

**Sai Kung District  
Summaries of Written Representations**

<i>Item no.</i>	<i>DCCAs concerned</i>	<i>No. of representations</i>	<i>Representations</i>	<i>EAC's views</i>
1	Q02 – Pak Sha Wan	1	This representation suggests that the arrangement of allowing electors at Mau Ping and Wong Chuk Shan to cast their votes at the polling station in Q02 should continue.	The electors concerned could continue to be assigned to cast their votes at a polling station in Q02.
2	Q03 – Sai Kung Islands	2	The representations support the inclusion of Nam Shan Village in Q03.	The supporting views are noted.
3	Q04 – Hang Hau East  Q05 – Hang Hau West	10	<p>All 10 representations object to moving the Film Studio, Hang Hau Village, Shui Bin Tseun, Fu Tau Chau Vilage, Boon Kin Village and Tin Ha Wan Village from the existing Q04 to the proposed Q05 because:</p> <p>(i) strong local community ties exist between these villages and Mang Kung Uk Village in the existing Q04; and</p> <p>(ii) the residents concerned used to vote at the polling station set up in the office of the Hang Hau Rural Committee in the existing Q04.</p> <p>The representations put up three proposals: <u>Proposal (a)</u> Three representations</p>	<p><b>Proposal (b) is accepted</b> on grounds of community considerations because:</p> <p>(i) by transferring only Tai Po Tsai Village and Pik Shui Sun Tsuen from Q04 to Q05 under proposal (b), the resultant population of Q04 and Q05 would both be within the permissible limits (13,786 (-19.82%) and 14,565 (-15.29%) respectively). The two villages concerned are geographically closer to Q05 which consists mainly of village clusters;</p> <p>(ii) proposal (a) is <b>not accepted</b> because if the status quo of Q04 and Q05 is maintained, the population of Q05 would exceed the lower permissible limit (-30.96%); and</p> <p>(iii) proposal (c) is <b>not accepted</b> because if the Hong Kong University of Science and Technology is also transferred from Q04 to Q05, the resultant population of Q04 would be</p>

<i>Item no.</i>	<i>DCCAs concerned</i>	<i>No. of representations</i>	<i>Representations</i>	<i>EAC's views</i>
			<p>suggest retaining the 1999 DCCA boundaries for Q04 and Q05.</p> <p><u>Proposal (b)</u> One representation proposes transferring Tai Po Tsai Village and Pik Shui Sun Tsuen from Q04 to Q05 instead to even out the populations between Q04 and Q05.</p> <p><u>Proposal (c)</u> The other six representations propose transferring the Hong Kong University of Science and Technology from Q04 to Q05 as well.</p>	10,684, which exceeds the lower permissible limit (-37.86%).
4	<p>Q06 – Po Ying</p> <p>Q07 – Tseung Kwan O Centre</p> <p>Q08 – Kin Choi</p>	4	<p>The representations suggest to delineate Q06, Q07 and Q08 as follows:</p> <p>Q06: East Point City, Nan Fung Plaza, Maritime Bay and La Cite Noble;</p> <p>Q07: Tong Ming Court, Park Central, Bauhinia Garden and Oscar By the Sea; and</p> <p>Q08: Choi Ming Court, Kin Ming Court and Ocean Shores</p> <p>because:</p> <p>(a) the suggested delineation would be more reasonable and better for district management; and</p> <p>(b) the residents in each proposed DCCA share common community facilities and are served by the same</p>	<p>The proposal is <b>not accepted</b> because the population of both Q07 and Q08 would exceed the permissible limits:</p> <p>Q07: 25,555 (+48.63%) Q08: 29,961 (+74.25%)</p>

<i>Item no.</i>	<i>DCCAs concerned</i>	<i>No. of representations</i>	<i>Representations</i>	<i>EAC's views</i>
			MTR station.	
5	Q06 – Po Ying Q16 – Fu Ming Q17 – Tung Ming Q18 – On Hong	15	<p>There are 11 representations which object to separating Ming Tak Estate and Hin Ming Court from Yuk Ming Court and Wo Ming Court, each group being in two different DCCAs because:</p> <p>(i) the nature of the four estates are very similar and they share the same community facilities, including carparks and management companies; and</p> <p>(ii) geographically, the four estates are adjacent to one another inside a very distinct area.</p> <p>The representations also put up four proposals:</p> <p><u>Proposal (a)</u> Two of the 11 representations propose the following grouping:</p> <p>(i) Q15: Hau Tak Estate (I), Chung Ming Court and Nan Fung Plaza; Q16: Fu Ning Garden, Yu Ming Court and Hau Tak Estate (II); and Q17: Ming Tak Estate, Hin Ming Court, Yuk Ming Court, Wo Ming Court and East Point City; or</p> <p>(ii) Q15: Hau Tak Estate</p>	<p>The representations of not separating the four estates are <b>accepted</b>.</p> <p>Proposal (a) is <b>not accepted</b> because:</p> <p>(i) the resultant population of the following DCCAs would exceed the upper permissible limit: <u>under proposal (a)(i)</u> Q17: 24,477 (+42.36%) <u>under proposal (a)(ii)</u> Q15: 22,297 (+29.68%) Q17: 23,449 (+36.38%);</p> <p>(ii) Hau Tak Estate, which is kept intact in the EAC's provisional recommendation, would have to be split into 2 DCCAs;</p> <p>(iii) Q15, which is unaltered under the provisional recommendations, has to be altered consequently; and</p> <p>(iv) there is a representation supporting the demarcation</p>

<i>Item no.</i>	<i>DCCAs concerned</i>	<i>No. of representations</i>	<i>Representations</i>	<i>EAC's views</i>
			<p>(I), Chung Ming Court and East Point City;            Q16: Fu Ning Garden, Yu Ming Court and Hau Tak Estate (II); and            Q17: Ming Tak Estate, Hin Ming Court, Yuk Ming Court, Wo Ming Court and Nan Fung Plaza.</p> <p><u>Proposal (b)</u>            One representation proposes revising Q16 by:            (i) transferring Tak On House and Tak Yu House of Hau Tak Estate from Q15 to Q16; and            (ii) transferring Ming Tak Estate and Hin Ming Court out of Q16            because:            (i) Fu Ning Garden and Yu Ming Court are adjacent to Hau Tak Estate (II) but far away from Ming Tak Estate and Hin Ming Court; and            (ii) it would be inconvenient for electors of Ming Tak Estate and Hin Ming Court to cast votes if the polling station in Q16 is located at Chap Fuk Road.</p> <p><u>Proposal (c)</u>            Two representations propose to revise the delineation and names of four DCCAs as follows:</p>	<p>proposals for Q15 (see item 7).</p> <p>Proposal (b) is <b>not accepted</b> for reasons stated under (ii)-(iv) for proposal (a) above, and the reason that the location of polling stations is not a consideration for demarcation.</p> <p>Proposal (c) is <b>accepted</b> because:            (i) the four housing estates of Ming Tak Estate, Hin Ming Court, Yuk Ming Court and Wo Ming Court can remain in one DCCA and the</p>

<i>Item no.</i>	<i>DCCAs concerned</i>	<i>No. of representations</i>	<i>Representations</i>	<i>EAC's views</i>
			<p>Q06 Wan Po: On Ning Garden, Nan Fung Plaza, Maritime Bay, La Cite Noble and Oscar By the Sea;</p> <p>Q16 Fu Yu: Fu Ning Garden, Yu Ming Court and East Point City;</p> <p>Q17 Tak Ming: Ming Tak Estate, Hin Ming Court, Yuk Ming Court and Wo Ming Court; and</p> <p>Q18 Po Hong: Beverly Garden and Bauhinia Garden taking into account the special geographical features of the Tseung Kwan O area.</p> <p>And, if the resultant population of Q06 is considered too large, Maritime Bay may be transferred from Q06 to Q17.</p> <p><u>Proposal (d)</u> One representation proposes the following grouping: Q15: Hau Tak Estate (I) and Chung Ming Court; Q16: Fu Ning Garden, Yu Ming Court and Hau Tak Estate (II); Q17: Ming Tak Estate, Hin Ming Court, Yuk Ming Court and Wo Ming Court; and</p>	<p>community ties among them can be maintained;</p> <p>(ii) the proposed Q06 will only include estates which are physically close to each other;</p> <p>(iii) no unaltered DCCA in the neighbourhood will be affected; and</p> <p>(iv) as the population of Sai Kung district has increased sharply by over 81,000 when compared with that in 1999, even with an additional three elected seats, the average population per DCCA is 18,823, representing +9.47% over the population quota. The deviation of over 25% from the population quota in Q06 and Q18 is considered acceptable in such circumstances.</p> <p>In accepting proposal (c), the EAC has also taken into consideration the fact that the resultant population of Q06 and Q18 would exceed the permissible limits, even if Maritime Bay were to be transferred from Q06 to Q17:</p> <p>Q06: 21,559 (+25.39%) Q18: 23,822 (+38.55%)</p> <p>Proposal (d) is <b>not accepted</b> because consequential amendments have to be made to Q06 - Q08.</p>

<i>Item no.</i>	<i>DCCAs concerned</i>	<i>No. of representations</i>	<i>Representations</i>	<i>EAC's views</i>
			Q18: On Ning Garden and Beverly Garden in order to minimize changes to the existing DCCAs.	
6	Q06 – Po Ying  Q18 – On Hong	3	<p>These representations object to grouping On Ning Garden and Beverly Garden in Q18 because:</p> <p>(a) the two developments are geographically separated as they are one MTR station away from each other; and</p> <p>(b) the two developments have different school networks and community developments.</p> <p>Two of the three representations propose to:</p> <p>(a) transfer Bauhinia Garden from Q06 to group with Beverly Garden in Q18; and</p> <p>(b) transfer On Ning Garden from Q18 to Q06 and group it with Oscar by the Sea, Maritime Bay, La Cite Noble and Nan Fung Plaza.</p>	<p>The proposal is <b>not accepted</b> as the resultant population would exceed the upper permissible limit:</p> <p>Q06: 23,537 (+36.89%) Q18: 23,822 (+38.55%)</p> <p>It should however be noted that as proposal (c) in item 5 is accepted, Q18 will not span over the two MTR stations of Hang Hau and Tseung Kwan O.</p>
7	Q15 – Hau Tak	1	The representation supports the demarcation proposals for Q15.	The supporting view is noted.

**Sai Kung District**  
**Oral Representations Received at the Public Forum on 24 January 2003**

<i>Item no.</i>	<i>DCCAs concerned</i>	<i>No. of representations</i>	<i>Representations</i>	<i>EAC's views</i>
8	Q03 – Sai Kung Islands	1	Same as item 2	See item 2.
9	Q04 – Hang Hau East  Q05 – Hang Hau West	4	Same as item 3.	See item 3.
10	Q06 – Po Ying  Q07 – Tseung Kwan O Centre  Q08 – Kin Choi	1	Same as item 4.	See item 4.
11	Q15 – Hau Tak  Q16 – Fu Ming  Q17 – Tung Ming	1	Same as proposal (a)(ii) in item 5.	See proposal (a) in item 5.
12	Q16 – Fu Ming  Q17 – Tung Ming	5	Same as proposal (a) in item 5.	See proposal (a) in item 5.

<i>Item no.</i>	<i>DCCAs concerned</i>	<i>No. of representations</i>	<i>Representations</i>	<i>EAC's views</i>
13	Q17 – Tung Ming Q18 – On Hong	1	The representation suggests to transfer On Ning Garden from Q18 to Q17 because it is adjacent to the developments in Q17 but far away from those in Q18 one MTR station away.	The proposal is <b>not accepted</b> as the resultant population of Q17 would far exceed the upper permissible limit (+70.58%).  It should however be noted that as proposal (c) in item 5 is accepted, Q18 will not span over the two MTR stations of Hang Hau and Tseung Kwan O.