

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	All DCCAs	1	The representation supports the EAC's demarcation proposals for all DCCAs in the district as they are in line with the statutory criteria and working principles.	The supporting view is noted.
2	All DCCAs	1	<p>The representation:</p> <p><u>D04</u></p> <p>(a) objects to the demarcation proposal for D04 because taking Yue On Court and moving out Sham Wan Towers will adversely affect the community integrity, and proposes to</p> <p>(i) retain its boundary the same as 2007, or</p> <p>(ii) move Larvotto (which is a private residential development with population intake starting in 2011) to D04; or</p> <p>(iii) move Sham Wan Towers and Larvotto to D04, and transfer one more block of Lei Tung Estate from D04 to D05, resulting in keeping two</p>	<p><u>Item (a)(i)</u> The proposal is not accepted as the boundary of the current D04 is altered in order to alleviate the population shortfall of D05. If the boundary of the current D05 remains unchanged, its population (9,899) will substantially fall below the lower permissible limit (-42.72%). Please also see item 6(b).</p> <p><u>Item (a)(ii)</u> The proposal is accepted. Please see item 6(b).</p> <p><u>Item (a)(iii)</u> The proposal is not accepted as the resultant population of D03 (12,739) will fall below the lower permissible limit (-26.29%).</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>blocks of the Estate in D04 together with Sham Wan Towers and Larvotto, and the remaining six blocks of the Estate all in D05; and</p> <p><u>Other DCCAs</u></p> <p>(b) supports the demarcation proposals for all other DCCAs in the district as the EAC has paid regard to the community integrity of the DCCAs and the populations of them are within the permissible range.</p>	
3	<p>D03 – Ap Lei Chau North</p> <p>D04 – Lei Tung I</p>	1	The representation supports the demarcation proposals for D03 and D04.	The supporting view is noted.
4	<p>D03 – Ap Lei Chau North</p> <p>D04 – Lei Tung I</p> <p>D05 – Lei Tung II</p>	1	<p>The representation proposes to:</p> <p>(a) retain Sham Wan Towers in D04 because Sham Wan Towers is not close to D03 geographically and their community ties are not strong;</p> <p>(b) retain Yue On Court in D04 because Yue On Court is not close to D03 geographically</p>	<p><u>Proposal (a)</u> The proposal is not accepted because the resultant population of D03 (12,739) will fall below the lower permissible limit (-26.29%) if Sham Wan Towers is retained in D04.</p> <p><u>Proposal (b)</u> Yue On Court is proposed to be put in D04 under the EAC's demarcation proposal and 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>
			and their community ties are not strong; and (c) move Larvotto, a private residential development with population intake starting in 2011, from D05 to D04 because Larvotto belongs to a class of development different from Lei Tung II, and their community ties will be weak.	<u>Proposal (c)</u> The proposal is accepted . Please see item 6(b).
5	D04 – Lei Tung I	1	The representation proposes to maintain the existing boundary of D04 and objects to moving Sham Wan Towers to D03 and Tung Sing House to D05 respectively because: (a) the population of D04 is within the permissible range; (b) the transfer of Tung Sing House to D05 will adversely affect the community integrity and harmony of D04; (c) Sham Wan Towers maintains closer community ties with D04 and is not close to D03 geographically; and (d) the harmonious relationship he has established with the local communities of D04 will be broken if Tung Sing House	The representation is not accepted for the following reasons: (i) the aim of re-delineating the current D04 is to alleviate the substantial population shortfall (-42.72%) of the adjoining D05; and (ii) if Tung Sing House is to be retained in D04, the population of D05 (9,899) will substantially fall below the lower permissible limit (-42.72%) and if Sham Wan Towers is to be retained in D04, the resultant population of D03 (12,739) will fall below the lower permissible limit (-26.29%). Please also see item 6(b).

<i>Item no.</i>	<i>DCCAs concerned</i>	<i>No. of representations</i>	<i>Representations</i>	<i>EAC's views</i>
			where his office is located is transferred to D05.	
6	D04 – Lei Tung I D05 – Lei Tung II D06 – South Horizons East D07 – South Horizons West D09 – Wah Fu I D10 – Wah Fu II	6	<p>These representations:</p> <p>(a) consider it appropriate to move Yue On Court to D04 and Tung Sing House to D05 having regard to the community integrity;</p> <p>(b) propose to move the area around Ap Lei Chau Praya Road, including the shipyards and the area up to Ap Lei Pai back to D04 because Larvotto, which is a private residential development at Ap Lei Chau Praya Road, will be completed by March 2011. The development is far away from the community and the polling station of D05 as they are separated by a hill. The residents' desire to vote will hence be weakened. Instead, the development will have closer local ties with D04.</p> <p>Five representations also put up suggestions on selecting venues for polling stations in D04, D05, D06, D07, D09 and D10.</p>	<p><u>Proposal (a)</u> The proposal is the same as the EAC's demarcation proposal. The supporting view is noted.</p> <p><u>Proposal (b)</u> The proposal is accepted because the shipyard, its adjoining areas along Ap Lei Chau Praya Road and Yuk Kwai Shan are geographically closer to D04 than D05 and are separated from the rest of D05 with no direct access. The resultant population of D04 would be 15,054 (-12.89%).</p> <p>However, upon adoption of the aforesaid proposal, the resultant population of D05 (12,548) will still fall below the population quota by 27.39% but it is an improvement to the original population quota shortfall of 42.72%.</p> <p>Noting that the resultant population of D05 will fall below the lower permissible limit, the EAC has explored the following options to see if it is possible to include more population in D05 so as to keep it within the permissible range. However, none of them are considered viable,</p> <p>(i) moving one more block of Lei Tung Estate in addition to Tung Sing House from D04 to D05. However, this will in turn cause the resultant population of D04 to fall below the lower permissible limit, even after the latter has taken Yue On Court from D03; and it is not</p>

<i>Item no.</i>	<i>DCCAs concerned</i>	<i>No. of representations</i>	<i>Representations</i>	<i>EAC's views</i>
				<p>desirable to transfer any one of the three remaining blocks, namely Tung On House, Tung Yat House and Tung Ping House of Lei Tung Estate from D04 to D05 as all of them are located at a lower level than those blocks of Lei Tung Estate in D05;</p> <p>(ii) transferring four blocks of Yue On Court (about 3,500 population) to D05. However, this will seriously upset the established community ties of the residents in Yue On Court; and</p> <p>(iii) moving a cluster of private buildings from D03 to D05. This option is considered not viable because these buildings are far away from the public housing in D05.</p> <p>Having carefully considered the above, the EAC recommends that D04 and D05 be re-delineated so that the shipyard, its adjoining area alongside Ap Lei Chau Praya Road and Yuk Kwai Shan be transferred from D05 to D04, thus resulting in a population below the lower permissible limit in D05 (12,548, -27.39%).</p> <p>Suggestions for polling stations are beyond the scope of this consultation exercise and have been forwarded to the REO for reference.</p>

Southern District
Oral Representation Received at the Public Forum on 17 December 2010

<i>Item no.</i>	<i>DCCAs concerned</i>	<i>No. of representations</i>	<i>Representations</i>	<i>EAC's views</i>
7	D03 – Ap Lei Chau North D04 – Lei Tung I D05 – Lei Tung II	1	<p>The representation:</p> <p>(a) proposes to move the shipyards located alongside Ap Lei Chau Praya Road from D05 to D04 because:</p> <p>(i) there is no direct access from the shipyards to Lei Tung Estate in D05 as they are separated by Yuk Kwai Shan geographically. This also makes it difficult for the residents of shipyards to vote at the future elections if the polling station is to be set up in D05; and</p> <p>(ii) the community ties between the shipyards and the Lei Tung Estate in D05 are relatively weak;</p> <p>(b) suggests that Larvotto, which is a private residential development at Ap Lei Chau Praya Road, be moved from D05 to D04 because the population intake of Larvotto will start from 2011; and</p>	<p><u>Proposal (a) and (b)</u></p> <p>Please see item 6(b).</p> <p><u>Proposal (c)</u></p> <p>The proposal is not accepted because the resultant population of D03 (12,739) will fall below the lower permissible limit (-26.29%) if Sham Wan Towers is retained in D04.</p>

<i>Item no.</i>	<i>DCCAs concerned</i>	<i>No. of representations</i>	<i>Representations</i>	<i>EAC's views</i>
			<p>(c) proposes to retain the Sham Wan Towers in D04 because:</p> <p>(i) the community ties between Sham Wan Towers and D03 are relatively weak as Sham Wan Towers is located at a higher level and it is separated from D03 by the Ap Lei Chau Bridge Road; and</p> <p>(ii) Sham Wan Towers share similar community identity with Yue On Court and Larvotto in D04.</p>	