

**Appendix II - S**

**Kwai Tsing 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	1	-	(a) Supports the provisional recommendations on all DCCAs in the district because they are in line with the EAC's statutory criteria and working principles.	<u>Items (a) and (b)</u> The supporting views are noted.
				(b) Supports the provisional recommendation on S07 (Shek Yam). Taking into account the community integrity, the provisional recommendation on S07 (Shek Yam) is more feasible.	
				(c) Objects to another representation proposing to transfer the villages from S22 (Greenfield) to S25 (Shing Hong), because three villages, among them, use Fung Shue Wo Road as the road access. There is a lack of local ties between the villages and Cheung Hong Estate in S25 (Shing Hong).	<u>Item (c)</u> Withdrawal of the relevant representation is noted. Further consideration by the EAC is not required.
2	S01 – Kwai Hing  S02 – Kwai Shing East Estate  S09 – Shek Lei South	1	-	(a) Proposes to retain Block 10 of Shek Lei (II) Estate in S10 (Shek Lei North) because the provisional recommendation would disrupt the community integrity and cause confusion to the residents.	<u>Item (a)</u> This proposal is <b>accepted</b> because:  (i) the projected population of S10 (Shek Lei North) (21,330) will slightly exceed the statutory permissible upper limit (+25.74%); and  (ii) both Blocks 10 and 11 of Shek Lei (II) Estate are transit housing and the local ties can

\* 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>		
	S10 – Shek Lei North  S11 – Tai Pak Tin  S16 – Hing Fong				<p>be maintained by including these two blocks in the same DCCA.</p> <p>Taking into account local ties factor, the EAC agrees that at the present stage, the projected population of S10 (Shek Lei North) (21,330) should be allowed to slightly exceed the statutory permissible upper limit (+25.74%).</p>
				(b) Proposes to retain the original names “Shek Lei Extension” for S09 (Shek Lei South) and “Shek Lei” for S10 (Shek Lei North).	<p><u>Item (b)</u> This proposal is <b>not accepted</b> because:</p> <p>(i) adoption of the names of “Shek Lei South” and “Shek Lei North” can reflect the geographical location of the two DCCAs; and</p> <p>(ii) there is a view supporting the proposed names for “Shek Lei South” and “Shek Lei North” (please see item 7(a)).</p>
				(c) Proposes to retain Hutchison Estate in S11 (Tai Pak Tin) because the projected population of the DCCA is not large. The provisional recommendation is made without consulting the views of the residents of the relevant housing estate.	<p><u>Item (c)</u> This proposal is <b>accepted</b> because:</p> <p>(i) the projected population of S11 (Tai Pak Tin) (21,829) will slightly exceed the statutory permissible upper limit (+28.68%); and</p> <p>(ii) Hutchison Estate has, to a certain extent, some local ties with other buildings in S11 (Tai Pak Tin). On the contrary, Hutchison Estate is further away from S01 (Kwai Hing) geographically with industrial area in between.</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>Taking into account local ties and geographical factors, the EAC agrees that at the present stage, the projected population of S11 (Tai Pak Tin) (21,829) should be allowed to slightly exceed the statutory permissible upper limit (+28.68%). Consequential re-delineation of the boundary of S12 (Kwai Fong) can also be avoided, thus the number of affected DCCAs is reduced.</p>
				<p>(d) Proposes to retain Kwai Hong Court, Sun Kwai Hing Gardens and Kwai Chung Centre in S16 (Hing Fong) because:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>● Kwai Hong Court, Sun Kwai Hing Gardens and Kwai Chung Centre, in the past terms of DC, were included in different DCCAs (S01 (Kwai Hing), S02 (Kwai Shing East Estate) and S16 (Hing Fong)) without consistency, which make the electors difficult to adapt; and</li> <li>● Sun Kwai Hing Gardens and New Kwai Fong Gardens are located atop the stations developed by the MTR Corporation Limited. The provisional recommendation would divide the abovementioned estates into S01 (Kwai Hing) and S16 (Hing Fong) respectively. Two DC members instead of one would be involved in discussion with the MTR</li> </ul>	<p><u>Item (d)</u> This proposal is <b>not accepted</b> because:</p> <p>(i) if the constituency boundary of S16 (Hing Fong) remains unchanged, the projected population of the DCCA (24,957) will exceed the statutory permissible upper limit (+47.12%); and</p> <p>(ii) 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.</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>Corporation Limited on related matters, such arrangement would seriously undermine the local ties.</p>	
				<p>(e) Proposes to increase one polling station in Kwai Luen Estate because the location of Kwai Luen Estate is geographically remote, such proposed arrangement would enable electors to cast their votes more conveniently.</p>	<p><u>Item (e)</u> Arrangements on polling station are not the factors of consideration in delineating constituencies. The EAC has referred the view to the REO for follow-up.</p>
3	<p>S01 – Kwai Hing</p> <p>S02 – Kwai Shing East Estate</p> <p>S16 – Hing Fong</p>	264	-	<p>(a) Propose to retain Kwai Hong Court, Sun Kwai Hing Gardens and Kwai Chung Centre in S16 (Hing Fong). Details are as follows:</p> <p>All representations consider that Kwai Hong Court, Sun Kwai Hing Gardens and Kwai Chung Centre, in the past terms of DC, were included in different DCCAs (S01 (Kwai Hing), S02 (Kwai Shing East Estate) and S16 (Hing Fong)) without consistency, which make the electors difficult to adapt.</p> <p>253 representations consider that Sun Kwai Hing Gardens and New Kwai Fong Gardens are located atop the stations developed by the MTR Corporation Limited. The provisional recommendation would divide the abovementioned two estates into S01 (Kwai Hing) and S16 (Hing Fong) respectively. Two DC members instead of one would be involved in discussion with the MTR</p>	<p><u>Item (a)</u> Please see item 2(d).</p>

Item No.	DCCAs	No.*		Representations	EAC's views
		W	O		
				<p>Corporation Limited on related matters, such arrangement would seriously undermine the local ties.</p>	
				<p>(b) 11 representations further propose to transfer Kwai Luen Estate out of S16 (Hing Fong) because:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>● the proposal could strengthen the local ties of the private housing estates in the surrounding areas of Kwai Fong and Kwai Hing; and</li> <li>● since 2011, Kwai Luen Estate has been included in S16 (Hing Fong), the DC member concerned has been required to take care of matters covering both public and private housing estates in the DCCA. Kwai Luen Estate is located quite far away from the town centre of Kwai Fong. These factors have undermined the working efficiency due to increase in workload.</li> </ul>	<p><u>Item (b)</u> This proposal is <b>not accepted</b> because:</p> <p>(i) please see item 2(d); and</p> <p>(ii) if Kwai Luen Estate is transferred out of S16 (Hing Fong), and transferred to other DCCAs, S02 (Kwai Shing East Estate) or S18 (Kwai Shing West Estate), the latter projected population will exceed the statutory permissible upper limit:</p> <p>S02: 24,554, +44.74% S18: 24,555, +44.75%</p> <p>Therefore, the proposal is not feasible.</p>
4	<p>S01 – Kwai Hing</p> <p>S07 – Shek Yam</p> <p>S09 – Shek Lei South</p> <p>S10 – Shek Lei North</p>	1	-	<p>(a) Objects to the provisional recommendations on S07 (Shek Yam) and S11 (Tai Pak Tin):</p> <p>(i) proposes to retain Hutchison Estate in S11 (Tai Pak Tin) because lowering down the projected population of S11 (Tai Pak Tin) is not necessary; and</p> <p>(ii) proposes to transfer the buildings at the junction</p>	<p><u>Item (a)(i)</u> The proposed retention of Hutchison Estate in S11 (Tai Pak Tin) is <b>accepted</b> (please see item 2(c)).</p> <p><u>Item (a)(ii)</u> The proposed transfer of the buildings at the junction of Lei Muk Road and Tung Chi Street from S07 (Shek Yam) to S11 (Tai Pak Tin) is <b>not accepted</b> because:</p> <p>(i) the projected population of S07 (Shek Yam) (21,347) will</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>		
	S11 – Tai Pak Tin  S16 – Hing Fong  S24 – Cheung Hong  S25 – Shing Hong			of Lei Muk Road and Tung Chi Street from S07 (Shek Yam) to S11 (Tai Pak Tin) because S11 (Tai Pak Tin) also covers part of Tai Pak Tin Street and preserving the integrity of S07 (Shek Yam) is not necessary.	slightly exceed the statutory permissible upper limit (+25.84%);  (ii) the projected population of S11 (Tai Pak Tin) (21,829) will exceed the statutory permissible upper limit (+28.68%). If one of the buildings of Shek Yam Estate located at the junction of Lei Muk Road and Tung Chi Street (say Chi Shek House) is transferred from S07 (Shek Yam) to S11 (Tai Pak Tin), after the proposed adjustment, the projected population of S11 (Tai Pak Tin) (23,940) will further deviate from the statutory permissible upper limit (+41.12%); and  (iii) there is a view supporting the delineation proposal for S07 (Shek Yam) (please see item 1(b)).
				(b) Proposes to retain the original names “Shek Lei Extension” for S09 (Shek Lei South) and “Shek Lei” for S10 (Shek Lei North), because Block 10 of Shek Lei (II) Estate is transit housing, the residents would move out in the future. Therefore, it is not necessary to rename S09 (Shek Lei South) and S10 (Shek Lei North) as a result of re-delineation of boundaries.	<u>Item (b)</u> Please see item 2(b).
				(c) Proposes to retain Kwai Hong Court, Sun Kwai Hing Gardens and Kwai Chung Centre in S16 (Hing Fong), and to transfer the buildings located within the area	<u>Item (c)</u> This proposal is <b>not accepted</b> because:  (i) if the buildings located within the area between Hing Fong

Item No.	DCCAs	No.*		Representations	EAC's views
		W	O		
				<p>between Hing Fong Road and Ha Kwai Chung Village from S16 (Hing Fong) to other DCCAs for reducing the projected population of S16 (Hing Fong), because under the provisional recommendation, it is proposed to transfer some major housing areas (Kwai Hong Court, Sun Kwai Hing Gardens and Kwai Chung Centre) from S16 (Hing Fong) to S01 (Kwai Hing), and to transfer some buildings of Kwai Chung Estate (Chun Kwai House, Ha Kwai House, Chau Kwai House and Yan Kwai House) from S01 (Kwai Hing) to S06 (Kwai Chung South Estate). It would undermine the harmony of communities in S01 (Kwai Hing).</p>	<p>Road and Ha Kwai Chung Village are to be transferred out from S16 (Hing Fong), there will be consequential re-delineation of the boundary of the four adjacent DCCAs including S12 (Kwai Fong), S13 (Wah Lai), S15 (Cho Yiu) or S17 (Lai King). After the proposed adjustment, the projected population of these three DCCAs will exceed the statutory permissible upper limit:</p> <p>S12: 24,443, +44.09% S13: 23,446, +38.21% S15: 22,779, +34.28%</p> <p>Also, the abovementioned area is located far away from the four DCCAs. Some areas are separated by hill slopes or industrial areas, without having obvious community ties between them; and</p> <p>(ii) there is no objective information and justification to prove that the proposal made in the representation is clearly better than the provisional recommendation in terms of preserving community identities and local ties.</p>
				<p>(d) Proposes to transfer Hong Shing House and Hong On House of Cheung Hong Estate from S24 (Cheung Hong) to S25 (Shing Hong). The population of the latter DCCA would be within the statutory permissible range. It is not necessary to transfer Hong Ping House of Cheung Hong Estate to S25 (Shing Hong).</p>	<p><u>Item (d)</u> This proposal is <b>not accepted</b> because:</p> <p>(i) if only Hong Shing House and Hong On House are transferred from S24 (Cheung Hong) to S25 (Shing Hong), the projected population of S24 (Cheung Hong) and S25 (Shing Hong) will be within</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>the statutory permissible range:</p> <p>S24: 16,506, -2.70% S25: 14,192, -16.34%</p> <p>However, in comparison, under the EAC's provisional recommendation, the projected population will be more evenly distributed:</p> <p>S24: 15,560, -8.28% S25: 15,138, -10.76%</p> <p>(ii) geographically, Hong Shing House, Hong On House and Hong Ping House were built side by side. Transferring them together to S25 (Shing Hong) can preserve the local ties of the three housing blocks.</p>
5	S01 – Kwai Hing  S11 – Tai Pak Tin	1	-	<p>Proposes to retain Hutchison Estate in S11 (Tai Pak Tin) because:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>● Hutchison Estate is closer to S11 (Tai Pak Tin) in respect of geographical factors, daily life of residents and participation in community activities. On the contrary, S01 (Kwai Hing) is further away geographically and such relationship is quite different from S01 (Kwai Hing) which mainly comprises public housing estates. Residents of Hutchison Estate would find it difficult to adapt. If Hutchison Estate is transferred out of S11 (Tai Pak Tin), it is likely that some elderly residents would be deprived of the original welfares; and</li> <li>● the residents of Hutchison Estate are used to casting their</li> </ul>	Please see item 2(c).



<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>votes in the polling station of Hong Kong Sheng Kung Hui Lady MacLehose Centre at Wo Yi Hop Road for many years. If Hutchison Estate is transferred to S01 (Kwai Hing), the residents, particularly the elderly, would be required to go to cast their votes in other polling stations. Their desires to vote would be affected.</p>	
6	<p>S01 – Kwai Hing</p> <p>S11 – Tai Pak Tin</p>	1	-	<p>Proposes to retain Hutchison Estate in S11 (Tai Pak Tin) because:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>● Hutchison Estate is closer to S11 (Tai Pak Tin) in respect of the daily life of residents and participation in community activities. On the contrary, such relationship is quite different from S01 (Kwai Hing) which mainly comprises public housing estates. Residents of Hutchison Estate would find it difficult to adapt;</li> <li>● currently, Hutchison Estate, along with Shek Yam, Shek Lei, Shek Lei Extension and On Yam belong to Kwai Chung North East Police Division. Under the provisional recommendation, Hutchison Estate would belong to Kwai Chung West Police Division, causing disruption to the relationship maintained with those government officials who familiarise themselves with the matters related to Hutchison Estate, e.g. HAD and Police Public Relations Office. If Hutchison Estate is transferred out of S11 (Tai Pak Tin), the residents would be unable to continue to seek assistance</li> </ul>	Please see item 2(c).

<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>from those officials and it is likely that the residents would be deprived of the original welfares; and</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>the residents of Hutchison Estate are used to casting their votes at the polling station located in Hong Kong Sheng Kung Hui Lady MacLehose Centre at Wo Yi Hop Road for many years. If Hutchison Estate is transferred to S01 (Kwai Hing), the residents would be required to go to cast their votes in other polling stations. Their desires to vote would be affected.</li> </ul>	
7	S09 – Shek Lei South  S10 – Shek Lei North  S24 – Cheung Hong  S25 – Shing Hong	-	1	<p>(a) Supports the names proposed for S09 (Shek Lei South) and S10 (Shek Lei North) as it is easier for the residents to differentiate the two DCCAs.</p> <p>(b) Proposes to transfer Wah Woon House and Wah Suen House of Ching Wah Court from S24 (Cheung Hong) to S25 (Shing Hong) because:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>the proposal made in the representation is considered better than the provisional recommendation and it could preserve the integrity of Cheung Hong Estate; and</li> <li>Ching Wah Court has a flyover connecting with S25 (Shing Hong) which could facilitate the DC member concerned working in the DCCA.</li> </ul>	<p><u>Item (a)</u> The supporting view is noted.</p> <p><u>Item (b)</u> This proposal is <b>not accepted</b> because:</p> <p>(i) transferring Wah Woon House and Wah Suen House of Ching Wah Court from S24 (Cheung Hong) to S25 (Shing Hong) will affect the community integrity of Ching Wah Court;</p> <p>(ii) taking into consideration the geographical separation, retaining Wah Woon House and Wah Suen House of Ching Wah Court in S24 (Cheung Hong) is more appropriate; and</p> <p>(iii) the delineation proposal must be based on objective data of the population distribution. Arrangements on district</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>		
					administration matters are not the relevant factors of consideration.
8	S09 – Shek Lei South  S10 – Shek Lei North	3	-	(a) Propose to retain Block 10 of Shek Lei (II) Estate in S10 (Shek Lei North) for preserving the community integrity and facilitating district management.	<u>Item (a)</u> Please see item 2(a).
				(b) Propose to retain the original names “Shek Lei Extension” for S09 (Shek Lei South) and “Shek Lei” for S10 (Shek Lei North), taking into account the local integrity and facilitating district management. It is easy for the residents to differentiate the two DCCAs by the original names “Shek Lei” and “Shek Lei Extension” and it could also promote the harmony among residents of the two DCCAs.	<u>Item (b)</u> Please see item 2(b).
9	S16 – Hing Fong  S24 – Cheung Hong  S25 – Shing Hong	-	1	(a) Proposes to increase one polling station in Kwai Luen Estate because there is a long distance between the polling station located at Kwai Fong Community Hall and Kwai Luen Estate. The desires of residents of Kwai Luen Estate to vote would be affected.	<u>Item (a)</u> Arrangements on polling station are not the factors of consideration in delineating constituencies. The EAC has referred the view to the REO for follow-up.
				(b) Proposes to change the name of S24 (Cheung Hong) to “Wah Hong” or “Hong Wah” because S24 (Cheung Hong) comprises a few blocks of Cheung Hong Estate and Ching Wah Court. Such proposed change makes reference to the name of S25 (Shing Hong) as the DCCA comprises a few blocks of	<u>Item (b)</u> This proposal is <b>not accepted</b> because the current DCCA name has been used since 1994. The majority of the public are used to this DCCA name and change of the DCCA name may cause confusion to the public.

Item No.	DCCAs	No.*		Representations	EAC's views
		W	O		
				Cheung Hong Estate and Ching Shing Court.	
10	S22 – Greenfield S24 – Cheung Hong S25 – Shing Hong	196	2	<p>(a) Propose to retain Hong Shing House, Hong On House and Hong Ping House of Cheung Hong Estate in S24 (Cheung Hong). Details are as follows:</p> <p>Seven representations consider that the proposed retention of the abovementioned three housing blocks in S24 (Cheung Hong) would be convenient to the residents, or consider that the provisional recommendation would cause inconvenience to the residents or to the elderlies.</p> <p>Two representations consider that the provisional recommendation has been made without consulting the residents of the abovementioned three housing blocks.</p> <p>Two representations consider that the original relationship concerning management matters should be maintained.</p> <p>Two representations consider that the residents of the abovementioned three housing blocks are closer to S24 (Cheung Hong) in respect of their participation in community activities. On the contrary, they are relatively far away from S25 (Shing Hong). They also consider that the provisional recommendation would split up “Cheung Hong (I) Estate”.</p>	<p><b>Item (a)</b> This proposal is <b>not accepted</b> because:</p> <p>(i) if the constituency boundary of S25 (Shing Hong) remains unchanged, the projected population of the DCCA (12,225) will be below the statutory permissible lower limit (-27.94%);</p> <p>(ii) Hong Shing House, Hong On House and Hong Ping House of Cheung Hong Estate in S24 (Cheung Hong) belong to the same public housing estate as the other housing blocks of Cheung Hong Estate in S25 (Shing Hong) which were inter-connected with pedestrian road crossing facilities, without obvious difference in local ties and geographical characteristics. Therefore, the EAC proposes to transfer the above housing blocks from S24 (Cheung Hong) to S25 (Shing Hong) which will not affect the local ties of the housing blocks concerned in Cheung Hong Estate; and</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.</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>One representation considers that the provisional recommendation would bring great nuisance to the residents. For instance, issues may be raised regarding the allocation of facilities amongst two phases of Cheung Hong Estate, whether by adopting 5:5 ratio according to two equal share of two phases, or 6:3:4 ratio based on the number of housing blocks. Such allocation issues would cause conflict amongst the residents and consultative representatives of the estate. Thus the original relationship of "Cheung Hong (I) Estate" should be maintained.</p> <p>One representation considers the residents getting along well with the environment in S24 (Cheung Hong) which facilitates their operation.</p> <p>One representation considers that the provisional recommendation would cause inconvenience to the residents who are not familiar with S25 (Shing Hong) and may not adapt to it.</p> <p>One representation considers that the provisional recommendation would cause difficulties in management.</p> <p>One representation considers that the existing management in S24 (Cheung Hong) is good enough, thus separate management is not necessary to avoid wastage of public money.</p> <p>One representation considers</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>that the location of the abovementioned three housing blocks is far away from S25 (Shing Hong), while these three housing blocks have been included in S24 (Cheung Hong) for 20 years. The residents are used to this arrangement.</p> <p>One representation considers that the elderly residents of the abovementioned three housing blocks would find it inconvenient to go to the other housing blocks located far apart in S25 (Shing Hong).</p> <p>One representation considers that the abovementioned three housing blocks have been included in S24 (Cheung Hong) for 20 years with steady development, while the DC member of S25 (Shing Hong) could not understand the needs of the residents of these three housing blocks.</p> <p>One representation considers that the provisional recommendation makes the residents difficult to adapt.</p> <p>One representation considers that the provisional recommendation would significantly increase the workload of the DC member of S25 (Shing Hong).</p> <p>One representation considers that the residents of the abovementioned three housing blocks often share most of the facilities with other housing blocks in S24 (Cheung Hong), thus they should be taken care</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>of by the same DC member.</p> <p>One representation considers that the provisional recommendation would require the residents of the abovementioned three housing blocks to travel longer distance with slopes to seek assistance from the DC member.</p> <p>One representation considers that the provisional recommendation would increase the area of S25 (Shing Hong) too much.</p> <p>One representation considers that the residents of the abovementioned three housing blocks are unclear about the provisional recommendation due to lack of consultation and low transparency. It suggests more public consultation forums and briefing sessions be conducted for residents' consideration beforehand.</p> <p>One representation considers that:</p> <p>(i) Cheung Hong Estate comprises 13 housing blocks and was occupied between 1979 and 1986. According to intake period and geographical distribution, Cheung Hong Estate is generally divided as "Cheung Hong Estate Phase 1" and "Cheung Hong Estate Phase 2";</p> <p>(ii) "Cheung Hong Estate Phase 1" in total comprises nine housing blocks</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>(including Hong Wing House, Hong Fu House, Hong Wah House, Hong Kwai House, Hong Wo House, Hong Tai House, Hong Ping House, Hong On House and Hong Shing House);</p> <p>(iii) “Cheung Hong Estate Phase 2” in total comprises four housing blocks (including Hong Fung House, Hong Cheung House, Hong Shun House and Hong Mei House);</p> <p>(iv) the nine housing blocks of “Cheung Hong Estate Phase 1” were built side by side, the distance between each housing block is around 100 meters. However, for “Cheung Hong Estate Phase 2” and its closest housing block Hong Shing House of “Cheung Hong Estate Phase 1” (i.e. under the provisional recommendation, one of the housing blocks to be transferred from S24 (Cheung Hong) to S25 (Shing Hong)), their distance is at least 400 meters, and also there is a nearly 300 meters long slope in between. Therefore, considering the geographical distribution, the provisional recommendation is unreasonable;</p> <p>(v) in the estate management aspect, “Cheung Hong</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>Estate Phase 1” mainly consists of Double H, Old Slab and Single H building types, while “Cheung Hong Estate Phase 2” consists of Trident building type. In respect of the building structure, flat areas, supporting facilities and population characteristics of the families, there are certain differences between “Cheung Hong Estate Phase 1” and “Cheung Hong Estate Phase 2”. Therefore, the residents of “Cheung Hong Estate Phase 1” and “Cheung Hong Estate Phase 2” would have different demands for the estate management. In addition, the estate facilities including car parks, food stalls and markets are clearly separated into “Cheung Hong Estate Phase 1” and “Cheung Hong Estate Phase 2”;</p> <p>(vi) the community identity of Cheung Hong Estate has been recognised as “Cheung Hong Estate Phase 1” and “Cheung Hong Estate Phase 2” for nearly 30 years. Regardless of the demand of residents for district services, the management service by the Housing Department, transportation and community facilities are also clearly separated into “Cheung Hong Estate Phase 1” and “Cheung</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>Hong Estate Phase 2”;</p> <p>(vii) since the 1994 DC Election, “Cheung Hong Estate Phase 1” (totally nine housing blocks) has been delineated in S24 (Cheung Hong) and “Cheung Hong Estate Phase 2” (totally four housing blocks) has been delineated in S25 (Shing Hong). The facilities and resources for engineering projects have been distributed to the two phases of Cheung Hong Estate by the Management Advisory Committee. The provisional recommendation would bring great nuisance to the residents. For instance, issues would be raised regarding the allocation of facilities amongst two phases of Cheung Hong Estate, whether by adopting 5:5 ratio according to two equal share of two phases, or 6:3:4 ratio based on the number of housing blocks. Such allocation issues would cause conflict amongst the residents and consultative representatives of the estate; and</p> <p>(viii) the proportion of elderlies is relatively high at Cheung Hong Estate. The adaptability of the elderlies is comparatively low relating to re-delineation of the</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>		
				boundary. The provisional recommendation would cause confusion to the elderlies, or may even cause conflict amongst the residents.	
				<p>(b) One representation proposes to transfer the villages from S22 (Greenfield) (including Chung Mei Lo Uk Village, Lutheran New Village, Tsing Fai San Tsuen, Lam Tin Resite Village, Yim Tin Kok Resite Village, Tai Wong Ha Resite Village and Tsing Yi Hui) to S25 (Shing Hong) because:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>● village houses are different from public housing in respect of housing types. The population distribution of the former is not so concentrated and re-delineation of the boundary would have less impact on the local community; and</li> <li>● Greenview Villa near S22 (Greenfield) under My Home Purchase Scheme would be completed in 2015. The population of the DCCA would be increased by approximately 3,000. The projected population of S22 (Greenfield) would be approximately 18,000 (after deducting the population of the abovementioned villages being transferred from S22 (Greenfield) to S25 (Shing Hong)). It would still be within the statutory</li> </ul>	<p><u>Item (b)</u> Withdrawal of the relevant representation is noted. Further consideration by the EAC 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>permissible range. In addition, the proposal made in the representation could provide a balanced population distribution in S22 (Greenfield), S24 (Cheung Hong) and S25 (Shing Hong).</p> <p>(Note : The relevant proposal has been withdrawn.)</p>	