

Appendix III - D

**Southern 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	D01 – Aberdeen D15 – Wong Chuk Hang	1	The representation proposes to retain Ocean Court in D01 because: (a) it is closer to D01; (b) the relationship with the DC member is well-established; and (c) the residents' desire to vote may be affected with its move to another DCCA.	The representation is not accepted because: (i) the population of D01 will exceed the upper permissible limit (22,198, +28.50%); and (ii) to retain Ocean Court in D01 would involve moving the excessive population in D01 to other unaltered DCCA such as D13.
2	D03 – Ap Lei Chau North D04 – Lei Tung I	1	This representation appreciates the proposal of putting the entire Yue On Court in one DCCA, but considers that it is more desirable to retain it in D03 instead of D04 because: (a) Yue On Court has been in D03 since the 1994 DB Election, the residents' sense of belonging has been well-established; (b) the geographical link and community ties of Sham Wan Towers with D03 are relatively weak; (c) it is more appropriate to delineate D03 and D04 by transportation network and Sham Wan Towers has a closer relationship with D04;	The representation is accepted because it will produce a better population distribution as follows: D03: 16,842 (-2.51%) D04: 14,060 (-18.61%) without affecting other DCCAs and valid reasons of (a) to (d) are given in the representation. As regard to (e), the EAC will not take any population figures beyond 30 June 2007 into consideration as it is necessary to use the same set of population data with the same basis and same cut-off date in projecting the population for all DCCAs.

<i>Item no.</i>	<i>DCCAs concerned</i>	<i>No. of representations</i>	<i>Representations</i>	<i>EAC's views</i>
			<p>(d) the population of D04 will still fall within the permissible range after moving Sham Wan Towers to D04 and moving Yue On Court from D04 to D03; and</p> <p>(e) as the population distribution will be even, it is unnecessary to alter the boundaries of D03 and D04 in the 2011 DC Election, even though there may be an increase in population arising from the new residential development in D04.</p>	
3	D17 – Stanley & Shek O	1	<p>The representation proposes to split D17 into two DCCAs, named as Stanley and Shek O respectively, because:</p> <p>(a) the population of D17 far exceeds the upper permissible limit;</p> <p>(b) the geographical settings are different;</p> <p>(c) residents in Shek O do not share any facilities with those in Stanley; and</p> <p>(d) the population of Shek O (8,000) may exceed the lower permissible limit but this is allowed in some DCCAs of other districts.</p>	The representation is not accepted because this would involve the addition of one seat for Southern District Council which is outside the EAC's jurisdiction.

Southern 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>
4	D03 – Ap Lei Chau North D04 – Lei Tung I	1	Same as item 2.	See item 2.
5	D09 – Wah Fu I D10 – Wah Fu II D11 – Pokfulam D12 – Chi Fu	1	The representation opines that: (a) it is more appropriate to retain Pok Fu Lam Village in D11 for the sake of electors' benefits because the tradition of the village is more closely related to the area of Baguio Villa, or (b) it is possible to move Bel-Air on the Peak to the area of Wah Fu Estate as they are close to each other and the population of Residence Bel-Air in 2007, as provided by Southern District Council, will be over 17,000.	The representation is not accepted because: (i) it is necessary to move Pok Fu Lam Village to D12 in order to relieve the population overflow of D11 (21,954, +27.09%); and (ii) taking geographical link and community setting into consideration, it is more appropriate to move the village to D12 instead of moving Bel-Air on the Peak from D11 to either D09 or D10.
6	D14 – Shek Yue D15 – Wong Chuk Hang	1	(a) The representation expresses concern over the accuracy of estimated population of D14 and D15. They query if the residents currently in Wong Chuk Hang Estate in D15, who will move to Shek Pai Wan	<u>Item (a)</u> According to the figure given by AHSG, all residents of Wong Chuk Hang Estate are expected to have moved out by 30 June 2007. <u>Item (b)</u> The view is noted and follow-up actions will be taken.

<i>Item no.</i>	<i>DCCAs concerned</i>	<i>No. of representations</i>	<i>Representations</i>	<i>EAC's views</i>
			<p>Estate in D14 in May 2007, are counted as population of either D14 or D15.</p> <p>(b) They also suggest the EAC to take actions to ensure that the addresses of residents in Shek Pai Wan Estate would be updated so that these residents can cast their votes in the DCCA of their residence in the coming election.</p>	