

Appendix III - J**Kwun Tong 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	J07 – Shun Tin	1	The representation supports the demarcation proposal for J07.	The supporting view is noted.
2	J10 – Po Tat	2	The representations support the demarcation proposal for J10.	The supporting views are noted.
3	J10 – Po Tat J13 – Sau Mau Ping South	7	The seven representations object to delineating the Tat Cheung House and Tat Hei House of Po Tat Estate into J13 because: (a) community integrity of Po Tat Estate would be hampered; (b) the operation of the Area Committee would be affected; (c) residents' sense of belonging would be affected; (d) the EAC permitted Laguna City to be grouped under the same DCCA even though its population is over the upper permissible limit; and (e) Tat Cheung House is mainly inhabited by elderly residents. They felt being separated from Po Tat Estate.	The representations are accepted although there are two representations supporting the proposal (See item 2), because: (i) Po Tat Estate is geographically isolated from Sau Mau Ping and separated by a major motorway; (although linked by a footbridge); (ii) Tat Cheung House and Tat Hei House are situated on the same elevated platform together with the other eleven residential blocks of the Po Tat Estate and sharing the same community facilities; and (iii) There is a need to preserve the community integrity of the Estate. However, the population of J10 will hence exceed the upper permissible limit (24,763, +43.35%).

<i>Item no.</i>	<i>DCCAs concerned</i>	<i>No. of representations</i>	<i>Representations</i>	<i>EAC's views</i>
4	J10 – Po Tat J13 – Sau Mau Ping South J16 – Kwong Tak J19 – Yau Tong East J20 – Yau Tong Central J21 – Yau Tong West	1	<p>The representation</p> <p>(a) objects to delineating the Tat Cheung House and Tat Hei House of Po Tat Estate into J13 because the community integrity of Po Tat Estate would be hampered;</p> <p>(b) suggests that Sau Ming House of Sau Mau Ping Estate should be moved from J13 into J11 to preserve community integrity;</p> <p>(c) suggests that Ping Chun House of Ping Tin Estate should be moved back from J16 into J17 to preserve the local ties and community integrity.</p> <p>(d) suggests that J19 should include Lei Yue Mun Estate and four blocks of Ko Cheung Court (Ko Ching House, Ko Hong House, Ko Fung House and Ko Fei House);</p> <p>(e) suggests that J20 should include five blocks of Ko Cheung Court (Ko On House, Ko Siu House, Ko Ki House, Ko Lun House and Ko Hang House), Yau Mei Court and Yau Lai Estate;</p> <p>(f) suggests that J21</p>	<p>(i) See items 3, 6, 11 and 13 for representations of (a), (c), (d) (e) and (f).</p> <p>(ii) Representation of (b) is not accepted because the population of J11 is within the permissible range (20,467, +18.48%). It is not necessary to change the existing boundaries.</p>

<i>Item no.</i>	<i>DCCAs concerned</i>	<i>No. of representations</i>	<i>Representations</i>	<i>EAC's views</i>
			should include Cha Kwo Ling, Lei Yue Mun, Yau Tong Estate and Yau Tong Centre.	
5	J12 – Hiu Lai	1	The representation suggests United Christian Hospital should be moved from J11 (Sau Mau Ping North) to J12 for better communication with the hospital and to maintain community integrity.	The representation is not accepted as the population of both DCCAs are within the permissible range: J11: 20,467 (+18.48%) J12: 18,896 (+9.38%) It is not necessary to change the existing boundaries.
6	J14 – Hing Tin J15 – Tak Tin J16 – Kwong Tak	2	(a) The representations object to dissolving the Lam Tin DCCA (former J16) because it is unfair to the residents of this DCCA; (b) one representation opines that the population of Lam Tin is increasing continuously and thus the cancellation of one DCCA would cause unfair community resources allocation; (c) one representation opines that dissolving the said DCCA would cause confusion to the residents and hamper community development; (d) one representation opines that the combination of DCCAs would cause inconvenience to the residents due to geographical differences;	The representations are partially accepted . Taking into account the geographical factors and in order to affect a smaller number of DCCA, the Lam Tin (former J16) can be kept intact by adopting the following modified proposal: (a) to merge the existing J15 (Tak Tin) and old J17 (Kwong Tak) into one DCCA (new J16 Kwong Tak); and (b) to move Tak Lai House, Tak King House and Tak Shui House from the existing J15 (Tak Tin) to J14 (Hing Tin). Under the modified proposal, only 3 existing DCCAs, one less than the original proposal, would be affected. The resultant populations are also within the upper permissible limit: J14: 20,040 (+16.01%) J16: 21,213 (+22.80%). The merging of 3 DCCAs to 2 in Lam Tin is required so as to release a seat to Yau Tong and to make the population of existing DCCA Kwong Tak (former J17) within the permissible limit.

<i>Item no.</i>	<i>DCCAs concerned</i>	<i>No. of representations</i>	<i>Representations</i>	<i>EAC's views</i>
			(e) one representation queries about the reason of cancellation of one DCCA as the population of Lam Tin DCCA is still within the permissible limit.	
7	J14 – Hing Tin J15 – Tak Tin J16 – Kwong Tak J17 – Ping Tin J18 – Pak Nga	1	(a) The representation supports the demarcation proposals for these 5 DCCAs. (b) It proposes to relocate the polling station of J17, ie Sing Yin Secondary School, to S.K.H Lee Shiu Keung Primary School for electors' convenience.	<u>Item (a)</u> The supporting view is noted. <u>Item (b)</u> The view is noted.
8	J14 – Hing Tin J15 – Tak Tin J16 – Kwong Tak J17 – Ping Tin J25 – Tsui Ping North J26 – Po Lok J27 – Yuet Wah J28 –	1	The representation suggests to dissolve the Po Lok DCCA (J26) and puts up a proposal on re-delineating J25, J26, J27 and J28 as follows: (a) Move Tsui Mui House, Tsui Nam House and Tsui Yue House of Tsui Ping North Estate from J26 into J25; (b) Move Po Pui Court from J26 into J28 and renamed J28 as “Po Cheung”; (c) Move Wo Lok Estate from J26 into J27. Also move Hopewell House, Hip Wo House and Yen Fu Mansion	The representation is not accepted because it would affect two originally unaltered DCCAs (J25 and J26) causing substantial changes to the existing boundaries.

<i>Item no.</i>	<i>DCCAs concerned</i>	<i>No. of representations</i>	<i>Representations</i>	<i>EAC's views</i>
	Hip Hong		<p>from J28 into J27 and renamed J27 as “Yuet Wo”.</p> <p>The reasons given are:</p> <p>(i) the average population of the DCCAs concerned is relatively low;</p> <p>(ii) the geographical features and community ties of the DCCAs will be better;</p> <p>(iii) community integrity can be preserved;</p> <p>(iv) the estimated population of the new proposal is within the permissible range; and</p> <p>(v) the new proposal conforms to the continuous development principle.</p> <p>Under this proposal, the existing number of DCCAs in Lam Tin can therefore be maintained.</p>	
9	J14 – Hing Tin J15 – Tak Tin J16 – Kwong Tak J17 – Ping Tin J18 –	1	<p>The representation</p> <p>(a) supports the demarcation proposals for dissolving the Lam Tin DCCA (former J16);</p> <p>(b) appreciates that the EAC accepted the proposal of renaming J18 as “Pak Nga”;</p> <p>(c) suggests that Ping</p>	<p>(i) The supporting view of (a) and (b) are noted.</p> <p>(ii) Representation (c) is not accepted as the population of J17 (17,347, +0.42%) is within the permissible limit. Change to the existing boundary is not necessary.</p> <p>(iii) Representation (d) is not accepted as the names currently adopted for the DCCAs concerned already reflected the</p>

<i>Item no.</i>	<i>DCCAs concerned</i>	<i>No. of representations</i>	<i>Representations</i>	<i>EAC's views</i>
	Pak Nga J19 – Yau Tong East J20 – Yau Tong Central J21 – Yau Tong West J23 – King Tin		<p>Chun House of Ping Tin Estate, Lee Shiu Keung Primary School and Lam Tin Methodist Primary School should be moved to J17;</p> <p>(d) as the Lam Tin DCCA (former J16) is dissolved, it suggests that J14 can be renamed as “Wah Hing Yat”, J15 can be renamed as “Tak Kai”, J17 can be renamed as “Ping On” or “On Ping” and J23 can be renamed as “King Tin and Lei On”;</p> <p>(e) suggests that J19 should include Ko Chun Court, Ko Yee Estate, Lei Yue Mun Estate and four blocks of Ko Cheung Court (Ko Ching House, Ko Hong House, Ko Fung House and Ko Fei House), J20 should include Yau Mei Court, Yau Lai Estate and five blocks of Ko Cheung Court (Ko On House, Ko Siu House, Ko Ki House, Ko Lun House and Ko Hang House) and J21 should include Yau Tong Estate, Yau Tong Centre, Lei Yue Mun and Cha Kwo Ling.</p> <p>The reasons given are:</p> <p>(i) Lei Yue Mun Estate has close relation with Ko Yee Estate and Ko</p>	<p>major buildings therein (See also item 6).</p> <p>(iv) See item 13 for representation (e).</p>

<i>Item no.</i>	<i>DCCAs concerned</i>	<i>No. of representations</i>	<i>Representations</i>	<i>EAC's views</i>
			Chun Court; and (ii) it is necessary to preserve the management integrity of Yau Mei Court and Yau Tong Estate.	
10	J15 – Tak Tin	1	The representation (a) opines that the Kai Tin Estate and Tak Tin Estate are located far apart geographically; (b) opines that as only one DC member's office will remain, it causes inconvenience to the residents of these two estates in seeking assistance from the DC member; and (c) opines that the cancellation of one DC member in Lam Tin district would cause confusion to residents in the future.	See item 6.
11	J16 – Kwong Tak	4	(a) The four representations object to delineating Ping Chun House of Ping Tin Estate into the new J16 (Kwong Tak) because it would hamper the community integrity and further suggest moving Ping Chun House to J17. (b) two of the representations support the demarcation proposals	(i) The representations of (a) are not accepted as the population of J17 (17,347, +0.42%) is within the permissible limit. Change to the existing boundary is not necessary. (ii) The supporting view of (b) is noted.

<i>Item no.</i>	<i>DCCAs concerned</i>	<i>No. of representations</i>	<i>Representations</i>	<i>EAC's views</i>
			for dissolving the Lam Tin DCCA.	
12	J19 – Yau Tong East J20 – Yau Tong Central	1	The representation supports the demarcation proposals for J19 and J20.	The supporting view is noted.
13	J19 – Yau Tong East J20 – Yau Tong Central J21 – Yau Tong West	11	<p>(a) These representations opposes the demarcation proposals for J19, J20 or J21;</p> <p>(b) one representation objects to delineating Lei Yu Mun Estate into J20 because Lei Yue Mun Estate, Ko Chun Court and Ko Yee Estate are connected geographically; and suggests moving Ko Cheung Court, including, Ko On House, Ko Siu House, Ko Ki House, Ko Lun House and Ko Hang House to J20 because they are connected to Yau Mei Court by bridge;</p> <p>(c) nine representations object to separating the Yau Mei Court and Yau Tong Estate into two parts because the community integrity would be adversely affected; and propose that J19 should include Ko Chun Court, Ko Yee Estate, Lei Yue Mun Estate and four blocks of Ko Cheung</p>	<p>Representations of (a), (b), (c) and (d) are accepted and the proposal at (c) is adopted because:</p> <p>(i) the integrity of Yau Mei Court and Yau Tong Estate can be preserved; and</p> <p>(ii) the resultant population of the DCCAs concerned is within the permissible deviation limits:</p> <p>J19: 21,442 (+24.12%) J20: 19,844 (+14.87%) J21: 18,781 (+8.72%).</p>

<i>Item no.</i>	<i>DCCAs concerned</i>	<i>No. of representations</i>	<i>Representations</i>	<i>EAC's views</i>
			<p>Court (Ko Ching House, Ko Hong House, Ko Fung House and Ko Fei House), J20 should include Yau Mei Court, Yau Lai Estate and five blocks of Ko Cheung Court (Ko On House, Ko Siu House, Ko Ki House, Ko Lun House and Ko Hang House) and J21 should include Yau Tong Estate, Yau Tong Centre, Lei Yue Mun and Cha Kwo Ling;</p> <p>(d) seven of the nine representations in (c) above, suggests that alternatively EAC's original proposal on J19 can be retained, but J20 should include Cha Kwo Ling, Yau Lai Estate, Yau Mei Court and Yau Tong Centre and J21 should include Yau Tong Estate, Lei Yue Mun Estate and Lei Yue Mun.</p> <p>The reasons given are:</p> <p>(i) it is necessary to preserve the management integrity of Yau Mei Court and Yau Tong Estate; and</p> <p>(ii) there are needs to maintain geographical connection between different estates.</p>	

<i>Item no.</i>	<i>DCCAs concerned</i>	<i>No. of representations</i>	<i>Representations</i>	<i>EAC's views</i>
14	J22 – Lai Kong	1	The representation (a) suggests that J22 should be renamed as “Laguna City”; and (b) opines that one seat should be added in this DCCA due to the continuous increase in population.	(i) Representation (a) is accepted . (ii) Representation (b) would involve the addition of one seat for the Kwun Tong DC which is outside EAC’s jurisdiction.
15	J29 – Hong Lok J30 – Ting On	1	The representation proposes to move Yee On Street Market from J29 to J30 for residences’ convenience in J30.	The representation is not accepted as the population of both DCCAs are within the permissible range: J29: 15,408 (-10.81%) J30: 18,139 (+5.00%) It is not necessary to change the existing boundaries.
16	J31 – Ngau Tau Kok	1	The representation suggests to move Tak Bo Garden from J31 (Ngau Tau Kok) to J32 (To Tai) because it is a private residential development, which is different from the public housing estates in the rest of the constituency.	The representation is not accepted as the population of both DCCAs are within the permissible range: J31: 19,610 (+13.52%) J32: 16,552 (-4.19%) It is not necessary to change the existing boundaries.
17	J34 – Lok Wah South	2	(a) The representations object to delineating the Hipway Towers and Wah Fung Gardens into J34 in terms of location, living habits and community integrity; and (b) one representation further suggests moving Fai Wah House or/and Chin Wah House of Lok	(i) The representations are not accepted . As the population of J34 would be 11,249, which exceeds the lower permissible limit (-34.88%), there is a need to move Disciplined Services Quarters, Hipway Towers and Wah Fung Gardens from J28 to J34 so as to contain the population of J34 within the permissible limit. (ii) The proposal in (b) would involve changing the boundary of J33, the population (15,281,

<i>Item no.</i>	<i>DCCAs concerned</i>	<i>No. of representations</i>	<i>Representations</i>	<i>EAC's views</i>
			Wah South Estate from J33 into J34 for alleviating the population shortfall of J34 and enhancing community integrity.	-11.54%) of which is within the permissible range. It is not necessary to change the existing boundaries.

Kwun Tong 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>
18	J10 – Po Tat	2	Same as item 3.	See item 3.
19	J13 – Sau Mau Ping South	1	The representation (a) opines that Sau Ming House of Sau Mau Ping Estate is located far apart geographically from the rest of other building in J13; and (b) suggests that EAC should consult public before demarcation.	See item 4.
20	J14 – Hing Tin J15 – Tak Tin J16 – Kwong Tak	3	(a) Same as item 6. (b) One representation opines that one seat should be added in the Kwun Tong DC. (c) One representation further suggests moving Tak Lung House and Tak Shing House to J15.	(i) See item 6. (ii) The proposal at (b) is not accepted because it would involve the addition of one seat for the Kwun Tong DC which is outside EAC's jurisdiction.
21	J14 – Hing Tin J15 – Tak Tin J16 – Kwong Tak J19 – Yau Tong East	1	The representation (a) opines that the existing boundaries of Lam Tin District and Yau Tong District should be kept intact; and (b) objects to delineating the Hong Yat Court into J14 due to geographical factor.	See items 6 and 13.

<i>Item no.</i>	<i>DCCAs concerned</i>	<i>No. of representations</i>	<i>Representations</i>	<i>EAC's views</i>
	J20 – Yau Tong Central J21 – Yau Tong West			
22	J19 – Yau Tong East J20 – Yau Tong Central J21 – Yau Tong West	4	(a) Same as item 13. (b) One representation supports the addition of one seat for the Yau Tong District. (c) Two representations further object to separating the Yau Tong Estate into two parts because the community integrity would be adversely affected.	(i) See item 13. (ii) The supporting view of (b) is noted.