

**Appendix II - Q**

**Sai Kung District**  
**Summaries of Written/Oral Representations**

<i>Item No.</i>	<i>DCCAs</i>	<i>No.*</i>		<i>Representations</i>	<i>EAC's views</i>
		<i>W</i>	<i>O</i>		
1	All DCCAs	2	-	(a) Propose to reduce the elected seats in the rural areas of Sai Kung in order to increase the elected seats in Tseung Kwan O so that public money could be more evenly distributed.	<u>Item (a)</u> This proposal is <b>not accepted</b> because the delineation proposal must be based on objective data of the population distribution as well as taking into account the existing constituency boundary and other factors relating to local ties.
				(b) Support to delineate Ocean Shores as a DCCA (i.e. Q07 (Wai King)).	<u>Item (b)</u> The supporting views are noted.
2	All DCCAs	1	-	(a) Proposes to transfer Man Sau Sun Tsuen, Pak Kong Au, Wong Chuk Shan New Village and Fu Yung Pit near Pak Kong Water Treatment Works from Q02 (Pak Sha Wan) and Q03 (Sai Kung Islands) to Q01 (Sai Kung Central), because they are similar communities and could reduce the population difference in these three DCCAs.	<u>Item (a)</u> This proposal is <b>not accepted</b> . The projected population of Q01 (Sai Kung Central) will be below the statutory permissible lower limit. Transferring villages near Pak Kong Water Treatment Works in Q02 (Pak Sha Wan) and Q03 (Sai Kung Islands) may maintain the projected population of Q01 (Sai Kung Central) within the statutory permissible range, but taking into account the community integrity, local ties, geographical factor, transportation and population distribution, the EAC considers it undesirable and recommends that the boundary of the DCCA should remain unchanged and its population be allowed to continue to deviate from the statutory permissible range (the population of this DCCA in 2011 delineation exercise was also allowed to deviate from the statutory permissible range).

\* W: Number of written representation  
O: Number of oral representation

<i>Item No.</i>	<i>DCCAs</i>	<i>No.*</i>		<i>Representations</i>	<i>EAC's views</i>
		<i>W</i>	<i>O</i>		
				(b) Holds reservation on the provisional recommendations on Q06 (Po Yee), Q07 (Wai King), Q08 (Do Shin), Q09 (Kin Ming), Q10 (Choi Kin), Q11 (O Tong), Q12 (Fu Kwan), Q13 (Kwan Po), Q14 (Nam On), Q21 (Hau Tak), Q22 (Fu Nam) and Q23 (Tak Ming).	<u>Item (b)</u> The view is noted.
				(c) Provisional recommendation has not solved the issue of the dumbbell shape of the boundary of Q13 (Kwan Po) spanning Wan Po Road.	<u>Item (c)</u> The EAC must adhere to its working principles to reduce the number of DCCAs affected by proposing to combine La Cite Noble and Tseung Kwan O Plaza and its adjoining part to create Q13 (Kwan Po) for maintaining the projected population of Q06 (Po Yee) and Q14 (Nam On) within the statutory permissible range. The shape of a DCCA is a factor of consideration but, to a certain extent, the decision depends on the population distribution and geographical factors.
				(d) Q22 (Fu Nam) is split into two areas by Q21 (Hau Tak) and re-delineation of the boundary is suggested in 2019.	<u>Item (d)</u> In drawing up the delineation proposals, the EAC has strictly adhered to the statutory criteria under the EACO and its working principles. The recommendations were made on the basis of the projected population, existing constituency boundaries and the relevant local factors. The EAC will continue to adhere to the above in future delineation exercises.
				(e) Supports the provisional recommendations on Q04 (Hang Hau East), Q05 (Hang Hau West), Q15 (Hong King), Q16 (Tsui Lam), Q17 (Po Lam), Q18 (Yan Ying), Q19 (Wan Hang), Q20 (King	<u>Item (e)</u> The supporting view is noted.

Item No.	DCCAs	No.*		Representations	EAC's views
		W	O		
				Lam), Q24 (Sheung Tak), Q25 (Kwong Ming), Q26 (Wan Po North) and Q27 (Wan Po South) as they are in line with the EAC's statutory criteria and working principles.	
3	Q01 – Sai Kung Central  Q03 – Sai Kung Islands	1	-	<p>Proposes to transfer Sha Ha Village from Q01 (Sai Kung Central) to Q03 (Sai Kung Islands) because:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Sha Ha Village is several hundred years old, being one of the “Ten Villages” (拾鄉) [Note]. It had a school named “Tai Wan Shui Ying Ten Villages School” (大環萃英拾鄉學校) a hundred years ago and the “Ten Villages Union” (拾鄉協會) is a registered incorporation; and</li> <li>• Q03 (Sai Kung Islands) has insufficient population. It does not help much by transferring Sha Ha Village to Q01 (Sai Kung Central).</li> </ul> <p>[Note] Ten Villages (拾鄉) includes: Shan Liu Village, Sha Ha Village, Tai Wan Village, Nam A Village, Long Keng Village, Wo Liu Village, O Tau Village, Wong Chuk Wan Village, Ngong Wo Village and Tso Wo Hang Village.</p>	<p>This proposal is <b>not accepted</b> because:</p> <p>(i) the projected population of Q03 (Sai Kung Islands) will fall within the statutory permissible range. According to the established working principles, adjustment to its existing boundary is not required; and</p> <p>(ii) the projected population of Q01 (Sai Kung Central) (11,755) will be below the statutory permissible lower limit (-30.71%) and by transferring Sha Ha Village from Q01 (Sai Kung Central) to Q03 (Sai Kung Islands), the projected population of Q01 (Sai Kung Central) will further deviate from the statutory permissible lower limit.</p>
4	Q06 – Po Yee  Q07 – Wai King	2	-	<p>Object to transferring The Wings II from Q07 (Wai King) to Q06 (Po Yee) for the benefit of future development of Q06 (Po Yee) and the fair distribution of resources.</p>	<p>These representations are <b>not accepted</b> because:</p> <p>(i) The Wings II is a newly completed estate. Geographically, it is on the opposite side of the road in Bauhinia Garden in Q06 (Po Yee) and is quite far away from Ocean Shores in Q07 (Wai King), the land in the middle of the areas has no projected population;</p>

<i>Item No.</i>	<i>DCCAs</i>	<i>No.*</i>		<i>Representations</i>	<i>EAC's views</i>
		<i>W</i>	<i>O</i>		
					<p>(ii) there is no objective information and justification to prove that the representations are clearly better than the provisional recommendations in terms of preserving community identities and local ties;</p> <p>(iii) the delineation proposal must be based on objective data of the population distribution. Arrangements on district administration matters are not the relevant factors of consideration; and</p> <p>(iv) there are views supporting the delineation proposal for Q07 (Wai King) (please see item 7).</p>
5	Q06 – Po Yee  Q12 – Fu Kwan  Q13 – Kwan Po  Q14 – Nam On	-	1	Objects to transferring La Cite Noble from Q14 (Nam On) to Q13 (Kwan Po) and proposes to re-delineate the boundaries of Q06 (Po Yee) and Q12 (Fu Kwan) into three DCCAs.	This proposal is <b>not accepted</b> because one of the aims of the provisional recommendations is to resolve the problem of the projected population of Q14 (Nam On) exceeding the statutory permissible range. If La Cite Noble is retained in Q14 (Nam On), the projected population of the DCCA (23,501) will exceed the statutory permissible upper limit (+38.53%). The proposal made in the representation would not solve this problem.
6	Q06 – Po Yee  Q13 – Kwan Po  Q14 – Nam On  Q22 – Fu Nam	1	-	(a) Proposes to transfer the area located in the south of Po Yap Road in front of Tseung Kwan O Plaza from Q13 (Kwan Po) to Q06 (Po Yee) or Q27 (Wan Po South).	<p><u>Item (a)</u>                      This proposal is <b>not accepted</b> because the EAC must adhere to the Administration's population forecast as at 30 June 2015 in delineating the constituency boundaries. The area mentioned in the representation has no projected population.</p>

<i>Item No.</i>	<i>DCCAs</i>	<i>No.*</i>		<i>Representations</i>	<i>EAC's views</i>
		<i>W</i>	<i>O</i>		
	Q27 – Wan Po South			(b) Proposes to transfer East Point City from Q14 (Nam On) to Q22 (Fu Nam) and to take up Residence Oasis from the latter, to improve the shape of the DCCA.	<u>Item (b)</u> This proposal is <b>not accepted</b> because the projected population of Q22 (Fu Nam) will fall within the statutory permissible range. According to the established working principles, adjustment to its existing boundary is not required.
7	Q07 – Wai King	13	-	<p>Support the delineation of a DCCA (i.e. Q07 (Wai King)) solely for Ocean Shores.</p> <p>Six representations consider that the estate is a middle class housing estate and should not be included in a DCCA mixing with public housing estates or housing estates under home ownership schemes. If the estate mixes with other private housing estates in a DCCA, the resources would be diluted. The estate delineated into an independent DCCA would make resources more evenly distributed.</p> <p>Four representations consider that there were too many people in the same DCCA in the past and resources were not sufficiently distributed.</p> <p>Three representations consider that there were too many people in the same DCCA in the past and voters' interest to vote was weakened since they needed to wait for a long time during polling.</p>	The supporting views are noted.

Item No.	DCCAs	No.*		Representations	EAC's views
		W	O		
8	Q08 – Do Shin	1	-	Supports the provisional recommendation on Q08 (Do Shin) because the contact between the residents of Metro Town and DC member of the DCCA could be strengthened.	The supporting view is noted.
9	Q08 – Do Shin Q10 – Choi Kin	1	-	Proposes to transfer Kin Ching House and Kin Hei House of Kin Ming Estate from Q10 (Choi Kin) to Q08 (Do Shin) to even out the population in these two DCCAs so that the residents' concerns could be addressed by the DC member of the DCCA.	This proposal is <b>not accepted</b> because:  (i) the projected population of Q10 (Choi Kin) will fall within the statutory permissible range. According to the established working principles, adjustment to its existing boundary is not required; and  (ii) there is a view supporting the delineation proposal for Q08 (Do Shin) (please see item 8).
10	Q08 – Do Shin Q09 – Kin Ming Q10 – Choi Kin Q13 – Kwan Po Q23 – Tak Ming	1	-	(a) Proposes:  (i) to transfer Kin Ching House and Kin Hei House of Kin Ming Estate from Q10 (Choi Kin) to Q09 (Kin Ming) to facilitate the DC member to serve the residents of Kin Ming Estate; or  (ii) to transfer one block from Kin Ming Estate to Q08 (Do Shin) to even out the populations of all DCCAs in Tiu Keng Leng.	<u>Item (a)(i)</u> This proposal is <b>not accepted</b> because:  (i) the projected population of Q10 (Choi Kin) will fall within the statutory permissible range. According to the established working principles, adjustment to its existing boundary is not required;  (ii) after the proposed adjustment, the projected population of Q09 (Kin Ming) (21,255) will exceed the statutory permissible upper limit (+25.29%); and  (iii) the delineation proposal must be based on objective data of the population distribution. Arrangements on district administration matters are not

<i>Item No.</i>	<i>DCCAs</i>	<i>No.*</i>		<i>Representations</i>	<i>EAC's views</i>
		<i>W</i>	<i>O</i>		
					<p>the relevant factors of consideration.</p> <p><u>Item (a)(ii)</u> This proposal is <b>not accepted</b> because:</p> <p>(i) the buildings of Kin Ming Estate are now in Q09 (Kin Ming) and Q10 (Choi Kin). The projected population of Q10 (Choi Kin) will fall within the statutory permissible range. According to the established working principles, adjustment to its existing boundary is not required;</p> <p>(ii) according to the EAC's provisional recommendations, the projected population of Q08 (Do Shin) (15,314) will fall within the statutory permissible range (-9.73%), similar to that of Q09 (Kin Ming) (16,592). Therefore, there is no need to absorb the buildings of Kin Ming Estate in Q09 (Kin Ming); and</p> <p>(iii) there is a view supporting the delineation proposal for Q08 (Do Shin) (please see item 8).</p>
				<p>(b) Proposes to transfer Maritime Bay from Q23 (Tak Ming) to Q13 (Kwan Po) because:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Maritime Bay has closer community ties with La Cite Noble in Q13 (Kwan Po). Both are private housing estate and their shopping malls are inter-connected. Maritime Bay is</li> </ul>	<p><u>Item (b)</u> This proposal is <b>not accepted</b> because the projected population of Q23 (Tak Ming) will fall within the statutory permissible range. According to the established working principles, adjustment to its existing boundary is not required.</p>

<i>Item No.</i>	<i>DCCAs</i>	<i>No.*</i>		<i>Representations</i>	<i>EAC's views</i>
		<i>W</i>	<i>O</i>		
				<p>geographically relatively remote from Ming Tak Estate and Hin Ming Court; and</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>the proposal could even out the population in these two DCCAs.</li> </ul>	
11	Q21 – Hau Tak	1	-	Proposes to rename Q21 (Hau Tak) as “Chung Tak” because Hau Tak Estate and Chung Ming Court are included in the DCCA.	This proposal is <b>not accepted</b> because its current name has been used since 1999 and the majority of the public are used to this name. Moreover, no adjustment has been made to its boundary and change of the DCCA name may cause confusion to the public.
12	Q26 – Wan Po North  Q27 – Wan Po South	1	-	Supports the provisional recommendations on Q26 (Wan Po North) and Q27 (Wan Po South) because the projected population of Q27 (Wan Po South) (including the newly created Q26 (Wan Po North)) in 2015 would exceed the statutory permissible upper limit, therefore, the creation of a new DCCA is required to absorb the population in excess of the permissible range.	The supporting view is noted.