

選舉管理委員會

ELECTORAL AFFAIRS COMMISSION

香港灣仔港灣道 25 號
海港中心 10 樓

10/F, Harbour Centre
25 Harbour Road
Wan Chai
Hong Kong

本函檔號 OUR REF.: REO 14/12/DC-07
來函檔號 YOUR REF.:

圖文傳真 Fax: 2507 5810
電話 Tel.: 2827 7017
網址 Web Site: <http://www.eac.gov.hk>

21 November 2006

The Honourable Donald Tsang, GBM
The Chief Executive
Hong Kong Special Administrative Region
of the People's Republic of China
Chief Executive's Office
Hong Kong

Dear Mr Tsang,

Pursuant to section 18 of the Electoral Affairs Commission Ordinance, we have the pleasure in submitting to you the enclosed report containing our recommendations on the delineation of District Council constituencies for the purpose of the ordinary election in respect of the District Councils to be held in 2007.


Yours sincerely,



PANG Kin-kee, Chairman



Lawrence LOK Ying-kam, Member



Andrew CHAN Chi-fai, Member

ABBREVIATIONS

CAB	Constitutional Affairs Bureau
CE	Chief Executive
DC, DCs	District Council, District Councils
DCCA, DCCAs	district council constituency area, district council constituency areas
DCCs	district council constituencies
DOs	District Officers
EAC	Electoral Affairs Commission
EACO	Electoral Affairs Commission Ordinance
HAD	Home Affairs Department
HD	Housing Department
ISD	Information Services Department
LandsD	Lands Department
PlanD	Planning Department
REO	Registration and Electoral Office
the AHSG	the ad hoc subgroup formed under the Working Group on Population Distribution Projections set up in the Planning Department
the Commission	the Electoral Affairs Commission
unaltered DCCAs	DCCAs which were provisionally determined to be the same as those of the DCCAs in 2003

CHAPTER 1

INTRODUCTION

Section 1 : The Responsibility of the Electoral Affairs Commission

1.1 Under section 4(a) of the Electoral Affairs Commission Ordinance (“EACO”) (Chapter 541 of the Laws of Hong Kong), one of the functions of the Electoral Affairs Commission (“EAC” or “Commission”) is to consider and review the boundaries of district council constituencies for the purpose of making recommendations on the boundaries and names of constituencies for a District Council (“DC”) ordinary election.

1.2 The Commission is required under section 18 of the EACO to submit a report to the Chief Executive (“CE”) on its recommendations for DC constituencies not more than 36 months from the preceding DC ordinary election. As the last DC ordinary election was held on 23 November 2003, the EAC should submit its report and recommendations to the CE by 22 November 2006.

1.3 Under section 21 of the EACO, the CE in Council shall consider the Commission’s report. Subject to CE in Council’s approval, the boundaries and names proposed by the Commission would be adopted for the DC ordinary election to be held in late 2007.

Section 2 : Changes since the last demarcation exercise in 2003

1.4 In drawing up the provisional recommendations for the district council constituency area (“DCCA”) boundaries for the 2007 DC Election, the EAC took into account the two changes set out in paragraphs 1.5-1.7 below, which were put in place since the last DCCA demarcation exercise in 2003.

(a) The increased number of elected seats

1.5 In view of the sharp population growth in the new towns of Tung Chung and Tseung Kwan O in the Islands and Sai Kung districts respectively since the last DC election in 2003, the Administration amended Part I of Schedule 3 of the District Councils Ordinance (Cap 547) in June 2006 to increase the number of elected seats in the **Islands DC** and **Sai Kung DC** by **two and three** respectively for the 2007 DC Election. The amendment legislation was passed by the Legislative Council on 7 June 2006 and published in the Gazette on 9 June 2006.

1.6 The change increased the total number of elected seats in the 2007 DC Election by five from 400 to 405. Therefore, the total number of DCCAs to be delineated was increased to 405, as one DC member was to be elected from each constituency.

(b) The change of boundary between Sham Shui Po and Kwai Tsing districts

1.7 In its Report on the recommended constituency boundaries for the 2003 District Councils Election, the EAC pointed out that a private residential development named Nob Hill which straddled the boundaries of Sham Shui Po and Kwai Tsing districts had affected the EAC's work in the delineation exercise and suggested that the district boundary should be revised to include the whole of Nob Hill in one single district. In response to the EAC's suggestion, the Administration consulted local residents and relevant parties concerned on the issue. On the basis of the views received, the Administration proposed that the district boundary between Sham Shui Po and Kwai Tsing districts should be revised to include the whole of Nob Hill in Sham Shui Po district. The legislative amendment to revise the boundary for the two districts was endorsed by the Legislative Council on 21 June 2006.

Section 3 : Scope of the Report

1.8 The scope and content of this report are based on the requirement stipulated under section 18 of the EACO. The report is published in three volumes. **Volume 1** primarily describes how the proposed delineation of the boundaries of DCCAs was worked out and sets out the Commission's recommendations on the boundaries and the names of the DCCAs with the reasons for its recommendations.

Volume 2 contains the maps of all the districts showing the proposed boundaries and names of the DCCAs in each district and the related boundary descriptions. **Volume 3** records all written representations and minutes of a special meeting held in Sham Shui Po DC to discuss the demarcation proposals relating to the district.

CHAPTER 2

THE DEMARCATION EXERCISE

Before Public Consultation

Section 1 : Statutory Criteria for Demarcation

2.1 The Commission adopted a set of criteria, as stipulated under section 20 of the EACO, as the basis for making its recommendations.

These criteria are –

- (a) The EAC shall ensure that the population in each proposed DCCA is as near the population quota as practicable.
“Population quota” means the figure arrived at by dividing the total population of Hong Kong by the total number of elected members to be returned in the DC ordinary election.
- (b) Where it is not practicable to comply with (a) in a certain proposed DCCA, the EAC shall ensure that the population in that DCCA does not exceed or fall short of the population quota by more than 25%.
- (c) The EAC shall have regard to the community identities, preservation of local ties, and the physical features (such as the size, shape, accessibility and development) of the area.

- (d) The EAC must follow the existing boundaries of the districts and the number of elected members to be returned to a DC as specified in Schedules 1 and 3 of the District Councils Ordinance.
- (e) The EAC may depart from strict adherence to (a) and (b) only where it appears that considerations referred to in (c) justify such departure.

2.2 After the addition of five elected seats for the third term DC, the number of constituencies to be delineated for the 2007 DC ordinary election is 405. A list of DCCAs after the addition is at **Appendix I**.

2.3 For this demarcation exercise, the population quota was 17,275 (6,996,222, being the projected population of Hong Kong as at 30 June 2007 provided by the Administration (see paragraph 2.6), divided by 405 (the total number of elected members to be returned to DCs in the 2007 ordinary election)). Consequently, the permissible range of deviation (referred to in paragraph 2.1 (b) above) of the population of a DCCA from the population quota is 12,956 to 21,594.

Section 2 : Working Principles

2.4 The Commission also adopted a set of working principles for the demarcation exercise –

- (a) For existing DCCAs where the population falls within the permissible range of 12,956 to 21,594, their boundaries will not be changed.
- (b) For existing DCCAs where the population falls outside the permissible range, but the situation was allowed for the 2003 ordinary election and the justifications have remained valid, their boundaries will not be changed.
- (c) For existing DCCAs other than those in (b) where the population falls outside the permissible range, their boundaries will be adjusted to comply with the population quota requirement. This may necessitate revising the boundaries of the adjoining DCCAs. Where there is more than one way to adjust the boundaries of the DCCAs concerned, the one which affects the least number of existing DCCAs, or the one with the least departure from the population quota, will be adopted.
- (d) Factors with political implications will not be taken into consideration.
- (e) The names of the new DCCAs to be formed are proposed by reference to major landmarks, roads or residential settlements in the DCCAs after consultation with the relevant District Officers (“DOs”).

- (f) The Commission's provisional recommendations on the code references of districts and constituency areas were that the districts should be given the alphabetical reference from "A" onwards, with the omission of "I" and "O" to prevent confusion, starting from Central and Western district and other districts on Hong Kong Island, followed by the districts in Kowloon and the New Territories. The numbering of constituency areas in a district was to be prefixed by the alphabet reference for the district and started from the first numeral. "01" should be allocated to the most densely populated area, or the area traditionally considered most important or prominent or the centre of the district, and the number proceeded consecutively in a clockwise direction so that as far as possible two consecutive numbers should be found in two areas contiguous to each other. The Commission hoped that by adopting this system, any one who consults the maps would find it easier to understand them and locate the constituency areas. These methods have been employed since 1994 and the public should be generally familiar with them.
- (g) Where constituency boundaries have to continue into the sea, the DCCA boundary lines are, as far as possible, drawn perpendicular to the district boundary lines on the sea.
- (h) Suggestions and comments from members of the public

received since the last demarcation exercise will be taken into consideration and, where appropriate, accepted.

The criteria and working principles mentioned above were also adopted for the demarcation exercise for the 1999 and 2003 DC Elections.

Section 3 : Working Partners

2.5 The Registration and Electoral Office (“REO”) provided the manpower required for carrying out the exercise.

2.6 An Ad Hoc Subgroup (“AHSG”), formed under the Working Group on Population Distribution Projections set up in the Planning Department (“PlanD”), took up the primary task of providing the Commission with the necessary population forecasts, the most essential information required for the conduct of the exercise. The AHSG was chaired by an Assistant Director of the PlanD and comprised representatives from Constitutional Affairs Bureau (“CAB”), Census and Statistics Department, Home Affairs Department (“HAD”), Housing Department (“HD”), Lands Department (“LandsD”), Rating and Valuation Department and the REO. To enhance the accuracy of the result produced, the AHSG was requested to project the population distribution figures as at a date as close to the election date as practicable. The AHSG provided a population forecast as at 30 June 2007, assuming that the DC ordinary election would be held in late 2007.

2.7 The LandsD rendered assistance in producing maps for the Commission, including the base maps (maps with street blocks, population figure in each block, existing DCCA boundaries and district boundaries), maps with the proposed DCCA boundaries, and boundary descriptions.

2.8 The District Offices of the HAD provided strong support in the demarcation exercise. Using their local knowledge about community identities, local ties, and physical features and developments in the DCCAs of their districts, the DOs contributed valuable advice to the EAC's delineation work

2.9 The Information Services Department ("ISD") contributed expert advice for mapping out the publicity strategy and ideas for designing the publicity programmes and materials for the consultation exercise.

Section 4 : The Work Process

Start of work

2.10 The AHSG held its first meeting in September 2005 to work out the method to be adopted for compiling the data and the work schedule. In late March 2006 the forecast population figures were made available, on the basis of which the LandsD prepared the base maps.

When these base maps were ready, the REO staff proceeded to work on the preliminary proposed delineation of the boundaries.

Site visits

2.11 Since physical features such as the size, shape, accessibility and development of an area were important considerations in the delineation work, in order to gain first-hand information on areas where the geographical situations might impact on the delineation of constituency boundaries, the REO staff conducted site visits to various districts to identify the unique physical features, transport facilities and accessibility in the DCCAs where the population had exceeded the permissible limits and significant developments had taken place since the last demarcation exercise. The relevant information and topographical facts so gathered were analysed and taken into account in drawing up the preliminary proposals.

EAC meetings with the DOs

2.12 When the REO staff had finalised their preliminary recommendations on the boundaries and names of the DCCAs, the proposals were presented to the Commission for consideration with the aid of base maps and satellite maps, as appropriate. The Commission invited all the DOs to attend a series of meetings in June 2006 to discuss the proposals relating to their districts. Photographs taken from the site

visits were presented at the meetings to facilitate better understanding of the local features and the environment of the DCCAs affected by the delineation.

Provisional proposal

2.13 In the EAC's provisional recommendations, the boundaries of 142 DCCAs had to be changed and 29 DCCAs were renamed. The EAC allowed the permissible limits of the population quota to be exceeded in 14 DCCAs for one reason or the other. The names of these DCCAs, the percentages of deviation and the reasons for allowing the permissible limits to be exceeded, are shown in **Appendix II**.

2.14 After the EAC had come up with the provisional recommendations on the boundaries of the DCCAs, the REO started to prepare for the launch of public consultation exercise on the EAC's provisional proposal for a period of 30 days, from 27 July to 25 August 2006. Details of the provisional recommendations were contained in two volumes published for the public consultation exercise.

CHAPTER 3

THE PUBLIC CONSULTATION

Section 1 : The Consultation Period and Public Forums

3.1 In compliance with the requirement of section 19 of the EACO, the Commission conducted a public consultation exercise on its provisional recommendations from 27 July to 25 August 2006 for a period of 30 days. During this period, members of the public could send in their representations, in writing, to the Commission to express their views on the Commission's provisional recommendations on the boundaries and names of the DCCAs.

3.2 The public consultation was widely publicised through Announcement of Public Interest on radio and TV, press releases, newspaper advertisements, posters and websites on the Internet.

3.3 On the first day of the consultation period, ie 27 July 2006, the Commission held a press conference to launch the exercise and invited the public to give their views on the Commission's provisional recommendations. The Commission also appealed to the public that not only those who had opposing or different views should speak up, but those who supported the provisional recommendations should also do likewise. This was to enable the EAC to more accurately gauge the

public's views and degree of acceptance of the provisional recommendations.

3.4 Two forums were conducted from 10:30 am to 4:30 pm daily from 15 to 16 August 2006 at the Recital Hall of the City Hall and at the Cultural Activities Hall of the Sha Tin Town Hall respectively, where members of the public could personally attend and express their views to the Commission directly. Audio-visual aids were used to facilitate understanding of the representations by making reference to maps.

Section 2 : Number of Representations Received

3.5 During the consultation period the Commission received a total of 368 written representations. On the two days of the forums, 162 persons turned up and 68 of them expressed their views on the provisional recommendations.

3.6 The Sham Shui Po DC held a special meeting to discuss the provisional recommendations relating to the district. Representatives from the REO were present at the meeting to listen to the views of members of the DC.

3.7 Among the representations received, there were 150 which supported the EAC's provisional recommendations. A few were not related to delineation of boundaries or naming of the DCCAs but related to such issues as district boundaries, arrangements of the public forums

and location of polling stations. The Commission took note of these views and instructed the REO to take the necessary follow-up action.

3.8 The original texts of the written representations and minutes of the special meeting of the Sham Shui Po DC are set out in **Volume 3** of this report. Summaries of the written representations, oral representations and representations raised at the meeting of the Sham Shui Po DC are shown in **Appendix III** of this volume by district.

CHAPTER 4

THE DEMARCATION EXERCISE

After the Public Consultation

Section 1 : Deliberations on the Representations

4.1 As soon as the public consultation period ended, the EAC went through all the written and oral representations to consider whether they should be accepted.

4.2 Since some representations considered that the special physical characteristics of individual areas should be taken into account in the delineation exercise, the REO staff conducted site visits to specific areas in the various districts concerned to assess the validity of the arguments raised and to explore the feasibility of the proposals given. To enable the EAC to thoroughly consider the representations and arrive at a fair and balanced deliberation, the information gathered from the site visits and the REO's analysis and observations were presented to the EAC again with the aid of satellite maps and photographs showing the buildings and areas affected by the delineation proposed by the EAC and the counter-proposals raised in the representations.

General Approaches adopted by the Commission

4.3 For representations regarding DCCAs which were provisionally determined to be the same as those of the DCCAs in 2003 (“unaltered DCCAs”), modifications to their boundaries would be considered only if:

- (a) they are supported by cogent reasons and would result in substantial and notable improvement on community, geographical and development considerations;
- (b) they would not in turn affect an unacceptable number of unaltered DCCAs;
- (c) all the resulting populations will not depart from the population quota by more than 25%; and
- (d) no representation supporting the retention of the provisional recommendations in respect of the same unaltered DCCAs has been received.

4.4 The Commission considered it inappropriate to accept representations on unaltered DCCAs which proposed solely improvement on population distribution. If the Commission were to accept them, many DCCAs would have to be re-delineated and included in the final

recommendations without the benefit of further public consultation as to their acceptability.

4.5 For representations regarding new DCCAs, all suggestions with sufficient cause on better population distribution or on community considerations would be accepted, except those adopting an approach entirely different from the Commission's and affecting an unacceptable number of unaltered DCCAs.

The Commission's General Views

4.6 In considering the representations, the Commission also took the following factors into account –

(a) Preserving community identity and local ties

The majority of representations made to the Commission stressed the importance of maintaining local community identities and ties even though the population deviation in the DCCAs concerned would exceed the permissible limits. Some representations pointed out that the Commission's proposed delineation had disrupted the community identity and cohesiveness of the residents already well established, and would affect the integrity of the community.

Some representations also emphasized that the residents of the affected areas would likely have a weaker sense of belonging to the DCCAs to which they had been newly assigned, and this in turn, would adversely affect the voters' turnout rate. Some envisaged that the DC Member of a constituency might have difficulty in serving two or more heterogeneous communities, on the other hand, other representations held contrary views that it would not create any particular problems under the circumstances.

The Commission fully understood the sentiments and wishes of the representations and had considered all of them very carefully. Community identities and local ties were given due weight. Reasonable suggestions to alter the Commission's provisional recommendations on the grounds of community and geographical considerations would be accepted. The Commission had allowed some DCCAs to have their populations deviating from the population quota in excess of the permissible limits. The rationale was to view the conflict between the population quota requirement and local sentiments in an impartial manner so as to achieve a fair balance.

The EAC was pleased to note that through the concerted efforts of all parties concerned, the boundaries for a smaller

number of DCCAs (ie 139 as compared to 182) were changed in this exercise as compared to that in 2003.

(b) The estimated population figures

There were representations objecting to the provisional recommendations on the grounds that they queried the accuracy of the estimated population figures which the Commission adopted for the demarcation exercise. They quoted other figures known to them, which were different from those used by the Commission. The Commission believed that the queries were merely based on personal estimation and/or information obtained from other sources eg the HD, which might not be appropriate for the exercise. The Commission's view in this aspect was that the estimated population figures used was supplied by the AHSG, which was set up solely for the purpose of the demarcation exercise. It had conducted comprehensive researches before compiling the relevant data by a systematic methodology. Moreover, for the reason of fairness and consistency, the EAC considered it necessary to use the same set of population distribution projections with the same basis and the same cut-off date for all DCCAs being considered under the demarcation exercise.

The Commission therefore held that the official data provided by the AHSG should remain as the sole and authoritative basis

for the demarcation work.

(c) Anticipated changes in population

There were representations which considered that the future population of certain DCCAs would increase or decrease substantially, and the boundaries of such DCCAs should therefore be adjusted in anticipation of the future development, so that they would not have to be re-delineated again in the 2011 DC Election.

Although the development of an area was one of the factors which the EAC would have regard to, the Commission considered it essential to adhere to the population forecasts projected as at 30 June 2007 in delineating the boundaries of all DCCAs in this exercise, since the demarcation work was to facilitate the conduct of the 2007 DC Election. Future changes in population after the said cut-off date would be catered for in the next demarcation exercise, taking into account the latest development at that time.

(d) Supporting views

Where there were supporting representations received on the one hand and opposing ones relating to the same DCCA(s) on the other, the EAC would examine the acceptability of both

sides in the light of the reasons given vis-à-vis the working principles.

4.7 In the course of considering the public representations, the Commission noticed that despite the population changes, many representations preferred to retain the existing boundaries of their constituencies for the preservation of established community identities and local ties. The EAC fully appreciated their sentiments and considers that some of the views were supported by reasonable and valid grounds. In finalizing its delineation proposals, the Commission had, as far as possible, accepted the representations in accordance with the working principles described in paragraph 2.4(a) and (b).

Section 2 : The Recommendations

4.8 At its meeting on 26 September 2006, the Commission met the DOs concerned to discuss its revised recommendations, having taken into consideration the representations received. Its views on the representations are recorded in the last column of **Appendix III**.

4.9 Having regard to the representations received, the EAC adjusted its provisional recommendations in respect of the boundaries of 47 DCCAs and the names of 9 DCCAs. Details of the alterations and changes are set out in **Appendices IV and V** respectively.

4.10 In the finalised recommendations, the boundaries of 139 DCCAs were changed and the EAC allowed the population in 17 DCCAs to deviate from the permissible limits of population quota for reasons specified in **Appendix VI**.

4.11 A summary of the Commission's final recommendations is shown in **Appendix VII** of this volume. The details of these final recommendations with reference to maps and boundary descriptions are in **Volume 2**.

CHAPTER 5

A CONCLUDING NOTE

Section 1 : Acknowledgements

5.1 With the completion of this demarcation exercise, the Commission would like to express its gratitude towards the following units for their contributions: the AHSG, for its provision of the population forecasts; the DOs of the HAD, for their input on the basis of their district knowledge; the LandsD, for their production of the various maps for the conduct of the consultation exercise and production of the report; the ISD for their contribution to the publicity programme relating to the consultation exercise, the Government Logistics Department for the printing of the consultation materials and this report, the Leisure and Cultural Services Department for their permission to use the City Hall and the Sha Tin Town Hall as venues for holding the two public forums, and the CAB for their advice throughout the exercise.

5.2 The Commission is particularly thankful to the staff of the REO for their dedicated and concerted efforts in the preparation work.

5.3 Last but not least, the Commission is most grateful to those members of the public for their representations, put forth in writing or personally voiced in the public forums. Some of them have given suggestions relating to boundary descriptions, such as the inclusion of

other major buildings in the constituencies apart from those listed in the consultation documents. These suggestions which make the boundary descriptions more comprehensive were constructive and gratefully accepted by the Commission.

Section 2 : The Important Principle

5.4 As in previous demarcation exercises, the EAC has adhered to the statutory requirements and its working principles as far as practicable. The EAC has made every effort to observe the population quota requirement and at the same time to accommodate the suggestions from the public with reference to the community considerations in their districts, particularly in cases where the suggestions would result in substantial improvement on community ties, geographical accessibility and development. As always, the Commission has paid no regard to any suggestions with political implications.

5.5 Delineation of constituency boundaries is an integral part of an election. The Commission is committed to conducting each and every election under its supervision in an open, fair and honest manner. The Commission has all the time held on to this important principle in this demarcation exercise.

Number of District Council Constituencies (“DCCs”) to be Delineated

Item	District	Number of DCCs
1.	Central and Western	15
2.	Wan Chai	11
3.	Eastern	37
4.	Southern	17
5.	Yau Tsim Mong	16
6.	Sham Shui Po	21
7.	Kowloon City	22
8.	Wong Tai Sin	25
9.	Kwun Tong	34
10.	Tsuen Wan	17
11.	Tuen Mun	29
12.	Yuen Long	29
13.	North	16
14.	Tai Po	19
15.	Sai Kung	23
16.	Sha Tin	36
17.	Kwai Tsing	28
18.	Islands	10
		<hr/>
	Total:	405

**DCCAs with Population Exceeding the Permissible Limits
of the Population Quota
(Provisional Recommendations)**

District	DCCA exceeding permissible limits	Population and deviation percentage	Reason
Southern	D17 Stanley & Shek O	24,216 (+40.18%)	Because of the need to preserve community identities and local ties
Kwun Tong	J22 Lai Kong	22,186 (+28.43%)	Because of the need to preserve community integrity
Yuen Long	M07 Shap Pat Heung North	25,801 (+49.35%)	Because of the large area covered by this DCCA and the need to preserve community identities and local ties
	M19 Tin Heng	23,987 (+38.85%)	Because of the need to preserve community integrity
	M24 Tsz Yau	22,457 (+30.00%)	Because of the need to preserve community integrity and local ties
	M27 Kam Tin	11,241 (-34.93%)	Because of the need to preserve integrity or homogeneity of the community
	M28 Pat Heung North	10,378 (-39.92%)	Because of the large area covered by this DCCA and the need to preserve community identities and local ties

District	DCCA exceeding permissible limits	Population and deviation percentage	Reason
Tai Po	P19 Sai Kung North	10,013 (-42.04%)	Because of the large area covered by this DCCA and the need to preserve community identities and local ties
Sai Kung	Q03 Sai Kung Islands	10,784 (-37.57%)	Because of the large area covered by this DCCA (over 70 islands), accessibility, and the need to preserve community identities and local ties
Sha Tin	R30 Heng On	21,764 (+25.99%)	Because of the need to maintain homogeneity and local ties of the community
Islands	T07 Peng Chau & Hei Ling Chau	8,187 (-52.62%)	Because of the large area covered by these DCCAs and the need to preserve community identities and local ties
	T08 Lamma & Po Toi	5,581 (-67.69%)	
	T09 Cheung Chau South	11,201 (-35.16%)	
	T10 Cheung Chau North	11,955 (-30.80%)	

***Total number of DCCAs exceeding the permissible limits
of the population quota = 14***

Appendix III - A**Central and Western 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	A11 – Sai Ying Pun A14 – Centre Street	6	(a) These representations oppose the demarcation proposals for A11 and A14; (b) two representations further object to delineating the Wing Lee Building into A14 and suggest retaining it in A11 because such changes will affect the electors' desire for voting as they are familiar with the location of the polling station; (c) one representation further suggests that some population from A05 should be moved to A14.	The representations are not accepted because the resultant population of A14 would be 12,605, which exceeds the lower permissible limit (-27.03%). For geographical proximity and community ties concerns, it is not desirable to move the buildings from A05 to A14.

Appendix III - B

**Wan Chai 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	B01 – Hennessy	1	The representation objects to delineating the cluster of private buildings near and including the Hennessy Road Government Primary School into B02 because the change of the polling station in B01 will affect the local culture of this DCCA and the electors' desire for voting as they are familiar with the location of the polling station.	The representation is partially accepted by retaining Hennessy Road Government Primary School, which does not have any population, in B01.
2	B01 – Hennessy B02 – Oi Kwan B10 – Southorn	2	(a) The representations object to delineating the cluster of private buildings near Hennessy Road Government Primary School and including it in B02 because the change of the polling station in B01 will affect the local culture of this DCCA and the electors' desire for voting as they are familiar with the location of the polling station. (b)(i) The representations also object to delineating two street blocks, including 4-12 Kat On Street, 88-90 Stone Nullah Lane, 11-17 Kennedy Street etc into B10	The representations of (a) is partially accepted by retaining Hennessy Road Government Primary School, which does not have any population, in B01. The move of the cluster of private buildings from B01 to B02 is required so as to contain the population of B02 within the permissible limit. The representations of (b)(i) and (b)(ii) are not accepted because the resultant population of B01 would be 12,707, which exceeds the lower permissible limit (-26.44%).

<i>Item no.</i>	<i>DCCAs concerned</i>	<i>No. of representations</i>	<i>Representations</i>	<i>EAC's views</i>
			<p>because residents of the affected area would get confused.</p> <p>(b)(ii) As an alternative, they suggest to move 104-112 Johnston Road, 1-19 Tai Yuen Street, 2-12 Cross Street and 2-20 Spring Garden Lane to B10.</p>	
3	B02 – Oi Kwan	1	<p>The representation suggests to maintain the existing boundary of B02 because:</p> <p>(a) the change of the polling station in B01 will cause inconvenience to the residents;</p> <p>(b) the number of electors increased is minimal and would not affect the overall number of electors; and</p> <p>(c) there is no need to increase the number of electors in B02 in view of the high voter registration rate in this constituency in the past.</p>	<p>The representation is not accepted because the population of B02 would be 12,876, which exceeds the lower permissible limit (-25.46%). However, Hennessy Road Government Primary School (with no population) can be retained in B01 for use as polling station.</p>
4	B10 – Southorn B11 – Tai Fat Hau	1	<p>The representation objects to delineating Antung Building into B10 because such changes would cause confusion to the residents and some new buildings will be built in B10 in the future.</p>	<p>The representation is not accepted because the population of B10 would be 11,826, which exceeds the lower permissible limit (-31.54%). For this demarcation exercise, the EAC must adhere to the population projection as at 30 June 2007. Any developments beyond this cut off date will not be taken into account.</p>

<i>Item no.</i>	<i>DCCAs concerned</i>	<i>No. of representations</i>	<i>Representations</i>	<i>EAC's views</i>
5	B11 – Tai Fat Hau	2	The representations suggest maintaining the existing boundary of B11 because the proposed changes would affect the local culture of this DCCA and the electors' desire for voting as they are familiar with the location of the polling station.	See item 4.

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.

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>	

Appendix III - E**Yau Tsim Mong 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	All DCCAs	6	These representations support the demarcation proposals for all DCCAs in the district.	The supporting views are noted.
2	E01 – Tsim Sha Tsui West E02 – Jordan West	1	The representation objects to move the private residential buildings on the Kowloon MTR Station from E02 to E01 because: (a) the residents may get confused or even abstain from voting as they have to go to a different polling station to cast their votes; (b) the residents from Kowloon MTR Station are closely related to the area near Ferry street and Jordan in terms of living habits and local ties; and (c) the development in the nearby areas will further integrate the residential premises on Kowloon MTR Station with those of Ferry Street. The related communities should not be separated.	The representation is not accepted because: (i) the resultant population of E02 (27,798) would exceed the upper permissible limit (+60.91%) if the existing delineation of E02 is to remain intact; and (ii) there are supporting views for the demarcation proposals for E01 and E02 (see items 1, 5 and 23).
3	E01 – Tsim Sha Tsui West E02 – Jordan West	1	The representation objects to the delineation of E01, E02 and E03 and proposes to maintain the 2003 constituency boundaries of E01, E02 and E03 with some adjustments as follows:	The representation is not accepted because: (i) the resultant population of E02 and E03 would exceed the upper permissible limit: E02: 24,822 (+43.69%) E03: 22,916 (+32.65%);

<i>Item no.</i>	<i>DCCAs concerned</i>	<i>No. of representations</i>	<i>Representations</i>	<i>EAC's views</i>
	E03 – Jordan East		<p>(a) move the area bounded by Jordan Road, Cox's Road, Austin Road and Nathan Road from E01 to E03; and</p> <p>(b) move the area bounded by Saigon Street, Ferry Street, Jordan Road and Canton Road from E02 to E03</p> <p>because:</p> <p>(i) residents living on Kowloon MTR Station (including Waterfront) have close local ties with E02 and utilize the pedestrian footbridge and subways in E02 for access to the Jordan hinterland and wet-markets;</p> <p>(ii) the Kowloon MTR Station is physically remote and functionally unrelated to any of the E01 residential localities; and</p> <p>(iii) from a practical and reasonable estimate, the 2007 population on the top of Kowloon MTR Station would not be more than 11,000.</p>	<p>(ii) the EAC has to rely on the population forecasts provided by the AHSG for this demarcation exercise and 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; and</p> <p>(iii) there are supporting views for the demarcation proposals for E01, E02 and E03 (see items 1, 5, 7 and 23).</p>
4	E01 – Tsim Sha Tsui West E02 – Jordan West	1	<p>The representation proposes to:</p> <p><u>E01 and waterfront</u></p> <p>(a) put the cargo handling area (at E02, E04, E05 and E07) and the</p>	<p>The representation (a) is not accepted because it would unnecessarily affect the existing boundaries of E04, E05 and E07, which should not be changed since the population in E04, E05 and E07 is within the permissible limits.</p>

<i>Item no.</i>	<i>DCCAs concerned</i>	<i>No. of representations</i>	<i>Representations</i>	<i>EAC's views</i>
	E03 – Jordan East E05 – Charming E06 – Mong Kok West E08 – Cherry E09 – Tai Kok Tsui South E10 – Tai Kok Tsui North E11 – Tai Nan E12 – Mong Kok North E13 – Mong Kok East		<p>harbour under E08 and adjust the western boundary along the fencing of the cargo handling area as there is only one vehicle access from Hoi Fai Road in E08 (with the remaining western waterfront and harbour to continue to be put under E01);</p> <p><u>E02 and E03</u> (b) (i) move the King George V Memorial Park and Kwun Chung Municipal Services Building as well as Ho Kwun Building, Luen Tak Building and Vincent House from E02 to E03, or</p> <p>(ii) only move the park and market concerned from E02 to E03 (if the population exceeds the permissible limit under item (b)(i) above);</p> <p><u>E05 and E06</u> (c) move the Mong Kok Market and the adjacent buildings (area bounded by Argyle Street, Canton Road and Ferry Street) from E12 to E06;</p> <p>(d) move the area bounded by Dundas Street, Reclamation Street, Pitt Street and Canton Road from E06 to E05;</p>	<p>The representation (b)(i) is not accepted because:</p> <p>(i) the resultant population of E03 (22,097) would exceed the upper permissible limit (+27.91%); and</p> <p>(ii) there are supporting views for the demarcation proposals for E02 and E03 (see items 1, 5, 7 and 23).</p> <p>The representation (b)(ii) is accepted because:</p> <p>(i) it can preserve the community integrity for “Kwun Chung” area; and</p> <p>(ii) the move will not affect the population of E02 and E03 since the park and market do not have any population.</p> <p>The representations (c) and (d) are not accepted because:</p> <p>(i) it would affect the unaltered boundary of E05; and</p> <p>(ii) there are supporting views for the demarcation proposals for E05 and E06 (see items 1 and 10).</p> <p>The representations (e) to (g) and (i) to (n) are not accepted because:</p> <p>(i) the resultant population of E08, E09 and E11 would exceed the permissible limits:</p> <p>E08: 12,153 (-29.65%) E09: 24,081 (+39.40%) E11: 22,748 (+31.68%);</p>

<i>Item no.</i>	<i>DCCAs concerned</i>	<i>No. of representations</i>	<i>Representations</i>	<i>EAC's views</i>
			<p><u>E08 and E09</u></p> <p>(e) move the area bounded by Yen Chow Street West, West Kowloon Highway and Hoi Fan Road from E09 to E08;</p> <p>(f) move the area bounded by Oak Street, Anchor Street, Tai Kok Tsui Road, Li Tak Street, Kok Cheung Street, Sham Mong Road, Pok Man Street and Cherry Street from E08 to E09;</p> <p>(g) move the area bounded by Anchor Street, Palm Street, Cherry Street and Oak Street from E08 to E12;</p> <p>(h) move Tower 6 of Harbour Green from E10 to E09;</p> <p>(i) move the area bounded by Oak Street, Fir Street, Tong Mi Road and Anchor Street from E09 to E12;</p> <p>(j) rename E08 as "Tai Kok Tsui West";</p> <p><u>E10, E11 and E12</u></p> <p>(k) same as items (c), (g), (h) and (i);</p> <p>(l) move the area bounded by Bedford Road, Fir Street, Larch Street and Tai Kok Tsui Road from E11 to E10;</p> <p>(m) move the area bounded by Lai Chi Kok Road, Prince Edward Road</p>	<p>(ii) it is inappropriate to accept proposals solely for the purpose of improving the population distribution; and</p> <p>(iii) there are supporting views for the demarcation proposals for E08, E09, E10, E11, E12 and E13 (see items 1, 11, 13, 17, 18, 19 and 20).</p> <p>The representation (h) is accepted because:</p> <p>(i) the resultant population of E09 and E10 would be within the permissible limits:</p> <p>E09: 18,244 (+5.61%) E10: 19,876 (+15.06%); and</p> <p>(ii) it can preserve the community integrity by keeping all of the five blocks of Harbour Green within one DCCA.</p>

<i>Item no.</i>	<i>DCCAs concerned</i>	<i>No. of representations</i>	<i>Representations</i>	<i>EAC's views</i>
			<p>West and Tong Mi Road from E12 to E11; and</p> <p><u>E13</u> (n)adjust the western boundary from Nathan Road to Portland Street</p> <p>because:</p> <p>(i) the park and market concerned are integral parts of “Kwun Chung” in E03 and putting these public facilities in E02 will create more work for government offices to consult two instead of one DC member in dealing with frequent complaints from nearby residents in E03 about the operations of these facilities;</p> <p>(ii) putting the market under E12 will create more work for government offices to consult two instead of one DC member in dealing with such complaints;</p> <p>(iii)grouping new communities with similar characteristics and district issues under the same DCCA in order to facilitate district development and management; and</p> <p>(iv)achieving a reasonable or higher population size for the DCCAs and avoiding the</p>	

<i>Item no.</i>	<i>DCCAs concerned</i>	<i>No. of representations</i>	<i>Representations</i>	<i>EAC's views</i>
			creation of odd-shaped DCCAs.	
5	E02 – Jordan West	2	These representations support the demarcation proposals for E02.	The supporting views are noted.
6	E02 – Jordan West E03 – Jordan East E09 – Tai Kok Tsui South E10 – Tai Kok Tsui North E11 – Tai Nan E12 – Mong Kok North E13 – Mong Kok East	1	<p>The representation proposes to:</p> <p>(a) move the area bounded by Tung Chau Street, Fir Street, Larch Street and Tai Kok Tsui Road from E11 to E10 in order to preserve community integrity as Bedford Road and Larch Street have been regarded as part of Tai Kok Tsui;</p> <p>(b) move the area bounded by Fir Street, Tong Mi Road and Fuk Tsun Street from E09 to E10 so that the whole of Fuk Tsun Street can become part of E10 in order to preserve community integrity;</p> <p>(c) move Tower 6 of Harbour Green from E10 to E09 in order to preserve the integrity of the estate;</p> <p>(d) move the area bounded by Anchor Street, Tong Mi Road, Cherry Street and Palm Street from E12 to E09 because Tong Mi Road are used to separate Mong Kok and Tai Kok Tsui;</p> <p>(e) move the area bounded by Boundary Street,</p>	<p>The representations (a), (b), (d), (e), (f) and (g) are not accepted because:</p> <p>(i) the resultant population of E10 (23,797) would exceed the upper permissible limit (+37.75%);</p> <p>(ii) it would affect the unaltered boundary of E13; and</p> <p>(iii) there are supporting views for the demarcation proposals for E09, E10, E11, E12 and E13 (see items 1, 13, 17, 18, 19 and 20).</p> <p>The representation (c) is accepted because:</p> <p>(i) the resultant population of E09 and E10 would be within the permissible limits: E09: 18,244 (+5.61%) E10: 19,876 (+15.06%); and</p> <p>(ii) it can preserve the community integrity by keeping all of the five blocks of Harbour Green under one DCCA.</p> <p>The representations (h) to (k) are not accepted because:</p> <p>(i) the resultant population of E02 (24,406) would exceed the</p>

<i>Item no.</i>	<i>DCCAs concerned</i>	<i>No. of representations</i>	<i>Representations</i>	<i>EAC's views</i>
			<p>Nathan Road and Ki Lung Street from E11 to E13 because E11 and E13 belong to Mong Kok;</p> <p>(f) rename E10 as “Fuk Tsun” as Fuk Tsun Street is the main trunk road of the Tai Kok Tsui area;</p> <p>(g) maintain the name of E09 as “Tai Kok Tsui”. The proposed change of the name of E09 by EAC from “Tai Kok Tsui” to “Tai Kok Tsui South” is consequential to the proposed change of name of E10 from “Sycamore” to “Tai Kok Tsui North”. If E10 is not to be renamed as “Tai Kok Tsui North” (to be renamed as “Fuk Tsun” as suggested in item (f) above), there is no need to rename E09 as “Tai Kok Tsui South”;</p> <p>(h) move the area bounded by Jordan Road, Canton Road, Kwun Chung Street, Min Street and Shanghai Street from E02 to E03 to include the whole of “Kwun Chung” area under E03 for better community setting;</p> <p>(i) move the area bounded by Kansu Street, Woosung Street, Jordan Road and</p>	<p>upper permissible limit (+41.28%); and</p> <p>(ii) there are supporting views for the demarcation proposals for E02 and E03 (see items 1, 5, 7 and 23).</p>

<i>Item no.</i>	<i>DCCAs concerned</i>	<i>No. of representations</i>	<i>Representations</i>	<i>EAC's views</i>
			<p>Shanghai Street from E03 to E02 to address the population increase in E03 arising from (h) above;</p> <p>(j) rename E02 as “Ferry Point” because residents still regard the area around 八文樓 as Ferry Point; and</p> <p>(k) rename E03 as “Kwun Chung” if the Kwun Chung area (bounded by Nathan Road, Austin Road, Canton Road and Jordan Road) is to be included in E03 as suggested in (h) above.</p>	
7	E03 – Jordan East	6	These representations support the demarcation proposals for E03.	The supporting views are noted.
8	E03 – Jordan East	2	The representations suggest that the polling station should be located near Temple Street which is near to their place of residence.	The REO will take note of the representations when identifying the venue for the polling station in E03.
9	E04 – Yau Ma Tei	9	These representations support the demarcation proposals for E04.	The supporting views are noted.
10	E06 – Mong Kok West	3	These representations support the demarcation proposals for E06.	The supporting views are noted.
11	E08 – Cherry	5	These representations support the demarcation proposals for E08.	The supporting views are noted.
12	E08 – Cherry	1	The representation suggests to delineate E08,	The representation is not accepted because:

<i>Item no.</i>	<i>DCCAs concerned</i>	<i>No. of representations</i>	<i>Representations</i>	<i>EAC's views</i>
	E09 – Tai Kok Tsui South E10 – Tai Kok Tsui North E11 – Tai Nan E12 – Mong Kok North		<p>E09, E10, E11 and E12 as follows:</p> <p>(a) grouping Hampton Place (from E09) and Island Harbourview, The Long Beach and One Silversea (from E08) to form a new DCCA to be known as “Olympic”;</p> <p>(b) grouping the old residential area between West Kowloon Highway and Tai Kok Tsui Road to form “Tai Kok Tsui” DCCA (i.e. E09);</p> <p>(c) grouping the old residential area between Tai Kok Tsui Road, Tong Mi Road, Cherry Street, and Fuk Tsun Street to form “Cherry” (i.e. E08);</p> <p>(d) grouping the residential area (including Metro Harbour View and June Garden) between Chui Yu Road, Boundary Street, Tong Mi Road and Fuk Tsun Street to form “Sycamore” (i.e.E10) ; and</p> <p>(e) the boundary between E11 and E12 should be along Prince Edward Road West instead of Lai Chi Kok Road</p> <p>in order to take into account different community concerns and</p>	<p>(i) the resultant population of E08, E09, E10 and “Olympic” would exceed the permissible limits:</p> <p>E08: 9,235 (-46.54%) E09: 24,992 (+44.67%) E10: 23,945 (+38.61%) “Olympic”: 10,650 (-38.35%); and</p> <p>(ii) there are supporting views for the demarcation proposals for E08, E09, E10, E11 and E12 (see items 1, 11, 13, 17, 18 and 19).</p>

<i>Item no.</i>	<i>DCCAs concerned</i>	<i>No. of representations</i>	<i>Representations</i>	<i>EAC's views</i>
			the alignment of the main trunk roads.	
13	E09 – Tai Kok Tsui South	6	These representations support the demarcation proposals for E09.	The supporting views are noted.
14	E09 – Tai Kok Tsui South E10 – Tai Kok Tsui North	4	These representations suggest to move Tower 6 of Harbour Green from E10 to E09 in order to preserve the integrity of the whole estate.	The representations are accepted because: (i) the resultant population of E09 and E10 would be within the permissible limits: E09: 18,244 (+5.61%) E10: 19,876 (+15.06%); and (ii) it can preserve the community integrity by keeping the whole of Harbour Green under one DCCA.
15	E09 – Tai Kok Tsui South E10 – Tai Kok Tsui North E11 – Tai Nan	4	These representations suggest to delineate E10 as follows: (a) move Tower 6 of Harbour Green from E10 to E09 so that the whole of the Harbour Green is kept within E09; and (b) move the area bounded by Tai Kok Tsui Road, Larch Street, Fir Street and Fuk Tsun Street out of E10 so that E10 will include some old industrial buildings and the newly built Metro Harbour View where population is increasing rapidly, in order to enhance community integrity.	The representation (a) is accepted (see item 14). The representation (b) is not accepted because: (i) the resultant population of E11 (23,182) would exceed the upper permissible limit (+34.19%) if such area is moved from E10 to E11; and (ii) there are supporting views for the demarcation proposals for E09, E10 and E11 (see items 1, 13, 17 and 18).
16	E09 – Tai Kok	6	These representations suggest to:	The representation (a) is accepted (see item 14).

<i>Item no.</i>	<i>DCCAs concerned</i>	<i>No. of representations</i>	<i>Representations</i>	<i>EAC's views</i>
	Tsui South E10 – Tai Kok Tsui North E11 – Tai Nan		(a) move Tower 6 of Harbour Green from E10 to E09 in order to preserve community integrity; and (b) move the area bounded by Tung Chau Street, Fir Street, Larch Street and Tai Kok Tsui Road from E11 to E10 as it belongs to Tai Kok Tsui instead of Tai Nan (part of Mong Kok) in terms of community integrity.	The representation (b) is not accepted because: (i) the resultant population of E10 (22,737) would exceed the upper permissible limit (+31.62%); and (ii) there are supporting views for the demarcation proposals for E10 and E11 (see items 1, 17 and 18).
17	E10 – Tai Kok Tsui North	7	These representations support the demarcation proposals for E10.	The supporting views are noted.
18	E11 – Tai Nan	2	These representations support the demarcation proposals for E11.	The supporting views are noted.
19	E12 – Mong Kok North	4	These representations support the demarcation proposals for E12.	The supporting views are noted.
20	E13 – Mong Kok East	6	These representations support the demarcation proposals for E13.	The supporting views are noted.
21	E14 – Mong Kok South	3	These representations support the demarcation proposals for E14.	The supporting views are noted.
22	E16 – Tsim Sha Tsui East	1	The representation supports the demarcation proposals for E16.	The supporting view is noted.

Yau Tsim Mong 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>
23	E01 – Tsim Sha Tsui West E02– Jordan West E03– Jordan East	1	The representation supports the demarcation proposals for E01, E02 and E03.	The supporting view is noted.
24	E02 – Jordan West E03 – Jordan East E09 – Tai Kok Tsui South E10 – Tai Kok Tsui North E11 – Tai Nan E12 – Mong Kok North E13 – Mong Kok East	1	Same as item 6.	See item 6.

<i>Item no.</i>	<i>DCCAs concerned</i>	<i>No. of representations</i>	<i>Representations</i>	<i>EAC's views</i>
25	E09 – Tai Kok Tsui South E10 – Tai Kok Tsui North E11 – Tai Nan	1	Same as item 16.	See item 16.

Appendix III - F

**Sham Shui Po 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	All DCCAs	7	These representations support the provisional recommendation on the delineation of all DCCAs in the District, as it has balanced the interests of different types of residents.	The supporting views are noted.
2	DCCAs in the Western and Northern parts of the district	1	The proposals and justifications are the same as those under Options B and C of item 23 raised at the SSPDC Special Meeting.	The representation is accepted with modifications . Please see item 23.
3	F01 – Po Lai F02 – Cheung Sha Wan F15 – Lai Chi Kok North	1	The representation supports the demarcation proposals for F01 and F02. It also suggests to redraw the boundary of F15 at a later stage, as there will be a number of large scale redevelopment projects and resultant population changes in the future.	The supporting view is noted. On the suggestion concerning F15, 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. For this demarcation exercise, the EAC needs to adhere to the population projections as at 30.6.2007. Development beyond this date will not be considered.
4	F01 – Po Lai F10 – Un Chau F16 – So Uk	2	The representations suggest to make slight adjustments to the boundaries of F01, F10 and F16 so that the population of the DCCAs concerned is more evenly distributed: (a) extend the boundary of F01 to include the building blocks surrounded by Cheung Fat Street, Po On Road, Hing Wah Street and Un Chau Street;	These representations are not accepted because the population of F01 is within the permissible limits, and a change in boundary is not necessary. The REO will take the suggestion on polling station into consideration when identifying the venues of polling station for F16.

<i>Item no.</i>	<i>DCCAs concerned</i>	<i>No. of representations</i>	<i>Representations</i>	<i>EAC's views</i>
			<p>(b) for F10, gives the blocks of building in (a) to F01, takes the area near Hing Wah Street, Un Chau Street, Castle Peak Road and Fuk Wing Street from F16; and</p> <p>(c) for F16, gives the area near Hing Wah Street, Un Chau Street, Castle Peak Road and Fuk Wing Street to F10.</p> <p>One representation also suggests to maintain one of the two polling stations used in the 1999 and 2003 DC elections for F16, making it more convenient for elderly residents in So Uk Estate to go for polling, and to boost up the polling rate.</p>	
5	<p>F03 – Nam Cheong North</p> <p>F04 – Boundary Street North & Tai Hang Tung</p> <p>F21 – Shek Kip Mei</p>	1	<p>The representation suggests to move a cluster of private building blocks in F04 to F03 and F21 as follows:</p> <p>(a) move the buildings at the north of Tai Po Road to F21, and those at the south to F03; or</p> <p>(b) move the buildings at the east of Shek Kip Mei Street to F21, and those at the west to F03; or</p> <p>(c) move the buildings at the north of Tai Po Road and Shek Kip Mei Street to F21, and those at the south to F03; or</p> <p>(d) move the buildings at the north of Tai Po Road and Wong Chuk Street to F21, and those at the south to F03</p>	<p>Proposals (a) and (c) are not accepted because:</p> <p>(i) proposal (a) will cause the population of F03 to exceed the upper permissible limit [25,030 (+44.89%)]; and</p> <p>(ii) proposal (c) will cause the population of F04 to exceed the upper permissible limit [23,799 (+37.77%)].</p> <p>Proposals (b) and (d) are accepted with modifications as they are similar to the proposed delineation for F03 under item 23.</p>

<i>Item no.</i>	<i>DCCAs concerned</i>	<i>No. of representations</i>	<i>Representations</i>	<i>EAC's views</i>
			so as to preserve community ties and to group housing estates of the same type together.	
6	F03 – Nam Cheong North F05 – Nam Cheong South F07 – Nam Cheong West	1	The representation suggests to make the following slight adjustments to F03, F05 and F07 so that the population of these DCCAs will be more evenly distributed: (a) move the street blocks surrounded by Tung Chau Street, Nam Cheong Street, Lai Chi Kok Road and Pei Ho Street from F05 to F07; and (b) move the street blocks surrounded by Un Chau Street, Nam Cheong Street, Cheung Sha Wan Road and Shek Kip Mei Street from F03 to F05.	The representation is not accepted , because the population of F07 is within the permissible limits, and a change in boundary is not necessary.
7	F04 – Boundary Street North & Tai Hang Tung F20 – Nam Shan	4	(a) Two representations propose to include Tai Hang Tung Estate, Nam Sham Estate, Tai Hang Sai Estate and Ample Building to form a DCCA, and separate them from Yau Yat Tusen because: (i) the four estates/buildings are geographically close to each other; (ii) the residents share similar community facilities and there is strong community connection among them; (iii) Tai Hang Tung Estate, Nam Sham Estate and	The representations are accepted with modifications i.e. Tai Hang Tung Estate, Nam Sham Estate, Tai Hang Sai Estate and Ample Building will be grouped as a DCCA because the justifications are considered valid, although there are supporting views under (c). However, the new F20 would need to take up a few blocks of private buildings near Tai Po Road (details in item 23). The resultant population of the new F04 and F20 will be: F04 : 21,345 (+23.56%) F20 : 21,350 (+23.59%) As the new F20 includes not only Nam Shan Estate and Tai Hang Tung Estate but also Tai Hang Sai Estate, to better reflect

<i>Item no.</i>	<i>DCCAs concerned</i>	<i>No. of representations</i>	<i>Representations</i>	<i>EAC's views</i>
			<p>Tai Hang Sai Estate are occupied by residents of similar backgrounds and community needs; and</p> <p>(iv) under the provisional recommendations, the Ample building is separated from the majority of private buildings in the Nam Cheong area by a hill, making it difficult to travel between the two areas.</p> <p>(b) One of the representations elaborates that it:</p> <p>(i) objects to the provisional proposal on F04 under which Tai Hang Tung Estate, Boundary Street, and a cluster of private buildings near Fuk Wa Street, Fuk Wing Street and Tai Po Road are included to form a DCCA because:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ● the said cluster of private buildings is geographically separated by a hill from Tai Hang Tung Estate; and ● there is little community connection between the two groups of residents, as they use different community facilities and have 	<p>the major estates in the constituencies, it is recommended to change the name of F20 to “Nam Shan, Tai Hang Tung & Tai Hang Sai” (南山、大坑東及大坑西).</p>

<i>Item no.</i>	<i>DCCAs concerned</i>	<i>No. of representations</i>	<i>Representations</i>	<i>EAC's views</i>
			<p>different concern on housing matters;</p> <p>(ii) objects to the provisional proposal on F20 under which part of Pak Tin Estate, Nam Shan Estate and Tai Hang Sai Estate are grouped as a DCCA because:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ● the two groups of residents are from different communities and there is no direct links of transportation; and ● they share different community facilities (e.g. shopping centres, transportation network and community halls) and face different social problems. <p>(iii) considers that the delineation of F04 and F20 destroys the community integrity and makes it difficult for the respective DC members to serve the geographically separated area efficiently. It may also be necessary to set up at least two polling stations in each constituency in view of the dumb-bell shape.</p>	

<i>Item no.</i>	<i>DCCAs concerned</i>	<i>No. of representations</i>	<i>Representations</i>	<i>EAC's views</i>
			<p>(c) Two representations support the provisional demarcation proposal on F04 and F20 respectively because:</p> <p>(i) it preserves the community identity and sense of belonging of residents in areas of proximity; and</p> <p>(ii) the population in F04 and F20 fall within the permissible range.</p>	
8	F10 – Un Chau F16 – So Uk	1	<p>The representation suggests to make modifications to the boundaries of F10 and F16 by:</p> <p>(a) giving the area to the north of Castle Peak Road to F16 and that to the south to F10; or</p> <p>(b) giving the area to the north of Un Chau Street to F16 and that to the south to F10,</p> <p>so that the population of the two DCCAs can be more evenly distributed and community ties can be preserved.</p>	<p>The representation is not accepted because:</p> <p>(i) suggestion (a) will cause the population of F10 to reach 23,065 (+33.52%) which exceeds the upper permissible limit; and</p> <p>(ii) suggestion (b) will result in the population of F16 to be 22,552 (+30.55%) which exceeds the upper permissible limit.</p>
9	F11 – Lai Chi Kok South F15 – Lai Chi Kok North	1	<p>The representation suggests to move “Aqua Marine” from F11 to F15 because:</p> <p>(a) the community integrity of Hoi Lai Estate can be preserved; and</p> <p>(b) the EAC’s current proposal will increase the workload of the respective DC member.</p>	<p>The representation is not accepted because the population of F15 will be 25,472 (+47.45%), which would exceed the upper permissible limit.</p>

<i>Item no.</i>	<i>DCCAs concerned</i>	<i>No. of representations</i>	<i>Representations</i>	<i>EAC's views</i>
			It also suggests to change the name of F11 to "Hoi Lai" as Hoi Lai Estate is the major estate in the DCCA.	
10	F12 – Mei Foo South F13 – Mei Foo Central	1	The representation suggests to include: (a) Mei Foo Sun Chuen Phases 3 and 4 and Manhattan Hill in F12; and (b) Mei Foo Sun Chuen Phases 1, 2 and 7 in F13 because: (i) the possible confusion of residents in Mei Foo Sun Chuen can be avoided; (ii) it facilitates convenience in communication between DC members and Owners' Corporation; and (iii) it only involves a limited number of blocks, and the impact on the change of population of the two DCCAs concerned will be small.	The representation is not accepted because: (i) the population of F12 and F13 is within the permissible limits, and a change in the existing boundaries is not necessary; and (ii) electors will be formally notified of their respective constituency prior to the election, thereby preventing confusion.
11	F15 – Lai Chi Kok North F19 – Yau Yat Tsuen F21 – Shek Kip Mei	1	The representation suggests to group Caldecott, the Caldecott Hill, Villa Carlton, and Monte Carlton (in F15), with Dynasty Heights, Beacon Heights and Chak On Estate to form a new DCCA because: (a) the Caldecott, the Caldecott Hill, Villa Carlton and Monte Carlton are distant from the majority of	The representation is accepted with modifications . Please refer to item 12 for details.

<i>Item no.</i>	<i>DCCAs concerned</i>	<i>No. of representations</i>	<i>Representations</i>	<i>EAC's views</i>
			<p>building blocks near Cheung Sha Wan Road of F15. The two areas do not have strong local ties; and</p> <p>(b) the geographical separation between the two said areas might make residents living in the northern part of Ching Cheung Road be abstained from voting.</p> <p>It also suggests to rename F15 as "Lai Chi Kok".</p>	
12	<p>F18 – Sheung Pak Tin</p> <p>F19 – Yau Yat Tsuen</p> <p>F21 – Shek Kip Mei</p>	9	<p>These representations propose to retain the former F15 (Lung Ping) and object to divide it into three parts.</p> <p>The reasons given are:</p> <p>(a) Chak On Estate and Shek Kip Mei Estate are separated by Pak Tin Estate (F18) and a hill;</p> <p>(b) geographically, Chak On Estate, Dynasty Heights in F21 and Beacon Heights in F19 form a small community and cannot be separated;</p> <p>(c) the said estates in (b) share common resources and facilities (e.g. transport facilities) and has been in the same DCCA for many years;</p> <p>(d) community ties and integrity cannot otherwise be maintained;</p> <p>(e) it is difficult for the residents of Chak On</p>	<p>The representations are accepted with modifications by retaining the majority of residential developments including Chak On Estate, Dynasty Heights, Beacon Heights, Villa Carlton, Monte Carlton, Blocks 9-11 and 13 of Pak Tin Estate in one DCCA, but still moves the Yau Yat Tsuen area and Student Hostel of the City University from the existing F15 to F19, because:</p> <p>(i) the resultant populations of the new F15 (Lai Chi Kok North) and new F21 (Lung Ping & Sheung Pak Tin) are 20,563(+19.03%) and 17,111 (-0.95%) respectively, which fall within the permissible range;</p> <p>(ii) the community ties among Chak On Estate, Dynasty Heights and Beacon Heights can be maintained;</p> <p>(iii) reasons (a) – (d) are considered valid;</p>

<i>Item no.</i>	<i>DCCAs concerned</i>	<i>No. of representations</i>	<i>Representations</i>	<i>EAC's views</i>
			<p>Estate to seek assistance from the DC member;</p> <p>(f) residents of Beacon Heights may be neglected as it would be difficult for them to reach the DC member for assistance, and they will be abstained from voting if the polling station is in Yau Yat Tsuen.</p>	<p>(iv) there are supporting views on the delineation of F19 under item 14 (i.e. support to move Yau Yat Tsuen area and the Student Hostel of the City University to F19); and</p> <p>(v) a similar delineation proposal has been raised by the Sham Shui Po District Council (please refer to Option A in item 23).</p>
13	F18 – Sheung Pak Tin	2	<p>(a) One representation:</p> <p>(i) basically supports the delineation of F18, as the four blocks which are transferred to F20 are newly built, but considers that it will be best if all blocks of Pak Tin Estate can be kept in F18;</p> <p>(ii) considers that On Tin House should better be retained in F18, as residents of On Tin House are elderly persons and it may be difficult for them to adapt to the new demarcation boundary; and</p> <p>(iii) suggests that the name of the DCCA “Sheung Pak Tin”(上白田) should be renamed as “Pak Tin” to avoid the misconception that there is another DCCA named “Ha Pak Tin”(下白田).</p> <p>(b) Another representation suggests to maintain the status quo of F18 so as to</p>	<p><u>Proposal (a)(i)</u> The proposal is not accepted because maintaining the status quo would cause the population in F18 to exceed the upper permissible limit [24,091 (+39.46%)].</p> <p><u>Proposal (a)(ii)</u> The proposal is accepted. However, to bring the population of F18 within the permissible range, other blocks of Pak Tin Estate will be transferred to another DCCA (see item 12).</p> <p><u>Proposal (a)(iii)</u> The proposal is not accepted. As the new F21 is suggested to rename as “Lung Ping & Sheung Pak Tin”(please see item 23), the new F18 is suggested to be named as “Ha Pak Tin”.</p> <p>Proposal (b) is not accepted as the population of the existing F18 is 24,091(+39.46%) which exceeds the upper permissible limit.</p>

<i>Item no.</i>	<i>DCCAs concerned</i>	<i>No. of representations</i>	<i>Representations</i>	<i>EAC's views</i>
			preserve the community identity and local connections, and that it should be named as "Pak Tin".	
14	F19 – Yau Yat Tsuen	5	<p>These representations support the provisional recommendation on the delineation of F19 because:</p> <p>(a) residents of common characteristics and needs can be put in the same DCCA;</p> <p>(b) public and private housing estates will not be mixed together;</p> <p>(c) the elected DC member can better serve the Yau Yat Tsuen area; and</p> <p>(d) it can motivate future development.</p>	The supporting views are noted. In revising the boundary of F19 under item 12 above, the core housing estates in F19 are basically retained.
15	F20 – Nam Shan F21 – Shek Kip Mei	1	The representation proposes to move Tai Hang Tung Estate to F20, and then move a cluster of private buildings bounded by Pak Tin Street, Wai Lun Street and Nam Cheong Street from F20 to F21, so as to preserve the community ties of the respective areas. It also suggests that F20 and F21 should be named as "Nam Shan and Tai Hang Tung" and "Shek Kip Mei and Boundary Street North" respectively.	The representation is accepted with modifications . Please refer to item 7.

**Sham Shui Po 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	F01 – Po Lai F10 – Un Chau F16 – So Uk	1	Same as item 4.	Please see item 4.
17	F03 – Nam Cheong North F04 – Boundary Street North & Tai Hang Tung F14 – Mei Foo North	1	<p>The representation:</p> <p>(a) proposes to maintain the west boundary of the existing F04 (ie retain Nam Cheong Street as the boundary in F04);</p> <p>(b) considers that it is inappropriate to include Tai Hang Tung Estate in F04; and</p> <p>(c) proposes to change the district boundaries of Sham Shui Po District and Kwai Tsing District, so that Wah Lai Estate and Lai Yan Court in S13 are included in F14, because:</p> <p>(i) residents of the two estates share the community facilities of F14; and</p> <p>(ii) the names of the estates imply that the estates belong to the Sham Shui Po District.</p>	<p><u>Proposal (a)</u> The representation is not accepted, because the change will cause the population of F04 to exceed the upper permissible limit: F04 : 23,758(+37.53%)</p> <p><u>Proposal (b)</u> The representation is accepted, and Tai Hang Tung Estate will be moved to the new F20 because:</p> <p>(i) the community integrity of F20 can be better preserved; and</p> <p>(ii) there are six representations proposing such a change (see items 7(a)-(b), 18 and 30).</p> <p><u>Proposal (c)</u> The subject is outside the EAC's jurisdiction.</p>

<i>Item no.</i>	<i>DCCAs concerned</i>	<i>No. of representations</i>	<i>Representations</i>	<i>EAC's views</i>
18	F04 – Boundary Street North & Tai Hang Tung F18 – Sheung Pak Tin F20 – Nam Shan	2	Same as item 7(a). The reasons given are: (a) it will increase the sense of belonging of residents; (b) Pak Tin Estate and Nam Shan Estate is far away from each other; and (c) The resultant population of F20 should be within the permissible range.	Please see item 7.
19	F15 – Lai Chi Kok North F21 – Shek Kip Mei	1	Same as item 11.	Please see item 11.
20	F19 – Yau Yat Tsuen F21 – Shek Kip Mei	3	(a) These representations support the provisional recommendation on F19 (Same as item 14). The reasons given are: (i) the residents of the Beacon Heights in F19 will usually use the transport facilities near Festival Walk (F19) and seldom visit Chak On Estate; (ii) the provisional recommendation on F19 will not affect its community ties and middle-class residents will not be neglected; (iii) F19 containing estates of similar nature will benefit the residents	<u>Proposal (a)</u> The supporting views are noted (see item 14). <u>Proposal (b)</u> The proposal to include Dynasty Heights in provisional F19 as well is not supported because the resultant population of F19 will be 22,294 (+29.05%), which exceeds the upper permissible limit (please also see item 23).

<i>Item no.</i>	<i>DCCAs concerned</i>	<i>No. of representations</i>	<i>Representations</i>	<i>EAC's views</i>
			<p>and the DC member;</p> <p>(iv) the existing F19 contains public and private housing estates and the rights of some residents are ignored;</p> <p>(v) the DC member is able to reflect the rights of residents; and</p> <p>(vi) it is necessary to adjust the boundaries of some DCCAs as the population in Sham Shui Po West greatly increases.</p> <p>(b) One representation suggests to include Dynasty Heights (F21) in F19 as well if the population allows.</p>	
21	<p>F18 – Sheung Pak Tin</p> <p>F19 – Yau Yat Tsuen</p> <p>F21 – Shek Kip Mei</p>	4	Same as item 12.	See item 12.
22	Working principles of De-marcation	1	This representation suggests that apart from considering the population factor, community ties and integrity should also be considered in delineating the boundaries.	In drawing up the demarcation proposals, the EAC has adhered closely to the statutory criteria under the EAC Ordinance and its working principles which include factors such as preservation of community ties and integrity.

**Views Expressed by District Council Members
at the Special Meeting of the Sham Shui Po District Council on 9 August 2006**

<i>Item no.</i>	<i>DCCAs concerned</i>	<i>No. of representations</i>	<i>Representations</i>	<i>EAC's views</i>
23	DCCAs in the Western and Northern parts of district	3	<p>These representations propose to consider the three options provided by the Sham Shui Po District Council during the special meeting and further refine the options in order to meet the population requirement.</p> <p>A gist of the options and their justifications are as follows –</p> <p><u>Option A</u></p> <p>It proposes to:</p> <p>(a) retain the existing F15 with modifications by:</p> <p style="padding-left: 40px;">(i) moving the estates between Lung Cheung Road and Grandeur Road including Mount Beacon, Student Hostel of the City University, Tak Chee Yuen and Parc Oasis etc to F19; and</p> <p style="padding-left: 40px;">(ii) taking Blocks 9-11 and 13 of Pak Tin Estate, and renaming F15 as “Lung Ping & Sheung Pak Tin”;</p> <p>(b) group the five DCCAs in Nam Cheong area (F03 and F05-F08) into four;</p> <p>(c) modify F21 by:</p>	<p>These representations are accepted with modifications.</p> <p><u>Option A</u></p> <p>The proposal to group the five DCCAs in Nam Cheong area into four will:</p> <p>(i) affect the unaltered boundaries of three DCCAs (F05, F06 and F07); and</p> <p>(ii) cause the resultant population of F07 (Nam Cheong West) to exceed the upper permissible limit, as the population will be 21,945 (+27.03%).</p> <p><u>Options B and C</u></p> <p>The population of the DCCAs concerned will fall within the permissible range, but the proposed F19 in Options B and C (named as “Nam Cheong Tung and Yau Yat Tsuen” and “Kowloon Tsai and Yau Yat Tsuen” in Options B and C respectively) will affect the provisional recommendation on F19, for which 13 representations supporting the delineation have been received (see items 14, 20 and 39).</p> <p>However, it is considered that there are some valid grounds for the proposed changes. To bring the population of all DCCAs concerned within the permissible range and keep the number of affected DCCAs to</p>

<i>Item no.</i>	<i>DCCAs concerned</i>	<i>No. of representations</i>	<i>Representations</i>	<i>EAC's views</i>
			<p>(i) moving the buildings near Wai Chi Lane in F21 to F18;</p> <p>(ii) taking the redevelopment area of Shek Kip Mei Estate from F20; and</p> <p>(iii) taking a cluster of private buildings from F03, and renaming F21 as “Shek Kip Mei & Un Chau Street North”; and</p> <p>(d) move Tai Hang Tung Estate from F19 to F20, and renaming F20 as “Nam Shan & Tai Hang Tung”.</p> <p><u>Option B</u></p> <p>It proposes to:</p> <p>(a) retain the existing F15 with modifications by:</p> <p>(i) taking Village Gardens from F19; and</p> <p>(ii) moving the estates near Caldecott including Villa Carlton and Monte Carlton to Lai Chi Kok North (ie the provisional F15).</p> <p>(b) dissolve F04 by</p> <p>(i) moving a cluster of private building in F04 to F03(ie same as provisional F03); and</p>	<p>the minimum, <i>it is therefore recommended to combine Options A and B along the thinking of the counter-proposals with further modifications:</i></p> <p>(i) accept the proposed boundaries on the areas in Yau Yat Tsuen, Pak Tin and Lung Ping in Option A and the proposed boundaries on the Nam Shan area in Option B;</p> <p>(ii) dissolve the existing F04 so that it will be absorbed by F03, new F04, F05 and F20; and</p> <p>(iii) F06 to take up some street blocks from F05 consequently (note: F05 and F06, which are originally unaltered, have to be slightly adjusted to bring the population of DCCAs concerned within the permissible limit).</p> <p>Details of the DCCAs with major changes are as follow:</p> <p><u>F04</u> <u>(Shek Kip Mei & Nam Cheong East)</u> Includes Shek Kip Mei Estate and some buildings of the existing F04. F04 is suggested to rename as Shek Kip Mei & Nam Cheong East, as Shek Kip Mei Estate is moved to F04.</p> <p><u>F18 (Ha Pak Tin)</u> Includes Pak Tin Estate (except Blocks 9-11 and 13) and the buildings near Wai Chi Lane.</p>

<i>Item no.</i>	<i>DCCAs concerned</i>	<i>No. of representations</i>	<i>Representations</i>	<i>EAC's views</i>
			<p>(ii) moving the remaining part of F04 to F19, and renaming F19 as “Nam Cheong East & Yau Yat Tsuen”;</p> <p>(c) move the redevelopment area of Shek Kip Mei Estate from F20 to F21;</p> <p>(d) move Tai Tin House, Lai Tin House and Wan Tin House of Pak Tin Estate from F18 to F21, and rename F21 as “Shek Kip Mei & Ha Pak Tin”; and</p> <p>(e) move Tai Hang Tung Estate from F19 to F20, and renaming F20 as “Nam Shan & Tai Hang Tung”.</p> <p><u>Option C</u></p> <p>It proposes to:</p> <p>(a) retain the existing F15;</p> <p>(b) dissolve the existing F20 by:</p> <p>(i) moving Nam Shan Estate to F19 and renaming F19 as “Kowloon Tsai & Yau Yat Tsuen”; and</p> <p>(ii) moving Tai Hang Sai Estate and Ample Building to F04 and renaming F04 as “Nam Cheong East & Tai Hang Sai”;</p> <p>(c) same as (d) of Option B; and</p>	<p><u>F19 (Yau Yat Tsuen)</u> Includes Yau Yat Tsuen, Tak Chi Yuen and Student Hostel of the City University.</p> <p><u>F20 (Nam Shan, Tai Hang Tung & Tai Hang Sai)</u> Includes Nam Shan Estate, Tai Hang Tung Estate, Tai Hang Sai Estate, Ample Building and some private buildings of the existing F04.</p> <p><u>F21 (Lung Ping & Sheung Pak Tin)</u> Includes Dynasty Heights, Beacon Heights, Chak On Estate, the estates near Caldecott including Villa Carlton and Monte Carlton, and Blocks 9-11 and 13 of Pak Tin Estate.</p> <p>The resultant population will be:</p> <p>F04 : 21,345 (+23.56%) F18 : 18,394 (+6.48%) F19 : 17,961 (+3.97%) F20 : 21,350 (+23.59%) F21 : 17,111 (-0.95%)</p> <p>and that of F03, F05 and F06 which are slightly adjusted will be:</p> <p>F03 : 21,308 (+23.35%) F05 : 21,568 (+24.85%) F06 : 21,307 (+23.34%)</p>

<i>Item no.</i>	<i>DCCAs concerned</i>	<i>No. of representations</i>	<i>Representations</i>	<i>EAC's views</i>
			<p>(d) same as b(i) and (c) of Option B.</p> <p>The reasons given are:</p> <p>(i) Under provisional recommendations,</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ● Shek Kip Mei Estate and Chak On Estate are separated by Pak Tin Estate (in F18); ● Tai Tin House, Lai Tin House and Wan Tin House of Pak Tin Estate and Nam Shan Estate are separated by a playground; and ● the buildings near Boundary Street North and Tai Hang Tung Estate are separated by a hill, and <p>(ii) the proposals will preserve community integrities.</p>	
24	All DCCAs	4	<p>These representations support the provisional recommendations on Sham Shui Po District because:</p> <p>(a) the boundaries of 10 DCCAs remain unaffected although the population of the District has greatly increased; and</p> <p>(b) only one public housing estate (Pak Tin Estate) is put in two DCCAs under the provisional recommendations.</p>	The supporting views are noted.

<i>Item no.</i>	<i>DCCAs concerned</i>	<i>No. of representations</i>	<i>Representations</i>	<i>EAC's views</i>
25	F01 – Po Lai F10 – Un Chau F16 – So Uk	1	Same as item 4.	See item 4.
26	F03 – Nam Cheong North F04 – Boundary Street North & Tai Hang Tung F05 – Nam Cheong South F06 – Nam Cheong Central F07 – Nam Cheong West F12 – Mei Foo South F13 – Mei Foo Central F14 – Mei Foo North	1	The representation proposes to: (a) group F03-F07 (five DCCAs) into four DCCAs, or combine the five DCCAs in Shek Kip Mei area to four DCCAs; or (b) group F12-F14 (three DCCAs) into two DCCAs, because it can provide one extra DCCA for the existing F11 and will not destroy the community integrity.	<u>Proposal (a)</u> The proposals to re-delineate the DCCAs in Shek Kip Mei area are accepted with modifications (Please see item 23 for details). <u>Proposal (b)</u> The representation is not accepted because the average population of F12-F14 is above 24,192 (+40.04%), which exceeds the upper permissible limit.

<i>Item no.</i>	<i>DCCAs concerned</i>	<i>No. of representations</i>	<i>Representations</i>	<i>EAC's views</i>
27	F03 – Nam Cheong North F05 – Nam Cheong South F07 – Nam Cheong West	1	Same as item 6.	Please see item 6.
28	F04 – Boundary Street North & Tai Hang Tung	2	These representations object to the name of F04, and one of them proposes to rename F04 as “Nam Cheong East & Tai Hang Tung”.	The representations are accepted , but since the boundaries in Shek Kip Mei area are modified, we recommend renaming F04 as “Shek Kip Mei & Nam Cheong East” because Shek Kip Mei Estate is moved to the new F04 (see item 23).
29	F04 – Boundary Street North & Tai Hang Tung F18 – Sheung Pak Tin F20 – Nam Shan F21 – Shek Kip Mei	3	These representations object to the provisional recommendation on F04, F20 and F21. The reasons given are: (a) the buildings in the west area of F04 and Tai Hang Tung Estate are separated by a hill; (b) Nam Shan Estate and the buildings near Wai Chi Lane in F20 are separated by a park/playground; and (c) Shek Kip Mei Estate and Chak On Estate in F21 are separated by F18 and a hill. It is therefore considered that the community integrity will be adversely affected. One of the representations suggest to add	The representations are accepted . Please see item 23 for details.

<i>Item no.</i>	<i>DCCAs concerned</i>	<i>No. of representations</i>	<i>Representations</i>	<i>EAC's views</i>
			the buildings along Shek Kip Mei Street and Nam Cheong Street to item 1 of Option B in the proposals sent to the REO before the meeting, so as to meet the population requirement.	
30	F04 – Boundary Street North & Tai Hang Tung F20 – Nam Shan	1	Same as item 7(a).	See item 7(a).
31	F05 – Nam Cheong South F06 – Nam Cheong Central F07 – Nam Cheong West F08 – Fu Cheong	1	The representation supports to keep the boundaries near Lai Chi Kok Road and Tung Chau Street unchanged.	The supporting view is noted.
32	F10 – Un Chau F16 – So Uk	1	The representation objects to item 4.	See item 4.
33	F11 – Lai Chi Kok South	2	Same as item 9.	See item 9.

<i>Item no.</i>	<i>DCCAs concerned</i>	<i>No. of representations</i>	<i>Representations</i>	<i>EAC's views</i>
	F15 – Lai Chi Kok North			
34	F12 – Mei Foo South F13 – Mei Foo Central F14 – Mei Foo North	1	The representation considers that: (a) adjusting boundaries of the DCCAs should be avoided if the population falls within the permissible range; and (b) grouping F12-F14 into two DCCAs (ie item 26(b)) is impossible because the average population exceeds the permissible range.	<u>Item (a)</u> In line with EAC's working principles. <u>Item (b)</u> The view is noted.
35	F14 – Mei Foo North	2	These representations support to move the Nob Hill from Kwai Tsing District to F14, because: (a) the community integrity can be preserved; and (b) residents of the estate use the transport facilities of Mei Foo.	The supporting views are noted, but delineation of district boundary is outside the EAC's jurisdiction.
36	F15 – Lai Chi Kok North F19 – Yau Yat Tsuen	1	The representation objects to the provisional recommendation on F15 and F19, because residents of Beacon Heights(F19), Villa Carlton and Monte Carlton in F15 may be abstained from voting.	The representation is accepted . Please see item 23 for details.
37	F15 – Lai Chi Kok North F18 – Sheung Pak Tin	2	Same as item 12. The additional reasons given are: (a) the same polling station was designated for Chak On Estate, Dynasty Heights (F21) and Beacon Heights (F19) in the 2003 DC	The representations are accepted with modifications . Please see item 12 for details.

<i>Item no.</i>	<i>DCCAs concerned</i>	<i>No. of representations</i>	<i>Representations</i>	<i>EAC's views</i>
	F19 – Yau Yat Tsuen F21 – Shek Kip Mei		<p>Election(as they were in the same DCCA);</p> <p>(b) the transportation network in Monte Carlton, Villa Carlton and the buildings near Caldecott in F15 is connected to that near Shek Kip Mei MTR station; and</p> <p>(c) the management companies of buildings in F15 object to the provisional recommendation.</p>	
38	F15 – Lai Chi Kok North	1	<p>The representation proposes to move the buildings in the north of Ching Cheung Road to the Sham Shui Po east area, instead of F15 (Lai Chi Kok North) (Similar to item 11),</p> <p>because:</p> <p>(a) there is not much community ties between the buildings and F15 (Lai Chi Kok North); and</p> <p>(b) the community integrity can be maintained.</p>	See item 11.
39	F19 – Yau Yat Tsuen	5	Same as item 20(a).	See item 20(a).
40	F19 – Yau Yat Tsuen	2	The representation considers that the “class-segregation” approach (社區階級) should not be adopted in delineating F19.	EAC will adhere to the statutory criteria stipulated under the EAC Ordinance and working principles on the demarcation exercise.

<i>Item no.</i>	<i>DCCAs concerned</i>	<i>No. of representations</i>	<i>Representations</i>	<i>EAC's views</i>
41	F19 – Yau Yat Tsuen F21 – Shek Kip Mei	1	Same as item 20(b).	Please see item 20(b).
42	F20 – Nam Shan F21 – Shek Kip Mei	1	The representation proposes to move Tai Tin House, Lai Tin House and Wan Tin House of Pak Tin Estate from F20 to F21.	The representation is accepted with modifications (Please see item 23).
43	Working principles for de-marcation	2	These representations propose that: (a) preservation of community integrity and the approaches which will affect the least number of residents should be used as the main principles for demarcation; and (b) the changes of boundaries should be avoided if the population falls within the permissible range.	In line with EAC's working principles.
44	Designation of polling stations	1	The representation proposes to set up additional polling stations for some DCCAs in view of geographical factors.	The REO will take this into consideration when identifying the locations of polling stations.
45	Number of elected seats	5	These representations propose to increase the number of DCCAs in Sham Shui Po District to absorb the sharp increase of population of Lai Chi Kok area.	The subject is outside the EAC's jurisdiction.

Appendix III - G

**Kowloon City 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	G01 – Ma Tau Wai G04 – Lok Man G17 – Whampoa West	1	The representation supports the demarcation proposals for the said DCCAs in the district.	The supporting view is noted.
2	G05 – Sheung Lok G06 – Ho Man Tin	1	<p>The representation proposes to move Sheung Lok Estate from G06 to G05, and to move Hang Shan Court and the Customs & Excise Service Married Quarters out of G05 because:</p> <p>(a) Sheung Lok Estate and Ho Man tin Estate are both public housing estates, such grouping can facilitate unity and convenience in district management;</p> <p>(b) the population of the two DCCAs can be more evenly distributed;</p> <p>(c) Hang Shan Court and the Customs & Excise Service Married Quarters are geographically separated from Ho Man Tin Estate by a hill; and</p> <p>(d) the population in the Customs & Excise Service Married Quarters is expected to decrease.</p>	<p>The representation is not accepted because:</p> <p>(i) Sheung Lok Estate has been included in G06 since the 1994 DC Election;</p> <p>(ii) the population of G05, G06 is within the permissible limits, and a change in boundary is not necessary; and</p> <p>(iii) 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.</p>

<i>Item no.</i>	<i>DCCAs concerned</i>	<i>No. of representations</i>	<i>Representations</i>	<i>EAC's views</i>
3	G16 – Whampoa East G17- Whampoa West	1	<p>The representation suggests to maintain the status quo for G16 and G17 because:</p> <p>(a) the population difference between the two DCCAs will be narrowed down as Hunghom Peninsula (in G17) will be put out for sale in the near future, and no population growth is expected in G16;</p> <p>(b) the possible confusion for residents of G16 and G17 can be avoided as the existing boundary has been adopted for more than 12 years; and</p> <p>(c) the trouble of re-drawing the boundary again in the next demarcation exercise due to the increase of population in G17 after the Hunghom Peninsula is put out for sale can be avoided.</p>	<p>This representation is not accepted because:</p> <p>(i) in this demarcation exercise the EAC needs to adhere to the population projection as at 30 June, 2007. Future developments beyond this date will not be considered;</p> <p>(ii) maintaining the status quo would cause the population in G17 to exceed the lower permissible limit (-25.39%), as the population of the DCCA will only be 12,889;</p> <p>(iii) there are supporting views on the delineation of G17 (see item 1); and</p> <p>(iv) electors will be formally notified of their respective constituency prior to the election, thereby preventing confusion.</p>

Appendix III - H

**Wong Tai Sin 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	H02 – Lung Kai H08 – Tung Tau H09 – Tung Mei H20 – King Fu H21 – Choi Wan East H23 – Choi Wan West H24 – Chi Choi H25 – Choi Hung	1	<p>The representation:</p> <p>(a)(i) objects to delineating the King Kung House of Choi Wan Estate into H23 because King Kung House and Yok Yu House are inseparable in terms of architectural structure; and</p> <p>(a)(ii) suggests that if the move of King Kung House is really necessary, Yok Yu House and Fung Chak House of Choi Wan Estate should also be moved to H23;</p> <p>(b) supports the proposal of moving Kingsford Terrace from H20 to H24;</p> <p>(c) objects to delineating the Kam Wah House and Luk Ching House of Choi Hung Estate into H25 because the population of H25 should be contained within the permissible limit. Suggests to retain the existing boundary of H25;</p>	<p>(i) Representation (a)(i) is accepted because of the need to preserve community integrity and taking into account that King Kung House and Yok Yu House are architecturally together, although the resultant population of H23 will hence exceed the lower permissible limit (12,063, -30.17%).</p> <p>For (a)(ii), the suggestion is not feasible as the population of H21 would be 9,772, which exceeds the lower permissible limit (-43.43%).</p> <p>(ii) Representation (c) is not accepted because the resultant population of H25 would be 12,190, which exceeds the lower permissible limit (-29.44%).</p> <p>(iii) Representation (e) on the renaming the H02 as “Lung Ha” is accepted.</p> <p>(iv) The supporting views of (b) and (d) are noted.</p>

<i>Item no.</i>	<i>DCCAs concerned</i>	<i>No. of representations</i>	<i>Representations</i>	<i>EAC's views</i>
			<p>(d) supports the proposal of moving Kai Tak Garden from H02 to H09, Wing Tung House and Wai Tung House of Tung Tau (II) Estate from H09 to H08; and</p> <p>(e) as Kai Tak Garden is removed from H02, it suggests that H02 can be renamed as “Lung Ha”, “Lung Har” or “Lung South”.</p>	
2	H04 – Fung Wong	1	The representation supports that the boundary for H04 should remain unchanged.	The supporting view is noted.
3	H13 – Tsui Chuk & Pang Ching H14 – Chuk Yuen South H15 – Chuk Yuen North	3	<p>The representations reiterate the objection to maintain the existing boundaries of H13 and H15, in which 2 blocks of Chuk Yuen (North) Estate are placed in H13. They request the EAC to re-consider the previous suggestions which are as follows:</p> <p>(a)(i) to form a DCCA by grouping Ying Fuk Court and three or four blocks of Chuk Yuen (North) Estate; and</p> <p>(a)(ii) to group the remaining blocks of the Estate to form another DCCA; or</p> <p>(b) to revert to the 1999 DCCA</p>	<p>The representation is not accepted because it would involve the addition of one seat for the Wong Tai Sin DC which is outside EAC's jurisdiction.</p> <p>Also, the population of H13, H14 and H15 are within the permissible range:</p> <p>H13: 20,157 (+16.68%) H14: 17,108 (-0.97%) H15: 18,832 (+9.01%)</p> <p>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>
			boundaries for Chuk Yuen (North) Estate.	
4	H21 – Choi Wan East H22 – Choi Wan South H23 – Choi Wan West	2	The representations object to delineating the King Kung House of Choi Wan Estate into H23 because: (a) King Kung House and Yok Yu House are inseparable in terms of management, maintenance and public facilities; (b) if Choi Wan Estate is separated into three DCCAs, electors of Choi Wan Estate will become the minority in each DCCA; (c) the location of the polling station which is well familiar to electors would be affected; and (d) the normal operation of the Estate Management Advisory Committee and peaceful atmosphere of the estate would be affected.	See item 1.
5	H24 – Chi Choi H25 – Choi Hung	1	The representation objects to delineating the Kam Wah House and Luk Ching House of Choi Hung Estate into H25 because: (a) the community integrity of Choi Hung Estate would be hampered; and (b) Choi Hung Estate is	The representation is not accepted because the resultant population of H25 would be 12,190, which exceeds the lower permissible limit (-29.44%). The EAC considered moving all the four blocks of Choi Hung Estate, namely Luk Ching House, Kam Wah House, Chi Mei House and Tan Fung House, from H24 to H25. However, the resultant population of

<i>Item no.</i>	<i>DCCAs concerned</i>	<i>No. of representations</i>	<i>Representations</i>	<i>EAC's views</i>
			<p>mainly inhabited by elderly residents and any change to the boundary of this DCCA will affect the electors' desire for voting because they are familiar with the location of the polling station.</p>	<p>H24 would be 11,639, which exceeds the lower permissible limit (-32.63%).</p>

Wong Tai Sin 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>
6	H02 – Lung Kai H08 – Tung Tau H09 – Tung Mei H20 – King Fu H21 – Choi Wan East H23 – Choi Wan West H24 – Chi Choi H25 – Choi Hung	1	Same as item 1.	See item 1.
7	H04 – Fung Wong	1	The representation suggests to move Fung Chuen Court from H06 to H04 because: (a) the population of H04 is low; and (b) it is better for the residents of Fung Chuen Court in terms of the community identity and local ties.	The representation is not accepted as the population of both DCCAs are within the permissible range: H04: 14,930 (-13.57%) H06: 19,584 (+13.37%) It is not necessary to change the existing boundaries.
8	H21 – Choi Wan East H23 – Choi Wan West	1	Same as item 1(a).	See item 1.

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.

Appendix III - K**Tsuen Wan 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	K07 – Tsuen Wan Centre K08 – Allway K13 – Luk Yeung	1	The representation proposes to: (a) move Kam Fung Garden from K07 to K08 as it is closely related to Tsuen Tak Garden, Joyful Building, Sheeny Terrace and Summit Terrace; (b) move Allway Gardens from K08 to K07 so that it is in the same DCCA with Tsuen Wan Centre; (c) move the village areas of K08, such as the Cliveden, to K13 to facilitate transport convenience; and (d) suggest renaming the newly formed DCCA as “Tsuen Tak” or “Tsuen King Circuit”.	The representation is not accepted because: (i) it would affect the existing boundaries of K07 and K08, which should not be changed since the population of both DCCAs are within the permissible range; and (ii) the resultant population of K07 and K08 will exceed the permissible limits under the proposal: K07: 22,102 (+27.94%) K08: 8,363 (-51.59%)
2	K11 – Tsuen Wan Rural West K12 – Tsuen Wan Rural East	1	The representation proposes the following: (a) including Rhine Terrace within the constituency boundary description of K12; and (b) moving Pai Min Kok Village in K11 to K12 as it is located between Sea Crest Villa Phase 2 and 3 and shares the same transportation facilities with the	The representation is accepted because the resultant population of both DCCAs will still fall within the permissible range: K11: 20,418 (+18.19%) K12: 21,374 (+23.73%) and valid reasons are given in the representation.

<i>Item no.</i>	<i>DCCAs concerned</i>	<i>No. of representations</i>	<i>Representations</i>	<i>EAC's views</i>
			residents therein.	
3	K11 – Tsuen Wan Rural West K12 – Tsuen Wan Rural East	1	This representation proposes: (a) to move Lido Garden in Sham Tseng from K12 to K11; (b) to move Ma Wan to any DCCA in Tsuen Wan town centre which has direct transport. As there is no kaito route serving Sham Tseng and Ma Wan, the residents have difficulty to contact the DC member; and (c) to include all 4 phases of Sea Crest Villa in one DCCA, if possible.	Proposals (a) - (c) are not accepted because: <u>Proposals (a) and (c)</u> (i) The aim of moving Sea Crest Villa Phases 1 to 3 with other residential buildings nearby to K12 is to alleviate the population overflow of K11 (24,810, +43.62%). (ii) The EAC has considered including Sea Crest Villa Phase 4 in K12 but the resultant population of K12 will exceed the upper permissible limit (22,397, +29.65%). <u>Proposal (b)</u> The population of Ma Wan is 11,193. The move of Ma Wan to other DCCAs in Tsuen Wan town centre will cause the population of the DCCAs to exceed the upper permissible limit.
4	K11 – Tsuen Wan Rural West K12 – Tsuen Wan Rural East	1	The representation suggests the following: (a) to move the area of Tsing Lung Tau from K11 to K12 so that it is in the same DCCA with Sham Tseng for community integrity; (b) to move Ma Wan to Kwai Tsing District as they have closer community ties; and (c) to move the north of Lantau in K11 to Islands District for proper management.	Proposals (a) – (c) are not accepted because: <u>Proposal (a)</u> The resultant population of K12 will exceed the upper permissible limit (22,906, +32.60%). <u>Proposals (b) and (c)</u> The alternation of district boundaries is outside the EAC's jurisdiction.

<i>Item no.</i>	<i>DCCAs concerned</i>	<i>No. of representations</i>	<i>Representations</i>	<i>EAC's views</i>
5	K13 – Luk Yeung K17 – Cheung Shek	1	This representation proposes to move Hoi Pa Village Northeast Terrace from K13 to K17 because its historical background, culture and way of living are the same as Hoi Pa Resite Village in K17.	The representation is not accepted because: (i) Hoi Pa Village Northeast Terrace is geographically separated from Hoi Pa Resite Village by Yi Pei Chun; and (ii) Hoi Pa Village Northeast Terrace and Hoi Pa Resite Village has been in K13 and K17 since 1999 respectively. There is also another Hoi Pa Resite Village, ie Hoi Pa San Tsuen, in K14 since 1999.
6	K14 – Lei Muk Shue East K15 – Lei Muk Shue West	1	This representation supports the demarcation proposals for these two DCCAs.	The supporting view is noted.

Appendix III - L

**Tuen Mun District
Summaries of Written Representations**

<i>Item no.</i>	<i>DCCAs concerned</i>	<i>No. of representations</i>	<i>Representations</i>	<i>EAC's views</i>
1	L05 – Yau Oi South L06 – Yau Oi North L13 – Hanford	1	This representation proposes to move Goodview Garden, the Sea Crest, Myloft, Ching Chung Hau Po Woon Secondary School, NLSI Peace Evangelical Secondary School and a recreational park, which were proposed to be moved from L13 to L06 in the provisional recommendations, to L05 instead, because: (a) the population of L05 is expected to exceed the lower permissible limit by the 2011 DC Election and; (b) such move will lead to a more even distribution of population in L05 and L06 and minimize the disturbance to residents in the future.	The representation is not accepted because: (i) it would affect the existing boundary of L05, the population (14,655, -15.17%) of which is within the permissible range; and (ii) the population figures used in this demarcation exercise is projected as at 30 June 2007, any developments beyond this date will not be taken into consideration.
2	L06 – Yau Oi North L13 – Hanford	5	(a) The five representations object to the move of a cluster of private residential buildings including Nerine Cove and the Sea Crest, currently in L13, to L06 because: (i) the demographic features, styles of living, residents' needs and modes of management of private buildings in	The representations are partially accepted . The re-delineation of L06 and L13 aims at alleviating the population shortfall of L06 (12,305, -28.77%) and overflow of L13 (25,619, +48.30%). It is agreed that only Goodview Garden and Oceania Heights will be moved from L13 to L06 and Nerine Cove and the Sea Crest are retained in L13, as the resultant population of L06 and L13 are still within the

<i>Item no.</i>	<i>DCCAs concerned</i>	<i>No. of representations</i>	<i>Representations</i>	<i>EAC's views</i>
			<p>L13 are different from that of public rental housing in L06;</p> <p>(ii) two of the representations expressed concern that the resources to be allocated by the DC member concerned to the DCCA would be affected;</p> <p>(iii) one representation pointed out that the DC member of L13 currently in office has better understanding of the management of private buildings in the area; and</p> <p>(iv) one representation noted that some boundaries of the DCCAs of which the populations exceed the lower permissible limit are allowed to remain unchanged.</p> <p>(b) Three of the representations consider that moving only Goodview Garden to L06 is acceptable.</p>	<p>permissible range as follows:</p> <p>L06: 16,541 (-4.25%) L13: 21,383 (+23.78%)</p> <p>The suggestion of moving only Goodview Garden to L06 is not acceptable because the population of L13 will still exceed the upper permissible limit (22,861, +32.34%).</p>
3	L06 – Yau Oi North L13 – Hanford	1	<p>The representation objects to the move of the four private residential developments from L13 to L06 because:</p> <p>(a) the inclusion would affect the demographic feature and community</p>	See item 2.

<i>Item no.</i>	<i>DCCAs concerned</i>	<i>No. of representations</i>	<i>Representations</i>	<i>EAC's views</i>
			<p>integrity of L06;</p> <p>(b) the population would be within the permissible range after some vacant flats are occupied; and</p> <p>(c) it is desirable to allow the population of L06 falling short of the lower permissible limit.</p>	
4	L14 – Fu Sun L18 – Butterfly	1	The representation supports the demarcation proposals for L14 and L18 as Siu Shan Court has closer community ties with Butterfly Estate.	The supporting view is noted.
5	L14 – Fu Sun L18 – Butterfly	4	<p>The four representations object to moving Siu Shan Court from L14 to L18 because:</p> <p>(a) Butterfly Estate itself has been formed as a DCCA since 1994;</p> <p>(b) according to the Housing Authority, the population of Butterfly Estate (12,733) is slightly deviated from the lower permissible limit and it is still under-estimated;</p> <p>(c) the population of the Estate will meet the lower permissible limit when all units are being occupied;</p> <p>(d) there is no community ties between Siu Shan Court and Butterfly</p>	<p>The representations are not accepted because:</p> <p>(i) the EAC has to rely on the population forecast provided by AHSB for the demarcation exercise;</p> <p>(ii) according to the figure provided by AHSB, the boundary of L18 has to be re-delineated because its population exceeds the lower permissible limit (12,409, -28.17%); and</p> <p>(iii) there are five representations supporting the move of the whole Siu Shan Court from L14 to L18 (see items 4, 10(c) and 13).</p>

<i>Item no.</i>	<i>DCCAs concerned</i>	<i>No. of representations</i>	<i>Representations</i>	<i>EAC's views</i>
			Estate as the housing types and residents' needs are different. The move will hamper the community integrity and harmony of Butterfly Estate.	
6	L14 – Fu Sun L20 – Lung Mun	2	The representations propose to move Glorious Garden Block 1 to 6 from L20 to L14 for enhancing community integrity and avoiding confusion of the residents.	The representations are not accepted because it would affect the existing boundary of L20, the population (19,446, +12.57%) of which is within the permissible range.
7	L24 – Po Tin L29 – Tuen Mun Rural	1	The representation proposes to keep the existing boundary of L29 unchanged because: (a) the population of L29 would remain within the permissible range if not counting the population forecast of the Sherwood, which has no imminent plan for occupation; (b) even if the population of L29 would exceed the upper permissible limit after the flats of the Sherwood are occupied, L29 should be allowed to remain unchanged as there is a DCCA of other district in the New Territories West which exceeds the upper permissible limit by 49%; and (c) keeping the existing boundary of L29 unchanged would help	The representation is not accepted because: (i) according to the figure provided by AHSG, the population of L24 and L29 will far exceed the lower or upper permissible limit (L24:9,349, -45.88%; L29: 26,353, +52.55%) if the existing boundary of L29 is maintained; and (ii) the aim of re-delineating the boundaries of L24 and L29 is to bring the population of both DCCAs within the permissible range.

<i>Item no.</i>	<i>DCCAs concerned</i>	<i>No. of representations</i>	<i>Representations</i>	<i>EAC's views</i>
			maintain the community integrity of rural area.	
8	L24 – Po Tin L29 – Tuen Mun Rural	2	<p>The representations propose to keep the existing boundary of L29 unchanged in order to preserve its tradition, culture and community integrity.</p> <p>One representation considered that:</p> <p>(a) the development of rural area would be hindered under the EAC's proposal; and</p> <p>(b) sense of belongings of the residents living in private residential buildings like Po Wah Garden in L29 has been well-established and it is unnecessary to make any changes.</p>	See item 7.
9	L24 – Po Tin L29 – Tuen Mun Rural	2	<p>The representations propose to keep the existing boundary of L24 unchanged because:</p> <p>(a) the ways of living, needs and community development of the Po Tin Estate and the villages in L29 are different;</p> <p>(b) putting different types of housing in L24 would affect the utilization of resources by the DC member; and</p>	See item 7.

<i>Item no.</i>	<i>DCCAs concerned</i>	<i>No. of representations</i>	<i>Representations</i>	<i>EAC's views</i>
			(c) the population of Po Tin Estate will be increased as around 2,000 units will be occupied in the future.	
10	L03 – Siu Tsui L04 – On Ting L14 – Fu Sun L15 – Yuet Wu L16 – Siu Hei L18 – Butterfly L20 – Lung Mun	3	The three representations all suggest the following for community integrity and the residents' interests: (a) <u>L03 Siu Tsui</u> <u>L04 On Ting</u> L03 should include Siu Lun Court and Tsui Ning Garden while L04 should consist solely of On Ting Estate. (b) <u>L14 Fu Sun</u> <u>L20 Lung Mun</u> Same as item 6. (c) <u>L15 Yuet Wu</u> <u>L16 Siu Hei</u> <u>L18 Butterfly</u> All representations support the demarcation proposals for these three DCCAs.	<u>Item (a)</u> It is not accepted because the resultant population of L03 would exceed the upper permissible limit (22,167, +28.32%). <u>Item (b)</u> See item 6. <u>Item (c)</u> The supporting views are noted.
11	L05 – Yau Oi South L06 – Yau Oi North L13 – Hanford L14 – Fu Sun	1	The representation proposes to keep the existing boundaries of L05, L06, L13, L14, L18, L24 and L29, and the name of L14 unchanged. Reasons given are: (a) <u>L05 Yau Oi South</u> The population falls within the permissible range. (b) <u>L06 Yau Oi North</u> The population would be within the	<u>L05 Yau Oi South</u> The boundary of L05 remains unchanged under the EAC's proposal. <u>L06 Yau Oi North and L13 Hanford</u> See item 2. <u>L14 Fu Sun and L18 Butterfly</u> See items 4, 5, 10(c) and 13. <u>L24 Po Tin and L29 Tuen Mun Rural</u> See item 7.

<i>Item no.</i>	<i>DCCAs concerned</i>	<i>No. of representations</i>	<i>Representations</i>	<i>EAC's views</i>
	L18 – Butterfly L24 – Po Tin L29 – Tuen Mun Rural		<p>permissible range after some vacant flats are occupied.</p> <p>(c) <u>L13 Hanford</u> <u>L14 Fu Sun</u> <u>L18 Butterfly</u> Similar to the practices in other districts, it is also desirable to allow the population of L13 and L18 falling short of or exceeding the permissible limits. Thus, the boundary and name of L14 can remain unchanged.</p> <p>(d) <u>L24 Po Tin</u> <u>L29 Tuen Mun Rural</u> Same as items 7 and 9(c).</p>	

Tuen Mun District
Oral Representations Received at the Public Forum on 16 August 2006

<i>Item no.</i>	<i>DCCAs concerned</i>	<i>No. of representations</i>	<i>Representations</i>	<i>EAC's views</i>
12	L06 – Yau Oi North L13 – Hanford	2	(a) Same as item 2(a)(i). (b) One representation expressed concern that community development of L13 will be hindered after moving some private buildings from L13 to L06. (c) One representation queries if the population figure is still an appropriate statutory criteria for delineating DCCA boundaries.	<u>Items (a) and (b)</u> See item 2. <u>Item (c)</u> The view is noted.
13	L14 – Fu Sun L18 – Butterfly	1	The representation supports the move of Siu Shan Court from L14 to L18 because it has closer community ties with L18 and the population of L18 is expected to drop continuously.	The supporting view is noted.
14	L14 – Fu Sun L18 – Butterfly	3	Same as item 5. One representation added that it would cause difficulty to the DC member for coping with the needs of the two residential areas which are of different natures.	See item 5.

<i>Item no.</i>	<i>DCCAs concerned</i>	<i>No. of representations</i>	<i>Representations</i>	<i>EAC's views</i>
15	L14 – Fu Sun L18 – Butterfly	1	The representation suggests moving several blocks of Siu Shan Court which are near to Butterfly Estate from L14 to L18 for easier management and minimizing conflicts between the residents if the lower permissible limit has to be met.	The representation is not accepted because the community integrity of Siu Shan Court will be hampered.
16	L24 – Po Tin L29 – Tuen Mun Rural	1	Same as item 9. The representation queries that temporary residents of Po Tin Estate are not counted.	See item 7.

Appendix III - M

**Yuen Long 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	M01 – Fung Lin	1	The representation supports the existing demarcation proposal for M01 and objects to a proposal raised by a member of the public at the Public Forum suggesting to move the Sereno Verde from M07 into M01.	The supporting view is noted.
2	M01 – Fung Lin M06 – Fung Cheung M07 – Shap Pat Heung North M08 – Shap Pat Heung South	3	The representations object to retaining the Sereno Verde (a newly built development) within M07 and suggests that it should be moved to M06 because: (a) Sereno Verde is different from the rural villages in M07 in terms of living habits and culture; and (b) it will produce a better population distribution if the Sereno Verde is included in M06.	The representations are not accepted because: (i) Sereno Verde is surrounded by a cluster of villages and the villages have to be moved as well if Sereno Verde is moved to M06. Under such circumstances, the resultant population of M06 would far exceed the upper permissible limit (24,668, +42.80%); and (ii) there are supporting views for the demarcation proposals for M06 and M07 (see items 3 and 4).
3	M06 – Fung Cheung	1	The representation objects to moving the Sereno Verde to M06 and supports the demarcation proposal for M06.	The supporting view is noted.
4	M07 – Shap Pat Heung North	2	The representations support the demarcation proposal for M07.	The supporting views are noted.
5	M16 – Yuet Yan M17 – Fu Yan	1	The representation (a) supports the demarcation proposal for M20;	(i) The supporting view of (a) is noted. (ii) The view of (b)(i) and (ii) are noted.

<i>Item no.</i>	<i>DCCAs concerned</i>	<i>No. of representations</i>	<i>Representations</i>	<i>EAC's views</i>
	M20 – Wang King		<p>(b)(i) opines that one of the four blocks of public housing at Tin Shui Wai Area 103, which is under construction, is located on the boundaries of both M16 and M17;</p> <p>(b)(ii) seven blocks of public housing under construction at Tin Shui Wai Areas 103 and 104 are demarcated into 3 DCCAs which is confusing; and</p> <p>(c) suggests that all four blocks of public housing at Area 103 should be grouped within the same DCCA to preserve community integrity.</p>	(iii) The view of (c) is accepted and all the four blocks of public housing at Area 103 would be grouped in M16. Under such arrangement, the resultant population of M16 and M17 would remain the same as the four blocks in question do not have any population as at 30 June 2007.
6	M17 – Fu Yan	1	The representation suggests that Yan Yi House of Tin Yan Estate should be moved from M16 back to M17 in order to preserve community integrity.	The representation is not accepted because the purpose of re-delineating M17 is to alleviate the population quota overflow (+42.79%) of the adjacent M20 by moving four blocks of Tin Yat Estate from M20 to M17. So that the resultant population of M17 would not exceed the upper permissible limit, it is necessary to include Yan Yi House, Yan Ying House and Yan Sui House of Tin Yan Estate in M16.
7	M20 – Wang King	2	The representations support the demarcation proposal for M20.	The supporting views are noted.
8	M22 – Kingswood South	6	The representations suggest retaining Kingswood Ginza in M22 in order to preserve community integrity and local ties.	The representations are not accepted because the resultant population of M22 would be 22,211, which exceeds the upper permissible limit (+28.57%).

<i>Item no.</i>	<i>DCCAs concerned</i>	<i>No. of representations</i>	<i>Representations</i>	<i>EAC's views</i>
9	M22 – Kingswood South M24 – Tsz Yau	1	The representation objects to moving Tin Lai Court into M22 and opines that it should be moved to M24 as the Court has closer ties with Tin Tsz Estate in terms of geographical link and community setting.	The representation is not accepted as the population of M24 has already exceeded the upper permissible limit (22,457, +30.00%) under the current proposal.

Yuen Long District
Oral Representations Received at the Public Forum on 16 August 2006

<i>Item no.</i>	<i>DCCAs concerned</i>	<i>No. of representations</i>	<i>Representations</i>	<i>EAC's views</i>
10	M06 – Fung Cheung M07 – Shap Pat Heung North	1	Same as item 2.	See item 2.
11	M07 – Shap Pat Heung North	1	Same as item 4.	See item 4.
12	M22 – Kingswood South	1	Same as item 8.	See item 8.
13	M27 – Kam Tin M28 – Pat Heung North M29 – Pat Heung South	1	The representation (a) opines that the location of the polling station in M29, ie Pat Heung Central Primary School, is far away from the eastern part of this DCCA; (b) suggests relocating the polling station of M29 in Yuen Kong Public School for the electors' convenience; and (c) opines that the number of Yuen Long DC elected member seats should be reduced as the population of some DCCAs are below the lower permissible limit.	(i) Opinion of (a) and (b) are noted. (ii) For (c), the subject is outside EAC's jurisdiction.

<i>Item no.</i>	<i>DCCAs concerned</i>	<i>No. of representations</i>	<i>Representations</i>	<i>EAC's views</i>
14	Number of elected seats	1	The number of Yuen Long DC elected seats should be increased due to rapid growth in population.	The subject is outside EAC's jurisdiction.
15	—	1	The representation opines that the demarcation exercise is for administrative purpose and it would not hamper the community or rural cultures.	The view is noted.
16	M16 – Yuet Yan M17 – Fu Yan	1 (Received on 23 August, 2006)	<p>The representation opines that:</p> <p>(a) under the EAC's proposal, the DC member of M17 will have difficulty in serving residents therein. As the member's office can only be set up at either Tin Yan Estate or Tin Yat Estate, while Tin Fu Court is a cluster of private residential buildings, it will cause inconvenience to the residents of the other estate in seeking assistance from the DC member;</p> <p>(b) the consultation period should be extended so that the public is given sufficient time to collect views; and</p> <p>(c) instead of organizing a forum for receiving oral representations in Sha Tin, the EAC may co-ordinate with the HAD to hold forums in each DC so that residents of every district can express</p>	<p><u>Item (a)</u> See item 6.</p> <p><u>Item (b)</u> The representation is not accepted because the consultation period 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 EAC's practice to hold one month consultation on its demarcation proposal 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.</p> <p><u>Item (c)</u> The view is noted.</p>

<i>Item no.</i>	<i>DCCAs concerned</i>	<i>No. of representations</i>	<i>Representations</i>	<i>EAC's views</i>
			views at their convenience and DC members' views can be thoroughly considered.	

Appendix III - N

**North 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	N01 – Luen Wo Hui N02 – Fanling Town N16 – Queen's Hill	1	<p>The representation suggests to move Belair Monte from N16 to either N01 or N02 because:</p> <p>(a) Belair Monte, Regentville and Grand Regentville in N01 are the same type of residential development;</p> <p>(b) the residents of these buildings are closely related to each other in terms of community ties and geographical link, as they share common community facilities such as market, library, sports centre and transportation network; and</p> <p>(c) the DC member of N16 has neglected the interests of the residents of Belair Monte in the past few years.</p>	<p>The representation is not accepted because although there is a sense of affiliation of Belair Monte with the community in N01 or N02, there is little scope for adjustment because the resultant population of N01 or N02 would exceed the upper permissible limit as follows:</p> <p>N01: 25,328(+46.62%) N02: 25,583(+48.09%)</p> <p>The EAC has explored other alternatives to see if the representation can be entertained, but all of them would exceed the permissible deviation limits.</p> <p>One possible option is to move 綠悠軒 and other adjacent street blocks including 龍躍頭 from N16 to N15 which would be within the permissible limits. However, this option may not satisfy the wish of the residents of 綠悠軒, who has specifically requested for inclusion in either N01 or N02 rather than N15.</p> <p>The EAC considers the present proposals the most viable one as the population of N01, N02 and N16 will all fall within the permissible deviation limits. It is not necessary to change the existing unaltered boundaries of N02 and N16.</p>
2	N01 – Luen Wo Hui	1	<p>The representation suggests to move Belair Monte from N16 to N01 because:</p> <p>(a) Belair Monte is</p>	<p>For (a), see item 1.</p> <p>For (b), the EAC has to rely on the population forecasts provided by the AHSG in this exercise and it is</p>

<i>Item no.</i>	<i>DCCAs concerned</i>	<i>No. of representations</i>	<i>Representations</i>	<i>EAC's views</i>
	N16 – Queen's Hill		<p>contiguous to N01 in terms of community integrity and culture and is different from N16 which is a rural area; and</p> <p>(b) the inclusion of Belair Monte in N16 may affect the population quota of N16 as many small houses have been built in N16 in recent years.</p>	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.
3	N01 – Luen Wo Hui N15 – Tin Ping East N16 – Queen's Hill	2	These representations suggest to move Belair Monte from N16 to N01 for reasons stated in item 2, and propose to move Good View New Village, Fan Garden Government Police Married Quarters, Ling Hill, Ling Shan Tsuen and Fanling Garden from N01 to N15 in order to even out the population in the DCCAs concerned.	The representation is not accepted because the resultant population of N01 (23,068) would exceed the upper permissible limit (+33.53%) (see also item 1).
4	N02 – Fanling Town N16 – Queen's Hill	2	<p>These representations suggest to move Belair Monte from N16 to N02 because:</p> <p>(a) Belair Monte is a modern estate and different from the rural villages in N16 in terms of living habits and community culture; and</p> <p>(b) the DC member of N16 has neglected the interests of the residents of Belair Monte in the past few years.</p>	<p>The representation is not accepted because:</p> <p>(i) the resultant population of N02 would be 25,583, which would exceed the upper permissible limit (+48.09%) (see item 1); and</p> <p>(ii) it is not necessary to change the existing boundaries of N02 and N16 since the population in N02 and N16 is within the permissible limits.</p>

<i>Item no.</i>	<i>DCCAs concerned</i>	<i>No. of representations</i>	<i>Representations</i>	<i>EAC's views</i>
5	N07 – Ka Fuk	1	The representation suggests to rename N07 as “Shing Fuk” (盛福) because Ka Shing Court has a larger population than Ka Fuk Estate .	The representation is accepted because: (i) Ka Shing Court and Ka Fuk Estate are the most densely populated places in N07; (ii) Ka Shing Court has more population than that of Ka Fuk Estate; and (iii)it would better reflect the identity of the DCCA.
6	N08 – Sheung Shui Rural N09 – Yu Tai N10 – Choi Yuen N13 – Fung Tsui	1	The representation supports the inclusion of Choi Po Court in N10 and puts up two proposals: <u>Proposal (a)</u> (i) move the northeastern area of N08 to N13 and move Ching Ho Estate back from N09 to N08; and (ii) group Tai Ping Estate, Yuk Po Court, Venice Garden, Police Quarters, Royal Green, Little Sisters of the Poor St Joseph's Home for the Aged and Ng Uk Tsuen into one DCCA <u>Proposal (b)</u> (i) same as proposal (a)(i); and (ii) group Tai Ping Estate, Yuk Po Court, Venice Garden, Police Quarters, Eden Garden, Glamour Garden and Belair Villa into one DCCA in order to address the	The supporting view is noted. Both proposals are not accepted because: (i) the resultant population of N08 would exceed the upper permissible limit: <u>Proposal (a)</u> N08: 23,072 (+33.56%) <u>Proposal (b)</u> N08: 24,961 (+44.49%) (ii) it is not necessary to change the existing boundary of N13 since the population in N13 is within the permissible limits; and (iii)the merger of the rural areas or villages in N08 with N13 may affect the community ties of the former.

<i>Item no.</i>	<i>DCCAs concerned</i>	<i>No. of representations</i>	<i>Representations</i>	<i>EAC's views</i>
			population overflow in N08.	

**North District
Oral Representations Received at the Public Forum on 16 August 2006**

<i>Item no.</i>	<i>DCCAs concerned</i>	<i>No. of representations</i>	<i>Representations</i>	<i>EAC's views</i>
7	N02 – Fanling Town N16 – Queen's Hill	1	Same as item 4.	See item 1.

Appendix III - P

Tai Po 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	P02 – Tai Po Central P08 – Kwong Fuk and Plover Cove	3	The three representations object to the move of Plover Cove Garden from P02 to P08 because: (a) the population of P08 is under-estimated; (b) the inclusion of Plover Cove Garden, a private residential building, will hamper the community integrity of P08, which consisted solely of public rental housing; and (c) there is no community ties between Plover Cove Garden and Kwong Fuk Estate.	The representations are not accepted because the population of P08 will fall below the lower permissible limit (12,491, -27.69%). The EAC has considered moving Kwong Yan House of Kwong Fuk Estate from P09 to P08, but the population of P09 will fall far below the lower permissible limit (10,774, -37.63%).

Appendix III - Q

**Sai Kung 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	All DCCAs	1	Supports EAC's provisional demarcation proposal for the District.	The supporting view is noted.
2	Q04 – Hang Hau East Q05 – Hang Hau West	1	Supports EAC's provisional demarcation proposals for Q04 and Q05.	The supporting view is noted.
3	Q04 – Hang Hau East	1	Supports EAC's provisional demarcation proposal for Q04. The representation further suggests to include Fu Tau Chau Village, Shui Bin Tsuen and Tai Wan Tau Village in the list of major estates under Q04 in the boundary description, so that residents concerned will be aware that they belong to 04.	The supporting view is noted. Views regarding the boundary descriptions are accepted to enhance clarity.
4	Q06 – Wan Po	1	Supports EAC's provisional demarcation proposals for Q06. The representation further suggests to designate Tseung Kwan O Methodist Primary School as the polling station for Q06.	The supporting view is noted. REO will take the suggestion into consideration when identifying the venues of polling stations for Q06.
5	Q07 – Wai Do	1	Supports EAC's provisional demarcation proposals for Q07.	The supporting view is noted.

<i>Item no.</i>	<i>DCCAs concerned</i>	<i>No. of representations</i>	<i>Representations</i>	<i>EAC's views</i>
6	Q08 – Kin Ming Q09 – Choi Kin Q23 – Kwong Ming	1	Suggests to put Choi Ming Court, Kin Ming Estate and Kwong Ming Court in one DCCA, as the area covering these estates is small and there is no need to have one District Council member for each estate.	The representation is not accepted because the resultant population of the combined DCCA would be 53,271, which would exceed the upper permissible limit (+208.37%).
7	Q12 – Nam On Q20 – Fu Nam	3	(a) Two representations suggest to move Residence Oasis from Q12 to Q20 and East Point City from Q20 to Q12 in view of their geographical locations, and support the demarcation of other constituencies for the District in general. (b) One representation suggests to retain the existing Q16 (ie Fu Yu), and put Residence Oasis, On Ning Garden, Nan Fung Plaza and La Cite Noble in the new Q12 in order to maintain community integrity.	(a) The representations are not accepted because the resultant population of Q12 would be 21,961, which would exceed the upper permissible limit (+27.13%). The supporting view for other DCCAs is noted. (b) The representation is not accepted because the resultant population of Q12 would be 21,961, which would exceed the upper permissible limit (+27.13%).
8	Q19 – Hau Tak Q20 – Fu Nam	2	The representations suggest to move Yu Ming Court from Q20 to Q19 as Yu Ming Court has close community tie with Hau Tak Estate in Q19.	The representations are not accepted because these two estates have been in different constituencies since the 1999 District Council Election, and the resultant population of Q19 would be 23,839, which would exceed the upper permissible limit (+38%).
9	Q21 – Tak Ming	1	Supports EAC's provisional demarcation proposals for Q21.	The supporting view is noted.

Appendix III - R

**Sha Tin 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	All DCCAs	3	The representations support the demarcation proposals for all DCCAs in the district.	The supporting views are noted.
2	R01 – Sha Tin Town Centre R02 – Lek Yuen R19 – Chung Tin	1	<p>The representation suggests to move Pristine Villa from R19 to R01, instead of to R02 because:</p> <p>(a) it is closely related to R01 in terms of similar community facilities and private residential developments;</p> <p>(b) residents of Pristine Villa can easily reach R01 on the polling day by village bus or walking;</p> <p>(c) as Pristine Villa is close to R01, it would be convenient for the DC member to serve the needs of residents there;</p> <p>(d) if the same DC member can serve the Sha Tin / Tai Wai areas and the Pristine Villa, problems relating to them may be easily resolved;</p> <p>(e) if the population quota exceeds the permissible limit upon the proposed transfer, Man Lai Court could be moved from R01 to the adjacent Tai Wai</p>	<p>The representation is accepted because:</p> <p>(i) although Pristine Villa is separated from R01 by Shing Mun Tunnel Road, it is closer to R01 than R02 in terms of geographical, community and traffic link; and</p> <p>(ii) the resultant population of R01 and R02 would be within the permissible limits:</p> <p>R01: 20,317(+17.61%) R02: 13,825(-19.97%)</p>

<i>Item no.</i>	<i>DCCAs concerned</i>	<i>No. of representations</i>	<i>Representations</i>	<i>EAC's views</i>
			<p>area to address the over-population problem;</p> <p>(f) the population in Tung Lo Wan area will increase drastically after 2007 because of future developments; and</p> <p>(g) the parking facility in R02 is insufficient which may cause the electors to abstain from voting.</p>	
3	R02 – Lek Yuen R03 – Wo Che Estate	7	These representations propose to move King Wo House of Wo Che Estate from R02 to R03 because the separation of King Wo House from the rest of Wo Che Estate would affect the community integrity and the sense of belongings for the residents.	The representations are not accepted because: (i) King Wo House, together with 4 schools, 1 police station and 2 disciplined services quarters, are geographically separated from the rest of Wo Che Estate by Fung Shun Street; (ii) King Wo House has been included in R02 since 1994; and (iii) it would affect the existing boundary of R03, which should not be changed since the population in R03 is within the permissible limits.
4	R02 – Lek Yuen R14 – Lower Shing Mun R17 – Sun Chui R18 – Tai Wai	4	These representations object to the proposed groupings of R02, R14, R18 and R19 and propose to: <u>Proposal (a)</u> (i) maintain the 2003 DCCA boundary for R02; (ii) maintain the 2003 DCCA boundary for	Proposal (a) is not accepted because: (i) Mei Tin Estate (with a population of around 9,500) is geographically more related to R19 and has all along been included in R19; (ii) Carado Garden is geographically separated from R17 by Tin Sam area in R16; (iii) there are supporting views for

<i>Item no.</i>	<i>DCCAs concerned</i>	<i>No. of representations</i>	<i>Representations</i>	<i>EAC's views</i>
	R19 – Chung Tin		<p>R19 but to move Mei Tin Estate from R19 to R14;</p> <p>(iii) maintain the 2003 DCCA boundary for R18; and</p> <p>(iv) move Carado Garden from R14 to R17</p> <p>in order to even out the population in the DCCAs concerned and to reduce changes to the boundaries concerned to preserve community integrity and local ties;</p> <p><u>Proposal (b)</u></p> <p>(i) maintain the 2003 DCCA boundary for R02;</p> <p>(ii) maintain the 2003 DCCA boundary for R19 but to move Mei Tin Estate from R19 to R18;</p> <p>(iii) move back Mei Shing Court from R18 to R19; and</p> <p>(iv) move Tai Wai Village and the adjacent private buildings from R18 to R14</p> <p>in order to even out the population of R14 and R18, to preserve the community integrity and local ties of R02 and R19 and to avoid splitting the private residential developments in Tai Wai town centre into two</p>	<p>the demarcation proposals for R02, R14, R17, R18 and R19 (see items 1, 5, 8, 9, 10, 15 and 29);</p> <p>(iv) the proposal will cause substantial changes to the existing boundaries of Mei Tin as well as Lower Shing Mun and affect a large number of electors. With the population distribution and geographical factors taken into consideration, it would be more appropriate to retain Mei Tin Estate in R19; and</p> <p>(v) the unaltered boundary of R17 will need to be changed.</p> <p>Proposal (b) is not accepted because:</p> <p>(i) the resultant population of R14 (22,580) would exceed the upper permissible limit (+30.71%);</p> <p>(ii) Mei Tin Estate (with a population of around 9,500) is geographically more related to R19 and has all along been included in R19; and</p> <p>(iii) there are supporting views for the demarcation proposals for R02, R14, R18 and R19 (see items 1, 5, 9, 10, 15 and 29).</p>

<i>Item no.</i>	<i>DCCAs concerned</i>	<i>No. of representations</i>	<i>Representations</i>	<i>EAC's views</i>
			different DCCAs for community integrity reason.	
5	R02 – Lek Yuen R14 – Lower Shing Mun R18 – Tai Wai R19 – Chung Tin	1	The representation supports the demarcation proposals for these four DCCAs.	The supporting view is noted.
6	R02 – Lek Yuen R18 – Tai Wai R19 – Chung Tin	2	<p>These representations object to move Pristine Villa and Tung Lo Wan from R19 to R02 and propose to move Pristine Villa from R02 to R18 because:</p> <p>(a) Pristine Villa is too far away from R02, causing much inconvenience to the electors;</p> <p>(b) Pristine Villa is closely related to R18 in terms of geographical link and community ties;</p> <p>(c) the DC member of R02 has no knowledge of the interests of the residents in Pristine Villa; and</p> <p>(d) two new developments are expected to start in Tung Lo Wan whereby a new DCCA should be formed there to</p>	<p>The representations are not accepted because:</p> <p>(i) the resultant population of R18 (23,720) would exceed the upper permissible limit (+37.31%); and</p> <p>(ii) the EAC has to rely on the population forecasts provided by the AHSG for the conduct of this exercise and 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.</p> <p>It should however be noted that a modified proposal is accepted (see item 2).</p>

<i>Item no.</i>	<i>DCCAs concerned</i>	<i>No. of representations</i>	<i>Representations</i>	<i>EAC's views</i>
			cope with the increasing population.	
7	R02 – Lek Yuen R19 – Chung Tin	1	The representation objects to move Pristine Villa, Tung Lo Wan and Yau Oi Tsuen from R19 to R02 because: (a) Pristine Villa, Tung Lo Wan and Yau Oi Tsuen are adjacent to the development in R18 but far away from R02, thus causing much inconvenience for the residents to seek the assistance of the DC member at R02; and (b) Pristine Villa, Tung Lo Wan and Yau Oi Tsuen are different from R02 in terms of geographical link and community ties.	The representation is not accepted because the resultant population of R19 (22,975) will exceed the upper permissible limit (+33.00%) if Pristine Villa, Tung Lo Wan and Yau Oi Tsuen are to be retained in R19. It should however be noted that a modified proposal is accepted (see item 2).
8	R12 – Chui Tin R17 – Sun Chui	1	The representation supports the demarcation proposals for R12 and R17.	The supporting view is noted.
9	R14 – Lower Shing Mun	1	The representation supports the demarcation proposals for R14.	The supporting view is noted.
10	R14 – Lower Shing Mun	1	The representation supports the inclusion of Carado Garden in R14.	The supporting view is noted.
11	R14 – Lower Shing Mun R18 –	1	The representation objects to separate Tai Wai Village in R18 and Tai Wai New Village in R14 into two DCCAs because: (a) they belong to the same	The suggestion is not accepted because: (i) both villages are geographically separated from each other by blocks of private buildings and Tai Po Road;

<i>Item no.</i>	<i>DCCAs concerned</i>	<i>No. of representations</i>	<i>Representations</i>	<i>EAC's views</i>
	Tai Wai		village office “村公所”; and (b) strong community ties exist between these villages.	(ii) Tai Wai Village and Tai Wai New Village have all along been included in two DCCAs; and (iii) there are supporting views for demarcation proposals for R14 and R18 (see items 1, 5, 9 and 15).
12	R15 – Keng Hau	1	The representation suggests to rename R15 as “Hin Keng” because: (a) Hin Keng Estate can reflect the identity of the DCCA; (b) Hin Keng, instead of Keng Hau, is indicated on government signboards; (c) the name of Hin Keng Estate is shown on buses and minibuses; and (d) Keng Hau is not the name of a place, and is therefore not representative.	The representation is not accepted because the location of Hin Keng Estate covers both R15 (Keng Hau) and R13 (Hin Ka) (five blocks in R15 and four blocks in R13). The Chinese name of R13 has already reflected the Chinese characters of Hin Keng Estate and Ka Tin Court (ie “Hin” and “Ka”). Further reflection of Hin Keng Estate in R15 would cause confusion.
13	R16 – Tin Sum	1	The representation supports the demarcation proposals for R16.	The supporting view is noted.
14	R17 – Sun Chui	1	The representation suggests to use Shatin Tsung Tsin Secondary School, instead of G.C.C.I.T.K.D. Cheong Wong Wai Primary School, as the polling station for R17 because the former is more convenient to the elderly and disabled.	The REO will take note of the representation when identifying the venue for the polling station in R17.

<i>Item no.</i>	<i>DCCAs concerned</i>	<i>No. of representations</i>	<i>Representations</i>	<i>EAC's views</i>
15	R18 – Tai Wai	2	These representations support the inclusion of May Shing Court in R18.	These supporting views are noted.
16	R25 – Sunshine City R28 – Kam Ying	1	The representation suggests to: (a) move Sunshine City Phases 1 to 3 from R28 to R25; and (b) move Fu Fai Garden and Fok On Garden from R25 to R28 because: (i) the whole of Sunshine City (Phases 1 to 5) should be kept intact within one DCCA to preserve community integrity; and (ii) with the above changes, R25 will comprise private residential buildings while R28 will consist of public housing estates and Home Ownership Scheme / Sandwich Class Housing Scheme estates. Such groupings can facilitate the DC member to serve residents with similar needs.	The representation is not accepted because: (i) if Sunshine city Phases 1 to 3 are moved from R28 to R25, it will not be possible to move Fu Fai Garden and Fok On Garden from R25 to R28 because they will be geographically separated from R28 by Sunshine City Phases 1 to 3; and (ii) it would affect the unaltered boundaries of R25 and R28.
17	R28 – Kam Ying	2	These representations support the demarcation proposals for R28.	The supporting views are noted.
18	R33 – Yu Yan R34 – Bik Woo	1	The representation proposes to: (a) move Fa Sam Hang Tsuen from R33 to R35 because: (i) it is closely related	Proposal (a) is accepted because: (i) Fa Sam Hang Tsuen is geographically closer to the villages in R35 and it is isolated from the other villages in R33 at a far distance. The community

<i>Item no.</i>	<i>DCCAs concerned</i>	<i>No. of representations</i>	<i>Representations</i>	<i>EAC's views</i>
	R35 – Kwong Hong		<p>to R35 in terms of geographical link and community ties as the Fa Sam Hang Tsuen (in R33) and Wong Nai Tau Tsuen and Tai Che Tsuen (in R35) have the same village representative and share the use of the same community facilities and resources such as market, transportation network etc; and</p> <p>(ii) the population of the villages concerned will continue to grow in the future based on present developments; and</p> <p>(b) move Shek Mun and A Kung Kok from R35 to R34 as they are related to each other in terms of community setting, geographical link and transportation network.</p>	<p>integrity of the nearby villages can be improved by moving it to R35; and</p> <p>(ii) the resultant population of R33 and R35 are within the permissible limits:</p> <p>R33: 13,271(-23.18%) R35: 13,164(-23.80%)</p> <p>Proposal (b) is not accepted because:</p> <p>(i) it would affect the unaltered boundary of R34; and</p> <p>(ii) Tate's Cairn Highway geographically separates Shek Mun and A Kung Kok from R34.</p>
19	R33 – Yu Yan R35 – Kwong Hong	1	Same as item 18(a).	See item 18.
20	Number of elected seats	1	The number of DC members in Sha Tin District should be increased to cope with the	The subject is outside EAC's jurisdiction.

<i>Item no.</i>	<i>DCCAs concerned</i>	<i>No. of representations</i>	<i>Representations</i>	<i>EAC's views</i>
			growth in population.	
21	Demarcation of boundaries	1	The representation suggests that community integrity should be the prime consideration in delineation of boundaries and the EAC should listen to the views of the residents and adhere to the majority views.	The points are noted for review.
22	Voting System	1	The representation suggests that the uncontested candidates should also be voted by electors to ensure that he has the support of not less than 35% of the electors.	The subject is outside EAC's jurisdiction.

Sha Tin District
Oral Representations Received at the Public Forum on 16 August 2006

<i>Item no.</i>	<i>DCCAs concerned</i>	<i>No. of representations</i>	<i>Representations</i>	<i>EAC's views</i>
23	R02 – Lek Yuen R14 – Lower Shing Mun R17 – Sun Chui R18 – Tai Wai R19 – Chung Tin	2	Same as item 4.	See item 4.
24	R02 – Lek Yuen R14 – Lower Shing Mun R18 – Tai Wai R19 – Chung Tin	2	Same as item 5.	See item 5.
25	R02 – Lek Yuen R19 – Chung Tin	2	Same as item 7.	See item 7.
26	R14 – Lower Shing	1	The representation objects to rename R14 as Lower Shing Mun as the name is	The representation is not accepted because the revised name can better reflect the identity of this DCCA.

<i>Item no.</i>	<i>DCCAs concerned</i>	<i>No. of representations</i>	<i>Representations</i>	<i>EAC's views</i>
	Mun		not appropriate.	
27	R15 – Keng Hau	1	Same as item 12.	See item 12.
28	R18 – Tai Wai	1	Same as item 15.	See item 15.
29	R19 – Chung Tin	1	The representation supports the demarcation proposals for R19.	The supporting view is noted.
30	R21 – Fo Tan	1	The representation supports the demarcation proposals for R21.	The supporting view is noted.
31	R33 – Yu Yan R35 – Kwong Hong	1	Same as item 18(a).	See item 18.
32	Demarcation of boundaries	1	The representation suggests that the electors of the affected DCCAs should be notified of the proposed delineation individually.	The representation is not accepted because the maps showing the proposed boundaries of the DCCAs and a booklet on the boundary descriptions are available for public inspection at the REO, DOs, post offices and public housing estates and public libraries. They are also available on website. The electors of the affected DCCAs should have easy access to the proposed boundaries.
33	District boundary	1	The representation suggests to move Kwun Yam Shan from R33 to Wong Tai Sin District.	The demarcation of district boundaries is outside EAC's jurisdiction.
34	Number of elected seats	4	The number of seats for DC members in Sha Tin District should be increased to cope with the growth in population.	The subject is outside EAC's jurisdiction.

<i>Item no.</i>	<i>DCCAs concerned</i>	<i>No. of representations</i>	<i>Representations</i>	<i>EAC's views</i>
35	Voting System	1	Same as item 22.	See item 22.

Appendix III - S**Kwai Tsing 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	S01 – Kwai Hing S04 – Lower Tai Wo Hau S05 – Kwai Chung Estate	7	<p>(a) These representations propose to retain Chin Kwai House and Tsz Kwai House of Kwai Chung Estate in S05 instead of moving these two blocks to S04.</p> <p>The reasons given are:</p> <p>(i) the community integrity and residents' sense of belonging can be preserved;</p> <p>(ii) the said buildings are situated at a higher level than S04;</p> <p>(iii) the rights of the residents of Chin Kwai House and Tsz Kwai House will not be neglected; and</p> <p>(iv) putting the said buildings in S04 will cause inconvenience to residents in casting votes, making complaints and taking part in District Council activities.</p> <p>(b) Three of the</p>	<p>(a) The representations are accepted, although the resultant population of S05 would exceed the upper permissible limit (25,797, +49.33%) because:</p> <p>(i) Tsz Kwai House and Chin Kwai House, together with three other blocks of Kwai Chung Estate, are all situated at the same elevated platform, sharing common facilities (eg leisure ground and carpark) under the same management;</p> <p>(ii) valid reasons are provided in the representations (see also item 18);</p> <p>(iii) S04 can then be unaltered; and</p> <p>(iv) the alternatives of moving the two blocks to other adjacent DCCAs such as S01, S03 and S17 have been explored but not considered viable because under these options, the resultant population will also exceed the upper permissible limits and there were also geographical and community differences between these DCCAs and the two blocks.</p> <p>(b) The proposed further changes are not accepted because:</p> <p>(i) there are 8 representations that support keeping Kwai Hing Estate in S01 with Kwong Fai Circuit and Kwai</p>

<i>Item no.</i>	<i>DCCAs concerned</i>	<i>No. of representations</i>	<i>Representations</i>	<i>EAC's views</i>
			representations also propose to group Kwai Chung Estate Phase 1 (Chun Kwai House, Ha Kwai House and Chau Kwai House), Kwong Fai Circuit, Kwai Fuk Court and Kwai Chung Estate Phase 6 (which is under construction) in the same DCCA; and move Kwai Fuk Court (S05) to S01.	Chung Estate (see item 2(b)); and (ii) if Kwai Fuk Court is moved to S01, since Kwai Chun Court is also required to be moved to S01 (see item 2(b)), the resultant population of S01 will be 22,522 (+30.37%), which would exceed the upper permissible limit.
2	S01 – Kwai Hing S15 – Hing Fong	12	(a) One of the representations proposes to retain Kwai Chun Court in S01 (instead of moving to S15) because: (i) Kwai Chun Court and Kwai Hing Estate share common facilities; (ii) Kwai Chun Court is far away from other estates in S15 such as Kwai Hong Court and Hibiscus Park; and (iii) Kwai Chun Court and Kwai Hing Estate are next to each other and have close community ties. (b) Eight of the representations	(a) The representation is accepted because: (i) the reasons given are considered valid; and (ii) the resultant population of S01 is 20,828 (+20.57%), which still falls within the permissible range. However, further changes will need to be made by moving New Kwai Fong Gardens, Kwai Chung Plaza, Kwai Fong Terrace and some rural villages from S12 to S15, and Block 12 of Kwai Shing East Estate from S17 to S15 because: (i) it will bring the population of S15 within the permissible limit, otherwise the population of S15 will be 11,297(-34.60%); and (ii) there are 13 representations which propose to move the said buildings from S12 to S15 (please refer to item 6). The resultant population distribution will be:

<i>Item no.</i>	<i>DCCAs concerned</i>	<i>No. of representations</i>	<i>Representations</i>	<i>EAC's views</i>
			<p>support:</p> <p>(i) to move Kwai Hing Estate from S15 to S01, together with Kwong Fai Circuit and part of Kwai Chung Estate; and</p> <p>(ii) to put Kwai Chun Court, Kwai Hong Court and Sun Kwai Hing Gardens in S15 as in the provisional recommendations.</p> <p>The reasons given are:</p> <p>(i) the area covered by the existing S01 is too large, and the elected DC member is thus not able to take care of all residents efficiently;</p> <p>(ii) the said estates are close to each other and have common concern in environmental, transport, community and housing matters;</p> <p>(iii) the elected DC member can focus his duties on the two public housing estates in S01; and</p> <p>(iv) it can help to</p>	<p>S01 : 20,828 (+20.57%) S15 : 20,538 (+18.89%)</p> <p>(b) The supporting views regarding Kwai Hing Estate are noted. However, Kwai Chun Court should be retained in S01 because:</p> <p>(i) if Kwai Chun Court is not retained in S01, Block 12 of Kwai Shing East Estate, New Kwai Fong Gardens, Kwai Chung Plaza and Kwai Fong Terrace cannot be moved to S15 as proposed in a number of representations (see items 3 and 6) because the resultant population of S15 will then be 23,962 (+38.71%), which exceeds the upper permissible limit; and</p> <p>(ii) there is a representation (item (a) above) proposing the change.</p> <p>(c) The representation is not accepted because:</p> <p>(i) the resultant population of S01 will be 22,925 (+32.71%), which would exceed the upper permissible limit; and</p> <p>(ii) there are eight representations which support to move Sun Kwai Hing Gardens to S15 (see item (b) above).</p> <p>(d) The REO will bear this point in mind when identifying polling stations for residents of the area.</p>

<i>Item no.</i>	<i>DCCAs concerned</i>	<i>No. of representations</i>	<i>Representations</i>	<i>EAC's views</i>
			<p>resolve existing problems of Kwai Hing Estate in the areas of transport, housing, security and leisure.</p> <p>(c) One of the representations objects to move Sun Kwai Hing Gardens from S01 to S15 because the existing DC member is familiar with the affairs of the estate and has established a good relationship with its residents.</p> <p>(d) Two representations propose to retain the CNEC Ta Tung School(中華傳道會許大同學校) as the polling station for Kwai Hing Estate because:</p> <p>(i) such retention can facilitate the elderly and the disabled to cast their votes on the polling day; and</p> <p>(ii) it can avoid abstaining residents from voting.</p>	
3	S02 – Kwai Shing East Estate	5	(a) These representations propose to move High Prosperity Terrace from S03 to S17 (or to S02 as in one representation),	(a) The proposals on moving High Prosperity Terrace from S03 to S17 is accepted because: <p>(i) S03 can remain unaltered; and</p>

<i>Item no.</i>	<i>DCCAs concerned</i>	<i>No. of representations</i>	<i>Representations</i>	<i>EAC's views</i>
	S03 – Upper Tai Wo Hau S17 – Kwai Shing West Estate		<p>because:</p> <p>(i) the said estate is located at the hilltop and is geographically isolated;</p> <p>(ii) High Prosperity Terrace is geographically closer to S17;</p> <p>(iii) most of the residents come from Kwai Shing West Estate, and they often use the transport and shopping facilities in Kwai Shing West Estate; and</p> <p>(iv) it is difficult for candidates to conduct electioneering activities, and for the elected DC member to carry out his duties in this estate.</p> <p>(b) Four of the representations also object to move Block 12 of Kwai Shing East Estate to S17, because the building is not close to S17 geographically.</p> <p>(c) One representation further proposes that Shing Ka House of</p>	<p>(ii) High Prosperity Terrace is geographically closer to S17.</p> <p>(b) The proposal to remove Block 12 of Kwai Shing East Estate from S17 is accepted. It is further suggested to move it to S15 because:</p> <p>(i) it will bring the population of S17 within the permissible limit:</p> <p>S15 : 20,538 (+18.89%) S17 : 20,100 (+16.35%)</p> <p>otherwise the population of S17 will be 23,116 (+33.81%); and</p> <p>(ii) Block 12 of Kwai Shing East Estate, together with Kwai Hong Court and Sun Kwai Hing Gardens are still grouped in one single DCCA.</p> <p>(c) Proposal (c) is not accepted, because it will affect the unaltered boundary of S02.</p>

<i>Item no.</i>	<i>DCCAs concerned</i>	<i>No. of representations</i>	<i>Representations</i>	<i>EAC's views</i>
			Kwai Shing East Estate (S02), instead of Block 12 of the estate, should be moved to S17, because the building is geographically close to S17.	
4	S06 – Shek Yam S08 – Shek Lei Extension S09 – Shek Lei S10 – Tai Pak Tin	8	<p>(a) These representations suggest to retain Kwai Chung Fa Yuen, Tin On House and Kwai Fat Building in S10, and not to move Block 11 of Shek Lei (II) Estate from S09 to S10. The reasons are as follows:</p> <p>(i) the population of S10 should not exceed the upper permissible limit as the Apex (雍雅軒) is still under construction; and</p> <p>(ii) the community integrity can be preserved.</p> <p>(b) one representation further suggests that S08 should contain Shek Lei (I) Estate only;</p> <p>(c) two representations further suggest that the private buildings in S09 should be moved to S10; and</p> <p>(d) one representation further suggests to retain Greenknoll Court (S12) in S08.</p>	<p>(a) The representations are not accepted because:</p> <p>(i) while the population of the Apex and the nearby industrial estates is very small, the population of the unaltered S10 is 23,395 (+35.43%), which exceeds the upper permissible limit. Even if the population of the Apex and the nearby estates is taken out, S10 still exceeds the upper permissible limit and its boundary is thus required to be adjusted;</p> <p>(ii) if Block 11 of Shek Lei (II) Estate is retained in S09, the resultant population of S09 will be 23,079 (+33.60%), which would exceed the upper permissible limit; and</p> <p>(iii) Block 11 of Shek Lei (II) Estate is an interim housing block, its community ties with other blocks of the same estate is not strong.</p> <p>For (b) to (d), the representations are not accepted because the resultant population of S09 will be 26,321 (+52.36%), which would exceed the upper permissible limit.</p>

<i>Item no.</i>	<i>DCCAs concerned</i>	<i>No. of representations</i>	<i>Representations</i>	<i>EAC's views</i>
			<p>The reasons given for items (b) to (d) are that such grouping:</p> <p>(i) will preserve community integrity and facilitate community management;</p> <p>(ii) will make the boundaries clear and easy to be understood and avoid confusion;</p> <p>(iii) will avoid the situation of three DC members serving one estate; and</p> <p>(iv) will facilitate the residents and the elderly to seek assistance from DC members or make complaints.</p>	
5	S12 – Fong Yiu S13 – Lai Wah S16 – Lai King	6	<p>(a) Five representations suggest to group the Wonderland Villas (S13) and the nearby estates in S12, such as Regency Park and Wah Yuen Chuen, into the same DCCA.</p> <p>The reasons given are:</p> <p>(i) the said estates are closer to each other and belong to the same DCCA in the past;</p> <p>(ii) the Wonderland Villas is geographically far</p>	<p>(a) The representations are accepted with modifications because:</p> <p>(i) reasons (i) and (ii) are considered valid;</p> <p>(ii) the resultant population of S13 is 14,733 (-14.71%), which still falls within the permissible range; and</p> <p>(iii) the community integrity can be better maintained.</p> <p>In addition to the changes proposed in these representations, we recommend moving New Kwai Fong Gardens, Kwai Chung Plaza, Kwai Fong Terrace and some rural villages from S12 to S15, because:</p> <p>(i) it will bring the population of</p>

<i>Item no.</i>	<i>DCCAs concerned</i>	<i>No. of representations</i>	<i>Representations</i>	<i>EAC's views</i>
			<p>away from the other estates in S13, and the needs and concern of residents in the Wonderland Villas are different from those of the other estates in S13; and</p> <p>(iii) Under the provisional recommendation for S13, the Wonderland Villas will be neglected, and the DC member cannot efficiently attend to its affairs.</p> <p>(b) One representation suggests:</p> <p>(i) to put both Wonderland Villas (S13) and Wah Yuen Chuen (S12) in S13, or S16 if the permissible limit is exceeded; and</p> <p>(ii) to move Lai Yiu Estate (S12) to S16</p> <p>because:</p> <p>(i) the area covered by S12 is too large, as the Wonderland Villas, Wah Yuen Chuen and Lai Yiu Estate are located at the</p>	<p>S12 within the permissible limit, otherwise the population of S12 will be 23,871(+38.18%);</p> <p>(ii) there are 13 representations (item 6) which propose to move the above private buildings from S12 to S15;</p> <p>(iii) the community integrity of S12 can be maintained; and</p> <p>(iv) the modified proposal will not result in an increased number of affected DCCAs.</p> <p>The resultant population distribution will be:</p> <p>S12 : 17,646 (+2.15%) S13 : 14,733 (-14.71%)</p> <p>(b) The proposal on grouping Wonderland Villas with Wah Yuen Chuen is accepted (ie item (b)(i)), but they are grouped in S12 instead of S13 or S16 because there are five representations proposing the change (see item (a) above).</p> <p>As for the proposal to move Lai Yiu Estate to S16 (ie item (b)(ii)), it is not accepted because the resultant population of S16 will be:</p> <p>S16 : 22,905 (+32.59%)</p> <p>which would exceed the upper permissible limit.</p>

<i>Item no.</i>	<i>DCCAs concerned</i>	<i>No. of representations</i>	<i>Representations</i>	<i>EAC's views</i>
			<p>top, middle and lower part of the hill respectively, while 葵芳圍 is located at the bottom of the hill and is far away from the others; and</p> <p>(ii) it is difficult for candidates to conduct electioneering activities, and for the elected DC member to carry out his duties in view of the extensive area covered.</p>	
6	S12 – Fong Yiu S15 – Hing Fong	13	<p>(a) These representations object to move New Kwai Fong Gardens, Kwai Chung Plaza and Kwai Fong Terrace from S15 to S12.</p> <p>The reasons given are:</p> <p>(i) to preserve the community integrity;</p> <p>(ii) the said estates (S12) together with Kwai Tsing Theatre and Metroplaza in S15 are the core community;</p> <p>(iii) the residents of the said estates</p>	<p>(a) The representations are accepted with modifications because:</p> <p>(i) reasons (i)-(iv) are considered valid; and</p> <p>(ii) the resultant population of S12 and S15 are still within the permissible range.</p> <p>In addition to the changes proposed in this representation, we recommend moving the Wonderland Villas from S13 to S12, Kwai Chun Court from S15 to S01, the rural villages from S12 to S15, and Block 12 of Kwai Shing East Estate from S17 to S15 because:</p> <p>(i) there are ten representations (items 2, 3 and 5) which propose such changes; and</p> <p>(ii) the community integrity can be better maintained;</p>

<i>Item no.</i>	<i>DCCAs concerned</i>	<i>No. of representations</i>	<i>Representations</i>	<i>EAC's views</i>
			<p>share common transport and leisure facilities and had common concerns;</p> <p>(iv) the said estates are far away from Lai Yiu Estate (S12);</p> <p>(v) the population of S12 and S15 is uneven;</p> <p>(vi) it is difficult for the elected DC member to understand the needs of residents from the estates which are newly included in the DCCA, thereby affecting the efficiency of his work;</p> <p>(vii) it is inconvenient for the residents to seek assistant from the DC member; and</p> <p>(viii) it is inconvenient for tenants of Kwai Chung Plaza to seek help from two different DC members.</p> <p>(b) One representation also proposes to:</p> <p>(i) rename S12 as</p>	<p>The population of S12 and S15 will be :</p> <p>S12 : 17,646 (+2.15%) S15 : 20,538 (+18.89%)</p> <p>(b) The proposal on renaming S12 (ie item (b)(i)) is accepted, but the name Wah Lai (華麗) is recommended instead because:</p> <p>(i) New Kwai Fong Gardens and Kwai Fong Terrace, which contain the word 'Fong' are moved to S15; and</p> <p>(ii) the major residential development in S12 now includes 華景山莊 and 麗瑤邨.</p> <p>Item (b)(ii) is not accepted because if the GreenKnoll Court is moved to S08 (the only adjoining DCCA in North-east area of Kwai Chung), the resultant population of S08 will be 22,497 (+30.23%), which would exceed the upper permissible limit.</p>

<i>Item no.</i>	<i>DCCAs concerned</i>	<i>No. of representations</i>	<i>Representations</i>	<i>EAC's views</i>
			<p>Lai Fong, as the proposed name of "Fong Yiu" cannot reflect the community identity and does not sound well;</p> <p>(ii) move GreenKnoll Court out of S12 as its residents mostly use the transport and community facilities of the North-east area of Kwai Chung, and have weak community ties with those in Lai Yiu and Kwai Fong.</p>	
7	S14 – Cho Yiu	2	The representations support the provisional recommendation of S14 because it can maintain the community integrity and enhance the sense of belonging of residents.	The supporting views are noted.
8	S14 – Cho Yiu S16 – Lai King	2	<p>(a) The representations suggest to move the Clothing Industry Training Centre, Lai King Community Hall and Asbury Methodist Primary School from S14 to S16 because:</p> <p>(i) the primary school is under the management of Lai King Estate, which is in S16; and</p> <p>(ii) such grouping</p>	<p><u>Item (a)</u> The representations on the minor adjustment of boundaries are accepted because the reasons given are considered valid, and no population is involved in the said premises.</p> <p><u>Item (b)</u> The supporting view is noted.</p>

<i>Item no.</i>	<i>DCCAs concerned</i>	<i>No. of representations</i>	<i>Representations</i>	<i>EAC's views</i>
			<p>will enhance the unity of administration.</p> <p>(b) One representation also supports the name of S16.</p>	
9	S20 – Tsing Yi Estate	2	The representations support the provisional recommendation on S20.	The supporting views are noted.
10	S21 – Greenfield S25 – Tsing Yi South	4	<p>These representations propose to:</p> <p>(a) group Cheung Wang Estate (S25), Mount Haven (S25) and the village areas (S21) into a DCCA; and</p> <p>(b) group Rambler Crest (S25), Greenfield Garden (S21), Grand Horizon (S21) and Serene Garden (S21) into another DCCA;</p> <p>because:</p> <p>(i) the area covered by S25 is large, and it is not reasonable to group all such estates in the same DCCA;</p> <p>(ii) Rambler Crest, Greenfield Garden and Grand Horizon are all private housing estates;</p> <p>(iii) the grouping should satisfy the population requirement;</p>	<p>Although the population of such grouping falls within the permissible range, the representations are not accepted because it will affect the unaltered boundary of S21.</p> <p>The supporting views on the delineation proposals of the other constituencies are noted.</p>

<i>Item no.</i>	<i>DCCAs concerned</i>	<i>No. of representations</i>	<i>Representations</i>	<i>EAC's views</i>
			<p>(iv) Rambler Crest is geographically separated from the other estates in S25; and</p> <p>(v) the lifestyle of the residents in Rambler Crest, Cheung Wan Estate and Mount Haven are different.</p> <p>(c) one representation supports the provisional recommendations on other constituencies.</p>	
11	S22 – Cheung Ching	3	<p>(a) The representations support the provisional recommendation on S22. The reasons given are:</p> <p>(i) the estates share common facilities;</p> <p>(ii) Mayfair Gardens is close to Cheung Ching Estate;</p> <p>(iii) the population is within the permissible range; and</p> <p>(iv) it is convenient for residents to seek assistance from the DC member.</p>	<p>(a) The supporting views are noted.</p> <p>(b) The proposal on renaming S22 is not accepted because:</p> <p>(i) the major population of S22 belongs to Cheung Ching Estate, and the existing name of “Cheung Ching” is able to reflect the community identity of S22; and</p> <p>(ii) electors have got used to the existing name.</p>

<i>Item no.</i>	<i>DCCAs concerned</i>	<i>No. of representations</i>	<i>Representations</i>	<i>EAC's views</i>
			(b) one representation further suggests to rename S22 as "Mei Ching".	
12	S22 – Cheung Ching S23 – Cheung Hong S24 – Shing Hong S25 – Tsing Yi South	4	(a) These representations propose to split the original S25 into two parts along Tsing Yi Road West, and rename the 2 DCCAs as Tsing Yi South and Tsing Yi West; and (b) one representation further suggests to dissolve S23, and put part of it in S22 (renamed as Ching Hong) with the remaining part in S24 (renamed as Cheung Hong). Details are as follows: <u>(i) Tsing Yi South</u> Includes Tsing Wah Court, Mayfair Gardens and Rambler Crest <u>(ii) Tsing Yi West</u> Includes Cheung Wang Estate, Mount Haven and Liu To Village <u>(iii) Ching Hong</u> Includes the original S22 and four buildings of Cheung Hong Estate in S23(Hong Wing House, Hong Wah House, Hong Fu House and Hong Tai House) <u>(iv) Cheung Hong</u> Includes the original S24 and five buildings of Cheung Hong Estate in	The representations are not accepted because: (a) the population of the proposed constituency Cheung Hong under item (iv) of the representation is 21,799 (+26.19%), which exceeds the upper permissible limit; (b) the unaltered boundary of S24 will be affected; and (c) there are 12 representations (items 11 and 13) supporting the provisional recommendations on S22-S24, and one representation that objects to this counter proposal (item 13(d)).

<i>Item no.</i>	<i>DCCAs concerned</i>	<i>No. of representations</i>	<i>Representations</i>	<i>EAC's views</i>
			<p>S23 (Hong Kwai House, Hong Wo House, Hong Ping House, Hong On House and Hong Shing House)</p> <p>The reasons given are:</p> <p>(i) since the area covered by S25 is very large, dividing it into two parts will enable the elected DC members to focus his work in serving the residents;</p> <p>(ii) the lifestyle of residents in Mayfair Gardens and Ching Wah Court is similar and the estates are the core community in Tsing Yi South; and</p> <p>(iii) Cheung Ching Estate, Cheung Hong Estate and Ching Shing Court (ie original S22-S24) can be combined into two DCCAs based on their total population.</p>	
13	<p>S23 – Cheung Hong</p> <p>S24 – Shing Hong</p> <p>S25 – Tsing Yi South</p>	9	<p>These representations:</p> <p>(a) agree to move Ching Wah Court from S25 to S23 because:</p> <p>(i) the population of S23 has decreased; and</p> <p>(ii) Ching Wah Court and Cheung Ching Estate have close community ties, and share common</p>	<p><u>Proposals (a) and (c)</u> The supporting views are noted.</p> <p><u>Proposal (b)</u> The proposal on renaming S23 is not accepted because:</p> <p>(i) the major population of S23 belongs to Cheung Hong Estate, the existing name is able to reflect the community identities of S23; and</p> <p>(ii) electors have got used to the existing name.</p>

<i>Item no.</i>	<i>DCCAs concerned</i>	<i>No. of representations</i>	<i>Representations</i>	<i>EAC's views</i>
			<p>facilities;</p> <p>(iii) the provisional recommendation is reasonable and there is no better alternatives;</p> <p>(iv) the community integrity can be better maintained; and</p> <p>(v) it can facilitate residents to reflect their views on community facilities.</p> <p>(b) one representation further proposes to rename S23 as Wah Hong or Hong Wah;</p> <p>(c) one representation supports the provisional recommendation of S24; and</p> <p>(d) one representation objects to item 12 because it is not consider to be reasonable.</p>	<p><u>Proposal (d)</u> The proposal is accepted. Please see item 12 for details.</p>
14	<p>S22 – Cheung Ching</p> <p>S23 – Cheung Hong</p> <p>S24 – Shing Hong</p> <p>S25 –</p>	1	<p>The representation proposes to:</p> <p><u>Proposal (a)</u></p> <p>(i) group Tsing Wah Court (S23), Mayfair Gardens (S22) and Rambler Crest (S25) into the same DCCA;</p> <p>(ii) move Mount Haven (S25) to S24; and</p> <p>(iii) move Cheung Wang</p>	<p>Proposal (a) is not accepted because the resultant population of S23 and S26 will be:</p> <p>S23 : 12,788(-25.97%) S26 : 28,891(+67.24%)</p> <p>which would be outside the permissible range.</p> <p>Proposal (b) is not accepted because:</p> <p>(i) the resultant population of S23</p>

<i>Item no.</i>	<i>DCCAs concerned</i>	<i>No. of representations</i>	<i>Representations</i>	<i>EAC's views</i>
	Tsing Yi South S26 – Cheung Hang		Estate from S25 to S26. or <u>Proposal (b)</u> (i) same as proposal a(i); (ii) maintain the existing S24 and S26; and (iii) group Mount Haven, Cheung Wang Estate and Liu To Area into a new DCCA. The reasons given are: (i) it is difficult for the elected DC member to carry out his duties efficiently in view of the extensive area covered by the DCCA; (ii) under the provisional recommendation, S25 contains different types of estates including public housing, private buildings and rural villages and their residents have different needs; and (iii) the suggested grouping will perverse the community integrity.	will be 12,788(-25.97%), which would fall below the lower permissible limit; and (ii) one DCCA has to be dissolved in return, and this may affect a large number of unaltered DCCAs.

Kwai Tsing District
Oral Representations Received at the Public Forum on 16 August 2006

<i>Item no.</i>	<i>DCCAs concerned</i>	<i>No. of representations</i>	<i>Representations</i>	<i>EAC's views</i>
15	All DCCAs	1	The representation considers that the provisional recommendations on constituency boundaries of Kwai Tsing District are reasonable and acceptable.	The supporting view is noted.
16	S01 – Kwai Hing S04 – Lower Tai Wo Hau S05 – Kwai Chung Estate	1	The representation considers that Kwai Chung Estate should be put in two instead of three DCCAs.	The representation is accepted (See item 1(a)).
17	S02 – Kwai Shing East Estate S03 – Upper Tai Wo Hau S17 – Kwai Shing West Estate	1	The representation proposes to: (a) move Block 12 of Kwai Shing East Estate (S17) to S02 because the resultant population will not exceed the upper permissible limit; and (b) same as item 3(a), the reason given is that the estate is geographically closer to these two DCCAs.	<u>Item (a)</u> The representation is not accepted because the resultant population of S02 will be 22,325(+29.23%), which would exceed the upper permissible limit. Block 12 is recommended to be moved to S15 instead. Please see item 3(b) for details. <u>Item (b)</u> See item 3(a).
18	S04 – Lower Tai Wo Hau S05 – Kwai Chung	2	Same as item 1(a). The reasons given are: (a) the two buildings and the other parts of S04 are separated by a slope, and it is	See item 1(a).

<i>Item no.</i>	<i>DCCAs concerned</i>	<i>No. of representations</i>	<i>Representations</i>	<i>EAC's views</i>
	Estate		<p>difficult for the residents to seek assistance from the DC member, especially the elderly;</p> <p>(b) it is difficult for the elected DC member of S04 to take care of these two buildings; and</p> <p>(c) it can avoid dividing Kwai Chung Estate into three parts, thereby help maintain its integrity.</p>	
19	S08 – Shek Lei Extension S09 – Shek Lei S10 – Tai Pak Tin	2	Same as item 4(a)-(c).	See item 4(a)-(c).
20	S21 – Greenfield S25 – Tsing Yi South	2	Same as item 10.	See item 10.
21	S22 – Cheung Ching S25 – Tsing Yi South	1	<p>Same as item 11(a). The reasons given are:</p> <p>(a) the residents share the facilities of Cheung Ching Estate; and</p> <p>(b) Mayfair Gardens is close to Cheung Ching Estate.</p>	See item 11(a).

<i>Item no.</i>	<i>DCCAs concerned</i>	<i>No. of representations</i>	<i>Representations</i>	<i>EAC's views</i>
22	S22 – Cheung Ching S23 – Cheung Hong S24 – Shing Hong S25 – Tsing Yi South	1	Same as item 12.	See item 12.
23	S23 – Cheung Hong S25 – Tsing Yi South	1	Same as item 13(a) and (d).	See item 13(a) and (d).
24	General	1	The representation proposes to cut one DCCA in Tsing Yi area and to add one in Kwai Chung area.	The representation is not accepted because the approach will affect an unacceptable number of unaltered DCCAs.
25	Number of elected seats	1	This representation proposes to increase the number of elected seats instead of cutting or combining certain DCCAs.	The subject is outside the EAC's jurisdiction.

Appendix III - T

Islands District
Summaries of Written Representations and REO's Views

<i>Item no.</i>	<i>DCCAs concerned</i>	<i>No. of representations</i>	<i>Representations</i>	<i>EAC's views</i>
1	T02 - Yat Tung Estate North T03 - Yat Tung Estate South	1	<p>The representation suggests to move 康逸樓 (a block of 逸東(一)邨) from T02 to T03 where other blocks of 逸東(一)邨 is located because:</p> <p>(a) there will be foreseeable population growth in 逸東(二)邨, and its population is expected to come close to that in 逸東(一)邨 in the coming years;</p> <p>(b) putting all blocks of 逸東(一)邨 in T03 and all blocks of 逸東(二)邨 in T02 can preserve the community integrity of the two phases of the estate; and</p> <p>(c) the possible confusion to residents living in 康逸樓 about the constituency boundary and polling station can be prevented, and the names of the two constituencies should be changed to '逸東一' and '逸東二'.</p>	<p>The representation is not accepted because:</p> <p>(a) for this demarcation exercise, the EAC needs to use the population projection as at 30 June, 2007. Developments beyond this date will not be considered;</p> <p>(b) the suggestion would cause the population in T03 to exceed the upper permissible limit in T03 (+30.63%), as the population of the DCCA will be 22 567;</p> <p>(c) as the two phases are situated right next to each other and are both constructed in the early 2000s, the preservation of community integrity is not considered a valid concern; and</p> <p>(d) electors will be formally notified of their respective constituency and polling station prior to the election, thereby preventing confusion.</p>

Islands District
Oral Representations Received at the Public Forum on 16 August, 2006

<i>Item no.</i>	<i>DCCAs concerned</i>	<i>No. of representations</i>	<i>Representations</i>	<i>EAC's views</i>
2	T02 - Yat Tung Estate North T03 - Yat Tung Estate South	1	Same as item 1.	See item 1.

Appendix III - General Issues**Summaries of Representations Related to General Issues**

<i>Item no.</i>	<i>Subject</i>	<i>No. of representations</i>	<i>Representations</i>	<i>EAC's views</i>
1	District boundaries	1	(a) <u>Central & Western and Southern</u> This representation suggests that the northern areas of Mount Davis Road should be moved from the Central & Western District to the Southern District.	All the representations concern the re-delineation of district boundary which is outside EAC's jurisdiction.
		1	(b) <u>Wan Chai and Eastern</u> This representation suggests that the whole of Lai Tak Tsuen Road should be moved from the Wan Chai District to the Eastern District.	
		1	(c) <u>Sai Kung and Tai Po</u> This representation opines that the Sai Kung North constituency (P19) should be moved from Tai Po District to the Sai Kung District.	
		1	(d) <u>Tsuen Wan and Tai Po</u> This representation suggests that the whole of Disneyland and Science Park should be included in Tsuen Wan District and Tai Po District respectively.	
		2	(e) <u>Southern and Eastern</u> One representation suggests that the Shek O area in the Stanley & Shek O constituency (D17) of the Southern District should be	

<i>Item no.</i>	<i>Subject</i>	<i>No. of representations</i>	<i>Representations</i>	<i>EAC's views</i>
		2	<p>included in the Shaukeiwan constituency (C04) of the Eastern District.</p> <p>One representation suggests that Shek O Village and Tai Long Wan Village in Stanley & Shek O constituency (D17) of the Southern District should be included in Wan Tsui constituency (C12) of the Eastern District.</p> <p>(f) <u>Tsuen Wan and Kwai Tsing</u> These representations suggest that Ma Wan should be included in Kwai Tsing District instead of Tsuen Wan District.</p>	
2	No. of seats for each constituency	1	This representation suggests that the population quota for each constituency could be increased from 17,275 to 34,550 and the number of seats for each constituency should be two.	The representation concerns policy matter which is outside EAC's jurisdiction.
3	Layout of maps in consultation documents	1	<p>This representation suggests that the consultation maps should:</p> <p>(a) be printed in full colours and double in size; and</p> <p>(b) include names of building, areas of constituencies and the number of eligible electors to enhance clarity.</p>	The points are noted for review.

**Changes Made to the Boundaries of DCCAs
as a Result of Public Consultation**

District	No. of DCCAs Affected	Code and Name of DCCAs Affected
Wan Chai	2	B01 Hennessy B02 Oi Kwan
Southern	2	D03 Ap Lei Chau North D04 Lei Tung I
Yau Tsim Mong	4	E02 Jordan West E03 Jordan East E09 Tai Kok Tsui South E10 Tai Kok Tsui North
Sham Shui Po	9	F03 Nam Cheong North F04 Shek Kip Mei & Nam Cheong East F05 Nam Cheong South F06 Nam Cheong Central F15 Lai Chi Kok North F18 Ha Pak Tin F19 Yau Yat Tsuen F20 Nam Shan, Tai Hang Tung & Tai Hang Sai F21 Lung Ping & Sheung Pak Tin
Wong Tai Sin	2	H21 Choi Wan East H23 Choi Wan West
Kwun Tong	8	J10 Po Tat J13 Sau Mau Ping South J14 Hing Tin J15 Lam Tin J16 Kwong Tak J19 Yau Tong East J20 Yau Tong Central J21 Yau Tong West

District	No. of DCCAs Affected	Code and Name of DCCAs Affected
Tsuen Wan	2	K11 Tsuen Wan Rural West K12 Tsuen Wan Rural East
Tuen Mun	2	L06 Yau Oi North L13 Hanford
Yuen Long	2	M16 Yuet Yan M17 Fu Yan
Sha Tin	4	R01 Sha Tin Town Centre R02 Lek Yuen R33 Yu Yan R35 Kwong Hong
Kwai Tsing	10	S01 Kwai Hing S03 Upper Tai Wo Hau S04 Lower Tai Wo Hau S05 Kwai Chung Estate S12 Wah Lai S13 Lai Wah S14 Cho Yiu S15 Hing Fong S16 Lai King S17 Kwai Shing West Estate
Total :	47	

**Changes Made to the Names of DCCAs
as a Result of Public Consultation**

District	DCCA Code	DCCA Name	
		EAC's Provisional Recommendations	EAC's Final Recommendations
Sham Shui Po	F04	Boundary Street North & Tai Hang Tung	Shek Kip Mei & Nam Cheong East
	F18	Sheung Pak Tin	Ha Pak Tin
	F20	Nam Shan	Nam Shan, Tai Hang Tung & Tai Hang Sai
	F21	Shek Kip Mei	Lung Ping & Sheung Pak Tin
Wong Tai Sin	H02	Lung Kai	Lung Ha
Kwun Tong	J15	Tak Tin	Lam Tin
	J22	Lai Kong	Laguna City
North	N07	Ka Fuk	Shing Fuk
Kwai Tsing	S12	Fong Yiu	Wah Lai

**DCCAs with Population Exceeding the Permissible Limits
of the Population Quota
(Final Recommendations)**

District	DCCA exceeding permissible limits	Population and deviation percentage	Reason
Southern	D17 Stanley & Shek O	24,216 (+40.18%) <i>(same as in the provisional recommendations)</i>	Because of the need to preserve community identities and local ties
Wong Tai Sin	H23 Choi Wan West	12,063 (-30.17%)	Because of the need to preserve community integrity
Kwun Tong	J10 Po Tat	24,763 (+43.35%)	Because of the need to preserve community integrity
	J22 Laguna City	22,186 (+28.43%) <i>(same as in the provisional recommendations)</i>	
Yuen Long	M07 Shap Pat Heung North	25,801 (+49.35%) <i>(same as in the provisional recommendations)</i>	Because of the large area covered by this DCCA and the need to preserve community identities and local ties
	M19 Tin Heng	23,987 (+38.85%) <i>(same as in the provisional recommendations)</i>	Because of the need to preserve community integrity

District	DCCA exceeding permissible limits	Population and deviation percentage	Reason
	M24 Tsz Yau	22,457 (+30.00%) <i>(same as in the provisional recommendations)</i>	Because of the need to preserve community integrity and local ties
	M27 Kam Tin	11,241 (-34.93%) <i>(same as in the provisional recommendations)</i>	Because of the need to preserve integrity and homogeneity of the community
	M28 Pat Heung North	10,378 (-39.92%) <i>(same as in the provisional recommendations)</i>	Because of the large area covered by this DCCA and the need to preserve community identities and local ties
Tai Po	P19 Sai Kung North	10,013 (-42.04%) <i>(same as in the provisional recommendations)</i>	Because of the large area covered by this DCCA and the need to preserve community identities and local ties
Sai Kung	Q03 Sai Kung Islands	10,784 (-37.57%) <i>(same as in the provisional recommendations)</i>	Because of the large area covered by this DCCA (over 70 islands), accessibility, and the need to preserve community identities and local ties

District	DCCA exceeding permissible limits	Population and deviation percentage	Reason
Sha Tin	R30 Heng On	21,764 (+25.99%) <i>(same as in the provisional recommendations)</i>	Because of the need to maintain homogeneity and local ties of the community
Kwai Tsing	S05 Kwai Chung Estate	25,797 (+49.33%)	Because of the need to preserve community integrity
Islands	T07 Peng Chau & Hei Ling Chau	8,187 (-52.62%) <i>(same as in the provisional recommendations)</i>	Because of the large area covered by these DCCAs and the need to preserve community identities and local ties
	T08 Lamma & Po Toi	5,581 (-67.69%) <i>(same as in the provisional recommendations)</i>	
	T09 Cheung Chau South	11,201 (-35.16%) <i>(same as in the provisional recommendations)</i>	
	T10 Cheung Chau North	11,955 (-30.80%) <i>(same as in the provisional recommendations)</i>	

Total number of DCCAs exceeding the permissible limits of the population quota = 17

建議概要
Summary of Final Recommendations

中西區 Central and Western		估計人口 Estimated Population	標準人口基數偏差百份比 +/- % of Population Quota (17 275)
建議選區 Recommended Constituency Areas			
代號 Code	名稱 Name		
A01	中環 Chung Wan	16 090	-6.86%
A02	半山東 Mid Levels East	18 412	6.58%
A03	衛城 Castle Road	17 905	3.65%
A04	山頂 Peak	19 252	11.44%
A05	大學 University	19 253	11.45%
A06	堅摩 Kennedy Town & Mount Davis	16 319	-5.53%
A07	觀龍 Kwun Lung	14 333	-17.03%
A08	西環 Sai Wan	15 580	-9.81%
A09	寶翠 Belcher	21 141	22.38%
A10	石塘咀 Shek Tong Tsui	16 597	-3.92%
A11	西營盤 Sai Ying Pun	14 841	-14.09%
A12	上環 Sheung Wan	17 425	0.87%
A13	東華 Tung Wah	13 352	-22.71%
A14	正街 Centre Street	15 045	-12.91%
A15	水街 Water Street	14 362	-16.86%

總數 Total : 249 907

建議概要
Summary of Final Recommendations

灣仔 Wan Chai		估計人口 Estimated Population	標準人口基數偏差百份比 +/- % of Population Quota (17 275)
建議選區 Recommended Constituency Areas			
代號 Code	名稱 Name		
B01	軒尼詩 Hennessy	13 029	-24.58%
B02	愛群 Oi Kwan	13 178	-23.72%
B03	鵝頸 Canal Road	14 930	-13.57%
B04	銅鑼灣 Causeway Bay	13 975	-19.10%
B05	大坑 Tai Hang	13 713	-20.62%
B06	渣甸山 Jardine's Lookout	14 333	-17.03%
B07	樂活 Broadwood	13 724	-20.56%
B08	跑馬地 Happy Valley	13 534	-21.66%
B09	司徒拔道 Stubbs Road	13 893	-19.58%
B10	修頓 Southorn	12 985	-24.83%
B11	大佛口 Tai Fat Hau	13 211	-23.53%

總數 Total : 150 505

建議概要
Summary of Final Recommendations

東區 Eastern		估計人口 Estimated Population	標準人口基數偏差百份比 +/- % of Population Quota (17 275)
代號 Code	建議選區 名稱 Name Recommended Constituency Areas		
C01	太古城西 Tai Koo Shing West	17 603	1.90%
C02	太古城東 Tai Koo Shing East	18 742	8.49%
C03	鯉景灣 Lei King Wan	20 598	19.24%
C04	筲箕灣 Shaukeiwan	13 311	-22.95%
C05	愛秩序灣 Aldrich Bay	20 833	20.60%
C06	阿公岩 A Kung Ngam	13 966	-19.15%
C07	杏花邨 Heng Fa Chuen	18 485	7.00%
C08	翠灣 Tsui Wan	12 983	-24.85%
C09	欣藍 Yan Lam	15 561	-9.92%
C10	小西灣 Siu Sai Wan	13 640	-21.04%
C11	景怡 King Yee	16 905	-2.14%
C12	環翠 Wan Tsui	15 840	-8.31%
C13	翡翠 Fei Tsui	13 116	-24.08%
C14	柏架山 Mount Parker	14 442	-16.40%
C15	寶馬山 Braemar Hill	15 290	-11.49%
C16	天后 Tin Hau	14 647	-15.21%
C17	炮台山 Fortress Hill	15 199	-12.02%
C18	維園 Victoria Park	14 530	-15.89%
C19	城市花園 City Garden	15 088	-12.66%
C20	和富 Provident	20 785	20.32%
C21	堡壘 Fort Street	16 086	-6.88%
C22	錦屏 Kam Ping	16 446	-4.80%
C23	丹拿 Tanner	15 035	-12.97%
C24	健康村 Healthy Village	15 530	-10.10%
C25	鯪魚涌 Quarry Bay	14 368	-16.83%
C26	南豐 Nam Fung	13 967	-19.15%
C27	康怡 Kornhill	13 272	-23.17%
C28	康山 Kornhill Garden	13 852	-19.81%
C29	興東 Hing Tung	20 158	16.69%
C30	西灣河 Sai Wan Ho	18 263	5.72%
C31	下耀東 Lower Yiu Tung	16 937	-1.96%
C32	上耀東 Upper Yiu Tung	13 768	-20.30%
C33	興民 Hing Man	18 153	5.08%
C34	樂康 Lok Hong	12 986	-24.83%
C35	翠德 Tsui Tak	13 435	-22.23%
C36	漁灣 Yue Wan	13 630	-21.10%
C37	佳曉 Kai Hiu	14 468	-16.25%

總數 Total : 581 918

建議概要
Summary of Final Recommendations

南區 Southern		估計人口 Estimated Population	標準人口基數偏差百份比 +/- % of Population Quota (17 275)
建議選區 Recommended Constituency Areas	名稱 Name		
代號 Code	名稱 Name		
D01	香港仔 Aberdeen	20 343	17.76%
D02	鴨脷洲邨 Ap Lei Chau Estate	13 973	-19.11%
D03	鴨脷洲北 Ap Lei Chau North	16 842	-2.51%
D04	利東一 Lei Tung I	14 060	-18.61%
D05	利東二 Lei Tung II	13 425	-22.29%
D06	海怡東 South Horizons East	13 968	-19.14%
D07	海怡西 South Horizons West	14 514	-15.98%
D08	華貴 Wah Kwai	16 422	-4.94%
D09	華富一 Wah Fu I	14 090	-18.44%
D10	華富二 Wah Fu II	15 841	-8.30%
D11	薄扶林 Pokfulam	19 967	15.58%
D12	置富 Chi Fu	16 151	-6.51%
D13	田灣 Tin Wan	18 450	6.80%
D14	石漁 Shek Yue	20 922	21.11%
D15	黃竹坑 Wong Chuk Hang	16 851	-2.45%
D16	海濱 Bays Area	15 008	-13.12%
D17	赤柱及石澳 Stanley & Shek O	24 216	40.18%

總數 Total : 285 043

建議概要
Summary of Final Recommendations

油尖旺 Yau Tsim Mong			估計人口 Estimated Population	標準人口基數偏差百份比 +/- % of Population Quota (17 275)
建議選區 Recommended Constituency Areas				
代號 Code	名稱 Name			
E01	尖沙咀西	Tsim Sha Tsui West	21 383	23.78%
E02	佐敦西	Jordan West	19 871	15.03%
E03	佐敦東	Jordan East	21 421	24.00%
E04	油麻地	Yau Ma Tei	19 840	14.85%
E05	富榮	Charming	17 351	0.44%
E06	旺角西	Mong Kok West	21 587	24.96%
E07	富柏	Fu Pak	16 730	-3.15%
E08	櫻桃	Cherry	20 853	20.71%
E09	大角咀南	Tai Kok Tsui South	18 244	5.61%
E10	大角咀北	Tai Kok Tsui North	19 876	15.06%
E11	大南	Tai Nan	21 165	22.52%
E12	旺角北	Mong Kok North	19 475	12.74%
E13	旺角東	Mong Kok East	15 573	-9.85%
E14	旺角南	Mong Kok South	16 624	-3.77%
E15	京士柏	King's Park	16 701	-3.32%
E16	尖沙咀東	Tsim Sha Tsui East	19 608	13.51%

總數 Total: 306 302

建議概要
Summary of Final Recommendations

深水埗 Sham Shui Po		估計人口 Estimated Population	標準人口基數偏差百份比 +/- % of Population Quota (17 275)
建議選區 Recommended Constituency Areas			
代號 Code	名稱 Name		
F01	寶麗 Po Lai	15 032	-12.98%
F02	長沙灣 Cheung Sha Wan	16 131	-6.62%
F03	南昌北 Nam Cheong North	21 308	23.35%
F04	石硤尾及南昌東 Shek Kip Mei & Nam Cheong East	21 345	23.56%
F05	南昌南 Nam Cheong South	21 568	24.85%
F06	南昌中 Nam Cheong Central	21 307	23.34%
F07	南昌西 Nam Cheong West	14 177	-17.93%
F08	富昌 Fu Cheong	17 399	0.72%
F09	麗閣 Lai Kok	15 566	-9.89%
F10	元州 Un Chau	20 997	21.55%
F11	荔枝角南 Lai Chi Kok South	21 376	23.74%
F12	美孚南 Mei Foo South	15 855	-8.22%
F13	美孚中 Mei Foo Central	14 682	-15.01%
F14	美孚北 Mei Foo North	17 848	3.32%
F15	荔枝角北 Lai Chi Kok North	20 563	19.03%
F16	蘇屋 So Uk	21 444	24.13%
F17	李鄭屋 Lei Cheng Uk	15 602	-9.68%
F18	下白田 Ha Pak Tin	18 394	6.48%
F19	又一村 Yau Yat Tsuen	17 961	3.97%
F20	南山、大坑東及大坑西 Nam Shan, Tai Hang Tung & Tai Hang Sai	21 350	23.59%
F21	龍坪及上白田 Lung Ping & Sheung Pak Tin	17 111	-0.95%

總數 Total : 387 016

建議概要
Summary of Final Recommendations

九龍城 Kowloon City		估計人口 Estimated Population	標準人口基數偏差百份比 +/- % of Population Quota (17 275)
建議選區 Recommended Constituency Areas			
代號 Code	名稱 Name		
G01	馬頭圍 Ma Tau Wai	17 899	3.61%
G02	馬坑涌 Ma Hang Chung	20 154	16.67%
G03	馬頭角 Ma Tau Kok	15 082	-12.69%
G04	樂民 Lok Man	13 970	-19.13%
G05	常樂 Sheung Lok	17 422	0.85%
G06	何文田 Ho Man Tin	20 025	15.92%
G07	嘉道理 Kadoorie	18 778	8.70%
G08	太子 Prince	16 034	-7.18%
G09	九龍塘 Kowloon Tong	21 220	22.84%
G10	龍城 Lung Shing	15 968	-7.57%
G11	啓德 Kai Tak	21 104	22.16%
G12	海心 Hoi Sham	15 350	-11.14%
G13	土瓜灣北 To Kwa Wan North	13 521	-21.73%
G14	土瓜灣南 To Kwa Wan South	14 824	-14.19%
G15	鶴園海逸 Hok Yuen Laguna Verde	17 915	3.70%
G16	黃埔東 Whampoa East	14 625	-15.34%
G17	黃埔西 Whampoa West	15 215	-11.92%
G18	紅磡灣 Hung Hom Bay	20 842	20.65%
G19	紅磡 Hung Hom	14 062	-18.60%
G20	家維 Ka Wai	14 835	-14.12%
G21	愛民 Oi Man	14 891	-13.80%
G22	愛俊 Oi Chun	15 025	-13.02%

總數 Total : 368 761

建議概要
Summary of Final Recommendations

黃大仙 Wong Tai Sin		估計人口 Estimated Population	標準人口基數偏差百份比 +/- % of Population Quota (17 275)
建議選區 Recommended Constituency Areas			
代號 Code	名稱 Name		
H01	龍趣 Lung Tsui	15 838	-8.32%
H02	龍下 Lung Ha	14 534	-15.87%
H03	龍上 Lung Sheung	19 917	15.29%
H04	鳳凰 Fung Wong	14 930	-13.57%
H05	鳳德 Fung Tak	18 334	6.13%
H06	龍星 Lung Sing	19 584	13.37%
H07	新蒲崗 San Po Kong	20 993	21.52%
H08	東頭 Tung Tau	13 357	-22.68%
H09	東美 Tung Mei	15 144	-12.34%
H10	樂富 Lok Fu	15 288	-11.50%
H11	橫頭磡 Wang Tau Hom	18 823	8.96%
H12	天強 Tin Keung	16 161	-6.45%
H13	翠竹及鵬程 Tsui Chuk & Pang Ching	20 157	16.68%
H14	竹園南 Chuk Yuen South	17 108	-0.97%
H15	竹園北 Chuk Yuen North	18 832	9.01%
H16	慈雲西 Tsz Wan West	20 320	17.63%
H17	正愛 Ching Oi	17 559	1.64%
H18	正安 Ching On	19 992	15.73%
H19	慈雲東 Tsz Wan East	21 414	23.96%
H20	瓊富 King Fu	19 856	14.94%
H21	彩雲東 Choi Wan East	14 535	-15.86%
H22	彩雲南 Choi Wan South	13 854	-19.80%
H23	彩雲西 Choi Wan West	12 063	-30.17%
H24	池彩 Chi Choi	15 522	-10.15%
H25	彩虹 Choi Hung	15 125	-12.45%

總數 Total : 429 240

建議概要
Summary of Final Recommendations

觀塘 Kwun Tong		估計人口 Estimated Population	標準人口基數偏差百份比 +/- % of Population Quota (17 275)
建議選區 Recommended Constituency Areas	名稱 Name		
代號 Code	名稱 Name		
J01	觀塘中心 Kwun Tong Central	13 978	-19.09%
J02	九龍灣 Kowloon Bay	13 734	-20.50%
J03	啓業 Kai Yip	13 010	-24.69%
J04	麗晶 Lai Ching	17 074	-1.16%
J05	坪石 Ping Shek	14 280	-17.34%
J06	佐敦谷 Jordan Valley	15 707	-9.08%
J07	順天 Shun Tin	20 577	19.11%
J08	雙順 Sheung Shun	18 488	7.02%
J09	安利 On Lee	13 544	-21.60%
J10	寶達 Po Tat	24 763	43.35%
J11	秀茂坪北 Sau Mau Ping North	20 467	18.48%
J12	曉麗 Hiu Lai	18 896	9.38%
J13	秀茂坪南 Sau Mau Ping South	17 996	4.17%
J14	興田 Hing Tin	20 040	16.01%
J15	藍田 Lam Tin	13 977	-19.09%
J16	廣德 Kwong Tak	21 213	22.80%
J17	平田 Ping Tin	17 347	0.42%
J18	栢雅 Pak Nga	14 840	-14.10%
J19	油塘東 Yau Tong East	21 442	24.12%
J20	油塘中 Yau Tong Central	19 844	14.87%
J21	油塘西 Yau Tong West	18 781	8.72%
J22	麗港城 Laguna City	22 186	28.43%
J23	景田 King Tin	16 847	-2.48%
J24	翠屏南 Tsui Ping South	14 422	-16.52%
J25	翠屏北 Tsui Ping North	13 610	-21.22%
J26	寶樂 Po Lok	15 754	-8.80%
J27	月華 Yuet Wah	13 334	-22.81%
J28	協康 Hip Hong	16 706	-3.29%
J29	康樂 Hong Lok	15 408	-10.81%
J30	定安 Ting On	18 139	5.00%
J31	牛頭角 Ngau Tau Kok	19 610	13.52%
J32	淘大 To Tai	16 552	-4.19%
J33	樂華北 Lok Wah North	15 281	-11.54%
J34	樂華南 Lok Wah South	14 076	-18.52%

總數 Total : 581 923

建議概要
Summary of Final Recommendations

荃灣 Tsuen Wan		估計人口 Estimated Population	標準人口基數偏差百份比 +/- % of Population Quota (17 275)
建議選區 Recommended Constituency Areas			
代號 Code	名稱 Name		
K01	德華 Tak Wah	20 625	19.39%
K02	楊屋道 Yeung Uk Road	21 093	22.10%
K03	海濱 Hoi Bun	18 671	8.08%
K04	祈德尊 Clague Garden	16 751	-3.03%
K05	福來 Fuk Loi	13 633	-21.08%
K06	愉景 Discovery Park	16 024	-7.24%
K07	荃灣中心 Tsuen Wan Centre	13 256	-23.26%
K08	荃威 Allway	21 174	22.57%
K09	麗濤 Lai To	21 095	22.11%
K10	麗興 Lai Hing	14 191	-17.85%
K11	荃灣郊區西 Tsuen Wan Rural West	20 418	18.19%
K12	荃灣郊區東 Tsuen Wan Rural East	21 374	23.73%
K13	綠楊 Luk Yeung	14 553	-15.76%
K14	梨木樹東 Lei Muk Shue East	19 872	15.03%
K15	梨木樹西 Lei Muk Shue West	15 142	-12.35%
K16	石圍角 Shek Wai Kok	14 080	-18.49%
K17	象石 Cheung Shek	13 112	-24.10%

總數 Total : 295 064

建議概要
Summary of Final Recommendations

屯門 Tuen Mun			估計人口 Estimated Population	標準人口基數偏差百份比 +/- % of Population Quota (17 275)
建議選區 Recommended Constituency Areas				
代號 Code	名稱 Name			
L01	屯門市中心	Tuen Mun Town Centre	17 245	-0.17%
L02	兆置	Siu Chi	20 902	21.00%
L03	兆翠	Siu Tsui	17 188	-0.50%
L04	安定	On Ting	18 041	4.43%
L05	友愛南	Yau Oi South	14 655	-15.17%
L06	友愛北	Yau Oi North	16 541	-4.25%
L07	翠興	Tsui Hing	16 812	-2.68%
L08	山景	Shan King	17 412	0.79%
L09	景興	King Hing	17 467	1.11%
L10	興澤	Hing Tsak	17 090	-1.07%
L11	新墟	San Hui	16 534	-4.29%
L12	三聖	Sam Shing	19 851	14.91%
L13	恆福	Hanford	21 383	23.78%
L14	富新	Fu Sun	14 365	-16.85%
L15	悅湖	Yuet Wu	13 126	-24.02%
L16	兆禧	Siu Hei	13 781	-20.23%
L17	湖景	Wu King	15 078	-12.72%
L18	蝴蝶	Butterfly	18 590	7.61%
L19	樂翠	Lok Tsui	14 053	-18.65%
L20	龍門	Lung Mun	19 446	12.57%
L21	新景	San King	16 591	-3.96%
L22	良景	Leung King	15 438	-10.63%
L23	田景	Tin King	18 422	6.64%
L24	寶田	Po Tin	15 762	-8.76%
L25	建生	Kin Sang	17 747	2.73%
L26	兆康	Siu Hong	17 095	-1.04%
L27	景峰	Prime View	18 414	6.59%
L28	富泰	Fu Tai	20 137	16.57%
L29	屯門鄉郊	Tuen Mun Rural	19 940	15.43%

總數 Total : 499 106

建議概要
Summary of Final Recommendations

元朗 Yuen Long		估計人口 Estimated Population	標準人口基數偏差百份比 +/- % of Population Quota (17 275)
建議選區 Recommended Constituency Areas			
代號 Code	名稱 Name		
M01	豐年 Fung Nin	20 585	19.16%
M02	水邊 Shui Pin	21 548	24.74%
M03	南屏 Nam Ping	15 193	-12.05%
M04	北朗 Pek Long	13 846	-19.85%
M05	元朗中心 Yuen Long Centre	21 474	24.31%
M06	鳳翔 Fung Cheung	19 530	13.05%
M07	十八鄉北 Shap Pat Heung North	25 801	49.35%
M08	十八鄉南 Shap Pat Heung South	21 257	23.05%
M09	屏山南 Ping Shan South	17 886	3.54%
M10	屏山北 Ping Shan North	20 410	18.15%
M11	廈村 Ha Tsuen	15 510	-10.22%
M12	天盛 Tin Shing	20 473	18.51%
M13	瑞愛 Shui Oi	19 747	14.31%
M14	瑞華 Shui Wah	18 784	8.74%
M15	頌華 Chung Wah	20 112	16.42%
M16	悅恩 Yuet Yan	20 996	21.54%
M17	富恩 Fu Yan	20 753	20.13%
M18	逸澤 Yat Chak	20 616	19.34%
M19	天恒 Tin Heng	23 987	38.85%
M20	宏景 Wang King	18 754	8.56%
M21	嘉湖北 Kingswood North	21 418	23.98%
M22	嘉湖南 Kingswood South	21 398	23.87%
M23	天耀 Tin Yiu	21 515	24.54%
M24	慈祐 Tsz Yau	22 457	30.00%
M25	錦綉花園 Fairview Park	15 240	-11.78%
M26	新田 San Tin	19 206	11.18%
M27	錦田 Kam Tin	11 241	-34.93%
M28	八鄉北 Pat Heung North	10 378	-39.92%
M29	八鄉南 Pat Heung South	15 742	-8.87%

總數 Total : 555 857

建議概要
Summary of Final Recommendations

北區 North		估計人口 Estimated Population	標準人口基數偏差百份比 +/- % of Population Quota (17 275)
建議選區 Recommended Constituency Areas			
代號 Code	名稱 Name		
N01	聯和墟 Luen Wo Hui	21 229	22.89%
N02	粉嶺市 Fanling Town	21 484	24.36%
N03	祥華 Cheung Wah	19 633	13.65%
N04	華都 Wah Do	19 339	11.95%
N05	華明 Wah Ming	19 161	10.92%
N06	欣盛 Yan Shing	20 528	18.83%
N07	盛福 Shing Fuk	19 962	15.55%
N08	上水鄉郊 Sheung Shui Rural	21 382	23.77%
N09	御太 Yu Tai	18 413	6.59%
N10	彩園 Choi Yuen	20 920	21.10%
N11	石湖墟 Shek Wu Hui	20 274	17.36%
N12	天平西 Tin Ping West	13 155	-23.85%
N13	鳳翠 Fung Tsui	16 122	-6.67%
N14	沙打 Sha Ta	15 044	-12.91%
N15	天平東 Tin Ping East	15 792	-8.58%
N16	皇后山 Queen's Hill	20 821	20.53%

總數 Total : 303 259

建議概要
Summary of Final Recommendations

大埔 Tai Po		建議選區 Recommended Constituency Areas	估計人口 Estimated Population	標準人口基數偏差百份比 +/- % of Population Quota (17 275)
代號 Code	名稱 Name			
P01	大埔墟	Tai Po Hui	16 171	-6.39%
P02	大埔中	Tai Po Central	14 346	-16.96%
P03	頌汀	Chung Ting	16 073	-6.96%
P04	大元	Tai Yuen	16 360	-5.30%
P05	富亨	Fu Heng	18 621	7.79%
P06	怡富	Yee Fu	17 248	-0.16%
P07	富明新	Fu Ming Sun	17 514	1.38%
P08	廣福及寶湖	Kwong Fuk & Plover Cove	14 666	-15.10%
P09	宏福	Wang Fuk	14 062	-18.60%
P10	大埔滘	Tai Po Kau	13 582	-21.38%
P11	運頭塘	Wan Tau Tong	18 761	8.60%
P12	新富	San Fu	16 164	-6.43%
P13	林村谷	Lam Tsuen Valley	18 243	5.60%
P14	寶雅	Po Nga	16 780	-2.87%
P15	太和	Tai Wo	17 676	2.32%
P16	舊墟及太湖	Old Market & Serenity	14 618	-15.38%
P17	康樂園	Hong Lok Yuen	14 856	-14.00%
P18	船灣	Shuen Wan	17 434	0.92%
P19	西貢北	Sai Kung North	10 013	-42.04%

總數 Total : 303 188

建議概要
Summary of Final Recommendations

西貢 Sai Kung		估計人口 Estimated Population	標準人口基數偏差百份比 +/- % of Population Quota (17 275)
建議選區 Recommended Constituency Areas			
代號 Code	名稱 Name		
Q01	西貢市中心 Sai Kung Central	13 318	-22.91%
Q02	白沙灣 Pak Sha Wan	15 264	-11.64%
Q03	西貢離島 Sai Kung Islands	10 784	-37.57%
Q04	坑口東 Hang Hau East	16 130	-6.63%
Q05	坑口西 Hang Hau West	14 195	-17.83%
Q06	環保 Wan Po	14 388	-16.71%
Q07	維都 Wai Do	14 959	-13.41%
Q08	健明 Kin Ming	17 232	-0.25%
Q09	彩健 Choi Kin	20 583	19.15%
Q10	澳唐 O Tong	17 618	1.99%
Q11	富軍 Fu Kwan	21 106	22.18%
Q12	南安 Nam On	21 529	24.63%
Q13	康景 Hong King	19 745	14.30%
Q14	翠林 Tsui Lam	18 393	6.47%
Q15	寶林 Po Lam	19 023	10.12%
Q16	欣英 Yan Ying	18 866	9.21%
Q17	運亨 Wan Hang	17 994	4.16%
Q18	景林 King Lam	20 873	20.83%
Q19	厚德 Hau Tak	19 946	15.46%
Q20	富藍 Fu Nam	18 276	5.79%
Q21	德明 Tak Ming	19 601	13.46%
Q22	尚德 Sheung Tak	21 122	22.27%
Q23	廣明 Kwong Ming	18 227	5.51%

總數 Total : 409 172

建議概要
Summary of Final Recommendations

沙田 Sha Tin		估計人口 Estimated Population	標準人口基數偏差百份比 +/- % of Population Quota (17 275)
建議選區 Recommended Constituency Areas			
代號 Code	名稱 Name		
R01	沙田市中心 Sha Tin Town Centre	20 317	17.61%
R02	瀝源 Lek Yuen	13 825	-19.97%
R03	禾輦邨 Wo Che Estate	20 150	16.64%
R04	第一城 City One	13 707	-20.65%
R05	愉城 Yue Shing	17 358	0.48%
R06	王屋 Wong Uk	18 070	4.60%
R07	沙角 Sha Kok	17 206	-0.40%
R08	博康 Pok Hong	19 302	11.73%
R09	乙明 Jat Min	13 343	-22.76%
R10	秦豐 Chun Fung	16 846	-2.48%
R11	新田圍 Sun Tin Wai	18 144	5.03%
R12	翠田 Chui Tin	16 031	-7.20%
R13	顯嘉 Hin Ka	15 009	-13.12%
R14	下城門 Lower Shing Mun	19 358	12.06%
R15	徑口 Keng Hau	21 109	22.19%
R16	田心 Tin Sum	16 621	-3.79%
R17	新翠 Sun Chui	13 778	-20.24%
R18	大圍 Tai Wai	21 468	24.27%
R19	松田 Chung Tin	19 677	13.90%
R20	穗禾 Sui Wo	13 678	-20.82%
R21	火炭 Fo Tan	15 158	-12.25%
R22	駿馬 Chun Ma	16 107	-6.76%
R23	頌安 Chung On	20 653	19.55%
R24	錦濤 Kam To	14 815	-14.24%
R25	新港城 Sunshine City	20 459	18.43%
R26	利安 Lee On	18 346	6.20%
R27	富龍 Fu Lung	18 653	7.98%
R28	錦英 Kam Ying	18 426	6.66%
R29	耀安 Yiu On	18 201	5.36%
R30	恒安 Heng On	21 764	25.99%
R31	鞍泰 On Tai	20 518	18.77%
R32	大水坑 Tai Shui Hang	13 571	-21.44%
R33	愉欣 Yu Yan	13 271	-23.18%
R34	碧湖 Bik Woo	15 815	-8.45%
R35	廣康 Kwong Hong	13 164	-23.80%
R36	廣源 Kwong Yuen	16 641	-3.67%

總數 Total : 620 559

建議概要
Summary of Final Recommendations

葵青 Kwai Tsing		估計人口 Estimated Population	標準人口基數偏差百份比 +/- % of Population Quota (17 275)
建議選區 Recommended Constituency Areas			
代號 Code	名稱 Name		
S01	葵興 Kwai Hing	20 828	20.57%
S02	葵盛東邨 Kwai Shing East Estate	19 309	11.77%
S03	上大窩口 Upper Tai Wo Hau	14 670	-15.08%
S04	下大窩口 Lower Tai Wo Hau	14 537	-15.85%
S05	葵涌邨 Kwai Chung Estate	25 797	49.33%
S06	石蔭 Shek Yam	21 273	23.14%
S07	安蔭 On Yam	17 307	0.19%
S08	新石籬 Shek Lei Extension	21 464	24.25%
S09	石籬 Shek Lei	20 784	20.31%
S10	大白田 Tai Pak Tin	21 239	22.95%
S11	葵芳 Kwai Fong	19 895	15.17%
S12	華麗 Wah Lai	17 646	2.15%
S13	荔華 Lai Wah	14 733	-14.71%
S14	祖堯 Cho Yiu	18 673	8.09%
S15	興芳 Hing Fong	20 538	18.89%
S16	荔景 Lai King	14 157	-18.05%
S17	葵盛西邨 Kwai Shing West Estate	20 100	16.35%
S18	安灝 On Ho	21 495	24.43%
S19	偉盈 Wai Ying	18 763	8.61%
S20	青衣邨 Tsing Yi Estate	16 128	-6.64%
S21	翠怡 Greenfield	18 043	4.45%
S22	長青 Cheung Ching	20 172	16.77%
S23	長康 Cheung Hong	20 849	20.69%
S24	盛康 Shing Hong	14 336	-17.01%
S25	青衣南 Tsing Yi South	20 231	17.11%
S26	長亨 Cheung Hang	15 311	-11.37%
S27	青發 Ching Fat	19 759	14.38%
S28	長安 Cheung On	15 315	-11.35%

總數 Total : 523 352

建議概要
Summary of Final Recommendations

離島 Islands		估計人口 Estimated Population	標準人口基數偏差百份比 +/- % of Population Quota (17 275)
建議選區 Recommended Constituency Areas	名稱 Name		
T01	大嶼山 Lantau	17 687	2.38%
T02	逸東邨北 Yat Tung Estate North	18 862	9.19%
T03	逸東邨南 Yat Tung Estate South	19 345	11.98%
T04	東涌北 Tung Chung North	18 579	7.55%
T05	東涌南 Tung Chung South	18 947	9.68%
T06	愉景灣 Discovery Bay	15 706	-9.08%
T07	坪洲及喜靈洲 Peng Chau & Hei Ling Chau	8 187	-52.61%
T08	南丫及蒲台 Lamma & Po Toi	5 581	-67.69%
T09	長洲南 Cheung Chau South	11 201	-35.16%
T10	長洲北 Cheung Chau North	11 955	-30.80%

總數 Total : 146 050