

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	The representation supports the 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	The representation: (a) objects to the demarcation for Q06 as it will undermine the community integrity; and (b) supports the demarcation proposals for all the remaining DCCAs of the district.	<u>Item (a)</u> The representation is not accepted because: (i) it has not explained how the demarcation proposal for Q06 will undermine the community integrity; (ii) it is necessary to re-delineate the boundaries of the current Q06 and the new Q06 comprises solely two private housing estates, i.e. Bauhinia Garden and Tseung Kwan O Plaza (please see also item 5(d)); and (iii) there are supporting views for the demarcation proposal for Q06 (see items 1 and 3 below). <u>Item (b)</u> The supporting view is noted.
3	Q06 – Po Kwan	2	The representations support the demarcation proposal for Q06.	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>
4	Q07 – Wai Do	1	The representation supports the demarcation proposal for Q07 as the DCCA is comprised solely of private housing estates, thus enhancing community homogeneity.	The supporting view is noted.
5	Q07 – Wai Do	71	<p>(a) These representations:</p> <p>(i) query the accuracy of the population figures which the EAC adopted for this demarcation exercise and quote other figures for reference;</p> <p>(ii) propose to split Ocean Shores and Metro Town I and Metro Town II - Le Point and let Ocean Shores become a DCCA alone as its estimated population has reached 18,329; and</p> <p>(iii) suggest that Metro Town I, Metro Town II and Shin Ming Estate be grouped together to form a new DCCA.</p> <p>(b) Sixty-seven of the representations also propose to:</p> <p>(i) group Ocean Shores with Shin Ming Estate in the same DCCA, put Metro Town II together with Choi Ming</p>	<p><u>Item (a)(i)</u></p> <p>In this demarcation exercise, the EAC has to rely on the population figures provided by the AHSG. AHSG had conducted comprehensive researches before compiling the relevant data by a systematic methodology. For the reason of fairness and consistency, the EAC considers it necessary to use the same set of population distribution projections with the same basis and the same cut-off date (i.e. 30 June 2011) for all DCCAs;</p> <p><u>Items (a)(ii) and (iii)</u></p> <p>The proposal is not accepted because:</p> <p>(i) it would involve the addition of one more seat for Sai Kung District Council which is outside the EAC's jurisdiction; or</p> <p>(ii) alternatively, in order to vacate a DCCA for Metro Town I, Metro Town II and Shin Ming Estate, the populations of the neighbouring DCCAs will have to be moved, which will affect many DCCAs including three originally unaltered DCCAs (Q09, Q10 and Q12) and cause substantial changes to their existing boundaries; and</p> <p>(iii) there are supporting views for the demarcation proposals for</p>

<i>Item no.</i>	<i>DCCAs concerned</i>	<i>No. of representations</i>	<i>Representations</i>	<i>EAC's views</i>
			<p>Court in one DCCA and let Metro Town I and the entire Kin Ming Estate form a DCCA; or</p> <p>(ii) put Ocean Shores and Metro Town I together in Q07, move Metro Town II to join Choi Ming Court in Q09; and group the entire Kin Ming Estate and Shin Ming Estate in Q08.</p> <p>(c) Fifty-two of the representations opine that the merger of Ocean Shores and Metro Town will thin out the community resources in the DCCA;</p> <p>(d) Six of the representations also question the reason why Ocean Shores is put in the same DCCA with Metro Town I and Metro Town II - Le Point but Lohas Park can be separated from Bauhinia Garden and form a new DCCA with Oscar by the Sea; and</p> <p>(e) One of the representations further comments that the demarcation proposals favour the political parties but not independent candidates.</p>	<p>Q07, Q08 and Q09 as well as an objection to separating the Metro Town from Ocean Shores (see items 1, 2 and 4).</p> <p><u>Item (b)(i)</u></p> <p>The proposal is not accepted because the resultant population of the new DCCA, which comprises Metro Town I and Kin Ming Estate (25,575), will exceed the upper permissible limit (+47.99%).</p> <p><u>Item (b)(ii)</u></p> <p>The proposal is not accepted because:</p> <p>(i) the resultant population of Q08 (25,246) will exceed the upper permissible limit (+46.08%);</p> <p>(ii) it will affect the boundary of Q09, the population of which is within the permissible range and a change in its boundary is not necessary; and</p> <p>(iii) there are supporting views for the demarcation proposals for Q07, Q08 and Q09 as well as an objection to separating the Metro Town from Ocean Shores (see items 1, 2 and 4).</p> <p><u>Item (c)</u></p> <p>Distribution of community resources is not a factor of consideration for delineating the boundaries of DCCAs.</p> <p><u>Item (d)</u></p> <p>The re-delineation of Ocean Shores in Q07 and Lohas Park in Q24 are two separate cases.</p>

<i>Item no.</i>	<i>DCCAs concerned</i>	<i>No. of representations</i>	<i>Representations</i>	<i>EAC's views</i>
				<p>As the populations of the current Q06 (25,134, +45.43%) and Q11 (24,291, +40.56%) exceed the upper permissible limit, it is necessary to add the new DCCA at a place close to these two DCCAs so as to alleviate in one go their population overflow. Grouping Oscar By The Sea together with Lohas Park to form a new DCCA (i.e. Q24) will not only bring the population of the current Q06 within the permissible range, but also allow room for the new Q06 to absorb the excessive population of Q11 by taking Tseung Kwan O Plaza from Q11.</p> <p>Also, there are supporting views for the demarcation proposal for Q24 (see items 1 and 2).</p> <p><u>Item (e)</u></p> <p>The EAC has not taken into account factors with political implications in the demarcation exercise.</p>
6	Q12 – Nam On Q19 – Hau Tak Q20 – Fu Nam	1	<p>The representation objects to the demarcation proposals for Q12 and Q20 and put forth two proposals as follows:</p> <p>(a) <u>Proposal (A)</u></p> <p>(i) move Residence Oasis from Q20 to Q19 since it is closer to Hau Tak Estate geographically and it has no community ties with the remaining parts in Q20;</p> <p>(ii) move Tak On House and Tak Yue House from Q19 to Q20 because these two</p>	<p><u>Proposal (A)</u></p> <p>The proposal is not accepted because:</p> <p>(i) the resultant population of Q20 (22,224) will exceed the upper permissible limit (+28.60%);</p> <p>(ii) it will affect the existing boundaries of Q19 and Q20, the populations of which are within the permissible limits and a change in their boundaries is not necessary;</p> <p>(iii) the split of Tak On House and Tak Yue House from Hau Tak Estate will adversely affect the community integrity of Hau Tak Estate; and</p>

<i>Item no.</i>	<i>DCCAs concerned</i>	<i>No. of representations</i>	<i>Representations</i>	<i>EAC's views</i>
			<p>buildings and the remaining buildings of Hau Tak Estate are separated by Sheung Ning Road geographically and the community ties between them are relatively weak; and</p> <p>(iii) move East Point City from Q12 to Q20 in order to make up for the decrease of population in Q20, because the proposal will establish closer community ties, achieve better population distribution in each the 3 DCCAs, enable the population of Q12 to fall within the permissible range and eliminate the need to re-delineate the boundary of Q19 in the future since decrease in population in Hau Tak Estate will be compensated by the increase in population from the future intake in Residence Oasis.</p> <p>(b) <u>Proposal (B)</u></p> <p>If proposal (A) is not adopted because of the need to preserve community integrity of Hau Tak Estate,</p> <p><u>Option A</u></p> <p>(i) move Yu Ming Court from Q20 to Q19;</p> <p>(ii) put East Point City into Q20 to group together</p>	<p>(iv) there are supporting views for the demarcation proposals for Q12, Q19 and Q20 (see items 1 and 2).</p> <p><u>Proposal (B) – Options A and B</u></p> <p>The proposals are not accepted because:</p> <p>(i) the resultant population of Q12 (23,028) will exceed the upper permissible limit (+33.25%) under both options;</p> <p>(ii) they will cause changes to the existing boundaries of Q19 and/or Q20, which should not be altered as their populations are within the permissible limits;</p> <p>(iii) residents of Chung Ming Court have established strong community identity and local ties with those of Hau Tak Estate in Q19 and they have common concerns and objectives because of the close proximity of these two housing estates; and</p> <p>(iv) there are supporting views for the demarcation proposals for Q12, Q19 and Q20 (see items 1 and 2).</p>

<i>Item no.</i>	<i>DCCAs concerned</i>	<i>No. of representations</i>	<i>Representations</i>	<i>EAC's views</i>
			<p>with Fu Ning Garden and Residence Oasis in the same DCCA; and</p> <p>(iii) move Chung Ming Court from Q19 to Q12.</p> <p>If proposal (A) is not accepted for reasons other than preservation of community identity of Hau Tak Estate,</p> <p><u>Option B</u></p> <p>(i) move Chung Ming Court from Q19 to Q12; and</p> <p>(ii) move East Point City from Q12 to Q19.</p>	
7	Q24 – Wan Po	2	<p>The representations:</p> <p>(a) considers that the population forecast of Q24 (14,572) has been underestimated; and</p> <p>(b) comments that there were frequent changes to delineation of Oscar by the Sea as it has been put into different DCCA in previous demarcation exercises and is proposed to be grouped with Lohas Park in Q24 under the demarcation proposals and</p> <p>(c) requests that the constituency boundary of Q24 should be maintained in future demarcation exercise if Lohas Park and Oscar by the Sea are put together in one DCCA.</p>	<p><u>Item (a)</u></p> <p>See item 5(a)(i).</p> <p><u>Items (b) and (c)</u></p> <p>In drawing up the demarcation proposals, the EAC has adhered closely to the statutory criteria under the EAC Ordinance and its working principles. The EAC will continue to do so in future demarcation exercises.</p>