

Appendix III - C**Eastern 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	C04 – Shaueiwan C31– Lower Yiu Tung	1	The representation objects to move the area between Nam On Lane, Nam On Street and Shau Kei Wan Road from C31 to C04 because: (a) the change of boundary is not necessary; and (b) the proposed odd-shaped boundary will cause confusion to the residents there.	The representation is not accepted because: (i) by maintaining the status quo for C31, the population of C04 would fall below the lower permissible limit (-28.97%); (ii) the shape of DCCAs should not be a consideration for delineating DCCAs; and (iii) there is a representation supporting the demarcation proposals for C04 (see item 16).
2	C13 – Fei Tsui C33 – Hing Man C34 – Lok Hong C35 – Tsui Tak	1	The representation objects to the transfer of Shan Tsui Court from C33 to C34 and proposes to: (a) move Koway Court and Bay View Park from C35 to C34; (b) move Wah Tai Mansion, Cinema Building and Hing Wah (I) Estate from C33 to C35; and (c) rename C33 as “Hing Tsui”, because: (i) Shan Tsui Court is geographically more related to C33; and (ii) a more even population distribution among C33, C34 and C35 will be achieved. The representation also proposes to add Moon	The representation is not accepted because the resultant population of C33 (12,244) would fall below the lower permissible limit (-29.12%). The proposed amendment of the boundary description of C13 is accepted for the reason stated.

<i>Item no.</i>	<i>DCCAs concerned</i>	<i>No. of representations</i>	<i>Representations</i>	<i>EAC's views</i>
			Wah Building, Man Wah Building and Chai Wan Rank & File Married Quarters in the boundary description of C13 because they are major buildings therein.	
3	C15 – Braemar Hill C16 – Tin Hau C17 – Fortress Hill	1	The representation suggests to move the buildings between 8-10 Cloud View Road and Viking Villas from C16 to C15 or C17 because: (a) the DC member in C16 has only focused on the interests of the residents in Lai Tak Tsuen. The residents of Cloud View Road and Viking Villas are neglected. It is also inconvenient for them to seek help from the DC member in C16; and (b) it is inconvenient for the elderly and people with disabilities to access the polling station in C16 whereas it is easier for them to reach the polling stations in C15 or C17.	The representation is not accepted because: (i) it would unnecessarily affect the existing boundaries of C15, C16 and C17, which should not be changed since the population in C15, C16 and C17 is within the permissible limits; and (ii) the REO will take note of the representation when identifying the venue for the polling station in C16.
4	C16 – Tin Hau C17 – Fortress Hill C18 – Victoria Park C20 – Provident	1	The representation proposes the delineation of C16, C17, C18, C20, C21 and C24 as follows: (a) move the area bounded by Oil Street, Electric Road, Merlin Street and King's Road from C17 to C18; (b) move the area bounded by Fortress Hill Road, King's Road, Cheung	The representation is not accepted because: (i) the resultant population of C17 and C20 would exceed the permissible limits: C17: 11,892(-31.16%) C20: 21,874(+26.62%); and (ii) it would also affect the unaltered boundaries of 6 DCCAs (C16, C17, C18, C20, C21 and C24) where no change is necessary.

<i>Item no.</i>	<i>DCCAs concerned</i>	<i>No. of representations</i>	<i>Representations</i>	<i>EAC's views</i>
	C21 – Fort Street C24 – Healthy Village		<p>Hong Street and Tin Hau Temple Road from C17 to C21;</p> <p>(c) move the area bounded by Tin Hau Temple Road, Lau Sin Street and King's Road from C16 to C17;</p> <p>(d) move the area bounded by King's Road, North View Street, Fort Street and Cheung Hong Street from C20 to C21;</p> <p>(e) move the area bounded by Java Road, North Point Road, King's Road and Tong Shui Road from C21 to C20; and</p> <p>(f) move the area bounded by Shu Kuk Street, King's Road and Kam Hong Street from C20 to C24,</p> <p>to maintain geographical and community link and to cope with the outflow of population due to the demolition of North Point Estate.</p>	
5	C17 – Fortress Hill C18 – Victoria Park C19 – City Garden	1	<p>The representation suggests to move Yuet Ming Building, Carson Mansion and United Building from C17 to C18 or C19 because:</p> <p>(a) they are geographically more related to C18 and C19; and</p> <p>(b) the residents of these buildings frequently</p>	<p>The representation is not accepted because it would affect the existing boundaries of C17, C18 and C19 which are unaltered under the provisional recommendation.</p>

<i>Item no.</i>	<i>DCCAs concerned</i>	<i>No. of representations</i>	<i>Representations</i>	<i>EAC's views</i>
			take part in the activities of C18 and C19.	
6	C23 – Tanner C24 – Healthy Village	1	The representation suggests to move Tung Po Building from C24 to C23 because: (a) the building is situated closer to C23 rather than C24; (b) Tung Po residents often take part in the activities of C23 rather than those of C24 and are better integrated with the community in C23; and (c) the building is isolated from the rest of C24 and separated from it by fly-overs.	The representation is not accepted because C23 and C24, which are unaltered under the provisional recommendations, would be affected.
7	C26 – Nam Fung C27 – Kornhill C28 – Kornhill Garden	1	The representation objects to transfer The Orchards from C26 to C28 as there has been no change to the constituency boundary of C26 since 1999.	The representation is not accepted because: (i) the aim of re-delineating C26 is to alleviate the population quota shortfall (-30.05%) of the adjacent C27. If The Orchards is to be retained in C26, the population of C28 (12,668) will fall below the lower permissible limit (-26.67%); (ii) the proposal is the most viable option as the population of C26, C27 and C28 will all fall within the permissible limits; (iii) The Orchards was built just two years ago and its community ties with the other buildings in C26 are relatively less strong; and (iv) there are 2 representations in support of the demarcation proposals for C26 and C28 (see

<i>Item no.</i>	<i>DCCAs concerned</i>	<i>No. of representations</i>	<i>Representations</i>	<i>EAC's views</i>
				item 10).
8	C27 – Kornhill C28 – Kornhill Garden	3	<p>The representation objects to move Block N of Kornhill from C28 to C27 because:</p> <p>(a) Blocks N, P, Q, R of Kornhill belong to an independent development lot and their financial and day-to-day management should not be separated;</p> <p>(b) all these buildings are closely related to each other in terms of geographical link and community ties; and</p> <p>(c) it may cause unnecessary disputes if these buildings are served by 2 DC members having conflicting interests.</p>	<p>The representation is not accepted because the aim of re-delineating C28 is to alleviate the population quota shortfall (-30.05%) of the adjacent C27. If Block N of Kornhill is to be retained in C28, the population of C27 (12,084) will fall below the lower permissible limit (-30.05%).</p>
9	C27 – Kornhill C28 – Kornhill Garden	1	<p>The representation:</p> <p>(a) objects to move Block N of Kornhill from C28 to C27 and proposes to move The Floridian and Sai Wan Terrace from C28 to C27 instead, as both buildings have been part of C27 previously; and</p> <p>(b) suggests to rename C27 as “Kornhill and Sai Wan Terrace” to reflect the above change.</p>	<p>The representation is not accepted because the resultant population of C27 (12,802) would fall below the lower permissible limit (-25.89%).</p>

<i>Item no.</i>	<i>DCCAs concerned</i>	<i>No. of representations</i>	<i>Representations</i>	<i>EAC's views</i>
10	C28 – Kornhill Garden	2	These representations support the transfer of The Orchards from C26 to C28.	The supporting views are noted.
11	C33 – Hing Man C34 – Lok Hong	1	The representation objects to transfer Shan Tsui Court from C33 to C34 because: (a) the electors of Shan Tsui Court (most of them being the elderly) might abstain from voting at the polling station in C34 as they would have to travel a very long distance from Shan Tsui Court to the polling station; (b) residents of Shan Tsui Court have long been accustomed to the existing boundary since 1996; and (c) it would be inconvenient for the residents of Shan Tsui Court to seek the assistance of the DC member of C34 because of the geographical distance.	The representation is not accepted because: (i) the purpose for re-delineating C33 is to alleviate the population quota shortfall (-38.84%) of the adjacent C34; (ii) to facilitate the residents of Shan Tsui Court to cast their votes, the REO would identify an additional polling station for C34 in the vicinity of Shan Tsui Court such as Shau Kei Wan Government Secondary School; (iii) the location of the office of the DC member is not a consideration for delineating DCCAs; and (iv) there are no other viable options to address the under-population problem of C34.
12	C33 – Hing Man C34 – Lok Hong C35 – Tsui Tak	1	The representation objects to move Shan Tsui Court from C33 to C34 because it is geographically closer to C33 than C34, and proposes to move Koway Court from C35 to C34 to address the population deficit of C34.	The representation is not accepted because the resultant population of C34 and C35 would fall below the lower permissible limit: C34: 12,778(-26.03%) C35: 11,282(-34.69%)
13	C33 – Hing Man C34 – Lok Hong	1	The representation objects to move Shan Tsui Court from C33 to C34 and proposes to: (a) move Koway Court and Bay View Park	The representation is not accepted because the resultant population of C36 (8,536) would fall below the lower permissible limit (-50.59%).

<i>Item no.</i>	<i>DCCAs concerned</i>	<i>No. of representations</i>	<i>Representations</i>	<i>EAC's views</i>
	C35 – Tsui Tak C36 – Yue Wan		from C35 to C34 because they are closely related to Greenwood Terrace and Neptune Terrace in C34; and (b) move Lok Hin Terrace from C36 to C35 to preserve community integrity.	
14	C34 – Lok Hong	1	The representation suggests to set up a polling station at Lutheran Philip House Hing Man Child Care Centre instead of Shau Kei Wan Government Secondary School (as raised by the EAC Chairman at the public forum held on 15 August 2006) because the elderly of Shan Tsui Court would have to walk through a steep road before reaching the proposed polling station at Shau Kei Wan Government Secondary School.	The REO will take note of the representation when identifying the venue for the polling station in C34.
15	C34 – Lok Hong C35 – Tsui Tak C36 – Yue Wan	2	These representations propose to: (a) move Koway Court and Bay View Park from C35 to C34; and (b) move Lok Hin Terrace from C36 to C35, because of geographical and community concerns and better distribution of workload for DC members.	The representations are not accepted because the resultant population of C36 (8,536) would fall below the lower permissible limit (-50.59%).

Eastern District
Oral Representations Received at the Public Forum on 15 August 2006

<i>Item no.</i>	<i>DCCAs concerned</i>	<i>No. of representations</i>	<i>Representations</i>	<i>EAC's views</i>
16	C04 – Shaukeiwan	1	The representation supports the demarcation proposals for C04.	The supporting view is noted.
17	C33 – Hing Man C34 – Lok Hong	1	The representation supports the demarcation proposals for C33 and C34 if an additional polling station could be set up at Shau Kei Wan Government Secondary School to serve the electors of Shan Tsui Court as raised by the EAC Chairman at the public forum.	The supporting view is noted.
18	C33 – Hing Man C34 – Lok Hong	1	Same as item 11.	See item 11.
19	Consultation period arrangement	1	The representation suggests to: (a) publicise the locations of polling stations at the same time when the consultation document is released; and (b) extend the consultation period.	Representation (a) is noted for review. Representation (b) is not accepted because the consultation period in question has been announced to the public and the EAC is under a tight schedule to complete the demarcation exercise. Over the years, it has been the EAC's practice to hold one month consultation on its demarcation proposals or guidelines for various elections. This is in line with Government's guidelines on the consultation of public opinion and is generally accepted by the public.