

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 CR/14/5/DC-15  
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>

5 November 2014

The Honourable C Y Leung, GBM, GBS, JP  
The Chief Executive  
Hong Kong Special Administrative Region  
People's Republic of China  
Chief Executive's Office  
Hong Kong

Dear Mr Leung,


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 2015.

Yours sincerely,



---

Barnabas Wah FUNG, Chairman



---

Lawrence Ying-kam LOK, Member



---

Fanny Mui-ching CHEUNG, Member

## ABBREVIATIONS

CMAB	Constitutional and Mainland Affairs Bureau
CE	Chief Executive
DC, DCs	District Council, District Councils
DCCA, DCCAs	district council constituency area, district council constituency areas
DCO	District Councils Ordinance
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
LegCo	Legislative Council
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

## 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”) (Cap 541), 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 6 November 2011, the EAC should submit its report and recommendations to the CE by 5 November 2014.

1.3 Under section 21 of the EACO, the CE-in-Council shall consider the Commission’s report as soon as practicable after receiving the report. Subject to the CE-in-Council’s approval and the completion of the negative vetting procedure of the Legislative Council (“LegCo”), the boundaries and names proposed by the Commission would be adopted for the DC ordinary election to be held in November 2015.

## **Section 2 : Increase in the number of elected seats and adjustment to the district boundaries**

1.4 Delineation of the DC constituencies is based on the total number of elected seats for the next DC ordinary election and the existing district boundaries.

1.5 After undertaking an overall review on the number of elected seats for each DC having regard to the population forecast in Hong Kong in mid-2015, the Administration proposed to increase 19 elected seats in nine DCs for the fifth-term DCs as follows:

- (a) one additional seat for each DC in Tsuen Wan and North;
- (b) two additional seats for each DC in Sham Shui Po, Kowloon City, Kwun Tong, Yau Tsim Mong and Sha Tin;
- (c) three additional seats for the Sai Kung DC; and
- (d) four additional seats for the Yuen Long DC.

1.6 The Administration consulted the LegCo Panel on Constitutional Affairs on 20 May 2013 on the proposed addition of 19 elected seats for the 2015 DC ordinary election. A motion was moved at

the LegCo meeting on 6 November 2013 for the approval of the District Councils Ordinance (Amendment of Schedule 3) Order 2013 to implement this proposal. The Order was approved by the LegCo on the same day and published in the Gazette on 8 November 2013.

1.7 After consultation, the Administration also proposed adjustment to the boundaries of the Eastern and Wan Chai Districts by transferring the Tin Hau and Victoria Park district council constituency areas (“DCCAs”) from the Eastern District to the Wan Chai District and a corresponding amendment to the number of elected seats of the two DCs from the fifth term DCs onwards (including for the 2015 DC ordinary election). A resolution to implement the proposal by the District Councils Ordinance (Amendment of Schedules 1 and 3) Order 2013 was passed by the LegCo on 22 January 2014 and the approved Order was published in the Gazette on 24 January 2014.

1.8 Following the LegCo’s approval for the two Orders as mentioned in paras 1.6 and 1.7 above, the total number of elected seats for the 2015 DC ordinary election was increased by 19 from 412 to 431 and the boundaries of the Eastern and Wan Chai Districts were adjusted to effect the transfer of the Tin Hau and Victoria Park DCCAs from the Eastern District to the Wan Chai District. Accordingly, the total number of DCCAs to be delineated by the EAC was increased to 431 as one DC member is to be elected from each constituency. The number of DCCAs to be delineated by district is set out in **Appendix I**.

### **Section 3 : Scope of the Report**

1.9 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.

## CHAPTER 2

### THE DELINEATION EXERCISE

#### Section 1 : Statutory Criteria for Delineation

2.1 The Commission drew up its recommendations in accordance with the criteria stipulated under section 20 of the EACO. These criteria are recapitulated below:

- (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 may depart from strict application of (a) and (b) above only where it appears that one or more of the considerations in (c) above render such a departure necessary or desirable.
  
- (e) 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 (“DCO”) (Cap. 547) respectively.

2.2 For this delineation exercise, the population quota was 16,964 (7,311,300, being the projected population of Hong Kong as at 30 June 2015 provided by the Administration (see paragraph 2.5 below) divided by 431, being the total number of elected members to be returned to DCs in the 2015 DC ordinary election after the addition of 19 elected seats, i.e.  $7,311,300 \div 431$ ). Consequently, the permissible range of deviation from the population quota (referred to in paragraph 2.1 (b) above) of a DCCA is from 12,723 to 21,205.

## **Section 2 : Working Principles**

2.3 The Commission also adopted a set of working principles for the delineation exercise:

- (a) For existing DCCAs where the population falls within the



permissible range of 12,723 to 21,205, their boundaries will be maintained as far as possible.

- (b) For existing DCCAs where the population falls outside the permissible range, but the situation was allowed for the 2011 DC election and the justifications continue to be valid, their boundaries will be maintained as far as possible.
- (c) Other than (b) above, for existing DCCAs where the population falls outside the permissible range, adjustments will be made to their boundaries (unless there are justifications for maintaining their boundaries on grounds of community identities, preservation of local ties and/or physical features) and also those of adjacent DCCAs so that their populations stay within the permissible range. 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 will be adopted, otherwise the one with the least departure from the population quota will be used.
- (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 features, roads or residential settlements in the DCCAs after consultation with the relevant District

Officers (“DOs”) of the Home Affairs Department (“HAD”).

- (f) The Commission’s provisional recommendations on the code references of districts and constituency areas are 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 is to be prefixed by the alphabetical reference for the district and starts from the first numeral. The number “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 be 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 code reference does not have any bearing on the delineation of DCCA boundaries but, with the adoption of this system, it is hoped that any one who consults the maps would find it easier to understand them and locate the constituency areas. These methods have been adopted since 1994 and the public should be generally familiar with them.
- (g) Where the constituency boundaries have to continue into the sea to align with the district boundary, the DCCA boundary

lines are, as far as possible, drawn perpendicular to the district boundary lines on the sea.

### **Section 3 : Working Partners**

2.4 The EAC Secretariat, staffed by designated personnel of the Registration and Electoral Office (“REO”), assisted the Commission in carrying out the exercise.

2.5 As in the past, 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 and Mainland Affairs Bureau (“CMAB”), Census and Statistics Department, Housing Department (“HD”), Lands Department (“LandsD”), Rating and Valuation Department, the HAD and REO. To ensure that the forecasts can cater for the 2015 DC ordinary election, the AHSG was requested to project the population distribution figures as at a date as close to the election date as practicable. For this reason, AHSG drew reference to the practice in past exercises and provided a population forecast as at 30 June 2015, assuming that the DC ordinary election would be held in November 2015.

2.6 The LandsD rendered assistance in producing maps showing projected population figures and district and DCCA boundaries and the boundary descriptions for use by the Commission in the boundary delineation exercise.

2.7 According to the statutory criteria, the EAC needs to have regard to the community identities, preservation of local ties, and the physical features (such as the size, shape, accessibility and development) of the relevant areas when formulating its recommendations on the boundaries of DCCAs. In order to have a better understanding of the community characteristics and local features, where necessary, the EAC invited the DOs to provide factual information in relation to community identities, local ties, and physical features and developments in the DCCAs based on their knowledge about their respective districts. The information was taken into consideration when formulating proposals for delineation of boundaries.

2.8 The Information Services Department (“ISD”) gave 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***

2.9 The AHSG held its first meeting in May 2013 to work out the

method to be adopted for compiling the data and the work schedule. In late December 2013 the forecast population figures were made available, on the basis of which the LandsD prepared the maps for each district. When these maps were ready, the EAC Secretariat proceeded to work on the preliminary proposals for delineation of boundaries.

### *Site visits*

2.10 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 staff of the EAC Secretariat conducted site visits as required to identify the unique physical features, transport facilities and accessibility of the DCCAs concerned. Relevant information and topographical facts so gathered were analysed and taken into account in drawing up the preliminary proposals.

### *Meetings to deliberate and formulate proposals*

2.11 When the staff of the EAC Secretariat had finalised their preliminary recommendations on the boundaries and names of the DCCAs, meetings were convened to present the proposals to the Commission for consideration with the aid of maps and photographs to facilitate better understanding of the local features and the environment of

the DCCAs concerned. Information gathered from site visits and provided by DOs was also submitted to the Commission for reference.

### ***Provisional proposal***

2.12 In the EAC's provisional recommendations, the boundaries of 111 DCCAs had to be changed and 24 DCCAs were renamed. The EAC allowed 21 DCCAs to exceed the permissible limits of the population quota for one reason or the other. The proposed boundaries and names of the DCCAs requiring adjustments and those allowed to exceed the permissible limits as well as the EAC's relevant considerations were set out in the consultative documents.

2.13 After the EAC had come up with the provisional recommendations on the boundaries of the DCCAs, the EAC Secretariat started to prepare for the launch of a public consultation exercise on the EAC's provisional proposal for the period from 26 June 2014 to 25 July 2014. Details of the provisional recommendations were contained in two volumes published for the public consultation exercise.

## **CHAPTER 3**

### **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 for the period from 26 June 2014 to 25 July 2014. 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 exercise was widely publicised through Announcements in the Public Interest on radio and TV, press releases, newspaper advertisements, posters and the Commission's website.

3.3 On the first day of the consultation period, i.e. 26 June 2014, 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 Three public forums were conducted from 7:00 p.m. to 9:00 p.m. on 7, 9 and 11 July 2014 at the Quarry Bay Community Hall, the Lai Chi Kok Community Hall and the Lung Hang Estate Community Centre respectively, where members of the public could 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 1,446 written representations. On the three days of the public forums, 104 persons turned up and 64 oral representations were received.

3.6 Among the representations received, there were 140 representations which supported the EAC's provisional recommendations. There were views in some representations that were not related to the delineation of boundaries or naming of the DCCAs but related to matters such as district boundaries, allocation of elected seats and designation/allocation of polling stations. Where the subject was related to delineation of district boundaries, the representations were referred to the HAD for consideration. For allocation of elected seats and related



matters, they were referred to the CMAB for reference. For matters related to polling stations, the EAC had requested the REO to take necessary follow-up action.

3.7 All the written representations are reproduced and organised by district in **Volume 3** of this report. Summaries of the written and oral representations are shown in **Appendix II** of this volume.

## CHAPTER 4

### WORK AFTER THE PUBLIC CONSULTATION

#### Section 1 : Deliberations and Observations

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

4.2 Some representations referred to some special physical features of individual areas which should be taken into account in the delineation exercise. Where required, the staff of the EAC Secretariat conducted site visits to appreciate and assess the arguments raised and explore the feasibility of the proposals given. To enable the EAC to thoroughly consider the representations and arrive at a fair and balanced recommendation, the information gathered from the site visits and the EAC Secretariat's analysis and observations were presented to the EAC with the aid of maps and photographs to show the relevant features.

4.3 As with past delineation exercises, the EAC has received both supporting and opposing representations on its provisional recommendations. When deliberating such cases, the EAC continued to adopt the relevant statutory criteria and working principles (see Chapter 2) to examine the merits on both sides in a prudent manner.

4.4 In the course of deliberation, the EAC adopted broadly the same approaches as with previous delineation exercises. Regarding the views expressed in the representations, the EAC noted the following issues and set out its observations so that the public can fully understand the factors that have been taken into consideration:

**(a) Deviation from the population quota**

The principle of “equal representation” (i.e. equal number of people should have equal number of representatives) is an important consideration in the delineation of constituency boundaries. Therefore, under the statutory criteria in the EACO for making recommendations as to the delineation of boundaries of DCCAs for a DC ordinary election, the projected population of each DCCA should be as near the population quota as practicable. However, given the unique situation of Hong Kong being a small and compact place with a dense population, which is distributed vertically, we need to achieve a sensible balance against the other criteria, i.e. community identities, preservation of local ties and the physical features of the relevant area. For these reasons, it is not practicable to strictly adhere to the population quota in every DCCA. Furthermore, in the context of an election, there is a need to have regard to the existing boundaries and keep the number of affected DCCAs in the delineation exercise to a minimum so that any impact or

disruption which will likely be caused to electors in coming elections can be reduced as far as practicable. Moreover, the existing boundaries of many DCCAs have been long-established and redrawing all the boundaries would unnecessarily upset local ties and generate controversies. Therefore, from a pragmatic point of view, it is neither practicable nor desirable to redraw the existing boundaries of all DCCAs for the sake of strict compliance with the requirement of population quota. Hence, where it is not practicable to ensure that the population in a DCCA is the same as the population quota, the EACO allows the population in a DCCA to deviate from the population quota within a 25% permissible range. The EACO further allows departure from the strict application of the above population requirements when considerations of community identity, preservation of local ties and the physical features of the relevant area render such departure necessary or desirable.

Given the above considerations, when embarking on a new delineation exercise, there is a reasonable and practical need to formulate proposals having regard to the existing DCCA boundaries, which have been drawn up in accordance with the same statutory criteria, and at the same time, to ensure that the boundaries continue to comply with the relevant criteria. If the constituency boundaries are substantially redrawn in every exercise, serious disruption to many well-established local communities as well as unnecessary confusion and complaints

among the affected electors may result. As such, there is a practical need and it has long been a long-established working principle of the EAC that existing DCCA boundaries should as far as possible be maintained if the projected population stays within the 25% permissible range. This working principle has worked well in past exercises and therefore should continue to be adopted in the present exercise.

There are representations suggesting re-delineation of the boundaries of some DCCAs for the sole purpose of bringing their populations (which are already within the permissible range) even closer to the population quota. With the above considerations, the EAC would seek to maintain the existing boundaries as far as practicable although these representations may potentially bring about improvement on the population distribution across the DCCAs within a District. Notwithstanding this, where a new DCCA is to be created or the boundaries of one or more DCCAs are to be re-delineated to accommodate neighbouring population changes, the EAC would take the opportunity to explore ways to achieve a smaller population deviation or a more even population distribution while ensuring that the populations of all the affected DCCAs stay within the permissible range and the extent of changes is kept to a minimum.

As explained above, the statutory criteria allow the population of a DCCA to go beyond the 25% permissible range if considerations of community identity, preservation of local ties and the physical features of the areas concerned render it necessary or desirable. To ensure that the boundary delineation exercise can be conducted in a systematic and orderly manner, the 25% permissible limit should in principle be strictly applied. Exceptions should be granted only in clear and well-justified cases. When considering whether an exception should be granted or not, the extent of deviation is obviously a relevant consideration. For example, where the percentage of deviation is substantial, re-delineation of boundaries is required unless there is very cogent and persuasive argument to justify otherwise. Even if a DCCA was allowed to exceed the limits in the last boundary delineation exercise, it does not necessarily mean that such departure should continue to be allowed in the present exercise, and the EAC will examine the case afresh to determine if there are viable means to reduce the deviation and/or to bring the projected population of the DCCA within the permissible range. On the other hand, if the departure from the permissible limits is only marginal and any change to the existing boundaries would unnecessarily upset long-established local ties, there is a greater likelihood for an exception to be made.

**(b) Community identity and preservation of local ties**

Many representations have put forward grounds of community integrity and preservation of local ties in support of their proposals to either preserve or re-delineate the existing DCCA boundaries. Community integrity and local ties are of course relevant considerations in a delineation exercise but their significance need to be considered in the context of other considerations such as the geography of the areas, characteristics of the surrounding communities and the local infrastructure interlinking them. Also, some of the arguments are entirely a matter of preference, and sometimes, based on parochial perspectives and might in some cases be affected by subjective feelings. The EAC noted that due to continuing urbanisation and the gradual development of community infrastructure over the past decades, factors defining community identities, integrity or local ties might have become more obscure in many areas. In any case, the EAC would assess these representations on the basis of clear and objective factual evidence as far as practicable. While the number of representations might to some extent reflect the intensity of local sentiments on the issues, the substance and merits of a proposal should prevail when weighing different or opposing proposals.

When considering these representations, we consider it necessary to recapitulate the key objective of the boundary delineation

exercise as elucidated above, namely, to ensure that the projected population of each proposed DCCA is as near the population quota as practicable and where this is not practicable, to ensure that the projected population would not exceed or fall short of the population quota by more than 25%. The EAC understands that where the boundaries need to be adjusted to accommodate projected changes in population, conflicts would naturally arise between the need to adhere to the criterion of population quota on the one hand and to have regard to the local sentiments in keeping the existing boundaries intact on the ground of community integrity and local ties on the other. As always, the principle remains that population consideration comes first unless it is clearly necessary or desirable to keep the boundaries intact for reasons of community identity and preservation of local ties. This is especially the case when the projected population of a DCCA exceeds the 25% permissible limits.

Conversely, the EAC also needs to adopt an equally prudent and cautious approach when examining representations advocating re-delineation of the boundaries of some DCCA on account of community integrity and local ties even though the projected population deviations in these DCCAs stay well within the statutory permissible limits, and therefore, their boundaries do not require adjustment (referred to hereunder as “unaltered DCCAs”). In keeping with the established practice, modifications to the boundaries of any unaltered DCCAs would



be considered only if:

- (i) they are supported by overwhelming reasons and would bring about notable and substantial improvement on community and development considerations which is incontrovertible;
- (ii) the total number of unaltered DCCAs which would be affected will not exceed a reasonable limit; and
- (iii) except for special circumstance, all the resulting populations of the affected DCCAs should stay within the permissible range.

**(c) Role of District Officers in the boundary delineation exercise**

The statutory criteria require the consideration of the community identities, preservation of local ties, and the physical features (such as the size, shape, accessibility and development) of the relevant areas when formulating its recommendations on the boundaries of DCCAs. The relevance and significance of these considerations varies in different districts and there is a need for a fair and objective assessment whenever a boundary delineation proposal touches upon community identities, local ties and local features of a district. For this reason, and given DOs' relevant knowledge about the local environment and district features, the

EAC would in accordance with the established practice invite them to provide factual information relating to their respective districts. The EAC considers such a process both necessary and useful as better understanding of the local environment and features would enable the EAC to better appreciate the practicability of different delineation proposals. However, it must be emphasised that the inputs of DOs are strictly confined to factual information and objective observations relating to issues of the communities, local ties and local features of the areas under consideration.

**(d) Population figures for boundary delineation**

There are a few representations raising queries about the projected population figures adopted for the boundary delineation exercise. Most of them centre around two questions: (i) the projected figures do not agree with the population figures obtained from other sources; and (ii) the projected figures fail to take into account future developments in the districts.

Firstly, it is necessary to point out that, according to the EACO, the delineation exercise should be conducted on the basis of the projected populations of individual constituencies in the year in which the election to which the exercise relates is to be held. In accordance with the established practice, for the 2015 DC ordinary election, the projected population figures as at 30 June

2015 are adopted for delineation. As in past exercises, the projected population figures are provided by the AHSg, set up specially for the purpose of the delineation exercise under the Working Group on Population Distribution Projections in the PlanD. The population distribution projections are based on up-to-date official data kept by relevant government departments and are arrived at after a comprehensive data compilation process using a scientific and systematic methodology. As such, the data provided by AHSg should remain as the sole authoritative basis for the boundary delineation work. Secondly, although the development of an area is one of the factors which the EAC should have regard to when considering the boundary of a DCCA, it is essential to adhere to the projected population distribution as at 30 June 2015 in the present exercise. Changes in population arising from developments thereafter would not be taken into account and would be considered in future delineation exercises.

4.5 The above are some observations distilled from the experience of the present and past DCCA boundary delineation exercises and are set out to illustrate some general points of consideration. The EAC believes that in making these observations, it would be conducive to understanding the working principles adopted by the Commission in applying the statutory criteria. These are, however, only general observations, and they should be read in a holistic manner and in context when they are applied to specific cases.

## **Section 2 : The Recommendations**

4.6 At its meetings on 27 August and 18 September 2014, the Commission, having considered the representations received and information gathered from site visits and DOs on local features, drew up its final recommendations. Its views on the representations are recorded in the last column of **Appendix II**.

4.7 The EAC adjusted its provisional recommendations in respect of the boundaries of 20 DCCAs and the names of two DCCAs. Details of the alterations and changes are set out in **Appendices III and IV** respectively.

4.8 In its final recommendations, the EAC adjusted the boundaries of 109 DCCAs and allowed the projected population in 24 DCCAs to deviate from the permissible limits of the population quota for the reasons specified in **Appendix V**.

4.9 The EAC notes that a smaller number of DCCAs were required to change their boundaries this time as compared with the changes made in the last delineation exercise (i.e. 122).

4.10 A summary of the Commission's final recommendations is shown in **Appendix VI** of this volume. The boundary maps and descriptions of the final recommendations are in **Volume 2**.

## CHAPTER 5

### A CONCLUDING NOTE

#### Section 1 : Acknowledgements

5.1 With the completion of this delineation exercise, the Commission would like to express its gratitude towards the following government departments/units for their contributions: the AHSG for its provision of the population forecasts; the DOs of the 18 districts for their information on the basis of their district knowledge; the LandsD for its production of the various maps and boundary descriptions for the conduct of the consultation exercise and production of the report; the ISD for its contribution to the publicity programme relating to the consultation exercise, the Government Logistics Department for the printing of the consultation materials and this report, and the HAD for the provision of venues for holding the three public forums.

5.2 The Commission is particularly thankful to the EAC Secretariat 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 orally in the public forums.

## **Section 2 : Conclusion**

5.4 As in previous delineation exercises, the EAC has adopted a pragmatic approach. The EAC has made every effort to observe the requirements of the population quota and permissible range as far as practicable, and at the same time to accommodate the suggestions from members of the public which are supported by overwhelming reasons and would bring about notable and substantial improvement on community and development considerations. As always, the Commission has paid no regard to any suggestions with political implications.

5.5 Delineation of the DCCA boundaries is an integral part of an ordinary 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 delineation exercise.

**Number of DCCAs to be Delineated**

	<b>District Council</b>	<b>Number of constituencies</b>
1.	Central and Western	15
2.	Wan Chai	13
3.	Eastern	35
4.	Southern	17
5.	Yau Tsim Mong	19
6.	Sham Shui Po	23
7.	Kowloon City	24
8.	Wong Tai Sin	25
9.	Kwun Tong	37
10.	Tsuen Wan	18
11.	Tuen Mun	29
12.	Yuen Long	35
13.	North	18
14.	Tai Po	19
15.	Sai Kung	27
16.	Sha Tin	38
17.	Kwai Tsing	29
18.	Islands	10
	<b>Total:</b>	<hr/> 431

Appendix II - A

**Central and Western 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	-	Supports the EAC's delineation proposals as they are in line with the EAC's statutory criteria and working principles.	The supporting view is noted.
2	A01 – Chung Wan	2	1	Propose to change the English name of A01 (Chung Wan) from "Chung Wan" to "Central". One of the representations considers that the majority of the public use "Central" to represent the Central area. They would not regard "Chung Wan" as Central. Besides, people who do not understand Chinese would not know that "Chung Wan" refers to the well-known "Central".	These proposals are <b>not accepted</b> because the current English name has been used since 1994 and the majority of the public are used to this name. The proposed English name also has an implication of the entire Central District. Therefore, change of the DCCA name may cause confusion to the public.
3	A01 – Chung Wan	1	-	Proposes to transfer the Central Government Offices and the CITIC Tower from A01 (Chung Wan) to B13 (Tai Fat Hau) in the Wan Chai District because it seems that these two buildings belong to the Wan Chai District instead of the Central and Western District.	This proposal involves alteration of district boundaries which does not fall under the purview of the EAC. The EAC has referred this view to the HAD for consideration.
4	A10 – Shek Tong Tsui  A15 – Water Street	1	-	Proposes to transfer Clarence Terrace from A15 (Water Street) to A10 (Shek Tong Tsui) because the daily activities of the residents of Clarence Terrace mainly take place in A10 (Shek Tong Tsui). They use the facilities of Shek Tong Tsui, such as buying groceries at the Shek Tong Tsui Market, shopping at the Chong Yip Shopping Centre, having meals along Whitty Street and using transport facilities along Queen's	This proposal is <b>not accepted</b> because the projected population of A10 (Shek Tong Tsui) and A15 (Water Street) will fall within the statutory permissible range. According to the established working principles, adjustment to their existing boundaries is not required.

\* 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>		
				Road West and Des Voeux Road West every day.	

**Appendix II - B**

**Wan Chai 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	Considers the boundaries of DCCAs in the Wan Chai District unsatisfactory because they are not delineated in a circle-like manner as other districts. Proposes not to delineate the boundaries of DCCAs in the Wan Chai District by vertical separation as it would undermine community integrity.	This proposal is <b>not accepted</b> because the projected population of all the DCCAs in the Wan Chai District will fall within the statutory permissible range. According to the established working principles, adjustment to their existing boundaries is not required. In addition, the EAC should adopt appropriate ways to delineate the boundaries of DCCAs having regard to their geographical condition and population distribution.
2	All DCCAs	1	-	(a) Proposes to delineate B01 (Hennessy), B02 (Oi Kwan), B12 (Southorn) and B13 (Tai Fat Hau) by Queen's Road East, Wan Chai Road, Johnston Road, Hennessy Road and Gloucester Road because the existing boundaries have not taken into account the development history of the communities.	<u>Item (a)</u> This proposal is <b>not accepted</b> because the projected population of B01 (Hennessy), B02 (Oi Kwan), B12 (Southorn) and B13 (Tai Fat Hau) will fall within the statutory permissible range. According to the established working principles, adjustment to their existing boundaries is not required.
				(b) Proposes to re-arrange the order of the DCCA codes of B04 (Victoria Park), B05 (Tin Hau) and B06 (Causeway Bay) as follows to make all the DCCAs in the Wan Chai District with consecutive numbers contiguous to each other:  B04 (Causeway Bay) B05 (Victoria Park) B06 (Tin Hau)	<u>Item (b)</u> This proposal is <b>not accepted</b> because allocating codes to DCCAs is merely for the sake of easy identification of locations of the DCCAs on the constituency boundary maps and is not directly related to the review and naming of constituency boundaries. Changing the DCCA codes used in the provisional recommendations may also cause confusion to the public. In addition, the DCCA

\* 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>		
					codes used in the provisional recommendations have been allocated in a clockwise direction on the boundary maps to make the DCCAs with consecutive numbers contiguous to each other as far as possible so that it is easier to locate them.
				(c) Considers that based on the aggregate population and the existing number of seats, there is an excess of one seat in B01 (Hennessy), B02 (Oi Kwan), B11 (Stubbs Road), B12 (Southorn) and B13 (Tai Fat Hau). Therefore, it is proposed to reduce one elected seat in 2019.	<u>Items (c) to (e)</u> Delineation of constituency boundaries should follow the number of elected seats as specified in the DCO (Cap. 547) and the population distribution in the relevant districts. This proposal involves amendment to the Ordinance which does not fall under the purview of the EAC. The EAC has referred these views to the CMAB for reference.
				(d) Considers that based on the aggregate population and the existing number of seats, there is an excess of one seat in B03 (Canal Road), B04 (Victoria Park), B05 (Tin Hau) and B06 (Causeway Bay). Therefore, it is proposed to reduce one elected seat in 2019.	
				(e) Considers that based on the aggregate population and the existing number of seats, there is an excess of one seat in B07 (Tai Hang), B08 (Jardine's Lookout), B09 (Broadwood) and B10 (Happy Valley). Therefore, it is proposed to reduce one elected seat in 2019.	

<i>Item No.</i>	<i>DCCAs</i>	<i>No.*</i>		<i>Representations</i>	<i>EAC's views</i>
		<i>W</i>	<i>O</i>		
3	B01 – Hennessy  B02 – Oi Kwan	1	-	<p>Considers that the Hennessy Road Government Primary School located in B01 (Hennessy) and the buildings near the primary school located in B02 (Oi Kwan) should be viewed as a whole so as to facilitate management and coordination. It is proposed:</p> <p>(a) to transfer the buildings near the Hennessy Road Government Primary School, including Prime Mansion, Senior Buidling, Kwong Ah Building, Takan Lodge, Jade House and Wang Gee Mansion from B02 (Oi Kwan) to B01 (Hennessy); or</p> <p>(b) to transfer the Hennessy Road Government Primary School from B01 (Hennessy) to B02 (Oi Kwan).</p> <p>The representation considers that taking into account the number of electors, proposal (a) above is more appropriate. In addition, the Hennessy Road Government Primary School could be remained as the polling station of B01 (Hennessy).</p>	<p>This proposal is <b>not accepted</b> because:</p> <p>(i) the projected population of B01 (Hennessy) and B02 (Oi Kwan) will fall within the statutory permissible range. According to the established working principles, adjustment to their existing boundaries is not required; and</p> <p>(ii) arrangements on polling station are not the factors of consideration in delineating constituencies. The EAC has referred this view to the REO for follow-up.</p>
4	B04 – Victoria Park  B05 – Tin Hau  B06 – Causeway Bay	1	-	<p>Suggests re-arranging the order of DCCA codes of B04 (Victoria Park), B05 (Tin Hau) and B06 (Causeway Bay) as they are not arranged in a clockwise direction.</p>	<p>Please see item 2(b).</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>		
5	B05 – Tin Hau	1	-	Proposes to transfer the Tung Wah Group of Hospitals Lee Ching Dea Memorial College from B05 (Tin Hau) to the Eastern District. This would not affect the number of electors in the Eastern and Wan Chai Districts, and the administration structure of the school and Education Bureau.	This proposal involves alteration of district boundaries which does not fall under the purview of the EAC. The EAC has referred this view to the HAD for consideration.

**Appendix II - C**

**Eastern 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	-	<p>(a) Proposes to reduce the number of seats of the Eastern DC because:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>● the population of the Eastern District has substantially decreased in recent years and many of its DCCAs' population has been lower than the population quota by more than 20%;</li> <li>● there were too many DC members so the time for them to speak at DC meetings is limited, resulting in insufficient time for discussion of local issues; and</li> <li>● reducing the number of seats would help save government expenses and effectively enhance communication between DC members and local residents.</li> </ul> <p>(b) Proposes to reduce the number of DCCAs in Chai Wan from 11 to 9, including the deletion of C33 (Tsui Tak) and C35 (Kai Hiu) as well as re-delineation of C08 (Tsui Wan), C10 (Siu Sai Wan), C11 (King Yee), C12 (Wan Tsui), C31 (Hing Man), C32 (Lok Hong) and C34 (Yue Wan) so that the population of these DCCAs would be closer to the population quota.</p>	<p><u>Items (a) and (b)</u> Delineation of constituency boundaries should follow the number of elected seats as specified in the DCO (Cap. 547) and the population distribution in the relevant districts. Part of the representation involves amendment to the Ordinance which does not fall under the purview of the EAC. The EAC has referred this view to the CMAB for reference. Moreover, arrangements on district administration matters are not the relevant factors of consideration in delineating constituencies.</p>

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

Item No.	DCCAs	No.*		Representations	EAC's views
		W	O		
				(c) Proposes to transfer Shan Tsui Court from C32 (Lok Hong) to C31 (Hing Man) to facilitate the residents to seek assistance from their DC member.	<p><u>Item (c)</u> This proposal is <b>not accepted</b> because:</p> <p>(i) the projected population of C31 (Hing Man) will fall within the statutory permissible range. According to the established working principles, adjustment to its existing boundary is not required;</p> <p>(ii) after the proposed adjustment, the projected population of C32 (Lok Hong) (10,214) will be below the statutory permissible lower limit (-39.79%); and</p> <p>(iii) the delineation proposal must be based on objective data of population distribution. Arrangements on district administration matters are not the relevant factors of consideration.</p>
2	All DCCAs	1	-	(a) Objects to the delineation proposals for C05 (Shaukeiwan) and C06 (A Kung Ngam) and proposes to transfer Aldrich Garden from C06 (A Kung Ngam) to C05 (Shaukeiwan) because the location of Aldrich Garden is adjacent to Shau Kei Wan MTR Station in C05 (Shaukeiwan). Moreover, the transferral of Aldrich Garden from C06 (A Kung Ngam) to C05 (Shaukeiwan) could help narrow down the population difference between the two DCCAs.	<p><u>Item (a)</u> This proposal is <b>not accepted</b> because after the proposed adjustment, the projected population of C06 (A Kung Ngam) (9,190) will be below the statutory permissible lower limit (-45.83%) and that of C05 (Shaukeiwan) (23,248) will exceed the statutory permissible upper limit (+37.04%).</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>(b) Holds reservation on the delineation proposals for C07 (Heng Fa Chuen), C08 (Tsui Wan), C12 (Wan Tsui), C13 (Fei Tsui), C31 (Hing Man), C32 (Lok Hong), C33 (Tsui Tak) and C34 (Yue Wan) and considers that, based on the aggregate population, the total number of seats of the above DCCAs is currently one more than required. Therefore, it is proposed to reduce one seat in 2019.</p>	<p><u>Items (b) and (c)</u> Delineation of constituency boundaries should follow the number of elected seats as specified in the DCO (Cap. 547) and the population distribution in the relevant districts. These proposals may involve amendment to the Ordinance and change of the district boundary which do not fall under the purview of the EAC. The EAC has referred these views to the CMAB and HAD for reference.</p>
				<p>(c) Holds reservation on the delineation proposals for C15 (Braemar Hill), C16 (Fortress Hill), C17 (City Garden), C18 (Provident), C19 (Fort Street), C20 (Kam Ping), C21 (Tanner) and C22 (Healthy Village) and considers that, based on the aggregate population, the total number of seats of the above DCCAs is currently one more than required. Therefore, it is proposed to reduce one seat in 2019. Moreover, to narrow down the population difference between the Eastern and the Wan Chai Districts, it is proposed to transfer these DCCAs to the Wan Chai District in 2019 and to rename the Wan Chai District as the "Harbour" District so as to reflect that Wan Chai and North Point are in the bay area of the central part of the Hong Kong Island.</p>	
				<p>(d) Other than the DCCAs mentioned in items (a) to (c) above, supports the delineation proposals for all DCCAs as they are in</p>	<p><u>Item (d)</u> The supporting view is noted.</p>



Item No.	DCCAs	No.*		Representations	EAC's views
		W	O		
				line with the EAC's statutory criteria and working principles.	
3	C04 — Aldrich Bay C05 — Shaukeiwan C06 — A Kung Ngam C28 — Sai Wan Ho	1	-	(a) States that some buildings in C05 (Shaukeiwan) and C06 (A Kung Ngam) were demolished or are being re-developed so requests the EAC to take note of such population changes and if necessary, reconsider the delineation of the DCCAs concerned.	<u>Item (a)</u> The EAC must adhere to the Administration's population forecast as at 30 June 2015 in delineating the constituency boundaries. The AHSG, chaired by the PlanD and comprising members from various government departments, provided the required projected population figure based on a set of scientific and systematic methodology.
				(b) To preserve the community integrity, proposes to transfer Aldrich Garden from C06 (A Kung Ngam) to C04 (Aldrich Bay) or C05 (Shaukeiwan) because the location of Aldrich Garden is adjacent to Oi Tung Estate and Tung Yuk Court.	<u>Items (b) and (c)</u> These proposals are <b>not accepted</b> because:  (i) based on the 2011 original constituency boundary, the projected population of C05 (Shaukeiwan) (12,597) will be slightly below the statutory permissible lower limit (-25.74%), therefore, adjustment to its boundary is necessary. If Aldrich Garden is to be transferred from C06 (A Kung Ngam) to C04 (Aldrich Bay) or C05 (Shaukeiwan), the projected population of C06 (A Kung Ngam) (9,190) will be below the statutory permissible lower limit (-45.83%) and that of C05 (Shaukeiwan) (23,248) will exceed the statutory permissible upper limit (+37.04%). Moreover, transferring Aldrich Garden from C06 (A Kung Ngam) to C04 (Aldrich Bay) could not solve the problem of population in C05
				(c) Proposes to transfer Tung Tao Court from C04 (Aldrich Bay) to C28 (Sai Wan Ho) because the access to this housing estate is located in C28 (Sai Wan Ho).	

Item No.	DCCAs	No.*		Representations	EAC's views
		W	O		
					<p>(Shaukeiwan) (12,597) which is below the statutory permissible lower limit;</p> <p>(ii) the projected population of C04 (Aldrich Bay) and C28 (Sai Wan Ho) will fall within the statutory permissible range. According to the established working principles, adjustment to their existing boundaries is not required; and</p> <p>(iii) there is a view supporting the delineation proposals for C04 (Aldrich Bay) and C28 (Sai Wan Ho) (Please see item 2(d)).</p>
4	C04 — Aldrich Bay C05 — Shaukeiwan C06 — A Kung Ngam	1	-	<p>(a) Considers that the EAC's delineation proposals for Shaukeiwan district has not considered the community characteristics, history, ties among residents and community integrity of Shaukeiwan. It is proposed that the EAC should first consult the public on the basis of the 2011 constituency boundaries and collect their views before working on the delineation exercise. This would make the delineation proposals more in line with community development.</p> <p>(b) Disagrees with the transferral of Aldrich Garden to C06 (A Kung Ngam) because:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>residents of Aldrich Garden have less sense of belonging to C06 (A Kung Ngam);</li> </ul>	<p><u>Item (a)</u> In respect of the 2015 DC Election, the EAC must adhere to the statutory criteria, and the Administration's population forecast as at 30 June 2015 in reviewing the constituency boundaries. The EAC should also have regard to community identities, preservation of local ties and the physical features of the relevant DCCAs. Moreover, according to the requirement in section 19 of the EACO, the EAC should review the existing boundaries of DCCAs and put forward provisional recommendations for public consultation.</p> <p><u>Items (b) and (c)</u> These representations are <b>not accepted</b>. The delineation proposals must be based on objective data of population distribution. In view of the population and geographical factors, it is inevitable to form a DCCA with more than one</p>

Item No.	DCCAs	No.*		Representations	EAC's views
		W	O		
				<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>residents of Aldrich Garden may have more concerns on the integration and development of C04 (Aldrich Bay); and</li> <li>DC member of C06 (A Kung Ngam) is difficult to serve two or more different communities.</li> </ul>	community. Moreover, arrangements on district administration matters are not the relevant factors of consideration in delineating constituencies.
				(c) Proposes that the EAC should take into account the development of the entire Main Street East, the 70-year history of the community and the close community ties between Main Street East and C06 (A Kung Ngam) when delineating C05 (Shaukeiwan) and C06 (A Kung Ngam).	
5	C05 — Shaukeiwan  C06 — A Kung Ngam  C29— Lower Yiu Tung	1	-	<p>Proposes that C05 (Shaukeiwan) should absorb population from C29 (Lower Yiu Tung) while the boundary of C06 (A Kung Ngam) should remain unchanged because:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>in respect of community integrity, the location of the stand-alone buildings in C29 (Lower Yiu Tung) is close to C05 (Shaukeiwan). Besides, residents of the former DCCA conduct their daily activities in C05 (Shaukeiwan); and</li> <li>Ming Wah Dai Ha located in C06 (A Kung Ngam) would be re-built. This would affect the population of the adjacent buildings which have been transferred to C05 (Shaukeiwan).</li> </ul>	<p>This proposal is <b>not accepted</b> because:</p> <p>(i) based on the 2011 original constituency boundary, the projected population of C06 (A Kung Ngam) (19,841) will exceed the population quota (+16.96%) and the projected population of C29 (Lower Yiu Tung) (16,389) will be below the population quota (-3.39%). Therefore, it is more desirable to transfer the population of C06 (A Kung Ngam) to C05 (Shaukeiwan) to make the population of the latter fall within the statutory permissible range;</p> <p>(ii) the proposal made in the representation will make the projected population of C29 (Lower Yiu Tung) further deviate from the population quota. The proposal is also</p>

Item No.	DCCAs	No.*		Representations	EAC's views
		W	O		
					<p>not clearly better in terms of preserving community identities and local ties;</p> <p>(iii) the EAC must adhere to the Administration's population forecast as at 30 June 2015 in delineating the constituency boundaries. The development thereafter should not be taken into account; and</p> <p>(iv) there is a view supporting the delineation proposal for C29 (Lower Yiu Tung) (Please see item 2(d)).</p>
6	C05 — Shaukeiwan  C06 — A Kung Ngam	-	1	<p>Proposes to retain several buildings in Main Street East, which have already been transferred to C05 (Shaukeiwan), in C06 (A Kung Ngam) and to transfer Aldrich Garden from C06 (A Kung Ngam) to C05 (Shaukeiwan) because:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>the location of Aldrich Garden is adjacent to C05 (Shaukeiwan) such as Shau Kei Wan MTR Station. Moreover, there is no close community ties between Aldrich Garden and Ming Wah Dai Ha in C06 (A Kung Ngam); and</li> <li>it could make the population of both DCCAs more even by transferring Aldrich Garden from C06 (A Kung Ngam) to C05 (Shaukeiwan).</li> </ul>	<p>This proposal is <b>not accepted</b> because after the proposed adjustment, the projected population of C06 (A Kung Ngam) (9,843) will be below the statutory permissible lower limit (-41.98%) and the projected population of C05 (Shaukeiwan) (22,595) will exceed the statutory permissible upper limit (+33.19%).</p>
7	C05 — Shaukeiwan  C06 — A Kung Ngam	1	-	<p>Proposes to transfer all buildings on Main Street East, including Eastway Towers located in C06 (A Kung Ngam) and Perfect Mount Gardens and Shau Kei Wan Centre which are already located in C05 (Shaukeiwan) to C05 (Shaukeiwan). For C06 (A Kung</p>	<p>This proposal is <b>not accepted</b>. The EAC agrees that the proposal made in the representation could make the population of C05 (Shaukeiwan) fall within statutory permissible range and could narrow down the population difference between the DCCA and C06 (A</p>

Item No.	DCCAs	No.*		Representations	EAC's views
		W	O		
				<p>Ngam), it would include Aldrich Garden, Ming Wah Dai Ha, Brilliant Court, Heung Yuen Gardens and A Kung Ngam Village because:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>● under the provisional recommendations, C05 (Shaukeiwan) is one of the DCCAs in the Eastern District having the smallest population. Its projected population is 13,350 (-21.89%). C06 (A Kung Ngam), on the other hand, is one of the DCCAs in the Eastern District having the largest population with the projected population of 19,188 (+13.11%). These two DCCAs are adjacent to each other, therefore their population should be more fairly distributed to minimise the deviation;</li> <li>● in the 2011 DC Election, the number of electors in C05 (Shaukeiwan) was nearly half of that in C06 (A Kung Ngam). The number of electors could be more evenly distributed after transferring the entire Main Street East to C05 (Shaukeiwan);</li> <li>● the coverage of C06 (A Kung Ngam) is too wide which is unfair to the candidates contesting in the DCCA;</li> <li>● the polling station of C05 (Shaukeiwan) is the Shau Kei Wan Government Primary School on Main Street East, which in fact is located in C06 (A Kung Ngam). For residents near the school, they are required to cast their vote at the polling station in Ming Wah Dai</li> </ul>	<p>Kung Ngam). However, after balancing the relevant factors, the EAC considers that the provisional recommendations are more desirable than the representation because:</p> <p>(i) since 1994, the Main Street East has been delineated in both C05 (Shaukeiwan) and C06 (A Kung Ngam). The buildings near Main Street East in C06 (A Kung Ngam), for example, Ming Wah Dai Ha have established certain local ties with Main Street East;</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 recommendations in terms of preserving community identities and local ties; and</p> <p>(iii) arrangements on district administration matters and polling station are not the relevant factors of consideration in delineating constituencies. The EAC has referred the view on polling station arrangements to the REO for follow-up.</p>

Item No.	DCCAs	No.*		Representations	EAC's views
		W	O		
				<p>Ha uphill in C06 (A Kung Ngam), which is unreasonable;</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>● Main Street East is an ageing district and the elderly of C05 (Shaukeiwan) could cast their vote in proximity while the elderly of C06 (A Kung Ngam) are required to walk hundreds of steps to vote in Ming Wah Dai Ha. This is unfair to them and would discourage them to vote; and</li> <li>● C06 (A Kung Ngam) and C05 (Shaukeiwan) are only separated by a driveway, i.e. Main Street East. This makes it difficult for the coming DC member to distinguish his/her clientele, thus rendering him/her incapable of using the resources effectively.</li> </ul>	
8	C06 — A Kung Ngam	1	-	<p>Objects to the delineation of C06 (A Kung Ngam) because:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>● Main Street East is a long-established community. Its social network is crucial to maintaining community ties and sense of belonging. However, the EAC's delineation proposal would make the Main Street East community apart which is unfavourable to its community development; and</li> <li>● Aldrich Garden and Main Street East are two different communities of different demographic make-up. They have been put under the same DCCA since 2011. This has prevented DC resources for district administration from being put to good use.</li> </ul>	This representation is <b>not accepted</b> . Please see items 4(b), 4(c) and 7.

Item No.	DCCAs	No.*		Representations	EAC's views
		W	O		
9	C20 — Kam Ping C21 — Tanner C33 — Tsui Tak	1	-	(a) Proposes to transfer Island Place from C20 (Kam Ping) to C21 (Tanner) because the residents of C20 (Kam Ping) conduct their daily activities in C21 (Tanner) and have a closer tie with this DCCA in terms of transportation and community relationship.	<u>Item (a)</u> This proposal is <b>not accepted</b> because the projected population of C20 (Kam Ping) and C21 (Tanner) will fall within the statutory permissible range. According to the established working principles, adjustment to their boundaries is not required.
				(b) Proposes that the EAC should take into account the mobile population (i.e. those engaged in economic activities) in the delineation exercise as the DC member of C33 (Tsui Tak) is required to assist and participate in various kinds of industrial and commercial activities organised by industrial and commercial buildings and shopping centers in the DCCA, in addition to serving the residential population.	<u>Item (b)</u> The EAC must adhere to the Administration's population forecast as at 30 June 2015 in reviewing the constituency boundaries. The AHSG, chaired by the PlanD and comprising members from various government departments, provided the required projected population figure based on a set of scientific and systematic methodology. The population figure refers to population living in Hong Kong (including usual residents and mobile residents) but not including the mobile population as mentioned in the representation.
10	C20 — Kam Ping C21 — Tanner	2	-	Propose to adjust the north-eastern boundary of C20 (Kam Ping) from Tin Chiu Street to Kam Hong Street so as to transfer Island Place from C20 (Kam Ping) to C21 (Tanner). The proposal could make the distribution of population of both DCCAs more even and the residents' affairs in both sides of Tanner Road be handled by the same DC member.	Please see item 9(a). Moreover, the delineation proposal must be based on objective data of population distribution. Arrangements on district administration matters are not the relevant factors of consideration.
11	C32 — Lok Hong C33 — Tsui Tak	1	-	Proposes to transfer Koway Court and Bayview Park from C33 (Tsui Tak) to C32 (Lok Hong) because these two housing estates are close to Greenwood Terrace located in C32 (Lok Hong). Residents of Greenwood Terrace and Neptune	This proposal is <b>not accepted</b> because:  (i) after the proposed adjustment, the projected population of C33 (Tsui Tak) (10,507) will be below the statutory

<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>Terrace frequently use Koway Court's shopping centre and its facilities nearby. If the above two housing estates are transferred to C32 (Lok Hong), it would be more efficient for one DC member to handle the problems of the DCCA.</p>	<p>permissible lower limit (-38.06%); and</p> <p>(ii) the delineation proposal must be based on objective data of population distribution. Arrangements on district administration matters are not the relevant factors of consideration.</p>



**Appendix II - D**

**Southern 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 D01 (Aberdeen), D03 (Ap Lei Chau North), D04 (Lei Tung I), D05 (Lei Tung II), D06 (South Horizons East), D07 (South Horizons West), D08 (Wah Kwai), D11 (Pokfulam), D12 (Chi Fu), D13 (Tin Wan), D14 (Shek Yue), D15 (Wong Chuk Hang) as they are in line with the EAC's statutory criteria and working principles.	<u>Item (a)</u> The supporting view is noted.
				(b) Supports the provisional recommendation on D02 (Ap Lei Chau Estate), taking into account the community integrity, maintaining the existing boundary unchanged is more feasible.	<u>Item (b)</u> The supporting view is noted.
				(c)(i) Supports the provisional recommendations on D09 (Wah Fu South) and D10 (Wah Fu North), taking into account the community integrity, maintaining the existing boundaries unchanged is more feasible; and  (ii) Proposes to retain the original names of D09 (Wah Fu South) and D10 (Wah Fu North) as "Wah Fu I" and "Wah Fu II" respectively, which have been adopted for 20 years.	<u>Item (c)(i)</u> The supporting view is noted.  <u>Item (c)(ii)</u> This proposal is <b>not accepted</b> because adopting the names of "Wah Fu South" and "Wah Fu North" can clearly reflect the geographical locations of the two DCCAs. Also, D10 (Wah Fu North) has included other private buildings in addition to Wah Fu (II) Estate.

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

Item No.	DCCAs	No.*		Representations	EAC's views
		W	O		
				(d) Holds reservation on the provisional recommendations on D16 (Bays Area) and D17 (Stanley & Shek O). Since D17 (Stanley & Shek O) has larger population, the provisional recommendations could reduce the population difference between these two DCCAs. Taking into consideration the cluster of private housing blocks and detached houses along the area of Chung Hom Kok and that in D16 (Bays Area), the provisional recommendations are still considered acceptable.	<u>Item (d)</u> The view is noted.
2	D09 – Wah Fu South  D10 – Wah Fu North	-	1	Objects to the proposed names for D09 (Wah Fu South) and D10 (Wah Fu North) and proposes to retain the original names of “Wah Fu I” and “Wah Fu II” respectively, which could clearly reflect the main estates of the two DCCAs, namely Wah Fu (I) Estate and Wah Fu (II) Estate.	Please see item 1(c)(ii).
3	D09 – Wah Fu South  D10 – Wah Fu North  D15– Wong Chuk Hang  D16 – Bays Area  D17 – Stanley & Shek O	1	-	(a) Proposes to retain the original names of D09 (Wah Fu South) and D10 (Wah Fu North) as “Wah Fu I” and “Wah Fu II” respectively.	<u>Item (a)</u> Please see item 1(c)(ii).
				(b) Proposes to transfer the old site of Wong Chuk Hang Estate from D15 (Wong Chuk Hang) to D16 (Bays Area), because Wong Chuk Hang Estate has already been demolished, it is anticipated that the population would be greatly increased after its development.	<u>Item (b)</u> This proposal is <b>not accepted</b> because:  (i) the EAC must adhere to the Administration’s population forecast as at 30 June 2015 in delineating the constituency boundaries. The area in D15 (Wong Chuk Hang) mentioned in the representation has no projected population. The projected population of D15

<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>(Wong Chuk Hang) 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) based on the 2011 original constituency boundary shown on the proposed constituency boundary map, the projected population of D17 (Stanley &amp; Shek O) will substantially exceed the statutory permissible upper limit. To reduce its deviation from the population quota, the EAC proposes to re-delineate the boundary of D16 (Bays Area) to absorb part of the excess population of D17 (Stanley &amp; Shek O).</p>
				<p>(c) Proposes to maintain the existing constituency boundary of D17 (Stanley &amp; Shek O) unchanged because it has been used for many years by EAC to preserve the community ties.</p>	<p><u>Item (c)</u> This proposal is <b>not accepted</b>, because based on the 2011 original constituency boundary shown on the proposed constituency boundary map, the projected population of the DCCAs concerned in 2011 are as follows:</p> <p>D16: 16,270, -5.86% D17: 22,258, +28.79%</p> <p>The respective projected population in 2015 will be as follows:</p> <p>D16: 16,760, -1.20% D17: 23,665, +39.50%</p> <p>As the projected population of D17 (Stanley &amp; Shek O) in 2011 only slightly exceeds the statutory permissible upper limit (+28.79%), after taking into account the community identities and local ties,</p>

Item No.	DCCAs	No.*		Representations	EAC's views
		W	O		
					<p>it was proposed that the population of the DCCA should be allowed to deviate from the statutory permissible range. However, the projected population of D17 (Stanley &amp; Shek O) in 2015 will substantially exceed the statutory permissible upper limit (+39.50%). The EAC has to re-delineate the boundary of the DCCA, with a view to maintaining the population of the DCCA within the statutory permissible range. It is proposed that the housing estates along Chung Hom Kok Road within the original boundary of the DCCA be transferred to the adjacent D16 (Bays Area). After the proposed adjustment, the projected population will be as follows:</p> <p>D16: 18,417, +8.57% D17: 22,008, +29.73%</p> <p>Although the population of D17 (Stanley &amp; Shek O) will still slightly exceed the statutory permissible upper limit, taking into account the community integrity and local ties, it is proposed that the population of the DCCA be allowed to continue to deviate from the statutory permissible range.</p>
4	D16 – Bays Area  D17 – Stanley & Shek O	3	-	<p>(a) Object to the transfer of Chung Hom Kok from D17 (Stanley &amp; Shek O) to D16 (Bays Area) because:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>● Chung Hom Kok has close community ties with Stanley and the residents of Chung Hom Kok have a strong sense of belonging to Stanley because they use the facilities in D17 (Stanley &amp; Shek O) on a daily basis e.g. shopping,</li> </ul>	<p><u>Item (a)</u> These representations are <b>not accepted</b> because:</p> <p>(i) please see item 3(c); and</p> <p>(ii) the delineation proposal must be based on objective data of the population distribution. Arrangements on district administration matters and polling station are not the relevant factors of consideration. The EAC has</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>medical care and public transport;</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>in 2011, when Chung Hom Kok belonged to D17 (Stanley &amp; Shek O), its population was allowed to deviate from the statutory permissible upper limit;</li> <li>the polling station of D17 (Stanley &amp; Shek O) is near Chung Hom Kok, which is convenient for the electors of Chung Hom Kok. Making reference to the past arrangements, the polling stations of D16 (Bays Area) were located at South Island School in Nam Fung Road and Hong Kong International School in South Bay Close. They are too far away from Chung Hom Kok and it is expected that the voting rate would drop and traffic congestion would happen because the electors of Chung Hom Kok have to travel a long distance to go to the polling stations; and</li> <li>one of the representations considers that the DC member of D17 (Stanley &amp; Shek O) has his/her office near Chung Hom Kok, which is convenient for him/her to serve the residents of Chung Hom Kok.</li> </ul>	<p>referred these views on polling station arrangements to the REO for follow-up.</p>
				<p>(b) One representation proposes to transfer Shek O from D17 (Stanley &amp; Shek O) to the Eastern District because the residents of Shek O and Shau</p>	<p><u>Item (b)</u> This proposal involves alteration of the district boundary which does not fall under the purview of the EAC. The EAC has referred this</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>		
				Kei Wan are having closer ties with each other in terms of daily life and have no direct connections with Stanley in respect of geographical location and daily life.	view to the HAD for consideration.

**Appendix II - E**

**Yau Tsim Mong District  
Summaries of Written/Oral Representations**

Item No.	DCCAs	No.*		Representations	EAC's views
		W	O		
1	All DCCAs	1	-	<p>(a) Objects to the delineation of E01 (Tsim Sha Tsui West), E02 (Jordan South), E03 (Jordan West), E04 (Yau Ma Tei South), E05 (Charming), E07 (Fu Pak), E09 (Cherry), E16 (Yau Ma Tei North), E17 (East Tsim Sha Tsui &amp; King's Park), E18 (Tsim Sha Tsui Central) and E19 (Jordan North) and proposes to re-delineate the above DCCAs. Details are as follows:</p> <p><u>E07 (Fu Pak) and E09 (Cherry)</u> retains the Hermitage in E07 (Fu Pak) because transferring the Hermitage from E07 (Fu Pak) to E09 (Cherry) would undermine the community ties between the Hermitage and the Park Avenue. These two housing estates are managed and developed by the same developer and their residents also share the shopping centre and other facilities.</p> <p><u>E07 (Fu Pak) and E05 (Charming)</u> transfers Hoi Fu Court from E07 (Fu Pak) to E05 (Charming) because Hoi Fu Court and Charming Garden are both Home Ownership Scheme estates sharing the use of Hoi Wang Road, and adjusts the south boundary of E05 (Charming) to Lai Cheung Road.</p>	<p><u>Items (a), (b) and (c)</u> These proposals are <b>not accepted</b> because:</p> <p>(i) overall speaking, proposals made in the representation will affect E01 (Tsim Sha Tsui West), E10 (Tai Kok Tsui South), E11 (Tai Kok Tsui North), E14 (Mong Kok East) and E15 (Mong Kok South). The projected population of these DCCAs will fall within the statutory permissible range. According to the established working principles, adjustment to their existing boundaries is not required. Therefore, the number of affected DCCAs under the proposals made in the representation will be more than that in the EAC's recommendations;</p> <p>(ii) after the proposed adjustments, the projected population of E02 (Jordan South), E03 (Jordan West), E04 (Yau Ma Tei South), E05 (Charming), E07 (Fu Pak), E12 (Tai Nan), E16 (Yau Ma Tei North) and E17 (East Tsim Sha Tsui &amp; King's Park) will exceed or fall short of the statutory permissible upper/lower limit:</p> <p>E02 : 10,231, -39.69% E03 : 25,409, +49.78% E04 : 12,545, -26.05%</p>

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

Item No.	DCCAs	No.*		Representations	EAC's views
		W	O		
				<p><u>E05 (Charming) and E16 (Yau Ma Tei North)</u>  transfers the buildings from the east of Ferry Street to Canton Road in E05 (Charming) to E16 (Yau Ma Tei North) because the living circle of these buildings is different from that of Charming Garden. On the contrary, the living circle of these building is closer to that of Dundas Street and Shanghai Street. The proposal would also increase the population and area of E16 (Yau Ma Tei North).</p> <p><u>E04 (Yau Ma Tei South) and E16 (Yau Ma Tei North)</u>  in order to balance the population of E04 (Yau Ma Tei South) and E16 (Yau Ma Tei North), and having considered that the area in the north of Waterloo Road is far away from the community facilities of E04 (Yau Ma Tei South) resulting in a relatively weaker community tie, it is proposed to use Waterloo Road as the boundary of these two DCCAs.</p> <p><u>E03 (Jordan West) and E04 (Yau Ma Tei South)</u>  transfers the Coronation from E04 (Yau Ma Tei South) to E03 (Jordan West) because its nearby facilities (e.g. bus stops) are situated in E03 (Jordan West). Besides, changes the east boundary of E03 (Jordan West) to Nathan Road, Ning Po Street and Temple Street and renames this DCCA as "Jordan North".</p>	<p>E05 : 22,786, +34.32%  E07 : 11,520, -32.09%  E12 : 21,382, +26.04%  E16 : 23,590, +39.06%  E17 : 10,419, -38.58%</p> <p>(iii) there is a view supporting the delineation proposal for E03 (Jordan West) (Please see item (5)); and</p> <p>(iv) taking into account the population distribution and geographical factors, it is inevitable that a DCCA is formed by more than one community.</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><u>E17 (East Tsim Sha Tsui &amp; King's Park)</u> since E17 (East Tsim Sha Tsui and King's Park) is separated by Gascoigne Road so a weak community tie, proposes to re-delineate E17 (East Tsim Sha Tsui &amp; King's Park) by covering King's Park Hill and the area in the east of Nathan Road to Diocesan Girls' School of E19 (Jordan North). This DCCA is to be renamed as "King's Park".</p> <p><u>E18 (Tsim Sha Tsui Central)</u> comprises East Tsim Sha Tsui of E17 (East Tsim Sha Tsui &amp; King's Park) and the area in the south of Austin Road to Cameron Road (excluding the buildings alongside Hillwood Road and those near Nathan Road to Austin Avenue) of E18 (Tsim Sha Tsui Central). This DCCA is to be renamed as "Tsim Sha Tsui East".</p> <p><u>E19 (Jordan North)</u> comprises the area around Jordan Road, Temple Street, Ning Po Street and Nathan Road of E19 (Jordan North), the areas in the north of Kowloon Park to Jordan Road and Fortune Terrace of E02 (Jordan South), the buildings alongside Hillwood Road and the areas around Kowloon Cricket Club, United Services Recreation Club and Gun Club Hill Barracks of E18 (Tsim Sha Tsui Central). The code and name of this DCCA are to be changed to E02 "Jordan South".</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><u>E02 (Jordan South)</u> after the above adjustments, this DCCA would comprise the remaining part of the existing E02 (Jordan South) and E18 (Tsim Sha Tsui Central) as well as China Hong Kong City of E01 (Tsim Sha Tsui West) and the southern area of China Hong Kong City. The code and name of this DCCA are to be changed to E19 “Tsim Sha Tsui South”.</p> <p><u>E01 (Tsim Sha Tsui West)</u> after the above adjustments, set up a separate DCCA comprising the remaining part of the existing E01 (Tsim Sha Tsui West), which covers the area from Kowloon Station to Canton Road and Tsim Sha Tsui Fire Station.</p>	
				<p>(b) Proposes to delineate E06 (Mong Kok West), E13 (Mong Kok North), E14 (Mong Kok East) and E15 (Mong Kok South) according to the main roads, such as Prince Edward Road West, Mong Kok Road, Argyle Street and Nathan Road so as to allocate the community facilities in the district properly and balance the population of the DCCAs concerned. The proposed coverage of the DCCAs concerned is as follows:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>● E06 (Mong Kok West) includes the areas in the east of Ferry Street to Nathan Road, and the south of Argyle Street to Dundas Street.</li> </ul>	

<i>Item No.</i>	<i>DCCAs</i>	<i>No.*</i>		<i>Representations</i>	<i>EAC's views</i>
		<i>W</i>	<i>O</i>		
				<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>● E13 (Mong Kok North) includes the areas in the east of Tong Mi Road to Nathan Road, and the south of Prince Edward Road West to Argyle Street.</li> <li>● E14 (Mong Kok East) includes the areas in the east of Nathan Road and Sai Yee Street to the District Boundary, and the south of Boundary Street to Mong Kok Road and Argyle Street.</li> <li>● E15 (Mong Kok South) includes the areas in the east of Nathan Road to Sai Yee Street, District Boundary and Tung Choi Street, and the south of Mong Kok Road and Argyle Street to Dundas Street and Soy Street.</li> </ul>	
				<p>(c) Having considered the development history and background of Mong Kok to Tai Kok Tsui, proposes to delineate E10 (Tai Kok Tsui South) and E11 (Tai Kok Tsui North) by Tai Kok Tsui Road and rename these two DCCAs as “Tai Kok Tsui West” and “Tai Kok Tsui East” respectively. The boundary of E12 (Tai Nan) is then adjusted accordingly. The proposed coverage of the DCCAs concerned is as follows:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>● E10 “Tai Kok Tsui West” includes the areas in the east of Sham Mong Road to Tai Kok Tsui Road, the south of Chui Yu Road to Li Tak Street, and Tai Chi Factory</li> </ul>	

Item No.	DCCAs	No.*		Representations	EAC's views
		W	O		
				<p>Building.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>● E11 “Tai Kok Tsui East” includes the areas in the east of Tai Kok Tsui Road to Tong Mi Road, and the south of Tung Chau Street to Anchor Street.</li> <li>● E12 (Tai Nan) includes the areas in the east of Tung Chau Street to Nathan Road, the south of Boundary Street to Prince Edward Road West, and Cheung Fung Mansion.</li> </ul>	
				(d) Supports the provisional recommendation on E08 (Olympic) in Tai Kok Tsui as it is in line with the EAC’s statutory criteria and working principles.	<u>Item (d)</u> The supporting view is noted.
2	<p>E01 – Tsim Sha Tsui West</p> <p>E02 – Jordan South</p> <p>E16 – Yau Ma Tei North</p> <p>E17 – East Tsim Sha Tsui &amp; King’s Park</p> <p>E18 – Tsim Sha Tsui Central</p>	1	-	<p>Disagrees with the delineation of E01 (Tsim Sha Tsui West), E02 (Jordan South), E16 (Yau Ma Tei North), E17 (East Tsim Sha Tsui &amp; King’s Park) and E18 (Tsim Sha Tsui Central). In order to integrate people of different economic backgrounds and achieve a fairer allocation of resources and services, proposes to revise the boundaries of the DCCAs concerned as follows:</p> <p><u>E16 (Yau Ma Tei North)</u> adjusts the south boundary of the DCCA to King’s Park Rise.</p> <p><u>E17 (East Tsim Sha Tsui &amp; King’s Park)</u> includes the areas in the east of Nathan Road and Hong Tat Path to District Boundary, and the south of King’s Park Rise to Austin Road and District Boundary (excluding</p>	<p>This proposal is <b>not accepted</b> because:</p> <p>(i) overall speaking, the proposal made in the representation will affect E01 (Tsim Sha Tsui West). The projected population of this DCCA will fall within the statutory permissible range. According to the established working principles, adjustment to its existing boundary is not required. Therefore, the number of affected DCCAs under the proposal made in the representation will be more than that in the EAC’s recommendations;</p> <p>(ii) after the proposed adjustments, the projected population of E02 (Jordan South) (6,278) will be below the statutory</p>

Item No.	DCCAs	No.*		Representations	EAC's views
		W	O		
				<p>the area in the east of Nathan Road to Diocesan Girls' School).</p> <p><u>E18 (Tsim Sha Tsui Central)</u> includes the areas in the east of Nathan Road to Hong Tat Path and Cross Harbour Tunnel, and the south of Austin Road to District Boundary.</p> <p><u>E02 (Jordan South)</u> includes the nearby area in the east of Tsim Sha Tsim West to Nathan Road, and the south of Austin Road to District Boundary. Moreover, it is proposed to change the name of this DCCA accordingly to reflect that it mainly covers the area of Tsim Sha Tsui. Residents living in Tsim Sha Tsui do not want to be regarded as residents of Jordan.</p> <p><u>E01 (Tsim Sha Tsui West)</u> includes the areas in the west of Nathan Road, and the south of Kowloon Station and Jordan Road to Austin Road.</p>	<p>permissible lower limit (-62.99%); and</p> <p>(iii) arrangements on district administration matters and political considerations are not the factors of consideration in delineating constituencies.</p>
3	<p>E01 – Tsim Sha Tsui West</p> <p>E17 – East Tsim Sha Tsui &amp; King's Park</p>	11	-	<p>(a) Object to splitting up the original Constituency of King's Park into three DCCAs and grouping King's Park Hill and East Tsim Sha Tsui together to form the new E17 (East Tsim Sha Tsui &amp; King's Park). Reasons are summarised as follows:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>● the shape of E17 (East Tsim Sha Tsui &amp; King's Park) is not desirable and would undermine community integrity;</li> <li>● East Tsim Sha Tsui and King's Park are two communities. The</li> </ul>	<p><u>Item (a)</u> These representations are <b>not accepted</b> because:</p> <p>(i) in respect of the 2015 DC Election, the EAC must adhere to the statutory criteria and ensure that the population in the proposed DCCAs do not deviate from the population quota by more than 25% as far as possible. As the projected population of the original Constituency of Tsim Sha Tsui East will substantially exceed the statutory permissible upper limit (+38.71%), the EAC should propose to adjust the boundary of the DCCA and</p>

Item No.	DCCAs	No.*		Representations	EAC's views
		W	O		
				<p>economic backgrounds of the residents living there are totally different;</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>East Tsim Sha Tsui and King's Park are wholly separated by Gascoigne Road, Chatham Road South and the Hong Kong Polytechnic University. The two communities have no connection and lack of community identities and local ties;</li> <li>the coverage of E17 (East Tsim Sha Tsui &amp; King's Park) is too wide;</li> <li>it would affect the works of DC members in the district; and</li> <li>the splitting up of King's Park favours the pro-establishment camp to be elected in the new DCCAs.</li> </ul>	<p>those of the adjacent DCCAs (if necessary) so as to ensure that the projected population of the DCCAs concerned will fall within the permissible range;</p> <p>(ii) taking into account the population distribution and geographical factors, it is inevitable that a DCCA is formed by more than one community; and</p> <p>(iii) arrangements on district administration matters are not the factors of consideration in delineating constituencies.</p>
				<p>(b) One of the representations proposes to rename E01 (Tsim Sha Tsui West) as "Kowloon Station" to enable the public to have a better understanding on the location of the DCCA.</p>	<p><u>Item (b)</u> This proposal is <b>not accepted</b> because the existing name of the DCCA has been used since 1994 and it has reflected the coverage of the DCCA. Moreover, the boundary of the DCCA has not been changed. Change of name may cause confusion to the public.</p>
4	<p>E02 – Jordan South</p> <p>E17 – East Tsim Sha Tsui &amp; King's Park</p>	-	1	<p>Objects to the delineation proposal for E17 (East Tsim Sha Tsui &amp; King's Park) because the DCCA is separated by Chatham Road South and Gascoigne Road. There are no close community ties. Moreover, it is considered unreasonable for E02 (Jordan South) to cover both the south and</p>	<p>This proposal is <b>not accepted</b> because after the proposed adjustment, the projected population of E17 (East Tsim Sha Tsui &amp; King's Park) (8,525) will be below the statutory permissible lower limit (-49.75%).</p>

Item No.	DCCAs	No.*		Representations	EAC's views
		W	O		
	E18 – Tsim Sha Tsui Central			the north of Kowloon Park so it is proposed to transfer the area in the south of Kowloon Park to E18 (Tsim Sha Tsui Central). The population of E18 (Tsim Sha Tsui Central) would subsequently be increased so it is also proposed that another DCCA comprising the areas of East Tsim Sha Tsui of E17 (East Tsim Sha Tsui & King's Park) and Austin Road to Observatory Road of E18 (Tsim Sha Tsui Central) to be formed.	
5	E03 – Jordan West	1	-	Supports the delineation proposal for E03 (Jordan West) because it aligns with the population change in the district and does not have significant impact on the community composition.	The supporting view is noted.
6	E04 – Yau Ma Tei South E05 – Charming E07 – Fu Pak E09 – Cherry E13 – Mong Kok North E16 – Yau Ma Tei North E17 – East Tsim Sha Tsui & King's Park	1	-	(a) Objects to transferring the Hermitage from E07 (Fu Pak) to E09 (Cherry) because E09 (Cherry) is made up of stand-alone buildings. On the contrary, the Hermitage and the Central Park are both newly built housing estates. Delineating these two housing estates in E07 (Fu Pak) could improve their cohesion.  (b) Proposes to transfer Hoi Fu Court from E07 (Fu Pak) to E05 (Charming) so that E05 (Charming) would make up of Home Ownership Scheme estates. The excess population of E05 (Charming) (i.e. the population living in the buildings in the east of Ferry Street) could be absorbed by E04 (Yau Ma Tei South) and E16 (Yau Ma Tei North).	<u>Items (a) and (b)</u> These proposals are <b>not accepted</b> because after the proposed adjustment:  (i) the projected population of E07 (Fu Pak) (11,520) will be below the statutory permissible lower limit (-32.09%); and  (ii) the projected population of E05 (Charming) (22,654) will exceed the statutory permissible upper limit (+33.54%).

Item No.	DCCAs	No.*		Representations	EAC's views
		W	O		
	E18 – Tsim Sha Tsui Central  E19 – Jordan North			<p>(c) Disagrees with the boundary between E04 (Yau Ma Tei South) and E19 (Jordan North) because the population deviation percentage of the newly created E19 (Jordan North) is close to the statutory permissible lower limit, which fails to alleviate the situation of E04 (Yau Ma Tei South) for having excess population. It is proposed to transfer the area running from Public Square Street to Kansu Street from E04 (Yau Ma Tei South) to E19 (Jordan North). In addition to their proximity, their community ties could also be maintained.</p>	<p><u>Item (c)</u> This proposal is <b>not accepted</b> because the buildings around Public Square Street have been grouped together with the other buildings in E04 (Yau Ma Tei South) since 1994. The relevant buildings have developed a closer tie with the DCCA. The proposal made in the representation is not clearly better in terms of preserving community identity and local ties.</p>
				<p>(d) Disagrees with the name of E04 (Yau Ma Tei South), E17 (East Tsim Sha Tsui &amp; King's Park), E18 (Tsim Sha Tsui Central) and E19 (Jordan North) and proposes that:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>● E04 (Yau Ma Tei South) should be named after the main roads in the DCCA because it also covers the waterfront area of Tai Kok Tsui.</li> <li>● E17 (East Tsim Sha Tsui &amp; King's Park) should be renamed as "Hong Chong" because Hong Chong Road is the main road located in the middle of the DCCA which could represent the DCCA.</li> <li>● the Chinese name of E18 (Tsim Sha Tsui Central) should be renamed as "尖沙咀中部" because members</li> </ul>	<p><u>Item (d)</u> These proposals are <b>not accepted</b> because the names of E04 (Yau Ma Tei South), E17 (East Tsim Sha Tsui &amp; King's Park), E18 (Tsim Sha Tsui Central) and E19 (Jordan North) under the provisional recommendations have reflected properly the locations of these DCCAs. The names proposed in the representation are not clearly better.</p>



Item No.	DCCAs	No.*		Representations	EAC's views
		W	O		
				<p>of the public seldom use “尖中” as its name.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>E19 (Jordan North) should be renamed as “Jordan Road North” as it covers Jordan and part of Yau Ma Tei.</li> </ul>	
				(e) Considers that the shape of E13 (Mong Kok North) is undesirable. It is proposed that the DCCA to include some buildings located between the boundary of the DCCA and Cedar Street so as to improve its shape.	<u>Item (e)</u> This proposal is <b>not accepted</b> because the buildings around Cedar Street have been grouped together with the other buildings in E12 (Tai Nan) since 1994. The relevant buildings have developed a closer tie with the DCCA. The proposal made in the representation is not clearly better in terms of the shape of the DCCA.
7	E04 – Yau Ma Tei South  E16 – Yau Ma Tei North  E17 – East Tsim Sha Tsui & King's Park	1	-	Proposes the EAC to consider transferring the grass root buildings along Nathan Road (i.e. buildings from Jade Mansion to Methodist College) from E17 (East Tsim Sha Tsui & King's Park) to E04 (Yau Ma Tei South) or E16 (Yau Ma Tei North) because the economic and social backgrounds of the residents in E17 (East Tsim Sha Tsui & King's Park) are different.	<p>This proposal is <b>not accepted</b> because:</p> <p>(i) after the proposed adjustment, the projected population of E04 (Yau Ma Tei South) (22,163) will exceed the statutory permissible upper limit (+30.65%);</p> <p>(ii) if the area as proposed in the representation is transferred to E16 (Yau Ma Tei North), the projected population of E17 (East Tsim Sha Tsui &amp; King's Park) will further deviate from the population quota.</p> <p>Proposal made in the representation: 12,940, -23.72% Provisional recommendation: 15,185, -10.49%; and</p> <p>(iii) taking into account the population distribution and geographical factors, it is</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>		
					inevitable that a DCCA is formed by more than one community.
8	E05 – Charming  E07 – Fu Pak  E09 – Cherry  E16 – Yau Ma Tei North	-	1	<p>(a) Proposes to retain the Hermitage in E07 (Fu Pak) because the Hermitage and the Park Avenue belong to the same developer and the residents also share the community facilities. Moreover, there are no close community ties between E09 (Cherry) and the Hermitage.</p> <p>(b) Proposes to transfer Hoi Fu Court from E07 (Fu Pak) to E05 (Charming) because Hoi Fu Court and Charming Garden are adjacent to each other and both are Home Ownership Scheme estates, which have a stronger community tie.</p> <p>(c) Proposes to transfer the eastern part of Ferry Street from E05 (Charming) to E16 (Yau Ma Tei North) because the residents of this area would use the community facilities in Mong Kok and Yau Ma Tei. Moreover, the population deviation percentage of E16 (Yau Ma Tei North) is close to the statutory permissible lower limit under the provisional recommendations. Transferring the eastern part of Ferry Street from E05 (Charming) to E16 (Yau Ma Tei North) could improve the population distribution of the two DCCAs and maintain the community ties between the eastern part of Ferry Street and the western part of Nathan Road of E16 (Yau Ma Tei North).</p>	<p>Items (a), (b) and (c) Please see items 6(a) and (b).</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>		
				Proposals (a) to (c) above could make the four DCCAs' projected population closer to the population quota and delineate their boundaries more neatly.	
9	E06 – Mong Kok West E16 – Yau Ma Tei North E17 – East Tsim Sha Tsui & King's Park E18 – Tsim Sha Tsui Central	1	-	Considers that the coverage of E17 (East Tsim Sha Tsui & King's Park) is too wide and it consists of population of different economic backgrounds. It is proposed to maintain the 2011 original constituency boundaries of E06 (Mong Kok West), E16 (Yau Ma Tei North), E17 (East Tsim Sha Tsui & King's Park) and E18 (Tsim Sha Tsui Central) and allow their population to deviate from the statutory permissible range.	Please see item 3(a).
10	E10 – Tai Kok Tsui South E11 – Tai Kok Tsui North E12 – Tai Nan	-	1	Proposes to delineate E10 (Tai Kok Tsui South) and E11 (Tai Kok Tsui North) by Tai Kok Tsui Road and rename these two DCCAs as "Tai Kok Tsui East" and "Tai Kok Tsui West" respectively. Moreover, it is proposed to transfer the area between Tong Mi Road and Tung Chau Street of E12 (Tai Nan) to the proposed DCCA "Tai Kok Tsui East" so that the population of the DCCA concerned could be closer to the population quota.	These proposals are <b>not accepted</b> because the projected population of E10 (Tai Kok Tsui South) and E11 (Tai Kok Tsui North) will fall within the statutory permissible range. According to the established working principles, adjustment to their boundaries is not required.
11	E12 – Tai Nan E13 – Mong Kok North	1	1	Propose to retain Cheung Fung Mansion in E12 (Tai Nan) and maintain the boundary of the DCCA in 2011 because this building is separated from the other parts of E13 (Mong Kong North) by roads which would undermine community integrity.	This proposal is <b>not accepted</b> because if Cheung Fung Mansion is retained in E12 (Tai Nan), the projected population of the DCCA (21,455) will exceed the statutory permissible upper limit (+26.47%). Besides, the proposal made in the representations is not clearly better in terms of preserving community integrity.

<i>Item No.</i>	<i>DCCAs</i>	<i>No.*</i>		<i>Representations</i>	<i>EAC's views</i>
		<i>W</i>	<i>O</i>		
12	E17 – East Tsim Sha Tsui & King’s Park	1	-	(a) Objects to removing East Tsim Sha Tsui from E18 (Tsim Sha Tsui Central) because the two communities have shared facilities and are not large in size. Splitting them into two DCCAs would lead to a waste of resources.	<u>Item (a)</u> This representation is <b>not accepted</b> because if East Tsim Sha Tsui is retained in E18 (Tsim Sha Tsui Central), the projected population of the DCCA (23,531) will exceed the statutory permissible upper limit (+38.71%).
	E18 – Tsim Sha Tsui Central			(b) Objects to integrating three DCCAs to form E19 (Jordan North) because the DCCAs concerned were originally served by different DC members. The integration would cause confusion.	<u>Item (b)</u> The delineation proposal must be based on objective data of population distribution. Arrangements on district administration matters are not the relevant factors of consideration.
	E19 – Jordan North				

**Appendix II - F**

**Sham Shui Po District  
Summaries of Written/Oral Representations**

Item No.	DCCAs	No.*		Representations	EAC's Views
		W	O		
1	All DCCAs	1	-	(a) <u>F01 (Po Lai)</u> Proposes to transfer Un Chau Estate Phase 5 out of the DCCA, and transfer the original location of So Uk Estate and the area in the north of Castle Peak Road to F01 (Po Lai), and rename as "Po Lai and So Uk" for preserving the community identity.	<p>Items (a) and (b)</p> <p>These proposals are <b>not accepted</b> because:</p> <p>(i) the projected population of F01 (Po Lai), F02 (Cheung Sha Wan), F18 (Un Chau &amp; So Uk) and F19 (Lei Cheng Uk) will fall within the statutory permissible range. According to the established working principles, adjustment to their existing boundaries is not required; and</p> <p>(ii) there is a view supporting the delineation proposal for F01 (Po Lai) (please see item 2(a)).</p>
				(b) <u>F02 (Cheung Sha Wan)</u> Proposes to transfer the areas covering Tonkin Street, Castle Peak Road, Pratas Street and Cheung Sha Wan Road from F01 (Po Lai) to F02 (Cheung Sha Wan) for achieving balanced population distribution between the two DCCAs.	
				(c) <u>F05 (Nam Cheong East) and F06 (Nam Cheong South)</u> Proposes to transfer the area in the north of Cheung Sha Wan Road from F06 (Nam Cheong South) to F05 (Nam Cheong East) because:	<p>Item (c)</p> <p>This proposal is <b>not accepted</b> because after the proposed adjustment, the projected population of F05 (Nam Cheong East) (21,966) will exceed the statutory permissible upper limit (+29.49%).</p>
				<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>● the projected population of F06 (Nam Cheong South) is relatively more than that of F05 (Nam Cheong East), it would achieve balanced population distribution between the two DCCAs; and</li> </ul>	

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

Item No.	DCCAs	No.*		Representations	EAC's Views
		W	O		
				<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>geographically, there is a highway separating the two DCCAs.</li> </ul>	
				<p>(d) <u>F11 (Fortune)</u> Proposes to include in the areas covering Tung Chau Street, Tonkin Street, Cheung Sha Wan Road, Hing Wah Street, Lai Chi Kok Road and Fat Tseung Street, and take up Un Chau Estate Phase 5 from F01 (Po Lai) because the time of intake of both the Un Chau Estate Phase 5 and the Cheung Sha Wan Estate was within the same year.</p>	<p><u>Item (d)</u> This proposal is <b>not accepted</b> because:</p> <p>(i) the EAC considers it undesirable to transfer the buildings from F01 (Po Lai) to F11 (Fortune) because the projected population of F01 (Po Lai) will fall within the statutory permissible range. According to the established working principles, adjustment to its existing boundary is not required;</p> <p>(ii) by keeping the number of affected DCCAs to a minimum, the EAC proposes to re-delineate the boundaries of F11 (Fortune) and the adjacent two DCCAs with excess population, and to create a new DCCA, so that the projected population of the abovementioned three DCCAs can be maintained within the statutory permissible range; and</p> <p>(iii) there is a view supporting the delineation proposal for F01 (Po Lai) (please see item 2(a)).</p>
				<p>(e) <u>F12 (Lai Chi Kok South)</u> Proposes to rename the DCCA as "Hoi Lai" to depict that Hoi Lai Estate is included in the DCCA.</p>	<p><u>Item (e)</u> This proposal is <b>not accepted</b> because its current name has been used since 2007 and the majority of the public are used to this name, change of the DCCA name may cause confusion to the public.</p>

Item No.	DCCAs	No.*		Representations	EAC's Views
		W	O		
				(f) <u>F15 (Mei Foo North)</u> Proposes to adopt Tsing Sha Highway to be the eastern constituency boundary of F15 (Mei Foo North) to show revision of the road network.	<u>Item (f)</u> This proposal is <b>not accepted</b> because the projected population of F15 (Mei Foo North) will fall within the statutory permissible range. According to the established working principles, adjustment to its existing boundary is not required.
				(g) <u>F16 (Lai Chi Kok Central)</u> Proposes to form F16 by combining Aqua Marine, The Pacifica and The Sparkle because Aqua Marine has maintained local ties with Banyan Garden, Liberte and The Pacifica for ten years, and proposes to rename the DCCA as "Lai Chi Kok South".	<u>Items (g) and (h)</u> These proposals are <b>not accepted</b> because:  (i) by combining Aqua Marine, The Pacifica and The Sparkle into a DCCA, the projected population of the DCCA (10,839) will be below the statutory permissible lower limit (-36.11%); and  (ii) Banyan Garden, Liberte and The Pacifica have been constructed on the same elevated podium with an inter-connected shopping arcade, there are certain ties between them which will be unnecessarily affected due to the adjustment proposed in the representation.
				(h) <u>F17 (Lai Chi Kok North)</u> Proposes to form F17 (Lai Chi Kok North) by combining One West Kowloon, Banyan Garden, Liberte and the nearby industrial building zone.	
				(i) <u>F18 (Un Chau &amp; So Uk)</u> Proposes to form F18 by combining Un Chau Estate Phases 1 to 4 and the areas covering Cheung Sha Wan Road, Kwong Cheung Street, Castle Peak Road, Fuk Wah Street, Wing Hong Street, Kwong Shing Street and the private buildings in the vicinity of Castle Peak Road located in F17 (Lai Chi Kok North) and rename the DCCA as "Un Chau".	<u>Items (i) and (j)</u> Please see items 1(a) and (b).

<i>Item No.</i>	<i>DCCAs</i>	<i>No.*</i>		<i>Representations</i>	<i>EAC's Views</i>
		<i>W</i>	<i>O</i>		
				(j) <u>F19 (Lei Cheng Uk)</u> Proposes to transfer the areas covering Tonkin Street, Castle Peak Road, Pratas Street and Wai Wai Road from F01 (Po Lai) to F19 (Lei Cheng Uk) to achieve balanced population distribution between the two DCCAs.	
				(k) <u>F22 (Nam Shan, Tai Hang Tung &amp; Tai Hang Sai)</u> Proposes to “cut straight” the boundary in the area near Tsung Tsin Primary School and rename the DCCA as “Kowloon Tsai” (九龍仔) for residents’ convenience.	<u>Item (k)</u> This proposal is <b>not accepted</b> because:  (i) there is no justification to prove that the proposal made in the representation is clearly better than the provisional recommendations in terms of preserving community identities, local ties and geographical factors; and  (ii) its current name has been used since 2007 and the majority of the public are used to this name. Besides, the DCCA name proposed in the representation is similar to the area “Kowloon Tsai” (九龍仔) located in the Kowloon City District, change of the DCCA name may cause confusion to the public.
				(l) After the above adjustments, the code of the DCCAs has to be re-arranged accordingly.	<u>Item (l)</u> Please see items 1(a) to (k).
				(m) Supports the provisional recommendations on F03 (Nam Cheong North), F04 (Shek Kip Mei), F07 (Nam Cheong Central), F08 (Nam Cheong West), F09 (Fu Cheong), F10 (Lai Kok), F13 (Mei Foo South), F14 (Mei Foo Central), F20 (Ha Pak Tin), F21 (Yau	<u>Item (m)</u> The supporting view is noted.



<i>Item No.</i>	<i>DCCAs</i>	<i>No.*</i>		<i>Representations</i>	<i>EAC's Views</i>
		<i>W</i>	<i>O</i>		
				Yat Tsuen) and F23 (Lung Ping & Sheung Pak Tin) as they are in line with the EAC's statutory criteria and working principles.	
2	F01 – Po Lai	-	1	(a) Supports the provisional recommendations on F01 (Po Lai) and F04 (Shek Kip Mei).	<u>Item (a)</u> The supporting view is noted.
	F04 – Shek Kip Mei			(b) Same as item 1(c) because: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>the projected population of F06 (Nam Cheong South) is relatively more than that of F05 (Nam Cheong East); and</li> <li>the residents of the area in the north of Cheung Sha Wan Road mainly use the community facilities located nearby the Shek Kip Mei Street, thus the local ties of that area has comparatively less connection with that of the area in the south of Cheung Sha Wan Road.</li> </ul>	<u>Item (b)</u> Please see item 1(c).
	F05 – Nam Cheong East			(c) Proposes to rename F22 (Nam Shan, Tai Hang Tung & Tai Hang Sai) as “Kowloon Tsai” (九龍仔) because the name is composed of fewer words, and it could also represent the local identities.	<u>Item (c)</u> Please see item 1(k)(ii).
3	F01– Po Lai	1	-	Proposes:	Please see items 1(d), (g) and (h)(ii).
	F11– Fortune			(i) to transfer Un Chau Estate Phase 5 from F01 (Po Lai) to F11 (Fortune) for combining with public housing estates such as Fortune Estate, Hang Chun Court and Cheung Sha Wan Estate in the same DCCA; and	
	F16 – Lai Chi Kok Central				

<i>Item No.</i>	<i>DCCAs</i>	<i>No.*</i>		<i>Representations</i>	<i>EAC's Views</i>
		<i>W</i>	<i>O</i>		
	F17 – Lai Chi Kok North			<p>(ii) to transfer Aqua Marine from F11 (Fortune) to F16 (Lai Chi Kok Central) and to transfer The Pacifica to F17 (Lai Chi Kok North) because:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>● the DCCA is mainly composed of public housing estates having same factors of consideration in terms of public housing development;</li> <li>● Fortune Estate is far away from Aqua Marine. Un Chau Estate Phase 5 and Cheung Sha Wan Estate in F11 (Fortune) are connected by a footbridge;</li> <li>● the abovementioned proposal would not affect the demographic profile of F01 (Po Lai) on the ground that the time of intake of Un Chau Estate Phase 5 was mainly in July 2012; and</li> <li>● F16 (Lai Chi Kok Central) and F17 (Lai Chi Kok North) similarly belong to middle class private housing DCCAs.</li> </ul>	
4	F01 – Po Lai  F11 – Fortune	3	-	Propose to transfer Un Chau Estate Phase 5 from F01 (Po Lai) to F11 (Fortune) to combine with public housing estates such as Fortune Estate, Hang Chun Court and Cheung Sha Wan Estate in the same DCCA.	Please see item 1(d).

<i>Item No.</i>	<i>DCCAs</i>	<i>No.*</i>		<i>Representations</i>	<i>EAC's Views</i>
		<i>W</i>	<i>O</i>		
5	F01 – Po Lai  F11– Fortune  F18 – Un Chau & So Uk	-	2	<p>Propose:</p> <p>(i) to transfer Un Chau Estate Phase 5 from F01 (Po Lai) to F18 (Un Chau &amp; So Uk); or</p> <p>(ii) to transfer Un Chau Estate Phase 5 from F01 (Po Lai) to F11 (Fortune).</p> <p>One representation considers that:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>● the public housing estates residents share community facilities. If the public housing estates are put in the same DCCA, similar local services could be provided;</li> <li>● Un Chau Estate Phase 5 and other private buildings in F01 (Po Lai) does not have local ties; and</li> <li>● the projected population of F11 (Fortune) is relatively less than F01 (Po Lai).</li> </ul> <p>One representation considers that Un Chau Estate Phase 5 is far away from private buildings in F01(Po Lai) while it is closer to Fortune Estate located in F11 (Fortune).</p>	<p>These proposals are <b>not accepted</b> because:</p> <p>(i) the projected population of F01 (Po Lai) and F18 (Un Chau &amp; So Uk) will fall within the statutory permissible range. According to the established working principles, adjustment to their existing boundaries is not required;</p> <p>(ii) there is a view supporting the delineation proposal for F01 (Po Lai) (please see item 2(a)); and</p> <p>(iii) for the proposal (ii), please see item 1(d).</p>
6	F01 – Po Lai  F11 – Fortune	-	1	<p>Proposes to transfer Un Chau Estate Phase 5 from F01 (Po Lai) to F11 (Fortune). The representation emphasises the community integrity and expects that the residents of the DCCA could obtain similar local service.</p>	<p>Please see item 1(d).</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>		
7	F01 – Po Lai  F18 – Un Chau & So Uk	5	-	(a) Same as item 5(i) because Un Chau Estate has its community integrity and it is considered not suitable to separate the estate.  (b) Two representations propose to transfer the private buildings from F18 (Un Chau & So Uk) to other DCCAs.  (c) One representation proposes to rename F18 (Un Chau & So Uk) as “Un Chau” because So Uk Estate has been demolished. If such proposal would cause the population of F18 (Un Chau & So Uk) to exceed the statutory permissible upper limit, this problem would be solved by transferring the private buildings to F01 (Po Lai) for preserving community identity of F01 (Po Lai).	<u>Items (a) to (c)</u> Please see item 5(i) and (ii).
8	F01 – Po Lai  F18 – Un Chau & So Uk	2	-	Propose to transfer from F18 (Un Chau & So Uk) to F01 (Po Lai) the cluster of private buildings located in the area from Hing Wah Street to Cheung Fat Street and from Un Chau Street to Po On Road because the DCCA is composed of private buildings located within geographical distance, having its population within the statutory permissible range.	Please see item 5(i) and (ii).
9	F02 – Cheung Sha Wan  F05 – Nam Cheong East	1	-	(a) Proposes to rename F02 (Cheung Sha Wan) because most of the Cheung Sha Wan areas have already been included in F11 (Fortune) and F17 (Lai Chi Kok North).	<u>Item (a)</u> This proposal is <b>not accepted</b> because its current name has been used since 1994 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.

Item No.	DCCAs	No.*		Representations	EAC's Views
		W	O		
	F06 – Nam Cheong South			(b) Same as item 1(c).	<u>Item (b)</u> Please see item 1(c).
	F11 – Fortune			(c) Aqua Marine belongs to one of the estates of “Four Little Dragons of West Kowloon”, and is located far away from Fortune Estate. The representation proposes to transfer either Banyan Garden or The Pacifica from F16 (Lai Chi Kok Central) to F17 (Lai Chi Kok North), and retain the cluster of standalone private buildings in F11 (Fortune).	<u>Item (c)</u> This proposal is <b>not accepted</b> because:  (i) if the constituency boundary of F11 (Fortune) remains unchanged, the projected population of the DCCA (23,342) will exceed the statutory permissible upper limit (+37.60%); and  (ii) please see items 1(g) and (h)(ii).
	F16 – Lai Chi Kok Central				
	F17 – Lai Chi Kok North				
10	F04 – Shek Kip Mei	29	1	Object to transferring Blocks 19 and 20 of Shek Kip Mei Estate from F04 (Shek Kip Mei) to F05 (Nam Cheong East) because: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>F05 (Nam Cheong East) is mainly composed of private buildings, while the service requests related to public housing estates and private buildings are bound to be different; and</li> <li>the local ties of Blocks 19 and 20 of Shek Kip Mei Estate are comparatively closer to the remaining blocks of Shek Kip Mei Estate in F04 (Shek Kip Mei).</li> </ul> <p>One representation considers that Blocks 19 and 20 of Shek Kip Mei Estate are likely to be redeveloped in future, thus re-delineation of the boundary would be further required.</p>	These representations are <b>not accepted</b> because:  (i) if Blocks 19 and 20 of Shek Kip Mei Estate are retained in F04 (Shek Kip Mei), the projected population of the DCCA (22,612) will exceed the statutory permissible upper limit (+33.29%);  (ii) the EAC must adhere to the Administration's population forecast as at 30 June 2015 in delineating the constituency boundaries. Future development beyond this cut-off date will not be considered; and  (iii) there are views supporting the delineation proposal for F04 (Shek Kip Mei) (please see items 1(m) and 2(a)).

Item No.	DCCAs	No.*		Representations	EAC's Views
		W	O		
11	F04 – Shek Kip Mei  F05 – Nam Cheong East  F11 – Fortune  F16 – Lai Chi Kok Central  F17 – Lai Chi Kok North  F23 – Lung Ping & Sheung Pak Tin	1	-	(a) Proposes to transfer Blocks 19 and 20 of Shek Kip Mei Estate from F05 (Nam Cheong East) to F04 (Shek Kip Mei), and transfer Blocks 21 and 22 of Shek Kip Mei Estate from F04 (Shek Kip Mei) to F23 (Lung Ping & Sheung Pak Tin) to make the projected population of F04 (Shek Kip Mei) and F05 (Nam Cheong East) closer to the population quota.	<u>Item (a)</u> This proposal is <b>not accepted</b> because:  (i) the EAC considers it undesirable to transfer Blocks 21 and 22 of Shek Kip Mei Estate from F04 (Shek Kip Mei) to F23 (Lung Ping & Sheung Pak Tin) because the projected population of F23 (Lung Ping & Sheung Pak Tin) will fall within the statutory permissible range. According to the established working principles, adjustment to its existing boundary is not required;  (ii) by keeping the number of affected DCCAs to a minimum, the EAC proposes to create the new DCCA F05 (Nam Cheong East) within the original boundary of F04 (Shek Kip Mei), and to re-delineate the boundaries of the adjacent DCCAs, so that the projected population of the relevant DCCAs can be maintained within the statutory permissible range; and  (iii) there are views supporting the delineation proposals for F04 (Shek Kip Mei) and F23 (Lung Ping & Sheung Pak Tin) (please see items 1(m), 2(a) and 19(a)).
				(b) Proposes to transfer Aqua Marine from F11 (Fortune) to F16 (Lai Chi Kok Central), and to transfer The Pacifica to F17 (Lai Chi Kok North) for the same reasons as provided in item 3.	<u>Item (b)</u> This proposal is <b>not accepted</b> because:  (i) after the proposed adjustment, the projected population of F11 (Fortune) (11,275) will be below the statutory permissible lower limit (-33.54%); and

Item No.	DCCAs	No.*		Representations	EAC's Views
		W	O		
					(ii) please see item 1(g) and (h)(ii).
				(c) Proposes to transfer Sham Shui Po Sports Ground from F11 (Fortune) to F17 (Lai Chi Kok North) because no population is involved. This would make the shape of the DCCA more regular for management convenience.	<u>Item (c)</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.
12	F04 – Shek Kip Mei F05 – Nam Cheong East F20 – Ha Pak Tin F23 – Lung Ping & Sheung Pak Tin	1	-	Proposes:  (i) to combine Blocks 19 to 24 and 42 to 44 of Shek Kip Mei Estate located in F04 (Shek Kip Mei) and F05 (Nam Cheong East), and also Chak On Estate, the cluster of private buildings located along Lung Ping Road and Beacon Heights located in F23 (Lung Ping & Sheung Pak Tin) to form a DCCA;  (ii) to combine the rest of the buildings of Shek Kip Mei Estate in F04 (Shek Kip Mei) and the cluster of private buildings located in Wai Chi Street and Nam Cheong Street located within F20 (Ha Pak Tin) to form another DCCA; and  (iii) to form a DCCA solely for Pak Tin Estate,  because the proposal could better showcase the community integrity in terms of the building design, year of completion, demographic profile and local needs of Shek Kip Mei Estate.	This proposal is <b>not accepted</b> because:  (i) the EAC considers it undesirable to transfer the buildings of Shek Kip Mei Estate to F20 (Ha Pak Tin) and F23 (Lung Ping & Sheung Pak Tin) respectively because the projected population of these two DCCAs will fall within the statutory permissible range. According to the established working principles, adjustment to their existing boundaries is not required;  (ii) please see item 11(a)(ii); and  (iii) there are views supporting the delineation proposals for F04 (Shek Kip Mei), F20 (Ha Pak Tin) and F23 (Lung Ping & Sheung Pak Tin) (please see items 1(m), 2(a) and 19(a)).

Item No.	DCCAs	No.*		Representations	EAC's Views
		W	O		
13	F04 – Shek Kip Mei  F20 – Ha Pak Tin  F23 – Lung Ping & Sheung Pak Tin	1	1	<p>(a) Propose to form a DCCA solely for Pak Tin Estate because:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>● the EAC's working principle (a) is to maintain the existing community as far as possible, while principles (b) and (c) focus on the importance of community identity which is sufficient to override principle (a);</li> <li>● all buildings in Pak Tin Estate share community facilities in the estate. Although the buildings are separately included in different DCCAs in the past, the close ties among the residents would not be affected;</li> <li>● four buildings (Blocks 9, 10, 11 and 13) of Pak Tin Estate located in F23 (Lung Ping &amp; Sheung Pak Tin) would be redeveloped in 2018. All residents in Pak Tin Estate would be affected by the redevelopment. It is expected that due to the redevelopment, the estate's population (approximately 19,000) would not exceed the statutory permissible upper limit (+12.00%) and the deviation from the population quota is similar to that of the provisional recommendations (-13.34%);</li> <li>● four main estates in F23 (Lung Ping &amp; Sheung Pak Tin) are composed of Dynasty Heights, Beacon Heights, Chak On Estate and Pak Tin Estate (Blocks 9, 10, 11 and 13). Each housing estate is independent without any</li> </ul>	<p><u>Item (a)</u> This proposal is <b>not accepted</b> because:</p> <p>(i) the projected population of F20 (Ha Pak Tin) and F23 (Lung Ping &amp; Sheung Pak Tin) will fall within the statutory permissible range. According to the established working principles, adjustment to their existing boundaries is not required; and</p> <p>(ii) there are views supporting the delineation proposals for F20 (Ha Pak Tin) and F23 (Lung Ping &amp; Sheung Pak Tin) (please see items 1(m) and 19(a)).</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>linkage with each other. The residents of the DCCA usually use the facilities of Shek Kip Mei Estate. Therefore, the proposed transfer of the four buildings of Pak Tin Estate to F20 (Ha Pak Tin) would not adversely affect the residents of F23 (Lung Ping &amp; Sheung Pak Tin); and</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>it is hoped that the EAC would further consider the re-delineation proposal on the ground of community integrity.</li> </ul>	
				<p>(b) One representation raises concern about the projected population of F04 (Shek Kip Mei) exceeding the statutory permissible range and F23 (Lung Ping &amp; Sheung Pak Tin) located adjacent to F04 (Shek Kip Mei). It proposes to transfer part of Shek Kip Mei Estate from F04 (Shek Kip Mei) to F23 (Lung Ping &amp; Sheung Pak Tin), and/or to transfer six private buildings in Wai Chi Lane from F20 (Ha Pak Tin) to F23 (Lung Ping &amp; Sheung Pak Tin), to make up for the reduced population in F23 (Lung Ping &amp; Sheung Pak Tin).</p>	<p><u>Item (b)</u> This proposal is <b>not accepted</b> because:</p> <p>(i) the EAC considers it undesirable to transfer the buildings of Shek Kip Mei Estate from F04 (Shek Kip Mei) and the buildings from F20 (Ha Pak Tin) to F23 (Lung Ping &amp; Sheung Pak Tin) because the projected population of F20 (Ha Pak Tin) and F23 (Lung Ping &amp; Sheung Pak Tin) will fall within the statutory permissible range. According to the established working principles, adjustment to their existing boundaries is not required;</p> <p>(ii) please see item 11(a)(ii); and</p> <p>(iii) there are views supporting the delineation proposals for F04 (Shek Kip Mei), F20 (Ha Pak Tin) and F23 (Lung Ping &amp; Sheung Pak Tin) (please see items 1(m), 2(a) and 19(a)).</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>		
14	F07 – Nam Cheong Central  F08 – Nam Cheong West	2	-	<p>Propose to retain the area in the south of Lai Chi Kok Road, the east of Kweilin Street, the west of Nam Cheong Street, the north of Hai Tan Street, the west of Pei Ho Street and the north of Yee Kuk Street in F07 (Nam Cheong Central) because:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>● the above area comprises old building clusters and has its community identity;</li> <li>● there are concerns that community facilities in the area would not be enough to cope with the upsurge in the population in F08 (Nam Cheong West) as compared with that in 2012; and</li> <li>● F08 (Nam Cheong West) has a number of redevelopment projects later and there are concerns that the population in future would exceed the statutory permissible range.</li> </ul>	<p>This proposal is <b>not accepted</b> because:</p> <p>(i) after the proposed adjustment, the projected population of F07 (Nam Cheong Central) (22,771) will exceed the statutory permissible upper limit (+34.23%);</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> <p>(iii) the EAC must adhere to the Administration's population forecast as at 30 June 2015 in delineating the constituency boundaries. Future developments beyond this cut-off date will not be considered; and</p> <p>(iv) there is a view supporting the delineation proposals for F07 (Nam Cheong Central) and F08 (Nam Cheong West) (please see item 1(m)).</p>
15	F10 – Lai Kok  F11 – Fortune  F12 – Lai Chi Kok South  F16 – Lai Chi Kok Central	1	-	<p>Proposes:</p> <p>(i) to reinstate the 2011 constituency boundary of F11 (Fortune) and to transfer Cheung Sha Wan Estate to F10 (Lai Kok);</p> <p>(ii) to combine The Sparkle, Aqua Marine and The Pacifica to form a DCCA and rename as "Lai Chi Kok North";</p>	<p>This proposal is <b>not accepted</b> because:</p> <p>(i) please see items 1(g) and (h);</p> <p>(ii) the EAC considers it undesirable to transfer Cheung Sha Wan Estate from F11 (Fortune) to F10 (Lai Kok) because the projected population of F10 (Lai Kok) will fall within the statutory permissible range. According to the established working</p>

Item No.	DCCAs	No.*		Representations	EAC's Views
		W	O		
	F17 – Lai Chi Kok North			<p>(iii) to combine One West Kowloon, Banyan Garden and Liberte located within F16 (Lai Chi Kok Central) to form a DCCA and rename as “Lai Chi Kok South”; and</p> <p>(iv) to form a DCCA solely for Hoi Lai Estate.</p> <p>The above proposal is made by considering the balancing factors of geographical, demographic and community integrity.</p>	<p>principles, adjustment to its existing boundary is not required; and</p> <p>(iii) by keeping the number of affected DCCAs to a minimum, the EAC proposes to create the new DCCA F16 (Lai Chi Kok Central) within the original boundary of F17 (Lai Chi Kok North), and to re-delineate the boundaries of F11 (Fortune), F12 (Lai Chi Kok South) and F17 (Lai Chi Kok North), so that the projected population of the abovementioned DCCAs can be maintained within the statutory permissible range.</p>
16	F11 – Fortune  F12 – Lai Chi Kok South  F16 – Lai Chi Kok Central	1	-	<p>Objects to transferring Aqua Marine to F11 (Fortune) and proposes:</p> <p>(i) to retain Aqua Marine in F12 (Lai Chi Kok South) for providing convenience for the residents to express their views to the DC member; or</p> <p>(ii) to transfer Aqua Marine from F11 (Fortune) to F16 (Lai Chi Kok Central).</p>	<p>These proposals are <b>not accepted</b> because:</p> <p>(i) if the constituency boundary of F12 (Lai Chi Kok South) remains unchanged, the projected population of the DCCA (21,640) will exceed the statutory permissible upper limit (+27.56%);</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; and</p> <p>(iii) after the proposed adjustment, the projected population of F11 (Fortune) and F16 (Lai Chi Kok Central) will exceed the statutory permissible range:</p> <p>F11: 11,275, -33.54% F16: 24,008, +41.52%</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>		
17	F11 – Fortune	6	1	(a) Same as item 11(b).	<u>Item (a)</u> Please see items 11(b)(i) as well as 1(g) and (h)(ii).
	F16 – Lai Chi Kok Central F17 – Lai Chi Kok North			(b) One representation proposes to transfer Aqua Marine from F11 (Fortune) to F16 (Lai Chi Kok Central) and to transfer The Pacifica to F11 (Fortune).	<u>Item (b)</u> This proposal is <b>not accepted</b> because:  (i) please see items 1(g) and (h)(ii); and  (ii) Aqua Marine and The Pacifica are equidistant from F11 (Fortune). There is no objective information and justification to prove that the proposal made in the representations is clearly better than the provisional recommendations in terms of preserving community identities and local ties.
18	F11 – Fortune F16 – Lai Chi Kok Central F17 – Lai Chi Kok North	-	1	Due to the far distance between Aqua Marine and Fortune Estate making no strong local ties between both estates and “Four Little Dragons of West Kowloon” has been used to describe Aqua Marine and the other three large estates for ten years with strong local ties among them, the representation proposes:  (i) to combine Aqua Marine, Liberte and The Pacifica to form a DCCA;  (ii) to combine One West Kowloon and Banyan Garden to form another DCCA; and  (iii) to reinstate the 2011 constituency boundary of F11 (Fortune).	This proposal is <b>not accepted</b> because:  (i) by combining One West Kowloon and Banyan Garden to create a new DCCA, the projected population of the DCCA (7,417) will be below the statutory permissible lower limit (-56.28%); and  (ii) please see items 1(g) and (h)(ii) as well as 9(c)(i).

<i>Item No.</i>	<i>DCCAs</i>	<i>No.*</i>		<i>Representations</i>	<i>EAC's Views</i>
		<i>W</i>	<i>O</i>		
19	F23 – Lung Ping & Sheung Pak Tin	2	-	(a) Support the provisional recommendation on F23 (Lung Ping & Sheung Pak Tin) because it addresses the concerns from various points of view, and consider that adjustment to its boundary is not required.	<u>Item (a)</u> The supporting views are noted.
				(b) One representation proposes to set up a polling station in Chak On Estate for taking care of the residents of Chak On Estate, Beacon Heights and Dynasty Heights.	<u>Item (b)</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.

**Appendix II - G**

**Kowloon City 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	-	Support all the delineation proposals in the district and consider that the delineation has taken into account the factors of community identities, local ties and the physical features.	The supporting views are noted.
2	All DCCAs	1	-	(a) Objects to the existing delineation for G12 (Kai Tak North) and G13 (Kai Tak South) and if the population requirement could be met, proposes to delineate the whole Kai Ching Estate and Tak Long Estate in two separate DCCAs respectively for the sake of community ties and use the names of the estates "Kai Ching" and "Tak Long" as the respective names of the DCCAs to reflect their composition.	<u>Item (a)</u> This proposal is <b>not accepted</b> because if the whole Kai Ching Estate is delineated in one DCCA, the projected population of G12 (Kai Tak North) (12,228) will be below the statutory permissible lower limit (-27.92%).
				(b) Other than the DCCAs mentioned in item 2(a) above, supports the delineation proposals for all DCCAs in the district as they are in line with the EAC's statutory criteria and working principles.	<u>Item (b)</u> The supporting view is noted.
				(c) Proposes to use the following order in assigning the DCCA codes because this ordering would put all DCCAs in the Kowloon City District with consecutive numbers contiguous to each other:	<u>Item (c)</u> This proposal is <b>not accepted</b> because:  (i) allocating codes to DCCAs is merely for the sake of easy identification of locations of the DCCAs on the

\* 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>		
				G01 (Ma Tau Wai), G02 (Sung Wong Toi), G03 (Ma Hang Chung), G04 (Ma Tau Kok), G05 (Lok Man), G06 (Sheung Lok), G07 (Ho Man Tin), G08 (Kadoorie), G09 (Prince), G10 (Kowloon Tong), G11 (Lung Shing), G12 (Kai Ching), G13 (Tak Long), G14 (Hoi Sham).	<p>constituency boundary map and is not directly related to the review and naming of the constituency boundaries. Changing the DCCA codes used in the provisional recommendations may also cause confusion to the public. The DCCA codes used in the provisional recommendations have been allocated in a clockwise direction on the boundary map to make the DCCAs with consecutive numbers contiguous to each other as far as possible so that it is easier to locate them; and</p> <p>(ii) the order of DCCA codes proposed in the representation cannot make all DCCAs in the Kowloon City District with consecutive numbers contiguous to each other.</p>
3	G01 – Ma Tau Wai G02 – Ma Hang Chung G06 – Ho Man Tin G11 – Sung Wong Toi G12 – Kai Tak North G13 – Kai Tak South	1	-	<p>(a) Considers that there are many ways to deal with the excess population in G06 (Ho Man Tin) and objects to transferring The Astrid, which is far away from the main settlement of G01 (Ma Tau Wai), from G06 (Ho Man Tin) to G01 (Ma Tau Wai) due to the need to adjust the boundary of G11 (Sung Wong Toi). Besides, proposes to transfer the excess population of G11 (Sung Wong Toi) to G02 (Ma Hang Chung).</p> <p>(b) Objects to transferring the Hong Kong Aviation Club, which is adjacent to G11 (Sung Wong Toi) to a rather far away DCCA G13 (Kai Tak South).</p>	<p><u>Item (a)</u> This proposal is <b>not accepted</b> because, overall speaking, the proposed changes will affect G02 (Ma Hang Chung), hence, the number of affected DCCAs will be more than that in the EAC's provisional recommendations.</p> <p><u>Item (b)</u> This representation is <b>not accepted</b> because there is no projected population for the Hong Kong Aviation Club. The proposal will not bring about any improvement</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>		
					in terms of population distribution.
				(c) Considers that delineating all the surrounding areas of the whole New Development Area in G13 (Kai Tak South) would result in an uneven division of work between the DC members of G12 (Kai Tak North) and G13 (Kai Tak South).	<u>Item (c)</u> The delineation proposal must be based on objective data of population distribution. Arrangements on district administration matters are not the relevant factors of consideration.
4	G03 – Ma Tau Kok  G14 – Hoi Sham  G15 – To Kwa Wan North	1	-	Supports the delineation proposals and names for G03 (Ma Tau Kok), G14 (Hoi Sham) and G15 (To Kwa Wan North).	The supporting view is noted.
5	G12 – Kai Tak North  G13 – Kai Tak South	-	1	Proposes to delineate the whole Kai Ching Estate and Tak Long Estate in two separate DCCAs and use the names of the estates “Kai Ching” and “Tak Long” as the respective names of the two DCCAs.	Please see item 2(a).
6	G12 – Kai Tak North  G13 – Kai Tak South	1	-	Proposes to transfer the northern part of the Kai Tak Development Area (i.e. the areas near Prince Edward Road East covering the areas from the Trade and Industry Tower under construction to Sung Wong Toi) from G13 (Kai Tak South) to G12 (Kai Tak North) and to delineate these two DCCAs along the road running from the MTR station of the Shatin to Central Link (near Muk Chui Street) to the junction of Kowloon City Road and Sung Wong Toi Road because:	These proposals are <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 Kai Tak Development Area (except for Tak Long Estate and Kai Ching Estate) mentioned in the representation has no projected population. Moreover, there is no justification to support the point raised on local ties.



<i>Item No.</i>	<i>DCCAs</i>	<i>No.*</i>		<i>Representations</i>	<i>EAC's views</i>
		<i>W</i>	<i>O</i>		
				<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>the residents of G13 (Kai Tak South) do not have much links with the north of the Kai Tak Development Area along Prince Edward Road East. The residents of Tak Long Estate mostly use the facilities in the east, such as the bus stop in Richland Gardens, Kowloon Bay, which is opposite to Tak Long Estate, and the Choi Hung MTR Station; and</li> <li>there are closer links between G12 (Kai Tak North) and the north of the Kai Tak Development Area. The residents of Kai Ching Estate would walk to San Po Kong and Kowloon City via the footbridge and pedestrian subway in Prince Edward Road East and use the bus stop in Prince Edward Road East and the Diamond Hill MTR Station. Therefore, the residents of G12 (Kai Tak North) would have more links with the north of the Kai Tak Development Area. Delineating the above areas in G12 (Kai Tak North) would be more appropriate in terms of environmental improvement and management of public facilities.</li> </ul>	
7	G14 – Hoi Sham	2	-	Support the delineation proposal for G14 (Hoi Sham) and consider that the projected population of the DCCA is within the statutory permissible range. In addition, the proposal is appropriate in terms of the size and shape of the DCCA as well as the integrity of the housing estates in the DCCA.	The supporting views are noted.

<i>Item No.</i>	<i>DCCAs</i>	<i>No.*</i>		<i>Representations</i>	<i>EAC's views</i>
		<i>W</i>	<i>O</i>		
8	G19 – Whampoa West  G20 – Hung Hom Bay	1	-	Objects to transferring the Hong Kong Polytechnic University Student Halls of Residence Jockey Club Wing from G19 (Whampoa West) to G20 (Hung Hom Bay) because the proposed DCCAs would be lack of community integrity. Proposes to retain the original boundaries of the DCCAs.	This proposal is <b>not accepted</b> because if the original boundaries of the DCCAs are retained, the projected population of G19 (Whampoa West) (21,739) will exceed the statutory permissible upper limit (+28.15%).

**Appendix II - H**

**Wong Tai Sin 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 H01 (Lung Tsui), H02 (Lung Ha), H03 (Lung Sheung), H04 (Fung Wong), H05 (Fung Tak), H06 (Lung Sing), H10 (Lok Fu), H11 (Wang Tau Hom), H16 (Tsz Wan West), H17 (Ching Oi), H18 (Ching On), H19 (Tsz Wan East), H20 (King Fu), H24 (Chi Choi) and H25 (Choi Hung) as they are in line with the EAC's statutory criteria and working principles.	<u>Item (a)</u> The supporting view is noted.
				(b) Holds reservation on the provisional recommendations on H12 (Tin Keung), H13 (Tsui Chuk & Pang Ching), H14(Chuk Yuen South) and H15 (Chuk Yuen North) because although they are in line with the EAC's statutory criteria and working principles, it is not desirable for some DCCAs to span across Lung Cheung Road as this would undermine community development. It is hoped that the EAC would take note of this in future delineation exercises.	<u>Item (b)</u> This representation is <b>not accepted</b> because the projected population of H12 (Tin Keung), H13 (Tsui Chuk & Pang Ching), H14 (Chuk Yuen South) and H15 (Chuk Yuen North) will fall within the statutory permissible range. According to the established working principles, adjustment to their existing boundaries is not required.
				(c) Holds reservation on the provisional recommendations on H21 (Choi Wan East), H22 (Choi Wan South) and H23 (Choi Wan West) because although they could be	<u>Item (c)</u> Delineation of constituency boundaries should follow the number of elected seats as specified in the DCO (Cap. 547) and the population distribution in

\* 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>		
				accepted for they could reduce the population difference among the three DCCAs of Choi Wan and retain the community identity, based on the aggregate population, there is an excess of one seat in the area concerned. It is proposed to reduce one elected seat in 2019.	the relevant districts. Part of the representation involves amendment to the Ordinance which does not fall under the purview of the EAC. The EAC has referred this view to the CMAB for reference.
				<p>(d) Objects to the provisional recommendations on H07 (San Po Kong), H08 (Tung Tau) and H09 (Tung Mei) because in the 2011 delineation exercise, the buildings within the 2007 original boundary of H07 (San Po Kong) had been transferred to H08 (Tung Tau). Although the projected population of H07 (San Po Kong) in the current provisional recommendations is only 2% higher than the statutory permissible upper limit, a few buildings in H07 (San Po Kong) should also be transferred to H08 (Tung Tau). If the population of H08 (Tung Tau) is too high after the proposed change, one building in Tung Tau Estate could be transferred to H09 (Tung Mei) in order to reduce the population difference. The proposal is as follows:</p> <p>(i) to transfer the area around Yin Hing Street, Foo Yuen Street and Shung Ling Street (i.e. the parks on the two sides of Yan Oi Street and the tenement buildings in the south of Foo Yuen Street) from H07 (San Po Kong) to H08 (Tung Tau) so that the population of</p>	<p><u>Item (d)</u> This representation is <b>not accepted</b>. The EAC agrees that the proposal made in the representation can make the population of H07 (San Po Kong) fall within the statutory permissible range and reduce the population difference between H07 (San Po Kong) and H08 (Tung Tau). However, at the same time, taking into account the factor of community development, the buildings in the existing H07 (San Po Kong), which are adjacent to H08 (Tung Tau) certainly have established local ties with one another. Taking into account that the projected population of H07 (San Po Kong) in 2015 will only slightly exceed the statutory permissible upper limit and having balanced the relevant factors, the EAC considers that the existing boundary of H07 (San Po Kong) can be allowed to remain unchanged at this stage.</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>H07 (San Po Kong) would fall within the statutory permissible range;</p> <p>(ii) then, to transfer Wing Tung House of Tung Tau Estate from H08 (Tung Tau) to H09 (Tung Mei) so that the population of H08 (Tung Tau) would fall within the statutory permissible range. This would also increase the population of H09 (Tung Mei) so as to reduce the population difference between the two DCCAs.</p>	
2	H04 – Fung Wong	15	-	<p>Support maintaining the existing boundary of H04 (Fung Wong). The reasons are summarised below:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>● apart from the Firemen Quarters in the DCCA, all the buildings are small-scale private buildings. Among those, Fung Wong San Tsuen is a small community comprising old tenement buildings. The existing delineation would make the community more harmonious, foster a stronger sense of belonging among the residents and preserve the community integrity;</li> <li>● residents in large-scale public housing estates and old private buildings need different scopes of services. If a DCCA is made up of both public housing estates (or Home Ownership Scheme buildings) and old private buildings, all resources would be towards public housing estates and old private buildings would be ignored.</li> </ul>	The supporting views are noted.

<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>Given that the Government has been putting efforts in renovating old buildings in recent years, the DCCA would need the serving DC member to devote an enormous amount of time and resources to deal with the renovation and management of old buildings; and</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>the DCCA has been running smoothly for many years so no changes should be made.</li> </ul>	
3	H06 – Lung Sing	21	1	Propose to retain two polling stations in H06 (Lung Sing) for the 2015 DC Election. Apart from setting up a polling station in Lung Poon Court, another polling station should be set up in Galaxia to facilitate the voting of the residents living in buildings such as Galaxia and Bel Air Heights and avoid the occurrence of any possible physical conflicts.	Arrangements on polling station are not the factors of consideration in delineating constituencies. The EAC has referred these views to the REO for follow-up.
4	H06 – Lung Sing H07 – San Po Kong H08 – Tung Tau H09 – Tung Mei	-	1	(a) States that H07 (San Po Kong), H08 (Tung Tau) and H09 (Tung Mei) occupy a large area. Besides, the area in the west of Rhythm Garden in H07 (San Po Kong) and the site of the previous Tai Hom Village locating in the north of San Po Kong (currently located in H06 (Lung Sing)) would be developed. There are also public housing buildings being built next to Mei Tung Estate in H09 (Tung Mei). The representation questions that the provisional recommendations on the above DCCAs have not taken into account the above factors.	<p><u>Item (a)</u> This representation is <b>not accepted</b> because:</p> <p>(i) the EAC must adhere to the Administration's population forecast as at 30 June 2015 in delineating the constituency boundaries. The development thereafter should not be taken into account;</p> <p>(ii) the projected population of H06 (Lung Sing), H08 (Tung Tau) and H09 (Tung Mei) will fall within the statutory permissible range. According to the established working principles, adjustment to their existing</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>boundaries is not required; and</p> <p>(iii) based on the 2011 original constituency boundary, the projected population of H07 (San Po Kong) will only slightly exceed the statutory permissible upper limit. Taking into account the community integrity and local ties, the EAC considers that the existing boundary of H07 (San Po Kong) can remain unchanged at this stage.</p>
				(b) States that there are many elderlies in H07 (San Po Kong), H08 (Tung Tau) and H09 (Tung Mei) and expresses worries that there are political considerations in the delineation exercise.	<u>Item (b)</u> The delineation proposal must be based on objective data of population distribution. Factors with political implications are not taken into consideration.
				(c) Questions why The Latitude and Choi Hung Building were delineated in H08 (Tung Tau).	<u>Item (c)</u> This representation is <b>not accepted</b> because taking into account the population factor, buildings such as The Latitude and Choi Hung Building were delineated in H08 (Tung Tau) in the 2011 delineation exercise. As the projected population of H08 (Tung Tau) will fall within the statutory permissible range, according to the established working principles, adjustment to its existing boundary is not required.
				(d) Proposes to increase the number of polling stations in H08 (Tung Tau) to facilitate the voting of the elderly and residents of The Latitude of the DCCA.	<u>Item (d)</u> Arrangements on polling station are not the factors of consideration in delineating constituencies. The EAC has referred this view to the REO for follow-up.

<i>Item No.</i>	<i>DCCAs</i>	<i>No.*</i>		<i>Representations</i>	<i>EAC's Views</i>
		<i>W</i>	<i>O</i>		
5	H07 – San Po Kong	1	-	(a) States that the area between H07 (San Po Kong) and H08 (Tung Tau) is densely populated and proposes to transfer some buildings along Shung Ling Street, Hong Keung Street and Yan Oi Street from H07 (San Po Kong) to H08 (Tung Tau).	<u>Item (a)</u> This proposal is <b>not accepted</b> . Please see item 1(d).
	H08 – Tung Tau H21 – Choi Wan East H22 – Choi Wan South H23 – Choi Wan West			(b) States that if the boundary of H07 (San Po Kong) could be allowed to remain unchanged and its population be allowed to deviate from the statutory permissible range, the boundary of H23 (Choi Wan West) should also be allowed to remain unchanged and its population be allowed to deviate from the statutory permissible range because Choi Wan (I) Estate and Choi Wan (II) Estate are delineated in H21 (Choi Wan East), H22 (Choi Wan South) and H23 (Choi Wan West). These DCCAs are separated by major roads. If two houses of Choi Wan (II) Estate located within the original boundary of H21 (Choi Wan East) are transferred to H23 (Choi Wan West), it would undermine the community integrity. Besides, comparatively speaking, there are more elderlies in Choi Wan Estate and they do not want changes.	<u>Item (b)</u> This representation is <b>not accepted</b> because:  (i) if the boundaries of H21 (Choi Wan East) and H23 (Choi Wan West) remain unchanged, the projected population of H23 (Choi Wan West) (11,268) will be substantially below the statutory permissible lower limit (-33.58%); and  (ii) taking into account the population distribution, buildings of Choi Wan (I) Estate and Choi Wan (II) Estate are already delineated in three DCCAs. Therefore, the justification of maintaining the community integrity is not convincing.
6	H08 – Tung Tau	1	-	Proposes to transfer Billionnaire Royale from H08 (Tung Tau) to the Kowloon City District because:  ● according to the land lease, Billionnaire Royale (Address:	This proposal involves alteration of the district boundary, which does not fall under the purview of the EAC. The EAC has referred this view to the HAD for consideration.



<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>83 Sa Po Road) is part of the Kowloon City District. Putting the above address in the Wong Tai Sin District denies the authority and role of the land lease;</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• putting the above address in the Wong Tai Sin District deprives the legitimate rights of the residents of the above address as Kowloon City District residents. This runs against the principles of equal opportunity, fairness and impartiality; and</li> <li>• when the district boundary was delineated in 1982, the site of the above address was only an open space. But now, it is a building with residents living in it. The boundary is therefore no longer appropriate.</li> </ul>	
7	H21 – Choi Wan East  H22 – Choi Wan South  H23 – Choi Wan West	1	-	Proposes to merge H21 (Choi Wan East), H22 (Choi Wan South) and H23 (Choi Wan West) into one DCCA because if they are divided into three DCCAs, the DC member of any one DCCA would not care about the situation of the other two DCCAs, especially the use of Clear Water Bay Road and Fung Shing Street.	This proposal is <b>not accepted</b> because if H21 (Choi Wan East), H22 (Choi Wan South) and H23 (Choi Wan West) are merged into one DCCA, the projected population of the DCCA (40,205) will substantially exceed the statutory permissible upper limit (+137.00%).
8	H21 – Choi Wan East  H22 – Choi Wan South  H23 – Choi Wan	4	-	<p>Object to transferring Yok Yu House and King Kung House of Choi Wan (II) Estate to H23 (Choi Wan West) and splitting the Estate among H21 (Choi Wan East), H22 (Choi Wan South) and H23 (Choi Wan West) because:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• the Estate is only a small-scale estate. If it is divided into</li> </ul>	These representations are <b>not accepted</b> . Please see item 5(b). Moreover, arrangements on district administration matters and polling station are not the factors of consideration in delineating constituencies.

<i>Item No.</i>	<i>DCCAs</i>	<i>No.*</i>		<i>Representations</i>	<i>EAC's Views</i>
		<i>W</i>	<i>O</i>		
	West			<p>three parts, it would lead to differentiation, thereby undermining the harmony of the Estate;</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>● if three elected DC members are to provide services to the residents of the Estate separately, it would cause confusion to the residents;</li> <li>● the residents of Yok Yu House and King Kung House are used to seeking help from and expressing their opinions to the office of the existing DC member;</li> <li>● the electors of the Estate (such as the elderly) find it hard to tell which DCCA they belong to. The delineation in the provisional recommendations would cause great inconvenience to them;</li> <li>● if the DC members of the three DCCAs have different views on the affairs of the Estate, it would create hurdles for administration and would take more time to make decisions resulting in lower efficiency; and</li> </ul> <p>Out of the representations, two in number further state that:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>● the office of the existing DC member of H21 (Choi Wan East) is located at the ground floor of Yok Yu House and King Kung House. Residents are used to seeking help from and expressing their views to the office. After the change of boundary of the DCCA, the office may be relocated to a</li> </ul>	

<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>place that is farther away. In this case, it would cause great inconvenience to the residents of the Estate; and</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>in the past, the residents of Yok Yu House and King Kung House were used to voting at the school next to the buildings on the polling day. However, if the two buildings are transferred to H23 (Choi Wan West), most electors may go to the wrong polling station and it would definitely cause confusion. In addition, some electors may give up voting because the polling station is farther away. This may have a great effect on the polling results.</li> </ul>	
9	H21 – Choi Wan East  H23 – Choi Wan West	1	-	Objects to separating out Yok Yu House and King Kung House of Choi Wan (II) Estate, which would deprive the rights of the residents.	This representation is <b>not accepted</b> . Please see items 5(b) and 8.

**Appendix II - J**

**Kwun Tong 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	Considers that one district area should not be split into two DCCAs. For example, in the 2011 delineation exercise, one area in Kwun Tong was almost split into two DCCAs with only one alley in between. However, the situation has been improved in this delineation exercise. Therefore, all the delineation proposals in the district are supported.	The supporting view is noted.
2	All DCCAs	1	-	(a) Holds reservation on the provisional recommendations on J01 (Kwun Tong Central), J27 (Tsui Ping), J28 (Po Lok), J29 (Yuet Wah) and J30 (Hip Hong) although they are in line with the EAC's statutory criteria and working principles. It is unreasonable to split Tsui Ping (North) Estate into three DCCAs. Proposes that the above five DCCAs should be re-delineated in 2019 so that Tsui Ping (North) Estate would only be split into two DCCAs.	<u>Item (a)</u> The view is noted. 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.
				(b) Supports the provisional recommendations on J02 (Kowloon Bay), J08 (Shun Tin), J09 (Sheung Shun), J10 (On Lee), J16 (Hing Tin), J17 (Lam Tin), J18 (Kwong Tak), J19 (Ping Tin), J20 (Pak Nga), J21 (Yau Tong East), J22 (Yau Lai), J23 (Chui Cheung), J24	<u>Item (b)</u> The supporting view is noted.

\* W: Number of written representation

O: Number of oral representation

Item No.	DCCAs	No.*		Representations	EAC's views
		W	O		
				(Yau Tong West), J26 (King Tin), J31 (Hong Lok), J32 (Ting On), J36 (Lok Wah North) and J37 (Lok Wah South) because they are in line with the EAC's statutory criteria and working principles.	
				<p>(c) Proposes to transfer Tak Bo Garden from J03 (Kai Yip) to J35 (To Tai) because:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>the residents of Tak Bo Garden have to walk across Kwun Tong Road in order to reach the other buildings in J03 (Kai Yip). There is little relationship between the two communities. The only means of connection is through the flyover near Kai Tak Mansion; and</li> <li>Tak Bo Garden and its adjacent buildings are private buildings along Ngau Tau Kok Road.</li> </ul>	<p><u>Item (c)</u> This proposal is <b>not accepted</b> because the projected population of J03 (Kai Yip) and J35 (To Tai) will fall within the statutory permissible range. According to the established working principles, adjustment to their existing boundaries is not required.</p>
				(d) Holds reservation on the provisional recommendations on J04 (Lai Ching) and J05 (Ping Shek).	<p><u>Item (d)</u> The view is noted.</p>
				(e) Considers that the provisional recommendations on J06 (Sheung Choi) and J07 (Jordan Valley) are in line with the EAC's statutory criteria and working principles. Proposes to rename J06 (Sheung Choi) as "Tak Ying" and J07 (Jordan Valley) as "Fuk Har" because these two DCCAs should be named after the housing	<p><u>Item (e)</u> This proposal is <b>not accepted</b> because the majority of the public are used to the DCCA names and change of the DCCA names may cause confusion to the public.</p>

Item No.	DCCAs	No.*		Representations	EAC's views
		W	O		
				estates in the area.	
				<p>(f) Proposes:</p> <p>(i) to transfer 7 buildings, namely Tat Hei House, Tat Shun House, Tat Kai House and Tat Cheung House of Po Tat Estate from J11 (Po Tat) and Sau Ming House, Sau On House and Sau Fu House of Sau Mau Ping Estate from J12 (Sau Mau Ping North) to J14 (Sau Mau Ping South) because:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>● the residents of Tat Hei House, Tat Shun House and Tat Kai House of Po Tat Estate need to route through Tat Cheung House to use the flyovers for accessing the other parts of J14 (Sau Mau Ping South); and</li> <li>● Sau Ming House, Sau On House and Sau Fu House of Sau Mau Ping Estate are connected by a flyover to Sau Mau Ping South Estate in J14 (Sau Mau Ping South). On the contrary, they are further away from other part of J12 (Sau Mau Ping North). Furthermore, the projected population of J12 (Sau Mau Ping North) is larger than that of J14 (Sau Mau Ping South).</li> </ul>	<p><u>Item (f)</u> This proposal is <b>not accepted</b> because the proposal made in the representation will affect both J12 (Sau Mau Ping North) and J13 (Hiu Lai). The projected population of the two DCCAs will fall within the statutory permissible range. According to the established working principles, adjustment to their existing boundaries is not required. Overall speaking, the number of affected DCCAs of such proposal will be more than that in the EAC's provisional recommendations.</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) to transfer United Christian Hospital from J12 (Sau Mau Ping North) to J13 (Hiu Lai), because United Christian Hospital is far away from Sau Mau Ping Estate, and also the projected population of J12 (Sau Mau Ping North) is larger than that in J13 (Hiu Lai). It could also reduce the projected population difference of the abovementioned DCCAs; and</p> <p>(iii) after the above adjustments, the following renumbered DCCA codes could enable more adjacent DCCAs in Kwun Tong District with adjoining codes:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>● J13 (Hiu Lai) as J11;</li> <li>● Retain J12 (Sau Mau Ping North) as J12;</li> <li>● J14 (Sau Mau Ping South) as J13;</li> <li>● J15 (Sau Mau Ping Central) as J14, and rename as “Sau Mau Ping East”; and</li> <li>● J11 (Po Tat) as J15.</li> </ul>	
				<p>(g) Supports the provisional recommendation on J25 (Laguna City) but considers that the projected population of J25 (Laguna City) is nearly a double of J37 (Lok Wah</p>	<p><u>Item (g)</u> The supporting view is noted. In drawing up the delineation proposals, the EAC has strictly adhered to the statutory criteria under the EACO and its working</p>

Item No.	DCCAs	No.*		Representations	EAC's views
		W	O		
				South), therefore in 2019, J25 (Laguna City) should be split.	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.
				(h) Considers that the provisional recommendations on J33 (Upper Ngau Tau Kok Estate) and J34 (Lower Ngau Tau Kok Estate) are in line with the EAC's statutory criteria and working principles. Proposes to rename J33 (Upper Ngau Tau Kok Estate) as "Upper Ngau Tau Kok" and J34 (Lower Ngau Tau Kok Estate) as "Lower Ngau Tau Kok and Jordan Valley" to reflect that the DCCAs include other housing estates.	<u>Item (h)</u> This proposal is <b>not accepted</b> because the names of the DCCAs as recommended by the EAC are familiar by the local community, which can also reflect their geographical locations.
3	J01 – Kwun Tong Central J02- Kowloon Bay J03 – Kai Yip J04 – Lai Ching J06 – Sheung Choi J07 – Jordan Valley	1	-	(a) Proposes to change the district boundaries of the following:  (i) following the completion of new roads in the Kai Tak Development, Shing Kai Road could be used to separate Kwun Tong District and Kowloon City District;  (ii) the narrow area between New Clear Water Bay Road and Clear Water Bay Road is proposed to be transferred to Wong Tai Sin District H22 (Choi Wan South); and	<u>Item (a)</u> This proposal involves alteration of the district boundaries, which does not fall under the purview of the EAC. The EAC has referred this view to the HAD for consideration.



Item No.	DCCAs	No.*		Representations	EAC's views
		W	O		
	J08 – Shun Tin			(iii) to alter the boundaries of Kwun Tong District and Sai Kung District by using the ridge of Tai Sheung Tok as the district boundary. The development at Anderson Road Quarry should be included in Kwun Tong District for facilitating development in future.	
	J09 – Sheung Shun				
	J10 – On Lee				
	J11 – Po Tat				
	J12 – Sau Mau Ping North				
	J13 – Hiu Lai			(b) Proposes to re-delineate the boundaries of the following DCCAs and to change their names (except J05 (Ping Shek)) :  <u>J01 (Kwun Tong Central)</u> Includes Park Metropolitan, the areas in the south of Kwun Tong Road and Shui Ning Street, the west of Hip Wo Street, the northwest of Kwun Tong By-Pass and the southeast of Kai Fuk Road, Hong Tak Road and Cheung Yip Street.  <u>J02 (Kowloon Bay)</u> Includes Telford Gardens and other areas.  <u>J03 (Kai Yip)</u> Includes Kai Yip Estate, Kai Tai Court and other areas.  <u>J04 (Lai Ching)</u> Includes Richland Gardens. This DCCA is to be renamed as “Richland”.  <u>J06 (Sheung Choi)</u> Includes Choi Tak Estate, Choi Fook Estate and other areas. This DCCA is to be	<u>Items (b) and (c)</u> This proposal is <b>not accepted</b> because:  (i) overall speaking, the number of affected DCCAs of such proposal will be more than that in the EAC's provisional recommendations; and  (ii) after the proposed adjustment, the projected population of J03 (Kai Yip), J06 (Sheung Choi), J11 (Po Tat), J24 (Yau Tong West) and J36 (Lok Wah North) will exceed the statutory permissible range:  J03: 11,482, -32.32% J06: 21,634, +27.53% J11: 23,133, +36.37% J24: 21,700, +27.92% J36: 11,489, -32.27%
	J14 – Sau Mau Ping South				
	J15 – Sau Mau Ping Central				
	J16 – Hing Tin				
	J17 – Lam Tin				
	J18 – Kwong Tak				
	J19 – Ping Tin				
	J20 – Pak Nga				
	J21 – Yau Tong East				

<i>Item No.</i>	<i>DCCAs</i>	<i>No.*</i>		<i>Representations</i>	<i>EAC's views</i>
		<i>W</i>	<i>O</i>		
	J22 – Yau Lai			renamed as “Fook Tak”.	
	J23 – Chui Cheung			<u>J07 (Jordan Valley)</u> Includes Choi Ying Estate, Tak Bo Garden, Jade Field Garden, Wang Kwong Building and Lee Kee Building. This DCCA is to be renamed as “Po Ying”.	
	J24 – Yau Tong West			<u>J08 (Shun Tin)</u> Includes Amoy Gardens, Cheerful Court, Choi Ha Estate, Shiu King Building and other areas. This DCCA is to be renamed as “Jordan Valley”.	
	J25 – Laguna City			<u>J09 (Sheung Shun)</u> Includes Shun Tin Estate and other areas. This DCCA is to be renamed as “Shun Tin”.	
	J26 – King Tin			<u>J10 (On Lee)</u> Includes Shun On Estate, Lee Yip House, Lee Yat House, Lee Foo House and Lee Hong House of Shun Lee Estate and other areas. This DCCA is to be renamed as “Lee On”.	
	J27 – Tsui Ping			<u>J11 (Po Tat)</u> Includes Shun Chi Court, Lee Hang House, Lee Cheung House and Lee Ming House of Shun Lee Estate, Shun Lee Disciplined Services Quarters and other areas. This DCCA is to be renamed as “Shun Ching”.	
	J28 – Po Lok			<u>J12 (Sau Mau Ping North)</u> Includes Po Tat Estate and other areas. This DCCA is to be renamed as “Po Tak”.	
	J29 – Yuet Wah				
	J30 – Hip Hong				
	J31 – Hong Lok				
	J32 – Ting On				
	J33 – Upper Ngau Tau Kok Estate				
	J34 – Lower Ngau Tau Kok Estate				

<i>Item No.</i>	<i>DCCAs</i>	<i>No.*</i>		<i>Representations</i>	<i>EAC's views</i>
		<i>W</i>	<i>O</i>		
	J35 – To Tai  J36 – Lok Wah North  J37 – Lok Wah South			<p><u>J13 (Hiu Lai)</u> Includes Sau Nga House, Sau Yee House, Sau Hong House, Sau Lok House, Sau Wah House, Sau Yat House and Sau Wo House of Sau Mau Ping Estate. This DCCA is to be renamed as “Sau Mau Ping North”.</p> <p><u>J14 (Sau Mau Ping South)</u> Includes Sau Ching House, Sau Wai House, Sau Yin House, Sau Yue House, Sau King House, Sau Chi House and Sau Fai House of Sau Mau Ping Estate. This DCCA is to be renamed as “Sau Mau Ping Central”.</p> <p><u>J15 (Sau Mau Ping Central)</u> Includes Sau Fu House, Sau On House, Sau Ming House of Sau Mau Ping Estate and Sau Mau Ping South Estate. This DCCA is to be renamed as “Sau Mau Ping South”.</p> <p><u>J16 (Hing Tin)</u> Includes Hiu Lai Court, United Christian Hospital, Hiu Kwong Court, Hiu Ming Court, Fu Wah Court and Hiu Wah Building. This DCCA is to be renamed as “Hiu Kwong”.</p> <p><u>J17 (Lam Tin)</u> Includes Lam Tin Estate, Hing Tin Estate and Hong Wah Court.</p> <p><u>J18 (Kwong Tak)</u> Includes Kai Tin Estate, Hong Yat Court, Hong Tin Court and Kai Tin Tower. This DCCA is to be renamed as</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>“Kai Tin”.</p> <p><u>J19 (Ping Tin)</u> Includes Ping Tin Estate and On Tin Estate.</p> <p><u>J20 (Pak Nga)</u> Includes Tak Tin Estate, Hong Ying Court and other areas. This DCCA is to be renamed as “Tak Tin”.</p> <p><u>J21 (Yau Tong East)</u> Includes Kwong Tin Estate, Hong Pak Court, Hong Nga Court and Hong Shui Court. This DCCA is to be renamed as “Pik Tin”.</p> <p><u>J22 (Yau Lai)</u> Includes Ko Chun Court, Ko Yee Estate, Lei Yue Mun Estate, Ko Fung House and Ko Fei House of Ko Cheung Court and other areas. This DCCA is to be renamed as “Ko Chiu”.</p> <p><u>J23 (Chui Cheung)</u> Includes Ko Cheung Court (except Ko Fung House and Ko Fei House), Yau Mei Court, Yau Tong Centre, Canaryside, The Spectacle and Ocean One. This DCCA is to be renamed as “Yau Tong”.</p> <p><u>J24 (Yau Tong West)</u> Includes Yau Tong Estate, Fung Lai House, Ying Lai House, Tsui Lai House, Hong Lai House and Yan Lai House of Yau Lai Estate and other areas. This DCCA is to be renamed as “Lei Yue Mun”.</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><u>J25 (Laguna City)</u> Includes Yau Chui Court, Nga Lai House, Bik Lai House, Chi Lai House, Sau Lai House, Yat Lai House, Yi Lai House, Cheuk Lai House and Yung Lai House of Yau Lai Estate and the surrounding areas of Cha Kwo Ling Tsuen. This DCCA is to be renamed as "Cha Kwo Ling".</p> <p><u>J26 (King Tin)</u> Includes Laguna City. This DCCA is to be renamed as "Laguna City".</p> <p><u>J27 (Tsui Ping)</u> Includes Sceneway Garden, Lei On Court and other areas. This DCCA is to be renamed as "King Tin".</p> <p><u>J28 (Po Lok)</u> Includes Tsui Ping (South) Estate and other areas. This DCCA is to be renamed as "Tsui Ping South".</p> <p><u>J29 (Yuet Wah)</u> Includes Tsui Ping (North) Estate. This DCCA is to be renamed as "Tsui Ping North".</p> <p><u>J30 (Hip Hong)</u> Includes Wo Lok Estate and the buildings surrounding Yuet Wah Street. This DCCA is to be renamed as "Yue Wah".</p> <p><u>J31 (Hong Lok)</u> Includes Po Pui Court, Cheung Wo Court, Hipway Towers, Wah Fung Gardens, Wan Hon Estate and the area</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>surrounding Wan Hon Street. This DCCA is to be renamed as "Hip Hong".</p> <p><u>J32 (Ting On)</u> Includes Connie Towers, Hong Lee court, Bellevue Garden, Hamden Court, Hyde Towers and other areas. This DCCA is to be renamed as "Hong Lok".</p> <p><u>J33 (Upper Ngau Tau Kok Estate)</u> Includes Kwun Tong Garden Estate, Lotus Tower and the area in the north of Kwun Tong Road. This DCCA is to be renamed as "Garden".</p> <p><u>J34 (Lower Ngau Tau Kok Estate)</u> Includes Upper Ngau Tau Kok Estate. This DCCA is to be renamed as "Upper Ngau Tau Kok".</p> <p><u>J35 (To Tai)</u> Includes Lower Ngau Tau Kok Estate, On Kay Court and Chun Wah Court. This DCCA is to be renamed as "Lower Ngau Tau Kok".</p> <p><u>J36 (Lok Wah North)</u> Includes Lok Wah North Estate, Lok Nga Court and other areas.</p> <p><u>J37 (Lok Wah South)</u> Includes Lok Wah South Estate, Sau Mau Ping Disciplined Services Quarters and other areas.</p>	

Item No.	DCCAs	No.*		Representations	EAC's views
		W	O		
				(c) To change the codes of the abovementioned DCCAs accordingly (except J01 (Kwun Tong Central), J02 (Kowloon Bay), J03 (Kai Yip), J04 (Lai Ching), J17 (Lam Tin), J19 (Ping Tin), J36 (Lok Wah North) and J37 (Lok Wah South)).	
4	J02 – Kowloon Bay J11 – Po Tat J12 – Sau Mau Ping North J14 – Sau Mau Ping South J15 – Sau Mau Ping Central	1	-	<p>(a) Proposes to alter the district boundaries of Kwun Tong District and Kowloon City District by transferring Kai Tak Nullah and the area in the south of Kai Fuk Road leading to the waterfront of south airport apron of the former Kai Tak Airport to J02 (Kowloon Bay) because that area is adjacent to the business and trading area in Kowloon Bay, and also the planning for its community facilities, transport and environment is all closely related to Kwun Tong District.</p> <p>(b) Proposes to alter the district boundaries of Kwun Tong District and Sai Kung District by including the whole development at Anderson Road and the development at Anderson Road Quarry into Kwun Tong District for better coordination. Moreover, the current district boundaries would affect the community integrity and the working efficiency of the DCs.</p> <p>(c) Proposes to retain Tat Hei House, Tat Shun House and Tat Kai House of Po Tat Estate in J11 (Po Tat) and to transfer Tat Cheung House, Tat Hong</p>	<p><u>Items (a) and (b)</u> These proposals involve alteration of the district boundaries, which does not fall under the purview of the EAC. The EAC has referred these views to the HAD for consideration.</p> <p><u>Item (c)</u> This proposal is <b>not accepted</b> because:  (i) the proposal made in the</p>

Item No.	DCCAs	No.*		Representations	EAC's views
		W	O		
				<p>House and Tat Fu House of Po Tat Estate from J11 (Po Tat) to J15 (Sau Mau Ping Central). Moreover, to transfer Sau Ming House, Sau On House and Sau Fu House of Sau Mau Ping Estate from J12 (Sau Mau Ping North) to J14 (Sau Mau Ping South) because:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>● Tat Hei House, Tat Shun House and Tat Kai House of Po Tat Estate has no connecting pathways with Sau Mau Ping South Estate, and there is no connection among the residents. The problems of community facilities and transportations etc. are also different between the two communities;</li> <li>● Tat Cheung House, Tat Hong House and Tat Fu House of Po Tat Estate have adequate local ties and similar transport and environmental problems with J15 (Sau Mau Ping Central). Moreover, after the proposed adjustment, the projected population of J15 (Sau Mau Ping Central) would not exceed the statutory permissible upper limit;</li> <li>● it could reduce the projected population and area coverage of J12 (Sau Mau Ping North) so that the DC member in the area could provide better service to the residents; and</li> <li>● the transfer of Sau Ming</li> </ul>	<p>representation will affect the existing local ties of Po Tat Estate more seriously than that in provisional recommendations. Tat Cheung House, Tat Hong House and Tat Fu House are located at the centre of Po Tat Estate, and it has a large projected population (approximately 6,910). Tat Hei House, Tat Shun House and Tat Kai House are located at the periphery of the estate, and it has less projected population (approximately 3,270). Comparatively, the three housing blocks located at the periphery of the estate to be transferred under the provisional recommendation will affect the existing community ties less;</p> <p>(ii) after the proposed adjustment, the projected population of J15 (Sau Mau Ping Central) (22,159) will exceed the statutory permissible upper limit (+30.62%);</p> <p>(iii) the projected population of J12 (Sau Mau Ping North) will fall within the statutory permissible range. According to the established working principles, adjustment to its existing boundary is not required. Overall speaking, the number of affected DCCAs of such proposal will be more than that in the EAC's provisional recommendations; and</p> <p>(iv) the delineation proposal must</p>



Item No.	DCCAs	No.*		Representations	EAC's views
		W	O		
				House, Sau On House and Sau Fu House of Sau Mau Ping Estate from J12 (Sau Mau Ping North) to J14 (Sau Mau Ping South) could offset the projected population to be absorbed by J14 (Sau Mau Ping South) from Tat Hei House, Tat Shun House and Tat Kai House of Po Tat Estate under the provisional recommendations and preserve the community integrity.	be based on objective data of the population distribution. Arrangements on district administration matters are not the relevant factors of consideration.
5	J08 – Shun Tin J10 – On Lee J14 – Sau Mau Ping South J15- Sau Mau Ping Central J31 – Hong Lok J32 – Ting On J33 – Upper Ngau Tau Kok Estate J34 – Lower Ngau Tau Kok Estate	-	1	(a) Proposes to merge J08 (Shun Tin) and J10 (On Lee) into one DCCA to reduce one DC elected seat and to avoid wastage of public money.  (b) Proposes to merge J14 (Sau Mau Ping South) and J15 (Sau Mau Ping Central) into one DCCA to reduce one DC elected seat and to avoid wastage of public money.  (c) Proposes to combine J31 (Hong Lok), J32 (Ting On) and J37 (Lok Wah South) into two DCCAs to reduce one DC elected seat and to avoid wastage of public money.	<u>Item (a)</u> This proposal is <b>not accepted</b> because if J08 (Shun Tin) merges with J10 (On Lee) to reduce one DC elected seat, after the proposed adjustment, the projected population (32,371) will substantially exceed the statutory permissible upper limit (+90.82%).  <u>Item (b)</u> This proposal is <b>not accepted</b> because if J14 (Sau Mau Ping South) merges with J15 (Sau Mau Ping Central) to reduce one elected seat, after the proposed adjustment, the projected population (29,165) will substantially exceed the statutory permissible upper limit (+71.92%).  <u>Item (c)</u> This proposal is <b>not accepted</b> because if J31(Hong Lok), J32 (Ting On) and J37 (Lok Wah South) combine and form two DCCAs to reduce one DC elected seat, after the proposed adjustment, the average projected population (23,133) will exceed the statutory

Item No.	DCCAs	No.*		Representations	EAC's views
		W	O		
	J36 – Lok Wah North				permissible upper limit (+36.37%).
	J37 – Lok Wah South			<p>(d) Proposes:</p> <p>(i) to transfer Lok Nga Court from J34 (Lower Ngau Tau Kok Estate) to J36 (Lok Wah North); and</p> <p>(ii) to adjust the boundaries of J33 (Upper Ngau Tau Kok Estate) and J34 (Lower Ngau Tau Kok Estate) to reduce one DC elected seat and avoid wastage of public money.</p>	<p><u>Item (d)(i)</u> This proposal is <b>not accepted</b> because the projected population of J36 (Lok Wah North) will fall within the statutory permissible range. According to the established working principles, adjustment to its existing boundary is not required.</p> <p><u>Item (d)(ii)</u> This proposal is <b>not accepted</b> because if J33 (Upper Ngau Tau Kok Estate) merges with J34 (Lower Ngau Tau Kok Estate) to reduce one elected seat, after the proposed adjustment, the projected population (30,005) will substantially exceed the statutory permissible upper limit (+76.87%).</p>
6	J06 – Sheung Choi J07 – Jordan Valley J11 – Po Tat J14 – Sau Mau Ping South J17 – Lam Tin J19 – Ping Tin J26 – King Tin	1	-	<p>(a) Considers that there are little room of alteration for J06 (Sheung Choi), J07 (Jordan Valley), J17 (Lam Tin), J19 (Ping Tin), J26 (King Tin), J33 (Upper Ngau Tau Kok Estate) and J34 (Lower Ngau Tau Kok Estate). Proposes to transfer Lok Nga Court from J34 (Lower Ngau Tau Kok Estate) to J36 (Lok Wah North).</p>	<p><u>Item (a)</u> This proposal is <b>not accepted</b> because the projected population of J36 (Lok Wah North) will fall within the statutory permissible range. According to the established working principles, adjustment to its existing boundary is not required.</p>

Item No.	DCCAs	No.*		Representations	EAC's views
		W	O		
	J33 – Upper Ngau Tau Kok Estate  J34 – Lower Ngau Tau Kok Estate  J36 – Lok Wah North			(b) Proposes to retain Tat Hei House, Tat Shun House and Tat Kai House of Po Tat Estate in J11 (Po Tat) and to transfer Tat Cheung House, Tat Hong House and Tat Fu House in Po Tat Estate to J14 (Sau Mau Ping South).	<u>Item (b)</u> This proposal is <b>not accepted</b> because:  (i) please see item 4(c); and  (ii) there is a view supporting the delineation proposals for J11 (Po Tat) and J14 (Sau Mau Ping South) (please see item 1).
7	J11 – Po Tat  J12 – Sau Mau Ping North  J13 – Hiu Lai  J14 – Sau Mau Ping South	98	-	(a) Propose to retain Tat Hei House, Tat Shun House and Tat Kai House of Po Tat Estate in J11 (Po Tat). Details are as follows:  48 representations consider that:  ● since intake, all housing blocks of Po Tat Estate have been considered as a complete entity. The provisional recommendation would disrupt the community integrity of the estate;  ● one representation also considers that retaining Tat Hei House, Tat Shun House and Tat Kai House in J11 (Po Tat) could facilitate management; and  ● one representation also considers that it is inconvenient for elderlies to be far away from Po Tat Estate to cast votes.	<u>Item (a)</u> This proposal is <b>not accepted</b> because:  (i) if the constituency boundary of J11 (Po Tat) remains unchanged, the projected population of the DCCA (23,133) will exceed the statutory permissible upper limit (+36.37%);  (ii) by creating the new DCCA J15 (Sau Mau Ping Central) in the area of Sau Mau Ping Estate located within the original boundary of J14 (Sau Mau Ping South), J14 (Sau Mau Ping South) can still absorb the excess population of J11 (Po Tat). Therefore, the EAC proposes to transfer Tat Hei House, Tat Shun House and Tat Kai House of Po Tat Estate from J11 (Po Tat) to the adjacent J14 (Sau Mau Ping South); and  (iii) the delineation proposal must be based on objective data of the population distribution. Arrangements on district

<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>22 representations consider that:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>● Po Tat Estate has already been occupied for 12 years. Tat Hei House, Tat Shun House and Tat Kai House of Po Tat Estate are an important part of J11 (Po Tat); and</li> <li>● one representation also considers that retaining Tat Hei House, Tat Shun House and Tat Kai House of Po Tat Estate in J11 (Po Tat) could facilitate the elderlies.</li> </ul> <p>21 representations consider that:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>● the residents of Po Tat Estate have been together for 12 years and have established an integral community. Therefore, they consider that provisional recommendation would split Po Tat Estate and any proposals to split Po Tat Estate would be objected; and</li> <li>● one representation also considers that the residents at Tat Hei House, Tat Shun House and Tat Kai House seldom go to J14 (Sau Mau Ping South).</li> </ul> <p>Six representations consider that Po Tat Estate is under the Sze Shun Area Committee, while Sau Mau Ping South Estate is under Sau Mau Ping Area Committee. The</p>	<p>administration matters and polling station are not relevant factors of consideration. The EAC has referred the view on polling station arrangements to the REO for follow-up.</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>provisional recommendation would put Po Tat Estate under two area committees and therefore disrupt the community integrity.</p> <p>One representation considers that:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>● since intake, all housing blocks of Po Tat Estate have been considered as a complete entity. The provisional recommendation would disrupt the community integrity of the estate;</li> <li>● Po Tat Estate is under the Sze Shun Area Committee while Sau Mau Ping South Estate is under Sau Mau Ping Area Committee. The provisional recommendation would put Po Tat Estate under two area committees and therefore disrupt the community integrity; and</li> <li>● in 2007, Po Tat Estate was originally recommended to be split into two DCCAs. However, in the final recommendation, Po Tat Estate was retained as one DCCA to preserve community integrity.</li> </ul>	
				(b) Three representations further propose to transfer Sau Mau Ping South Estate to J11 (Po Tat).	<p><u>Item (b)</u> This proposal is <b>not accepted</b> because if Sau Mau Ping South Estate is transferred to J11 (Po Tat), the projected population of the DCCA (33,775) will substantially exceed the statutory</p>

Item No.	DCCAs	No.*		Representations	EAC's views
		W	O		
					permissible upper limit (+99.10%).
				(c) One representation further proposes to transfer Hiu Kwong Court, Hiu Ming Court, Fu Wah Court and Hiu Wah Building from J13 (Hiu Lai) to J14 (Sau Mau Ping South).	<u>Item (c)</u> This proposal is <b>not accepted</b> because J12 (Sau Mau Ping North) separates J13 (Hiu Lai) and J14 (Sau Mau Ping South), it is not feasible to transfer some buildings from J13 (Hiu Lai) to J14 (Sau Mau Ping South).
8	J11 – Po Tat  J12 – Sau Mau Ping North  J14 – Sau Mau Ping South	1	-	Proposes to retain Tat Hei House, Tat Shun House and Tat Kai House of Po Tat Estate in J11 (Po Tat) and transfer Sau Ming House, Sau On House and Sau Fu House of Sau Mau Ping Estate from J12 (Sau Mau Ping North) to J14 (Sau Mau Ping South) because: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>● under the provisional recommendation, Tat Hei House, Tat Shun House and Tat Kai House of Po Tat Estate would be transferred out from J11 (Po Tat). It is not logical that even though the residents still live at Po Tat Estate, any community improvement issues under further discussion would not be their concern;</li> <li>● the provisional recommendation would contravene the DC's established principle of improving local development and harmony in neighbourhood relations; and</li> <li>● the boundaries of J12 (Sau Mau Ping North) and J14 (Sau Mau Ping South) would be more distinct and even.</li> </ul>	This proposal is <b>not accepted</b> because: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>(i) please see item 7(a); and</li> <li>(ii) the projected population of J12 (Sau Mau Ping North) will fall within the statutory permissible range. According to the established working principles, adjustment to its existing boundary is not required.</li> </ul>

Item No.	DCCAs	No.*		Representations	EAC's views
		W	O		
9	J17 – Lam Tin J19 – Ping Tin J26 – King Tin	11	-	<p>Proposes to retain Kai Tin Tower in J26 (King Tin). Details are as follows:</p> <p>Nine representations consider that:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>● Kai Tin Tower is a private housing estate and its profile aligns with other housing estates in J26 (King Tin);</li> <li>● geographically, Kai Tin Tower aligns better with Hong Tin Court and Sceneway Garden in J26 (King Tin); and</li> <li>● Kai Tin Tower is managed by owners' incorporated, different from that of the public housing estates in J17 (Lam Tin).</li> </ul> <p>One representation considers that:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>● J17 (Lam Tin) already comprises Lam Tin Estate, Kai Tin Estate and Hong Yat Court. If Kai Tin Tower is transferred to J17 (Lam Tin), it is likely that the resources distribution may be unfair;</li> <li>● the number of electors served by the DC member in J17 (Lam Tin) would exceed other DCCAs; and</li> <li>● this representation supports the transfer of Ping Chun House of Ping Tin Estate from J17 (Lam Tin) to J19 (Ping Tin).</li> </ul> <p>One representation considers that for many years, Kai Tin Road has been the boundary between Lam Tin Area Committee and Kwun</p>	<p>This proposal is <b>not accepted</b> because:</p> <p>(i) if the constituency boundary of J26 (King Tin) remains unchanged, the projected population of the DCCA (22,096) will exceed the statutory permissible upper limit (+30.25%);</p> <p>(ii) there is only one street in between Kai Tin Tower and Kai Tin Shopping Centre in J17 (Lam Tin), on the aspects of daily life, the residents of Kai Tin Tower has certain connection with the DCCA; 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> <p>On the other hand, the supporting view is noted.</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>		
				Tong South Area Committee. There is an established relationship maintained among the estates' representatives. Therefore, the provisional recommendation would disrupt the long established community integrity.	
10	J34 – Lower Ngau Tau Kok Estate	1	-	Supports the provisional recommendation on for J34 (Lower Ngau Tau Kok Estate).	The supporting view is noted.



**Appendix II - K**

**Tsuen Wan 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	K01 – Tak Wah  K02 – Yeung Uk Road  K03 – Hoi Bun  K11 – Tsuen Wan West	1	-	Objects to the delineation proposal for the newly created K11 (Tsuen Wan West) because the area of the DCCA is quite large and it would be difficult for the coming DC member to take care of the residents in two far ends. The new DCCA should not cover Phase 3 of Belvedere Garden, Bayview Garden and Serenade Cove. Instead, it should cover The Dynasty, City Point and Waterside Plaza, together with Chelsea Court and H Cube of K02 (Yeung Uk Road) and be named as “Tsuen Wan Central”.	This proposal is <b>not accepted</b> because:  (i) the projected population of K02 (Yeung Uk Road) will fall within the statutory permissible range. According to the established working principles, adjustment to its existing boundary is not required; and  (ii) the delineation proposal must be based on objective data of population distribution. Arrangements on district administration matters are not the relevant factors of consideration.
2	K01 – Tak Wah  K03 – Hoi Bun  K11 – Tsuen Wan West	-	1	Objects to merging Phase 3 of Belvedere Garden, Bayview Garden and Serenade Cove together with The Dynasty and City Point to form the newly created K11 (Tsuen Wan West) because The Dynasty and City Point do not use the community facilities of Phase 3 of Belvedere Garden. Proposes to retain The Dynasty and City Point in K01 (Tak Wah) and K03 (Hoi Bun) respectively and to name the newly created K11 as “Lai Hing” because the new DCCA would cover Phase 3 of Belvedere Garden and Bayview Garden.	This proposal is <b>not accepted</b> because:  (i) if The Dynasty is to be retained in K01 (Tak Wah), the projected population of the DCCA (22,305) will exceed the statutory permissible upper limit (+31.48%); and  (ii) if the City Point is to be retained in K03 (Hoi Bun), the projected population of the DCCA (22,390) will exceed the statutory permissible upper limit (+31.99%).

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

Item No.	DCCAs	No. *		Representations	EAC's views
		W	O		
3	K01 – Tak Wah  K04 – Clague Garden  K10 – Ting Sham  K11 – Tsuen Wan West  K12 – Tsuen Wan Rural	1	-	<p>(a) Proposes that the Lido Garden of K12 (Tsuen Wan Rural) and the Bellagio should be put together in K10 (Ting Sham) because the Lido Garden is close to the Bellagio. If the projected population of K10 (Ting Sham) would exceed the statutory permissible range after the proposed change, the excess population (i.e. the area from Ting Kau to Yau Kom Tau) could be incorporated into the newly created K11 (Tsuen Wan West).</p> <p>(b) Considers that it would be more desirable to transfer the population which originally belonged to K01 (Tak Wah), to K04 (Clague Garden) than to K11 (Tsuen Wan West) because delineating the boundary along the Tsuen Wan Road would make the constituency boundary clearer. Besides, it would allow K11 (Tsuen Wan West) to have capacity to absorb the excess population of K10 (Ting Sham) resulting from the proposed adjustment in item (a) above.</p>	<p><u>Items (a) and (b)</u> These proposals are <b>not accepted</b> because:</p> <p>(i) the projected population of K04 (Clague Garden) will fall within the statutory permissible range. According to the established working principles, adjustment to its existing boundary is not required. The number of affected DCCAs under the proposal made in the representation will be more than that in the EAC's provisional recommendations;</p> <p>(ii) there is no objective information to support that because of local ties, the Lido Garden and the Bellagio should be put in the same DCCA; and</p> <p>(iii) after the proposed adjustment, the projected population of K10 (Ting Sham), K11 (Tsuen Wan West) and K12 (Tsuen Wan Rural) will further deviate from the population quota. Proposals made in the representation : K10: 20,894, +23.17% K11: 19,094, +12.56% K12: 14,890, -12.23% Provisional recommendations : K10: 18,540, +9.29% K11: 18,672, +10.07% K12: 18,896, +11.39%</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>		
				(c) Considers that the name of K10 (Ting Sham) is vague. Proposes to name the DCCA as "Ting Kau" or "Sham Tseng".	<u>Item (c)</u> This proposal is <b>not accepted</b> because neither "Ting Kau" nor "Sham Tseng" can fully reflect the area covered by the DCCA.
4	K04 – Clague Garden K08 – Allway K10 – Ting Sham K11 – Tsuen Wan West K13 – Ma Wan K14 – Luk Yeung K15 – Lei Muk Shue East K17 – Shek Wai Kok K18 – Cheung Shek	1	-	(a) Proposes to put the Tsuen Wan West development project in K04 (Clague Garden) because the project is close to K04 (Clague Garden) but not K11 (Tsuen Wan West). Besides, the project would be ready for occupation in the latter half of 2015. Its impact on population would be minimal. In this connection, it is proposed that the newly created K11 (Tsuen Wan West) be named as "Shing King" to reflect the major housing estates in the DCCA.	<u>Item (a)</u> Please see item (3)(i).
				(b) Proposes to name K10 (Ting Sham) as "Sham Ting" to reflect that the majority of population is in Sham Tseng.	<u>Item (b)</u> This proposal is <b>not accepted</b> because there is no apparent difference between the proposed name made in the representation "Sham Ting" and the name "Ting Sham" made in the provisional recommendation.
				(c) Taking into account the development of North Lantau, proposes to put K13 (Ma Wan) in the Islands District in 2019.	<u>Item (c)</u> This proposal involves alteration of the district boundary, which does not fall under the purview of the EAC. The EAC has referred this view to the HAD for consideration.

Item No.	DCCAs	No. *		Representations	EAC's views
		W	O		
				<p>(d) Considering that the residents in villages along Route Twisk (i.e. Kwong Pan Tin Tsuen, Kwong Pan Tin San Tsuen and Pak Tin Pa San Tsuen) would need to pass through Tsuen Kam Interchange in K14 (Luk Yeung) to go to other places in Tsuen Wan and that K08 (Allway) has a relatively larger population, it is proposed to transfer the abovementioned villages to K14 (Luk Yeung).</p>	<p><u>Items (d) and (e)</u> These proposals are <b>not accepted</b> because the projected population of K08 (Allway), K14 (Luk Yeung) and K18 (Cheung Shek) will fall within the statutory permissible range. According to the established working principles, adjustment to their existing boundaries is not required.</p>
				<p>(e) The area around Sam Dip Tam in K14 (Luk Yeung) and the villages in K18 (Cheung Shek) share the use of Lo Wai Road and have close community ties. Proposes to transfer the abovementioned areas to K18 (Cheung Shek) so as to increase the population of the DCCA.</p>	
				<p>(f) Proposes to transfer the villages along Kwok Shui Road (i.e. Kwan Mun Hau Tsuen, Yeung Uk Tsuen and Ho Pui Tsuen, etc.) from K15 (Lei Muk Shue East) to K17 (Shek Wai Kok) so as to reduce the difference in population in the relevant DCCAs.</p>	<p><u>Item (f)</u> This proposal is <b>not accepted</b> because :</p> <p>(i) the provisional recommendations have put the whole Lei Muk Shue (I) Estate in one DCCA; and</p> <p>(ii) since 1999 DC, the villages along Kwok Shui Road have been delineated in K15 (Lei Muk Shue East). Besides, the villages are distinctly separated from K17 (Shek Wai Kok) by hill slopes and the Tsuen Wan Water Treatment Works.</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>		
				(g) Other than those mentioned above, supports the delineation proposals for all DCCAs.	<u>Item (g)</u> The supporting view is noted.
5	K10 – Ting Sham  K12 – Tsuen Wan Rural	1	-	Supports the delineation proposals for K10 (Ting Sham) and K12 (Tsuen Wan Rural) and considers that the proposals have taken into account the geographical location and the population distribution.	The supporting view is noted.
6	K13 – Ma Wan	1	-	<p>Proposes that Park Island should be under Kwai Tsing DC but not Tsuen Wan DC because:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>● Ma Wan has a closer transport link with the Kwai Tsing District than the Tsuen Wan District. Residential bus service between Ma Wan and Tsing Yi runs approximately every 8 minutes while that between Ma Wan and Kwai Fong Metroplaza runs approximately every 12 minutes. On the contrary, the village bus service between Ma Wan and Tsuen Wan runs every 30 minutes and the ferry service is also infrequent; and</li> <li>● Ma Wan is under the jurisdiction of Tsing Yi Police Region.</li> </ul> <p>Taking into account that the rural representatives of Ma Wan Village would object to transferring the DCCA to the Kwai Tsing DC, the above proposal uses Pak Lam Road as the boundary and only proposes to transfer Park Island to the Kwai Tsing DC.</p>	Please see item 4(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>		
7	K15 – Lei Muk Shue East  K16 – Lei Muk Shue West	44	-	<p>Object to transferring Fung Shue House from K15 (Lei Muk Shue East) to K16 (Lei Muk Shue West). In general, the reasons are summarised as follows:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>● the residents of Fung Shue House often use the facilities of K15 (Lei Muk Shue East); and</li> <li>● Fung Shue House is used to be in K15 (Lei Muk Shue East). The polling station at the community hall has been used by the residents of Fung Shue House for many years. Transferring Fung Shue House to K16 (Lei Muk Shue West) would cause inconvenience and confusion to electors.</li> </ul> <p>Out of the representations, 11 in number further propose to transfer Lok Shue House from K15 (Lei Muk Shue East) to K16 (Lei Muk Shue West). The major reasons are summarised as follows:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>● the polling station of K16 (Lei Muk Shue West) is designated at Lei Muk Shue Catholic Primary School. It would be inconvenient for residents of Fung Shue House, who are elderly or with mobility difficulty to go there to vote;</li> <li>● many children of the residents of Lok Shue House attend primary schools in K16 (Lei Muk Shue West) and they always use the facilities of the Upper Estate (i.e. K16 (Lei Muk Shue West)). They have a sense of belonging towards the Upper Estate;</li> </ul>	<p>These proposals are <b>not accepted</b> because:</p> <p>(i) please see item 4(f)(i);</p> <p>(ii) there is no objective information and justification to prove that delineating Lok Shue House in K16 (Lei Muk Shue West) is clearly better than the provisional recommendations in terms of preserving the community identity and local ties;</p> <p>(iii) the delineation proposal must be based on objective data of population distribution. Arrangements on polling station are not the relevant factors of consideration. The EAC has referred these views to the REO for follow-up; and</p> <p>(iv) since 1999 DC, the villages along Ho Pui Tsuen / Kwok Shui Road has been delineated in K15 (Lei Muk Shue East). These villages are linked with K15 (Lei Muk Shue East) by Wo Yi Hop Road. On the contrary, there are no clear links between these villages and K16 (Lei Muk Shue West) and they are separated by hills in Sheung Kwai Chung.</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>		
				<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>● in terms of geographical location, comparatively speaking, Lok Shue House is nearer to K16 (Lei Muk Shue West) than Fung Shue House; and</li> <li>● the population of Lok Shue House and Fung Shue House is more or less the same. There is not much difference between the transferal of Fung Shue House (as proposed in the provisional recommendations) or Lok Shue House from K15 (Lei Muk Shue East) to K16 (Lei Muk Shue West).</li> </ul> <p>Out of the representations, six in number further propose to transfer the villages along Ho Pui Tsuen / Kwok Shui Road from K15 (Lei Muk Shue East) to K16 (Lei Muk Shue West) because even if the villages along Kwok Shui Road are transferred to K16 (Lei Muk Shue West), the residents would still use the same polling station and it would not cause any inconvenience to them. Moreover, the proposal would help solve the inconvenience brought to the residents of Fung Shue House under the provisional recommendations.</p> <p>One of the representations proposes to transfer Lok Shue House or villages along Ho Pui Tsuen / Kwok Shui Road from K15 (Lei Muk Shue East) to K16 (Lei Muk Shue West).</p>	
8	K15 – Lei Muk Shue East	1	-	(a) Objects to transferring Fung Shue House from K15 (Lei Muk Shue East) to K16 (Lei Muk Shue West) because	Please see item 7(i) to (iii).

<i>Item No.</i>	<i>DCCAs</i>	<i>No.*</i>		<i>Representations</i>	<i>EAC's views</i>
		<i>W</i>	<i>O</i>		
	K16 – Lei Muk Shue West  K17 – Shek Wai Kok			<p>Fung Shue House has been in K15 (Lei Muk Shue East) since its occupation and the residents of Fung Shue House would use the facilities next to Wing Shue House of K15 (Lei Muk Shue East). Moreover, the polling station of K15 (Lei Muk Shue East) is more convenient to the residents of Fung Shue House, who are elderly and with mobility difficulty. It is proposed to transfer Lok Shue House from K15 (Lei Muk Shue East) to K16 (Lei Muk Shue West) because more residents of Lok Shue House are young people and young parents would bring their children to the primary schools in K16 (Lei Muk Shue West). Besides, they always use the facilities of K16 (Lei Muk Shue West).</p>	
				<p>(b) Objects to delineating Wo Yi Hop Lane Village in K17 (Shek Wai Kok) because it would cause inconvenience to the villagers, and proposes to transfer the Village to the adjacent K15 (Lei Muk Shue East).</p>	<p><u>Item (b)</u> This proposal is <b>not accepted</b> because:</p> <p>(i) the projected population of K17 (Shek Wai Kok) 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) based on the 2011 original constituency boundary, the projected population of K15 (Lei Muk Shue East) (21,694) will exceed the statutory permissible upper limit (+27.88%). The proposal made in the representation will make the projected population further</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>		
					deviate from the statutory permissible upper limit.
9	K15 – Lei Muk Shue East  K17 – Shek Wai Kok	6	-	Object to delineating Wo Yi Hop Lane Village in K17 (Shek Wai Kok) because: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>● it would be very inconvenient to the villagers. Besides, Wo Yi Hop Lane Village and Shek Wai Kok are quite far apart. The villagers have to take transportation to reach Shek Wai Kok; and</li> <li>● there is a certain difficulty for the villagers to seek help from the DC member.</li> </ul> Proposes to transfer Wo Yi Hop Lane Village to the adjacent K15 (Lei Muk Shue East).	Please see item 8(b).

**Appendix II - L**

**Tuen Mun 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	-	Supports the provisional recommendations on all DCCAs in the district as they are in line with the EAC's statutory criteria and working principles.	The supporting view is noted.
2	L01 – Tuen Mun Town Centre  L11 – San Hui	1	-	(a) Proposes to keep the existing boundary of L11 (San Hui) unchanged.	<u>Item (a)</u> This proposal is <b>not accepted</b> because if the existing boundary of L11 (San Hui) remains unchanged, the projected population of L01 (Tuen Mun Town Centre) (21,597) will exceed the statutory permissible upper limit (+27.31%).
				(b) Proposes to transfer Luk Yuen Street, eastern part of SKH St. Simon's Lui Ming Choi Secondary School, but excluding the area of Yan Oi Town Square, from L01 (Tuen Mun Town Centre) to L11 (San Hui) because: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>● the population of L11 (San Hui) is less than that of L01 (Tuen Mun Town Centre) but L11 (San Hui) has around 30 single standalone buildings, three housing estates, and also villages/squatter areas. Its daily management and district administration are more complicated than those of L01 (Tuen Mun Town Centre), therefore many cases would have to be handled. The workload of the DC member in that</li> </ul>	<u>Item (b)</u> This proposal is <b>not accepted</b> because: <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>(i) according to the EAC's provisional recommendation, the projected population of L01 (Tuen Mun Town Centre) could be adjusted to 19,539 (+15.18%). After the proposed adjustment, its projected population (20,977) will further deviate from the population quota (+23.66%), compared with the provisional recommendation;</li> <li>(ii) the proposal made in the representation is not clearly better in preserving community identities and local ties; and</li> <li>(iii) the delineation proposal must be based on objective data of the population distribution.</li> </ol>

\* 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>		
				<p>DCCA and government departments would be increased eventually; and</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Century Gateway is a newly completed estate and not fully occupied. Therefore, the share of population for L01 (Tuen Mun Town Centre) is the same as San Fat Estate before.</li> </ul>	<p>Arrangements on district administration matters are not the relevant factors of consideration.</p>
				<p>(c) Proposes to rename L11 (San Hui) as "Town Centre North" which was used in 1997 for easy identification by members of the public.</p>	<p><u>Item (c)</u> This proposal is <b>not accepted</b> because the current name has been used since 1999. The majority of the public are used to this name and change of the DCCA name may cause confusion to the public.</p>
				<p>(d) Proposes to change the polling station from Tam Lee Lai Fun Memorial Secondary School to Lui Ming Choi Secondary School because the recent location of the polling station of L11 (San Hui) is very inconvenient. Change of the location of polling station could facilitate the residents of the area of Heung Sze Wui Road (in particular the elderly) to vote, which could improve the problem of low turnout in L11 (San Hui).</p>	<p><u>Items (d) and (e)</u> The delineation proposal must be based on objective data of the population distribution. Arrangements on polling station are not the relevant factors of consideration. The EAC has referred this view on polling station arrangements to the REO for follow-up.</p>
				<p>(e) Proposes to change the polling station for the areas of Hung Kiu, Heung Tsuen, Hoh Fuk Tong and Yan Oi Tong Circuit in L11(San Hui) to Tseng Choi Street Community Hall.</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>		
3	L01 – Tuen Mun Town Centre  L11 – San Hui	1	-	Proposes to transfer the area along Ho Pong Street to Luk Yuen Street, the buildings near Ming Ngai Street and Lui Ming Choi Secondary School to L11 (San Hui) because the population still substantially exceeds the statutory population quota after re-delineation of boundaries. The population of L01 (Tuen Mun Town Centre) and L11 (San Hui) are 19,539 (+15.18%) and 18,899 (+11.41%) respectively. As a result, the residents of the two DCCAs could not obtain sufficient local support and their views could not be reflected effectively.	This proposal is <b>not accepted</b> because:  (i) according to the EAC's provisional recommendation, the projected population of L01 (Tuen Mun Town Centre) could be adjusted to 19,539 (+15.18%). After the proposed adjustment, the projected population (20,433) will further deviate from the population quota (+20.45%), compared with the provisional recommendation;  (ii) the proposal made in the representation is not clearly better in preserving community identities and local ties; and  (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.
4	L01 – Tuen Mun Town Centre  L11 – San Hui  L12 – Sam Shing  L29 – Tuen Mun Rural	1	-	(a) Objects to the provisional recommendation on the transfer of the above-mentioned area to L11 (San Hui), separating the ties between the area and Tuen Mun Town Centre. Proposes to keep the population between Luk Yuen Street and the DCCA boundary in L01 (Tuen Mun Town Centre).	<u>Item (a)</u> This proposal is <b>not accepted</b> because:  (i) according to the EAC's provisional recommendation, the projected population of L01 (Tuen Mun Town Centre) could be adjusted to 19,539 (+15.18%). After the proposed adjustment, the projected population (20,065) will further deviate from the population quota (+18.28%), compared with the provisional recommendation; and

Item No.	DCCAs	No.*		Representations	EAC's views
		W	O		
					(ii) the proposal made in the representation is not clearly better in preserving community identities and local ties.
				(b) Proposes to transfer the marine population from L12 (Sam Shing) to L11 (San Hui) because the population of L12 (Sam Shing) exceeds the statutory permissible upper limit by 80 persons while L11 (San Hui) (18,000) still has the capacity to absorb the marine population in L12 (Sam Shing).	<u>Item (b)</u> This proposal is <b>not accepted</b> because there is Hanford Garden, which belongs to L13 (Hanford), separating the marine population of L12 (Sam Ching) from L11 (San Hui). Transferring the marine population in L12 (Sam Shing) to L11 (San Hui) is not feasible.
				(c) Objects to the provisional recommendation on L29 (Tuen Mun Rural) because the population of L29 (Tuen Mun Rural) still exceeds the statutory permissible upper limit.	<u>Item (c)</u> This representation is <b>not accepted</b> because based on the 2011 original constituency boundary, the projected population of L29 (Tuen Mun Rural) in 2015 will substantially exceed the statutory permissible upper limit. Therefore, the EAC proposes that Botania Villa, Fuk Hang Tsuen, Fu Tei Sheung Tsuen and Fu Tei Ha Tsuen located within the original boundary of the DCCA be transferred to the adjacent L28 (Fu Tai). Although the projected population still slightly exceeds the statutory permissible upper limit (+28.00%), taking into account the community integrity and local ties, the EAC considers that the population of the DCCA be allowed to deviate slightly from the statutory permissible range is suitable.
5	L02 – Siu Chi  L03 – Siu Tsui	12	-	Proposes to transfer four buildings of Siu Lun Court (Fai Lun House, Ngan Lun House, Po Lun House and Wah Lun House) from L04 (On Ting) to L03 (Siu Tsui); to transfer several blocks of Yau Oi	This proposal is <b>not accepted</b> because:  (i) the projected population of L02 (Siu Chi), L03 (Siu Tsui), L04 (On Ting), L05 (Yau Oi

<i>Item No.</i>	<i>DCCAs</i>	<i>No.*</i>		<i>Representations</i>	<i>EAC's views</i>
		<i>W</i>	<i>O</i>		
	L04 – On Ting  L05 – Yau Oi South  L06 – Yau Oi North			<p>Estate from L06 (Yau Oi North) to L05 (Yau Oi South); to transfer Siu On Court from L02 (Siu Chi) to L04 (On Ting); to transfer Nerine Cove and The Sea Crest from L03 (Siu Tsui) to L06 (Yau Oi North) because:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>● separating Siu Lun Court into two DCCAs would lead to serious misunderstanding and conflicts among residents in different blocks, and the residents would find it difficult to adapt because two DC members are serving the same housing estate; confusion arisen in the previous election, electors of Wah Lun House in L04 (On Ting) originally wanted to support the candidate who served L03 (Siu Tsui) but could not do so when casting their votes;</li> <li>● the Home Ownership Scheme buildings of Siu Lun Court and Tsui Ning Garden are closer in terms of the way of living and geographical location and they are not so close in every aspect with Nerine Cove. As a result, the DC member would find it difficult to provide service to electors from different types of housing;</li> <li>● relatively speaking, Nerine Cove, The Sea Crest and Oceania Heights are private housing. After the transfer of Oceania Heights to L06 (Yau Oi North), the residents of Nerine Cove and Oceania Heights would face the same situation as Siu Lun Court's residents, i.e. not knowing who their DC member is;</li> </ul>	<p>South) and L06 (Yau Oi North) will fall within the statutory permissible range. According to the established working principles, adjustment to their existing boundaries is not required; 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>		
				<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>to preserve community identities and local ties, the residents have always requested to put all the buildings in Siu Lun Court in the same DCCA and in the 1999 DC Election, Siu Lun Court was included in one DCCA; and</li> <li>after re-delineation, the new boundaries could make the population of the DCCAs fall within the statutory permissible range.</li> </ul>	
6	L07 – Tsui Hing L08 – Shan King L09 – King Hing L10 – Hing Tsak L27 – Prime View L28 – Fu Tai	1	-	<p>(a) Proposes to transfer King Mei House and King Lai House from L09 (King Hing) to L08 (Shan King) to preserve the community integrity of Shan King Estate.</p> <p>(b) Proposes to transfer Hing Ping House, Hing Yiu House and Hing Fai House from L10 (Hing Tsak) to L09 (King Hing) to preserve the community integrity of Tai Hing Estate.</p> <p>(c) Proposes to rename L09 (King Hing) as “Tai Hing”.</p>	<p><u>Item (a)</u> This proposal is <b>not accepted</b> because the projected population of L08 (Shan King) and L09 (King Hing) will fall within the statutory permissible range. According to the established working principles, adjustment to their existing boundaries is not required.</p> <p><u>Item (b)</u> This proposal is <b>not accepted</b> because the projected population of L09 (King Hing) and L10 (Hing Tsak) will fall within the statutory permissible range. According to the established working principles, adjustment to their existing boundaries is not required.</p> <p><u>Item (c)</u> This proposal is <b>not accepted</b> because the current name has been used since 2003 and the majority of the public are used to this name. Change of the DCCA name may cause confusion to the public.</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>		
				(d) Proposes to transfer Chelsea Heights from L07 (Tsui Hing) to L10 (Hing Tsak).	<u>Item (d)</u> This proposal is <b>not accepted</b> because the projected population of L07 (Tsui Hing) and L10 (Hing Tsak) will fall within the statutory permissible range. According to the established working principles, adjustment to their existing boundaries is not required.
				(e) Proposes to rename L10 (Hing Tsak) as "Cheuk Tsak".	<u>Item (e)</u> This proposal is <b>not accepted</b> because the current name has been used since 1999 and the majority of the public are used to this name. Change of the DCCA name may cause confusion to the public.
				(f) Proposes to transfer Lingnan University, Fu Tei Tsuen Village Office, South Hillcrest and Beneville from L27 (Prime View) to L28 (Fu Tai) because it could facilitate the DC member of the DCCA to maintain community ties and his/her liaison work.	<u>Item (f)</u> This proposal is <b>not accepted</b> because:  (i) the projected population of L27 (Prime View) will fall within the statutory permissible range. According to the established working principles, adjustment to its existing boundary is not required; and  (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.
7	L08 – Shan King	-	1	(a) Same as item 6(a).	<u>Item (a)</u> Please see item 6(a).
	L09 – King Hing			(b) Proposes to transfer all buildings from Hing Cheung House to Hing Tai House from L09 (King Hing) to L10 (Hing Tsak) to preserve the	<u>Item (b)</u> This proposal is <b>not accepted</b> because the projected population of L09 (Hing Tsak) and L10 (Hing Tsak) will fall within the statutory
	L10 – Hing Tsak				



<i>Item No.</i>	<i>DCCAs</i>	<i>No.*</i>		<i>Representations</i>	<i>EAC's views</i>
		<i>W</i>	<i>O</i>		
				community integrity of Tai Hing Estate.	permissible range. According to the established working principles, adjustment to their existing boundaries is not required.
8	L08 – Shan King  L20 – Lung Mun	1	-	<p>Proposes to transfer Yeung Siu Hang Tsuen from L20 (Lung Mun) to L08 (Shan King) because:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Yeung Siu Hang Tsuen's residents have closer community ties with L08 (Shan King). It also belonged to the DCCA of Shan King in Tuen Mun DC Election previously; and</li> <li>• Yeung Siu Hang Tsuen is too far away from L20 (Lung Mun) geographically. The villagers would find it difficult to seek community services.</li> </ul>	<p>This proposal is <b>not accepted</b> because:</p> <p>(i) the projected population of L08 (Shan King) 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 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>
9	L11 – San Hui  L28 – Fu Tai  L29 – Tuen Mun Rural	1	-	<p>(a) Proposes to transfer Botania Villa from L28 (Fu Tai) to L29 (Tuen Mun Rural) because:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• regarding the geographical location, Botania Villa is separated from L28 (Fu Tai) by Yuen Long Highway and they do not have close ties. However, To Yuen Wai and Tuen Mun San Tsuen, which are nearer to Fu Tai Estate, are not included in L28 (Fu Tai);</li> <li>• Botania Villa and The Sherwood have a relatively larger population in the area and are geographically closer to each other. The residents of these two</li> </ul>	<p><u>Item (a)</u> This proposal is <b>not accepted</b> because:</p> <p>(i) according to EAC's provisional recommendations, the projected population of L29 (Tuen Mun Rural) could be adjusted to 21,714 (+28.00%). After the proposed adjustment, its projected population (23,470) will further deviate from the population quota (+38.35%), compared with the provisional recommendation;</p> <p>(ii) the delineation proposal must be based on objective data of the population distribution. Arrangements on district administration matters are not</p>

Item No.	DCCAs	No.*		Representations	EAC's views
		W	O		
				<p>estates both use Lam Tei Main Street as the main access. If these two estates are separated and included in two DCCAs, there would be two different DC members to provide community support and the communication channel would be split, resulting in communication problems which seriously undermine the local ties and liaison work;</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>● Botania Villa was developed 10 years earlier than The Sherwood and Greenview. It was the main settlement area of indigenous villagers in the area and has close ties with the villagers in the vicinity; and</li> <li>● more housing estates would be completed in Lam Tei gradually and the population would increase. The representation proposes that when considering the overall future development of the area, the interests of Botania Villa's residents should not be ignored.</li> </ul>	<p>the relevant factors of consideration;</p> <p>(iii) although there are certain local ties between the area mentioned in the representation and part of L29 (Tuen Mun Rural), the EAC considers that adjustment to the constituency boundaries is required because the population will substantially exceed the permissible range based on the 2011 original constituency boundaries;</p> <p>(iv) geographically, although Tuen Mun San Tsuen and To Yuen Wai are nearer to L28 (Fu Tai) than Botania Villa, these two villages have clansman relationship with other villages in L29 (Tuen Mun Rural). Therefore, it was inappropriate to transfer these two villages to L28 (Fu Tai); and</p> <p>(v) the EAC must adhere to the Administration's population forecast as at 30 June 2015 in delineating the constituency boundaries. Future development after the cut-off date will not be considered.</p>
				<p>(b) Objects to separating Fuk Hang Tsuen into two DCCAs, contrary to the expectation of the residents of that DCCA in respect of the natural features. Also, if Botania Villa, The Sherwood and other areas adjacent to Fuk Hang Tsuen Road are put in the same DCCA, it would facilitate the residents to work together for the improvement works of Fuk</p>	<p><u>Item (b)</u> According to the EAC's provisional recommendation, the whole Fuk Hang Tsuen should be put in L28 (Fu Tai), so the representation is <b>accepted</b> by the EAC. Based on the village boundary of Fuk Hang Tsuen, the proposed boundaries of L28 (Fu Tai) and L29 (Tuen Mun Rural) will be adjusted. Regarding the other matters raised in the</p>

Item No.	DCCAs	No.*		Representations	EAC's views
		W	O		
				<p>Hang Tsuen Road by participating in the local consultation exercise.</p> <p>(c) Proposes to transfer Lam Tei Quarry from L11(San Hui) to L29 (Tuen Mun Rural) because Lam Tei's residents have been annoyed by the heavy trucks in the Quarry. They have repeatedly reflected the problem and complained to the Quarry but the problem is still unresolved. The district consultation work used to be taken up by the DC member of San Hui on behalf of Lam Tei's residents to reflect their local views to the government. The DC member and residents of San Hui could never understand the nuisance caused by the Quarry to Lam Tei's residents.</p>	<p>representation, involving the arrangements on district administration matters, they are not the relevant factors of consideration in delineating constituencies.</p> <p><u>Item (c)</u> This proposal is <b>not accepted</b> because:</p> <p>(i) the EAC must adhere to the Administration's population forecast as at 30 June 2015 in delineating the constituency boundaries. The Lam Tei Quarry mentioned in the representation has no population; 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>
10	L14 – Fu Sun	1	-	Supports the provisional recommendation on L14 (Fu Sun) because combining the 12 blocks of Glorious Garden and Sun Tuen Mun Centre into a DCCA could preserve community integrity and harmony.	The supporting view is noted.
11	L24 – Po Tin L26 – Siu Hong	1	-	Proposes to transfer Kei Lun Wai from L24 (Po Tin) to L26 (Siu Hong) because the population of L24 (Po Tin) mainly comes from Po Tin Estate and Kei Lun Wai's residents always use the community facilities and transport provided by Siu Hong Court. Also, geographically, the area is nearer to L26 (Siu Hong) and rather remote from L24 (Po Tin).	<p>This proposal is <b>not accepted</b> because:</p> <p>(i) the projected population of L24 (Po Tin) and L26 (Siu Hong) will fall within the statutory permissible range. According to the established working principles, adjustment to their existing boundaries 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>		
				As a result, Kei Lun Wai's residents find it easier to seek assistance from the DC member in L26 (Siu Hong). Moreover, new public housing would be built in Area 54 of Tuen Mun which would make it more inappropriate to put Kei Lun Wai in L24 (Po Tin).	<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; and</p> <p>(iii) the EAC must adhere to the Administration's population forecast as at 30 June 2015 in delineating the constituency boundaries. Future development after the cut-off date will not be considered.</p>
12	L28 – Fu Tai  L29 – Tuen Mun Rural	1	-	Proposes to transfer Fuk Hang Tsuen (Upper/ Lower) from L28 (Fu Tai) to L29 (Tuen Mun Rural) because Fuk Hang Tsuen is a rural community and the DC member of L28 (Fu Tai) would not understand the rural culture and daily life of the villagers. This would cause difficulties in assisting the villagers. Fuk Hang Tsuen's electors are used to going to L29 (Tuen Mun Rural) to cast their votes and seek community services.	<p>This proposal is <b>not accepted</b> because:</p> <p>(i) according to the EAC's provisional recommendation, the projected population of L29 (Tuen Mun Rural) could be adjusted to 21,714 (+28.00%). After the proposed adjustment based on the representation, the projected population (22,135) will further deviate from the population quota (+30.48%), compared with the provisional recommendation;</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; and</p> <p>(iii) although there are certain local ties between the area mentioned in the representation and part of L29 (Tuen Mun Rural), the EAC considers that adjustment to the constituency</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>		
					boundaries is required because the population will substantially exceed the permissible range based on the 2011 original constituency boundaries.
13	L28 – Fu Tai  L29 – Tuen Mun Rural	1	-	Proposes to transfer Fu Tei Sheung Tsuen and Fu Tei Ha Tsuen from L28 (Fu Tai) to L29 (Tuen Mun Rural) because Fu Tei Sheung Tsuen and Fu Tei Ha Tsuen are rural communities and the DC member of L28 (Fu Tai) would not understand the rural culture and daily life of the villagers. This would cause difficulties in assisting the villagers. The electors of Fu Tei Sheung Tsuen and Fu Tei Ha Tsuen are used to going to L29 (Tuen Mun Rural) to vote and seek community services.	This proposal is <b>not accepted</b> because:  (i) according to the EAC's provisional recommendation, the projected population of L29 (Tuen Mun Rural) could be adjusted to 21,714 (+28.00%). After the proposed adjustment, the projected population (21,755) will further deviate from the population quota (+28.24%), compared with the provisional recommendation;  (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; and  (iii) although there are certain local ties between the area mentioned in the representation and the part of L29 (Tuen Mun Rural), the EAC considers that adjustment to the constituency boundaries is required because the population will substantially exceed the permissible range based on the 2011 original constituency boundaries.

**Appendix II - M**

**Yuen Long 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) Proposes to transfer the area in the south of Shap Pat Heung Road located in M01 (Fung Nin) to M09 (Shap Pat Heung Central) so as to maintain ties between the villages therein and improve the dumbbell-shaped boundary of M09 (Shap Pat Heung Central).	<u>Item (a)</u> This proposal is <b>not accepted</b> because the proposal made in the representation is not clearly better in terms of population distribution, shape of the DCCAs, preserving community integrity or local ties.
				(b) Proposes to restore the name of M05 (Yuen Long Centre) to "Tai Kiu" and to rename M06 (Yuen Lung) as "Yuen Long Centre" because Yuen Lung Street is far away from the Sun Yuen Long Centre located in M06 (Yuen Lung). Besides, Sun Yuen Long Centre could be retained in the DCCA named "Yuen Long Centre" to reduce the possibility of causing confusion to local residents.	<u>Item (b)</u> These proposals are <b>not accepted</b> because the existing names of the DCCAs can appropriately reflect their locations. The names proposed in the representation are not clearly better.
				(c) Proposes to transfer the area in the north of Kin Lok Street located in M07 (Fung Cheung) (i.e. Yuen San Building, Kin Wai Building and Hang Fat Mansion, etc.) to M06 (Yuen Lung) so as to reduce the population difference between the two DCCAs.	<u>Item (c)</u> This proposal is <b>not accepted</b> because after the proposed adjustment, although the projected population of M06 (Yuen Lung) will be closer to the population quota as compared with the provisional recommendations, the projected population of M07 (Fung Cheung) will deviate further from the population quota. Therefore, the proposal made in the representation is not clearly better. Moreover, taking into

\* 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>		
					account the geographical and community facilities factors, the buildings in the north of Kin Lok Street certainly have established ties with M07 (Fung Cheung). In this connection, the EAC considers that there is no sufficient justification to accept the changes proposed in the representation.
				(d) States that the population difference among the three DCCAs of Shap Pat Heung (i.e. M08 (Shap Pat Heung East), M09 (Shap Pat Heung Central) and M10 (Shap Pat Heung West)) amounts to 5,000. It is hoped that the EAC would improve such situation in the 2019 delineation exercise.	<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) States that six DCCAs, namely M08 (Shap Pat Heung East), M09 (Shap Pat Heung Central), M10 (Shap Pat Heung West), M11 (Ping Shan South), M12 (Ping Shan Central) and M13 (Ping Shan North) are relatively less populated. It is hoped that the EAC would provide the justification on creating the new DCCAs in these areas but not the constantly more populated DCCAs in Tin Shui Wai (i.e. M25 (Kingswood North)).	<u>Item (e)</u> Based on the 2011 original constituency boundaries, the projected population of M08 (Shap Pat Heung East), M10 (Shap Pat Heung West) and M12 (Ping Shan Central) will substantially exceed the statutory permissible upper limit. Therefore, it is necessary to create the new M09 (Shap Pat Heung Central) and M13 (Ping Shan North) at the locations concerned and make corresponding adjustments to the adjacent DCCAs to absorb the excess population.  In respect of M15 (Tin Shing), M22 (Tin Heng) and M25 (Kingswood North) located in Tin Shui Wai, as based on the 2011

<i>Item No.</i>	<i>DCCAs</i>	<i>No. *</i>		<i>Representations</i>	<i>EAC's Views</i>
		<i>W</i>	<i>O</i>		
					original constituency boundaries, the projected population of these three DCCAs will exceed the statutory permissible upper limit, the EAC has also considered the feasibility of creating a new DCCA at the location of these three DCCAs in this delineation exercise. However, taking into account the community integrity and geographical factors, the EAC considers that there is no apparently acceptable proposal at present. Therefore, the EAC proposes to maintain the existing boundaries of the three DCCAs at this stage and allow their population to continue to deviate from the statutory permissible range (taking into account the community integrity, the population of these DCCAs in the 2011 delineation exercise was also allowed to deviate from the statutory permissible range).
				<p>(f) Objects to the provisional recommendations on M17 (Shui Wah), M18 (Chung Wah), M25 (Kingswood North) and M30 (Chung Pak). In view that M25 (Kingswood North) is over-populated, it is proposed:</p> <p>(i) to maintain the existing boundary of M17 (Shui Wah) but to revise the delineation of M30 (Chung Pak) by transferring Chung Pik House and Chung Shui House of Tin Chung Court to M18 (Chung Wah) and to transfer Lynwood Court of Kingswood Villas from M25 (Kingswood North) to M30 (Chung Pak); and</p>	<p><u>Items (f)(i) and (ii)</u> Regarding the considerations for the delineation of M25 (Kingswood North), please see item 1(e).</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) if the population of M30 (Chung Pak) would exceed the statutory permissible upper limit as a result of the above adjustment, it is proposed to put the whole Tin Wah Estate in M17 (Shui Wah) and the entire Tin Chung Court in M18 (Chung Wah). M18 (Chung Wah) would then be renamed as "Tin Chung". Besides, M30 (Chung Pak) would include Central Park Towers and Lynwood Court of Kingswood Villas and be renamed as "Pak Lai".</p>	
				<p>(g) The provisional recommendations are in line with the EAC's statutory criteria and working principles but do not have an appropriate delineation of some community facilities. It is proposed to transfer the Tin Pak Road Park in M25 (Kingswood North) and Tin Shui Wai Swimming Pool in M29 (Kingswood South) to M26 (Tsz Yau) for a better distribution of the above community facilities.</p>	<p><u>Item (g)</u> This proposal is <b>not accepted</b>. The areas mentioned in the proposal are community facilities and have no projected population.</p>
				<p>(h) States that the population of each of the three DCCAs M26 (Tsz Yau), M27 (Yiu Yau) and M28 (Tin Yiu) is less than that of M25 (Kingswood North) for about 9,000. The EAC should take note of this and reduce the population difference in the next delineation exercise.</p>	<p><u>Item (h)</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</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>		
					factors. The EAC will continue to adhere to the above in future delineation exercises.
				(i) Other than those mentioned above, supports the provisional recommendations on all the DCCAs as they are in line with the EAC's statutory criteria and working principles. Moreover, supports the provisional recommendation on M15 (Tin Shing) because taking into account its community integrity, it is more practicable to maintain its existing delineation.	<u>Item (i)</u> The supporting view is noted.
2	M01 – Fung Nin M05 – Yuen Long Centre M07 – Fung Cheung M25 – Kingswood North M26 – Tsz Yau M27 – Yiu Yau M29 – Kingswood South	1	-	(a) Proposes to transfer the buildings in the south of Castle Peak Road – Yuen Long located in M05 (Yuen Long Centre) (i.e. Hing Loong Building, Kwong Wah Centre, Kui Fat Building and Wun Fat Building, etc.) to M07 (Fung Cheung) as far as possible, and to transfer the buildings in the north of Kau Yuk Road located in M01 (Fung Nin) (i.e. Hing Yip Building, Hong Shing Building, Tung Fook Building and Kwan Tak Building, etc.) to M05 (Yuen Long Centre) so as to spare capacity for M01 (Fung Nin) to absorb the increasing population brought about by the development in the nearby areas in future.	<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 development thereafter should not be taken into account.
				(b) Disagrees that the creation of the new M27 (Yiu Yau) is to improve the population of M29 (Kingswood South). It is proposed that the newly created M27 (Yiu Yau) to	<u>Item (b)</u> This representation is <b>not accepted</b> . Please see item 1(e). Moreover, the area between M25 (Kingswood North) and M26 (Tsz Yau) comprises telephone

<i>Item No.</i>	<i>DCCAs</i>	<i>No. *</i>		<i>Representations</i>	<i>EAC's Views</i>
		<i>W</i>	<i>O</i>		
				absorb the buildings of Tin Yau Court located in M26 (Tsz Yau) so that M26 (Tsz Yau) would have capacity to help improve the population overflow of Kingswood North. Alternatively, the new DCCA could be created in Kingswood North by way of dividing it into two DCCAs.	exchange, bus depot, schools, parks and sports ground, etc. which has no projected population. Besides, there are no community ties between the housing estates in the two DCCAs. The proposal made in the representation is not desirable in terms of community integrity, local ties and population distribution.
3	M05 – Yuen Long Centre M07 – Fung Cheung M08 – Shap Pat Heung East M10 – Shap Pat Heung West M11 – Ping Shan South M12 – Ping Shan Central M15 – Tin Shing M19 – Yuet Yan M20 – Fu Yan M21 – Yat Chak	1	-	<p>(a) Agrees with the re-delineation of M10 (Shap Pat Heung West) and M12 (Ping Shan Central), which have a serious overflow of population based on their 2011 original constituency boundaries, together with the adjacent M08 (Shap Pat Heung East) and M11 (Ping Shan South) to form six DCCAs. Moreover, as there is an increase in the overall population for M05 (Yuen Long Centre) and M07 (Fung Cheung) based on their 2011 original constituency boundaries, it is reasonable to re-delineate these two DCCAs to form three DCCAs.</p> <p>(b) Disagrees with the creation of the fourth new DCCA in the southern area of Tin Shui Wai where has no serious overflow of population but a decreasing population in general. On the contrary, there are three DCCAs, namely M15 (Tin Shing), M22 (Tin Heng) and M25 (Kingswood North) in Tin Shui Wai which are facing the problem of serious population overflow. These DCCAs should be handled first. Justifications are as</p>	<p><u>Item (a)</u> The supporting view is noted.</p> <p><u>Item (b)</u> This proposal is <b>not accepted</b>. The representation objects to the provisional recommendation on creating a new DCCA in the southern area of Tin Shui Wai, which covers M26 (Tsz Yau), M28 (Tin Yiu) and M29 (Kingswood South). Instead, the representation proposes to create a new DCCA in the northern area of Tin Shui Wai, which covers M21 (Yat Chak), M22 (Tin Heng), M23 (Wang Yat) and M24 (Ching King) by adjusting their</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>		
	M22 – Tin Heng  M23 – Wang Yat  M24 – Ching King  M25 – Kingswood North  M26 – Tsz Yau  M27 – Yiu Yau  M28 – Tin Yiu			<p>follows:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>● there are insufficient grounds for the EAC to remain the boundaries of the above three DCCAs unchanged and to allow their population to continue to deviate from the statutory permissible range on the considerations of community integrity and local ties because out of the 16 DCCAs in Tin Shui Wai, community integrity is not applicable in 11 DCCAs, including the newly created M27 (Yiu Yau), which has split Tin Yau Court (consisting of three buildings) into two DCCAs;</li> <li>● according to the projected population in 2015, the population overflow of M26 (Tsz Yau) will be far lower than that of M22 (Tin Heng) and M25 (Kingswood North). Therefore, there is no justifiable ground to accord priority to create a new DCCA in M26 (Tsz Yau);</li> <li>● in considering a proposal to create a new DCCA, apart from the existing population, the planned development and population growth of the community in future should also be taken into account. Considering that Tin Yiu Estate and Tin Tsz Estate are established housing estates with a steady population and there would be no planned development in future, the</li> </ul>	<p>boundaries starting from M22 (Tin Heng). The EAC agrees in principle with the rationale of the above proposal because it can solve the problem of M22 (Tin Heng) for having the projected population exceeding the statutory permissible range. After the proposed adjustments, the population of the affected DCCAs will also be more evenly distributed and closer to the population quota. However, the above proposal can only solve the population problem of M22 (Tin Heng). It cannot deal with the other two DCCAs with projected population exceeding the statutory permissible range. Moreover, due to the following considerations, the EAC is of the view that the proposal has significant inadequacies. Having balanced different factors, the EAC decides not to accept the proposal:</p> <p>(i) the proposal will affect four existing DCCAs. The number is higher than three under the provisional recommendations;</p> <p>(ii) it is proposed in the representation that three buildings of Tin Heng Estate located in M22 (Tin Heng) be transferred to M21 (Yat Chak). In view that Tin Heng Estate is rather independent and self-contained in terms of community and transport facilities, the proposal will disrupt the local ties of the Estate itself;</p> <p>(iii) the proposal made in 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>		
				<p>EAC's provisional recommendations would result in a relatively low percentage of deviation from the population quota of M26 (Tsz Yau), M27 (Yiu Yau) and M28 (Tin Yiu). That means the DCCAs concerned would have the problem of relatively low population in the long run; and</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>● on the contrary, for the six DCCAs in the northern area of Tin Shui Wai, they should be divided into seven DCCAs according to the projected population in 2015. In addition, there would be large-scale residential development in Areas 112 and 115 in Tin Shui Wai in future. The northern area of Tin Shui Wai would have further population growth in the long run.</li> </ul> <p>It is proposed to create a new DCCA in the northern area of Tin Shui Wai instead of M27 (Yiu Yau). Details of the proposal are as follows:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>(i) maintains the 2011 original boundaries of M26 (Tsz Yau) and M28 (Tin Yiu) and cancels the newly created M27 (Yiu Yau);</li> <li>(ii) creates a new DCCA in the northern area of Tin Shui Wai so that the number of DCCAs</li> </ul>	<p>representation is not clearly better in terms of community integrity and local ties. It proposes to delineate Vianni Cove and Tin Yat Estate in one DCCA. However, these two housing estates are geographically far apart and do not have apparent community ties with each other. On the contrary, Vianni Cove and Tin Ching Estate are geographically close and they have closer community ties with each other. Therefore, it is more reasonable for the abovementioned two housing estates to continue to form the existing M24 (Ching King);</p> <p>(iv) the EAC must adhere to the Administration's population forecast as at 30 June 2015 in delineating the constituency boundaries. The development thereafter should not be taken into account; and</p> <p>(v) there is a view supporting the delineation proposals for M21 (Yat Chak), M22 (Tin Heng), M23 (Wang Yat) and M24 (Ching King) (please see item 1(i)).</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>there would increase from six to seven;</p> <p>(iii) delineates three buildings of Tin Heng Estate with Tin Chak Estate located in M21 (Yat Chak) to form a DCCA named "Heng Chak" so as to keep the population of M22 (Tin Heng) within the statutory permissible range;</p> <p>(iv) revises the boundary of M23 (Wang Yat) to include Grandeur Terrace only, instead of covering Grandeur Terrace and part of Tin Yat Estate and renames the DCCA as "Chun Wang";</p> <p>(v) creates a new DCCA named "Yat King" which includes the entire Tin Yat Estate and Vianni Cove;</p> <p>(vi) revises the boundary of M24 (Ching King) to include Tin Ching Estate only, instead of covering Tin Ching Estate and Vianni Cove and renames the DCCA as "Tin Ching"; and</p> <p>(vii) supports maintaining the existing boundaries of M19 (Yuet Yan) and M20 (Fu Yan).</p> <p>The above proposal could reduce the number of</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>		
				DCCAs exceeding the statutory permissible range in the Yuen Long District from three, as proposed by the EAC in its provisional recommendations, to two.	
4	M06 – Yuen Lung  M07 – Fung Cheung	47	-	<p>Based on the 2011 original constituency boundary, basically do not object to splitting M07 (Fung Cheung) into two DCCAs, namely M06 (Yuen Lung) and M07 (Fung Cheung). However, object to transferring Shun Fung Building, Yik Fat Building, Cheong Wai Building and Wai Fat Building on Fung Yau Street North to M06 (Yuen Lung) and request for transferring the above four buildings back to M07 (Fung Cheung) so as to avoid disrupting the integrity of M07 (Fung Cheung). Reasons are as follows:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>● the above four buildings have been in Fung Cheung area since 1987. Same as the other buildings in Fung Cheung area, these four buildings are stand-alone buildings. Residents living in this area share the same sense of belonging to the community;</li> <li>● the above four buildings are situated on Fung Yau Street North. Since 1984, these buildings together with Fung Yau Street South, Fung Yau Street East, Fung Kam Street, Fung Kwan Street and Fung Cheung Road have formed a residential area of stand-alone buildings called “Kei Tei”. The community integrity of the area would be disrupted if the buildings on Fung Yau Street</li> </ul>	<p>These representations are <b>not accepted</b> because:</p> <p>(i) after the proposed adjustment, the projected population of M06 (Yuen Lung) (12,344) will be below the statutory permissible lower limit (-27.23%);</p> <p>(ii) arrangements on district administration matters are not the factors of consideration in delineating constituencies; and</p> <p>(iii) the EAC must adhere to the Administration’s population forecast as at 30 June 2015 in delineating the constituency boundaries. The development thereafter should not be taken into account.</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>North are transferred from Fung Cheung area to M06 (Yuen Lung);</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>● if the above four buildings are delineated in M07 (Fung Cheung), it would be conducive to the integrity of the DCCA and M06 (Yuen Lung) as they have Yuen Long East Nullah to serve as a clear boundary between them;</li> <li>● there are about 15,000 electors in M07 (Fung Cheung). The population of the DCCA would not exceed the permissible upper limit even after adding residents of the above four buildings;</li> <li>● YOHO Town, YOHO Midtown and Sun Yuen Long Centre located in M06 (Yuen Lung) are three large-scale housing estates developed by Sun Hung Kai Properties while the above four buildings are stand-alone residential buildings managed by different developers and property management companies. The residents do not have common matters of interest. The coming DC member of the DCCA may focus on serving the residents of the large-scale housing estates and neglect those of the above four buildings, which is unfair to the latter;</li> <li>● currently, all flats of YOHO Midtown have been sold out. Although half of the residents have not yet moved in, it is believed that they would do so in half years' time. Afterwards, the population of</li> </ul>	



<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>M06 (Yuen Lung) would increase substantially so there is no need to transfer the above four buildings to M06 (Yuen Lung) at present; and</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• a large-scale housing estate (i.e. phase III of YOHO) is now under construction in M06 (Yuen Lung). Upon its completion, the population of the DCCA would increase by 8,000. If the above four buildings are to be transferred back to M07 (Fung Cheung) in 2019, it would be even more unfair to the residents concerned.</li> </ul>	
5	<p>M08 – Shap Pat Heung East</p> <p>M10 – Shap Pat Heung West</p>	2	-	<p>Taking into account the community integrity, it is proposed to delineate the boundary for M08 (Shap Pat Heung East) and M10 (Shap Pat Heung West) by Tai Shu Ha Road West.</p> <p>One of the representations indicates that the provisional recommendations have divided Nam Hang Tsuen into two DCCAs, namely M08 (Shap Pat Heung East) and M10 (Shap Pat Heung West). This would disrupt the local ties of the village and cause confusion to villagers. The other representation opines that the division of Nam Hang Tsuen and Nam Hang Pai in M08 (Shap Pat Heung East) and M10 (Shap Pat Heung West) under the provisional recommendations has violated the principles of community identity and local ties. It would also cause confusion to villagers and affect community integrity.</p>	<p>This proposal <b>is accepted</b> because under the provisional recommendations, the boundary of M08 (Shap Pat Heung East) and M10 (Shap Pat Heung West) will delineate Nam Hang Tsuen and Nam Hang Pai in two DCCAs. Taking into account the community integrity and geographical factors, the EAC accepts the proposal to use the prominent Tai Shu Ha Road West as boundary and extend it to the south to delineate the boundary for M08 (Shap Pat Heung East) and M10 (Shap Pat Heung West) so that the entire Nam Hang Tsuen and Nam Hang Pai will be delineated in M10 (Shap Pat Heung West). The population of M10 (Shap Pat Heung West) will be allowed to slightly exceed the statutory permissible upper limit.</p> <p>After the proposed adjustment, the projected population of M08 (Shap Pat Heung East) and M10 (Shap Pat Heung West) will be as follows:</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>		
					M08: 15,217, -10.30% M10: 21,626, +27.48%
6	M16 – Shui Oi  M17 – Shui Wah	2	-	<p>Propose to transfer Shui Choi House of Tin Shui Estate from M16 (Shui Oi) to M17 (Shui Wah) because:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>● under the provisional recommendations, the population of M17 (Shui Wah) is less than M16 (Shui Oi) by 3,026. Transferring Shui Choi House from M16 (Shui Oi) to M17 (Shui Wah) would make the population of the two DCCAs closer;</li> <li>● Shui Choi House as well as Shui Sing House, Shui Yee House, Shui Chuen House, Shui Lung House and Shui Kwok House located in M17 (Shui Wah) all belong to Tin Shui (I) Estate while Shui Fai House, Shui Fung House, Shui Moon House, Shui Yip House and Shui Lam House located in M16 (Shui Oi) all belong to Tin Shui (II) Estate. Transferring Shui Choi House to M17 (Shui Wah) would bring about administrative convenience; and</li> <li>● geographically, Shui Choi House is adjacent to M17 (Shui Wah).</li> </ul>	<p>This proposal is <b>not accepted</b> because:</p> <p>(i) the projected population of M16 (Shui Oi) will fall within the statutory permissible range. According to the established working principles, adjustment to its existing boundary is not required;</p> <p>(ii) arrangements on district administration matters are not the factors of consideration in delineating constituencies; and</p> <p>(iii) there is a view supporting the delineation proposal for M16 (Shui Oi) (please see item 1(i)).</p>
7	M17 – Shui Wah  M18 – Chung Wah	1	-	<p>Proposes to group all buildings of Tin Wah Estate located in M17 (Shui Wah) and M18 (Chung Wah) in the same DCCA so as to maintain the integrity and harmony of Tin Wah Estate.</p>	<p>This proposal is <b>not accepted</b> because:</p> <p>(i) if the whole Tin Wah Estate is delineated in M18 (Chung Wah), the projected population of M17 (Shui Wah) (10,352)</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>will be below the statutory permissible lower limit (-38.98%); and</p> <p>(ii) if the whole Tin Wah Estate is delineated in M17 (Shui Wah), the projected population of both M17 (Shui Wah) and M18 (Chung Wah) will exceed the statutory permissible range:</p> <p>M17: 21,664, +27.71% M18: 8,946, -47.26%</p>
8	M27 – Yiu Yau	1	-	<p>Objects to the creation of the new DCCA M27 (Yiu Yau) because there is no significant increase of population and no new housing estates have been built in the areas concerned. Delineating Yau Tai House of Tin Yau Court and some buildings of Tin Yiu Estate in this new DCCA would give rise to the suspicion that the recommendation is tailor-made for the pro-establishment parties in the areas and disregards the interest of residents.</p>	<p>This representation is <b>not accepted</b>. Please see item 1(e).</p>
9	M29 – Kingswood South	4	-	<p>Support the delineation proposal for retaining Locwood Court, Sherwood Court and Chestwood Court of Kingswood Villas in the same DCCA (i.e. M29 (Kingswood South)) so as to preserve its community integrity. The reasons are as follows:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>the above housing estates have been a close and inseparable community since the moving-in of the residents in 1992, and they have been delineated in the same DCCA since the District Board Election held in 1994; and</li> </ul>	<p>The supporting views are noted.</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>		
				<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>residents of these housing estates use common facilities, such as transport facilities and club houses, etc. and are served by the same management company. The daily management issues of the estates, residents' interests and needs of community services are similar and closely-related, which have made these estates an inseparable community.</li> </ul>	

**North 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	N01 – Luen Wo Hui N02 – Fanling Town N06 – Yan Shing N07 – Shing Fuk N08 – Fanling South N10 – Yu Tai N11 – Shueng Shui Rural N13 – Shek Wu Hui N14 – Tin Ping West N17 – Tin Ping East	1	-	(a) <u>N10 (Yu Tai) and N11 (Sheung Shui Rural)</u> (i) Proposes to maintain the original constituency boundary of N11 (Sheung Shui Rural) and to allow the population of the DCCA to continue to deviate from the statutory permissible range; or (ii) to transfer Tai Tau Leng and Tsung Pak Long from N11 (Sheung Shui Rural) to N10 (Yu Tai); or (iii) to transfer Ying Pun and Lin Tong Mei from N11 (Sheung Shui Rural) to N10 (Yu Tai); or (iv) to extend the coverage of N10 (Yu Tai) to Sheung Yue River.	<u>Item (a)(i)</u> This proposal is <b>not accepted</b> because if the constituency boundary of N11 (Sheung Shui Rural) remains unchanged, the projected population of the DCCA (23,281) will substantially exceed the statutory permissible upper limit (+37.24%). Therefore, the EAC's provisional recommendations have transferred the area of Ping Kong and Tai Lung from N11 (Sheung Shui Rural) to N10 (Yu Tai). Even though the projected population of the DCCA still slightly exceeds the statutory permissible upper limit (+27.20%), the deviation has been reduced to the least.  <u>Item (a)(ii) &amp; (iii)</u> This proposal is <b>not accepted</b> . The EAC considers that the proposals made in the representation could make the projected population of N11(Sheung Shui Rural) fall within the statutory permissible range. However, at the same time, the EAC understands that:  (i) both Tsung Pak Long and Tai Tau Leng are the key members of the Sheung Shui rural community, and there are close historical and community ties between the two villages and the other villages in N11(Sheung Shui

\* 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>		
					<p>Rural). Comparatively speaking, the daily ties between the two villages and N10 (Yu Tai) is not obvious; and</p> <p>(ii) Ying Poon, Ling Tong Mei and the other villages in the proximity of Fan Kam Road (e.g. Tsiu Keng, Cheung Lek) have a vegetable cooperative and the residents of the above villages rely on the Fan Kam Road as access.</p> <p>After balancing the relevant factors and taking into account the geographical factor, transportation, community integrity and community ties, the EAC remains the provisional recommendations unchanged.</p> <p><u>Item (a)(iv)</u> This proposal is <b>not accepted</b> because if the coverage of N10 (Yu Tai) is extended to Sheung Yue River, the projected population of both N10 (Yu Tai) and N11 (Sheung Shui Rural) will exceed the statutory permissible range:</p> <p>N10: 31,095, +83.30% N11: 7,637, -54.98%</p>
				(b) Proposes to transfer some buildings of Tin Ping Estate from N17 (Tin Ping East) to N14 (Tin Ping West).	<p><u>Item (b)</u> Based on the 2011 original constituency boundary, the projected population of N14 (Tin Ping West) (12,666) will be slightly below the statutory permissible lower limit and therefore adjustment to its boundary is required. The EAC</p>

Item No.	DCCAs	No. *		Representations	EAC's views
		W	O		
					<p>agrees that this proposal is more preferable and should be <b>accepted</b> because the buildings of Tin Ping Estate are located in both N14 (Tin Ping West) and N17 (Tin Ping East) and they have certain local ties. In this connection, the EAC proposes to transfer Tin Long House located in N17 (Tin Ping East) to N14 (Tin Ping West) and to maintain Sunningdale Garden in N13 (Shek Wu Hui). After the proposed adjustment, the projected population of N13 (Shek Wu Hui), N14 (Tin Ping West) and N17 (Tin Ping East) will remain within the statutory permissible range. They are:</p> <p>N13: 19,736 , +16.34%                      N14: 15,062, -11.21%                      N17: 17,298, +1.97%</p>
				<p>(c) Objects to the delineation proposal for the newly created N08 (Fanling South). It is proposed that the new DCCA should be delineated at the location of Ka Shing Court and Ka Fuk Estate in N07 (Shing Fuk) and Kai Leng in N08 (Fanling South). N07 (Shing Fuk) would then be formed by the remaining parts of the existing N07 (Shing Fuk) together with Wu Tip Shan of N08 (Fanling South) and N06 (Yan Shing). Another DCCA should be formed by the remaining parts of the newly created N08 (Fanling South) together with Wong Kong Shan and Fanling Centre of N02 (Fanling Town). If the projected population of N02 (Fanling Town) is insufficient, it is proposed to transfer some</p>	<p><u>Item (c)</u>                      This proposal is <b>not accepted</b> because:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• after the proposed adjustment, the projected population of N07 (Shing Fuk) (21,469) will exceed the statutory permissible upper limit (+26.56%);</li> <li>• after the proposed adjustment, the projected population of N02 (Fanling Town) (8,037) will be below the statutory permissible lower limit (-52.62%). Taking into account the population distribution and local ties, it is not desirable to transfer some buildings of N01 (Luen Wo Hui) to N02 (Fanling Town) at this stage; and</li> </ul>

Item No.	DCCAs	No. *		Representations	EAC's views
		W	O		
				population from N01 (Luen Wo Hui) to N02 (Fanling Town).	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>there is no objective information and justification to prove that the proposal made in the representation is clearly better than the provisional recommendations in terms of community identities and local ties.</li> </ul>
2	N02 – Fanling Town  N17 – Tin Ping East	1	-	Proposes to transfer Belair Monte and Green Code from N17 (Tin Ping East) to N02 (Fanling Town) because the two housing estates have inseparable ties with Fanling and Luen Wo Hui in terms of community ties and due to the geographical consideration. Taking into account that the above adjustment may make the projected population of N17 (Tin Ping East) deviate from the statutory permissible range, and that Ling Shan Tsuen is adjacent to Good View New Village of the existing N17 (Tin Ping East), it is therefore proposed to transfer Ling Shan Tsuen from N02 (Fanling Town) to N17 (Tin Ping East). After the above adjustment, the projected population of N02 (Fanling Town) would not deviate from the statutory permissible range.	<p>This proposal is <b>not accepted</b> because:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>in view of the EAC's revision to the boundaries of N13 (Shek Wu Hui), N14 (Tin Ping West) and N17 (Tin Ping East) in item 1(b), the projected population of N17 (Tin Ping East) (11,140) will be below the statutory permissible lower limit (-34.33%) if Belair Monte and Green Code are to be transferred from N17 (Tin Ping East) to N02 (Fanling Town) (Please see item 1); and</li> <li>in view of the profound history and ties of the Chinese clan between Ling Shan Tsuen and Fanling Wai of N02 (Fanling Town), it is not desirable to transfer Ling Shan Tsuen to N17 (Tin Ping East).</li> </ul>
3	N01 – Luen Wo Hui  N02 – Fanling Town  N06 – Yan Shing	1	-	(a) <u>N08 (Fanling South)</u> Objects to the delineation proposal for the newly created N08 (Fanling South). It is proposed to form a new DCCA comprising Grand Regentville and Regentville in N01 (Luen Wo Hui), Fan Garden Government Police Married Quarters and Fanling Garden in N02 (Fanling Town) and Belair	<p><u>Item (a)</u> This proposal is <b>not accepted</b> because:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>the projected population of N15 (Fung Tsui) will fall within the statutory permissible range. According to the established working principles,</li> </ul>



<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>N07 – Shing Fuk</p> <p>N08 – Fanling South</p> <p>N10 – Yu Tai</p> <p>N11 – Sheung Shui Rural</p> <p>N13 – Shek Wu Hui</p> <p>N14 – Tin Ping West</p> <p>N15 – Fung Tsui</p> <p>N17 – Tin Ping East</p> <p>N18 – Queen's Hill</p>			<p>Monte, Green Code, Ma Shi Po and Wu Nga Lok Yeung in N17 (Tin Ping East) and name the new DCCA as “Luen Wo Hui North” because:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>consideration has been given to the factors of projected growth in population and community ties brought about by the occupation of Green Code and Mount One; and</li> <li>some housing estates/villages in Luen Wo Hui (e.g. Belfair Monte and the area of Ma Shi Po) in N17 (Tin Ping East) mainly rely on Luen Wo Hui, instead of N17 (Tin Ping East) for external transport, shopping and community facilities. The existing constituency boundaries undermine the areas concerned in terms of the geographical factor, transportation, community integrity and local ties.</li> </ul> <p>In view of the above proposal for forming the new DCCA, adjustments to the delineation of the other DCCA are proposed as follows:</p> <p><u>N01 (Luen Wo Hui)</u> comprises Luen Wo Hui, Union Plaza, Mount One, Wing Fok Centre and Wing Fai Centre and renamed as “Luen Wo Hui South”.</p> <p><u>N02 (Fanling Town)</u> comprises Fanling Centre, Avon Park, DawningViews, Fanling Wai, Fan Leng Lau Tsuen, On Lok Tsuen, Sui Pak Villa and Swallow</p>	<p>adjustment to its existing boundary is not required;</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>the projected population of the proposed new DCCA “Luen Wo Hui North” (11,953) will be below the statutory permissible lower limit (-29.54%); and</li> <li>there is no objective information and justification to prove that the proposal made in the representation is clearly better than the provisional recommendations in terms of community identity and local ties.</li> </ul>

<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>Garden.</p> <p><u>N07 (Shing Fuk)</u> comprises Belair Villa, Camellia Court, Eden Garden, Glamour Garden and Kai Leng from the existing N08 (Fanling South), together with Ka Fuk Estate, Ka Shing Court, Cheerful Park, Greenpark Villa and Vienna Garden so as to enhance the community integrity and local ties of the residential area around Kai Leng on Pak Wo Road.</p> <p><u>N10 (Yu Tai)</u> comprises Tai Ping Estate, Cheung Lung Wai Estate, Royal Green, 8 Royal Green, Glorious Peak, Venice Garden, Sheung Shui Disciplined Services Quarters, Sheung Shui Police Married Quarters and Ng Uk Tsuen. In view that the DCCA would cover a large number of housing estates, the DCCA is to be renamed as “Po Kin” which comes from the name of Po Kin Road, the major road in the DCCA concerned.</p> <p><u>N11 (Sheung Shui Rural)</u> in view of the community integrity and local ties of the Sheung Shui Rural villages, N11 (Sheung Shui Rural) comprises Kwu Tung, Kam Tsin, Hang Tau, Lin Tong Mei, Tong Kung Leng, Tsiu Keng, Ying Pun, Ho Sheung Heung, Ma Tso Lung, Lo Wu, Europa Garden and Valais and be renamed as “Sheung Shui Rural West”.</p> <p><u>N13 (Shek Wu Hui)</u> transfers So Kwun Po from the existing N02 (Fanling Town) to N13 (Shek Wu Hui). N13 (Shek</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>Wu Hui) comprises Shek Wu Hui, Royal Jubilee, Lung Fung Garden, Metropolis Plaza, Sheung Shui Centre, Sheung Shui Town Centre, Sunningdale Garden, So Kwun Po Tsuen and Yuk Po Court so as to enhance the community integrity and local ties for the area around So Kwun Po Tsuen which is adjacent to Sheung Shui town centre.</p> <p><u>N14 (Tin Ping West)</u> transfers Tsui Lai Garden from the existing N15 (Fung Tsui) to N14 (Tin Ping West) so as to enhance the community integrity and local ties for the subsidised flats for sale schemes (Tin Ping Estate and Tsui Lai Garden) around the area of Tin Ping Road. This DCCA comprises Tin Yee House, Tin Cheung House and Tin Hor House of Tin Ping Estate, Tsui Lai Garden and Woodland Crest. In view of the proposed change to the area of the DCCA, it is proposed to rename N14 as “Ping Tsui”, which comes from the name of Tin Ping Estate and Tsui Lai Garden.</p> <p><u>N15 (Fung Tsui)</u> apart from the above adjustment to transfer Tsui Lai Garden to N14 (Tin Ping West), it is proposed to transfer Golfpark View and the area for Tsung Pak Long Village to the south of Fanling Highway from the existing N10 (Yu Tai) to N15 (Fung Tsui) as well as to transfer Yin Kong, Tsung Pak Long, Tai Tau Leng and the area around Ping Kong from the existing N11 (Sheung Shui Rural) to N15 (Fung Tsui) so as to enhance the community integrity and local ties for the villages of the Sheung Shui</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>rural area. This DCCA comprises Sheung Shui Wai, Tin Ping Shan Tsuen, Fu Tei Au Tsuen, Hung Kiu San Tsuen, Wa Shan, Tai Tau Leng, Tsung Pak Long, Yin Kong, Ping Kong and Golfpark View. In view of the change to the area of the DCCA, it is proposed to rename N15 as “Sheung Shui Rural East”.</p> <p><u>N17 (Tin Ping East)</u> taking into account the geographical factor, transportation, community integrity and local ties, it is proposed to transfer Ling Shan Tsuen and Tin Ming House of Tin Ping Estate from the existing N02 (Fanling Town) and N14 (Tin Ping West) to N17 (Tin Ping East) respectively. This DCCA comprises Tin Ming House, Tin Long House, Tin Mei House, Tin Hee House of Tin Ping Estate, On Shing Court, On Kwok Villa, Noble Hill, Shek Wu Sun Tsuen, Ling Shan Tsuen and Good View New Village. In view of the change to the area of the DCCA, it is proposed to rename the DCCA as “Tin Ping”.</p>	
				(b) Proposes to rename N06 (Yan Shing) as “Yung Yan”, which comes from Yung Shing Court and Yan Shing Court so as to reflect the coverage of the DCCA.	<p><u>Item (b)</u> This proposal is <b>not accepted</b> because the name of the DCCA has been used since 2003 and the majority of the public are used to this name. Moreover, the major estates in the DCCA have not been changed. Change of the DCCA name may cause confusion to the public.</p>
				(c) As N18 (Queen’s Hill) covers a large area (from the northern end of Sha Tau Kok Road – Ma Mei Ha section to the southern	<p><u>Item (c)</u> This proposal is <b>not accepted</b> because the name of the DCCA has</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>		
				end of Wo Hop Shek Village), it is proposed to rename the DCCA as “Fanling Rural” so as to reflect the coverage of the DCCA.	been used since 1994 and the majority of the public are used to this name. Moreover, the boundary of the DCCA has not been changed. Change of the DCCA name may cause confusion to the public.
4	N10 – Yu Tai N11 – Sheung Shui Rural N12 – Choi Yuen	1	-	<p>(a) Proposes to transfer the whole of the northern part of Fan Kam Road in N11 (Sheung Shui Rural) to N10 (Yu Tai) as the residents of The Green, Lin Tong Mei and Tsiu Keng rely on Fan Kam Road as the access and the above proposal helps maintain the rural ties along Fan Kam Road.</p> <p>(b) Proposes to transfer Tsung Pak Long in N11 (Sheung Shui Rural) to N12 (Choi Yuen) so as to reflect that the residents of Tsung Pak Long would use the community facilities of Choi Yuen Estate and to reduce the projected population difference between N11 (Sheung Shui Rural) and N12 (Choi Yuen).</p>	<p><u>Item (a) &amp; (b)</u> This proposal is <b>not accepted</b> because:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>● based on the 2011 original constituency boundary, the projected population of N11 (Sheung Shui Rural) will substantially exceed the statutory permissible upper limit. The EAC’s provisional recommendations can reduce the population deviation to around 27%. Although the proposal made in the representation can make the projected population of the DCCA closer to the population quota, the proposal, at the same time, will affect more members of the public;</li> <li>● the projected population of N12 (Choi Yuen) will fall within the statutory permissible range. According to the established working principles, adjustment to its boundary is not required; and</li> <li>● there is no objective information and justification to prove that the proposal made in the representation is clearly better than the provisional recommendations in terms of population</li> </ul>

<i>Item No.</i>	<i>DCCAs</i>	<i>No. *</i>		<i>Representations</i>	<i>EAC's views</i>
		<i>W</i>	<i>O</i>		
					distribution.
5	N08 – Fanling South	-	1	Proposes to re-delineate the boundary of N08 (Fanling South) because the distance between Dawning Views and Cheerful Park in the DCCA is far apart. Transport is needed to go from one end to the other, which is inconvenient for the DC member of the DCCA to discharge his/her duties in relation to district administration.	This proposal is <b>not accepted</b> because the delineation proposal should be based on objective data of population distribution. Arrangements on district administration matters are not the relevant factors of consideration.
6	N16 – Sha Ta	1	-	Proposes to set up the polling station for Wo Keng Shan Tsuen in the Ping Che Government Building so as to facilitate electors to cast their vote.	Arrangements on polling station are not the factors of consideration in delineating constituencies. The EAC has referred the view to REO for follow-up.

**Appendix II - P**

**Tai Po District**  
**Summaries of Written/Oral Representations**

Item No.	DCCAs	No.*		Representations	EAC's views
		W	O		
1	All DCCAs	1	-	(a) Supports the provisional recommendations on P01 (Tai Po Hui), P02 (Tai Po Central), P03 (Chung Ting), P04 (Tai Yuen), P05 (Fu Heng), P06 (Yee Fu), P07 (Fu Ming Sun), P08 (Kwong Fuk & Plover Cove), P09 (Wang Fuk), P10 (Tai Po Kau), P11 (Wan Tau Tong), P12 (San Fu), P15 (Tai Wo), P16 (Old Market & Serenity) and P18 (Shuen Wan) as they are in line with the EAC's statutory criteria and working principles.	<u>Item (a)</u> The supporting view is noted.
				(b) Proposes to transfer Tai Po Tau Shui Wai from P13 (Lam Tsuen Valley) to P14 (Po Nga), instead of P17 (Hong Lok Yuen) under the provisional recommendation because: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>● Tai Po Tau Shui Wai is relatively further away from the villages in P17 (Hong Lok Yuen);</li> <li>● the residents of Tai Po Tau Shui Wai use the MTR station and facilities of Tai Wo Estate;</li> <li>● the population difference between P13 (Lam Tsuen Valley) and P14 (Po Nga) could be reduced; and</li> </ul>	<u>Item (b)</u> This proposal is <b>not accepted</b> because: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>(i) P14 (Po Nga) is formed mainly by Home Ownership Scheme estate (Po Nga Court) and public housing (part of Tai Wo Estate), while P17 (Hong Lok Yuen) is an urban-cum-rural DCCA, including the low-rise housing estate (Hong Lok Yuen) and villages (e.g. Tai Po Tau ). Hence, it is more desirable to transfer the villages in Tai Po Tau Shui Wai to P17 (Hong Lok Yuen); and</li> <li>(ii) Tai Po Tau in P17 (Hong Lok Yuen) and Tai Po Tau Shui Wai belong to the same clanship and have certain ties between them.</li> </ul>

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

Item No.	DCCAs	No.*		Representations	EAC's views
		W	O		
				<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>the community ties of Tai Po Tau Shui Wai and Tai Wo could be preserved.</li> </ul>	
				<p>(c) (i) Holds reservation on the provisional recommendation on P19 (Sai Kung North) for the 2015 DCCA boundary delineation; and</p> <p>(ii) proposes to transfer P19 (Sai Kung North) to Sai Kung District in 2019.</p>	<p><u>Item (c)(i)</u> The view is noted.</p> <p><u>Item (c)(ii)</u> This proposal involves alteration of the district boundary, which does not fall under the purview of the EAC. The EAC has referred this view to the HAD for consideration.</p>
2	P09 – Wang Fuk  P10 – Tai Po Kau	1	-	<p>Proposes to transfer Providence Bay from P10 (Tai Po Kau) to P09 (Wang Fuk) because:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Providence Bay near Pak Shek Kok is close to P09 (Wang Fuk) and it is in line with the principle of “having regard to the community identities, preservation of local ties, and physical features of the area”; and</li> <li>although the population of the DCCA is not below 25% of the population quota, P09 (Wang Fuk) has the least population among all DCCAs in the Tai Po District, with the population and electors now at 13,044 and 8,957 respectively. The total projected population and electors in 2015 would be 12,744 and 8,394 respectively.</li> </ul>	<p>This proposal is <b>not accepted</b> because:</p> <p>(i) the projected population of P09 (Wang Fuk) and P10 (Tai Po Kau) will fall within the statutory permissible range. According to the established working principles, adjustment to their existing boundaries is not required; and</p> <p>(ii) there is a view supporting the delineation proposals for P09 (Wang Fuk) and P10 (Tai Po Kau) (please see item 1(a)).</p>



Item No.	DCCAs	No.*		Representations	EAC's views
		W	O		
3	P09 – Wang Fuk P10 – Tai Po Kau P13 – Lam Tsuen Valley P14 – Po Nga P17 – Hong Lok Yuen	1	-	(a) Proposes to transfer Providence Bay from P10 (Tai Po Kau) to P09 (Wang Fuk) for reducing the deviation percentage of the population quota of P09 (Wang Fuk).	<u>Item (a)</u> This proposal is <b>not accepted</b> . Please see item 2.
				(b) Proposes to transfer Tai Po Tau Shui Wai from P13 (Lam Tsuen Valley) to P14 (Po Nga) because: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>● the projected population of P14 (Po Nga) in 2015 would be lower than that of P17 (Hong Lok Yuen); and</li> <li>● Tai Po Tau Shui Wai was included in Tai Wo Constituency previously.</li> </ul>	<u>Item (b)</u> This proposal is <b>not accepted</b> because: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>(i) please see item 1(b); and</li> <li>(ii) the delineation proposal must be in accordance with the projected population and the present situation of the relevant DCCA.</li> </ul>
4	P12 – San Fu P13 – Lam Tsuen Valley P14 – Po Nga	1	-	(a) Proposes to transfer Tai Po Tau Shui Wai from P13 (Lam Tsuen Valley) to P14 (Po Nga) because the projected population of P14 (Po Nga) in 2015 would be lower than that of P17 (Hong Lok Yuen).	<u>Item (a)</u> This proposal is <b>not accepted</b> . Please see item 1(b).
				(b) Proposes to transfer Pun Chun Yuen and its vicinity from P13 (Lam Tsuen Valley) to P12 (San Fu) because: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>● the projected population of P12 (San Fu) in 2015 would be lower than that of P17 (Hong Lok Yuen); and</li> <li>● P12 (San Fu) and P13 (Lam Tsuen Valley) are both rural areas.</li> </ul>	<u>Item (b)</u> This proposal is <b>not accepted</b> because after the proposed adjustment, the projected population of P13 (Lam Tsuen Valley) (21,386) will still exceed the statutory permissible upper limit (+26.07%).

Item No.	DCCAs	No.*		Representations	EAC's views
		W	O		
				(c) Proposes to maintain the boundary of P13 (Lam Tsuen Valley) because the EAC allowed the population of other DCCAs to deviate from the statutory permissible range in the past. Moreover, different villages have different customs and close ties with their adjacent villages. Hence, the EAC should not ignore the ties among villages in order to be in line with the population permissible range.	<p><u>Item (c)</u> This proposal is <b>not accepted</b> because :</p> <p>(i) if the boundary of P13 (Lam Tsuen Valley) remains unchanged, the projected population of P13 (Lam Tsuen Valley) (21,655) will exceed the statutory permissible upper limit (+27.65%); and</p> <p>(ii) please see item 1(b)(ii).</p>
5	P13 – Lam Tsuen Valley  P14 – Po Nga  P17 – Hong Lok Yuen	-	1	Proposes to transfer Tai Po Tau Shui Wai from P13 (Lam Tsuen Valley) to P14 (Po Nga) because: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>● the residents of Tai Po Tau Shui Wai not only frequently use the community facilities of Po Nga Court and Tai Wo Estate in P14 (Po Nga), but they also often go to Tai Wo MTR Station via Po Nga Court; and</li> <li>● the projected population of P14 (Po Nga) in 2015 would be lower than that of P17 (Hong Lok Yuen).</li> </ul>	This proposal is <b>not accepted</b> . Please see item 1(b).
6	P19 – Sai Kung North	1	-	Proposes to transfer Symphony Bay from P19 (Sai Kung North) to either the Sha Tin DC or the Sai Kung DC.	This proposal involves alteration of the district boundary, which does not fall under the purview of the EAC. The EAC has referred this view to the HAD for consideration.

**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>

Item No.	DCCAs	No.*		Representations	EAC's views
		W	O		
					<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.

**Appendix II – R**

**Sha Tin 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 R01 (Sha Tin Town Centre), R02 (Lek Yuen), R03 (Wo Che Estate), R04 (City One), R05 (Yue Shing), R06 (Wong Uk), R10 (Chun Fung), R11 (Sun Tin Wai), R12 (Chui Tin), R13 (Hin Ka), R14 (Lower Shing Mun), R15 (Wan Shing), R16 (Keng Hau), R17 (Tin Sum), R18 (Chui Ka), R19 (Tai Wai), R20 (Chung Tin), R21 (Sui Wo), R22 (Fo Tan), R23 (Chun Ma), R24 (Chung On), R25 (Kam To), R26 (Ma On Shan Town Centre), R27 (On Lung), R28 (Fu Nga), R29 (Wu Kai Sha), R30 (Kam Ying), R31 (Yiu On), R32 (Heng On), R33 (On Tai) and R34 (Tai Shui Hang) as they are in line with the EAC's statutory criteria and working principles.	<u>Item (a)</u> The supporting view is noted.
				(b) Holds reservation on the provisional recommendations on the 2015 constituency delineation for R35 (Yu Yan), R36 (Bik Woo), R37 (Kwong Hong) and R38 (Kwong Yuen). Proposes to transfer Mui Tsz Lam and Ah Kung Kok Fishermen Village from R35 (Yu Yan) to R36 (Bik Woo) because:	<u>Item (b)</u> This representation is <b>not accepted</b> because the projected population of R35 (Yu Yan) will fall within the statutory permissible range. According to the established working principles, adjustment to its existing boundary is not required.

\* 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>		
				<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>● the abovementioned proposal could achieve a more balanced population distribution for R35 (Yu Yan), R36 (Bik Woo), R37 (Kwong Hong) and R38 (Kwong Yuen);</li> <li>● the residents of the above-mentioned villages use the roads in R36 (Bik Woo) or R34 (Tai Shui Hang) for daily access; and</li> <li>● without sufficient community ties between the abovementioned villages and R35 (Yu Yan), it is considered desirable to transfer these villages to R36 (Bik Woo).</li> </ul>	
				(c) Same as item 5.	<u>Item (c)</u> Please see item 5.
2	R01– Sha Tin Town Centre  R02– Lek Yuen  R24– Chung On  R25– Kam To  R26– Ma On Shan Town Centre  R30– Kam Ying	1	-	(a) Proposes: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>(i) to comprise R24 (Chung On) with Vista Paradiso, Oceanaire and Kam On Court;</li> <li>(ii) to transfer Chung On Estate from R24 (Chung On) to R25 (Kam To); and</li> <li>(iii) to transfer Marbella and The Waterside from R25 (Kam To) to R26 (Ma On Shan Town Centre) or R30 (Kam Ying).</li> </ul>	<u>Item (a)</u> This proposal is <b>not accepted</b> because: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>(i) after the proposed adjustment, the projected population of R25 (Kam To) (26,739) will exceed the statutory permissible range (+57.62%);</li> <li>(ii) overall speaking, the representation will affect R25 (Kam To) and R30 (Kam Ying). The projected population of the abovementioned DCCAs will fall within the statutory permissible range. According to the established working principles, adjustment to their existing boundaries is not</li> </ul>

<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>required. Therefore, the number of affected DCCAs under the proposal made in the representation will be more than that in the EAC's provisional recommendations; and</p> <p>(iii) there is a view supporting the delineation proposals for R24 (Chung On), R25 (Kam To), R26 (Ma On Shan Town Centre) and R30 (Kam Ying) (please see item 1(a)).</p>
				<p>(b) Proposes to transfer the excess population from R01 (Sha Tin Town Centre) to R02 (Lek Yuen).</p>	<p><u>Item (b)</u> This proposal is <b>not accepted</b> because:</p> <p>(i) based on the 2011 original constituency boundaries, the projected population of R01 (Sha Tin Town Centre), R14 (Lower Shing Mun) and R20 (Chung Tin) will exceed the statutory permissible upper limit, thus the EAC proposes to create a new constituency R15 (Wan Shing) and re-delineate the boundaries of the abovementioned DCCAs by keeping the number of affected DCCAs to a minimum, so that the population of the relevant DCCAs can be maintained within the statutory permissible range;</p> <p>(ii) the proposal made in the representation will affect R02 (Lek Yuen). The projected population of the DCCA will fall within the statutory permissible range. According to the established</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>working principles, adjustment to its existing boundary is not required; and</p> <p>(iii) there is a view supporting the delineation proposals for R01 (Sha Tin Town Centre) and R02 (Lek Yuen) (please see item 1(a)).</p>
3	R01– Sha Tin Town Centre  R20– Chung Tin	1	-	<p>Objects to transferring Peak One and Tung Lo Wan from R01 (Sha Tin Town Centre) to R20 (Chung Tin) as such proposal would disrupt the community integrity of R01 (Sha Tin Town Centre). Proposes to maintain the boundary of R01 (Sha Tin Town Centre) because:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>● Peak One and Pristine Villa in R01 (Sha Tin Town Centre) belong to the same type of housing estate, they are developed by the same developer and the residents therein belong to the same social strata;</li> <li>● Peak One, Pristine Villa, The Great Hill and Tung Lo Wan are low-rise housing estates and have been integrated as a community. They are different from the Home Ownership Scheme housing, public housing and squatters. If all of them were included in R20 (Chung Tin), it would create a problem of mis-match; and</li> <li>● the residents of Peak One, Pristine Villa, The Great Hill and Tung Lo Wan share the community and transportation facilities.</li> </ul>	<p>This proposal is <b>not accepted</b> because:</p> <p>(i) if the boundary of R01 (Sha Tin Town Centre) remains unchanged, the projected population (22,091) of R01 (Sha Tin Town Centre) will exceed the statutory permissible upper limit (+30.22%);</p> <p>(ii) although it is likely that local ties exist between Peak One and Tung Lo Wan with the estates in R01 (Sha Tin Town Centre), no convincing information is available to support that such an area cannot be transferred to R20 (Chung Tin). Moreover, taking into account the population distribution and geographical factors, it is unavoidable to have a DCCA composed of more than one community; and</p> <p>(iii) there is a view supporting the delineation proposals for R01 (Sha Tin Town Centre) and R20 (Chung Tin) (please see item 1(a)).</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>			
4	R02– Lek Yuen	-	1	(a) Proposes to transfer Yau Oi Tsuen from R02 (Lek Yuen) to R20 (Chung Tin) because: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>the residents of Yau Oi Tsuen need to use Tung Lo Wan Hill Road as access and have less links with other areas (e.g. Lek Yuen Estate, Fung Wo Estate, Sheung Wo Che Village and Ha Wo Che Village, etc) of R02 (Lek Yuen); and</li> <li>Yau Oi Tsuen is closer to the areas in R20 (Chung Tin) and such would strengthen ties between villagers.</li> </ul>	<u>Item (a)</u> This proposal is <b>not accepted</b> because:  (i) please see item 2(b); and  (ii) there is a view supporting the delineation proposals for R02 (Lek Yuen) and R20 (Chung Tin) (please see item 1(a)).	
	R07– Sha Kok			(b) Same as item 5(a)(i).	<u>Item (b)</u> Please see item 5.	
	R08– Pok Hong			(c) Same as items 31(a) and (b).	<u>Item (c)</u> Please see item 31.	
	R09– Jat Min					
	R20– Chung Tin					
	R27– On Lung					
	R28– Fu Nga					
	R29– Wu Kai Sha					
5	R07– Sha Kok	4	2	(a) Propose: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>to transfer Yue Shing Court from R09 (Jat Min) to R07 (Sha Kok);</li> <li>to maintain the original boundary of R08 (Pok Hong); and</li> <li>to retain Sha Tin Wai, Sha Tin Wai New Village, Fui Yiu Ha New Village, Tse Uk Village and the areas in the north of Pok Chuen Street in R09 (Jat Min).</li> </ul> <p>The reasons are summarised as follows:</p>	<u>Items (a) to (d)</u> According to the 2011 constituency boundary, R09 (Jat Min) will exceed the statutory permissible upper limit in 2015. The EAC's provisional recommendation proposes to transfer the northern area of the DCCA comprising 4 villages (namely Sha Tin Wai, Sha Tin Wai New Village, Fui Yiu Ha New Village and Tse Uk Village) to R08 (Pok Hong) for maintaining the population within the statutory permissible range.  There are representations saying that the residents of the abovementioned 4 villages use Shui Chuen Au Street for accessing	
	R08– Pok Hong					
	R09– Jat Min					

<i>Item No.</i>	<i>DCCAs</i>	<i>No. *</i>		<i>Representations</i>	<i>EAC's views</i>
		<i>W</i>	<i>O</i>		
				<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>● for showing respect to residents of various communities;</li> <li>● for simultaneous development of Yue Shing Court and Sha Kok Estate;</li> <li>● for the share use of community facilities of Yue Shing Court and Sha Kok Estate;</li> <li>● previously Yue Shing Court and Sha Kok Estate had been included in the same DCCA;</li> <li>● the population of R07 (Sha Kok) is relatively low, thus if incorporating the population of Yue Shing Court (over 1,000 persons), the projected population of the DCCAs concerned would be closer to the population quota;</li> <li>● Yue Shing Court which is currently included in R09 (Jat Min) had previously been included in R07 (Sha Kok);</li> <li>● the population of R09 (Jat Min) exceeds the population quota by 19.01%, while the population of R07 (Sha Kok) falls short of the population quota by 11.24%, so it is unreasonable to transfer Sha Tin Wai, Sha Tin Wai New Village, Fui Yiu Ha New Village and Tse Uk Village to R08 (Pok Hong) which is</li> </ul>	<p>the villages, thus geographically there exists some local ties between the villages and R09 (Jat Min). Also, Fui Yiu Ha New Village, Sha Tin Wai and Tse Uk Village, as well as Shan Ha Wai and Tsok Pok Hang San Tsuen within R09 (Jat Min) are indigenous villages, having common concerns associated with the style of living and culture, thus the provisional recommendations will disrupt the local ties.</p> <p>The EAC understands the situation as raised by the representations, but also notes the presence of the ties between the abovementioned 4 villages and Pok Hong Estate of R08 (Pok Hong) in terms of daily life. Therefore, the EAC does not agree that there are clearly strong justifications to prove that the provisional recommendations will disrupt the local ties of the relevant areas.</p> <p>There are proposals made by the representations concerning the proposed transfer of Yue Shing Court from R09 (Jat Min) to R07 (Sha Kok) for maintaining the population of the R09 (Jat Min) within the statutory permissible range and replacing the proposal contained in the provisional recommendations. The EAC <b>accepts</b> that such proposed transfer is comparatively desirable, because:</p> <p>based on the provisional recommendation, the population of R07 (Sha Kok), R08 (Pok Hong) and R09 (Jat Min) will be as follows:</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>near the population quota;</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>the abovementioned proposals could achieve a balanced population distribution among R07 (Sha Kok), R08 (Pok Hong) and R09 (Jat Min);</li> <li>in anticipation of the completion of Phase I of Shui Chuen O Estate very soon, there would be an increase in the population in R09 (Jat Min). The abovementioned proposals could even out the population distribution and it could save effort in respect of future re-delineation of the boundaries again;</li> <li>geographically, Yue Shing Court is adjacent to Sha Kok Estate, having similar living style and social needs with inseparable local ties between them;</li> <li>without community facilities in Yue Shing Court, most of the residents use the community facilities of Sha Kok Estate, thus Sha Kok Estate becomes part of the daily life of the residents of Yue Shing Court;</li> <li>Yue Shing Court and Sha Kok Estate have shared significant portion of community facilities, reflecting the close community ties between the two estates;</li> </ul>	<p>R07: 15,057, -11.24% [boundary unchanged] R08: 18,247, +7.56% R09: 20,189, +19.01%</p> <p>After the proposed adjustment, the projected population of the DCCAs will be as follows:</p> <p>R07: 16,543, -2.48% R08: 16,341, -3.67% [boundary unchanged] R09: 20,609, +21.49%</p> <p>Although the number of DCCAs affected by the representations and that of the EAC's provisional recommendations are both two in total, overall speaking, the projected population after re-delineation of boundaries will be much closer to the population quota.</p> <p>Geographically, Yue Shing Court and Sha Kok Estate are relatively close to each other, the proposals made by the representations will not affect the community ties between these areas. On the contrary, the local residents raised different views on the effect on the villages in the northern area of R08 (Pok Hong) under the provisional recommendation.</p> <p>Besides, 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>		
				<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>● integration of Yue Shing Court and Sha Kok Estate would ensure that the community resources and facilities are put into more effective uses, enhance management efficiency and also improve district administration works;</li> <li>● the abovementioned proposal could reduce the impact on only one housing estate rather than 4 villages, significantly reducing the areas being affected;</li> <li>● the abovementioned proposal could help solving the excess population for R09 (Jat Min) in 2015;</li> <li>● since 1999 DC Election, Fui Yiu Ha New Village, Tse Uk Village, Shan Ha Wai (Tsang Tai Uk), Sha Tin Wai and Tsok Pok Hang San Tsuen have been delineated in the same DCCA and these villages have already established close local ties for 15 years;</li> <li>● by transferring Sha Tin Wai, Sha Tin Wai New Village, Fui Yiu Ha New Village and Tse Uk Village to R08 (Pok Hong), it would adversely affect the community ties established for many years and cause negative impact on the community integrity;</li> </ul>	

<i>Item No.</i>	<i>DCCAs</i>	<i>No. *</i>		<i>Representations</i>	<i>EAC's views</i>
		<i>W</i>	<i>O</i>		
				<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>● Sha Tin Wai, Sha Tin Wai New Village, Fui Yiu Ha New Village and Tse Uk Village are all New Territories indigenous villages and each has its own unique tradition and community features, and villagers have common concerns. Therefore, the villages should be retained in the same DCCA for the preservation of their community identity;</li> <li>● it may even out the population deviation from the population quota between R07 (Sha Kok) and R09 (Jat Min);</li> <li>● geographically, Sha Tin Wai, Sha Tin Wai New Village, Fui Yiu Ha New Village and Tse Uk Village are in the neighbourhood of Tsok Pok Hang San Tsuen in R09 (Jat Min); and</li> <li>● the residents of Sha Tin Wai, Sha Tin Wai New Village, Fui Yiu Ha New Village, Tse Uk Village and Tsok Pok Hang San Tsuen share the use of the community facilities.</li> </ul>	
				(b) Object to the provisional recommendation on R07 (Sha Kok).	
				(c) Object to transferring Sha Tin Wai, Sha Tin Wai New Village, Fui Yiu Ha New Village and Tse Uk Village to R08 (Pok Hong).	

<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>(d) Object to the delineation proposal for R09 (Jat Min).</p> <p>The reasons are summarised as follows:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>● a DCCA has all along been delineated solely for Pok Hong Estate with a view to preserving community integrity;</li> <li>● the residents of Sha Tin Wai, Sha Tin Wai New Village, Fui Yiu Ha New Village and Tse Uk Village are using Shui Chuen Au Street as their daily access, thus the provisional recommendation would disrupt the community ties;</li> <li>● the DC member of R08 (Pok Hong) is unable to take care of the needs of residents of Pok Hong Estate and the four villages because the residents of the public housing estates and villages have different community needs;</li> <li>● Shui Chuen O Estate is located far away from Jat Min Chuen that creates difficulties for the DC member of R09 (Jat Min) to effectively perform district administration duties; and</li> <li>● it will contravene the EAC's underlining principle of preservation of community integrity.</li> </ul>	

Item No.	DCCAs	No. *		Representations	EAC's views
		W	O		
6	R07– Sha Kok	1	-	(a) Proposes to retain Sha Tin Wai, Sha Tin Wai New Village, Fui Yiu Ha New Village and Tse Uk Village in R09 (Jat Min), allowing its population to slightly exceed the statutory permissible upper limit because its deviation of 0.26% could be regarded as a reasonable level when compared to the population of the adjacent DCCAs.	<u>Item (a)</u> This proposal is <b>not accepted</b> because if the original boundary of R09 (Jat Min) is maintained, the projected population (22,095) will exceed the statutory permissible upper limit (+30.25%).
	R08– Pok Hong			(b) Same as item 5(a)(ii).	<u>Item (b)</u> Please see item 5.
	R09– Jat Min			(c) Same as item 31(a).	<u>Item (c)</u> Please see item 31.
7	R27– On Lung	1	-		
	R28 – Fu Nga				
	R29 – Wu Kai Sha				
8	R07– Sha Kok	1	-	(a) Same as items 5(a)(i) and (iii).	<u>Item (a)</u> Please see item 5.
	R08– Pok Hong			(b) Same as item 39.	<u>Item (b)</u> Please see item 39.
	R09– Jat Min				
	R34– Tai Shui Hang				
	R35– Yu Yan				
8	R08– Pok Hong	1	-	Proposes to transfer Shui Chuen O Estate to R08 (Pok Hong) instead of R09 (Jat Min) because:	This proposal is <b>not accepted</b> because:
	R09– Jat Min			<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>the geographical location of Phase I of Shui Chuen O Estate is relatively close to Pok Hong Estate;</li> <li>Shui Chuen O Estate has better local ties with Pok Hong Estate than Jat Min Chuen; and</li> </ul>	(i) after the proposed adjustment, the projected population of R08 (Pok Hong) and R09 (Jat Min) will deviate from the statutory permissible range:  R08: 25,835, +52.29% R09: 12,601, -25.72%

<i>Item No.</i>	<i>DCCAs</i>	<i>No. *</i>		<i>Representations</i>	<i>EAC's views</i>
		<i>W</i>	<i>O</i>		
				<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>if the abovementioned proposal results in the population of R09 (Jat Min) deviating from the statutory permissible range, it proposes to transfer the adjacent residential buildings to R09 (Jat Min) to even out the population distribution.</li> </ul>	(ii) R09 (Jat Min) and the adjacent constituency are separated by Shing Mun River or hillside, it is considered not appropriate to transfer the residential area of the adjacent constituency to R09 (Jat Min).
9	R08– Pok Hong  R09– Jat Min	2	-	Propose to form R09 (Jat Min) by Shui Chuen O Estate, Sha Tin Wai, Sha Tin Wai New Village and Fui Yiu Ha New Village because the local ties between these estates and villages are relatively strong.	This proposal is <b>not accepted</b> because if adopting the proposal to combine the proposed areas into one constituency, the projected population (9,375) will fall below the statutory permissible lower limit (-44.74%). Besides, the DCCA's existing boundary should be taken into consideration in delineating the DCCA boundary.
10	R08– Pok Hong	1	-	(a) Same as items 5(c) and (d).	<u>Item (a)</u> Please see item 5.
	R09– Jat Min			(b) Same as item 9.	<u>Item (b)</u> Please see item 9.
11	R08– Pok Hong  R09– Jat Min	1	-	Holds skeptical view that the delineation proposals for R08 (Pok Hong) and R09 (Jat Min) involve political consideration.	The delineation proposal must be based on objective data of population distribution. The political factor will not be taken into consideration.
12	R08– Pok Hong  R09– Jat Min	1	-	<p>Proposes to combine Shui Chuen O Estate and Tsok Pok Hang San Tsuen of R09 (Jat Min), together with Sha Tin Wai, Sha Tin Wai New Village and Fui Yiu Ha New Village of R08 (Pok Hong) for the formation of a DCCA because:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>the community ties of the abovementioned estates and villages would be maintained intact; and</li> <li>the DC member would be able</li> </ul>	<p>This proposal is <b>not accepted</b> because:</p> <p>(i) if adopting the proposal to combine the areas into one constituency, the projected population of the constituency (9,780) will be below the statutory permissible lower limit (-42.35%); and</p> <p>(ii) the delineation proposal must be based on objective data of the population distribution.</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>		
				to render better support to the estates and villages.	The arrangements on district administration matters are not the relevant factors of consideration.  Besides, the DCCA's existing boundary should be taken into consideration in delineating the DCCA boundary.
13	R08– Pok Hong  R09– Jat Min  R35– Yu Yan	2	-	Propose to combine Shui Chuen O Estate, Sha Tin Wai, Sha Tin Wai New Village, Fui Yiu Ha New Village and To Shek Village, etc for the formation of a DCCA because: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>geographically, Shui Chuen O Estate is located nearer to Pok Hong Estate;</li> <li>including Shui Chuen O Estate in R09 (Jat Min) would disrupt the integrity of the DCCA; and</li> <li>Shui Chuen O Estate, Sha Tin Wai, Sha Tin Wai New Village, Fui Yiu Ha New Village and To Shek Village, etc have stronger local ties with each other.</li> </ul>	This proposal is <b>not accepted</b> , because if adopting the proposal to combine the areas into one constituency, the projected population of the constituency (10,318) will fall below the statutory permissible lower limit (-39.18%). Besides, the DCCA's existing boundary should be taken into consideration in delineating the DCCA boundary.
14	R09– Jat Min	1	-	Proposes to delineate Shui Chuen O Estate of R09 (Jat Min) as an individual DCCA so that it would be in line with the principle of preservation of community integrity.	This proposal is <b>not accepted</b> because if re-delineating a constituency solely for Shui Chuen O Estate, the projected population of the constituency (7,588) will fall below the statutory permissible lower limit (-55.27%).
15	R09– Jat Min	1	-	Proposes to delineate the whole Jat Min Chuen within a DCCA.	The view is noted as it is in line with the EAC's provisional recommendation on its delineation.
16	R10– Chun Fung	1	-	Supports the delineation proposal for R10 (Chun Fung) because: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>The Riverpark is close to Chun Shek Estate, Fung Shing Court</li> </ul>	The supporting view is noted.

<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>and Sha Tin Tau. Therefore, it is desirable to transfer The Riverpark to R10 (Chun Fung); and</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>the population and the activities of residents of R10 (Chun Fung) are mainly in The Riverpark, Chun Shek Estate, Fung Shing Court and Sha Tin Tau. Their local ties are close. Therefore, it is appropriate to put the above four housing estates and villages in the same DCCA.</li> </ul>	
17	R12– Chui Tin  R13– Hin Ka  R16– Keng Hau	1	-	<p>(a) Proposes to combine Golden Lion Garden Stage II, King Tin Court, Sun Chun House, Sun Hok House and Sun Kit House of Sun Chui Estate to form R12 (Chui Tin) in order to preserve the community integrity and local ties.</p> <p>(b) Proposes to combine Hin Hing House, Hin Pui House, Hin Tak House, Hin Yeung House, Hin Fu House, Hin Kwai House, Hin Wan House and Hin Yau House to form R13 (Hin Ka). The projected population of the above buildings is 21,552. Although the projected population would slightly exceed the statutory permissible upper limit, taking into account the community integrity and local ties, the population is proposed to be allowed to exceed the statutory permissible upper limit.</p> <p>(c) Proposes to combine Ha Keng Hau, Hill Paramount, Ka Tin Court, Hin Tin, Hin Yiu Estate, Julimount Garden, Ka Keng</p>	<p><u>Items (a) to (c)</u> This proposal is <b>not accepted</b> because:</p> <p>(i) the projected population of R12 (Chui Tin), R13 (Hin Ka) and R16 (Keng Hau) will fall within the statutory permissible range. According to the established working principles, adjustment to their existing boundaries is not required; and</p> <p>(ii) there is a view supporting the delineation proposals for R12 (Chui Tin), R13 (Hin Ka) and R16 (Keng Hau) (please see item 1(a)).</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>		
				Court, Parc Royale, Sheung Keng Hau and World-Wide Gardens to form R16 (Keng Hau).	
18	R14– Lower Shing Mun  R15– Wan Shing  R20– Chung Tin	1	-	<p>Proposes:</p> <p>(i) to transfer Tai Wai New Village of R14 (Lower Shing Mun) and Holford Gardens of R15 (Wan Shing) to R20 (Chung Tin); and</p> <p>(ii) to transfer Mei Chuen House of Mei Tin Estate from R20 (Chung Tin) to R14 (Lower Shing Mun) because:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>● the population of R20 (Chung Tin) would be closer to the population quota;</li> <li>● the population of R15 (Wan Shing) is diminishing. It could facilitate the DC member concerned to take better care of the residents; and</li> <li>● for preserving the community integrity of R14 (Lower Shing Mun).</li> </ul>	<p>This proposal is <b>not accepted</b> because:</p> <p>(i) after the proposed adjustment, the projected population of R15 (Wan Shing) will be nearer to the population quota. However, Holford Gardens, Festival City and Carado Garden are located in the town centre of Tai Wai using common community facilities. Taking into consideration the geographical and community factors, the cluster of residential buildings belongs to a relatively independent society with community integrity. On the contrary, they are geographically separated from Tai Wai New Village of R14 (Lower Shing Mun) and the adjacent areas under R20 (Chung Tin). Therefore, the EAC considers it desirable to include Holford Gardens in R15 (Wan Shing);</p> <p>(ii) there is a view supporting the delineation proposals for R14 (Lower Shing Mun), R15 (Wan Shing) and R20 (Chung Tin) (please see item 1(a));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>		
19	R14– Lower Shing Mun  R15– Wan Shing  R20– Chung Tin	-	2	<p>Support the provisional recommendations on R14 (Lower Shing Mun), R15 (Wan Shing) and R20 (Chung Tin) because:</p> <p>one representation considers that:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>the population of the DCCAs concerned could be evenly distributed. Besides, major part of Mei Tin Estate would be transferred to R14 (Lower Shing Mun) for better integrity;</li> </ul> <p>another representation considers that:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>the population is increasing substantially because tenants are moving into Festival City, thus the creation of the new DCCA R15 (Wan Shing) is supported;</li> <li>in delineating the boundaries, the EAC has taken into account the population distribution, geographical location and local ties of the DCCAs. Besides, the population of the three DCCAs concerned would not exceed the statutory permissible range, thus the proposal is considered appropriate; and</li> <li>the provisional recommendations have taken into account the population increase brought by the newly completed buildings (e.g. a Home Ownership Scheme building in Pik Tin Street and more than 10 private residential buildings in Heung Fan Liu Street).</li> </ul>	The supporting views are noted.

<i>Item No.</i>	<i>DCCAs</i>	<i>No. *</i>		<i>Representations</i>	<i>EAC's views</i>
		<i>W</i>	<i>O</i>		
20	R14– Lower Shing Mun  R20– Chung Tin	-	1	(a) Objects to the name of R20 (Chung Tin) because only one block (Mei Chuen House) in Mei Tin Estate is included in that DCCA and the name could not fully reflect the major estates or buildings in R20 (Chung Tin).	<u>Item (a)</u> This proposal is <b>not accepted</b> because the DCCA name has been used since 2007 and the majority of the public are used to this name. The change of the DCCA name may cause confusion to the public.
				(b) Proposes to delineate the whole Mei Tin Estate within a DCCA.	<u>Item (b)</u> This proposal is <b>not accepted</b> because:  (i) if R14 (Lower Shing Mun) includes the whole Mei Tin Estate, the projected population of R14 (Lower Shing Mun) and R20 (Chung Tin) will deviate from the statutory permissible range:  R14: 21,584, +27.23% R20: 12,141, -28.43%  (ii) if R20 (Chung Tin) includes the whole Mei Tin Estate, the projected population of R14 (Lower Shing Mun) and R20 (Chung Tin) will deviate from the statutory permissible range:  R14: 3,035, -82.11% R20: 30,690, +80.91%  (iii) there is a view supporting the delineation proposals for R14 (Lower Shing Mun) and R20 (Chung Tin) (please see item 1(a)).
21	R15– Wan Shing	-	1	Proposes to rename R15 (Wan Shing) as “Wan Hoi Shing” (雲海城), which is more representative, because Carado Garden (雲疊花	This proposal is <b>not accepted</b> , because the DCCA name has reflected the main housing estates, such as Carado Garden and Festival City I in the DCCA.

Item No.	DCCAs	No. *		Representations	EAC's views
		W	O		
				園), Holford Gardens (海福花園) and Festival City (名城) are the main housing estates of the DCCA.	
22	R15– Wan Shing	-	1	(a) Supports the delineation proposals for the creation of two new DCCAs of R15 (Wan Shing) and R29 (Wu Kai Sha).	<u>Item (a)</u> The supporting view is noted.
	R27– On Lung			(b) Same as items 31(c) to (e).	<u>Item (b)</u> Please see item 31.
	R28– Fu Nga			(c) Same as item 39.	<u>Item (c)</u> Please see item 39.
	R29– Wu Kai Sha				
	R34– Tai Shui Hang				
	R35– Yu Yan				
23	R18– Chui Ka	-	1	Proposes to add a polling station in Tai Wai in R18 (Chui Ka) because the polling station in Sun Chui Estate is quite far for the electors living in Tai Wai.	Arrangements on polling station are not the relevant factors of consideration. The EAC has referred this view on polling station arrangements to the REO for follow-up.
24	R20– Chung Tin	1	-	Proposes to change the name of R20 (Chung Tin) as “Chung Fung”.	This proposal is <b>not accepted</b> , because the DCCA name has been used since 2007 and the majority of the public are used to this name. The change of the DCCA name may cause confusion to the public.
25	R21– Sui Wo	1	-	Proposes to retain Fo Tan Village in R22 (Fo Tan).	This proposal is <b>not accepted</b> because:  (i) if Fo Tan Village is retained in R22 (Fo Tan), the projected population of R21 (Sui Wo) (12,712) will fall below the statutory permissible lower limit (-25.06%); and
	R22– Fo Tan				



<i>Item No.</i>	<i>DCCAs</i>	<i>No. *</i>		<i>Representations</i>	<i>EAC's views</i>
		<i>W</i>	<i>O</i>		
27	R24– Chung On  R27– On Lung  R28 – Fu Nga  R29 – Wu Kai Sha  R31 – Yiu On  R33 – On Tai  R34 – Tai Shui Hang  R35 – Yu Yan	-	1	(a) Objects to transferring Oceanaire from R33 (On Tai) to R24 (Chung On) and proposes to retain Oceanaire in R33 (On Tai) because the local issues concerned by the residents of Oceanaire are more closely related to R33 (On Tai) (e.g. the site development of Po Tai Street and reclamation of Ma Liu Shui).	<p><u>Item (a)</u> This proposal is <b>not accepted</b> because:</p> <p>(i) if Oceanaire is retained in R33 (On Tai), the projected population (24,996) will substantially exceed the statutory permissible upper limit (+47.35%);</p> <p>(ii) the EAC must adhere to the statutory criteria in a practical and viable manner for ensuring that the population of each DCCA will not deviate from the population quota by more than 25%. Although according to the provisional recommendation, the projected population (21,661) of R33 (On Tai) will still slightly exceed the statutory permissible upper limit (+27.69%), taking into account the community integrity, population factors and local ties, the EAC allows its population to slightly exceed the statutory permissible upper limit;</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 factor of consideration; and</p> <p>(iv) there is a view supporting the delineation proposals for R24 (Chung On) and R33 (On Tai) (please see item 1(a)).</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>		
				(b) Supports transferring Kam Hay Court from R24 (Chung On) to R31 (Yiu On) because the residents of Kam Hay Court mainly use the community facilities of Yiu On Estate.	<u>Item (b)</u> The supporting view is noted.
				(c) Proposes to revise the code of the following DCCAs:  R27 – Wu Kai Sha R28 – On Lung R29 – Fu Nga	<u>Item (c)</u> This proposal is <b>not accepted</b> because the allocating codes to DCCA is merely for the sake of identification of locations of the DCCAs on the constituency boundary maps and is not directly related to the review and naming of constituency boundaries. Changing the DCCA codes used in the provisional recommendations may also cause confusion to the public. In addition, the DCCA codes used in the provisional recommendations have been allocated in a clockwise direction on the boundary maps to make the DCCAs with consecutive numbers contiguous to each other as far as possible so that it is easier to locate them.
				(d) Proposes to retain the original name “Lee On” for R27 (On Lung) because Lee On Estate is the major estate in the DCCA.	<u>Item (d)</u> Please see item 31.
				(e) Same as items 31(c) and (e).	<u>Item (e)</u> Please see item 31.
				(f) Same as item 39.	<u>Item (f)</u> Please see item 39.
28	R25– Kam To  R26– Ma On Shan Town	1	-	(a) Supports the delineation proposals for R25 (Kam To) and R26 (Ma On Shan Town Centre).	<u>Item (a)</u> The supporting view is noted.

<i>Item No.</i>	<i>DCCAs</i>	<i>No. *</i>		<i>Representations</i>	<i>EAC's views</i>
		<i>W</i>	<i>O</i>		
	Centre R27– On Lung R28– Fu Nga R29 – Wu Kai Sha			(b) Same as items 31(b) to (d).	<u>Item (b)</u> Please see item 31.
29	R26 – Ma On Shan Town Centre R27 – On Lung R28 – Fu Nga R29 – Wu Kai Sha	-	1	(a) Same as items 31(a), (f) and (g).	<u>Item (a)</u> Please see item 31.
				(b) Supports transferring Villa Athena to other DCCA and the creation of a new DCCA in the area of Wu Kai Sha because the projected population of R26 (Ma On Shan Town Centre) and R28 (Fu Nga) would exceed the statutory permissible upper limit in 2015.	<u>Item (b)</u> The supporting view is noted.
30	R26– Ma On Shan Town Centre R27– On Lung R28– Fu Nga R29 – Wu Kai Sha	2	-	(a) Support the provisional recommendation on R26 (Ma On Shan Town Centre).	<u>Item (a)</u> The supporting view is noted.
				(b) One representation is same as items 31(a).	<u>Items (b) and (c)</u> Please see item 31.
				(c) Another representation is same as items 31(c) to (e).	
31	R27– On Lung R28– Fu Nga R29 –	466	12	(a) Propose:  (i) to form R27 by Lee On Estate and Monte Vista;  (ii) to form R28 by Kam Lung Court and Saddle	<u>Items (a) to (h)</u> The representers concerned have provided their opinions and various information from the viewpoint of local people's daily life and district's future development, focusing on the aspects of



<i>Item No.</i>	<i>DCCAs</i>	<i>No. *</i>		<i>Representations</i>	<i>EAC's views</i>
		<i>W</i>	<i>O</i>		
	Wu Kai Sha			<p>Ridge Garden;</p> <p>(iii) to form R29 by Lake Silver, Double Cove, Wu Kai Sha Village, Cheung Kang Village and Villa Athena.</p> <p>The reasons are summarised as follows:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>● the projected population of the DCCAs would be maintained within the statutory permissible range, reducing its deviation from the population quota when comparing with the EAC's proposal;</li> <li>● after transferring Kam Lung Court to R28, the population of that DCCA and the population quota would only differ by 10 persons (0.06%);</li> <li>● after transferring Monte Vista to R27, the population of that DCCA would fall short of the population quota by 4.49% only;</li> <li>● the adjustments to the original constituency boundary of the abovementioned DCCAs are less than those of the EAC's proposals;</li> <li>● the adjustments to DCCAs and the impact on electors could be reduced (e.g. the original names of R27 and</li> </ul>	<p>community integrity and local ties.</p> <p>Admittedly, based on various community development factors, there exists more or less established linkage between various housing estates in the area and the residents living therein, but the EAC considers it without a comparatively clear and concrete linkage among them. In these circumstances, solely relying on the factors of community integrity and local ties in concluding delineation of the DCCAs' boundary is not convincing and may be controversial. Based on the above considerations, the EAC considers it desirable and proper to adopt the existing boundary as the basis for recommending the re-delineation of boundary of the DCCAs, having regard to the principle of keeping the number of affected DCCAs to a minimum and referring to the population distribution among DCCAs. After detailed consideration, the EAC's revision to the provisional recommendation are appended below, by adopting the following approaches for re-delineation of the boundary of the DCCAs concerned:</p> <p>(i) to group Lee On Estate and Monte Vista in the DCCA R27;</p> <p>(ii) to group Kam Lung Court and Saddle Ridge Garden in the DCCA R28; and</p> <p>(iii) to group Villa Athena, Lake Silver, Wu Kai Sha and Double Cove in the DCCA</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>R28 would remain, i.e. 'Lee On' and 'Fu Lung', without the need to change their names). Hence, the residents of these DCCAs could adapt to the changes easily without confusion. It is in line with the delineation principle 'keeping the number of affected DCCAs to a minimum';</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>the delineation of the above proposals is straightforward and affects less major estates. Hence, the community integrity and local ties of the original R27 and R28 could be maintained;</li> <li>the electors of Lee On Estate and Monte Vista are used to casting their votes in the same polling station;</li> <li>the residents of Lee On Estate and Monte Vista share the community facilities;</li> <li>both Saddle Ridge Garden and Kam Lung Court are the Home Ownership Scheme estates and were occupied in the same year, having the same housing and population characteristics, encountering similar housing problems. Hence, their residents interact and communicate frequently with each other;</li> </ul>	<p>R29.</p> <p>The above re-delineation will solve the excess population of R26 (Ma On Shan Town Centre), R27 (On Lung) and R28 (Fu Nga) based on the projected population of the DCCAs in 2015, and to certain extent, it will further take care of the present major constituent housing estates.</p> <p>Under the provisional recommendation, the projected population of R27 (On Lung), R28 (Fu Nga) and R29 (Wu Kai Sha) will be as follows:</p> <p>R27: 15,675, -7.60% R28: 16,330, -3.74% R29: 17,674, +4.19%</p> <p>After the proposed adjustment, the projected population are as follows:</p> <p>R27: 16,354, -3.60% R28: 16,979, +0.09% R29: 16,346, -3.64%</p> <p>The abovementioned proposal would affect the same DCCAs R27, R28 and R29, which is the same as the provisional recommendation, and the projected population would be closer to the population quota.</p> <p>Arrangements on the polling station are not the relevant factors of consideration. The EAC has referred these views on the polling station arrangements to the REO for follow-up.</p> <p>The delineation proposal must be based on objective data 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>		
				<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>● if Villa Athena is transferred to R28, the residents of Villa Athena would have to walk across Sai Sha Road, requiring passage of 101 steps and 200 meters to reach Saddle Ridge Garden, which would affect their desire to vote;</li> <li>● the residents of Saddle Ridge Garden and Kam Lung Court have been using the same bus stops to go to Ma On Shan and the urban for a long time;</li> <li>● changing the location of the polling station would affect the voting habit and desire of the residents of Kam Lung Court and Monte Vista;</li> <li>● Kam Lung Court and Saddle Ridge Garden have been put into the same DCCA for three consecutive elections, the same arrangement applies to Lee On Estate and Monte Vista. The community identities and close local ties have already been established between these housing estates;</li> <li>● the residents of Kam Lung Court and Saddle Ridge Garden have close ties in daily life;</li> <li>● Kam Lung Court and</li> </ul>	<p>population distribution, while arrangements on district administration matters are not the relevant factors of consideration.</p> <p>The EAC must adhere to the Administration's population forecast as at 30 June 2015 in delineating the constituency. The future development after the cut-off date will not be taken into consideration.</p> <p>After having adopted the above re-delineation proposal, the original name of "Lee On" and "Fu Lung" will continue for R27 (On Lung) and R28 (Fu Nga) respectively because:</p> <p>(i) the names of "Lee On" and "Fu Lung" have been separately adopted since 1999 and 2003 respectively, the retention of such names for the DCCAs may avoid confusion to the public; and</p> <p>(ii) the names of the above-mentioned DCCAs may also reflect the major housing estates included in the area.</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>Saddle Ridge Garden have already been included in the same DCCA for 12 years. The DC member of that DCCA is very familiar with the local affairs;</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>● transferring Kam Lung Court to new DCCA would make the residents of that DCCA difficult to adapt to constituency change;</li> <li>● transferring Villa Athena to R29 could alleviate the population shortage due to incomplete occupation of Double Cove;</li> <li>● Villa Athea is close to Wu Kai Sha Village. They share the community facilities and transportation in Sai Sha Road, having close community ties;</li> <li>● Villa Athena and Monte Vista are both private housing estates. Hence, the above proposal of transferring Villa Athena to R29, rather than Monte Vista, could preserve the community identities of R29 as it has room for accommodating the future change of population;</li> <li>● Monte Vista has developed community ties with the existing DCCA for 12 years. Transferring Monte</li> </ul>	

<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>Vista to R29 and absorbing Kam Lung Court would affect the boundary of two DCCAs, thus such arrangement is incomprehensible;</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>● the provisional recommendation would disrupt the community integrity for the reason that the existing R27 and R28 have a history of 16 years. The DC members of the two DCCAs have been serving the DCCA for many years and understand the needs of the citizens. After re-delineation of the boundaries of the above two DCCAs, the relevant DC members would have to adapt to the changes, their services would be affected;</li> <li>● Villa Athena belongs to a high-class housing estate, which is different from Saddle Ridge Garden. Barrier exists between the two estates so it would be difficult to organize inclusive activities for these two estates;</li> <li>● there are considerable numbers of housing estates in Ma On Shan (e.g. Lee On Estate, Kam Lung Court, Saddle Ridge Garden, Monte Vista and Lake Silver etc.) using the facilities of Lee On Shopping Centre, thus it</li> </ul>	

<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>could not be regarded as a factor of consideration supporting the transfer of Kam Lung Court to R27 (On Lung);</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>● the residents of Villa Athena and Wu Kai Sha Village have close community ties and common concerns;</li> <li>● Villa Athena and Wu Kai Sha Youth Village have unique historical connection;</li> <li>● Lake Silver, Double Cove, Wu Kai Sha Village, Cheung Kang Village and Villa Athena are close to the coastal area of Wu Kai Sha with common concerns of local affairs (e.g. reclamation of Wu Kai Sha);</li> <li>● Villa Athena is geographically closer to Wu Kai Sha Village than Saddle Ridge Garden;</li> <li>● the residents of Villa Athena, Lake Silver, Wu Kai Sha and Double Cove share public facilities, e.g. Wu Kai Sha MTR Station; and</li> <li>● the above proposal could make the delineation of the area of Wu Kai Sha more unified.</li> </ul>	

<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>(b) Support the provisional recommendation on the creation of a new DCCA R29 (Wu Kai Sha).</p> <p>(c) Support to form R27 (On Lung) by Kam Lung Court and Lee On Estate.</p> <p>(d) Support to form R28 (Fu Nga) by Villa Athena and Saddle Ridge Garden.</p> <p>(e) Support to form R29 (Wu Kai Sha) by Wu Kai Sha, Double Cove, Monte Vista and Lake Silver.</p> <p>The reasons are summarised as follows:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>● the EAC has taken into account the population distribution of all DCCAs, and adaptation period should be provided to the residents of the affected DCCAs;</li> <li>● it is beneficial for monitoring district affairs;</li> <li>● Villa Athena and Saddle Ridge Garden are just separated by a road and they share the same section of road network;</li> <li>● Double Cove, Monte Vista and Lake Silver adjoin the Wu Kai Sha public transport interchange area. The residents of the above-mentioned estates belong to the same income group;</li> </ul>	

<i>Item No.</i>	<i>DCCAs</i>	<i>No. *</i>		<i>Representations</i>	<i>EAC's views</i>
		<i>W</i>	<i>O</i>		
				<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>● Lee On Estate and Kam Lung Court are originally the properties of Housing Authority;</li> <li>● Kam Lung Court adjoins Lee On Estate;</li> <li>● Kam Lung Court and Lee On Estate share the leisure area and community facilities (e.g. Lee On Shopping Centre and Lee On Community Centre);</li> <li>● Kam Lung Court is far away from Saddle Ridge Garden;</li> <li>● the current-term DC member has never been to Kam Lung Court for work;</li> <li>● it could facilitate better community planning and overall development;</li> <li>● Kam Lung Court and Lee On Estate have close community ties (e.g. participating in community activities together);</li> <li>● the recommendations could strengthen the community integrity of the two DCCAs; and</li> <li>● creating R29 (Wu Kai Sha) as a new DCCA could accommodate future population growth and development to cater for massive areas to be developed in Wu Kai Sha later.</li> </ul>	



<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>(f) Object to the delineation proposal for R27 (On Lung).</p> <p>(g) Object to the delineation proposal for R28 (Fu Nga).</p> <p>(h) Object to the delineation proposal for R29 (Wu Kai Sha).</p> <p>The reasons are summarised as follows:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>● Kam Lung Court and Saddle Ridge Garden have been included in the same DCCA for 12 years. The two estates have close community ties;</li> <li>● the residents of Kam Lung Court and Saddle Ridge Garden use the same polling station;</li> <li>● the residents of Villa Athena have to go to the polling station of Saddle Ridge Garden via 101 steps and extra 200 meters walking distance. This would affect the citizens' desire to vote;</li> <li>● Lee On Estate and Monte Vista have been included in the same DCCA for 12 years;</li> <li>● adjustment to the constituency boundaries would be minimised by keeping Lee On Estate and Monte Vista in the same DCCA;</li> </ul>	

<i>Item No.</i>	<i>DCCAs</i>	<i>No. *</i>		<i>Representations</i>	<i>EAC's views</i>
		<i>W</i>	<i>O</i>		
				<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>● keeping Lee On Estate and Monte Vista in the same DCCA would make the population closer to the population quota;</li> <li>● according to the 2011 Population Census, the population of Monte Vista is 5,286, Lake Silver 6,149 and Wu Kai Sha Village 1,500. The projected population of Double Cove would be 9,000 upon full occupation, while the dormitory of City University of Hong Kong would accommodate 4,000 persons. The projected population of the 'Comprehensive Development Area' of Whitehead Headland in Ma On Shan is about 500, and that of the Government Land at Yiu Sha Road of Ma On Shan is about 1,710, making the total projected population at 28,145. Therefore, the EAC's proposal would make the future population of R29 (Wu Kai Sha) overloaded and necessitate re-delineation in future;</li> <li>● the original boundaries of R27 and R28 will have a 16-year history by 2015. The DC members of these DCCAs have established certain reputation, acquired full knowledge of the geographical surroundings and are capable of meeting the</li> </ul>	

<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>people's needs. The new proposal would waste efforts of the DC members and demand starting their work afresh. Moreover, the DC members working in a new DCCA undoubtedly would require adaptation period and extra time and efforts for familiarisation;</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>● the residents of these DCCAs have affection and reliance on the DC members who have served them for a long time, so it is hard for them without the existing DC members who would no longer serve them;</li> <li>● the EAC's proposed delineation would cause unnecessary changes. Future re-delineation would be required, by taking into further consideration the increase of the projected population of R29 (Wu Kai Sha);</li> <li>● Kam Lung Court and Saddle Ridge Garden have been included in the same DCCA since 2003. It is considered that community relations have been established between the two estates. Consensus on traffic and community issues could be easily attained; and</li> <li>● the residents of Saddle Ridge Garden and Kam Lung Court invite each</li> </ul>	

<i>Item No.</i>	<i>DCCAs</i>	<i>No. *</i>		<i>Representations</i>	<i>EAC's views</i>
		<i>W</i>	<i>O</i>		
				other to attend their residents' meetings and New Year Spring Reception, indicating good community ties of these estates. The provisional recommendation would split the original DCCA into three. It would be obviously harmful to residents' welfare and disadvantageous to the DC in implementation of public administration issues.	
32	R27– On Lung	-	1	(a) Same as items 31(c) and (d).	<u>Item (a)</u> Please see item 31.
	R28– Fu Nga  R29 – Wu Kai Sha  R34 – Tai Shui Hang  R35 – Yu Yan			(b) Same as item 39.	<u>Item (b)</u> Please see item 39.
33	R27– On Lung	1	-	(a) Same as items 31(a), (b) and (f) to (h).	<u>Item (a)</u> Please see item 31.
	R28 – Fu Nga  R29 – Wu Kai Sha			(b) Proposes that if R29 is composed of Double Cove, Lake Silver, Villa Athena and Wu Kai Sha Village, the polling station may be set up in the Village Office of the Wu Kai Sha Village because: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>the Village Office of the Wu Kai Sha Village is in the middle of Villa Athena,</li> </ul>	<u>Items (b) and (c)</u> The delineation proposal must be based on objective data of the population distribution. Arrangements on polling station are not the relevant factors of consideration. The EAC has referred this view on the polling station arrangements to the REO for follow-up.

<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>Double Cove and Lake Silver for encouraging and enhancing the voting desire of the villagers of the aging Wu Kai Sha Village; and</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>the walking distance between the Village Office of the Wu Kai Sha Village and Villa Athena is less than 5 minutes, while that of Double Cove and Wu Kai Sha Village is just a road apart; and</li> </ul>	
				(c) Proposes that if R29 is composed of Double Cove, Lake Silver, Villa Athena and Wu Kai Sha Village, the polling station may also be set up in Wu Kai Sha Station.	
34	R27 – On Lung  R28 – Fu Nga  R29 – Wu Kai Sha	-	1	(a) Same as items 31(a) and (b).	<u>Item (a)</u> Please see item 31.
				(b) Considers that the projected population of the development area in the vicinity of Wu Kai Sha (Comprehensive Development Areas (1), (2) and (3)) is under-estimated, because according to the 2011 Population Census, the population of Monte Vista is 5,286, Lake Silver 6,149 and Wu Kai Sha Village 1,500. The projected population of Double Cove would be 9,000 upon full occupation, while the dormitory of City University of Hong Kong would accommodate 4,000 persons, making the total projected population at 28,145. Therefore, the EAC's proposal would make the future	<u>Item (b)</u> The EAC must adhere to the Administration's population forecast as at 30 June 2015 in delineating the constituencies. The future development after the cut-off date will not be taken into consideration.

<i>Item No.</i>	<i>DCCAs</i>	<i>No. *</i>		<i>Representations</i>	<i>EAC's views</i>	
		<i>W</i>	<i>O</i>			
				population of R29 (Wu Kai Sha) overloaded and necessitate re-delineation in future.		
35	R27– On Lung	-	1	(a) Same as items 31(a)(i) and (ii).	<u>Item (a)</u> Please see item 31.	
	R28 – Fu Nga			(b) Same as item 39.	<u>Item (b)</u> Please see item 39.	
	R29 – Wu Kai Sha			(c) Considers that the EAC should not take into consideration the political factors.	<u>Item (c)</u> The delineation proposal must be based on objective data of the population distribution. The political factors are not the relevant factors of consideration.	
	R34 – Tai Shui Hang					
	R35 – Yu Yan					
36	R27– On Lung	1	-	(a) Same as item 31(c).	<u>Items (a) to (c)</u> The supporting view is noted.	
	R31 – Yiu On			(b) Supports transferring Kam Hay Court to R31 (Yiu On) because the community facilities of Kam Hay Court are the same as Yiu On Estate's.		
	R33 – On Tai			(c) Supports transferring Castello to R37 (Kwong Hong) because the proposal would maintain the population of R36 (Bik Woo) and R37 (Kwong Hong) within the statutory population range.		
	R34 – Tai Shui Hang					
	R35 – Yu Yan					
	R36 – Bik Woo					
	R37 – Kwong Hong					(d) Same as item 39.
				(e) Proposes to transfer the Area 73 of Sha Tin from R35 (Yu Yan) to R33 (On Tai) because that area is right next to Kam	<u>Item (e)</u> This proposal is <b>not accepted</b> because the EAC must adhere to the Administration's population	

<i>Item No.</i>	<i>DCCAs</i>	<i>No. *</i>		<i>Representations</i>	<i>EAC's views</i>
		<i>W</i>	<i>O</i>		
				Tai Court. Therefore, future planning and development of that area are also closely relevant to the residents of R33 (On Tai).	forecast as at 30 June 2015 in delineating the constituency. The Area 73 of Sha Tin mentioned in the representation has no projected population.
37	R29 – Wu Kai Sha	1	-	<p>Proposes to form R29 (Wu Kai Sha) by Double Cove and Whitehead area only because:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>● Double Cove would be completed in 2 years and the number of households would be as many as 3,500. The housing estates of Whitehead area would also be completed shortly afterwards, causing upsurge in the projected population; and</li> <li>● the size of the constituency under the provisional recommendation is too large. The DC member would find it difficult to take care of the local affairs.</li> </ul>	<p>This proposal is <b>not accepted</b> because:</p> <p>(i) the EAC must adhere to the Administration's population forecast as at 30 June 2015 in delineating the constituency boundaries. The future development after the cut-off date will not be taken into consideration;</p> <p>(ii) after the proposed adjustment, the projected population of R29 (Wu Kai Sha) (4,597) will substantially fall short of the statutory permissible lower limit (-72.90%); and</p> <p>(iii) the delineation proposal must be based on objective data of population distribution. Arrangements on district administration matters are not the relevant factors of consideration.</p>
38	R33 – On Tai  R34 – Tai Shui Hang  R35 – Yu Yan	-	1	(a) Proposes to transfer the Vehicle Detention Centre of Customs and Excise Department in Area 73 of Sha Tin from R35 (Yu Yan) to R33 (On Tai) for facilitating future development because the area adjoins Kam Tai Court in R33 (On Tai).	<p><u>Item (a)</u></p> <p>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 of the Vehicle Detention Centre of Customs and Excise Department in Area 73 of Sha Tin 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>		
				(b) Same as item 39.	<u>Item (b)</u> Please see item 39.
39	R34 – Tai Shui Hang  R35 – Yu Yan	65	5	<p>Propose to transfer Ah Kung Kok Fishermen Village from R35 (Yu Yan) to R34 (Tai Shui Hang).</p> <p>66 representations consider that Ah Kung Kok Fishermen Village is geographically nearer to Tai Shui Hang Village and Chevalier Garden of Ma On Shan.</p> <p>65 representations consider that the residents of Ah Kung Kok Fishermen Village are used to getting to R34 (Tai Shui Hang) for share use of the community facilities in the area.</p> <p>64 representations consider that the mode of public transportation used by the residents of Ah Kung Kok Fishermen Village is the same as that used by the residents of R34 (Tai Shui Hang).</p> <p>63 representations consider that :</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>● after transferring Ah Kung Kok Fishermen Village from R35 (Yu Yan) to R34 (Tai Shui Hang), the projected population of R34 (Tai Shui Hang) and R35 (Yu Yan) would still fall within the statutory permissible range and their deviation from the population quota would not be significantly affected; and</li> <li>● the future planning and development of the community would be more comprehensive.</li> </ul>	<p>This proposal is <b>not accepted</b> because:</p> <p>(i) the projected population of R34 (Tai Shui Hang) and R35 (Yu Yan) will fall within the statutory permissible range. According to the established working principles, adjustment to their existing boundaries is not required; 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>Two representations consider that since most of the residents of Ah Kung Kok Fishermen Village are elderly, the proposal would ensure that they would find it convenient to cast their votes in R34 (Tai Shui Hang).</p> <p>Two representations consider that the residents of Ah Kung Kok Fishermen Village often have their day-to-day activities in R34 (Tai Shui Hang).</p> <p>One representation considers that the residents of Ah Kung Kok Fishermen Village would be encouraged to fulfill their citizen obligation in casting their votes in R34 (Tai Shui Hang) due to close proximity of the village to R34 (Tai Shui Hang).</p> <p>One representation considers that Ah Kung Kok Fishermen Village has been included in R34 (Tai Shui Hang) previously.</p> <p>One representation considers that the residents of Ah Kung Kok Fishermen Village and Chevalier Garden have maintained close ties with each other (e.g. in respect of joint participation in community activities).</p> <p>One representation considers that the EAC could refer to the past voting turnout records showing that the election results would be unaffected by the transfer of Ah Kung Kok Fishermen Village to R34 (Tai Shui Hang).</p> <p>One representation considers that the District Officer has previously</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>responded to the residents' wishes to increase the provision of community facilities, indicating that Ah Kung Kok Fishermen Village's residents could share the facilities installed in Tai Shui Hang, which represents that the local ties of both areas are close.</p> <p>One representation considers that in terms of the mode of transport, the residents of Ah Kung Kok Fishermen Village would encounter difficulties in travelling to R35 (Yu Yan) because the transportation is not convenient enough. If they wished to cast their votes, they would have to get access to the polling station in Yu Chui Court by taking minibus and bus and also pass through R36 (Bik Woo) and R37 (Kwong Hong), which is contrary to the principle of transportation convenience for people's voting.</p> <p>One representation considers that the transfer of Ah Kung Kok Fishermen Village to R34 (Tai Shui Hang) could further enhance the community integrity and help the Administration's future planning and development.</p>	

**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				be maintained by including these two blocks in the same DCCA.  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%).
				(b) Proposes to retain the original names “Shek Lei Extension” for S09 (Shek Lei South) and “Shek Lei” for S10 (Shek Lei North).	<u>Item (b)</u> This proposal is <b>not accepted</b> because:  (i) adoption of the names of “Shek Lei South” and “Shek Lei North” can reflect the geographical location of the two DCCAs; and  (ii) there is a view supporting the proposed names for “Shek Lei South” and “Shek Lei North” (please see item 7(a)).
				(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.	<u>Item (c)</u> This proposal is <b>accepted</b> because:  (i) the projected population of S11 (Tai Pak Tin) (21,829) will slightly exceed the statutory permissible upper limit (+28.68%); and  (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.

<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>		
				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.	
6	S01 – Kwai Hing  S11 – Tai Pak Tin	1	-	Proposes to retain Hutchison Estate in S11 (Tai Pak Tin) because: <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>	

**Appendix II - T**

**Islands 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 T01 (Lantau) and T06 (Discovery Bay) as they are in line with the EAC's statutory criteria and working principles.	<u>Item (a)</u> The supporting view is noted.
				(b)(i) Supports the provisional recommendations on T02 (Yat Tung Estate North) and T03 (Yat Tung Estate South) because the community identity could be preserved; and  (ii) proposes to rename T02 (Yat Tung Estate North) and T03 (Yat Tung Estate South) as "Yat Tung II" and "Yat Tung I" respectively.	<u>Item (b)(i)</u> The supporting view is noted.  <u>Item (b)(ii)</u> This proposal is <b>not accepted</b> because the names of "Yat Tung Estate North" and "Yat Tung Estate South" have been used since 2007. The majority of the public are used to these names and change of the DCCA names may cause confusion to the public. Moreover, the names can clearly reflect the geographical location of the two DCCAs.
				(c)(i) Supports the provisional recommendations on T04 (Tung Chung North) and T05 (Tung Chung South); and  (ii) proposes to increase one elected seat in Tung Chung in 2019 to cope with the community problems caused by population growth.	<u>Item (c)(i)</u> The supporting view is noted.  <u>Item (c)(ii)</u> Delineation of constituency boundaries should follow the number of elected seats as specified in the DCO (Cap. 547) and the population distribution in the relevant districts. This proposal involves amendment to the Ordinance which does not fall under the purview of the EAC. The EAC has referred this view to the CMAB for reference.

\* 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>		
				<p>(d) Holds reservation on the provisional recommendations on T07 (Peng Chau &amp; Hei Ling Chau) and T08 (Lamma &amp; Po Toi) because the projected population of the two DCCAs is below the statutory permissible lower limit. However, taking into account the community identity, it considers that their original boundaries could remain unchanged.</p>	<p><u>Item (d)</u> The view is noted.</p>
				<p>(e) Holds reservation on the provisional recommendations on T09 (Cheung Chau South) and T10 (Cheung Chau North) because the total population of the two DCCAs is less than that of T04 (Tung Chung North). Also, the Chairman of Cheung Chau Rural Committee is an ex-officio member. Hence, it proposes that Cheung Chau should be formed as one DCCA in the future, instead of two.</p>	<p><u>Item (e)</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.</p>
2	All DCCAs	-	1	Proposes to increase one DCCA in the Islands District (Tung Chung) because the population of the Islands District is unevenly distributed. Cheung Chau with population of more than 20,000 is divided into two DCCAs, while Tung Chung of more than 80,000 people has four DCCAs only.	<p>This proposal is <b>not accepted</b>. The Islands District now covers the areas including multiple islands, vast rural areas and some developed and developing towns. Due to geographical and various development factors, the population within the district is very unevenly distributed. In delineating the DCCA boundaries, the projected population as well as the existing boundaries and local factors, such as community identities and local ties etc., have to be taken into consideration. In view of the population distribution and geographical factors 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>		
					Islands District, as well as the stipulated number of DCCAs in the DCO, it is inevitable that obvious population deviation exists in some DCCAs of the Islands District. Under such situation, increasing one new DCCA in Tung Chung or releasing one DCCA by adjusting the boundaries of the adjacent DCCAs to reduce the population of T04 (Tung Chung North) and its adjacent DCCAs is not feasible. Therefore, the EAC proposes that the population of T04 (Tung Chung North) should 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).
3	T01 – Lantau  T06 – Discovery Bay  T07 – Peng Chau & Hei Ling Chau	-	1	(a) Proposes to transfer Yi Pak Au from T01 (Lantau) to T06 (Discovery Bay) because Yi Pak Au is geographically closer to Discovery Bay.  (b) Proposes to transfer Nim Shue Wan from T07 (Peng Chau & Hei Ling Chau) to T06 (Discovery Bay) because the indigenous inhabitants of Nim Shue Wan use the access of	<u>Item (a)</u> This proposal is <b>not accepted</b> because:  (i) the projected population of T01 (Lantau) and T06 (Discovery Bay) will fall within the statutory permissible range. According to the established working principles, adjustment to their existing boundaries is not required; and  (ii) there is a view supporting the delineation proposals for T01 (Lantau) and T06 (Discovery Bay) (please see item 1(a)).  <u>Item (b)</u> This proposal is <b>not accepted</b> because:  (i) the projected population of T06 (Discovery Bay) will fall

<i>Item No.</i>	<i>DCCAs</i>	<i>No.*</i>		<i>Representations</i>	<i>EAC's views</i>
		<i>W</i>	<i>O</i>		
				Discovery Bay more often.	<p>within the statutory permissible range. According to the established working principles, adjustment to its existing boundary is not required;</p> <p>(ii) the projected population of T07 (Peng Chau &amp; Hei Ling Chau) (7,376) will be below the statutory permissible lower limit (-56.52%). After the proposed adjustment, the projected population of T07 (Peng Chau &amp; Hei Ling Chau) will deviate further from the statutory permissible lower limit; and</p> <p>(iii) 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>
4	T02 – Yat Tung Estate North	4	-	(a) Support the provisional recommendation to transfer Hong Yat House to T03 (Yat Tung Estate South).	<u>Item (a)</u> The supporting views are noted.
	T03 – Yat Tung Estate South			(b) One representation proposes to rename T02 (Yat Tung Estate North) and T03 (Yat Tung Estate South) as “Yat Tung II” and “Yat Tung I” respectively in order to make residents clear to which DCCA they belong and raise their desire to vote.	<u>Item (b)</u> Please see item 1(b)(ii).
				(c) Two representations propose to rename T02 (Yat Tung Estate North) and T03 (Yat Tung Estate South) as “Yat Tung II Estate” and “Yat Tung I Estate”	<u>Item (c)</u> Please see item 1(b)(ii).

<i>Item No.</i>	<i>DCCAs</i>	<i>No.*</i>		<i>Representations</i>	<i>EAC's views</i>
		<i>W</i>	<i>O</i>		
				respectively in order to make residents clear to which DCCA they belong.	
5	T02 – Yat Tung Estate North  T03 – Yat Tung Estate South	-	2	Support the provisional recommendations on T02 (Yat Tung Estate North) and T03 (Yat Tung Estate South). One representation considers that the provisional recommendation puts Yat Tung (II) Estate and Yat Tung (I) Estate completely into T02 (Yat Tung Estate North) and T03 (Yat Tung Estate South) respectively, which helps to maintain community integrity.	The supporting views are noted.
6	T02 – Yat Tung Estate North  T03 – Yat Tung Estate South  T04 – Tung Chung North  T05 – Tung Chung South	1	-	<p>(a) Considers that the constituency boundary of T02 (Yat Tung Estate North) should remain unchanged because:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>● the population of many DCCAs in the Islands District deviates from the statutory permissible range but their constituency boundaries are still allowed to remain unchanged; and</li> <li>● the boundary change of T02 (Yat Tung Estate North) just involves one building, indicating that the projected population of that DCCA does not exceed much from the statutory permissible range. Moreover, the boundaries of T02 (Yat Tung Estate North) and T03 (Yat Tung Estate South) are often changed which would make electors inconvenient.</li> </ul> <p>(b) Considers that The Visionary should be transferred from T05 (Tung Chung South) to T04</p>	<p><u>Item (a)</u> This proposal is <b>not accepted</b> because:</p> <p>(i) if the constituency boundary of T02 (Yat Tung Estate North) remains unchanged, the projected population (21,333) will exceed the statutory permissible upper limit (+25.75%);</p> <p>(ii) the EAC's provisional recommendations will not have any impacts on the preservation of local ties and community identities of the two DCCAs; and</p> <p>(iii) there are views supporting the delineation proposals for T02 (Yat Tung Estate North) and T03 (Yat Tung Estate South) (please see items 1(b), 4(a) and 5).</p> <p><u>Item (b)</u> This proposal is <b>not accepted</b> because:</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>		
				(Tung Chung North) because the population of T04 (Tung Chung North) is allowed to deviate from the statutory permissible range.	<p>(i) the EAC must adhere to the Administration's population forecast as at 30 June 2015 in delineating the constituency boundaries. The Visionary in T05 (Tung Chung South) mentioned in the representation has no projected population and the projected population of T05 (Tung Chung South) 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) there is a view supporting the delineation proposals for T04 (Tung Chung North) and T05 (Tung Chung South) (please see item 1(c)).</p>
7	T04 – Tung Chung North  T05 – Tung Chung South	-	1	<p>Proposes:</p> <p>(i) to transfer The Visionary from T05 (Tung Chung South) to T04 (Tung Chung North) because The Visionary is geographically closer to T04 (Tung Chung North). Moreover, there is no population for the time being so it would not affect the population of T04 (Tung Chung North);</p> <p>(ii) to transfer Seaview Crescent from T04 (Tung Chung North) to T05 (Tung Chung South) if it is necessary to adjust T04 (Tung Chung North) due to excessive population; and</p> <p>(iii) to transfer the ferry pier, located outside the Seaview</p>	<p>This proposal is <b>not accepted</b> because:</p> <p>(i) please see item 6(b)(i);</p> <p>(ii) if Seaview Crescent is transferred from T04 (Tung Chung North) to T05 (Tung Chung South), the projected population of T05 (Tung Chung South) (21,843) will exceed the statutory permissible upper limit (+28.76%);</p> <p>(iii) the EAC must adhere to the Administration's population forecast as at 30 June 2015 in delineating the constituency boundaries. The ferry pier mentioned in the representation has no projected population; and</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>		
				Crescent, from T05 (Tung Chung South) to T04 (Tung Chung North) to maintain local area integrity.	(iv) there is a view supporting the delineation proposals for T04 (Tung Chung North) and T05 (Tung Chung South) (please see item 1(c)).
8	T06 – Discovery Bay  T07 – Peng Chau & Hei Ling Chau	1	-	<p>Objects to retaining the marina of Discovery Bay Marina Club in T07 (Peng Chau &amp; Hei Ling Chau) and proposes to transfer that area to T06 (Discovery Bay) because:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>the residents on the yachts are the members of Discovery Bay Marina Club, which provides services and facilities to them. Hence, the boundary of T06 (Discovery Bay) should include the marina; and</li> <li>the projected population of T06 (Discovery Bay) would be below the population quota.</li> </ul>	<p>This proposal is <b>accepted</b> because the marina is under the management of Discovery Bay. The residents on the yachts have very close connection with Discovery Bay. Thus, it is reasonable to transfer the marina of Discovery Bay Marina Club to T06 (Discovery Bay). Moreover, the proposal will not have obvious impacts on the preservation of local ties and community integrity of T07 (Peng Chau &amp; Hei Ling Chau).</p> <p>After the proposed adjustment, the projected population of T06 (Discovery Bay) and T07 (Peng Chau &amp; Hei Ling Chau) will be as follows:</p> <p>T06: 13,390, -21.07% T07: 7,376, -56.52%</p>
9	T07 – Peng Chau & Hei Ling Chau  T08 – Lamma & Po Toi	-	1	Supports the provisional recommendations on T07 (Peng Chau & Hei Ling Chau) and T08 (Lamma & Po Toi) and considers that even though the projected population of the two DCCAs is below the statutory permissible lower limit, they should belong to two different DCCAs.	The supporting view is noted.

<i>Item No.</i>	<i>DCCAs</i>	<i>No.*</i>		<i>Representations</i>	<i>EAC's views</i>
		<i>W</i>	<i>O</i>		
10	T07 – Peng Chau & Hei Ling Chau  T08 – Lamma & Po Toi	1	-	Considers that the total population of T07 (Peng Chau & Hei Ling Chau) and T08 (Lamma & Po Toi) is still within the statutory permissible range. Hence, it proposes to combine the two DCCAs in order to release one DCCA to Tung Chung.	This proposal is <b>not accepted</b> because:  (i) please see item 2;  (ii) taking into account the geographical factor, transportation, community integrity and local ties, it is not feasible to maintain the population of T07 (Peng Chau & Hei Ling Chau) and T08 (Lamma & Po Toi) within the statutory permissible range by adjusting the boundaries of the adjacent DCCAs. Therefore, the EAC proposes that the original boundaries of these two DCCAs should remain unchanged and their population be allowed to continue to deviate from the statutory permissible range (the population of these DCCAs in 2011 delineation exercise was also allowed to deviate from the statutory permissible range); and  (iii) there is a view supporting the delineation proposals for T07 (Peng Chau & Hei Ling Chau) and T08 (Lamma & Po Toi) (please see item 9).

**Appendix II - General Issues**

**General Issues**  
**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	General views on the delineation	2	-	(a) Object to the requirement to adjust the constituency boundaries and propose to maintain the existing boundaries.	<u>Item (a)</u> According to the requirement of the EACO, for a DC ordinary election, the EAC must adhere to a set of statutory criteria and working principles, and the population distribution in the relevant districts to review the existing boundaries of DCCAs and submit a report to the CE on its recommendations concerning the boundaries of DCCAs.
		-	1	(b) Proposes to review the existing methods for calculating the population forecasts used by the AHSG because its projected figures are often very different from the actual population figures before 30 June 2015. Factors such as voter registration and the timing of occupation of buildings would affect the situation of community. It is considered that the EAC must set up a mechanism to review the existing system to ensure the accuracy of the projected figures.	<u>Item (b)</u> In accordance with section 20 of the EACO, in delineating the constituency boundaries, the EAC shall endeavor to project the total population of Hong Kong or any proposed constituency in the year in which the election, to which the recommendations relate, is to be held. In respect of the 2015 DC Election, as in the past, the AHSG provided the EAC with the necessary population forecasts. The AHSG, chaired by the PlanD and comprising members from various government departments, provided the required projected population figures based on a set of scientific and systematic methodology.

\* 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>		
		-	1	(c) Objects to re-delineating the boundaries with a view to retaining polling station in a particular DCCA because this would affect the overall number of electors and the integrity of the DCCA. It is proposed that subject to the circumstances of individual community, delineation should be along streets.	<u>Item (c)</u> The EAC must adhere to a set of statutory criteria as stated in the EACO and must be based on objective data of population distribution in delineating constituencies. Arrangements on polling station are not the factors of consideration in delineating constituencies.
		-	1	(d) Proposes that the names of DCCAs should be familiar to the electors as far as possible. The names of some DCCAs are long, using names of three places to form the DCCA name, e.g. F22 (Nam Shan, Tai Hang Tung & Tai Hang Sai).	<u>Item (d)</u> When naming a DCCA, the EAC will make reference to the major features, roads or residential settlements of the DCCA so as to make a recommendation on its name. The majority of the DCCA names under the provisional recommendations have been used for a long time. Change of the names may cause confusion to the public.
		1	-	(e) Satisfies with the arrangements for this public consultation. The document "The proposed boundaries of the DCCAs requiring adjustments in the 2015 DC Election" enables members of the public to know about the adjusted DCCAs and understand the reasons for adjustment so that they could examine in greater detail the rationale of the adjustments.	<u>Item (e)</u> The view is noted.
		-	1	(f) Considers that some DCCA boundary lines are not drawn perpendicular to the district boundary lines on the sea.	<u>Item (f)</u> The DCCA boundary lines are drawn perpendicular to the district boundary lines on the sea as far as possible. However, if there are geographical considerations, where appropriate, the DCCA



<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 lines will be adjusted to fit in the physical features of the area.
2	Electoral policy	1	-	(a) Proposes that the boundaries of DCCAs should adopt the delineation method for big constituencies (i.e. to elect more seats in one DCCA) and the existing delineation method for small constituencies (i.e. to elect one seat in one DCCA) be abolished. Besides, in delineating constituencies, one district could be delineated into 2-5 DCCAs and each DCCA has 5-10 seats or one district could be regarded as one DCCA. It is not necessary to re-delineate the DCCAs in every election.	<u>Items (a) and (b)</u> These proposals involve amendment to the DCO, which does not fall under the purview of the EAC. The EAC has referred these views to the CMAB for reference.
		-	1	(b) Proposes to review the existing statutory requirements, criteria and working principles in respect of delineation of constituencies because the growing population and the existing practice to delineate small constituencies have made the delineation exercise more difficult. For example, altering the boundary of certain DCCA may affect the sources of votes, which would likely lead to the opposition of DC members. Therefore, it is proposed to revise the statutory requirements to adopt the delineation method for big constituencies.	

<i>Item No.</i>	<i>DCCAs</i>	<i>No.*</i>		<i>Representations</i>	<i>EAC's views</i>
		<i>W</i>	<i>O</i>		
3	Arrangements on election	1	-	(a) Proposes to make voting mandatory so as to encourage members of the public to bear the civic responsibilities and enhance the legitimacy and credibility of the election as a whole. It is also proposed to set the polling day as a cooling-off period to allow the electors to consider their voting preference thoroughly and not to be affected by the external information. This would make the election fairer and more rational.	<u>Items (a) and (b)</u> These proposals involve amendment to the DCO, which does not fall under the purview of the EAC. The EAC has referred these views to the CMAB for reference.
		1	-	(b) In respect of the counting of votes, proposes to adopt the system of absolute majority and two rounds of voting.	

**Changes Made to the Boundaries of DCCAs  
after the Public Consultation Exercise**

<b>District</b>	<b>No. of DCCAs Affected</b>	<b>Code and Name of DCCAs Affected</b>
Tuen Mun	2	L28 Fu Tai L29 Tuen Mun Rural
Yuen Long	2	M08 Shap Pat Heung East M10 Shap Pat Heung West
North	3	N13 Shek Wu Hui N14 Tin Ping West N17 Tin Ping East
Sha Tin	6	R07 Sha Kok R08 Pok Hong R09 Jat Min R27 On Lung R28 Fu Nga R29 Wu Kai Sha
Kwai Tsing	5	S01 Kwai Hing S09 Shek Lei South S10 Shek Lei North S11 Tai Pak Tin S12 Kwai Fong
Islands	2	T06 Discovery Bay T07 Peng Chau & Hei Ling Chau
<b>Total :</b>	<b>20</b>	

**Changes Made to the Names of DCCAs  
after the Public Consultation Exercise**

<b>District</b>	<b>DCCA Code</b>	<b>Name of DCCA</b>	
		<b>EAC's Provisional Recommendations</b>	<b>EAC's Final Recommendations</b>
Sha Tin	R27	On Lung	Lee On
	R28	Fu Nga	Fu Lung

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

District	DCCA exceeding permissible range	Projected population (Deviation percentage)	Reason
Eastern	C32 Lok Hong	12,391 (-26.96%) <i>(same as in the provisional recommendations)</i>	Because of the need to preserve community integrity and local ties as well as the consideration of geographical location and population distribution
Southern	D02 Ap Lei Chau Estate	12,478 (-26.44%) <i>(same as in the provisional recommendations)</i>	Because of the need to preserve community integrity and local ties as well as the consideration of population distribution
	D09 Wah Fu South	12,429 (-26.73%) <i>(same as in the provisional recommendations)</i>	Because of the need to preserve community integrity and local ties as well as the consideration of population distribution  (the population of this DCCA in 2011 demarcation exercise was also allowed to deviate from the statutory permissible range)

District	DCCA exceeding permissible range	Projected population (Deviation percentage)	Reason
	D17 Stanley & Shek O	22,008 (+29.73%) <i>(same as in the provisional recommendations)</i>	Because of the need to preserve community integrity and local ties  (the population of this DCCA in 2011 demarcation exercise was also allowed to deviate from the statutory permissible range)
Wong Tai Sin	H07 San Po Kong	21,677 (+27.78%) <i>(same as in the provisional recommendations)</i>	Because of the need to preserve community integrity and local ties
Kwun Tong	J25 Laguna City	24,598 (+45.00%) <i>(same as in the provisional recommendations)</i>	Because of the need to preserve community integrity and local ties as well as the consideration of geographical location and transportation  (the population of this DCCA in 2011 demarcation exercise was also allowed to deviate from the statutory permissible range)
Tuen Mun	L12 Sam Shing	21,287 (+25.48%) <i>(same as in the provisional recommendations)</i>	Because of the need to preserve community identity and local ties as well as the consideration of geographical location and transportation

District	DCCA exceeding permissible range	Projected population (Deviation percentage)	Reason
	L29 Tuen Mun Rural	21,714 (+28.00%) <i>(lower than the deviation percentage as in the provisional recommendations)</i>	Because of the need to preserve community integrity and local ties  (the population of this DCCA in 2011 demarcation exercise was also allowed to deviate from the statutory permissible range)
Yuen Long	M10 Shap Pat Heung West	21,626 (+27.48%)	Because of the need to preserve community integrity
	M15 Tin Shing	21,328 (+25.73%) <i>(same as in the provisional recommendations)</i>	Because of the need to preserve community integrity and local ties  (the population of these DCCAs in 2011 demarcation exercise was also allowed to deviate from the statutory permissible range)
	M22 Tin Heng	22,520 (+32.75%) <i>(same as in the provisional recommendations)</i>	
	M25 Kingswood North	23,223 (+36.90%) <i>(same as in the provisional recommendations)</i>	
North	N11 Sheung Shui Rural	21,578 (+27.20%) <i>(same as in the provisional recommendations)</i>	

District	DCCA exceeding permissible range	Projected population (Deviation percentage)	Reason
Sai Kung	Q01 Sai Kung Central	11,755 (-30.71%) <i>(same as in the provisional recommendations)</i>	Because of the need to preserve community integrity and local ties as well as the consideration of geographical location, transportation and population distribution  (the population of this DCCA in 2011 demarcation exercise was also allowed to deviate from the statutory permissible range)
Sha Tin	R32 Heng On	21,864 (+28.88%) <i>(same as in the provisional recommendations)</i>	Because of the need to preserve community integrity and local ties
	R33 On Tai	21,661 (+27.69%) <i>(same as in the provisional recommendations)</i>	Because of the need to preserve community integrity and local ties as well as the consideration of population distribution
Kwai Tsing	S07 Shek Yam	21,347 (+25.84%) <i>(same as in the provisional recommendations)</i>	Because of the need to preserve community integrity and local ties as well as the consideration of geographical location and population distribution
	S10 Shek Lei North	21,330 (+25.74%)	Because of the need to preserve local ties



District	DCCA exceeding permissible range	Projected population (Deviation percentage)	Reason
	S11 Tai Pak Tin	21,829 (+28.68%)	Because of the need to preserve local ties and the consideration of geographical location
Islands	T04 Tung Chung North	22,450 (+32.34%) <i>(same as in the provisional recommendations)</i>	Because of the need to preserve community integrity and local ties as well as the consideration of population distribution  (the population of this DCCA in 2011 demarcation exercise was also allowed to deviate from the statutory permissible range)
	T07 Peng Chau & Hei Ling Chau	7,376 (-56.52%) <i>(higher than the deviation percentage as in the provisional recommendations)</i>	Because of the need to preserve community integrity and local ties as well as the consideration of geographical location and transportation  (the population of these DCCAs in 2011 demarcation exercise was also allowed to deviate from the statutory permissible range)
	T08 Lamma & Po Toi	6,183 (-63.55%) <i>(same as in the provisional recommendations)</i>	

District	DCCA exceeding permissible range	Projected population (Deviation percentage)	Reason
	T09 Cheung Chau South	11,108 (-34.52%) <i>(same as in the provisional recommendations)</i>	Because of the need to preserve community integrity and local ties as well as the consideration of geographical location, transportation and population distribution
	T10 Cheung Chau North	11,082 (-34.67%) <i>(same as in the provisional recommendations)</i>	(the population of these DCCAs in 2011 demarcation exercise was also allowed to deviate from the statutory permissible range)

***Total number of DCCAs exceeding the permissible limits of the population quota = 24***

中西區的正式建議摘要  
Summary of Final Recommendations for Central and Western District

選區代號 Code of Constituency	選區名稱 Name of Constituency	預計人口 Projected Population	標準人口基數 偏離百分比 +/- % of Population Quota (16,964)
A01	中環 Chung Wan	13,850	-18.36%
A02	半山東 Mid Levels East	18,828	+10.99%
A03	衛城 Castle Road	18,859	+11.17%
A04	山頂 Peak	20,324	+19.81%
A05	大學 University	19,010	+12.06%
A06	堅摩 Kennedy Town & Mount Davis	16,920 <sup>+</sup>	-0.26%
A07	觀龍 Kwun Lung	15,188	-10.47%
A08	西環 Sai Wan	14,789	-12.82%
A09	寶翠 Belcher	21,195	+24.94%
A10	石塘咀 Shek Tong Tsui	17,176 <sup>+</sup>	+1.25%
A11	西營盤 Sai Ying Pun	14,528	-14.36%
A12	上環 Sheung Wan	17,550	+3.45%
A13	東華 Tung Wah	13,051	-23.07%
A14	正街 Centre Street	16,227	-4.34%
A15	水街 Water Street	15,142	-10.74%
<b>總數 Total :</b>		<b>252,637</b>	

<sup>+</sup> Marine population added

<sup>+</sup> 加上水上人口

**灣仔區的正式建議摘要**  
**Summary of Final Recommendations for Wan Chai District**

選區代號 Code of Constituency	選區名稱 Name of Constituency		標準人口基數 偏離百分比 +/- % of Population Quota (16,964)
B01	軒尼詩 Hennessy	13,207	-22.15%
B02	愛群 Oi Kwan	14,442	-14.87%
B03	鵝頸 Canal Road	13,514	-20.34%
B04	維園 Victoria Park	14,642 <sup>+</sup>	-13.69%
B05	天后 Tin Hau	14,156	-16.55%
B06	銅鑼灣 Causeway Bay	13,655	-19.51%
B07	大坑 Tai Hang	13,637	-19.61%
B08	渣甸山 Jardine's Lookout	15,200	-10.40%
B09	樂活 Broadwood	14,677	-13.48%
B10	跑馬地 Happy Valley	14,090	-16.94%
B11	司徒拔道 Stubbs Road	14,203	-16.28%
B12	修頓 Southorn	14,597	-13.95%
B13	大佛口 Tai Fat Hau	13,346	-21.33%
<b>總數 Total :</b>		<b>183,366</b>	

<sup>+</sup> Marine population added

<sup>+</sup> 加上水上人口

東區的正式建議摘要  
Summary of Final Recommendations for Eastern District

選區代號 Code of Constituency	選區名稱 Name of Constituency	預計人口 Projected Population	標準人口基數 偏離百分比 +/- % of Population Quota (16,964)
C01	太古城西 Tai Koo Shing West	18,269	+7.69%
C02	太古城東 Tai Koo Shing East	19,530	+15.13%
C03	鯉景灣 Lei King Wan	20,803	+22.63%
C04	愛秩序灣 Aldrich Bay	19,119	+12.70%
C05	筲箕灣 Shaukeiwan	13,250	-21.89%
C06	阿公岩 A Kung Ngam	19,188 <sup>+</sup>	+13.11%
C07	杏花邨 Heng Fa Chuen	19,267	+13.58%
C08	翠灣 Tsui Wan	13,031	-23.18%
C09	欣藍 Yan Lam	16,981	+0.10%
C10	小西灣 Siu Sai Wan	13,176	-22.33%
C11	景怡 King Yee	15,934	-6.07%
C12	環翠 Wan Tsui	14,542	-14.28%
C13	翡翠 Fei Tsui	15,427	-9.06%
C14	柏架山 Mount Parker	14,048	-17.19%
C15	寶馬山 Braemar Hill	16,991	+0.16%
C16	炮台山 Fortress Hill	15,917	-6.17%
C17	城市花園 City Garden	15,679	-7.57%
C18	和富 Provident	21,058	+24.13%
C19	堡壘 Fort Street	15,583	-8.14%
C20	錦屏 Kam Ping	16,793	-1.01%
C21	丹拿 Tanner	15,345	-9.54%
C22	健康村 Healthy Village	14,480	-14.64%
C23	鯪魚涌 Quarry Bay	13,764	-18.86%
C24	南豐 Nam Fung	14,081	-16.99%
C25	康怡 Kornhill	14,724	-13.20%
C26	康山 Kornhill Garden	14,958	-11.83%
C27	興東 Hing Tung	18,899	+11.41%
C28	西灣河 Sai Wan Ho	19,482	+14.84%
C29	下耀東 Lower Yiu Tung	16,389	-3.39%
C30	上耀東 Upper Yiu Tung	12,732	-24.95%
C31	興民 Hing Man	14,432	-14.93%
C32	樂康 Lok Hong	12,391	-26.96%
C33	翠德 Tsui Tak	13,349	-21.31%
C34	漁灣 Yue Wan	14,804	-12.73%
C35	佳曉 Kai Hiu	13,343	-21.35%
<b>總數 Total :</b>		<b>557,759</b>	

<sup>+</sup> Marine population added

<sup>+</sup> 加上水上人口

南區的正式建議摘要  
Summary of Final Recommendations for Southern District

選區代號 Code of Constituency	選區名稱 Name of Constituency	預計人口 Projected Population	標準人口基數 偏離百分比 +/- % of Population Quota (16,964)
D01	香港仔 Aberdeen	19,698 <sup>+</sup>	+16.12%
D02	鴨脷洲邨 Ap Lei Chau Estate	12,478	-26.44%
D03	鴨脷洲北 Ap Lei Chau North	13,025	-23.22%
D04	利東一 Lei Tung I	16,828	-0.80%
D05	利東二 Lei Tung II	13,307	-21.56%
D06	海怡東 South Horizons East	15,340	-9.57%
D07	海怡西 South Horizons West	16,036	-5.47%
D08	華貴 Wah Kwai	14,737	-13.13%
D09	華富南 Wah Fu South	12,429	-26.73%
D10	華富北 Wah Fu North	14,296	-15.73%
D11	薄扶林 Pokfulam	19,996	+17.87%
D12	置富 Chi Fu	16,062	-5.32%
D13	田灣 Tin Wan	16,716	-1.46%
D14	石漁 Shek Yue	18,474	+8.90%
D15	黃竹坑 Wong Chuk Hang	17,251	+1.69%
D16	海灣 Bays Area	18,417	+8.57%
D17	赤柱及石澳 Stanley & Shek O	22,008	+29.73%
<b>總數 Total :</b>		<b>277,098</b>	

<sup>+</sup> Marine population added

<sup>+</sup> 加上水上人口

油尖旺區的正式建議摘要  
Summary of Final Recommendations for Yau Tsim Mong District

選區代號 Code of Constituency	選區名稱 Name of Constituency	預計人口 Projected Population	標準人口基數 偏離百分比 +/- % of Population Quota (16,964)
E01	尖沙咀西 Tsim Sha Tsui West	20,881 <sup>+</sup>	+23.09%
E02	佐敦南 Jordan South	18,327	+8.03%
E03	佐敦西 Jordan West	14,818	-12.65%
E04	油麻地南 Yau Ma Tei South	19,918	+17.41%
E05	富榮 Charming	17,628	+3.91%
E06	旺角西 Mong Kok West	15,423	-9.08%
E07	富柏 Fu Pak	18,820	+10.94%
E08	奧運 Olympic	18,162	+7.06%
E09	櫻桃 Cherry	15,676	-7.59%
E10	大角咀南 Tai Kok Tsui South	16,214	-4.42%
E11	大角咀北 Tai Kok Tsui North	18,474	+8.90%
E12	大南 Tai Nan	20,432	+20.44%
E13	旺角北 Mong Kok North	17,859	+5.28%
E14	旺角東 Mong Kok East	15,742	-7.20%
E15	旺角南 Mong Kok South	16,293	-3.96%
E16	油麻地北 Yau Ma Tei North	12,817	-24.45%
E17	尖東及京士柏 East Tsim Sha Tsui & King's Park	15,185	-10.49%
E18	尖沙咀中 Tsim Sha Tsui Central	16,871	-0.55%
E19	佐敦北 Jordan North	13,558	-20.08%
	<b>總數 Total:</b>	<b>323,098</b>	

<sup>+</sup> Marine population added

<sup>+</sup> 加上水上人口

深水埗區的正式建議摘要  
Summary of Final Recommendations for Sham Shui Po District

選區代號 Code of Constituency	選區名稱 Name of Constituency	預計人口 Projected Population	標準人口基數 偏離百分比 +/- % of Population Quota (16,964)
F01	寶麗 Po Lai	19,254	+13.50%
F02	長沙灣 Cheung Sha Wan	16,864	-0.59%
F03	南昌北 Nam Cheong North	19,807	+16.76%
F04	石硤尾 Shek Kip Mei	20,852	+22.92%
F05	南昌東 Nam Cheong East	18,487	+8.98%
F06	南昌南 Nam Cheong South	20,737	+22.24%
F07	南昌中 Nam Cheong Central	18,413	+8.54%
F08	南昌西 Nam Cheong West	20,523	+20.98%
F09	富昌 Fu Cheong	20,270	+19.49%
F10	麗閣 Lai Kok	14,379	-15.24%
F11	幸福 Fortune	15,401	-9.21%
F12	荔枝角南 Lai Chi Kok South	17,514	+3.24%
F13	美孚南 Mei Foo South	17,304	+2.00%
F14	美孚中 Mei Foo Central	14,675	-13.49%
F15	美孚北 Mei Foo North	16,929	-0.21%
F16	荔枝角中 Lai Chi Kok Central	19,882	+17.20%
F17	荔枝角北 Lai Chi Kok North	14,042	-17.22%
F18	元州及蘇屋 Un Chau & So Uk	18,626	+9.80%
F19	李鄭屋 Lei Cheng Uk	13,110	-22.72%
F20	下白田 Ha Pak Tin	14,701	-13.34%
F21	又一村 Yau Yat Tsuen	16,484	-2.83%
F22	南山、大坑東及大坑西 Nam Shan, Tai Hang Tung & Tai Hang Sai	16,244	-4.24%
F23	龍坪及上白田 Lung Ping & Sheung Pak Tin	16,794	-1.00%
<b>總數 Total :</b>		<b>401,292</b>	



九龍城區的正式建議摘要  
Summary of Final Recommendations for Kowloon City District

選區代號 Code of Constituency	選區名稱 Name of Constituency	預計人口 Projected Population	標準人口基數 偏離百分比 +/- % of Population Quota (16,964)
G01	馬頭圍 Ma Tau Wai	19,205	+13.21%
G02	馬坑涌 Ma Hang Chung	20,012	+17.97%
G03	馬頭角 Ma Tau Kok	14,990	-11.64%
G04	樂民 Lok Man	16,110	-5.03%
G05	常樂 Sheung Lok	16,095	-5.12%
G06	何文田 Ho Man Tin	20,651	+21.73%
G07	嘉道理 Kadoorie	18,756	+10.56%
G08	太子 Prince	16,841	-0.73%
G09	九龍塘 Kowloon Tong	19,293	+13.73%
G10	龍城 Lung Shing	15,460	-8.87%
G11	宋皇臺 Sung Wong Toi	20,487	+20.77%
G12	啓德北 Kai Tak North	16,562	-2.37%
G13	啓德南 Kai Tak South	14,599	-13.94%
G14	海心 Hoi Sham	15,823	-6.73%
G15	土瓜灣北 To Kwa Wan North	13,368	-21.20%
G16	土瓜灣南 To Kwa Wan South	15,454	-8.90%
G17	鶴園海逸 Hok Yuen Laguna Verde	18,930	+11.59%
G18	黃埔東 Whampoa East	18,187	+7.21%
G19	黃埔西 Whampoa West	20,624	+21.58%
G20	紅磡灣 Hung Hom Bay	19,607	+15.58%
G21	紅磡 Hung Hom	14,578	-14.07%
G22	家維 Ka Wai	19,301	+13.78%
G23	愛民 Oi Man	14,736	-13.13%
G24	愛俊 Oi Chun	13,524	-20.28%
<b>總數 Total :</b>		<b>413,193</b>	

黃大仙區的正式建議摘要  
Summary of Final Recommendations for Wong Tai Sin District

選區代號 Code of Constituency	選區名稱 Name of Constituency	預計人口 Projected Population	標準人口基數 偏離百分比 +/- % of Population Quota (16,964)
H01	龍趣 Lung Tsui	15,872	-6.44%
H02	龍下 Lung Ha	12,901	-23.95%
H03	龍上 Lung Sheung	20,477	+20.71%
H04	鳳凰 Fung Wong	16,200	-4.50%
H05	鳳德 Fung Tak	16,240	-4.27%
H06	龍星 Lung Sing	20,111	+18.55%
H07	新蒲崗 San Po Kong	21,677	+27.78%
H08	東頭 Tung Tau	19,630	+15.72%
H09	東美 Tung Mei	17,580	+3.63%
H10	樂富 Lok Fu	14,977	-11.71%
H11	橫頭磡 Wang Tau Hom	17,303	+2.00%
H12	天強 Tin Keung	14,528	-14.36%
H13	翠竹及鵬程 Tsui Chuk & Pang Ching	18,266	+7.68%
H14	竹園南 Chuk Yuen South	15,103	-10.97%
H15	竹園北 Chuk Yuen North	16,098	-5.10%
H16	慈雲西 Tsz Wan West	19,020	+12.12%
H17	正愛 Ching Oi	20,150	+18.78%
H18	正安 Ching On	20,235	+19.28%
H19	慈雲東 Tsz Wan East	20,122	+18.62%
H20	瓊富 King Fu	19,385	+14.27%
H21	彩雲東 Choi Wan East	13,945	-17.80%
H22	彩雲南 Choi Wan South	12,773	-24.71%
H23	彩雲西 Choi Wan West	13,487	-20.50%
H24	池彩 Chi Choi	16,110	-5.03%
H25	彩虹 Choi Hung	14,702	-13.33%
<b>總數 Total :</b>		<b>426,892</b>	

**觀塘區的正式建議摘要**  
**Summary of Final Recommendations for Kwun Tong District**

選區代號 Code of Constituency	選區名稱 Name of Constituency	預計人口 Projected Population	標準人口基數 偏離百分比 +/- % of Population Quota (16,964)
J01	觀塘中心 Kwun Tong Central	16,076	-5.23%
J02	九龍灣 Kowloon Bay	13,952	-17.76%
J03	啓業 Kai Yip	16,399	-3.33%
J04	麗晶 Lai Ching	15,770	-7.04%
J05	坪石 Ping Shek	13,362	-21.23%
J06	雙彩 Sheung Choi	19,162	+12.96%
J07	佐敦谷 Jordan Valley	19,358	+14.11%
J08	順天 Shun Tin	18,918	+11.52%
J09	雙順 Sheung Shun	17,661	+4.11%
J10	安利 On Lee	13,453	-20.70%
J11	寶達 Po Tat	19,866	+17.11%
J12	秀茂坪北 Sau Mau Ping North	20,579	+21.31%
J13	曉麗 Hiu Lai	18,457	+8.80%
J14	秀茂坪南 Sau Mau Ping South	13,909	-18.01%
J15	秀茂坪中 Sau Mau Ping Central	15,256	-10.07%
J16	興田 Hing Tin	17,218	+1.50%
J17	藍田 Lam Tin	20,947	+23.48%
J18	廣德 Kwong Tak	19,310	+13.83%
J19	平田 Ping Tin	18,151	+7.00%
J20	栢雅 Pak Nga	13,410	-20.95%
J21	油塘東 Yau Tong East	19,652	+15.85%
J22	油麗 Yau Lai	18,285	+7.79%
J23	翠翔 Chui Cheung	20,726	+22.18%
J24	油塘西 Yau Tong West	20,481	+20.73%
J25	麗港城 Laguna City	24,598	+45.00%
J26	景田 King Tin	20,623	+21.57%
J27	翠屏 Tsui Ping	19,113	+12.67%
J28	寶樂 Po Lok	14,443	-14.86%
J29	月華 Yuet Wah	13,845	-18.39%
J30	協康 Hip Hong	16,713	-1.48%
J31	康樂 Hong Lok	16,707	-1.51%
J32	定安 Ting On	16,465	-2.94%
J33	牛頭角上邨 Upper Ngau Tau Kok Estate	15,969	-5.87%
J34	牛頭角下邨 Lower Ngau Tau Kok Estate	17,736	+4.55%
J35	淘大 To Tai	17,013	+0.29%
J36	樂華北 Lok Wah North	13,325	-21.45%
J37	樂華南 Lok Wah South	13,093	-22.82%
<b>總數 Total :</b>		<b>640,001</b>	

荃灣區的正式建議摘要  
Summary of Final Recommendations for Tsuen Wan District

選區代號 Code of Constituency	選區名稱 Name of Constituency	預計人口 Projected Population	標準人口基數 偏離百分比 +/- % of Population Quota (16,964)
K01	德華 Tak Wah	21,075	+24.23%
K02	楊屋道 Yeung Uk Road	19,935	+17.51%
K03	海濱 Hoi Bun	19,641	+15.78%
K04	祈德尊 Clague Garden	14,549	-14.24%
K05	福來 Fuk Loi	13,898	-18.07%
K06	愉景 Discovery Park	17,420	+2.69%
K07	荃灣中心 Tsuen Wan Centre	16,595	-2.18%
K08	荃威 Allway	19,833	+16.91%
K09	麗濤 Lai To	19,431	+14.54%
K10	汀深 Ting Sham	18,540	+9.29%
K11	荃灣西 Tsuen Wan West	18,672	+10.07%
K12	荃灣郊區 Tsuen Wan Rural	18,896	+11.39%
K13	馬灣 Ma Wan	15,126	-10.83%
K14	綠楊 Luk Yeung	15,335	-9.60%
K15	梨木樹東 Lei Muk Shue East	19,502	+14.96%
K16	梨木樹西 Lei Muk Shue West	15,745	-7.19%
K17	石圍角 Shek Wai Kok	12,723	-25.00%
K18	象石 Cheung Shek	12,962	-23.59%
<b>總數 Total :</b>		<b>309,878</b>	

屯門區的正式建議摘要  
Summary of Final Recommendations for Tuen Mun District

選區代號 Code of Constituency	選區名稱 Name of Constituency	預計人口 Projected Population	標準人口基數 偏離百分比 +/- % of Population Quota (16,964)
L01	屯門市中心 Tuen Mun Town Centre	19,539	+15.18%
L02	兆置 Siu Chi	21,052	+24.10%
L03	兆翠 Siu Tsui	19,796	+16.69%
L04	安定 On Ting	16,704	-1.53%
L05	友愛南 Yau Oi South	15,172	-10.56%
L06	友愛北 Yau Oi North	15,090	-11.05%
L07	翠興 Tsui Hing	18,323	+8.01%
L08	山景 Shan King	17,898	+5.51%
L09	景興 King Hing	15,315	-9.72%
L10	興澤 Hing Tsak	16,134	-4.89%
L11	新墟 San Hui	18,899	+11.41%
L12	三聖 Sam Shing	21,287 <sup>+</sup>	+25.48%
L13	恆福 Hanford	20,700	+22.02%
L14	富新 Fu Sun	19,390	+14.30%
L15	悅湖 Yuet Wu	13,324	-21.46%
L16	兆禧 Siu Hei	13,096	-22.80%
L17	湖景 Wu King	13,747	-18.96%
L18	蝴蝶 Butterfly	17,013	+0.29%
L19	樂翠 Lok Tsui	14,544	-14.27%
L20	龍門 Lung Mun	17,252	+1.70%
L21	新景 San King	14,585	-14.02%
L22	良景 Leung King	14,416	-15.02%
L23	田景 Tin King	16,443	-3.07%
L24	寶田 Po Tin	19,100	+12.59%
L25	建生 Kin Sang	16,393	-3.37%
L26	兆康 Siu Hong	14,963	-11.80%
L27	景峰 Prime View	19,254	+13.50%
L28	富泰 Fu Tai	20,436	+20.47%
L29	屯門鄉郊 Tuen Mun Rural	21,714	+28.00%
<b>總數 Total :</b>		<b>501,579</b>	

<sup>+</sup> Marine population added

<sup>+</sup> 加上水上人口

元朗區的正式建議摘要  
Summary of Final Recommendations for Yuen Long District

選區代號 Code of Constituency	選區名稱 Name of Constituency	預計人口 Projected Population	標準人口基數 偏離百分比 +/- % of Population Quota (16,964)
M01	豐年 Fung Nin	19,454	+14.68%
M02	水邊 Shui Pin	19,277	+13.63%
M03	南屏 Nam Ping	16,800	-0.97%
M04	北朗 Pek Long	17,016	+0.31%
M05	元朗中心 Yuen Long Centre	17,543	+3.41%
M06	元龍 Yuen Lung	13,959	-17.71%
M07	鳳翔 Fung Cheung	15,611	-7.98%
M08	十八鄉東 Shap Pat Heung East	15,217	-10.30%
M09	十八鄉中 Shap Pat Heung Central	20,104	+18.51%
M10	十八鄉西 Shap Pat Heung West	21,626	+27.48%
M11	屏山南 Ping Shan South	16,337	-3.70%
M12	屏山中 Ping Shan Central	14,201	-16.29%
M13	屏山北 Ping Shan North	12,799	-24.55%
M14	廈村 Ha Tsuen	15,364	-9.43%
M15	天盛 Tin Shing	21,328	+25.73%
M16	瑞愛 Shui Oi	18,325	+8.02%
M17	瑞華 Shui Wah	15,299	-9.81%
M18	頌華 Chung Wah	15,311	-9.74%
M19	悅恩 Yuet Yan	19,339	+14.00%
M20	富恩 Fu Yan	19,773	+16.56%
M21	逸澤 Yat Chak	19,122	+12.72%
M22	天恒 Tin Heng	22,520	+32.75%
M23	宏逸 Wang Yat	20,242	+19.32%
M24	晴景 Ching King	19,925	+17.45%
M25	嘉湖北 Kingswood North	23,223	+36.90%
M26	慈祐 Tsz Yau	14,265	-15.91%
M27	耀祐 Yiu Yau	14,029	-17.30%
M28	天耀 Tin Yiu	14,424	-14.97%
M29	嘉湖南 Kingswood South	17,332	+2.17%
M30	頌栢 Chung Pak	15,681	-7.56%
M31	錦綉花園 Fairview Park	16,460	-2.97%
M32	新田 San Tin	20,990	+23.73%
M33	錦田 Kam Tin	13,462	-20.64%
M34	八鄉北 Pat Heung North	13,208	-22.14%
M35	八鄉南 Pat Heung South	19,645	+15.80%
<b>總數 Total :</b>		<b>609,211</b>	

北區的正式建議摘要  
Summary of Final Recommendations for North District

選區代號 Code of Constituency	選區名稱 Name of Constituency	預計人口 Projected Population	標準人口基數 偏離百分比 +/- % of Population Quota (16,964)
N01	聯和墟 Luen Wo Hui	19,439	+14.59%
N02	粉嶺市 Fanling Town	13,501	-20.41%
N03	祥華 Cheung Wah	17,874	+5.36%
N04	華都 Wah Do	19,452	+14.67%
N05	華明 Wah Ming	17,151	+1.10%
N06	欣盛 Yan Shing	20,102	+18.50%
N07	盛福 Shing Fuk	14,982	-11.68%
N08	粉嶺南 Fanling South	15,365	-9.43%
N09	清河 Ching Ho	20,610	+21.49%
N10	御太 Yu Tai	17,154	+1.12%
N11	上水鄉郊 Sheung Shui Rural	21,578	+27.20%
N12	彩園 Choi Yuen	17,909	+5.57%
N13	石湖墟 Shek Wu Hui	19,736	+16.34%
N14	天平西 Tin Ping West	15,062	-11.21%
N15	鳳翠 Fung Tsui	14,972	-11.74%
N16	沙打 Sha Ta	14,263	-15.92%
N17	天平東 Tin Ping East	17,298	+1.97%
N18	皇后山 Queen's Hill	17,962	+5.88%
<b>總數 Total :</b>		<b>314,410</b>	

大埔區的正式建議摘要  
Summary of Final Recommendations for Tai Po District

選區代號 Code of Constituency	選區名稱 Name of Constituency	預計人口 Projected Population	標準人口基數 偏離百分比 +/- % of Population Quota (16,964)
P01	大埔墟 Tai Po Hui	16,037	-5.46%
P02	大埔中 Tai Po Central	14,109	-16.83%
P03	頌汀 Chung Ting	14,946	-11.90%
P04	大元 Tai Yuen	14,379	-15.24%
P05	富亨 Fu Heng	16,576	-2.29%
P06	怡富 Yee Fu	16,606	-2.11%
P07	富明新 Fu Ming Sun	14,282	-15.81%
P08	廣福及寶湖 Kwong Fuk & Plover Cove	13,459	-20.66%
P09	宏福 Wang Fuk	12,744	-24.88%
P10	大埔滘 Tai Po Kau	19,556	+15.28%
P11	蓮頭塘 Wan Tau Tong	17,024	+0.35%
P12	新富 San Fu	16,714	-1.47%
P13	林村谷 Lam Tsuen Valley	21,098	+24.37%
P14	寶雅 Po Nga	14,902	-12.16%
P15	太和 Tai Wo	15,623	-7.90%
P16	舊墟及太湖 Old Market & Serenity	15,455	-8.90%
P17	康樂園 Hong Lok Yuen	20,783	+22.51%
P18	船灣 Shuen Wan	20,509 <sup>+</sup>	+20.90%
P19	西貢北 Sai Kung North	15,475 <sup>+</sup>	-8.78%
<b>總數 Total :</b>		<b>310,277</b>	

<sup>+</sup> Marine population added

<sup>+</sup> 加上水上人口



西貢區的正式建議摘要  
Summary of Final Recommendations for Sai Kung District

選區代號 Code of Constituency	選區名稱 Name of Constituency	預計人口 Projected Population	標準人口基數 偏離百分比 +/- % of Population Quota (16,964)
Q01	西貢市中心 Sai Kung Central	11,755	-30.71%
Q02	白沙灣 Pak Sha Wan	18,728	+10.40%
Q03	西貢離島 Sai Kung Islands	13,103 <sup>+</sup>	-22.76%
Q04	坑口東 Hang Hau East	15,821 <sup>+</sup>	-6.74%
Q05	坑口西 Hang Hau West	15,591	-8.09%
Q06	寶怡 Po Yee	16,781	-1.08%
Q07	維景 Wai King	15,002	-11.57%
Q08	都善 Do Shin	15,314	-9.73%
Q09	健明 Kin Ming	16,592	-2.19%
Q10	彩健 Choi Kin	19,908	+17.35%
Q11	澳唐 O Tong	18,262	+7.65%
Q12	富君 Fu Kwan	19,951	+17.61%
Q13	軍寶 Kwan Po	13,726	-19.09%
Q14	南安 Nam On	17,506	+3.20%
Q15	康景 Hong King	20,623	+21.57%
Q16	翠林 Tsui Lam	16,311	-3.85%
Q17	寶林 Po Lam	16,722	-1.43%
Q18	欣英 Yan Ying	19,431	+14.54%
Q19	運亨 Wan Hang	21,169	+24.79%
Q20	景林 King Lam	17,890	+5.46%
Q21	厚德 Hau Tak	18,253	+7.60%
Q22	富藍 Fu Nam	17,572	+3.58%
Q23	德明 Tak Ming	19,323	+13.91%
Q24	尚德 Sheung Tak	18,356	+8.21%
Q25	廣明 Kwong Ming	18,555	+9.38%
Q26	環保北 Wan Po North	16,675	-1.70%
Q27	環保南 Wan Po South	16,570	-2.32%
<b>總數 Total :</b>		<b>465,490</b>	

<sup>+</sup> Marine population added

<sup>+</sup> 加上水上人口

沙田區的正式建議摘要  
Summary of Final Recommendations for Sha Tin District

選區代號 Code of Constituency	選區名稱 Name of Constituency	預計人口 Projected Population	標準人口基數 偏離百分比 +/- % of Population Quota (16,964)
R01	沙田市中心 Sha Tin Town Centre	19,821	+16.84%
R02	瀝源 Lek Yuen	16,442	-3.08%
R03	禾輦邨 Wo Che Estate	18,329	+8.05%
R04	第一城 City One	15,824	-6.72%
R05	愉城 Yue Shing	15,363	-9.44%
R06	王屋 Wong Uk	17,586	+3.67%
R07	沙角 Sha Kok	16,543	-2.48%
R08	博康 Pok Hong	16,341	-3.67%
R09	乙明 Jat Min	20,609	+21.49%
R10	秦豐 Chun Fung	15,274	-9.96%
R11	新田圍 Sun Tin Wai	17,028	+0.38%
R12	翠田 Chui Tin	15,432	-9.03%
R13	顯嘉 Hin Ka	13,242	-21.94%
R14	下城門 Lower Shing Mun	18,693	+10.19%
R15	雲城 Wan Shing	20,693	+21.98%
R16	徑口 Keng Hau	20,452	+20.56%
R17	田心 Tin Sum	14,986	-11.66%
R18	翠嘉 Chui Ka	16,045	-5.42%
R19	大圍 Tai Wai	20,765	+22.41%
R20	松田 Chung Tin	15,032	-11.39%
R21	穗禾 Sui Wo	13,191	-22.24%
R22	火炭 Fo Tan	16,960	-0.02%
R23	駿馬 Chun Ma	14,491	-14.58%
R24	頌安 Chung On	20,910	+23.26%
R25	錦濤 Kam To	20,813	+22.69%
R26	馬鞍山市中心 Ma On Shan Town Centre	18,206	+7.32%
R27	利安 Lee On	16,354	-3.60%
R28	富龍 Fu Lung	16,979	+0.09%
R29	烏溪沙 Wu Kai Sha	16,346	-3.64%
R30	錦英 Kam Ying	17,726	+4.49%
R31	耀安 Yiu On	19,370	+14.18%
R32	恒安 Heng On	21,864	+28.88%
R33	鞍泰 On Tai	21,661	+27.69%
R34	大水坑 Tai Shui Hang	17,868	+5.33%
R35	愉欣 Yu Yan	18,197	+7.27%
R36	碧湖 Bik Woo	16,660	-1.79%
R37	廣康 Kwong Hong	18,016	+6.20%
R38	廣源 Kwong Yuen	13,883	-18.16%
<b>總數 Total :</b>		<b>663,995</b>	

**葵青區的正式建議摘要**  
**Summary of Final Recommendations for Kwai Tsing District**

選區代號 Code of Constituency	選區名稱 Name of Constituency	預計人口 Projected Population	標準人口基數 偏離百分比 +/- % of Population Quota (16,964)
S01	葵興 Kwai Hing	17,975	+5.96%
S02	葵盛東邨 Kwai Shing East Estate	18,253	+7.60%
S03	上大窩口 Upper Tai Wo Hau	12,957	-23.62%
S04	下大窩口 Lower Tai Wo Hau	13,301	-21.59%
S05	葵涌邨北 Kwai Chung Estate North	19,197	+13.16%
S06	葵涌邨南 Kwai Chung Estate South	20,793	+22.57%
S07	石蔭 Shek Yam	21,347	+25.84%
S08	安蔭 On Yam	16,044	-5.42%
S09	石籬南 Shek Lei South	19,630	+15.72%
S10	石籬北 Shek Lei North	21,330	+25.74%
S11	大白田 Tai Pak Tin	21,829	+28.68%
S12	葵芳 Kwai Fong	17,652	+4.06%
S13	華麗 Wah Lai	16,655	-1.82%
S14	荔華 Lai Wah	14,771	-12.93%
S15	祖堯 Cho Yiu	15,988	-5.75%
S16	興芳 Hing Fong	20,293	+19.62%
S17	荔景 Lai King	14,095	-16.91%
S18	葵盛西邨 Kwai Shing West Estate	18,254	+7.60%
S19	安瀨 On Ho	20,850	+22.91%
S20	偉盈 Wai Ying	19,576	+15.40%
S21	青衣邨 Tsing Yi Estate	17,201	+1.40%
S22	翠怡 Greenfield	19,924	+17.45%
S23	長青 Cheung Ching	18,733	+10.43%
S24	長康 Cheung Hong	15,560	-8.28%
S25	盛康 Shing Hong	15,138	-10.76%
S26	青衣南 Tsing Yi South	19,744	+16.39%
S27	長亨 Cheung Hang	13,616	-19.74%
S28	青發 Ching Fat	18,267	+7.68%
S29	長安 Cheung On	13,832	-18.46%
<b>總數 Total :</b>		<b>512,805</b>	

離島區的正式建議摘要  
Summary of Final Recommendations for Islands District

選區代號 Code of Constituency	選區名稱 Name of Constituency	預計人口 Projected Population	標準人口基數 偏離百分比 +/- % of Population Quota (16,964)
T01	大嶼山 Lantau	19,207	+13.22%
T02	逸東邨北 Yat Tung Estate North	18,959	+11.76%
T03	逸東邨南 Yat Tung Estate South	20,124	+18.63%
T04	東涌北 Tung Chung North	22,450	+32.34%
T05	東涌南 Tung Chung South	18,489	+8.99%
T06	愉景灣 Discovery Bay	13,390	-21.07%
T07	坪洲及喜靈洲 Peng Chau & Hei Ling Chau	7,376 <sup>+</sup>	-56.52%
T08	南丫及蒲台 Lamma & Po Toi	6,183 <sup>+</sup>	-63.55%
T09	長洲南 Cheung Chau South	11,108	-34.52%
T10	長洲北 Cheung Chau North	11,082 <sup>+</sup>	-34.67%
<b>總數 Total :</b>		<b>148,368</b>	

<sup>+</sup> Marine population added

<sup>+</sup> 加上水上人口