

Appendix VI - A

**Representations on Central & Western District
Summaries of Written Representations**

Item No.	Comments	No. of Representations	EAC's Responses
1	<p><u>A01 Chung Wan and A04 Peak</u> Objected to delineating these two DCCAs along MacDonnell Road because:</p> <p>(a) it hampered the unity of community and residents' sense of belonging;</p> <p>(b) it would be a waste of resources to have 2 DC members to serve residents along MacDonnell Road; and</p> <p>(c) it would adversely affect the voter turnout rate because the polling station for A01, being far away from MacDonnell Road would diffuse the enthusiasm of the voters living on the northern side of MacDonnell Road.</p>	1	<p>The representation was not accepted because the population of A04 (21,943; +28.75%) would exceed the normally permissible deviation of the population quota.</p> <p>It was doubtful that point (a) was sound. Regarding the question of polling station, the EAC would consider setting up a polling station in the Hong Kong Park Indoor Games Hall to facilitate voters living in the northern side of MacDonnell Road.</p>
2	<p><u>A02 Mid Levels East, A11 Sai Ying Pun and A12 Sheung Wan</u> Supported the demarcation of these three DCCAs.</p> <p><u>A05 University and A14 Centre Street</u> The 1994 DBCA southern boundary of A14 should be moved from High Street towards the Mid-levels to fulfill the population requirements to the effect that changes to A05 could be kept to the minimum.</p> <p><u>A01 Chung Wan and A04 Peak</u> No change to the 1994 DBCA boundaries should be made if the populations did not exceed the \pm 25% range of population quota.</p>	1	<p><u>A02, A11 and A12</u> Supporting views noted.</p> <p><u>A05 and A14</u> The boundary between A14 and A05 would be delineated along Bonham Road (see item 4).</p> <p><u>A01 and A04</u> If the 1994 DBCA boundary of A04 was kept intact, its population (21,943) would exceed the population quota by 28.75%. The EAC's proposed changes to A04, which affected A01, were necessary in order to keep the population within the permitted 25% deviation from population quota.</p>

Item No.	Comments	No. of Representations	EAC's Responses
3	<p><u>A03 Castle Road and A13 Tung Wah</u> There were four proposals as to how these two DCCAs should be delineated:</p> <p>(a) along Bonham Road/Caine Road/Ladder Street (i.e. retain the boundary as in the 1994 DB election);</p> <p>(b) along Bonham Road/Caine Road;</p> <p>(c) along Breezy Path/Caine Road/Ladder Street; and</p> <p>(d) along Breezy Path/Caine Road.</p> <p>The supporting reasons were:</p> <p>(a) the southern parts of the roads mentioned above were traditionally regarded as Mid-levels;</p> <p>(b) the problems of Mid-levels residents were different from those of the residents in A13; and</p> <p>(c) Mid-levels residents' sense of belonging and willingness to participate in community activities in A13 would be low.</p>	9	<p>The populations of A03 and A13 for the four proposals would be follows:-</p> <p>(a) A03 : 22,874 (+34.21%) A13 : 10,693 (-37.26%)</p> <p>(b) A03 : 20,918 (+22.74%) A13 : 12,649 (-25.78%)</p> <p>(c) A03 : 20,794 (+22.01%) A13 : 12,773 (-25.05%)</p> <p>(d) A03 : 18,838 (+10.53%) A13 : 14,729 (-13.58%)</p> <p>While community identity might be a valid consideration, there was little scope for adjustment because as indicated above, all proposals, with the exception of proposal (d), would fall short of the population quota by over 25%. On balance, proposal (d) is accepted.</p>
4	<p><u>A05 University and A14 Centre Street</u> The delineation of A14 and A05 should be revised as follows:</p> <p>(a) the northern boundary of A14 be moved northward from Queen's Road West to Des Voeux Road West in A11 Sai Ying Pun; and</p> <p>(b) the northern boundary of A05 be delineated along Bonham Road.</p> <p>The supporting reasons were:</p> <p>(a) to maintain unity and geographical characteristics of Mid-levels, the then BEC having accepted to group residents at the northern part of Bonham Road into A05 in the 1994 DB election;</p> <p>(b) problems faced by residents around Centre Street of Sai Ying</p>	2	<p>The proposed change to the northern boundary of A05 was accepted because:</p> <p>(a) it would improve the homogeneity of the inhabitants living in the south of Bonham Road; and</p> <p>(b) the populations of A14 (14,887; -12.65%) and A05 (19,860; +16.53%) would not exceed the permitted 25% deviation from the population quota.</p> <p>The proposed change to the northern boundary of A14 was not accepted because it:</p> <p>(a) would affect the boundary of A11 which was the same as that of the 1994 DBCA; and</p> <p>(b) was put forward solely to compensate for the loss in population in A14 on the assumption that A14's southern</p>

Item No.	Comments	No. of Representations	EAC's Responses
	<p>Pun are greatly different from those of the Mid-levels residents. Benefits of mid-levels residents would likely be neglected by the elected DC member of A14; and</p> <p>(c) voter turnout rate for A05 would be adversely affected if residents in the areas around Bonham Road and Park Road, who were active voters in the “University” constituency, were transferred from A05 to A14.</p> <p>One of the representations contained the results of an opinion survey which were summarized below:</p> <p>(a) agreed that Park Road, Bonham Road and south of High Street should be grouped with other areas in Mid-levels to form one constituency (Yes – 64, No – 9);</p> <p>(b) agreed to EAC’s proposed recommendations, (Yes – 1, No – 72); and</p> <p>(c) worried that the affected residents would be neglected by the elected DC member of A14 (Yes – 70, Others/No opinion – 3).</p>		<p>boundary would be moved northward to Bonham Road; there was no improvement at all to A11 in respect of community, geographical or development considerations.</p>
5	<p><u>A07 Kwun Lung and A08 Sai Wan</u></p> <p>There were two proposals as to how these two DCCAs should be delineated:</p> <p>(a) the area between Rock Hill Road and Pok Fu Lam Road in A08 should be transferred to A07; and</p> <p>(b) the area between Pokfield Road and Pok Fu Lam Road in A08 should be transferred to A07.</p> <p>The proposals were made on the ground that both population distribution and geographical link could be improved.</p>	<p>6</p> <p>3</p>	<p>The representations were not accepted because:</p> <p>(a) they would affect the boundaries of A07 and A08 which were the same as those of the 1994 DBCAs; and</p> <p>(b) no substantial reason in support of improvement in geographical link was presented.</p>

Summaries of Oral Representations Received
at the Public Forum on 13 April 1999

Item No.	Comments	No. of Representations	EAC's Responses
6	<u>A03 Castle Road and A13 Tung Wah</u> The south-eastern boundary of A13 should be delineated along Caine Road and Ladder Street (i.e. retain the boundary as in the 1994 DB election). Only when this proposal resulted in a deviation from the population quota of more than 25% should consideration be given to delineating the same boundary along Caine Road alone.	1	See item 3.
7	<u>A05 University/A14 Centre Street and A01 Chung Wan/A04 Peak</u> Same as items 1 and 4.	1	See items 1 and 4.
8	<u>District Boundaries</u> Queried why Monmouth Path, which used to be in Wan Chai District, was now in the Central and Western District.	1	The subject is outside EAC's jurisdiction. It should be noted, however, that no change has been made to the boundaries of the Districts concerned.

**Summaries of Views Expressed by PDB Members
at the Meeting of the Central & Western PDB on 12 April 1999**

Item No.	Comments	No. of Representations	EAC's Responses
9	<u>A01 Chung Wan and A04 Peak</u> Same as item 1.	1	See item 1.
10	<u>A03 Castle Road and A13 Tung Wah</u> Same as item 3, comment (c).	2	See item 3.
11	<u>A05 University and A14 Centre Street</u> Same as item 4.	1	See item 4.
12	<u>A07 Kwun Lung and A08 Sai Wan</u> Same as item 5, comment (b).	1	See item 5.
13	<u>A11 Sai Ying Pun and A12 Sheung Wan</u> To maintain community homogeneity and to balance the population between these two DCCAs, the boundary between these two constituencies should be delineated along Eastern Street instead of Wilmer Street.	1	The representation was not accepted because: (a) they would affect the boundaries of A11 and A12 which were the same as those of the 1994 DBCAs; and (b) no substantial reason in support of improvement in community homogeneity had been presented.
14	<u>Criteria for delinating DCCAs</u> (a) The $\pm 25\%$ range of population quota was too big. (b) Population quota and community identity should be of equal importance.	1	The subject is outside EAC's jurisdiction.

Appendix VI - B

**Representations on Wan Chai District
Summaries of Written Representations**

Item No.	Comments	No. of Representations	EAC's Responses
1	<u>Wan Chai District</u> Supported the demarcation of the District.	2	Supporting view noted.
2	<u>Numbering of constituency areas (CAs)</u> The 11 CAs in Wan Chai should be numbered from left to right instead of from the centre in a clockwise spiral.	1	The representation was not accepted because: (a) it was not appropriate to have Wan Chai adopting a numbering system different from the other 17 districts; and (b) the method of numbering from left to right had only taken into one dimension of the plan. It would not be workable, taking into account the top to bottom direction, and the fact that the DCCAs were not regularly aligned.

Appendix VI - C

**Representations on Eastern District
Summaries of Written Representations**

Item No.	Comments	No. of Representations	EAC's Responses
1	<p><u>EAC's provisional recommendations</u> Supported the demarcations of the following DCCAs: C01 Tai Koo Shing West C02 Tai Koo Shing East C03 Lei King Wan C04 Shau Kei Wan C05 A Kung Ngam C08 Yan Yee C09 Siu Sai Wan C13 Mount Parker C25 Quarry Bay C26 Nam Fung C27 Kornhill C28 Kornhill Garden C29 Hing Tung C30 Sai Wan Ho C31 Lower Yiu Tung C32 Upper Yiu Tung</p>	<p>3 (each covering different DCCAs)</p>	<p>Supporting views noted.</p>
2	<p><u>C01 Tai Koo Shing West</u> The name of "Cityplaza 1" should be included in the boundary descriptions of C01.</p>	<p>1</p>	<p>The representation was accepted.</p>
3	<p><u>C01 Tai Koo Shing West and C02 Tai Koo Shing East</u> The estimated total population of these two DCCAs should be 50,792 (on the basis of 4 persons per flat for a total of 12,698 flats) and not 39,873 as published in the boundary descriptions. Tai Koo Shing should therefore be delineated into three DCCAs as follows: (a) Tai Koo Shing West which should include Cityplaza 3 and 20 Mansions (Tang Kung, Yen Kung, Yuan Kung, Ming Kung, Hsia Kung, Han Kung, Chai Kung, Tsui Kung, Ning On, Po On, Shun On, Hing On, Kin On, Ko On, Pine, Banyan, Willow,</p>	<p>6</p>	<p>The representations were not accepted because the EAC considered the population forecasts of C01 (19,094) and C02 (20,779) provided by the Ad Hoc Subgroup more reliable. As advised by the Ad Hoc Subgroup, these population forecasts were derived from the latest information on living quarters and results of the 1996 Population By-census. Specifically, (a) in C01, there were 6,028 living quarters with around 94% occupancy rate and an average of 3.4 persons in each occupied flat resulting in a population of about 19,094; (b) in C02, there were 6,815 living</p>

Item No.	Comments	No. of Representations	EAC's Responses
	<p>Oak, Maple and Juniper).</p> <p>(b) Tai Koo Shing Central which should include Cityplaza 4 and 22 Mansions (Marigold, Begonia, Lotus, Wisteria, Primrose, Hang Sing, Tien Sing, Hoi Sing, Wai Sing, Yiu Sing, Chi Sing, Kam Sing, Ngan Sing, Kai Tien, Hoi Tien, Fu Tien, Choi Tien, Heng Tien, Kwun Tien, Yat Tien, Nam Tien and King Tien).</p> <p>(c) Tai Koo Shing East which should include Tai Lok House, Cityplaza 1 and 19 Mansions (Pak Hoi, Tung Hoi, Nam Hoi, Tung Shan, Tien Shan, Tai Shan, Lu Shan, Nan Shan, Po Shan, Heng Shan, Wah Shan, Loong Shan, Foong Shan, Yee Shan, Kam Shan, Fu Shan, Po Yang, Tai Woo and Tung Ting).</p>		<p>quarters with around 96% occupancy rate and an average of 3.2 persons in each occupied flat resulting in a population of about 20,779;</p> <p>(c) the assumption of 4 persons per flat in the representations was too high and would lead to over-estimation of the population. According to the 1996 Population By-census, the average number of persons per occupied flat was only 3.3 for private residential flats. Such number was declining as revealed in the results of past censuses;</p> <p>(d) the assumption of full occupancy in the representation was too high as some flats might be vacant and a household might occupy more than one flat, which again would lead to over-estimation of the population; and</p> <p>(e) the population figures published in the boundary descriptions referred to residential population only. Transient population such as workers, tourists, visitors and school children was not taken into account.</p>
4	<p><u>C02 Tai Koo Shing East</u> The name of "Tai Lok House" should be included in the boundary descriptions of this DCCA.</p>	1	<p>The representation was not accepted because "Tai Lok House" was not a major estate. Only major estates/areas would be printed in the boundary descriptions.</p>
5	<p><u>C07 Tsui Wan and C37 Hiu Tsui</u> The area south of Chai Wan Road in C07 should be transferred to C37 because the buildings in this area were the same type as those immediately to the east of Hong Ping Street in C37 i.e. private residential buildings.</p>	1	<p>The representation was not accepted because it would:</p> <p>(a) affect the boundaries of C07 and C37 which were the same as those of the 1994 DBCAs; and</p> <p>(b) result in a greater deviation from the population quota in C07 i.e. from 14,412 (-15.44%)</p>

Item No.	Comments	No. of Representations	EAC's Responses
			to 13,083 (-23.24%).
6	<p><u>C15 Tin Hau and C16 Fortress Hill</u> The area bounded by King's Road, Lau Sin Street and Tin Hau Temple Road should be transferred from C15 to C16 for reasons of community integrity and similar domestic characteristics.</p>	2	<p>The representations were not accepted because:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> (a) the proposed changes would result in a greater population deviation in C15 i.e. from 16,689 (-2.08%) to 14,987 (-12.06%); (b) they would affect the boundaries of C15 and C16 which were the same as those of the 1994 DBCAs; and (c) no substantial reason in support of improvement in domestic and geographical links had been presented.
7	<p><u>C16 Fortress Hill and C17 Victoria Park</u> The area around Shell Street, Jupiter Road and Mercury Street in C17 should preferably be grouped into C16.</p>	1	<p>The representation was not accepted because it would:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> (a) affect the boundaries of C16 and C17 which were the same as those of the 1994 DBCAs; and (b) weaken the sense of belonging of the community in C17.
8	<p><u>C16 Fortress Hill and C18 City Garden</u> The two DCCAs should be delineated along King's Road so that the area bounded by Oil Street, Electric Road and Merlin Street could be grouped into C18 for reasons of similar domestic and geographical link and providing convenience to electors to cast their votes at the nearest polling stations.</p>	3	<p>The representations were not accepted because:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> (a) the proposed changes would result in a greater population deviation i.e. C16 from 15,680 (-8%) to 13,111 (-23.07%); C18 from 17,089 (+0.27%) to 19,658 (+15.34%); (b) they would affect the boundaries of C16 and C18 which were the same as those of the 1994 DBCAs; (c) no substantial reason in support of improvement in domestic and geographical links had been presented; and (d) the location of polling stations was not a criterion for delineating DCCAs. <p>The CEO has been requested to take note of the representation when he</p>

Item No.	Comments	No. of Representations	EAC's Responses
			designates polling stations for the DCCAs concerned.
9	<p><u>C19 Provident and C20 Fort Street</u> The two DCCAs should be delineated along King's Road, in order to facilitate electors to cast their votes at the nearest polling stations.</p>	4	<p>The representations were not accepted because:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> (a) they would affect the boundaries of C19 and C20 which were the same as those of the 1994 DBCAs; and (b) the location of polling stations was not a criterion for delineating DCCAs. <p>The CEO has been requested to take note of the representation when he designates polling stations for the DCCAs concerned.</p>
10	<p><u>C21 North Point Estate, C22 Kam Ping and C23 Tanner</u> All three representations opined that Island Place should not be placed in C22.</p> <p>One representation suggested that the area bounded by King's Road, Tin Chiu Street, Tanner Road and Kam Hong Street (which included Island Place) should be placed in C21 as this would help even out the populations between C21 and C22.</p> <p>Another representation suggested that the same area should be placed in C23 as this would help even out the populations between C22 and C23.</p> <p>The third representation offered the general views that:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> (a) the delineation of C22 was unfair because it was the most densely populated in the District; and (b) in terms of cultural background and service need, residents of Island Place were different from those living in the neighbouring 	3	<p>The representations were not accepted because:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> (a) they would affect the boundaries of C21, C22 and C23 which were the same as those of the 1994 DBCAs; and (b) North Point was a built-up area consisting mostly private residential blocks. As shown by the diverse views of the representations, it was doubtful as to whether different community identities existed.

Item No.	Comments	No. of Representations	EAC's Responses
	<p>areas. Island Place should therefore be moved to either C21 or C23.</p>		
11	<p><u>C33 Hing Man and C34 Lok Hong</u> Shan Tsui Court in C34 should be transferred into C33 because geographically it was more related to the adjacent Hing Man Estate in C33. The proposed change would enable electors from Shan Tsui Court to cast their vote at the polling station in Hing Man Estate instead of having to travel a long distance to Lok Man Road if Shan Tsui Court was to remain in C34.</p>	1	<p>The EAC remained of the view that the location of polling station should not be a criterion for delineating DCCAs but nevertheless accepted the representation.</p> <p>This was because the EAC noted, after careful consideration of the geographical situation in the vicinity, that Shan Tsui Court did have close links with Hing Man Estate as both of them used Tai Tam Road for travelling to and from the housing estates. Its community link with the rest of the residential blocks in C34 was however rather weak because it was separated from them by Chai Wan Road – a trunk road with heavy traffic.</p>
12	<p><u>C35 Tsui Tak</u> (a) The name of “Yee Tsui Court” was wrongly included in the boundary descriptions of C07 Tsui Wan. (b) The name of “Yee Tsui Court” was printed outside the boundary of C35 and fell within that of the neighbouring DCCA C07 on the proposed electoral boundary map. This printing arrangement was misleading.</p>	1	<p>(a) The name of “Yee Tsui Court” should only appear in the boundary descriptions of C35. It would be deleted from C07. (b) The location of Yee Tsui Court was correctly shown within the boundary of C35 but its name was not because of the limited space available on the map. The Lands Department would be requested to improve on the positioning of the name on the map.</p>

**Summaries of Oral Representations Received
at the Public Forum on 13 April 1999**

Item No.	Comments	No. of Representations	EAC's Responses
13	<u>C01 Tai Koo Shing West and C02 Tai Koo Shing East</u> Same as items 2, 3 and 4.	1	See items 2, 3 and 4.

Appendix VI - D

**Representations on Southern District
Summaries of Written Representations**

Item No.	Comments	No. of Representations	EAC's Responses
1	<u>D01 Aberdeen and D13 Tin Wan</u> Objected to splitting these two DCCAs along Shek Pai Wan Road as there was a strong tie among residents living on either side of the road. The southern boundary of D13 should be extended to the sea front.	1	The representation was accepted in order to preserve the local tie. The resultant populations would be: D01 : 13,537(-20.57%) D13 : 19,445(+14.09%)
2	<u>D04 Lei Tung I, D05 Lei Tung II and D06 South Horizons East</u> The service reservoir in D05 and the industrial area in D04 should be transferred to D06 because: (a) the only access by lorries and trucks to the industrial area in D04 was through Lee Nam Road which was next to D06; and (b) noise nuisance and air pollution generated by these lorries and trucks mainly affected residents of D06.	1	The representation was accepted . No population was involved.
3	<u>D06 South Horizons East and D07 South Horizons West</u> Supported the demarcation of these two DCCAs.	1	Supporting views noted.

**Summaries of Views Expressed by PDB Members
at the Meeting of the Southern PDB on 29 March 1999**

Item No.	Comments	No. of Representations	EAC's Response
4	<u>D01 Aberdeen and D13 Tin Wan</u> Same as item 1.	4	See item 1.
5	<u>D06 South Horizons East</u> Same as item 2.	5	See item 2.
6	<u>D01 Aberdeen, D13 Tin Wan and D14 Heung Yue</u> D13 should give the private buildings north of Shek Pai Wan Road to D01 and take Yue Kwong Estate from D14.	1	The representation was not accepted because: (a) the resultant population of D14 (12,226) would fall short of the population quota by 28.26%; and (b) Tin Wan Estate in D13 and Yue Kwong Estate in D14 were separated geographically by Tin Wan Shan. Their local tie was not strong.
7	<u>D15 Bays Area and D17 Stanley & Shek O</u> The whole of Chung Hom Kok in D15 should be transferred to D17 because of its close community tie with Stanley.	2	The representations were accepted because: (a) geographically Chung Hom Kok was more closely linked to Stanley than the rest of the Bays Area. Chung Hom Kok's local tie with Stanley would be further enhanced; and (b) the resultant populations would still be within the 25% deviation from the population quota as follows: D15 : 18,945 (+11.16%) D17 : 20,337 (+19.33%)

Appendix VI - E

**Representations on Yau Tsim Mong District
Summaries of Written Representations**

Item No.	Comments	No. of Representations	EAC's Responses
1	<p><u>E05 Charming, E06 Mong Kok West and E07 Mong Kok Central</u> Objected to placing the private buildings in the area bounded by Ferry Street, Pitt Street, Canton Road and Dundas Street in E05 because they were of a different housing type when compared with Charming Garden in E05.</p> <p>Proposed to:</p> <p>(a) move the area concerned to E06; and</p> <p>(b) in order to compensate for the population loss in E05 as a result of (a) above, move Olympian City from E07 to E05.</p>	1	<p>The representation was not accepted because:</p> <p>(a) according to the population figure provided by the Ad Hoc Subgroup, the population forecast of Olympian City as at 31 March 1999 was zero. The inclusion of Olympian City would not increase the population in E05; and</p> <p>(b) the resultant population of E05(8,722) would fall short of the population quota by 48.82%.</p>

**Summaries of Oral Representations Received
at the Public Forum on 14 April 1999**

Item No.	Comments	No. of Representations	EAC's Responses
2	<u>E05 Charming, E06 Mong Kok West and E07 Mong Kok Central</u> Same as item 1.	1	See item 1.

Appendix VI - F

**Representations on Sham Shui Po District
Summaries of Written Representations**

Item No.	Comments	No. of Representations	EAC's Responses
1	<p><u>F01 Po Lai and F02 Cheung Sha Wan</u> Objected to allocating Hung Yu Mansion to F01. Suggested to re-group the building back to F02 because it had been in F02 for many years. Residents and Owners' Corporation of the mansion had a strong tie with residents and Owners' Corporations of other buildings in F02.</p>	1	<p>Items 1 to 4 should be considered together because Hung Yu Mansion and Sunning Court mentioned in items 1 and 2 respectively are actually located within the area described in item 3(a).</p> <p>The 4 representations, except item 3(b), were accepted in order to maintain the community tie. The resultant populations would still be within the permitted $\pm 25\%$ deviation from the population quota as follows: F01 : 15,369 (-9.82%) F02 : 18,559 (+8.90%) F09 : 20,805 (+22.07%)</p>
2	<p><u>F01 Po Lai and F02 Cheung Sha Wan</u> Objected to allocating Sunning Court to F01. Suggested to re-group the building back to F02 because the residents and Owners' Corporation of Sunning Court had a strong tie with residents and Owners' Corporations of other buildings in F02.</p>	1	
3	<p><u>F01 Po Lai and F02 Cheung Sha Wan</u> Suggested either: (a) to move the area bounded by Pratas Street, Un Chau Street, Camp Street and Po On Road from F01 to F02; or (b) to move the area bounded by Pratas Street, Un Chau Street, Camp Street and Shun Ning Road from F01 to F02 and to move Cronin Garden from F02 to F01.</p>	1	

Item No.	Comments	No. of Representations	EAC's Responses
4	<p><u>F02 Cheung Sha Wan and F09 Lai Kok</u> Yee Kok Court and Yee Ching Court should be transferred from F02 to F09 because:</p> <p>(a) Yee Kok Court and Lai Kok Estate shared the same facilities, such as park, access paths, car park and flush water pipe, etc;</p> <p>(b) Yee Ching Court and Lai On Estate, which was in F09, shared the same facilities;</p> <p>(c) residents of the four estates had the same problems, and they solicited help from the same PDB member; and</p> <p>(d) residents of Yee Kok Court and Yee Ching Court went to polling station in F09 to cast their votes in 1998 LegCo election.</p>	3	
5	<p><u>F10 Un Chau, F20 Nam Shan and F21 Shek Kip Mei</u></p> <p>(a) Objected to mixing private buildings and public housing estates in F10 as it would damage the community identity of F10.</p> <p>(b) Allocating part of Shek Kip Mei Estate i.e. Blocks 1-7 to F20 would damage the community identity of Shek Kip Mei Estate. These blocks should be grouped in F21.</p>	1	The representation was not accepted because the resultant population of F21 (22,489) would exceed the population quota by 31.95%.
6	<p><u>F15 Chak On and F19 Tai Hang Tung & Yau Yat Tsuen</u> Objected to Phase III (Towers 26 – 33) of Parc Oasis being split into two DCCAs i.e. F15 and F19 because:</p> <p>(a) Towers 26 – 33 were developed under the same phase;</p> <p>(b) they were managed by the same Management Company and Owners' Corporation;</p> <p>(c) they shared the same common area and club house; and</p>	1	The representation was accepted and Phase III of Parc Oasis would be grouped together in F15. The resultant populations would be as follows: F15 : 17,595 (+3.24%) F19 : 15,543 (-8.80%)

Item No.	Comments	No. of Representations	EAC's Response
	(d) residents of these blocks would be confused.		
7	<p><u>Population</u> Opined that the population of the 21 DCCAs in Sham Shui Po District should be evenly distributed.</p> <p><u>F18 Pak Tin and F20 Nam Shan</u> Objected to any proposal of allocating Blocks 1-7 of Shek Kip Mei Estate to F18 because this would make the population of F18 and F20 uneven.</p>	1	The representation was noted.

Appendix VI - G

**Representations on Kowloon City District
Summaries of Written Representations**

Item No.	Comments	No. of Representations	EAC's Responses
1	<u>Kowloon City District</u> Supported the demarcation of the District.	1	Supporting views noted.
2	<u>G02 Ma Hang Chung and G11 Kai Tak</u> The area around Ming Lun Street, Chung Sun Street, Hing Yin Street and Hing Yan Street should be moved from G02 to G11 as it was more related to G11 in terms of housing type, domestic matter and geographical link.	1	The representation was not accepted because: (a) it would affect the boundaries of G02 and G11 which were the same as those of the 1994 DBCAs and the populations in both DCCAs were all within the permitted 25% deviation from the population quota; (b) representation supporting the delineation of G02 and G11 had been received (see item 1); and (c) the housing type and domestic matters of the areas concerned were similar to the rest of G02. In terms of geographical link, the argument that the area concerned was separated from the rest of G02 by the Ma Tau Kok Cattle Depot and the gas depot was not sound because there existed a good road network. Travelling from the area concerned to the other side of G02 was not inconvenient.
3	<u>G03 Ma Tau Kok</u> To better reflect the identity of DCCA "Ma Tau Kok" (G03), it should preferably be renamed as either "Honour" or "San Shan".	1	The representation was not accepted . Given that the delineation and naming of G03 "Ma Tau Kok" were basically identical to that in the 1994 DB election except that a street block with a population of 1,547 had been allocated to the neighbouring DCCA G13 "To Kwa Wan North", the proposed renaming might confuse the electors who had got used to that name since 1994.

**Summaries of Oral Representations Received
at the Public Forum on 14 April 1999**

Item No.	Comments	No. of Representations	EAC's Responses
4	<p><u>G15 Hok Yuen</u> A new DCCA should be delineated for Laguna Verde because its domestic characteristic was different from that of the neighbouring old residential areas in the same constituency. Upon occupation of the remaining new flats by end 1999, the population of Laguna Verde would be greatly increased to nearly 10,000.</p>	1	The representation was not accepted because the population of Laguna Verde as at end March 1999 was only 2,260, which on its own was not sufficient to form a new DCCA.

Appendix VI - H

**Representations on Wong Tai Sin District
Summaries of Written Representations**

Item No.	Comments	No. of Representations	EAC's Responses
1	<p><u>H04 Fung Wong and H06 Diamond Hill</u> Supported the demarcation of H04 and objected to moving Fung Chuen Court from H06 to H04 for the following reasons:</p> <p>(a) Fung Chuen Court had all along been allocated to H06, residents there would not have the sense of belonging to the new DCCA H04;</p> <p>(b) Fung Chuen Court was separated from H04 by Po Kong Village Road, so residents there were used to use the facilities in Fung Tak Estate; and</p> <p>(c) Fung Chuen Court and H04 belonged to two different Area Committees.</p>	1	Supporting views noted.
2	<p><u>H04 Fung Wong and H06 Diamond Hill</u> Proposed to move Fung Chuen Court from H06 to H04 for the following reasons:</p> <p>(a) Fung Chuen Court was physically near Fung Wong San Tsuen and residents would use the facilities there;</p> <p>(b) Fung Chuen Court and Lung Poon Court were separated by Fung Tak Road, hence they did not belong to the same community; and</p> <p>(c) the population in H06 would increase when housing estates such as Grand View Garden were completed.</p>	1	<p>The representation was not accepted because:</p> <p>(a) the housing in H06 were of a similar type: Fung Chuen Court and Lung Poon Court were blocks of HOS, Galaxia and Grand View Garden were private housing, and the estates to be completed were “sandwich class housing”; their needs should be similar;</p> <p>(b) Fung Chuen Court did not belong to the Area Committee serving H04; and</p> <p>(c) there were supporting views for H04 (see item 1 above).</p>
3	<p><u>H05 Fung Tak and H18 Tsz Wan East</u> Objected to moving Fung Lai Court from H05 to H18. Suggested to retain the 1994 DBCA boundary for H05. Reasons being:</p>	3	The representations were accepted despite the resultant population in H05 (22,711) would exceed the population quota by 33.26% because geographically, Fung Lai Court was

Item No.	Comments	No. of Representations	EAC's Responses
	<p>(a) strong local community ties between Fung Lai Court and Fung Tak Estate;</p> <p>(b) Fung Lai Court was geographically separated from H18 by Po Kong Village Road; and</p> <p>(c) Fung Lai Court belonged to San Tsuen Area Committee while H18 belonged to Tsz Wan Shan Area Committee.</p>		<p>contiguous to Fung Tak Estate. The two estates shared the same facilities such as community centre, market, youth centre, elderly centre, and recreational amenities. In addition, they belonged to the same area committee, i.e. San Tsuen Area Committee. The local community tie between them was strong.</p> <p>The resultant population of H18 would become 15,822 (-7.16%).</p>
4	<p><u>H10 Lok Fu, H12 Tin Keung, H21 Choi Wan East and H23 Choi Wan West</u> Supported the demarcation of these four DCCAs.</p>	1	Supporting views noted.
5	<p><u>H17 Tsz Wan West, H18 Tsz Wan East and H19 Tsz Wan North</u> Proposed to maintain the boundary in 1994 for DCCA H19 and divide the then DBCA Tsz Wan South into two DCCAs as H17 and H18 because of the following reasons:</p> <p>(a) community ties and identities should be considered;</p> <p>(b) the existing boundaries should be maintained as far as possible since residents had got used to them.</p>	1	<p>The representation regarding H17, H18 and H19 was not accepted because:</p> <p>(a) if the 1994 boundary for H19 was accepted, the population (12,147) would fall short of the population quota by 28.73%;</p> <p>(b) the then DBCA Tsz Wan South had a population of 41,851 (+145.56%). Given the high density of population in the buildings, it was not possible to divide the buildings evenly into two DCCAs so that each of them would have an equal population of 20,925. Dividing the DBCA on its own would cause the population in one of the new DCCAs to exceed the population quota by more than 25%.</p>
6	<p><u>H17 Tsz Wan West and H19 Tsz Wan North</u> Suggested to move the existing blocks of Tsz Oi Court from H19 to H17. Reasons being:</p> <p>(a) by mid 2000, the population of H19 would be 43,933 (+158%), due to the completion of six blocks each of Tsz Ching Estate</p>	1	<p>The representation was not accepted because:</p> <p>(a) the resultant population (26,020) in H17 would exceed the population quota by 52.67%;</p> <p>(b) the EAC had to adopt a cut-off date for population forecast which for this demarcation exercise was 31 March 1999;</p>

Item No.	Comments	No. of Representations	EAC's Responses
	<p>and Tsz Oi Court Phase II;</p> <p>(b) by mid 1999, the population of H17 would be 22,134 (+30%), due to the completion of two blocks of Tsz Lok Estate and an hostel for the elderly; and</p> <p>(c) by mid 2000, the proposal would result in a more balanced distribution of population between H17 and H19 which would be 29,420 (+73%) and 36,647 (+115%) respectively.</p>		<p>(c) the whole Tsz Oi Court, after completion in 2000, would then be split and grouped in two DCCAs if the representations were accepted now; and</p> <p>(d) supporting views for H17 and H19 had been received (see item 10 below).</p> <p>The EAC realized the strong feelings of the residents of Tsz Oi Court and had explored the possibility of moving Wong Tai Sin Hospital, Home for the Aged and Our Lady of Maryknoll Hospital (population : 1,263) from H17 to H04 so that H17 could have more capacity to accommodate Tsz Oi Court. Regrettably, the resultant population (24,514) in H17 remained unacceptably high and exceeded the population quota by as much as 43.84%. The EAC finally considered that the present delineation was the most viable option given the constraints of moving the “extra” population in H17 to its adjacent DCCAs.</p>

**Summaries of Oral Representations Received
at the Public Forum on 14 April 1999**

Item No.	Comments	No. of Representations	EAC's Responses
7	<p><u>H04 Fung Wong, H06 Diamond Hill and H18 Tsz Wan East</u> Proposed to allocate Fung Chuen Court and Fung Lai Court which were now in H06 and H18 respectively, to H04 because:</p> <p>(a) both Fung Chuen Court and Fung Lai Court were HOS blocks while Fung Tak Estate was a public housing estate, so it would be more appropriate to group the same type of housing into one DCCA; and</p> <p>(b) population of H04 was the lowest in WTS District.</p>	1	The representation was not accepted because geographically, Fung Chuen Court and Fung Lai Court were physically separated by Fung Tak Estate.
8	<p><u>H05 Fung Tak</u> Supported the demarcation of this DCCA.</p>	1	Supporting views noted.
9	<p><u>H05 Fung Tak and H18 Tsz Wan East</u> Same as item 3.</p>	3	See item 3.
10	<p><u>H17 Tsz Wan West and H19 Tsz Wan North</u> Supported the demarcation of these two DCCAs.</p>	2	Supporting views noted.
11	<p><u>H17 Tsz Wan West and H19 Tsz Wan North</u> Same as item 6.</p>	1	See item 6.
12	<p><u>H21 Choi Wan East</u> Suggested that three blocks of Government Staff Living Quarters in H21 should be included in the Boundary Descriptions.</p>	1	To be effected.

**Summaries of Views Expressed by PDB Members
at the Meeting of the Wong Tai Sin PDB on 31 March 1999**

Item No.	Comments	No. of Representations	EAC's Responses
13	<p><u>Population</u></p> <p>(a) Opined that the EAC should consider including future development and variation in population as criteria for delineating constituency boundaries.</p> <p>(b) Objected to using 31 March 1999 as the cut-off date for forecasting the population figures. Consideration should be given to new housing development projects such as Galaxia and Sandwich Class Housing, the estimated population of "Diamond Hill" (H06) would be over 30,000 after completion.</p> <p>(c) Expressed that a cut-off date was necessary in forecasting population and future change in population should not be taken into account.</p>	<p align="center">1</p> <p align="center">1</p> <p align="center">1</p>	<p>A cut-off date was necessary as a point of reference. Consideration of future development and the resultant variation in population in one DCCA would lead to a corresponding change in population in other DCCAs which are unknown variables.</p>
14	<p><u>Community Considerations</u></p> <p>Expressed that community identities and local ties should be major criteria for delineating constituency boundaries.</p>	3	<p>Due regard had already been paid to such factors.</p>
15	<p><u>Population quota</u></p> <p>Supported the use of population quota as the principal criterion in delineating constituency boundaries.</p>	2	<p>Noted.</p>

Appendix VI - J

**Representations on Kwun Tong District
Summaries of Written Representations**

Item No.	Comments	No. of Representations	EAC's Responses
1	<u>J03 Kai Yip</u> Supported the demarcation of this DCCA.	1	Supporting views noted.
2	<u>J07 Shun Tin West and J10 Shun Tin East</u> Supported the demarcation of these two DCCAs.	1	Supporting views noted.
3	<u>J07 Shun Tin West, J10 Shun Tin East, J27 Hip Hong and J28 Hong Lok</u> (a) Objected to including Hip Way Towers, Wah Fung Gardens and Wan Hon Estate in J07 and proposed to keep them in J27 which was within the proximity of the town centre (J27). (b) To avoid over-population in J27 with the proposed take-over of Hip Way Towers, Wah Fung Gardens and Wan Hon Estate, proposed to transfer the street block within Shung Yan Street and Fu Yan Street from J27 to J28. (c) To avoid under-population in J07, proposed to transfer Tin Lok House of Shun Tin Estate from J10 to J07.	3	The representations essentially requested that Wan Hon Estate, Hip Way Towers and Wah Fung Gardens be grouped in J27 instead of J07. After careful consideration, the EAC accepted the proposal to relocate Wan Hon Estate but not the other two estates to J27 because: (a) there was valid ground in terms of community link – the only access to Wan Hon Estate was through J27; (b) the boundaries of J10 (which includes Tin Lok House) and J28 (which includes Shung Yan Street and Fu Yan Street) were the same as those of the 1994 DBCAs and the populations in both DCCAs were within the permitted 25% deviation from the population quota. No representation objecting to these DCCAs had been received. As a matter of fact, item 2 above and item 16 below supported the delineation of J07 & J10; and (c) to accommodate the wish of one DCCA i.e. J07 to preserve its community integrity would be at the expense of sacrificing the community integrity of two DCCAs i.e. J10 and J28 if the proposals contained in (b) and

Item No.	Comments	No. of Representations	EAC's Responses
			<p>(c) under the "comments" column were accepted.</p> <p>The resultant populations after allocating Wan Hon Estate to J27 are as follows: J07 : 13,265 (-22.17%) J27 : 21,026 (+23.37%)</p>
4	<p><u>J11 Sau Mau Ping West and J13 Sau Mau Ping East</u> Sau Mau Ping Estate (J11 and J13) should be delineated into north and south instead of into east and west along Sau Ming Road so as to reflect the geography and community setting.</p> <p>Blocks 37 to 41, Sau Hong House, Sau Lok House, Sau Fu House and Sau On House should form Sau Mau Ping North while Blocks 19 to 25 and Sau Ming House should form Sau Ming Ping South.</p>	3	<p>The representations were accepted because:</p> <p>(a) the arguments in support of the representations in terms of local geography and community setting were considered valid; and</p> <p>(b) the proposals would produce a better population distribution as follows: J11: 16,603 (-2.58%) J13: 16,679 (-2.14%)</p> <p>The DCCAs were to be renamed.</p>
5	<p><u>J11 Sau Mau Ping West, J13 Sau Mau Ping East, J20 Yau Tong Sze Shan, J30 Upper Ngau Tau Kok and J31 Lower Ngau Tau Kok</u> Supported the demarcation of these five DCCAs and the use of population quota as the main criterion for delineation.</p>	1	Supporting views noted.
6	<p><u>J12 Hiu Lai and J25 Po Lok</u> The 4 private buildings Hiu Ming Court, Hiu Kwong Court, Fu Wah Court and Hiu Wah Building in J25 should be transferred to J12. In terms of geography and community link, these buildings were closer to Hiu Lai than Po Lok.</p>	4	<p>The representations were accepted because:</p> <p>(a) the arguments in support of the representations in terms of local geography and community setting were considered valid; and</p> <p>(b) the resultant populations would not exceed the population quota by more than 25%: J12: 20,752 (+21.76%) J25: see item 8 below</p>

Item No.	Comments	No. of Representations	EAC's Responses
7	<p><u>J14 Hing Tin, J15 Tak Tin, J16 Lam Tin, J17 Kwong Tak, J18 Ping Tin and J19 Hong Pak</u> Supported the demarcation of these six DCCAs.</p>	1	Supporting views noted.
8	<p><u>J24 Tsui Ping North and J25 Po Lok</u> Proposed to move: (a) Tsui Nam House, Tsui Mui House and Tsui Yue House of Tsui Ping (North) Estate from J24 to J25; and (b) Tsui Mei House and Tsui Yeung House from J25 to J24, in order to maintain integrity of the community.</p> <p>Tsui Ping (North) Estate should form a DCCA on its own.</p>	<p>2</p> <p>1</p>	<p>The representations were accepted because: (a) Tsui Nam House, Tsui Mui House and Tsui Yue House were in close proximity to Po Pui Court and Wo Lok Estate and they shared common community facilities. Tsui Mei House (707) and Tsui Yeung House (1774) were situated on the same side of Tsui Ping Road; and (b) the resultant populations would be within the permitted $\pm 25\%$ deviation from the population quota: J24 : 14,736 (-13.54%) J25 : 18,496 (+8.53%)</p> <p>The representation was not accepted because the above package should have already met the wish of the local community.</p>
9	<p><u>Ngau Tau Kok and Lam Tin areas</u> Queried the rationale for reducing 1 DCCA in Ngau Tau Kok area (7 DCCA to 6) while increasing 1 DCCA in Lam Tin area (5 to 6), which had a smaller population figure.</p>	1	Delineation was on the basis of the population in an entire District, not the population in specific areas in the District.

**Summaries of Oral Representations Received
at the Public Forum on 14 April 1999**

Item No.	Comments	No. of Representations	EAC's Responses
10	<u>J07 Shun Tin West, J10 Shun Tin East and J27 Hip Hong</u> Same as item 3.	2	See item 3.
11	<u>J11 Sau Mau Ping West and J13 Sau Mau Ping East</u> Same as item 4.	2	See item 4.
12	<u>J12 Hiu Lai, J13 Sau Mau Ping East and J25 Po Lok</u> (a) One representation was the same as item 6. (b) Another representation suggested to move Hiu Ming Court, Hiu Kwong Court, Fu Wah Court and Hiu Wah Building from J25 to J13, because J13 had a population of about 15,000 and thus had more capacity to take in the 4 buildings as compared with J12 with a population of 16,875.	2	For comments (a), please see item 6. Comment (b) was not accepted because it neglected the community consideration.
13	<u>J24 Tsui Ping North and J25 Po Lok</u> Same as item 8.	2	See item 8.
14	<u>J30 Upper Ngau Tau Kok and J31 Lower Ngau Tau Kok</u> Objected to delineating Ngau Tau Kok area into 2 DCCAs as this would affect the unity of the community and would upset the work of the Area Committees. Proposed to: (a) retain the 1994 DBCA boundaries for Ngau Tau Kok area i.e. having 3 DCCAs of Upper Ngau Tau Kok, Central Ngau Tau Kok and Lower Ngau Tau Kok; and (b) if (a) above was not considered viable by EAC, exclude Tak Po Garden (a private building development) from J31.	1	The representation was not accepted because: (a) due to the redevelopment programme in Ngau Tau Kok Estate, its population had dropped considerably. It was not justified to have 3 DCCAs with 2 of them having a population below the population quota as follows:- Upper Ngau Tau Kok : 12,190 (-28.48%) Central Ngau Tau Kok : 10,422 (-38.85%) (b) the number of DCCAs in Kwun Tong District would increase only by one from 33 to 34. If this additional DCCA was given to Ngau Tau Kok area as

Item No.	Comments	No. of Representations	EAC's Responses
			<p>proposed, it would be unfair to other areas e.g. DCCA J19 Hong Pak, the population of which (34,111; +100.15%) had doubled since 1994 (17,911; +4.98%);</p> <p>(c) Tak Po Garden had always been in J31; and</p> <p>(d) representation objecting to maintaining 3 DCCAs for Ngau Tau Kok was received (see item 15).</p>
15	<p><u>J30 Upper Ngau Tau Kok and J31 Lower Ngau Tau Kok</u> Supported the demarcation of these two DCCAs.</p> <p>Objected to any proposal of maintaining 3 DCCAs in Ngau Tau Kok area. The population quota should be strictly followed. Besides, Tak Po Garden had all along been within the same constituency area with Ngau Tau Kok Estate. No change should be made.</p>	1	<p>Supporting views noted.</p> <p>Also see item 14.</p>

**Summaries of Views Expressed by PDB Members
at the Meeting of the Kwun Tong PDB on 12 April 1999**

Item No.	Comments	No. of Representations	EAC's Responses
16	<u>J07 Shun Tin West and J10 Shun Tin East</u> Same as item 2.	1	See item 2.
17	<u>J07 Shun Tin West, J10 Shun Tin East and J27 Hip Hong</u> Same as item 3.	4	See item 3.
18	<u>J11 Sau Mau Ping West and J13 Sau Mau Ping East</u> Same as item 4.	3	See item 4.
19	<u>J12 Hiu Lai and J25 Po Lok</u> Same as item 6.	2	See item 6.
20	<u>J14 Hing Tin and J16 Lam Tin</u> Supported the demarcation of these two DCCAs.	2	Supporting views noted.
21	<u>J14 Hing Tin, J15 Tak Tin, J16 Lam Tin, J17 Kwong Tak, J18 Ping Tin and J19 Hong Pak</u> Same as item 7.	1	See item 7.
22	<u>J24 Tsui Ping North and J25 Po Lok</u> Same as item 8.	2	See item 8.
23	<u>Ngau Tau Kok and Lam Tin area</u> Same as item 9.	1	See item 9.
24	<u>Lam Tin area</u> Supported the demarcation of this area.	1	Supporting views noted.

Appendix VI - K

**Representations on Tsuen Wan District
Summaries of Written Representations**

Item No.	Comments	No. of Representations	EAC's Responses
1	<u>Tsuen Wan District</u> Supported the demarcation of the District.	3	Supporting views noted.
2	<u>K08 Allway, K09 Lai To, K12 Tsuen Wan Rural East and K14 Lei Muk Shue East</u> Proposed to transfer the following areas from K12 to other DCCAs: (a) Hon Man Tsuen to K09; (b) Chuen Lung Village to K08, using Route Twisk as boundary; and (c) Shing Mun Reservoir and the surrounding areas to K14 .	1	The representation was accepted because: (a) the sole access to Hon Man Tsuen was a footpath within K09 and the village was not connected with K12 either geographically or socially; (b) the ties of Chuen Lung Village were historically and traditionally with Tsuen Wan Town Centre. Transportation facilities ran between Chuen Lung and Tsuen Wan Town through K08; (c) the only access by car to Shing Mun Reservoir was via Shing Mun Road in K14 and the Wo Yip Hop Village in K14 had long been identified with the Shing Mun Reservoir area; and (d) the resultant populations would be: K08 : 18,984 (+11.39%) K09 : 17,249 (+1.21%) K12 : 14,178 (-16.81%) K14 : 15,560 (-8.70%)
3	<u>K14 Lei Muk Shue East and K15 Lei Muk Shue West</u> Supported the demarcation of these two DCCAs.	5	Supporting views noted.

**Summaries of Oral Representations Received
at the Public Forum on 15 April 1999**

Item No.	Comments	No. of Representations	EAC's Responses
4	<p><u>K02 Yeung Uk Road</u> Regarding the population figure of K02:</p> <p>(a) One representation opined that the population had been over-estimated because people were moving out of a re-development residential area (bounded by Tai Ho Road, Sha Tsui Road, Luen Yan Street and Yeung Uk Road) in the DCCA; and</p> <p>(b) another representation opined that the population figure was correct because Po Shek Mansion which had not yet been fully occupied in the 1994 demarcation exercise was now fully occupied.</p>	2	As confirmed with the Planning Department, the population forecast for K02 was correct.
5	<p><u>K12 Tsuen Wan Rural East</u> One representation each with the same suggestion regarding Hon Man Tsuen, Chuen Lung Village and Shing Mun Reservoir as in item 2.</p>	3	See item 2.

Appendix VI - L

**Representations on Tuen Mun District
Summaries of Written Representations**

Item No.	Comments	No. of Representations	EAC's Responses
1	<p><u>L07 Tsui Hing and L11 Hing Tsak</u> The population of L07 and L11 should be 18,384 and 19,927 respectively, not 13,720 and 21,133 as contained in EAC's provisional recommendations.</p>	16	<p>The population figures quoted in the representations were based mainly on the information papers prepared for the Area Committee. They were estimated by DO staff after having consulted building management offices. Upon EAC's request, the Ad Hoc Subgroup had re-confirmed that its population forecasts were correct. The representation was not accepted.</p>
2	<p><u>L11 Hing Tsak</u> Supported the demarcation of this DCCA.</p>	1	<p>Supporting views noted.</p>
3	<p><u>L12 San Hui and L13 Prime View</u> The private residential estate of Brilliant Garden (in L12) and the villages Tuen Mun San Hui Tsuen and Leung Tin Tsuen, etc. (in L13) should be swapped. This arrangement would result in better community identity in these two DCCAs.</p>	1	<p>The representation was accepted because: (a) L12 and L13 were new DCCAs in the EAC's provisional recommendation; (b) the suggestion was justified on community integrity considerations; and (c) better population distribution would be achieved in that L12 would improve from 14,247 (-16.41%) to 14,997 (-12%) and L13 from 18,288 (+7.31%) to 17,538 (+2.9%).</p>
4	<p><u>L17 Siu Shan</u> (a) Siu Shan Court should be removed from L17 so that the remaining two residential estates namely Sun Tuen Mun Centre and Glorious Garden could form a DCCA of their own. (b) The newly formed DCCA should be renamed as Sun Fu.</p>	1	<p>The representation was not accepted because the population of the proposed DCCA (9,453; -44.53%) would fall short of the population quota by much more than 25%. In order to reflect the names of the two largest estates in the DCCA, L17 would be renamed to Siu Sun.</p>

Item No.	Comments	No. of Representations	EAC's Responses
5	<u>L20 Wu King</u> Supported the demarcation of this DCCA.	8	Supporting views noted.
6	<u>L23 Lung Mun</u> Lung Mun Oasis in L23 had a population of 16,000 and should therefore form a separate DCCA on its own.	8	The representation was not accepted because as advised by the Ad Hoc Subgroup, the population of Lung Mun Oasis was only 10,517 which fell short of the population quota by 38.29%.
7	<u>L23 Lung Mun</u> A polling station should be designated for Lung Kwu Tan.	16	The EAC would try to accommodate the request.
8	<u>L25 Tuen Mun Rural</u> The whole Wo Ping Sun Chuen, Shun Tat Street and Fuk Hang Tsuen should be included in L25 in order to maintain community integrity.	16	L25 had already included the two villages and the street mentioned in the representations. For the avoidance of doubt, the names of the two villages would be printed in the boundary description of L25.

**Summaries of Oral Representations Received
at the Public Forum on 15 April 1999**

Item No.	Comments	No. of Representations	EAC's Responses
9	<p><u>L07 Tsui Hing</u> Chelsea Heights should be transferred from L07 to L10 Tai Hing South or L12 San Hui.</p> <p><u>L11 Hing Tsak</u> Supported the demarcation of this DCCA.</p> <p><u>Population figures</u> Doubted the accuracy of the population figures adopted by the EAC.</p>	1	<p>The representation was not accepted because the resultant population of 12,151 in L07 would fall short of the population quota by 28.70%.</p> <p>Supporting view noted.</p> <p>The population figures quoted by the representation were based mainly on the information papers prepared for the Area Committee. They were estimated by DO staff after having consulted building management offices. Upon EAC's request, the Ad Hoc Subgroup had re-confirmed that its population forecasts were correct. The representation was not accepted.</p>
10	<p><u>L17 Siu Shan</u> Same as item 4.</p>	1	See item 4.

Appendix VI - M

**Representations on Yuen Long District
Summaries of Written Representations**

Item No.	Comments	No. of Representations	EAC's Responses
1	<p><u>M07 Shap Pat Heung North and M08 Shap Pat Heung South</u> Tai Kei Leng Tsuen should be transferred from M07 to M08 in order to facilitate voters of the village to cast their votes at a more conveniently located polling station.</p>	1	<p>The representation was not accepted because polling station was not a criterion for demarcation. Nevertheless, the EAC had asked REO to pay attention to this representation when identifying polling station for M07.</p>
2	<p><u>M09 Ping Shan South and M10 Ping Shan North</u> Fui Sha Wai and San Hei Tsuen which were part and parcel of the “Three Wai and Six Tsuen” should be transferred from M09 to M10 where the remaining seven villages were located.</p>	1	<p>The representation was accepted because all nine villages belonged to the Tang clan and it would be proper if they could be grouped together. The resultant populations would be: M09: 14,270 (-16.27%) M10: 16,490 (-3.24%)</p>
3	<p><u>M19 Fairview Park and M20 San Tin Palm Springs in M19 and Royal Palms in M20</u> should be grouped together either in M19 or M20 because they belonged to one single development and were managed by one management company.</p>	2	<p>The representations were accepted because: (a) the argument in support of the representations in terms of community integrity was considered valid; and (b) the resultant populations would not depart from the population quota by more than 25%: M19: 16,353 (-4.05%) M20: 17,221 (+1.04%)</p>

**Summaries of Oral Representations Received
at the Public forum on 15 April 1999**

Item No.	Comments	No. of Representations	EAC's Responses
4	<u>M07 Shap Pat Heung North</u> Claimed that in the 1994 DB election, voters of "Chun Wah Villas Phase III" and "Pretti Coins Garden" in this DCCA were wrongly assigned to a polling station located in M08 Shap Pat Heung South.	1	The EAC had asked the REO to look into the allegation.
5	<u>M08 Shap Pat Heung South</u> Some parts of M08 should be transferred to other DCCAs as its population was large.	1	The representation was not accepted because: (a) the boundary of M08 was the same as that of the 1994 DBCA; and (b) although its population was large (20,053; +17.66%), its deviation from the population quota was still less than 25%.
6	<u>M19 Fairview Park and M20 San Tin</u> Same as item 3.	1	See item 3.

Appendix VI - N

**Representations on North District
Summaries of Written Representations**

Item No.	Comments	No. of Representations	EAC's Responses
1	<u>DCCAs in North District</u> Supported the demarcation of all DCCAs in North District.	4	Supporting views noted.
2	<u>N02 Fanling Town and N11 Shek Wu Hui</u> So Kwun Po Tsuen should be transferred from N11 to N02 because the residents there belonged to the same clan as the residents of Fanling Wai Tsuen and Fan Leng Lau Tsuen in N02.	2	The representation was accepted because: (a) the integrity of the rural villages concerned should be maintained; and (b) the resultant populations would not exceed the permitted deviation from the population quota: N02: 18,877 (+10.76%) N11: 14,795 (-13.19%)
3	<u>N12 Tin Ping West and N13 Tin Ping East</u> Supported the demarcation of these two DCCAs.	6	Supporting views noted.
4	<u>N15 Sha Ta and N16 Queen's Hill</u> Wang Shan Keuk San Tsuen should be transferred from N16 to N15 because it was under the purview of the Sha Tau Kok Rural Committee instead of the Fanling Rural Committee.	1	The representation was not accepted because: (a) the boundaries of N15 and N16 were the same as those of the 1994 DBCAs. As a matter of fact, Wang Shan Keuk San Tsuen was included in N16 in 1994 at the request of the North DB and Fanling Rural Committee. At that time, this village was part of the Fanling Rural Committee; (b) although the village had now become part of the Sha Tau Kok Rural Committee, the EAC was given to understand that Fanling Rural Committee still considered that the village should remain in N16; and (c) there were diverse views on the proposed change as indicated in (b) above.

**Summaries of Oral Representations Received
at the Public Forum on 16 April 1999**

Item No.	Comments	No. of Representations	EAC's Responses
5	<u>N02 Fanling Town and N11 Shek Wu Hui</u> Same as item 2.	1	See item 2.

Appendix VI - P

**Representations on Tai Po District
Summaries of Written Representations**

Item No.	Comments	No. of Representations	EAC's Responses
1	<p><u>P10 Tai Po Kau and P12 San Fu</u> Objected to the delineation of P10 and P12 and suggested to move Ha Wan Yiu, Lai Chi Shan, Sheung Wun Yiu, San Uk Ka, Pun Shan Chau, Yuen Tun Ha, Ta Tit Yan, etc. to P12 for the following reasons:</p> <p>(a) residents in these villages relied on Tat Wan Road in P12 for access to the railway station while residents in the eastern part of P10 made use of Tai Po Road in P10 for communication with other areas; and</p> <p>(b) villagers concerned were served by the Post Office in P11, which was adjacent to P12, instead of the Post Office in P10.</p>	1	<p>The representation was not accepted because:</p> <p>(a) the resultant population of 10,356 in P10 would fall short of the population quota by 39.24%;</p> <p>(b) judging from rural nature of the villages, it would be more appropriate to include them in P10 which was mainly rural in nature instead of P12 which was a more town-like area with high-rise buildings; and</p> <p>(c) the reasons given in the representation were not sufficient.</p>
2	<p><u>P13 Lam Tsuen Valley and P14 Po Nga</u> Proposed to include Shui Wai Village in P13 instead of P14 for the following reasons:</p> <p>(a) Shui Wai Village had the same community identity with villages in P13 but was rather different in nature from Tai Wo Estate/Po Nga Court in P14;</p> <p>(b) Matters related to Shui Wai Village should be dealt with by a DC member familiar with village affairs; and</p> <p>(c) population of P13 and P14 would deviate less from the population quota if the population of Shui Wai Village was transferred from P14 to P13.</p>	2	<p>The representations were accepted because:</p> <p>(a) Shui Wai Village identified more with the villages in P13 than the remaining part of P14 which consisted mainly of public housing estate and HOS developments; and</p> <p>(b) there would be improvement in the resultant population distribution in both P13 and P14 as follows: P13 : from 15,007 (-11.95%) to 15,441 (-9.40%) P14 : from 19,164 (+12.44) to 18,730 (+9.90%)</p>

Item No.	Comments	No. of Representations	EAC's Responses
3	<u>P17 Hong Lok Yuen</u> Proposed to include "Chuk Hang" in the boundary descriptions of P17 for the reason that its population was higher than those of some other villages in the constituency.	1	The representation was accepted .

Appendix VI - Q

**Representations on Sai Kung District
Summaries of Written Representations**

Item No.	Comments	No. of Representations	EAC's Responses
1	<u>Q01 Sai Kung Central, Q02 Pak Sha Wan and Q03 Sai Kung Islands</u> Supported the demarcation for these DCCAs.	1	Supporting views noted.
2	<u>Q01 Sai Kung Central and Q03 Sai Kung Islands</u> These DCCAs should be divided along Hiram's Highway because: (a) the housing types on the two sides of the Hiram's Highway were different; and (b) the proposed delineation would improve population distribution.	1	The representation was accepted because: (a) better population distribution would be achieved in Q01 from 20,045 (+17.61%) to 15,655 (-8.14%) and in Q03 from 7,047 (-58.65%) to 11,437 (-32.89%); and (b) the different community ties on each side of Hiram's Highway would not be disturbed.
3	<u>Q02 Pak Sha Wan</u> Supported the demarcation for this DCCA.	1	Supporting views noted.
4	<u>Q02 Pak Shan Wan and Q03 Sai Kung Islands</u> Nam Shan Village should be transferred from Q02 to Q03 because it was more convenient for its residents to vote in the polling station in Q03.	1	The representation was not accepted because polling station was not a criterion for demarcation. Nevertheless, the EAC had asked REO to pay attention to this representation when identifying polling station for Q02.
5	<u>Q04 Hang Hau East and Q06 Hang Hau West</u> (a) Tai Po Tsai Village should be transferred from Q06 to Q04 because it had close relationship with the villages in Q04 in terms of traffic access and cultural background. (b) Hang Hau Village, Shui Bin Village, and Film Studio on the east of Ying Yip Road should be transferred from Q06 to Q04 as the communities there were more closely related to the Hang Hau	3 4	Representations (a) to (c) were accepted because: (a) the local ties of the villages would be preserved; and (b) the resultant populations would not exceed the permitted deviation from the population quota: Q04: 18,183 (+6.69%) Q06: 12,868 (-24.50%)

Item No.	Comments	No. of Representations	EAC's Responses
	<p>Rural Committee in Q04.</p> <p>(c) Shui Bin Village and the areas of San Wan Sin should be transferred from Q06 to Q04.</p> <p>(d) Film Studio and Hang Hau Village should remain in Q06.</p>		
6	<p><u>Q05 Sheung Tak, Q13 Hau Tak and Q17 Kwong Ming</u></p> <p>(a) Chung Ming Court in Q13 should be grouped with East Point City, Yuk Ming Court and Wo Ming Court in Q15 to form one DCCA.</p> <p>(b) Fu Ning Garden in Q14 should be grouped with Ming Tak Estate and Hin Ming Court in Q15 to form one DCCA.</p> <p>(c) On Ning Garden in Q16 should be grouped with La Cite Noble, Nan Fung Plaza and Maritime Bay to form one DCCA.</p> <p>(d) Tseung Kwan O Town Center and Tiu Keng Leng should be divided into two DCCAs as follows:</p> <p>(i) Sheung Tak Estate and Tong Ming Court in Q05 should be grouped with Beverly Garden in Q16.</p> <p>(ii) Kwong Ming Court and Po Ming Court in Q17 should be grouped together.</p>	2	<p>The proposed grouping in (d)(ii) was in fact EAC's proposed delineation for Q17. The other groupings were not accepted because two of them would have populations exceeding the permitted departure from the population quota:</p> <p>Proposal (c) : 9,370 (-45.02%)</p> <p>Proposal (d)(i): 25,989 (+52.49%)</p>
7	<p><u>Q05 Sheung Tak and Q16 On Hong</u></p> <p>Beverly Garden should be transferred from Q16 to Q05 because it was near Sheung Tak Estate.</p>	1	<p>The representation was not accepted because:</p> <p>(a) Q05 would then have a population of 25,989 which would exceed the population quota by 52.49%; and</p> <p>(b) representation supporting the demarcation of Q16 had been received (see item 8).</p>

Item No.	Comments	No. of Representations	EAC's Responses
8	<u>Q05 Sheung Tak, Q16 On Hong and Q17 Kwong Ming</u> Supported the demarcation for these DCCAs.	1	Supporting views noted.
9	<u>Q05 Sheung Tak and Q17 Kwong Ming</u> Sheung Tak Estate should be transferred from Q05 to Q17 to join Po Ming Court and Kwong Ming Court, all of which were managed by the Housing Authority.	1	The representation was not accepted because the proposed grouping would have a population of 32,051 which would exceed the population quota by 88.10%.
10	<u>Q08 Hong King and Q11 Wan Hang</u> Well On Garden and Finery Park should be transferred from Q08 to Q11.	1	The representation was not accepted because Q11 would then have a population of 22,438 which would exceed the population quota by 43.39%.
11	<u>Q11 Wan Hang and Q12 King Lam</u> Ho Ming Court should be transferred from Q11 to Q12 because it shared common facilities with King Lam Estate in Q12.	2	The representation was not accepted because Q12 would then have a population of 23,818 which would exceed the population quota by 39.75%.
12	<u>Q13 Hau Tak and Q14 Fu Ning</u> Yu Ming Court should be transferred from Q14 to Q13 because: (a) it shared common facilities with Hau Tak Estate in Q13; and (b) its Mutual Aid Committee had already built up close relationship with those in Hau Tak Estate.	4	The representations were not accepted because: (a) the resultant populations would exceed the permissible deviation from the population quota: Q13: 10,122 (-40.61%) Q14: 24,660 (+44.69%) (b) as a result of Yu Ming Court being grouped with Hau Tak Estate, Fu Ning Garden would have to be grouped with Ming Tak Estate in Q15. 2 representations (items 15 and 27), however, objected to this way of delineation.
13	<u>Q13 Hau Tak, Q14 Fu Ning, Q15 Tung Ming and Q16 On Hong</u> (a) Fu Ning Garden in Q14 and Ming Tak Estate in Q15 should be grouped together; (b) Q15 should only consist of Yuk Ming Court, Hin Ming Court and East Point City; and (c) Chung Ming Court should be transferred from Q13 to Q16.	1	The representation was not accepted because the population of Q05 Sheung Tak would exceed the population quota by 52.67% as a result of the proposed groupings.

Item No.	Comments	No. of Representations	EAC's Responses
14	<u>Q14 Fu Ning</u> (a) Supported the demarcation for this DCCA. (b) The DCCA should be renamed as “Fu Yu” so as to reflect the major estates in the DCCA.	1	(a) Supporting views noted. (b) Proposed new name accepted .
15	<u>Q15 Tung Ming</u> Supported the demarcation for this DCCA.	1	Supporting views noted.

**Summaries of Oral Representations Received
at the Public Forum on 16 April 1999**

Item No.	Comments	No. of Representations	EAC's Responses
16	<u>Q01 Sai Kung Central and Q03 Sai Kung Islands</u> Same as item 2.	1	See item 2.
17	<u>Q01 Sai Kung Central and Q03 Sai Kung Islands</u> Q01 and Q03 should be renamed as Sai Kung South and Sai Kung North respectively.	1	The representation was not accepted because the names were representative enough and had also been accepted by residents for a long time.
18	<u>Q02 Pak Sha Wan</u> Supported the demarcation of this DCCA.	1	Supporting views noted.
19	<u>Q02 Pak Sha Wan and Q03 Sai Kung Islands</u> Same as item 4.	1	See item 4.
20	<u>Q03 Sai Kung Islands</u> The DCCA should be renamed as Sai Kung Rural East and Islands.	1	The representation was not accepted because Sai Kung Islands was representative enough and had also been accepted by residents for a long time.
21	<u>Q04 Hang Hau East and Q06 Hang Hau West</u> Same as item 5(a).	1	See item 5.
22	<u>Q04 Hang Hau East and Q06 Hang Hau West</u> Same as item 5(a) – (c).	1	See item 5.
23	<u>Q05 Sheung Tak, Q16 On Hong and Q17 Kwong Ming</u> Supported the demarcation of these DCCAs.	1	Supporting views noted.
24	<u>Q05 Sheung Tak and Q17 Kwong Ming</u> Same as item 9.	1	See item 9.
25	<u>Q13 Hau Tak and Q14 Fu Ning</u> Same as item 12	4	See item 12.

Item No.	Comments	No. of Representations	EAC's Responses
26	<u>Q13 Hau Tak and Q16 On Hong</u> Objected to grouping Chung Ming Court in Q13 and On Ning Garden in Q16 together.	1	Point noted.
27	<u>Q15 Tung Ming</u> Supported the demarcation for this DCCA.	1	Supporting views noted.

Appendix VI - R

**Representations on Sha Tin District
Summaries of Written Representations**

Item No.	Comments	No. of Representations	EAC's Responses
1	<u>R08 Pok Hong</u> Supported the demarcation of R08.	2	Supporting views noted.
2	<u>R09 Jat Min</u> Supported the demarcation of R09.	1	Supporting views noted.
3	<u>R10 Chan Kam</u> Supported the demarcation of R10.	3	Supporting views noted.
4	<u>R10 Chun Kam, R11 Sun Chui, R30 Tsang Tai Uk, R31 Sun Tin Wai, R32 Keng Hau and R36 Chui Tin</u> Proposed to delineate the DCCAs as follows:- (a) the 3 blocks of Sun Chui Estate should be transferred from R36 to R11 to keep the estate intact in R11; (b) Chun Shek Estate should be transferred from R10 to R30 and the remaining villages in R30 be grouped into adjacent DCCAs, i.e. Sha Tin Tau New Village to R31, Sha Tin Wai, Fui Yiu Ha and Tsok Pok Hang to R08; (c) the rest of R10, including Golden Lion Garden Phase I, Greenview Garden and San Tin Village, Kak Tin Village in R31 together with Worldwide Garden in R32 should be transferred to R36; and (d) the extra seat, resulting from combining R10 and R30, should be allocated to Ma On Shan area.	2	The representation was not accepted because: (a) the boundaries of all the DCCAs involved were the same as those of the 1994 DBCA, and the populations in all of them were within the permitted 25% departure from the population quota; and (b) the re-allocation of an extra seat to Ma On Shan area would inevitably lead to substantial changes to the provisional recommendations for the area, upon which there could not be another public consultation.
5	<u>R11 Sun Chui and R36 Chui Tin</u> (a) Supported the demarcation of R11. (b) Supported the demarcation of R36. (c) Proposed to keep Sun Chui Estate intact in one DCCA	5 3 2	(a) Supporting views noted. (b) Supporting views noted. (c) The representations were not accepted because:

Item No.	Comments	No. of Representations	EAC's Responses
	<p>instead of separating it into R11 and R36.</p> <p>The supporting reasons were:-</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> (i) Wo Che Estate (23,004, +34.98%), Sha Kok Estate (19,494, +14.38%) and Pok Hong Estate (21,785, +27.82%) were each delineated as one DCCA (i.e. R03, R07 and R08) on their own; (ii) the population of Sun Chui Estate was aging and decreasing; and (iii) the two parts of Sun Chui Estate in R11 and R36 were sharing the same community facilities. 		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> (i) the boundaries of R11 and R36 were the same as those of the 1994 DBCAs and the populations in both of them were within the permissible deviation from the population quota; and (ii) the resultant population of both R11 and R36 would deviate too much from of the population quota by more than 25%: R11 : -23,728 (+39.22%) R36 : -9,226 (-45.87%)
6	<p><u>R18 Heng To and R25 Heng On</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> (a) One representation supported EAC's provisional recommendation in Ma On Shan area. (b) One representation objected to grouping Ma On Shan Tsuen with Heng On Estate to form R25 and proposed to move it back to R18 to preserve community identity and local ties already established. It was also worried that the interests of Ma On Shan Tsuen might be neglected by the elected DC member of R25 who would likely be fully engaged in the business of Heng On Estate. (c) Three representations objected to separating Heng On Estate into 2 DCCAs R18 and R25 and suggested to move Ma On Shan Tsuen in R25 to another DCCA. The supporting reasons were:- <ul style="list-style-type: none"> (i) community integrity and harmony of the estate would be hampered by the separation; (ii) grouping all 7 blocks of the 	<p>1</p> <p>1</p> <p>3</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> (a) Supporting views noted. (b) The representation to include Ma On Shan Tsuen in R18 was accepted because this would help maintaining the existing ties already established among the local communities while minimizing changes to existing constituency boundaries (Ma On Shan Tsuen originally belonged to R18) though the resultant population of R18 would slightly exceed the normally permissible departure from the population quota (i.e. from 21,141 (+24.05%) to 21,389 (+25.50%)). (c) The representations to keep Heng On Estate intact in one DCCA were not accepted because the resultant population would be 24,184 (+41.50%) which far exceeded the population quota.

Item No.	Comments	No. of Representations	EAC's Responses
	<p>estate into 1 DCCA would facilitate management of the owners' corporations to be formed under the "Tenant Purchase Scheme"; and</p> <p>(iii) Wo Che Estate (23,004), which was over-populated by 34.98%, was also delineated as one DCCA on its own.</p>		
7	<p><u>R21 Lee On</u> Proposed to rename R21 as "Wu Kai Sha" as in 1994 DB election in view of the popularity and historical background of Wu Kai Sha Village in the area.</p>	1	<p>The representation was not accepted because the name "Lee On" was considered more appropriate than "Wu Kai Sha" in view of the fact that Lee On Estate contained largest portion of the population in the DCCA.</p>
8	<p><u>R30 Tsang Tai Uk and R31 Sun Tin Wai</u></p> <p>(a) Supported the demarcation of R30.</p> <p>(b) Supported the demarcation of R31.</p> <p>(c) Proposed to transfer Sha Tin Tau New Village from R30 to R31. The supporting reasons were:-</p> <p>(i) the village all along belonged to constituency Sun Tin Wai before it was transferred to constituency Tsang Tai Uk in 1994 DB election;</p> <p>(ii) the village had close ties and also shared the community facilities with Sun Tin Wai Estate in R31, which was situated adjacent to the village, instead of Fung Shing Court in R30;</p> <p>(iii) the polling station in R31 was nearer to them than the one in R30; and</p> <p>(iv) the population of R31 would not deviate much from the population quota if the village was</p>	<p>4</p> <p>4</p> <p>2</p>	<p>(a) Supporting views noted.</p> <p>(b) Supporting views noted.</p> <p>(c) The representations were not accepted because the boundaries of R30 and R31 were the same as those of the 1994 DBCAs and the populations in both of them were within the permissible deviation from the population quota.</p>

Item No.	Comments	No. of Representations	EAC's Responses
	transferred to R31.		

**Summaries of Oral Representations Received
at the Public Forum on 16 April 1999**

Item No.	Comments	No. of Representations	EAC's Responses
9	<u>R10 Chun Kam, R11 Sun Chui, R30 Tsang Tai Uk, R31 Sun Tin Wai R32 Keng Hau and R36 Chui Tin</u> Same as item 4.	2	See item 4.
10	<u>R10 Chun Kam, R31 Sun Tin Wai and R36 "Chui Tin"</u> Proposed to group Kak Tin Village in R31 with Golden Lion Garden Phase I, Greenview Garden and San Tin Village in R10 as well as Golden Lion Garden Phase II and King Tin Court in R36 to form one DCCA if a polling station in the vicinity of Kak Tin Village would not be available to facilitate the villagers to vote.	1	The representation was not accepted because allocation of polling station was not a criterion for delineating DCCAs.
11	<u>R17 Chun Ma</u> Proposed to transfer Sha Tin Race Course from R16 to R17 or the DCCA should be renamed as University, Chinese University or Ma Liu Shui to avoid misunderstanding in the meaning of the name of this DCCA.	1	The representation was not accepted because: (a) Residents of Jockey Club staff quarters used Fo Tan KCR station in R16 for outside communication. Sha Tin Race Course should therefore more appropriately be retained in R16; and (b) Chun Ma represented the Chinese names of Royal Ascot and Ma Liu Shui, the former being the largest residential development in the area.
12	<u>R18 Heng To and R25 Heng On</u> (a) Supported EAC's provisional recommendation to separate Heng On Estate into 2 DCCAs, and objected to grouping all 7 blocks of the estate into 1 DCCA. (b) Same as item 6(c). (c) Proposed to include only Heng Yat House of Heng On Estate in R18 for the reason that Heng	1 3 1	(a) Supporting views noted. (b) See items 6(c). (c) The representation was not accepted because it would make Heng Yat House even more

Item No.	Comments	No. of Representations	EAC's Responses
	Yuet House was geographically closer to Heng Sing House in R25. Also suggested to move Ma On Shan Tsuen from R25 to R18.		isolated and detached from Heng On Estate. For the proposal on Ma On Shan Tsuen, please see item 6(b).
13	<u>R20 Sunshine City and R22 Saddle Ridge</u> Proposed to transfer Fu Fai Garden from R20 to R22 for the reason that the elected DC member of R20 had to serve too many large developments in the DCCA.	1	The representation was not accepted because: (a) Fu Fai Garden was geographically more distant from Saddle Ridge than Sunshine City; and (b) Fu Fai Garden and Saddle Ridge were separated by a major road, Ma On Shan Road.
14	<u>R23 Kam Ying</u> Supported the demarcation of R23.	1	Supporting views noted.
15	<u>R30 Tsang Tai Uk and R31 Sun Tin Wai</u> (a) Same as item 8(a). (b) Same as item 8(c).	1 2	See item 8(a). See item 8(c).
16	<u>Consultation documents</u> Same as item 3(a) in General Issues of the Written Representations.	1	See item 3(a) in General Issues of the Written Representations.
17	<u>Population figures for the purpose of demarcation</u> Opined that the population of registered voters instead of the total population should be used for the purpose of delineating of electoral boundaries.	1	The issue was not under EAC's purview.
18	<u>Transparency of the demarcation process</u> Commented that the process of demarcation was not transparent enough.	1	EAC had already tried hard to make the whole demarcation process as transparent as possible by conducting public consultation on its provisional recommendations through various channels.

Appendix VI - S

**Representations on Kwai Tsing District
Summaries of Written Representations**

Item No.	Comments	No. of Representations	EAC's Responses
1	<u>Kwai Tsing District</u> Supported the demarcation of the District.	1	Supporting views noted.
2	<u>S13 Cho Yiu and S14 Lai Yiu</u> Proposed to move the area around Lai Chi Ling Road, Lai Kong Street and Highland Park from S13 to S14. The supporting reasons were: (a) to maintain integrity of the community; (b) upon occupation of Highland Park around mid-year, the population would increase by 4,400, thus bringing the population in S14 closer to the quota of 17,000; and (c) there were several up-coming developments in Lai Chi Ling Road which would greatly affect the residents of Tsui Yiu Court in S14. It would therefore be better for these areas to be grouped into one DCCA to reinforce co-ordination.	1	The representation was not accepted because it affected the boundary of S13, which was the same as that of the 1994 DBCA.
3	<u>S19 Wang Hoi</u> (a) Opined that the population of S19 was inaccurate as it excluded the residents who would move into Tierra Verde in end 1999. (b) The proposed name for S19 was not representative enough as Broadview Garden, being the most populated residential area in the constituency, was not reflected in the DCCA's naming. (c) Broadview Garden should not be grouped with Serene Garden and Tivoli Garden into the same DCCA as they were geographically separated.	1 2 1	(a) The representation was not accepted because the Ad Hoc Subgroup had confirmed that the population forecast for S19 was correct and the forecasted population of Tierra Verde as at end of March 1999 was zero. (b) The representations were accepted because Broadview Garden was the most densely populated residential development in S19. S19 would be renamed as "Wai Hoi" by adopting the Chinese names of Broadview Garden and Serene Garden, both of which were major centres of population in the DCCA.

Item No.	Comments	No. of Representations	EAC's Responses
			(c) The representation was not accepted because: (i) Broadview Garden was not significantly separated from Serene Garden and Tivoli Garden as they were quite mutually accessible by the road networks in the area; and (ii) the three developments were basically homogeneous in nature.

**Summaries of Oral Representations Received
at the Public Forum on 16 April 1999**

Item No.	Comments	No. of Representations	EAC's Responses
4	<u>S19 Wang Hoi</u> Same as item 3(b).	1	See item 3(b).
5	<u>DCCAs in Kwai Chung area</u> Commented that there was an uneven distribution of population in Kwai Chung area. The DCCAs in the northeast and south of Kwai Chung area had relatively smaller populations than those in the west. The representer undertook to submit his proposals in writing.	1	The representer had made no substantial proposal with regard to the delineation of DCCAs in Kwai Chung area and did not submit his written proposal eventually.

Appendix VI - T

**Representations on Islands District
Summaries of Written Representations**

Item No.	Comments	No. of Representations	EAC's Responses
1	<p><u>T03 Discovery Bay and T04 Peng Chau & Hei Ling Chau</u> Proposed to allocate La Vista to T03 instead of T04. This was because La Vista was part and parcel of the Discovery Bay development.</p>	1	<p>The representation was accepted in order to preserve the local tie. The resultant populations would be: T03 : 15,791 (-7.35%) T04 : 9,537 (-44.04%)</p>
2	<p><u>T06 Cheung Chau South and T07 Cheung Chau North</u> Opined that the EAC's proposal would confuse voters. Suggested to use Sing Cheong Lane and Cheung Chau Hospital Road to separate Cheung Chau into South and North.</p>	1	<p>The representation was not accepted because residents in the two DCCAs had become accustomed to the current demarcation since the 1994 DB election.</p>