

**Southern 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	D15 – Wong Chuk Hang D16 – Bays Area	1	<p>This representation objects to allocating Broadview Court to D16 and proposes to include it in D15 because:</p> <p>(a) Broadview Court is more related to buildings in D15 geographically and they share the same public facilities;</p> <p>(b) the long term development of public facilities will be affected;</p> <p>(c) the interests of Broadview Court's residents may be neglected by D16's DC member because of physical inconvenience; and</p> <p>(d) the distance between the Broadview Court and the polling station and the lack of public transport services will make it inconvenient for the Broadview Court's residents to go to the polling station to cast their votes.</p>	<p>The representation is not accepted because:</p> <p>(i) while community identity may be a valid point for consideration, there is however little scope for adjustment because the resultant population of D15 (26,197) would far exceed the population quota (+52.36%); and</p> <p>(ii) the location of the polling station is not a consideration in delineating DCCAs; nevertheless, the REO will bear this point in mind when identifying polling stations for D16.</p> <p>The EAC has attempted to explore other possibilities to see if the representation could be entertained. The EAC has considered transferring Grantham Hospital, Wong Chuk Hang Hospital and Police Training School (with a total population of 1,612) from D15 to D16 so that D15 can accommodate Broadview Court. However, the resultant population of D15 (24,585) will still exceed the population quota (+42.99%). The EAC considers the present proposal the most viable option as the population of D15 and D16 will fall within the permissible deviation limits.</p>
2	D03 – Ap Lei Chau North D04 – Lei Tung I	1	<p>The representation objects to moving two blocks of Yue On Court – Tse On House and Har On House from D03 to D04, and proposes that the entire Yue On Court should be</p>	<p>The representation is not accepted because:</p> <p>(i) for (a), the resultant population of D04 will far exceed the population quota (-33.85%) if Yue On Court is to be kept wholly in D03;</p>

<i>Item no.</i>	<i>DCCAs concerned</i>	<i>No. of representations</i>	<i>Representations</i>	<i>EAC's views</i>
	D05 – Lei Tung II		<p>kept wholly in D03 because:</p> <p>(a) the community integrity and residents' sense of belonging relating to Yue On Court will be hampered by the split up;</p> <p>(b) the population of D04 has been under-estimated; and</p> <p>(c) the population deficit of D04 can be reduced by transferring a new private residential estate, Sham Wan Towers, which will soon be occupied, from D03 to D04.</p> <p>The representation further suggests that, if the above is not considered viable by the EAC, the EAC should consider re-delineating D04 and D05 so as to even out the population of the two DCCAs.</p>	<p>(ii) for (b), the population figures provided by the AHSR have to be relied on in this demarcation exercise;</p> <p>(iii) for (c), according to the population figure provided by the AHSR, the population forecast of Sham Wan Towers as at 30 June 2003 is zero. The inclusion of Sham Wan Towers in D04 will have no effect on the population;</p> <p>(iv) the EAC's present proposal is the most viable option as the population of D03, D04 and D05 will all fall within the permissible deviation limits; and</p> <p>(v) to re-delineate D04 and D05 to achieve an even distribution of population between the two DCCAs is not feasible, because allocating any one of the buildings in Lei Tung Estate from D05 to D04 will not help out, and this would reduce the population of D05 well beyond the -25% limit.</p>