)) is under-estimated, because according to the 2011 Population Census, the population of Monte Vista is 5,286, Lake Silver 6,149 and Wu Kai Sha Village 1,500. The projected population of Double Cove would be 9,000 upon full occupation, while the dormitory of City University of Hong Kong would accommodate 4,000 persons, making the total projected population at 28,145. Therefore, the EAC's proposal would make the future	<u>Item (b)</u> The EAC must adhere to the Administration's population forecast as at 30 June 2015 in delineating the constituencies. The future development after the cut-off date 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>			
				population of R29 (Wu Kai Sha) overloaded and necessitate re-delineation in future.		
35	R27– On Lung	-	1	(a) Same as items 31(a)(i) and (ii).	<u>Item (a)</u> Please see item 31.	
	R28 – Fu Nga			(b) Same as item 39.	<u>Item (b)</u> Please see item 39.	
	R29 – Wu Kai Sha			(c) Considers that the EAC should not take into consideration the political factors.	<u>Item (c)</u> The delineation proposal must be based on objective data of the population distribution. The political factors are not the relevant factors of consideration.	
	R34 – Tai Shui Hang					
	R35 – Yu Yan					
36	R27– On Lung	1	-	(a) Same as item 31(c).	<u>Items (a) to (c)</u> The supporting view is noted.	
	R31 – Yiu On			(b) Supports transferring Kam Hay Court to R31 (Yiu On) because the community facilities of Kam Hay Court are the same as Yiu On Estate's.		
	R33 – On Tai			(c) Supports transferring Castello to R37 (Kwong Hong) because the proposal would maintain the population of R36 (Bik Woo) and R37 (Kwong Hong) within the statutory population range.		
	R34 – Tai Shui Hang					
	R35 – Yu Yan					
	R36 – Bik Woo					
	R37 – Kwong Hong					(d) Same as item 39.
				(e) Proposes to transfer the Area 73 of Sha Tin from R35 (Yu Yan) to R33 (On Tai) because that area is right next to Kam	<u>Item (e)</u> This proposal is not accepted because the EAC must adhere to the Administration's 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>		
				Tai Court. Therefore, future planning and development of that area are also closely relevant to the residents of R33 (On Tai).	forecast as at 30 June 2015 in delineating the constituency. The Area 73 of Sha Tin mentioned in the representation has no projected population.
37	R29 – Wu Kai Sha	1	-	<p>Proposes to form R29 (Wu Kai Sha) by Double Cove and Whitehead area only because:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ● Double Cove would be completed in 2 years and the number of households would be as many as 3,500. The housing estates of Whitehead area would also be completed shortly afterwards, causing upsurge in the projected population; and ● the size of the constituency under the provisional recommendation is too large. The DC member would find it difficult to take care of the local affairs. 	<p>This proposal is not accepted because:</p> <p>(i) the EAC must adhere to the Administration's population forecast as at 30 June 2015 in delineating the constituency boundaries. The future development after the cut-off date will not be taken into consideration;</p> <p>(ii) after the proposed adjustment, the projected population of R29 (Wu Kai Sha) (4,597) will substantially fall short of the statutory permissible lower limit (-72.90%); and</p> <p>(iii) the delineation proposal must be based on objective data of population distribution. Arrangements on district administration matters are not the relevant factors of consideration.</p>
38	R33 – On Tai R34 – Tai Shui Hang R35 – Yu Yan	-	1	(a) Proposes to transfer the Vehicle Detention Centre of Customs and Excise Department in Area 73 of Sha Tin from R35 (Yu Yan) to R33 (On Tai) for facilitating future development because the area adjoins Kam Tai Court in R33 (On Tai).	<p><u>Item (a)</u></p> <p>This proposal is not accepted because the EAC must adhere to the Administration's population forecast as at 30 June 2015 in delineating the constituency boundaries. The area of the Vehicle Detention Centre of Customs and Excise Department in Area 73 of Sha Tin mentioned in the representation has no projected 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>		
				(b) Same as item 39.	<u>Item (b)</u> Please see item 39.
39	R34 – Tai Shui Hang R35 – Yu Yan	65	5	<p>Propose to transfer Ah Kung Kok Fishermen Village from R35 (Yu Yan) to R34 (Tai Shui Hang).</p> <p>66 representations consider that Ah Kung Kok Fishermen Village is geographically nearer to Tai Shui Hang Village and Chevalier Garden of Ma On Shan.</p> <p>65 representations consider that the residents of Ah Kung Kok Fishermen Village are used to getting to R34 (Tai Shui Hang) for share use of the community facilities in the area.</p> <p>64 representations consider that the mode of public transportation used by the residents of Ah Kung Kok Fishermen Village is the same as that used by the residents of R34 (Tai Shui Hang).</p> <p>63 representations consider that :</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ● after transferring Ah Kung Kok Fishermen Village from R35 (Yu Yan) to R34 (Tai Shui Hang), the projected population of R34 (Tai Shui Hang) and R35 (Yu Yan) would still fall within the statutory permissible range and their deviation from the population quota would not be significantly affected; and ● the future planning and development of the community would be more comprehensive. 	<p>This proposal is not accepted because:</p> <p>(i) the projected population of R34 (Tai Shui Hang) and R35 (Yu Yan) will fall within the statutory permissible range. According to the established working principles, adjustment to their existing boundaries is not required; and</p> <p>(ii) the delineation proposal must be based on objective data of the population distribution. Arrangements on district administration matters 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>Two representations consider that since most of the residents of Ah Kung Kok Fishermen Village are elderly, the proposal would ensure that they would find it convenient to cast their votes in R34 (Tai Shui Hang).</p> <p>Two representations consider that the residents of Ah Kung Kok Fishermen Village often have their day-to-day activities in R34 (Tai Shui Hang).</p> <p>One representation considers that the residents of Ah Kung Kok Fishermen Village would be encouraged to fulfill their citizen obligation in casting their votes in R34 (Tai Shui Hang) due to close proximity of the village to R34 (Tai Shui Hang).</p> <p>One representation considers that Ah Kung Kok Fishermen Village has been included in R34 (Tai Shui Hang) previously.</p> <p>One representation considers that the residents of Ah Kung Kok Fishermen Village and Chevalier Garden have maintained close ties with each other (e.g. in respect of joint participation in community activities).</p> <p>One representation considers that the EAC could refer to the past voting turnout records showing that the election results would be unaffected by the transfer of Ah Kung Kok Fishermen Village to R34 (Tai Shui Hang).</p> <p>One representation considers that the District Officer has previously</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>responded to the residents' wishes to increase the provision of community facilities, indicating that Ah Kung Kok Fishermen Village's residents could share the facilities installed in Tai Shui Hang, which represents that the local ties of both areas are close.</p> <p>One representation considers that in terms of the mode of transport, the residents of Ah Kung Kok Fishermen Village would encounter difficulties in travelling to R35 (Yu Yan) because the transportation is not convenient enough. If they wished to cast their votes, they would have to get access to the polling station in Yu Chui Court by taking minibus and bus and also pass through R36 (Bik Woo) and R37 (Kwong Hong), which is contrary to the principle of transportation convenience for people's voting.</p> <p>One representation considers that the transfer of Ah Kung Kok Fishermen Village to R34 (Tai Shui Hang) could further enhance the community integrity and help the Administration's future planning and development.</p>	