

選舉管理委員會

香港灣仔港灣道 25 號
海港中心 10 樓

ELECTORAL AFFAIRS COMMISSION

10/F, Harbour Centre
25 Harbour Road
Wan Chai
Hong Kong

本函檔號 OUR REF.: REO 14/5 Pt. 16

來函檔號 YOUR REF.:

圖文傳真 Fax: 2507 5810

電話 Tel.: 2827 7017

網址 Web Site: <http://www.info.gov.hk/eac/>

22 April 2003

The Honourable TUNG Chee Hwa
The Chief Executive of the
Hong Kong Special Administrative Region
of the People's Republic of China
Chief Executive's Office
Hong Kong

Dear Mr Tung,

Pursuant to section 18 of the Electoral Affairs Commission
Ordinance, we have the pleasure in submitting to you the enclosed report
containing our recommendations on the delineation of District Council
constituencies for the purpose of the ordinary election in respect of the
District Councils to be held in November 2003.


Yours sincerely,



WOO Kwok-hing, Chairman



Norman LEUNG Nai-pang, Member



Elizabeth SHING Shiu-ching, Member

ABBREVIATIONS

CAB	Constitutional Affairs Bureau
CE	Chief Executive
DC, DCs	District Council, District Councils
DCCA, DCCAs	district council constituency area, district council constituency areas
DCCs	district council constituencies
DOs	District Officers
EAC	Electoral Affairs Commission
EACO	Electoral Affairs Commission Ordinance
ExCo	Executive Council
HAD	Home Affairs Department
HD	Housing Department
ISD	Information Services Department
LandsD	Lands Department
PlanD	Planning Department
REO	Registration and Electoral Office
the AHSG	the ad hoc subgroup formed under the Working Group on Population Distribution Projections set up in the Planning Department
the Commission	the Electoral Affairs Commission
unaltered DCCAs	DCCAs which were provisionally determined to be the same as those of the DCCAs in 1999

CHAPTER 1

INTRODUCTION

Section 1 : The Responsibility of the Electoral Affairs Commission

1.1 Under section 4(a) of the Electoral Affairs Commission Ordinance (“EACO”) (Chapter 541 of the Laws of Hong Kong), one of the functions of the Electoral Affairs Commission (“EAC” or “Commission”) is to consider and review the boundaries of district council constituencies (“DCCs”) for the purpose of making recommendations as to the boundaries and names of DCCs for a District Councils (“DCs”) ordinary election.

1.2 The Commission is required under section 18 of the EACO to submit a report to the Chief Executive (“CE”) on its recommendations for DCCs not more than 36 months from the preceding DCs ordinary election. As the last DCs ordinary election was held on 28 November 1999, the EAC should have submitted its report and recommendations to the CE by 27 November 2002. However, as a result of the Administration’s decision to add ten elected seats for the second term DCs, the CE extended the period for submission of the report to 27 May 2003. Details of the increase in the number of elected seats are set out in Section 2.

1.3 Under section 21 of the EACO, the CE in Council shall consider the Commission's report. Subject to CE in Council's approval, the boundaries and names proposed by the Commission would be adopted for the DCs ordinary election to be held in late 2003.

Section 2 : Changes arising from the increased number of elected seats

1.4 The Administration's original decision was to maintain the status quo in the composition of the second term DCs which meant that the number of seats of elected members, ie 390, should remain unchanged. With the approval of the Executive Council ("ExCo"), the Administration consulted the Legislative Council ("LegCo") and DCs on its initial proposal to maintain status quo for the second term DCs. The consultation exercise ended on 31 July 2002.

1.5 Having regard to the public views received during the consultation period, the Administration subsequently proposed to increase the number of elected seats for **Yuen Long, Sai Kung and Islands** DCs, by **six, three and one** respectively to cater for the sharp population growth in the new towns of Tin Shui Wai, Tseung Kwan O and Tung Chung.

1.6 On 24 September 2002, the ExCo endorsed the increase in the number of elected seats from 390 to 400. The enabling legislation was passed by the LegCo on 18 December 2002 and published in the Gazette on 27 December 2002.

1.7 This change in the number of elected seats entailed a series of related changes, namely –

- (a) the population quota adopted for the demarcation exercise was lowered from 17,635 to 17,194 (see paragraphs 2.1(a) and 2.2);
- (b) the originally planned public consultation period from 5 September 2002 to 4 October 2002 was changed to between 6 January 2003 and 4 February 2003; and
- (c) the statutory deadline for submitting the report to the CE was rescheduled from 27 November 2002 to 27 May 2003.

Section 3 : Scope of the Report

1.8 The scope and content of this report are based on the requirement stipulated under section 18 of the EACO. The report is published in three volumes. **Volume 1** primarily describes how the proposed delineation of the boundaries of district council constituency areas (“DCCAs”) was worked out and sets out the Commission’s recommendations on the boundaries and the names of the DCCAs with the reasons for its recommendations. **Volume 2** contains the maps of all the districts showing the proposed boundaries and names of the DCCAs in each district and the related boundary descriptions. **Volume 3** records all written representations and minutes of the meetings of those DCs held to discuss the demarcation proposals relating to their own district.

CHAPTER 2

THE DEMARCATION EXERCISE

Before Public Consultation

Section 1 : Statutory Criteria for Demarcation

2.1 The Commission adopted a set of criteria, as stipulated by section 20 of the EACO, as the basis for making its recommendations.

These criteria are –

- (a) The EAC shall ensure that the population in each proposed DCCA is as near the population quota as practicable.
“Population quota” means the figure arrived at by dividing the total population of Hong Kong by the total number of elected members to be returned in the DCs ordinary election.
- (b) Where it is not practicable to comply with (a) in a certain proposed DCCA, the EAC shall ensure that the population in that DCCA does not exceed or fall short of the population quota by more than 25%.
- (c) The EAC shall have regard to the community identities, preservation of local ties, and the physical features (such as the size, shape, accessibility, development, etc) of the area.

- (d) The EAC must follow the existing boundaries of the districts and the number of elected members to be returned to a DC as specified in Schedules 1 and 3 of the District Councils Ordinance (Cap 547).
- (e) The EAC may depart from strict adherence to (a) and (b) only where it appears that considerations referred to in (c) justify such departure.

2.2 After the increase of ten elected seats for the second term DCs, the number of constituencies to be delineated for the 2003 DCs ordinary election is 400. A list of DCCs is at **Appendix I**.

2.3 For this demarcation exercise, the population quota was 17,635 before the increase in the number of elected seats, ie 6,877,553 (the projected population of Hong Kong as at 30 June 2003 provided by the Administration (see paragraph 2.6)) divided by 390 (the total number of elected members to be returned to DCs in the 2003 ordinary election). After the increase in the number of elected seats, the population quota is 17,194, ie $6,877,553 \div 400$. Consequently the permissible range of deviation referred to in paragraph 2.1 (b) above of the population of a DCCA from the population quota is 12,896 - 21,493 while it was previously 13,226 - 22,044.

Section 2 : Working Principles

2.4 The Commission also adopted a set of working principles for the demarcation exercise –

- (a) For those existing DCCAs where the population falls within the permissible range of 12,896 - 21,493, their boundaries will not be changed.
- (b) For those existing DCCAs where the population falls outside the permissible range, but the situation was allowed for the 1999 ordinary election and the justifications have remained valid, their boundaries will not be changed.
- (c) For those existing DCCAs other than those in (b) where the population falls outside the permissible range, their boundaries will be adjusted for compliance with the population quota requirement. This may necessitate revising the boundaries of the adjoining DCCAs. Where there is more than one way to adjust the boundaries of the DCCAs concerned, the one which affects the least number of existing DCCAs will be adopted, or the one with the least departure from the population quota will be adopted.
- (d) Factors with political implications will not be taken into consideration.

- (e) The names of the new DCCAs to be formed are coined by making reference to major landmarks, roads or residential settlements in the DCCAs after consultation with the relevant District Officers (“DOs”).

- (f) The Commission’s provisional recommendations on the code references of districts and constituency areas were that the districts should be given the alphabetical reference from “A” onwards, with the omission of “I” and “O” to prevent confusion, starting from Central and Western on Hong Kong Island, followed by the districts in Kowloon and the New Territories. The numbering of constituency areas in a district was to be prefixed by the alphabet reference for the district and started from the first numeral. “01” should be allocated to the most densely populated area, or the area traditionally considered most important or prominent or the centre of the district and the number proceeded consecutively in a clockwise direction so that as far as possible two consecutive numbers should be found in two areas contiguous to each other. The Commission hoped that by adopting this system, any one who consults the maps would find it easier to understand them and locate the constituency areas. These methods were employed since 1994 and the public should be generally familiar with them.

- (g) When constituency boundaries had to continue into the sea, the DCCA boundary lines were, as far as possible, drawn perpendicular to the district boundary lines on the sea.
- (h) Suggestions and comments from members of the public received since the last demarcation exercise will be taken into consideration and, where appropriate, accepted.

The criteria and working principles mentioned above were also adopted for the demarcation exercise for the 1999 DCs election.

Section 3 : Working Partners

2.5 The Registration and Electoral Office (“REO”), being the executive arm of the Commission, provided the manpower required for carrying out the exercise.

2.6 An ad hoc subgroup (“AHSB”), formed under the Working Group on Population Distribution Projections set up in the Planning Department (“PlanD”), took up the primary task of providing the Commission with the necessary population forecasts, the most essential information required for the conduct of the exercise. The AHSB was chaired by an Assistant Director of the PlanD and comprised representatives from a number of bureaux and departments, including the Constitutional Affairs Bureau (“CAB”), Financial Services and the

Treasury Bureau, Census and Statistics Department, Home Affairs Department (“HAD”), Housing Department (“HD”), Lands Department (“LandsD”), Marine Department, Rating and Valuation Department and the REO. To enhance the accuracy of the result produced, the AHSG was requested to project the population distribution figures as at a date as close to the election date as practicable. The AHSG provided a population forecast as at 30 June 2003, assuming that the DCs ordinary election would be held in November 2003.

2.7 The LandsD rendered assistance in producing maps for the Commission, including the base maps (maps with street blocks, population figure in each block, existing DCCA boundaries and district boundaries) and maps with the proposed DCCA boundaries, and boundary descriptions. The LandsD also helped by making films of the maps for printing purposes.

2.8 The District Offices of the HAD provided strong support in the demarcation exercise. Input from the DOs was sought in view of their local knowledge about the community identities, local ties, and physical developments in the DCCAs in their districts.

2.9 The Information Services Department (“ISD”) contributed expert advice for mapping out the publicity strategy and ideas for designing the publicity materials for the consultation exercise.

Section 4 : The Work Process

Start of work

2.10 The AHSG held its first meeting in early January 2002 to work out the method to be adopted for compiling the data and the work schedule. In mid-April 2002 the forecast population figures were made available, on the basis of which the LandsD prepared the base maps. When these base maps were ready, the REO staff proceeded to work on the preliminary proposed delineation of the boundaries.

EAC meetings with the DOs

2.11 When the REO staff had finalised their preliminary recommendations on the boundaries and names of the DCCAs, they presented them to the Commission for consideration. The Commission invited all the DOs, who are familiar with the local circumstances, to attend a series of meetings in mid-June 2002 to discuss the proposals relating to their district.

Revising the initial proposal

2.12 On the basis of the Commission's decisions on the initial demarcation proposals, the REO staff proceeded to prepare for the public consultation exercise, which was originally scheduled for September - October 2002. However, as a result of the addition of ten elected seats

for three districts the population quota was lowered from 17,635 to 17,194. This resulted in many DCCAs having their population deviating beyond the permissible range referred to in paragraph 2.3 and therefore the initial demarcation proposals had to be revised.

2.13 The REO staff went through the initial proposals and noted that those relating to six districts could remain unchanged because their population deviations were still within the new permissible limits, despite the new population quota. These six districts were: Wan Chai, Eastern, Yau Tsim Mong, Sham Shui Po, Tsuen Wan and Tai Po. The staff then proceeded to work on the other 12 districts and consulted the DOs on the revised proposals. Thereafter the proposals were presented to the Commission for consideration. In mid-November 2002 the Commission invited the 12 DOs concerned again to a series of meetings to discuss the revised proposals relating to their district.

2.14 After the EAC had come up with the provisional recommendations, the REO staff started to make the necessary preparation for the public consultation exercise, launched for a period of 30 days, from 6 January to 4 February 2003.

2.15 In the provisional recommendations, the boundaries of 182 DCCAs had to be changed and 47 DCCAs were renamed. The EAC allowed the permissible limits of the population quota to be exceeded in 16 DCCAs for one reason or the other. The names of these DCCAs, the percentages of deviation and the reasons for allowing the

permissible limits to be exceeded are shown in **Appendix II**. Details of the provisional recommendations were contained in two volumes published for the public consultation exercise.

CHAPTER 3

THE PUBLIC CONSULTATION

Section 1 : The Consultation Period and Public Forums

3.1 In compliance with the requirement of section 19 of the EACO, the Commission conducted a public consultation exercise on its provisional recommendations from 6 January to 4 February 2003 for a period of 30 days. During this period, members of the public might send in their representations, in writing, to the Commission to express their views on the provisional recommendations on the boundaries and names of the DCCAs put forth by the Commission.

3.2 The public consultation was widely publicised through radio/TV APIs, press releases, newspaper advertisements, posters and websites on the Internet.

3.3 On the first day of the consultation period, ie 6 January 2003, the Commission held a press conference to launch the public consultation exercise and invited the public to give their views on the Commission's provisional recommendations. The Commission also appealed to the public that not only those who had opposing or different views should speak up, but also those who supported the provisional recommendations should do likewise. This was to enable the EAC to more accurately

gauge the public's views and degree of acceptance of the provisional recommendations.

3.4 Two forums were conducted from 10.30 am to 4.30 pm daily on 23 and 24 January 2003 at Meeting Rooms 606-607 in the Hong Kong Convention and Exhibition Centre in Wan Chai and at the Exhibition Gallery in the Kwai Tsing Theatre in Kwai Tsing respectively, where members of the public could personally attend and express their views to the Commission directly. Audio-visual aids were used to facilitate understanding the representations by making reference to maps.

Section 2 : Number of Representations Received

3.5 During the consultation period the Commission received a total of 262 written representations. On the two days of the forums, 207 persons turned up and 72 of them expressed their views on the provisional recommendations.

3.6 The DCs of two districts, namely Sham Shui Po and Kwai Tsing, held meetings to discuss the provisional recommendations relating to them. Representatives from the REO were present at these meetings to address queries from members of the DCs.

3.7 Among the representations received, there were 90 which supported the EAC's provisional recommendations. A few were not related to delineation of boundaries or naming of the DCCAs but related

to such issues as district boundaries, arrangements for the conduct of the public forums and locations of polling stations. The Commission took note of these views and instructed the REO to take the necessary follow-up action.

3.8 The original texts of the written representations and minutes of the meetings of the two aforementioned DCs are contained in **Volume 3** of this report. Summaries of the written representations, oral representations and representations raised at the meetings of the two DCs are shown by district in **Appendix III** of this volume.

CHAPTER 4

THE DEMARCATION EXERCISE

After the Public Consultation

Section 1 : Deliberations on the Representations

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

General Approaches adopted by the Commission

4.2 For representations regarding DCCAs which were provisionally determined to be the same as those of the DCCAs in 1999 (“unaltered DCCAs”), modifications to their boundaries would be considered only if :

- (a) they are supported by cogent reasons and would result in substantial and apparent improvement on community, geographical and development considerations;
- (b) they would not in turn affect an unacceptable number of unaltered DCCAs;

- (c) all the resulting populations will not depart from the population quota by more than 25%; and
- (d) no representation supporting the retention of the provisional recommendations in respect of the same unaltered DCCAs has been received.

4.3 The Commission considered it inappropriate to accept representations on unaltered DCCAs which proposed solely improvement on population distribution. If the Commission were to accept them, many DCCAs would have to be re-delineated and included in the final recommendations without the benefit of further public consultation as to their acceptability.

4.4 For representations regarding new DCCAs, all suggestions with sufficient cause on better population distribution or on community considerations would be accepted, except those adopting an approach entirely different from the Commission's and affecting an unacceptable number of unaltered DCCAs.

The Commission's General Views

4.5 In considering the representations, the Commission also took the following factors into account –

(a) Preserving community identity and local ties

The majority of representations made to the Commission stressed the importance of maintaining local community identities and ties even though the population deviation in the DCCAs concerned would exceed the permissible limits.

Some representers pointed out that the Commission's proposed delineation had disrupted the community identity and cohesiveness of the residents already well established, and would greatly affect the integrity of the community.

Some representers also emphasized that the residents of the affected areas would likely have a weaker sense of belonging to the DCCAs to which they had been newly assigned, and this in turn, would adversely affect the voters' turnout rate. Moreover, the DC Member of a constituency might have difficulty in serving two or more heterogeneous communities though some other representers held contrary views that it would not create any particular problems under the circumstances.

The Commission fully understood the sentiments and wishes of the representations and has considered all of them very carefully. Community identities and local ties were given due weight. Reasonable suggestions to alter the Commission's provisional recommendations on the grounds of

community, geographical and development considerations would be accepted. The Commission has allowed some DCCAs to have their populations deviating from the population quota in excess of the permissible limits. The rationale was to view the conflict between the population quota requirement and local sentiments in an impartial manner so as to achieve a fair balance.

(b) The estimated population figures

There were representations objecting to the provisional recommendations on the grounds that they queried the accuracy of the estimated population figures which the Commission adopted for the demarcation exercise. They quoted other figures known to them, which were different from those used by the Commission. The Commission believed that the queries were merely based on personal estimation and/or information obtained from other sources eg the HD, which might not be appropriate for the exercise. The Commission's view in this aspect was that the estimated population figures used was supplied by the AHSG, which was set up solely for the purpose of the demarcation exercise. It had conducted comprehensive researches before compiling the relevant data by a systematic methodology.

The Commission therefore held that the official data provided by the AHSG should remain as the sole and authoritative basis for the demarcation work.

(c) Supporting views

Where there were supporting representations received on the one hand and opposing ones relating to the same DCCA(s) on the other, the EAC would examine the acceptability of both sides in the light of the reasons given vis-à-vis the working principles.

Section 2 : The Recommendations

4.6 At its meeting on 13 March 2003 the Commission met the DOs concerned to discuss its revised recommendations, having taken into consideration the representations received. Its views on the representations are recorded in the last column of **Appendix III**.

4.7 In its finalised recommendations the Commission altered the boundaries of 62 DCCAs and changed the names of 8 DCCAs. Details of the alterations and changes are set out in **Appendices IV and V** respectively.

4.8 In its finalised recommendations the EAC allowed the population in 27 DCCAs to deviate from the permissible limits of population quota for reasons specified in **Appendix VI**.

4.9 A summary of the Commission's final recommendations is shown in **Appendix VII** of this volume. The details of these final recommendations with reference to maps and boundary descriptions are in **Volume 2**.

CHAPTER 5

A CONCLUDING NOTE

Section 1 : Acknowledgements

5.1 With the completion of this demarcation exercise, the Commission would like to express its gratitude towards the following units for their contributions: the AHSG, for its provision of the population forecasts; the DOs of the HAD, for their input on the basis of their district knowledge; the LandsD, for their production of the various maps and films for the conduct of the consultation exercise and production of the report; the ISD for their contribution to the publicity programme relating to the consultation exercise, the Printing Department for the printing of the consultation materials and this report, the Leisure and Cultural Services Department for their permission to use the Kwai Tsing Theatre as one of the venues for holding a public forum, and the CAB for their advice throughout the exercise.

5.2 The Commission is particularly thankful to the staff of the REO for their dedicated and concerted efforts in the preparation work.

5.3 Last but not least, the Commission is most grateful to those members of the public for their representations, put forth in writing or personally voiced in the public forums. Some of them have given suggestions relating to boundary descriptions, such as deletion of

buildings which had been demolished and addition of buildings which have recently come into existence. These suggestions would make the boundary descriptions clearer and more accurate or help correct mistakes in the descriptions due to oversight. These suggestions were constructive and gratefully accepted by the Commission.

Section 2 : The Important Principle

5.4 As in previous demarcation exercises, the EAC has adhered to the statutory requirements and its working principles as far as practicable. The EAC has made every effort to observe the population quota requirement and at the same time to accommodate the suggestions from the public with reference to the community considerations in their districts, particularly in cases where the suggestions would result in substantial improvement on community ties, geographical accessibility and development. As always, the Commission has paid no regard to any suggestions with political implications.

5.5 Delineation of constituency boundaries is an integral part of an election. The Commission is committed to conducting each and every election under its supervision in an open, fair and honest manner. The Commission has all the time held on to this important principle in this demarcation exercise.

Appendix I

Number of District Council Constituencies (“DCCs”) to be Delineated

Item	District	Number of DCCs
1.	Central and Western	15
2.	Wan Chai	11
3.	Eastern	37
4.	Southern	17
5.	Yau Tsim Mong	16
6.	Sham Shui Po	21
7.	Kowloon City	22
8.	Wong Tai Sin	25
9.	Kwun Tong	34
10.	Tsuen Wan	17
11.	Tuen Mun	29
12.	Yuen Long	29
13.	North	16
14.	Tai Po	19
15.	Sai Kung	20
16.	Sha Tin	36
17.	Kwai Tsing	28
18.	Islands	8
		<hr/>
	Total:	400

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

District	DCCA exceeding permissible limits	Population and deviation percentage	Reason
Southern	D17 Stanley & Shek O	24,624 (+43.21%)	Because of the need to preserve community identities and local ties
Tuen Mun	L24 Po Tin	22,072 (+28.37%)	Because of the need to preserve community identity and local ties
Yuen Long	M23 Tin Yiu	23,882 (+38.90%)	Because of the need to preserve community identity and local ties
	M24 Tsz Yau	23,807 (+38.46%)	Because of the need to preserve community identity and local ties
	M27 Kam Tin	10,274 (-40.25%)	Because of the need to preserve integrity or homogeneity of the community
	M28 Pat Heung North	9,297 (-45.93%)	Because of the large area covered by this DCCA and the need to preserve community identities and local ties
Tai Po	P19 Sai Kung North	9,726 (-43.43%)	Because of the large area covered by this DCCA and the need to preserve community identities and local ties

District	DCCA exceeding permissible limits	Population and deviation percentage	Reason
Sai Kung	Q03 Sai Kung Islands	10,303 (-40.08%)	Because of the large area covered by this DCCA (over 70 islands), accessibility, and the need to preserve community identities and local ties
	Q14 King Lam	22,160 (+28.88%)	Because the average population per DCCA in the Sai Kung District is higher than the population quota, and there is a need to preserve local community ties
Sha Tin	R03 Wo Che Estate	21,783 (+26.69%)	Because of the need to maintain the homogeneity and local ties of the community
	R30 Heng On	22,443 (+30.53%)	Because of the need to maintain the homogeneity and local ties of the community
Islands	T03 Tung Chung New Town	24,404 (+41.93%)	Because of the size, shape, accessibility and development of the area
	T05 Peng Chau & Hei Ling Chau	8,342 (-51.48%)	Because of the large area covered by this DCCA and the need to preserve community identities and local ties

District	DCCA exceeding permissible limits	Population and deviation percentage	Reason
Islands	T06 Lamma & Po Toi	5,568 (-67.62%)	Because of the large area covered by this DCCA and the need to preserve community identities and local ties
	T07 Cheung Chau South	12,027 (-30.05%)	Because of the large area covered by this DCCA and the need to preserve community identities and local ties
	T08 Cheung Chau North	11,878 (-30.92%)	Because of the large area covered by this DCCA and the need to preserve community identities and local ties

***Total number of DCCAs exceeding the permissible limits
of the population quota = 16***

**Central and Western 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	A05 – University	1	The representation objects to delineating the cluster of private buildings near the flyover at Bonham Road into A05 because the population of the existing A05 is already higher than that of most of the other DCCAs.	The representation is not accepted because: (i) no valid reasons have been given to justify the representation; and (ii) the population of A05 (21,134, +22.91%) is still within the permissible limits under the EAC's proposal.
2	A06 – Kennedy Town & Mount Davis A07 – Kwun Lung A08 – Sai Wan	2	The representations propose to retain the existing boundary for A06 but transfer the area at the southern part of Pokfield Road, including University Heights, Wah Fai House and Mei Wah Building, from A08 to A07 instead because: (a) changing the boundary of A06 will affect the well established local ties in this DCCA; (b) the population of A06 (13,957) is already below the population quota (-18.83%) and further reduction is not desirable; (c) dividing Hau Wo Street into two separate DCCAs (the northern side in A06 and the southern in A07) will give rise to difficulties in serving the residents of the street (eg handling their complaints);	The representations are accepted because it will produce a better population distribution as follows: A06: 14,817 (-13.82%) A07: 14,228 (-17.25%) A08: 15,824 (-7.97%) without affecting other DCCAs.

<i>Item no.</i>	<i>DCCAs concerned</i>	<i>No. of representations</i>	<i>Representations</i>	<i>EAC's views</i>
			<p>(d) transferring part of the population from A08 to A07 instead can achieve the same result of alleviating the population deficit of A07; and</p> <p>(e) a more even population distribution among A06, A07 and A08 will be achieved.</p>	
3	<p>A10 – Shek Tong Tsui</p> <p>A11 – Sai Ying Pun</p>	1	<p>The representation proposes to keep the existing boundaries of A10 and A11 unchanged because the EAC's proposal will not bring about any significant improvement to the population distribution in A10 and A11 but will affect the electors' well established sense of familiarisation with the location of the polling station and local ties in these DCCAs.</p>	<p>The representation is not accepted because:</p> <p>(i) under the EAC's proposal, the Western Wholesale Food Market will be kept wholly in one DCCA instead of being split into two;</p> <p>(ii) only one resident is involved in the change; and</p> <p>(iii) the reason given by the proposer is not considered valid.</p>

Central and Western District
Oral Representations Received at the Public Forum on 23 January 2003

<i>Item no.</i>	<i>DCCAs concerned</i>	<i>No. of representations</i>	<i>Representations</i>	<i>EAC's views</i>
4	A05 – University	1	Same as item 1.	See item 1.

**Wan Chai 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	B03 – Canal Road B04 – Causeway Bay	1	The representation objects to the delineation of B04 and proposes to keep the existing boundary of B04 unchanged because: (a) the community integrity of B04 can be maintained; (b) the population of B04 would still fall within the permissible deviation limits (-11.97%); and (c) the established community ties can be strengthened.	The representation is not accepted because the sole aim to re-delineate B04 is to alleviate the population quota shortfall (-30.57%) of the adjacent B03. Keeping B04 unchanged would defeat the purpose.
2	B10 – Southorn B11 – Tai Fat Hau	1	The representation objects to the re-delineation of B11 and proposes to keep the existing boundary of B11 unchanged because: (a) it would upset the work of B11's incumbent DC member; (b) it would affect the electioneering work of candidates for B11 in the coming DCs Election; and (c) community ties and identities of B11 would be hampered.	The representation is accepted because: (i) the integrity of B11 can be maintained; and (ii) the resultant population of the DCCAs concerned is still within the permissible deviation limits - B10 : 12,923 (-24.84%) B11 : 14,042 (-18.33%) Reasons (a) and (b) given by the proposer are considered not valid. Only (c) is taken.

Wan Chai District
Oral Representations Received at the Public Forum on 23 January 2003

<i>Item no.</i>	<i>DCCAs concerned</i>	<i>No. of representations</i>	<i>Representations</i>	<i>EAC's views</i>
3	B03 – Canal Road B04 – Causeway Bay	1	The representation objects to the re-delineation of B04 and proposes to retain the existing boundary because residents have got used to it.	The representation is not accepted for the reason stated in item 1.

**Eastern 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	C04 – Shaukei- wan C30 – Sai Wan Ho	3	All three representations object to including Les Saisons in C04 and propose to include it in C30 because: (a) Les Saisons is more associated with C30 than with C04 in geographical and community identity terms; and shares common community facilities with C30; (b) including Les Saisons in C30 would convenience electors in casting their votes at the polling station; and (c) residents and Owners' Committee of Les Saisons have expressed their concern that C04's DC member may neglect their interests because Les Saisons is situated far away from the rest of C04. Therefore they would not like to be included in C04.	The representations are accepted because: (i) reason (a) is considered valid; and (ii) the resultant population will still be within the permissible deviation limits as follows:- C04 : 13,048 (-24.11%) C30 : 18,307 (+6.47%)
2	C09 – Yan Lam C10 – Siu Sai Wan C11 – King Yee	6	All six representations support the demarcation proposals for C09, C10, C11 and C37. One of the representations also suggests that the same venue be designated as the polling station for C10 in	The supporting views are noted. The EAC will try to accommodate the request.

<i>Item no.</i>	<i>DCCAs concerned</i>	<i>No. of representations</i>	<i>Representations</i>	<i>EAC's views</i>
	C37 – Kai Hiu		future DCs elections.	
3	C10 – Siu Sai Wan	3	These representations support the demarcation proposals for this DCCA.	The supporting views are noted.
4	C11 – King Yee	1	This representation supports the demarcation proposals for this DCCA.	The supporting view is noted.
5	C13 – Fei Tsui C33 – Hing Man C34 – Lok Hong	2	<p>(a) Both representations object to including Shan Tsui Court in C34 because:</p> <p>(i) geographically it is more related to the adjacent Hing Man Estate in C33 as it is separated from C34 by Chai Wan Road – a trunk road with heavy traffic;</p> <p>(ii) EAC's proposal would discourage the electors (most of them being the elderly) from Shan Tsui Court to cast their votes at the polling station in C34 as they would have to travel a very long distance from Shan Tsui Court to the polling station; and</p> <p>(iii) residents of Shan Tsui Court have long been accustomed to the existing boundary since 1996.</p>	<p>The objection under (a) is accepted. Shan Tsui Court is to be retained in C33, with the following taken into consideration:</p> <p>(i) while the location of polling station should not be a consideration in delineating DCCAs, local geography and community ties are considered valid reasons;</p> <p>(ii) if the representation is to be accepted, the resultant population of C33 and C34 will exceed the permissible deviation limits as follows: C33 : 21,541 (+25.28%) C34 : 11,301 (-34.27%); and</p> <p>(iii) there is no other viable option to accede to the wish of the residents in C33 because all other options would unnecessarily lead to drastic changes to the boundaries of the existing adjacent DCCAs.</p> <p>The suggestion under (b) is not accepted because:</p> <p>(a) it would unnecessarily affect the existing boundaries of C13, which should not be changed because the population in C13 is within the permissible limits; and</p> <p>(b) it would split C33 into two separate parts as the two blocks are located in the middle of C33.</p>

<i>Item no.</i>	<i>DCCAs concerned</i>	<i>No. of representations</i>	<i>Representations</i>	<i>EAC's views</i>
			<p>(According to the REO's records, Shan Tsui Court had been in C34 since 1994 and moved to C33 in 1999.)</p> <p>(b) One of the representations further suggests moving two blocks – Lok Hing House and Yu Hing House of Hing Wah (II) Estate in C33 to C13 if Shan Tsui Court is kept intact in C33, where the population would exceed the upper permissible deviation limit.</p>	
6	C14 – Mount Parker	1	This representation supports the demarcation proposals of this DCCA.	The supporting view is noted.
7	C20 – Provident C23 – Tanner C24 – Healthy Village	1	The representation objects to allocating Ka Wai Building (146-166 Java Road) to C20 and proposes to move it to either C23 or C24 in order to preserve community integrity as residents of Ka Wai Building are used to using the facilities in C23 and C24.	The representation is not accepted because: (i) to preserve community integrity is not considered a convincing reason, as North Point is a built-up area with a good transportation network. The community identity is seen to be homogeneous; and (ii) the representation would unnecessarily affect the existing boundaries of C23 and inevitably C22 Kam Ping (as C22 is adjacent to C20), which should not be changed because the population in C22 and C23 is within the permissible deviation limits.

<i>Item no.</i>	<i>DCCAs concerned</i>	<i>No. of representations</i>	<i>Representations</i>	<i>EAC's views</i>
8	C22 – Kam Ping C23 – Tanner C24 – Healthy Village	1	<p>The representation proposes to allocate the area bounded by Tin Chiu Street, King's Road, Kam Hong Street and Island Eastern Corridor to either C22 or C23, so that the boundary of C24 can remain unchanged because:</p> <p>(a) the area concerned is geographically separated from C24 by C22 and C23; hence it would affect the community integrity of C24;</p> <p>(b) the residents of the area concerned would be reluctant to travel a long distance to cast their votes at a polling station in C24;</p> <p>(c) the residents would be confused by the election advertisements of the DC members of C22, C23 and C24 that would all be displayed along Kam Hong Street/Tin Chiu Street and King's Road;</p> <p>(d) it would be difficult for C24's DC member to look after the interests of the residents in the area concerned, since the DC member's office would be far away from them; and</p> <p>(e) the estimated population of the area concerned should be around 1,000 only. If it is allocated to</p>	<p>The representation is not accepted, though it is true that the area in question is geographically more related to C22 or C23 than to C24, because:</p> <p>(i) reasons (b) and (c) are considered not valid; and</p> <p>(ii) the representation would unnecessarily affect the existing boundaries of C22 or C23, which should not be changed because the population in C22 and C23 is within the permissible deviation limits.</p>

<i>Item no.</i>	<i>DCCAs concerned</i>	<i>No. of representations</i>	<i>Representations</i>	<i>EAC's views</i>
			C22 or C23, the resultant population of either one of the DCCAs would still stay within the permissible deviation limits.	
9	C32 – Upper Yiu Tung	1	This representation supports the demarcation proposals of this DCCA.	The supporting view is noted.
10	C37 – Kai Hiu	1	This representation supports the demarcation proposals of this DCCA.	The supporting view is noted.

Eastern District
Oral Representations Received at the Public Forum on 23 January 2003

<i>Item no.</i>	<i>DCCAs concerned</i>	<i>No. of representations</i>	<i>Representations</i>	<i>EAC's views</i>
11	C04 – Shaukei- wan C30 – Sai Wan Ho	4	Same as item 1.	See item 1.
12	C22 – Kam Ping C23 – Tanner C24 – Healthy Village	1	Same as item 8.	See item 8.
13	C33 – Hing Man C34 – Lok Hong	3	(a) One of the representations is the same as item 5. (b) One of the representations opines that the community identity and local ties should be the major consideration for this demarcation exercise and suggests that the existing boundary of C33 should be kept unchanged though its resultant population would slightly exceed the population quota. This is backed up by the result of an opinion survey, which shows that majority of the residents of Shan Tsui Court wish to keep the estate intact	For (a), (b) and (c)(ii), see item 5. For (c)(i), the population figures provided by the AHSG should be relied on insofar as this demarcation exercise is concerned.

<i>Item no.</i>	<i>DCCAs concerned</i>	<i>No. of representations</i>	<i>Representations</i>	<i>EAC's views</i>
			<p>in C33.</p> <p>(c) One of the representations opines that-</p> <p>(i) the population of C34 is under-estimated because the occupancy rate of the estates in C34 is high; and</p> <p>(ii) Shan Tsui Court is geographically separated from C34 because it is located on a steep slope.</p>	
14	C37 – Kai Hiu	1	<p>This representation objects to the demarcation proposals for C37 because:</p> <p>(a) Kai Tsui Court is geographically separated from the rest of the buildings in C37; and</p> <p>(b) it would be difficult for the existing C37's DC member to look after the interests of the residents of Kai Tsui Court as her office is far away from Kai Tsui Court.</p>	<p>The representation is not accepted because:</p> <p>(i) it would render the population of C37 falling beyond the population quota (-26.77%);</p> <p>(ii) reason (b) is not considered valid; and</p> <p>(iii) there are seven representations supporting the EAC's demarcation proposals for C37 (see items 2 and 10).</p>

**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	This representation objects to allocating Broadview Court to D16 and proposes to include it in D15 because: (a) Broadview Court is more related to buildings in D15 geographically and they share the same public facilities; (b) the long term development of public facilities will be affected; (c) the interests of Broadview Court's residents may be neglected by D16's DC member because of physical inconvenience; and (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.	The representation is not accepted because: (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 (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. 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.
2	D03 – Ap Lei Chau North D04 – Lei Tung I	1	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	The representation is not accepted because: (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;

<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 AHSB have to be relied on in this demarcation exercise;</p> <p>(iii) for (c), according to the population figure provided by the AHSB, 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>

**Yau Tsim Mong 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	E01 – Tsim Sha Tsui West E16 – Tsim Sha Tsui East	1	The representation proposes to move the area bounded by Nathan Road, Jordan Road, Cox's Road and Austin Road from E01 to E16 because: (a) the boundary shape and the community integrity of E01 would be adversely affected by the inclusion of the area concerned; and (b) residents of the area concerned would get confused as to whether they belong to Tsim Sha Tsui East or Tsim Sha Tsui West, thus affecting their community commitments and desire for voting.	The representation is not accepted because: (i) it would affect the boundary of E01, which is the same as that of the 1999 DCCA; and (ii) the resultant population of E16 would be 22,327, which exceeds the population quota (+29.85%).
2	E05 – Charming E06 – Mong Kok West E07 – Fu Pak	1	This representation objects to the delineation of E07 and proposes the following: (a) moving the old residential area bounded by Argyle Street, Nathan Road, Shantung Street and Ferry Street from E06 to E07; (b) moving Park Avenue from E07 to E05; (c) moving the area bounded by Ferry Street, Dundas Street, Canton Road and Pitt Street from E05 to E06; and (d) moving Hoi Yu House of Hoi Fu Court from E07 to E05, if permissible under the	The representation is not accepted because: (i) it would split Park Avenue and Central Park, which are under the same development and management, into 2 DCCAs, namely E05 and E07 respectively; and (ii) the boundary of E05 would be greatly affected, with the addition of the Park Avenue and loss of the old residential area, as a result of the proposed changes.

<i>Item no.</i>	<i>DCCAs concerned</i>	<i>No. of representations</i>	<i>Representations</i>	<i>EAC's views</i>
			<p>population criterion. Reasons given are:</p> <p>(a) the proposal would cater for the population increase from new developments, namely Hoi Fu Court, Park Avenue and Central Park in E07;</p> <p>(b) the population of E06 would become too high upon the transfer of the old residential area from E07 to E06 (from -34.60% to +13.07%); and</p> <p>(c) the population of E07 would be too low (from +39.69% to -11.59%).</p>	
3	<p>E05 – Charming</p> <p>E06 – Mong Kok West</p> <p>E07 – Fu Pak</p>	1	<p>This representation objects to the proposed groupings of E05, E06 and E07 and proposes the following:</p> <p><u>Proposal (a) -</u></p> <p>(i) keeping the old residential area east of Ferry Street within E07;</p> <p>(ii) moving the area bounded by Dundas Street, Canton Road, Pitt Street and Ferry Street from E05 to E06;</p> <p>(iii) moving Park Avenue from E07 to E05; and</p> <p>(iv) moving Hoi Yu House of Hoi Fu Court from E07 to E05.</p> <p><u>Proposal (b) -</u></p> <p>(i) same as proposal (a) except that the area bounded by Shantung Street, Canton Road, Soy Street and Ferry Street be transferred</p>	<p>Proposals (a) - (c) are not accepted because the resultant population deviation would exceed the permissible limits:</p> <p><u>Proposal (a)</u> E07: 21,637 (+25.84%)</p> <p><u>Proposal (b)</u> E06: 12,758 (-25.80%) E07: 25,147 (+46.25%)</p> <p><u>Proposal (c)</u> E06: 12,758 (-25.80%) E07: 23,594 (+37.22%)</p> <p>Proposal (d) is not accepted, although the resultant population deviation would not exceed the permissible limits, because:</p> <p>(i) it would split Park Avenue and Central Park, which are under the same development and management, into 2 DCCAs, namely E05 and E07 respectively;</p> <p>(ii) the boundary of E05 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>from E06 to E07.</p> <p><u>Proposal (c)</u> (i) same as proposal (b) except that Hoi Yu House not be moved from E07 to E05.</p> <p><u>Proposal (d)</u> (i) same as proposal (a) except that the area bounded by Fife Street, Nathan Road, Argyle Street and Canton Road not be transferred from E07 to E05.</p> <p>The reason given is that E07 would be substantially affected as the old residential area east of Ferry Street which captured all of the electors in the 1999 DCs election would be re-delineated to E06. (There were in fact no electors to the west of Ferry Street at that time.)</p>	<p>greatly affected as a result of the proposed changes; and (iii) for E07, the population and deviation from the population quota would increase from 15,201 (-11.59%) to 19,455 (+13.15%).</p>

**Sham Shui Po 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	F05 – Nam Cheong South F06 – Nam Cheong Central F07 – Nam Cheong West	7	<p>These representations propose:</p> <p>(a) to transfer some blocks in F06 to F05 and F07 to even out the population in these three DCCAs, because the relatively high population in F06 would pose unfairness to both the DC member and residents, given that resources for each DCCA are the same; and</p> <p>(b) to retain the 1999 DCCA boundaries for F06 and F07 in order to preserve community integrity and have two DC members instead of one to tackle the various problems of the old buildings.</p>	<p>Proposal (a) is accepted, subject to only F05 and F06 being affected, because:</p> <p>(i) F05 and F06 are new DCCAs while the boundary of F07 has only been slightly rectified in the provisional recommendations; and</p> <p>(ii) by refining the boundaries of F05 and F06, their populations would be more even and closer to the population quota.</p> <p>The resultant population of F05 and F06 would be:</p> <p>F05: 18,043 (+4.94%) F06: 17,235 (+0.24%)</p> <p>Proposal (b) is not accepted because the population in both F06 and F07 is below the lower permissible limit:</p> <p>F06: 11,109 (-35.39%) F07: 11,702 (-31.94%)</p>

**Views Expressed by District Council Members
at the Meeting of the Sham Shui Po District Council on 28 January 2003**

<i>Item no.</i>	<i>DCCAs concerned</i>	<i>No. of representations</i>	<i>Representations</i>	<i>EAC's views</i>
2	F05 – Nam Cheong South F06 – Nam Cheong Central F07 – Nam Cheong West F08 – Fu Cheong	6	<p>These representations put up proposals as follows:</p> <p>(a) Three of these representations propose the same as that in proposal (a) in item 1.</p> <p>(b) Three representations propose to:</p> <p>(i) transfer Nam Cheong Estate from the proposed F07 to join Fu Cheong Estate in the proposed F08, and</p> <p>(ii) combine the private premises in the proposed F07 with the existing F07; because:</p> <p>(i) public housing estates and private premises should not be mixed in a DCCA; and</p> <p>(ii) the actual population of Fu Cheong Estate should be less than the projected figures, and so the actual population of the resultant F08 should not exceed the upper permissible limit.</p> <p>But these three</p>	<p>For (a), see proposal (a) in item 1.</p> <p>The proposals under (b) are not accepted because:</p> <p>(i) the resultant population of F05 and F06 would fall below the lower permissible limit, while that of F08 would exceed the upper limit:</p> <p style="padding-left: 40px;">F05: 12,467 (-27.49%) F06: 11,109 (-35.39%) F08: 24,029 (+39.75%);</p> <p>(ii) there is one representation supporting putting Fu Cheong Estate and Nam Cheong Estate in two different DCCAs (see (c)); and</p> <p>(iii) it is necessary to use the same set of population data with the same basis and same cut-off date in projecting the population for all DCCAs.</p> <p>For (c), the supporting view is noted.</p>

<i>Item no.</i>	<i>DCCAs concerned</i>	<i>No. of representations</i>	<i>Representations</i>	<i>EAC's views</i>
			<p>representations would still support the EAC's proposals, if the resultant population arising from combining Fu Cheong Estate and Nam Cheong Estate into one DCCA is considered not acceptable.</p> <p>(c) One representation supports putting Fu Cheong Estate and Nam Cheong Estate in two different DCCAs, as they belong to different communities</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - the former is new but the latter is relatively old and would be for sale. 	
3	F14 – Mei Foo North	1	This representation supports the demarcation proposals for F14.	The supporting view is noted.
4	F15 – Lung Ping F19 – Tai Hang Tung & Yau Yat Tsuen	1	This representation proposes to group Yau Yat Tsuen, Parc Oasis and the City University of Hong Kong in one DCCA, because their residents are all of the same social class and different from those in the rest of their DCCAs.	The representation is not accepted because: (i) it would affect the boundaries of F15 and F19, which are unaltered under the provisional recommendations; and (ii) Tai Hang Tung Estate would become geographically separated.
5	District Boundary	3	These representations propose that the north-western boundary should be re-aligned with Lai King Hill Road so as to delineate Wah Lai Estate and its	The demarcation of district boundaries is outside EAC's jurisdiction.

<i>Item no.</i>	<i>DCCAs concerned</i>	<i>No. of representations</i>	<i>Representations</i>	<i>EAC's views</i>
			neighbouring estates from Kwai Tsing District to Sham Shui Po District, since the residents concerned mostly use the facilities of Sham Shui Po.	
6	Population quota	1	The representation proposes that: (a) longer term consideration should be taken in this demarcation exercise; and (b) different population quotas should be used for private premises and public housing as the level of difficulties encountered by the DC members would not be the same.	<u>Proposal (a)</u> The view is noted. <u>Proposal (b)</u> The subject is outside EAC's jurisdiction.
7	Criteria for delineating DCCAs	1	This representation opines that, apart from the population quota, consideration should also be given to the culture/habit of residents and the possibility of minimising changes to existing boundaries so as to avoid disruption to residents and DC members.	Due regard has already been paid to such factors.
8	Publication of the finalised decision on the delineation of boundaries	1	The final decision on the delineation of boundaries should be published as early as possible to facilitate preparation work to be done by the prospective candidates for the 2003 DCs Election.	The final boundaries will be published once approved by the CE in Council.

**Kowloon City 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	All DCCAs	1	This representation supports the EAC's provisional demarcation proposals for the whole district.	The supporting view is noted.
2	G05 – Sheung Lok G06 – Ho Man Tin	1	This representation proposes to: (a) move Sheung Lok Estate from G06 to G05, as G05 mainly consists of public housing estates, and such grouping can facilitate the DC member to serve residents with similar needs; and (b) change the name of G05 from “Sheung Lok” to “Ho Man Tin”.	The representation is not accepted because: (a) Sheung Lok Estate has been included in G06 since the 1994 DCs Election; (b) the population of G06 is within the permissible limits and the change of boundary is not necessary; (c) the existing name of G06 is “Ho Man Tin”. Changing the name of G05 to “Ho Man Tin” would cause confusion to residents of both constituencies; and (d) there is a representation supporting the demarcation of all constituencies in the district (see item 1).
3	G14 – To Kwa Wan South G15 – Hok Yuen Laguna Verde	1	The representation proposes to group a cluster of streets such as Wan Lok, Wan Fat, Wan Fuk, Wan Shun back to G15, because there are a lot of district management problems in these streets, and keeping them in G15 would facilitate the DC member concerned to continue to follow up these problems.	The representation is not accepted because: (i) G15 would then have a population of 23,071, which would exceed the population quota (+34.18%); and (ii) there is a representation supporting the demarcation of all constituencies in the district (see item 1).

<i>Item no.</i>	<i>DCCAs concerned</i>	<i>No. of representations</i>	<i>Representations</i>	<i>EAC's views</i>
4	G14 – To Kwa Wan South G15 – Hok Yuen Laguna Verde	2	The representations propose to move the buildings bounded by Hok Yuen Street East and Bailey Street from G15 to the adjacent DCCA of G14 because: (a) the nature of these buildings and their residents' concerns are very different from those of Laguna Verde, and the community ties between them are weak; (b) possibly there would be new residents moving to Laguna Verde, and the population of G15 would still increase in the future; and (c) there are strong community ties among residents in areas along Bailey Street, and therefore the boundary between G14 and G15 should not be delineated along Bailey Street.	The representations are not accepted because: (i) the buildings concerned have all along been in G15; (ii) such grouping would produce an uneven population distribution as follows: G14: 20,741 (+20.63%) G15: 12,930 (-24.80%) (iii) there is a representation supporting the demarcation of all constituencies in the district (see item 1).
5	G21 – Oi Man G22 – Oi Chun	1	The representation proposes to move Cascades from G21 to G22 because its residents' concerns are similar to those of G22, and such grouping would also facilitate convenience in district administration.	The representation is not accepted because: (i) the population of G22 is within the permissible limits and the change of boundary is not necessary; and (ii) there are supporting views for the demarcation of all constituencies in the district and specifically for G21 (see items 1 and 6).

Kowloon City District
Oral Representations Received at the Public Forum on 23 January 2003

<i>Item no.</i>	<i>DCCAs concerned</i>	<i>No. of representations</i>	<i>Representations</i>	<i>EAC's views</i>
6	G05 – Sheung Lok G21 – Oi Man	1	This representation supports the demarcation proposals for G05 and G21.	The supporting view is noted.

**Wong Tai Sin 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	H01 – Lung Tsui H04 – Fung Wong H13 – Tsui Chuk & Pang Ching H15 – Chuk Yuen North	19	(a) All representations object to including Mui Yuen House and Tao Yuen House of Chuk Yuen North Estate and Ying Fuk Court in H04 because: (i) their community concerns are different from the other private residential developments in H04 and the community integrity of H04 would be hampered; (ii) they share common facilities with other blocks of Chuk Yuen North Estate; (iii) there is no direct access between H04 and H15; (iv) H04 and H15 belong to different Area Committees; (v) the population of the existing H16 (ie Chuk Yuen North) is within the permissible limits and change is not necessary; and (vi) the office of H04's DC member would likely be set up at Chuk Yuen North Estate and	The representations are accepted , subject to our proposed modification to proposal (c) below, because: (i) the community integrity of H04 can be preserved; (ii) H04 and H15 consist of different types of housing and they belong to different Area Committees, and they are physically separated; and (iii) moving Hsin Kuang Centre and Tropicana Gardens to H04 instead of H01 would leave H01 unaltered. For proposal (c), we recommend moving an additional block, ie Pak Yuen House, to H13 which would bring the population of both H13 and H15 within the permissible limits, otherwise the population of H15 would be 22,860 (+32.95%). The resultant population distribution will be: H01: 15,391 (-10.49%) H04: 15,768 (-8.29%) H13: 21,135 (+22.92%) H15: 19,856 (+15.48%)

<i>Item no.</i>	<i>DCCAs concerned</i>	<i>No. of representations</i>	<i>Representations</i>	<i>EAC's views</i>
			<p>residents of Fung Wong San Tsuen in H04 would feel isolated.</p> <p>(b) Ten representations further suggest transferring Hsin Kuang Centre and Tropicana Gardens from H01 to H04 because:</p> <p>(i) they have similar community concerns ; and</p> <p>(ii) it can also bring the population of H04 within the permissible limits.</p> <p>(c) One representation further proposes to put Ying Fuk Court, Tao Yuen House, Mui Yuen House, Cheung Yuen House, Tung Yuen House, Yung Yuen House, Wai Yuen House and Pak Yuen House in H15, Chung Yuen House in H13 and Chui Yuen House in H14 because:</p> <p>(i) the population of the existing H15 is below the lower permissible limit; and</p> <p>(ii) Chung Yuen House shares common facilities with Pang Ching Court in H13.</p>	
2	H06 – Lung Sing	3	(a) These representations propose to re-group Chi Mei, Kam Wah, Luk Ching, Tan Fung	The representations are accepted , except the delineation part under proposal (c) because:
				(i) the established community ties

<i>Item no.</i>	<i>DCCAs concerned</i>	<i>No. of representations</i>	<i>Representations</i>	<i>EAC's views</i>
	H20 – King Fu H24 – Ngau Tsuen H25 – Choi Hung		<p>Houses of Choi Hung Estate back to H24;</p> <p>(b) one representation further suggests moving Grand View Garden from H24 to H20;</p> <p>(c) one representation further suggests moving Grand View Garden and Regent on the Hill from H24 to H20 and retaining the name of H24 (ie Chi Choi 池彩); and</p> <p>(d) one representation further proposes to transfer Chi Lin Care and Attention Home and Regent on the Hill from H24 to H06.</p> <p>The reasons given are:</p> <p>(i) the four blocks of Choi Hung Estate have all along been in H24; and</p> <p>(ii) Grand View Garden shares common transport facilities with other housing estates in H20.</p>	<p>in H24 will be maintained by retaining Chi Mei, Kam Wah, Luk Ching, Tan Fung Houses of Choi Hung Estate in H24;</p> <p>(ii) Grand View Garden shares common transport facilities with other housing estates in H20;</p> <p>(iii) it can leave H24 and H25 basically unaltered except for minor rectifications of boundary between H24 and H25 to put the whole Kam Pik House in H25; and</p> <p>(iv) the name of H24 would remain as “Chi Choi 池彩” as recommended in (c).</p> <p>The delineation part under proposal (c) is not accepted because the resultant population of H20 would become 21,886 (+27.29%).</p> <p>The resultant population distribution will be:</p> <p>H06: 20,429 (+18.81%) H20: 21,393 (+24.42%) H24: 14,596 (-15.11%) H25: 14,096 (-18.02%)</p>
3	H07 – San Po Kong H08 – Tung Tau H09 – Tung Mei	9	<p>All nine representations object to moving a few blocks of private residential buildings from H07 to H08 because:</p> <p>(a) H07 and H08 belong to two different Area Committees;</p> <p>(b) H08 consists of public housing estates, the residents of which have different community concerns and use different facilities;</p>	<p>The representations are in principle accepted because:</p> <p>(i) the community integrity of San Po Kong can be maintained;</p> <p>(ii) H07 and H08 consist of different types of housing with different community concerns;</p> <p>(iii) the interests of the isolated private building in H08 may be neglected; and</p> <p>(iv) the overall population of the district has increased by 22,825 when compared with that in 1999, with an average population per DCCA of</p>

<i>Item no.</i>	<i>DCCAs concerned</i>	<i>No. of representations</i>	<i>Representations</i>	<i>EAC's views</i>
			<p>(c) the community integrity, residents' sense of belonging and participation in community activities would be hampered by the separation;</p> <p>(d) residents of these buildings would become minority in H08 and their interests may be neglected; and</p> <p>(e) the population of San Po Kong is decreasing as many people have been moving out.</p>	<p>18,036, which is higher than the population quota, and so deviation from the population quota by more than 25% for certain DCCAs is justifiable.</p> <p>But there needs to be modifications as the private residential buildings concerned are retained in H07, consequential changes have to be made to H08 and the unaltered H09 in order to bring the population of H08 within the permissible limits. Pak Tung House of Tung Tau Estate would then have to be transferred from H09 to H08. The resultant population distribution will be:</p> <p>H07: 22,099 (+28.53%) H08: 13,113 (-23.74%) H09: 13,333 (-22.46%)</p> <p>In considering the acceptability of the representation, the EAC has also taken the following into consideration:</p> <p>(i) the resultant population of H07 would exceed the upper permissible limit (+28.53%); and</p> <p>(ii) the resultant population of H08 would fall below the lower permissible limit (-27.36%). Transferring Pak Tung House of Tung Tau Estate from H09 to H08 would then be required.</p>
4	H07 – San Po Kong H08 – Tung Tau	1	<p>The representation suggests to move the whole San Po Kong (including New Lai King Building) from H07 to H08 because:</p> <p>(a) the population of the latter is relatively low; and</p> <p>confusion to residents of San Po Kong can be avoided.</p>	<p>The representation is not accepted because the resultant population of H08 would be 34,589, which would far exceed the upper permissible limit (+101.17%).</p>

<i>Item no.</i>	<i>DCCAs concerned</i>	<i>No. of representations</i>	<i>Representations</i>	<i>EAC's views</i>
5	H10 – Lok Fu H11 – Wang Tau Hom	2	The representations suggest to move Wang Tak House, Wang Kei House and Wang Yip House of Wang Tau Hom Estate from H10 to H11 because: (a) the community integrity of Wang Tau Hom Estate can be enhanced by putting the whole estate in one DCCA (H11); and (b) the confusion to residents and electors of Wang Tau Hom Estate in seeking help from the relevant DC member or casting votes for the appropriate constituency could be avoided.	The representation is accepted because: (i) the community integrity of Wang Tau Hom Estate can be enhanced; and (ii) the resultant population would still be within the permissible limits: H10: 16,659 (-3.11%) H11: 21,130 (+22.89%)
6	H17 – Ching Oi H18 – Ching On	1	The representation suggests to retain the existing H19 (ie Tsz Wan North) unchanged as far as possible.	The representation is not accepted because by maintaining the status quo for H19, the resultant population would far exceed the upper permissible limit (+126.40%).
7	H18 – Ching On H19 – Tsz Wan East	1	(a) The representation objects to moving On Hong House of Tsz On Court from H19 to H18; and (b) proposes to group Hong Kin House of Tsz Hong Estate from H19 to H18 instead because: (i) On Hong House and On Yan House, both belonging to Tsz On Court, share common facilities and have strong community ties with Tsz Wan	The representation is not accepted , although the community integrity of Tsz On Court, which comprises two blocks, would be maintained, because: (i) if only proposal (a) were accepted, the resultant population of H19 would be 22,588, which exceeds the upper permissible limit (+31.37%); and (ii) the population deviation for the two DCCAs could be contained within the permissible limits if both proposals (a) and (b) were accepted; however it would be unfair to preserve the community integrity of Tsz On Court by sacrificing that of Tsz

<i>Item no.</i>	<i>DCCAs concerned</i>	<i>No. of representations</i>	<i>Representations</i>	<i>EAC's views</i>
			<p>East; and</p> <p>(ii) residents of Hong Kin House have just moved to H19 for a few months and have not yet established strong community ties with the constituency of Tsz Wan East and there will not be any difficulties for them to adapt themselves to another DCCA.</p>	Hong Estate, which comprises five blocks.
8	Number of elected seats	1	The number of Wong Tai Sin DC members should be increased so as to provide proper service.	The subject is outside EAC's jurisdiction.

Wong Tai Sin District
Oral Representations Received at the Public Forum on 23 January 2003

<i>Item no.</i>	<i>DCCAs concerned</i>	<i>No. of representations</i>	<i>Representations</i>	<i>EAC's views</i>
9	H04 – Fung Wong H15 – Chuk Yuen North	1	Same as item 1(a).	See items 1(i) and (ii).
10	H07 – San Po Kong H08 – Tung Tau	3	Same as item 3.	See item 3.
11	H07 – San Po Kong	1	This representation proposes that a new DCCA should be delineated for Rhythm Garden.	The representation is not accepted because the population of Rhythm Garden is only 9,679 (-43.71%), which is below the lower permissible limit.
12	H18 – Ching On H19 – Tsz Wan East	2	Same as item 7.	See item 7.
13	H20 – King Fu H24 – Ngau Tsuen H25 – Choi Hung	1	Same as items 2(a) and (c).	See item 2.

**Kwun Tong 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	J01 – Kwun Tong Central	1	<p>The representation proposes to:</p> <p>(a) transfer the residential buildings in the north of Kwun Tong Road from J01 to J27, J28, J29 or J30 as J01 mainly consists of industrial buildings, and the concerns of residential and industrial buildings are different; and</p> <p>(b) merge J01 with J02 or J22, if the resultant population of J01 is not within the permissible limits.</p>	<p>The representation is not accepted because:</p> <p><u>for proposal (a)</u></p> <p>(i) the residential buildings concerned have all along been in J01; and</p> <p>(ii) if the residential buildings concerned are excluded from J01, the population of J01 would be 296 (-98.28%), and it would have to merge with the residential buildings nearby to form a new DCCA.</p> <p><u>for proposal (b)</u></p> <p>(i) since J02 and J22 also consist of residential buildings, the same situation of having both industrial and residential buildings in one DCCA would also occur; and</p> <p>(ii) the proposal would result in changes in J01, J02, J27, J29 and J30, which do not require any changes at all in the original proposal.</p>
2	J07 – Shun Tin J08 – Sheung Shun J09 – Lee On Tin	7	<p>(a) All of these representations suggest transferring Tin Hang House and Tin Yiu House of Shun Tin Estate from J09 back to J07 (ie to group the all blocks of Shun Tin Estate in one DCCA);</p> <p>(b) one representation further proposes to move Lee Ming House and Lee Yip</p>	<p>The representations are not accepted because:</p> <p>(i) the resultant population of one DCCA in any one of the proposals would exceed the permissible limits:</p> <p><u>Proposal (a)</u> J07: 24,694 (+43.62%)</p> <p><u>Proposal (b)</u> J07: 24,694 (+43.62%)</p> <p><u>Proposal (c)</u> J10: 22,515 (+30.95%)</p> <p><u>Proposal (d)</u> J10: 22,515 (+30.95%)</p>

<i>Item no.</i>	<i>DCCAs concerned</i>	<i>No. of representations</i>	<i>Representations</i>	<i>EAC's views</i>
			<p>House of Shun Lee Estate from J08 to J09;</p> <p>(c) one representation further proposes to move Tin Wan House and Tin Chu House of Shun Tin Estate from J07 to J10 instead; and</p> <p>(d) one representation suggests the same thing as proposals (a) to (c), and to rename J09 and J10.</p> <p>Reasons given are:</p> <p>(i) division of Shun Tin Estate into different DCCAs would adversely affect its community integrity as the component blocks of Shun Tin Estate share common concerns and facilities;</p> <p>(ii) by maintaining different blocks of Shun Tin Estate almost equally in two DCCAs, there would be an equal share of the DC members' services enjoyed by residents; otherwise, Tin Hang House and Tin Yiu House would become the minority in J09;</p> <p>(iii) it would be difficult for the DC member concerned to serve</p>	<p>(ii) J08, which is unaltered, would be affected under proposals (b) and (d);</p> <p>(iii) Shun Tin Estate is also separated into two DCCAs under the status quo;</p> <p>(iv) political implications will not be considered;</p> <p>(v) Shun Tin Estate, Shun On Estate and Shun Lee Estate in J09 are of the same type of housing;</p> <p>(vi) population figures quoted come from the Housing Department as at June 2002; it is essential to adopt the forecast figures provided by the Ad Hoc Subgroup; and</p> <p>(vii) there is a representation supporting the proposals for J07 (see item 12).</p>

<i>Item no.</i>	<i>DCCAs concerned</i>	<i>No. of representations</i>	<i>Representations</i>	<i>EAC's views</i>
			<p>three estates as there would be conflicting interests among them; and</p> <p>(iv) the population of Shun Tin Estate has been overestimated.</p>	
3	<p>J11 – Sau Mau Ping North</p> <p>J13 – Sau Mau Ping South</p>	3	<p>(a) One representation proposes to move Sau Ming House of Sau Mau Ping Estate from J13 to J11 so as to preserve community ties;</p> <p>(b) two representations propose the same as (a) above, but further suggest moving Sau Nga House and Sau Yee House from J11 to J13, as it would result in a better population distribution; and</p> <p>(c) one representation proposes to amend the names of DCCAs and boundary descriptions as follows:</p> <p>(i) J11 and J13 to be renamed as Upper Sau Mau Ping and Lower Sau Mau Ping respectively;</p> <p>(ii) Sau Mau Ping (III) Estate to be deleted and Sau Hong House and Sau Lok House to be added in the boundary descriptions of J11; and</p>	<p><u>For proposal (a)</u> The representation is not accepted as Sau Ming House has not been in J11 since 1999, and under the proposal the resultant population of J11 would be 23,420, which exceeds the upper permissible limit (+36.21%).</p> <p><u>For proposal (b)</u> The representations are not accepted as Sau Nga House and Sau Yee House are geographically separated from the rest of J13.</p> <p><u>For proposal (c)</u></p> <p>(i) Proposal (c)(i) is not accepted as the delineation of J11 and J13 is in fact similar to that for the 1999 DCs Election, and electors have got used to such names;</p> <p>(ii) proposal (c)(ii) is accepted because most blocks of Sau Mau Ping (III) Estate have been demolished and it would be clearer to specify the two blocks which still exist; and</p> <p>(iii) proposal (c)(iii) is accepted.</p>

<i>Item no.</i>	<i>DCCAs concerned</i>	<i>No. of representations</i>	<i>Representations</i>	<i>EAC's views</i>
			(iii) blocks 19-20 of Sau Mau Ping (I) Estate to be deleted and Sau Mau Ping Estate Ancillary Facilities Block to be added in the boundary descriptions of J13.	
4	J16 – Lam Tin	1	The representation proposes to delete “Lam Tin Estate” from the boundary descriptions of J16 because the estate has already been demolished.	The representation is accepted for the reason so specified.
5	J16 – Lam Tin J18 – Ping Tin	1	The representation proposes to move Ping Chun House of Ping Tin Estate from J16 to J18 because: (a) all blocks of Ping Tin Estate are in J18, except Ping Chun House; (b) to preserve the community integrity, the whole Ping Tin Estate should be kept intact in J18; and (c) it would also facilitate the DC member to serve the whole Ping Tin Estate.	The representation is not accepted because the resultant population of J16 would be 12,671, which exceeds the lower permissible limit (-26.31%).
6	J18 – Ping Tin J23 – King Tin	1	The representation proposes to transfer SHK Kei Hau Secondary School and FDBWA Szeto Ho Secondary School from J18 to J23 to facilitate efficiency in community building.	The representation is not accepted because: (i) the two schools have all along been in J18, and there are no substantial reasons in support of the proposed move; and

<i>Item no.</i>	<i>DCCAs concerned</i>	<i>No. of representations</i>	<i>Representations</i>	<i>EAC's views</i>
				(ii) the population of J18 and that of J23 are within the permissible limits. Changing their boundaries is therefore not necessary.
7	J21 – Yau Tong Sze Shan West J22 – Lai Kong	4	The representations object to allocating blocks 32-38 (Phase 3) of Laguna City to J21 and propose to move these blocks back to J22 because: (a) community integrity and residents' sense of belonging would be hampered by the separation; (b) it would diffuse the enthusiasm of the voters living in Phase 3 to cast their votes as the polling station for J21 would be far away from Laguna City; (c) Phase 3 is geographically separated from the rest of J21 by Cha Kwo Ling and there is hardly anything in common between residents of the two areas; (d) residents of Laguna City share common community problems and concerns, and it would be a waste of resources to have 2 DC members serving them; (e) the population of J21 would likely increase sharply in the coming	The representations are accepted because: (i) keeping Laguna City intact would preserve the community integrity and resident's sense of belonging; (ii) the concerns of residents in Laguna City are very different from those living in J21, which mainly comprises Home Ownership Scheme housing estates and village clusters; and (iii) Phase 3 of Laguna City may be isolated as it is geographically separated from the rest of J21 by Cha Kwo Ling; notwithstanding that the resultant population (23,204) will exceed the upper permissible limit (+34.95%) while the overall population of Kwun Tong has decreased by 2,174 (0.37%) when compared with that of 1999.

<i>Item no.</i>	<i>DCCAs concerned</i>	<i>No. of representations</i>	<i>Representations</i>	<i>EAC's views</i>
			<p>years, and Phase 3 of Laguna City may then have to be moved to other DCCAs;</p> <p>(f) the population of Laguna City is just the same as that in 1999 and the supporting reasons in keeping Laguna City intact in the 1999 DCs Election should still be valid; and</p> <p>(g) there are other DCCAs with population exceeding the permissible limits under the provisional recommendations.</p>	
8	J31 – Ngau Tau Kok	1	The representation supports the demarcation proposals for J31.	The supporting view is noted.
9	J31 – Ngau Tau Kok	1	The representation proposes to transfer Tak Bo Garden from J31 to other DCCAs because it is a private residential development, which is different from the public housing estates in the rest of the constituency.	<p>The representation is not accepted because:</p> <p>(i) the nearest DCCA, J32, would then have a population of 22,055, which exceeds the upper permissible limit (+28.27%); and</p> <p>(ii) there is a representation supporting the demarcation proposals for J31 (see item 8).</p>
10	J33 – Lok Wah North J34 – Lok Wah South	1	The representation suggests to move Fai Wah House of Lok Wah South Estate from J33 to J34 because the population of the latter is smaller.	<p>The representation is not accepted because:</p> <p>(i) the population of J33 and J34 are within the permissible limits and the change of boundary is not necessary; and</p> <p>(ii) changes to existing unaltered DCCAs should be kept to the minimum and suggestions for any such changes solely for bringing about a better population distribution should</p>

<i>Item no.</i>	<i>DCCAs concerned</i>	<i>No. of representations</i>	<i>Representations</i>	<i>EAC's views</i>
				not be entertained, since, by doing so, many unaltered DCCAs would have to be re-delineated.

Kwun Tong District
Oral Representations Received at the Public Forum on 23 January 2003

<i>Item no.</i>	<i>DCCAs concerned</i>	<i>No. of representations</i>	<i>Representations</i>	<i>EAC's views</i>
11	J07 – Shun Tin J09 – Lee On Tin	3	Same as item 2.	See item 2.
12	J07 – Shun Tin J09 – Lee On Tin	1	This representation opines that: (a) putting Tin Hang House and Tin Yiu House in J09 would not cause confusion; (b) the delineation of DCCAs should not affect district administration and residents' use of facilities; and (c) a DC member should serve all residents in the DCCA concerned irrespective of the types of housing.	Views are noted.
13	J21 – Yau Tong Sze Shan West J22 – Lai Kong	4	Same as item 7.	See item 7.

**Tsuen Wan 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	All DCCAs	9	These representations support the demarcation proposals for all DCCAs in the district. But four of these representations indicate their objections should there be any other representations proposing transferring Fairview Garden from K13 to K16 because they think the housing types and the residents' needs which require the DC member's service are different in these two areas.	The supporting views are noted.
2	K07 – Tsuen Wan Centre K08 – Allway	1	This representation proposes to retain Kam Fung Garden in K08 because: (a) it would adversely affect the voter turnout rate because the residents of Kam Fung Garden have got used to casting their votes at the polling station in Allway; (b) it would adversely affect the community integrity of Tsuen Wan Centre; and (c) geographically, Kam Fung Garden is closer to Allway than to Tsuen Wan Centre.	The representation is not accepted because: (i) the resultant population in K07 (12,367) would exceed the lower permissible limit (-28.07%); (ii) the location of polling stations is not a consideration for delineating DCCAs; and (iii) no substantial reason in support of reason (b) is presented.
3	K08 – Allway K12 –	1	This representation proposes to allocate Chuen Lung Village from K08 to K12.	The representation is not accepted because Chuen Lung Village was transferred from K12 to K08 in the 1999 DCs Election at the request of

<i>Item no.</i>	<i>DCCAs concerned</i>	<i>No. of representations</i>	<i>Representations</i>	<i>EAC's views</i>
	Tsuen Wan Rural East			the Tsuen Wan Rural Committee, on account of the village's ties with the Tsuen Wan Town Centre. With the population distribution and geographical factors taken into consideration, it would be more appropriate to retain the village in K08.
4	K14 – Lei Muk Shue East K15 – Lei Muk Shue West	1	This representation supports the demarcation proposals for these DCCAs.	The supporting view is noted.
5	K14 – Lei Muk Shue East K15 – Lei Muk Shue West	2	These representations object to transferring Yeung Shue House of Lei Muk Shue Estate from K14 to K15 because: (a) Yeung Shue House is geographically separated from the other blocks of Lei Muk Shue Estate in K15; and (b) Yeung Shue House is closely linked with Toa Shue House and Fung Shue House in K14 in terms of community concerns and building management; they are new blocks in the estate and have formed a community of their own and the transfer of Yeung Shue House to K15 would affect the community integrity.	The representations are not accepted because: (i) the resultant population in K15 (10,487) would fall below the lower permissible limit (-39.01%); (ii) the reasons given are not sufficient; and (iii) there is a representation supporting the proposals for K14 and K15 (see item 4).

<i>Item no.</i>	<i>DCCAs concerned</i>	<i>No. of representations</i>	<i>Representations</i>	<i>EAC's views</i>
6	K16 – Shek Wai Kok K17 – Cheung Shan	1	This representation supports the demarcation proposals for these DCCAs.	The supporting view is noted.
7	K16 – Shek Wai Kok K17 – Cheung Shan	3	<p>These representations object to transferring Shek Lan House of Shek Wai Kok Estate from K17 to K16 because:</p> <p>(a) Shek Lan House has close relations with Shek Kuk House and Shek Tsui House in terms of building management, community setting and geographical link; and</p> <p>(b) if only Shek Lan House is transferred to K16, the community integrity of these three buildings would be hampered.</p>	<p>The representations are not accepted because:</p> <p>(i) the resultant population in K16 (12,804) would fall below the lower permissible limit (-25.53%);</p> <p>(ii) the reasons given are not sufficient; and</p> <p>(iii) there is a representation supporting the proposals for K16 and K17 (see item 6).</p>

Tsuen Wan 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	K16 – Shek Wai Kok K17 – Cheung Shan	1	This representation proposes: (a) same as item 7(a); and (b) renaming K17 as “Shek Cheung” because it would better reflect the identity of the DCCA.	(i) For (a), see item 7. (ii) The proposal of renaming the DCCA is accepted , but it should be renamed as “Cheung Shek” because Cheung Shan Estate has a larger population (6,023) than Shek Wai Kok Estate (Part) (5,631).

**Tuen Mun 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	L03 – Siu Tsui L04 – On Ting	1	This representation supports the demarcation proposals for these two DCCAs.	The supporting view is noted.
2	L03 – Siu Tsui L04 – On Ting L13 – Hanford	6	<p>All six representations object to the delineation of four blocks of Siu Lun Court from L03 to L04 on the grounds that the community integrity and residents' sense of belonging will not be preserved.</p> <p>One representation:</p> <p>(a) queries why Siu Lun Court in L03 has to be split into two parts and at the same time the whole Tsui Ning Garden has to be transferred from L13 to L03;</p> <p>(b) suggests to keep the entire Siu Lun Court in L03 together with Tsui Ning Garden, whereby the resultant population will still be within the permissible deviation limits;</p> <p>(c) opines that the interests of Siu Lun Court's residents might be affected because Siu Lun Court will be served by two DC members</p>	<p>The representations are not accepted because:</p> <p>(i) The aim of our proposals is to relieve the population overflow in L12 (existing L15 Sam Shing) (+61.65%) and L13 (existing L16 Tsui Fook) (+30.75%) by making adjustment to the adjacent DCCAs, ie L03 and L04;</p> <p>(ii) suggestion (b) is not viable since the resultant population of L03 (22,148) will exceed the upper permissible deviation limit (+28.81%), if both the entire Siu Lun Court and Tsui Ning Garden remain in the same DCCA (ie L03);</p> <p>(iii) reason (c) is not considered valid;</p> <p>(iv) according to the figures provided by the AHSG, the population of L04 will only be 15,306 as at 30 June 2003, and can absorb the population overflow from L03; and</p> <p>(v) there is a representation supporting our proposals for L03 and L04 (see item 1).</p>

<i>Item no.</i>	<i>DCCAs concerned</i>	<i>No. of representations</i>	<i>Representations</i>	<i>EAC's views</i>
			<p>who might have different working styles and political views; and</p> <p>(d) opines that the existing boundary of L04 should be kept unchanged because the population of L04 will increase to 20,000 upon full occupation of the On Ting Estate in 2003.</p>	
3	<p>L05 – Yau Oi South</p> <p>L06 – Yau Oi North</p> <p>L20 – Lung Mun</p>	1	This representation supports the demarcation proposals for these three DCCAs.	The supporting view is noted.
4	<p>L07 – Tsui Hing</p> <p>L08 – Shan King</p> <p>L09 – King Hing</p> <p>L10 – Hing Tsak</p>	5	<p>All five representations object to the delineation of L08, L09 and L10.</p> <p>(a) Three of the representations propose to delineate King Fu House, King Kwai House, King Lok House, King Wah House, King On House, King Wing House and King Yip House of Shan King Estate into L08.</p> <p>(b) Four of the representations object to including Hing Wai House of Tai Hing Estate in L10 and</p>	<p>(i) For proposals (a) and (b), the representations are accepted, because the reasons given are considered valid, with the following taken into consideration: the resultant population of L08 (21,535) will exceed the population quota (+25.25%) while the population deviation of L09 (19,082) will improve (+10.98%).</p> <p>(ii) For proposal (c), the representation is not accepted, because it will unnecessarily affect the existing boundary of L07, the population of which is within the permissible deviation limits.</p> <p>(iii) For proposal (d), the</p>

<i>Item no.</i>	<i>DCCAs concerned</i>	<i>No. of representations</i>	<i>Representations</i>	<i>EAC's views</i>
			<p>propose to delineate King Mei House and King Lai House of Shan King Estate and Hing Cheung House, Hing Shing House, Hing Tai House and Hing Wai House of Tai Hing Estate into L09.</p> <p>The existing boundary of L10 should be maintained because Hing Wai House had all along been in L09 (existing L10 Tai Hing South); and L10 had fulfilled the population requirement.</p> <p>(c) One representation further suggests transferring Chelsea Heights from L07 to L09.</p> <p>(d) One representation proposes to maintain the existing boundary for L10 and transfer King Lai House of Shan King Estate from L09 to L08 in order to even out the population of L08 and L09.</p>	<p>representation is not accepted because the resultant population of L08 (21,667) will have a higher deviation limit (+26.01%) than that under proposals (a) and (b).</p>
5	L08 – Shan King L20 – Lung Mun	1	<p>This representation objects to the delineation of L20 and proposes transferring Yeung Siu Hang Village from L20 to L08 because:</p> <p>(a) the Yeung Siu Hang Village is geographically</p>	<p>The representation is not accepted because, as considered together with the accepted proposals in item 4 above, the resultant population of L08 (22,544) will far exceed the upper permissible deviation limit (+31.12%).</p> <p>Also, we have received one</p>

<i>Item no.</i>	<i>DCCAs concerned</i>	<i>No. of representations</i>	<i>Representations</i>	<i>EAC's views</i>
			<p>separated from the rest of the buildings in L20;</p> <p>(b) there are no local ties and community links with Lung Mun Oasis in L20; and</p> <p>(c) there are close ties in terms of transportation and community facilities with Shan King Estate in L08, which is adjacent to the village.</p>	<p>representation in support of the demarcation proposals for L20 (see item 3).</p> <p>We have also taken into consideration that Yeung Siu Hang Village has once been grouped with Shan King Estate in the 1994 demarcation exercise (ie L19 – Yeung King), and has been transferred to L20 (existing L23 – Lung Mun) since 1999.</p>
6	L11 – San Hui	1	Two polling stations should be designated for L11.	The location of polling stations is not a consideration in delineating DCCAs. Nevertheless, the REO will bear this point in mind when identifying polling stations for L11.
7	L14 – Siu Sun	5	All five representations the demarcation proposals for this DCCA.	The supporting views are noted.
8	L15 – Yuet Wu L16 – Siu Hei L19 – Lok Tsui	2	Both representations propose to merge L15, L16 and L19 into two DCCAs and move the villages near Lung Kwu Tan and San Shek Wan Sun Tsuen to the former Shan King South as these villages have once been included in that DCCA before.	The representations are not accepted because it will affect the existing boundaries of L15 and L16, which should not be changed since the populations in L15 and L16 are within the permissible deviation limits. The existing community integrity will also be unnecessarily affected.
9	L17 – Wu King	4	All four representations support the demarcation proposals for this DCCA.	The supporting views are noted.
10	L18 – Butterfly	1	The representation supports the demarcation proposals for this DCCA.	The supporting view is noted.

<i>Item no.</i>	<i>DCCAs concerned</i>	<i>No. of representations</i>	<i>Representations</i>	<i>EAC's views</i>
11	L22 – Leung King L24 – Po Tin L25 – Kin Sang	6	All six representations support the demarcation proposals for these three DCCAs.	The supporting views are noted.
12	L22 – Leung King L24 – Po Tin L25 – Kin Sang	1	This representation proposes to disband L24 and move Po Tin Interim Housing to the adjacent L22 and L25 because of the high mobility of the Po Tin residents. As a result, it will not be necessary to combine Shan King North and Tai Hing South.	The representation is not accepted because the proposed merging of L22, L24 and L25 to form two new DCCAs will only result in huge population deviations from the population quota as the population forecast of L22 is 16,174; L24: 22,072; L25: 18,527.
13	L27 – Prime View L29 – Tuen Mun Rural	1	The representation objects to the delineation of L27 and proposes the whole To Yuen Wai Chuen be transferred from L27 to L29 to maintain the community integrity and local ties among To Yuen Wai Chuen and other villages in the rural area in L29.	The representation is accepted , because the reason given is considered valid, though the resultant population of L29 will be 21,510, which will slightly exceed the upper permissible deviation limit (+25.10%).

Tuen Mun 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>
14	L03 – Siu Tsui L04 – On Ting L13 – Hanford	2	(a) Two representations are the same as item 2. (b) One of the representations further suggests to delineate Siu Lun Court into L13 if (a) above is not considered viable by the EAC. (The proposer claims that she would submit her detailed proposals in writing later.)	For (a), see item 2. For (b), the proposer has not submitted the details of her proposal in writing. Therefore further consideration is not feasible.
15	L09 – King Hing L10 – Hing Tsak	1	Same as item 4(a) and (b).	See item 4(a) and (b).
16	L14 – Siu Sun	1	Same as item 7.	See item 7.
17	L22 – Leung King L24 – Po Tin	1	This representation supports the demarcation proposals for these two DCCAs.	The supporting view is noted.

**Yuen Long 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	M02 – Shui Pin M09 – Ping Shan South	1	The representation proposes to move Shui Pin Tsuen and Villa by the Park from M09 to M02.	The representation is not accepted because the resultant population of M02 would be 23,348, which exceeds the upper permissible limit (+35.79%).
2	M05 – Tai Kiu M06 – Fung Cheung	1	The representation proposes to move Hop Yick Plaza, Kui Fat Building or nearby old residential buildings from M05 to M06.	The representation is not accepted because the resultant population of M06 would be 23,268, which exceeds the upper permissible limit (+35.33%).
3	M12 – Tin Shing	5	These representations support the demarcation proposals for this DCCA.	The supporting views are noted.
4	M13 – Shui Oi M14 – Shui Wah M15 – Chung Wah M16 – Yuet Yan M17 – Fu Yan M18 – Yat Chak M19 – Tin Heng M20 – Wang Yat	3	These representations support the demarcation proposals for these 11 DCCAs.	The supporting views are noted.

<i>Item no.</i>	<i>DCCAs concerned</i>	<i>No. of representations</i>	<i>Representations</i>	<i>EAC's views</i>
	M22 – Kingswood South M23 – Tin Yiu M24 – Tsz Yau			
5	M12 – Tin Shing M23 – Tin Yiu M24 – Tsz Yau	1	The representation proposes to re-delineate Tin Yau Court, Tin Yiu Estate and Tin Tsz Estate in M12, M23 and M24 according to the 1999 DCCA boundaries, ie Yiu Yau (formerly M12), Tin Yiu (formerly M13) and Tin Tsz (formerly M18).	The representation is not accepted because the resultant population of the proposed Yiu Yau DCCA and the proposed Tin Tsz DCCA would exceed the permissible limits as follows: Yiu Yau: 39,252 (+128.29%) Tin Tsz: 12,860 (-25.21%)
6	M13 – Shui Oi M14 – Shui Wah	1	The representation proposes to move Shui Sum House from M13 to M14 because: (a) Shui Sum House belongs to Tin Shui (1) Estate in M14 and shares the same building management with the other 5 blocks of the Estate; (b) Shui Sum House is closely related to Shui Lung House/Shui Chuen House of Tin Shui (1) Estate in terms of community ties and geographical link, and the only access to Shui Shum House is through Shui Lung House/Shui Chuen House; (c) for the past two DCs elections, the residents of the 6 blocks were in the same constituency and went to the same polling station to vote;	The representation is not accepted because the resultant population of M14 would be 23,416, which exceeds the upper permissible limit (+36.19%).

<i>Item no.</i>	<i>DCCAs concerned</i>	<i>No. of representations</i>	<i>Representations</i>	<i>EAC's views</i>
			and (d) the above proposals would bring about a better shape for M13 and M14.	
7	M13 – Shui Oi M14 – Shui Wah M15 – Chung Wah	1	The representation proposes: (a) the same as item 6; and (b) moving Wah Yuet House of Tin Wah Estate from M14 to M15.	The representation is not accepted because the resultant population of M15 would be 23,093, which exceeds the upper permissible limit (+34.31%).
8	M13 – Shui Oi M14 – Shui Wah M15 – Chung Wah	3	These representations propose the following: (a)(i) moving Shui Sum House of Tin Shui (1) Estate and Shui Fai House of Tin Shui (2) Estate from M13 to M14, and transferring Wah Sui House, Wah Yau House and Wah Yuet House of Tin Wah Estate from M14 to M15 so as to keep the boundaries of the two existing DCCAs, namely Shui Oi (formerly M14) and Tin Shui (formerly M15) unchanged; (ii) renaming M14 as Tin Shui; and (iii) combining Tin Wah Estate in M14 and M15 and Tin Chung Court in M15 to form one DCCA; and (b) same as proposal (a) except moving Shui Choi House of Tin Shui (1) Estate from	These representations are not accepted because the resultant population of M15 would be 29,240, which far exceeds the upper permissible limit (+70.06%).

<i>Item no.</i>	<i>DCCAs concerned</i>	<i>No. of representations</i>	<i>Representations</i>	<i>EAC's views</i>
			M13 to M14, and retaining Shui Fai House of Tin Shui (2) Estate in M13.	
9	M14 – Shui Wah	1	The representation proposes to split M14 into 2 DCCAs, namely, Tin Shui DCCA and Tin Wah DCCA.	The representation is not accepted because the resultant population of the proposed Tin Wah DCCA would be 12,835, which exceeds the lower permissible limit (-25.35%).
10	M14 – Shui Wah M15 – Chung Wah	1	The representation proposes to group the whole of Tin Wah Estate in M14 and M15 (total of 7 blocks) into one DCCA because: (a) community ties and identification should be preserved; and (b) the split of the Estate into 2 DCCAs would confuse electors.	The representation is not accepted because: (i) if a separate DCCA is delineated for Tin Wah Estate, the resultant population would be 12,835, which exceeds the lower permissible limit (-25.35%); (ii) if part of Tin Wah Estate (ie Wah Choi House, Wah Long House, Wah Yat House and Ancillary Facilities Block) in M15 has to be transferred to M14 to keep the whole of the Estate intact, the resultant population of M14 would be 24,972, which exceeds the upper permissible limit (+45.24%); and (iii) if the other part of Tin Wah Estate (ie Wah Sui House, Wah Yau House and Wah Yuet House) in M14 has to be transferred to M15 to keep the whole Estate intact, the resultant population of M15 would be 29,240, which also exceeds the upper permissible limit (+70.06%).
11	M15 – Chung Wah M16 – Yuet Yan	1	The representation proposes the following: (a) delineating Tin Chung Court to form one DCCA, which should be renamed as Tin Chung;	The representation is not accepted because: <u>for proposal (a)</u> although the resultant population of the proposed Tin Chung DCCA

<i>Item no.</i>	<i>DCCAs concerned</i>	<i>No. of representations</i>	<i>Representations</i>	<i>EAC's views</i>
	M17 – Fu Yan		and (b) grouping Tin Fu Court in M17 and Tin Yuet Estate in M16 into one DCCA, which should be renamed as Yuet Fu.	would still be within the permissible limits, there is little scope for adjustment for Tin Chung Estate to form a DCCA on its own because the adjacent DCCAs will then be unduly affected by the suggested change and their corresponding populations will exceed the permissible limits; and <u>for proposal (b)</u> (i) the resultant population of the proposed DCCA of Yuet Fu would be 28,544, which far exceeds the upper permissible limit (+66.01%). (ii) there are supporting views for the demarcation proposals for M17 (see item 13).
12	M16 – Yuet Yan M17 – Fu Yan M18 – Yat Chak	3	These representations propose: (a) the same as item 11(b); and (b) grouping Tin Chak Estate in M18 and Tin Yan Court in M17 into a DCCA, which should be renamed as Chak Yan.	These representations are not accepted because: <u>for proposal (a)</u> see item 11 (b). <u>for proposal (b)</u> (i) the resultant population of the proposed DCCA of Chak Yan would be 24,474, which exceeds the upper permissible limit (+42.34%). (ii) there are supporting views for the demarcation proposals for M17 (see item 13).
13	M16 – Yuet Yan M17 – Fu Yan	6	These representations support the demarcation proposals for M17 and object to any other proposals for combining Tin Fu Court in M17 and Tin Yuet Estate in M16 to form a DCCA.	The supporting views are noted.

<i>Item no.</i>	<i>DCCAs concerned</i>	<i>No. of representations</i>	<i>Representations</i>	<i>EAC's views</i>
14	M18 – Yat Chak M20 – Wang Yat	3	These representations propose to group Tin Yat Estate in M18 and M20 and Grandeur Terrace in M20 into a DCCA.	These representations are not accepted because the resultant population of the suggested DCCA would be 24,346, which exceeds the upper permissible limit (+41.60%).
15	M19 – Tin Heng M20 – Wang Yat	4	These representations propose to allocate Heng Tung House and Heng Wan House of Tin Heng Estate from M20 to M19 so that the whole Estate (14 blocks) is kept within M19 because: (a) the separation of the 2 blocks from the rest of the Estate would hamper the community integrity and create inconvenience to the residents of these two blocks in seeking assistance from their DC member; and (b) the resultant populations of both M19 and M20 would not exceed the permissible limits.	These representations are accepted because: (i) the community integrity could be maintained in that the whole of the Tin Heng Estate would be put in the same DCCA; and (ii) a better population distribution would be achieved in M20, from 20,156 (+17.23%) to 17,301 (+0.62%); although the resultant population of M19 would be 21,913, which would exceed the upper permissible limit (+27.45%).
16	M21 – Kingswood North	5	These representations support the demarcation proposals for this DCCA.	The supporting views are noted.
17	M22 – Kingswood South	6	These representations support keeping Locwood Court, Sherwood Court and Chestwood Court within the same DCCA.	The supporting views are noted.
18	M22 – Kingswood South M24 – Tsz Yau	5	These representations propose to move Tin Lai Court from M22 to M24 to preserve its community ties.	These representations are not accepted because the resultant population of M24 would be 26,215, which exceeds the upper permissible limit (+52.47%).

<i>Item no.</i>	<i>DCCAs concerned</i>	<i>No. of representations</i>	<i>Representations</i>	<i>EAC's views</i>
19	M23 – Tin Yiu M24 – Tsz Yau	3	<p>These representations propose that:</p> <p>(a) Yiu Hing House and Yiu Shing House of Tin Yiu (1) Estate in M23 merge with Tin Yiu (2) Estate (in M24) to form M23; and</p> <p>(b) Yiu Foo House, Yiu Hong House, Yiu Man House and Yiu Yat House of Tin Yiu (1) Estate in M23 merge with Tin Yau Court in M24 to form M24, which should be renamed as Yiu Yau.</p>	<p>These representations are not accepted because:</p> <p><u>for proposal (a)</u> although the resultant population of the proposed Tin Yiu DCCA would still be within the permissible limits (+11.81%), there is little scope for these parts of Tin Yiu Estates to form a DCCA on their own because this would result in some of the DCCAs in the northern part of Tin Shui Wai exceeding the permissible limits.</p> <p><u>for proposal (b)</u> although the resultant population of Yiu Yau would still be within the permissible limits (+4.76%), there is little scope for Tin Yiu Estate (part) and Tin Yau Court to form a DCCA on their own because the DCCAs in the northern part of the Tin Shui Wai area would then be unduly affected by the suggested change and their corresponding populations would exceed the permissible limits.</p>

Yuen Long 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>
20	M13 – Shui Oi M14 – Shui Wah M15 – Chung Wah	1	Same as item 7.	See item 7.
21	M19 – Tin Heng M20 – Wang Yat	1	Same as item 15.	See item 15.
22	M18 – Yat Chak M20 – Wing Yat	3	These representations object to splitting the 9 blocks of Tin Yat Estate into 2 DCCAs, namely M18 and M20, and propose that they should remain in one single DCCA.	The representations are not accepted because while community integrity might be a valid consideration, there is little scope to put all the 9 blocks of Tin Yat Estate within a DCCA as this would result in some of the adjacent DCCAs exceeding the permissible limits.
23	M17 – Fu Yan	1	Same as item 13.	See item 13.
24	M18 – Yat Chak	1	The representation supports the demarcation proposals for this DCCA.	The supporting views are noted.
25	M18 – Yat Chak M19 – Tin Heng M20 – Tin Yat	1	Same as items 14, 15 and 22.	See items 14, 15 and 22.

<i>Item no.</i>	<i>DCCAs concerned</i>	<i>No. of representations</i>	<i>Representations</i>	<i>EAC's views</i>
26	M13 – Shui Oi M14 – Shui Wah M15 – Chung Wah M16 – Yuet Yan M17 – Fu Yan M18 – Yat Chak M19 – Tin Heng M20 – Wang Yat M22 – Kingswood South M23 – Tin Yiu M24 – Tsz Yau	2	Same as items 8, 12, 14, 15, 18 and 19.	See items 8, 12, 14, 15, 18 and 19.

**North 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	All DCCAs	2	These representations support the demarcation proposals for all DCCAs in the district.	The supporting views are noted.
2	N04 – Wah Do N15 – Tin Ping East N16 – Queen's Hill	25	<p>These representations object to transferring Dawning Views and Avon Park from N04 to N16, and the rural areas including Wu Nga Lok Yeung, Ma Shi Po, Ma Tau Leng, Wang Leng and Tai Hom Tuk from N16 to N15 because:</p> <p>(a) the community integrity of N16 would be adversely affected;</p> <p>(b) Dawning Views and Avon Park are different from the rural villages in N16 in terms of geographical link, living habits, community culture and traffic consideration; and</p> <p>(c) the services provided by the DC member would be affected and the interests of the residents from both rural villages and private premises would likely be neglected.</p>	<p>Items 2 to 8 should be considered together because all representations aim to keep N16 intact as far as possible in terms of community integrity while proposing some measures to relieve the over-populated N04 and N06. However, none of the proposals listed under items 2 to 8 is accepted because the resultant population of the DCCAs concerned would exceed the permissible limits, shown as follows:</p> <p><u>Item 2</u> N04: 23,642 (+37.50%) N06: 27,506 (+59.97%)</p> <p><u>Item 3</u> Given the high density of population in N04 and N06, it is not possible to evenly distribute the population to the other adjacent DCCAs, ie N05 and N07 so that each of these DCCAs would not exceed the permissible limits.</p> <p><u>Item 4</u> N02: 23,455 (+36.41%)</p> <p><u>Item 5</u> N04: 23,439 (+36.32%) N06: 27,506 (+59.97%)</p>

<i>Item no.</i>	<i>DCCAs concerned</i>	<i>No. of representations</i>	<i>Representations</i>	<i>EAC's views</i>
3	N04 – Wah Do N05 – Wah Ming N06 – Yan Shing N07 – Ka Fuk	9	These representations propose to allocate the additional population in Fanling South among N04, N05, N06 and N07.	<u>Item 6</u> N04: 23,461 (+36.45%) N06: 26,506 (+54.16%) <u>Item 7</u> N07: 25,131 (+46.16%) <u>Item 8</u> N04: 22,461 (+30.63%) In view of the large number of representations proposing to keep N16 intact in terms of community integrity, the EAC has revised its initial recommendations as follows:
4	N02 – Fanling Town N16 – Queen's Hill	2	These representations propose to allocate Belair Monte from N02 to N16 and transfer Dawning Views and Avon Park from N16 to N02.	(i) N02 will give Fanling Town Centre and Belair Monte to N03 and N16 respectively and take Dawning Views and Avon Park from N16; (ii) N03 will take Fanling Town Centre from N02;
5	N04 – Wah Do N05 – Wah Ming N06 – Yan Shing N16 – Queen's Hill	1	This representation proposes to allocate Avon Park and Dawning Views from N16 to N04 and transfer Flora Plaza from N04 to N05.	(iii) N04 will give Pak Fuk Tsuen to N07; (iv) N07 will take Pak Fuk Tsuen from N04; (v) N15 will remain unchanged by giving back Wu Nga Lok Yeung, Ma Shi Po, Ma Tau Leng, Wang Leng and Tai Hom Tuk to N16; and (vi) N16 will give Dawning Views and Avon Park to N02, take back Wu Nga Lok Yeung, Ma Shi Po, Ma Tau Leng, Wang Leng and Tai Hom Tuk from N15 and take Belair Monte from N02.
6	N04 – Wah Do N06 – Yan Shing N07 – Ka Fuk	2	These representations propose to group the major estates/areas as follows: <u>N04 Wah Do</u> Wah Sum Estate, King Shing Court, 6 blocks of Flora Plaza and Dawning Views	Under these revised recommendations, the population of all DCCAs would be within the permissible limits, and the community integrity of the rural areas of N16 Queen's Hill could be maintained.

<i>Item no.</i>	<i>DCCAs concerned</i>	<i>No. of representations</i>	<i>Representations</i>	<i>EAC's views</i>
			<p><u>N06 Yan Shing</u> Yan Shing Court, 4 blocks of Flora Plaza, Avon Park, Yung Shing Court and Cheong Shing Court</p> <p><u>N07 Ka Fuk</u> Ka Fuk Estate, Ka Shing Court, Cheerful Park, Greenpark Villa, Vienna Garden, Royal Knoll, Century Court, Wealthy Villas, Parkford Garden and Fortune House</p>	<p>In drawing up the revised recommendations, the EAC has also taken the following into consideration:</p> <p>(i) this would affect the boundaries of N02 and N03, which are the same as those in 1999; and</p> <p>(ii) N03 would become a mix of public rental housing and private housing.</p>
7	<p>N04 – Wah Do</p> <p>N07 – Ka Fuk</p> <p>N09 – Choi Yuk Tai</p> <p>N10 – Choi Yuen</p> <p>N12 – Tin Ping West</p> <p>N16 – Queen's Hill</p>	1	<p>This representation proposes to group the major estates/areas as follows:</p> <p><u>N04 Wah Do</u> Avon Park, Dawning Views, Wah Sum Estate and Flora Plaza</p> <p><u>N07 Ka Fuk</u> Ka Shing Court, Ka Fuk Estate, Parkford Garden and King Shing Court</p> <p><u>N09 Choi Yuk Tai</u> Tai Ping Estate, Choi Po Court, Police Quarters, Venice Garden, Vienna Garden and Greenpark Villa</p> <p><u>N10 Choi Yuen</u> Choi Yuen Estate and Yuk Po Court</p> <p><u>N12 Tin Ping West</u> Tin Ping Estate, On Shing Court, Shek Wu San Tsuen and Woodland Crest</p>	

<i>Item no.</i>	<i>DCCAs concerned</i>	<i>No. of representations</i>	<i>Representations</i>	<i>EAC's views</i>
8	N04 – Wah Do N07 – Ka Fuk N09 – Choi Yuk Tai N10 – Choi Yuen N12 – Tin Ping West N16 – Queen's Hill	1	<p>This representation proposes to group the major estates/areas as follows:</p> <p><u>N04 Wah Do</u> Avon Park, Dawning Views, Wah Sum Estate and King Shing Court</p> <p><u>N07 Ka Fuk</u> Ka Shing Court, Ka Fuk Estate, Parkford Garden and Greenpark Villa</p> <p><u>N09 Choi Yuk Tai</u> Tai Ping Estate, Choi Po Court, Police Quarters, Venice Garden and Vienna Garden</p> <p><u>N10 Choi Yuen</u> Choi Yuen Estate and Yuk Po Court</p> <p><u>N12 Tin Ping West</u> Tin Ping Estate, On Shing Court, Shek Wu San Tsuen and Woodland Crest</p>	
9	N04 – Wah Do N07 – Ka Fuk	1	<p>This representation proposes to transfer Buddhist Po Ching Home for the Aged Women and Buddhist Po Chung Care & Attention Home for the Aged Women from N04 to N07 because the elderly have got used to shopping in N07 Ka Fuk and using the facilities there.</p>	<p>The representation is accepted because the buildings concerned are part of Pak Fuk Tsuen, which will be transferred from N04 to N07 under the revised recommendations.</p>

North 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>
10	N04 – Wah Do N15 – Tin Ping East N16 – Queen's Hill	4	Same as item 2.	See item 2.

**Tai Po 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	P05 – Fu Heng P17 – Hong Lok Yuen	1	The representation proposes transferring Riviera Lodge from P17 to P05 because: (a) Riviera Lodge is in close proximity to Fu Heng Estate in P05; and (b) the polling station of P17 at Tai Po Tau is quite far away from Riviera Lodge.	The representation is not accepted because: (i) the reasons given by the proposer are not valid; (ii) it will unnecessarily alter the boundaries concerned, which are unchanged under the EAC's proposal; and (iii) the location of the polling station is not a consideration. Nonetheless, the REO will bear this in mind when identifying polling stations for P17.
2	P07 – Fu Ming Sun	1	This representation supports the naming of P07 as Fu Ming Sun.	The supporting view is noted.
3	P10 – Tai Po Kau P12 – San Fu P13 – Lam Tsuen Valley	3	All three representations object to transferring Kam Shan from P13 to P10 and propose to include it, together with Kam Shek New Village and Shek Kwu Lung in P13, into P12 instead; and transfer Dynasty View, Grand Dynasty View and To Yuen Tung from P12 to P10 because: (a) the group of Kam Shan, Kam Shek New Village and Shek Kwu Lung is more associated with Pan Chung in P12 in terms of their locations and community identity; and (b) the population deficit of P10 (12,235, -28.84%) will be	The representations are accepted because: (i) the reasons given are considered valid; and (ii) the resultant population will still be within the permissible limits: P10: 14,236 (-17.20%) P12: 14,948 (-13.06%) P13: 15,890 (-7.58%)

<i>Item no.</i>	<i>DCCAs concerned</i>	<i>No. of representations</i>	<i>Representations</i>	<i>EAC's views</i>
			reduced by including the adjoining Dynasty View, Grand Dynasty View and To Yuen Tung in P10.	

Tai Po 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>
4	P10 – Tai Po Kau P12 – San Fu P13 – Lam Tsuen Valley	1	Same as item 3.	See item 3.

**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	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: (i) strong local community ties exist between these villages and Mang Kung Uk Village in the existing Q04; and (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. The representations put up three proposals: <u>Proposal (a)</u> Three representations	Proposal (b) is accepted on grounds of community considerations because: (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; (ii) proposal (a) is not accepted because if the status quo of Q04 and Q05 is maintained, the population of Q05 would exceed the lower permissible limit (-30.96%); and (iii) proposal (c) is not accepted because if the Hong Kong University of Science and Technology is also transferred from Q04 to Q05, the resultant population of Q04 would be

<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 not accepted 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 accepted.</p> <p>Proposal (a) is not accepted 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 not accepted 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 accepted 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 not accepted 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 not accepted 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 not accepted 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.

**Sha Tin 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	R10 – Chun Shing	4	The representations propose this DCCA be renamed as Chun Fung, since it is more appropriate to use the first Chinese character of the two major estates in the DCCA, namely Chun Shek Estate and Fung Shing Court.	These representations are accepted .
2	R10 – Chun Shing R11 – Sun Tin Wai	1	<p>The representation proposes to transfer Sha Tin Tau New Village from R10 to R11 because:</p> <p>(a) the Village had all along belonged to Sun Tin Wai (R11) before it was transferred to Tsang Tai Uk (formerly R30) in the 1994 District Boards Election;</p> <p>(b) the Village has close ties with Sun Tin Wai Estate in R11, and also shares the community facilities. Geographically, the Village is closer to Sun Tin Wai Estate in R11 than Chun Shek Estate and Fung Shing Court in R10; and</p> <p>(c) the polling station in R11 is nearer to the residents of the Village than the one in R10 is.</p>	<p>The same representation was made in the last demarcation exercise. It was not accepted by the EAC at that time on the grounds that the boundaries of the existing R30 and R31 were the same as those in the 1994 District Boards Election and the population in R30 and that of R31 were within the permissible limits.</p> <p>However, under the current EAC proposal, in view of the fact that the existing R10 and R30 are under-populated, they together with R31 would be merged with R31 to form 2 new DCCAs, ie R10 and R11, in order to keep the population within the permissible limits. Hence, this representation is accepted because:</p> <p>(i) R10 and R11 are new DCCAs in the EAC provisional recommendations;</p> <p>(ii) the local ties of the Village with San Tin Wai Estate would be preserved; and</p> <p>(iii) the resultant population would not exceed the permissible limits:</p>

<i>Item no.</i>	<i>DCCAs concerned</i>	<i>No. of representations</i>	<i>Representations</i>	<i>EAC's views</i>
				R10: 18,331 (+6.61%) R11: 19,636 (+14.20%) However, the location of polling stations is not a consideration in delineating DCCAs.
3	R12 – Chui Tin R16 – Tin Sum	1	The representation proposes to transfer Worldwide Garden from R12 to R16 because: (a) geographically, Worldwide Garden is closer to Lung Hang Estate in R16 than to Golden Lion Garden and Sun Chui Estate in R12; and (b) Worldwide Garden has closer community ties with Lung Hang Estate and Tin Sam in R16.	The representation is not accepted because: (i) no substantial reason in support of improvement in community homogeneity has been presented; and (ii) Worldwide Garden is more related to R12, which consists mainly of private residential developments, HOS blocks and public housing estates, rather than R16, which consists mainly of public housing estates and rural villages.
4	R13 – Hin Ka	1	The representation supports the demarcation proposals for this DCCA.	The supporting view is noted.
5	R14 – Mei Tin R18 – Tai Wai R19 – Chung Shing	2	These representations propose that (a) Granville Garden and Park View Garden in R19 be retained as geographically they are more related to Mei Chung Court in R19; and (b) Mei Wai House of Mei Lam Estate be transferred from R19 to R18 to preserve community integrity.	These representations are considered in conjunction with those under items 6 and 7 since they should be considered together since the buildings concerned are all covered in the three items. The representations are all accepted because: (i) the arguments in support of the representation in terms of local geography and community setting are considered valid; (ii) the resultant population would not exceed the upper permissible limit: R14: 17,299 (+0.61%) R18: 18,491 (+7.54%) R19: 20,444 (+18.90%) (iii) the existing boundary of R14 will remain unchanged; and

<i>Item no.</i>	<i>DCCAs concerned</i>	<i>No. of representations</i>	<i>Representations</i>	<i>EAC's views</i>
6	R14 – Mei Tin R19 – Chung Shing	2	These representations propose to retain the 1999 DCCA boundaries for Lower Shing Mun in the former R14 in order to include Granville Garden and Park View Garden in the proposed R19 as they have close ties with Mei Chung Court in terms of local geography and community setting.	(iv) better population deviation percentages would be achieved in R14, ie from 20,895 (+21.52%) to 17,299 (+0.61%) and R18, ie from 15,528 (-9.69%) to 18,491 (+7.54%); while having considered that the boundary of R18 would be affected and the population deviation would be greater in R19, ie from 19,811 (+15.22%) to 20,444 (+18.90%).
7	R18 – Tai Wai R19 – Chung Shing	4	These representations propose to transfer Mei Wai House of Mei Lam Estate from R19 to R18 because of community integrity.	
8	R14 – Mei Tin R19 – Chung Shing	1	The representation objects to combining Lower Shing Mun in the former R14 with Mei Tin in the former R34 to form a new DCCA (R19) because: (a) the low population in Lower Shing Mun is only a temporary phenomenon as it would grow following the recovery of economy; (b) two future developments are expected to be completed between 2005 and 2007 in Lower Shing Mun, including 7 public housing estates in Area 4C38A and 5 blocks of private housing in Heung Fan Liu, which would accommodate some 20,000 people altogether; (c) the community	The representation is not accepted because: (i) the resultant population of Lower Shing Mun would be 11,127, which exceeds the population quota (-35.29%); and (ii) the EAC has to rely on the population forecasts provided by the AHSG for the conduct of this exercise.

<i>Item no.</i>	<i>DCCAs concerned</i>	<i>No. of representations</i>	<i>Representations</i>	<i>EAC's views</i>
			characteristics and integrity would be hampered; and (d) relocating Granville Garden and Park View Garden from R19 to R14 would hamper the unity of community.	
9	R26 – Lee On R27 – Fu Lung	4	These representations object to transferring Kam Lung Court from R26 to R27 because: (a) Kam Lung Court is sharing common facilities with Lee On Estate in R26; and (b) the separation of Kam Lung Court from Lee On Estate would hamper the community identity since they have been in the same DCCA since 1994.	These representations are not accepted because: (i) the resultant population of R26 would be 24,137, which far exceeds the upper permissible limit (+40.38%); and (ii) there are supporting views for the proposals for R27 (see item 10).
10	R27 – Fu Lung	2	These representations support the demarcation proposals for this DCCA.	The supporting views are noted.
11	R28 – Kam Ying	1	The representation supports the delineation of Phases I & II of Kam Ying Court within the same DCCA.	The supporting view is noted.
12	R28 – Kam Ying	1	The representation supports the delineation of Phases II & III of Sunshine City within R28.	The supporting view is noted.
13	R28 – Kam Ying R31 – On Tai	1	The representation objects to the delineation of R28 and proposes to re-delineate Kam Ying Court and Park Balvedere in R28 and Ma On Shan Tsuen in R31 into one DCCA because of geographical, traffic and	The representation is not accepted because: (i) Ma On Shan Tsuen is geographically separated from Kam Ying Court and Park Balvedere, and including this Village in R28 would physically split R31;

<i>Item no.</i>	<i>DCCAs concerned</i>	<i>No. of representations</i>	<i>Representations</i>	<i>EAC's views</i>
			community link. Kam Ying Court, Park Balvedere and Ma On Shan Tsuen would become more remote from Sunshine City following the commissioning of Ma On Shan Railway.	(ii) no substantial reason in support of bringing about improvements in geographical and community link are presented, and the Ma On Shan Railway would not affect the proximity of Kam Ying Court, Park Balvedere and Ma On Shan Tsuen with Sunshine City, as they will all be located on the same side of the railway; and (iii) there is a representation supporting the proposal for R28 (see item 12).
14	R30 – Heng On	1	The representation supports the delineation of the whole of Heng On Estate within the same DCCA.	The supporting view is noted.
15	R33 – Yu Chui	3	These representations propose this DCCA be renamed as Yu Yan or Chui Yan so as to reflect the names of the two major estates, namely Yu Chui Court and Prima Villa.	The proposed new name of Yu Yan is accepted .

Sha Tin 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>
16	R27 – Fu Lung	1	The representation (a) supports the EAC proposals (same as item 10); and (b) proposes that more conveniently located polling stations should be arranged to facilitate electors (including the disabled) in Kam Lung Court and Saddle Ridge Garden.	For (a), see item 10. For (b), the EAC will consider any suggestion from the public on the locations of polling stations.
17	R28 – Kam Ying	1	The representation (a) supports the demarcation proposals for this DCCA; and (b) proposes that more conveniently located polling stations should be arranged to facilitate electors in Sunshine City, Kam Ying Court and Park Balvedere.	For (a), the supporting view is noted. For (b), the EAC will consider any suggestion from the public on the locations of the polling stations.
18	R30 – Heng On	1	The representation supports the demarcation proposals for this DCCA.	The supporting view is noted.
19	R35 – Kwong Hong	1	The representation supports the demarcation proposals for this DCCA.	The supporting view is noted.

**Kwai Tsing 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	S01 – Kwai Hing S02 – Kwai Shing East Estate	4	<p>(a) The representations object to moving Shing Fung House and Shing Hei House of Kwai Shing East Estate from S02 to S01, and suggest to maintain the whole of Kwai Shing East Estate in S02 because:</p> <p>(i) the two buildings are situated on a slope while the rest of S01 is not;</p> <p>(ii) the community integrity would be impaired by separating Kwai Shing East Estate into 2 DCCAs; and</p> <p>(iii) S01 comprises mostly private housing estates, which have different community concerns.</p> <p>(b) One of the four representations proposes to even out the population of S01 and S02 by transferring Block 12 of Kwai Shing East Estate to S01 (instead of Shing Fung House and Shing Hei House) as it is an interim housing block and the residents' sense of</p>	<p>The representation to transfer Block 12 of Kwai Shing East Estate instead of Shing Fung House and Shing Hei House from S02 to S01 is accepted because:</p> <p>(i) the community ties of Kwai Shing East Estate can be improved; and</p> <p>(ii) the resultant population of S01 and S02 will still fall within the permissible limits:</p> <p>S01: 16,609 (-3.40%) S02: 19,899 (+15.73%)</p> <p>The representation to retain the whole Kwai Shing East Estate in S02 is not accepted because the resultant population of S02 would be 22,793, which exceeds the upper permissible limit (+32.56%).</p>

<i>Item no.</i>	<i>DCCAs concerned</i>	<i>No. of representations</i>	<i>Representations</i>	<i>EAC's views</i>
			belonging to the estate is relatively weaker.	
2	S04 – Lower Tai Wo Hau	1	The representation supports the demarcation proposals for S04.	The supporting view is noted.
3	S08 – Shek Lei Extension	1	The representation supports the demarcation proposals for S08.	The supporting view is noted.
4	S08 – Shek Lei Extension S09 – Shek Lei	3	These representations suggest to: (a) retain Shek Yan House of Shek Lei Estate in S09; and instead (b) move Shek Tai House of Shek Lei Estate from S09 to S08 to maintain geographical integrity.	The representations are not accepted because the resultant population of S08 would be 22,010, which exceeds the upper permissible limit (+28.01%).
5	S08 – Shek Lei Extension S11 – Kwai Fong S15 – Hing Fong	10	Ten representations object to allocating Kwai Ching House of Kwai Fong Estate from S11 to S15 because: (a) this would affect the unity of the whole estate, as all other blocks are situated in S11; and (b) the nature of Kwai Ching House, which is a public housing block, and the needs of its residents would be different from all others in S15, which are all private buildings. One of the representations also objects to transferring Greenknoll Court from S08 to S11 as it is	The representations are accepted because: (a) the original S11 comprises the whole of Kwai Fong Estate and some industrial buildings which are sparsely populated. The local community ties established among residents of Kwai Fong Estate could be preserved by retaining Kwai Ching House (the only separated block) in S11; (b) Greenknoll Court is physically separated from Kwai Fong Estate by industrial buildings, but close to other residential settlements in S08; and (c) if Shek Yan House of Shek Lei Estate is also retained in S09 under item 18, the boundaries of the DCCAs of S08, S09, S11 and S15 can remain the same as those in 1999.

<i>Item no.</i>	<i>DCCAs concerned</i>	<i>No. of representations</i>	<i>Representations</i>	<i>EAC's views</i>
			geographically far away from Kwai Fong Estate in S11, and suggests retaining the existing DCCA boundary for S11.	In accepting these representations, the EAC has also taken the following into consideration: (i) the resultant population of two of the DCCAs would slightly exceed the 25% deviation limits: S09: 21,611 (+25.69%) S11: 21,745 (+26.47%); and (ii) there is a representation supporting the demarcation proposals for S08 (see item 3).
6	S09 – Shek Lei	1	The representation supports the demarcation proposals for S09.	The supporting view is noted.
7	S11 – Kwai Fong S15 – Hing Fong	1	The representation proposes to transfer Kwai Ming House from S11 to S15 to preserve community integrity and the population distribution between the two DCCAs.	The representation is not accepted so as to preserve the community integrity of Kwai Fong Estate (see item 5).
8	S12 – Lai Yiu S13 – Lai Wah	1	The representation suggests to include Wonderland Villas in S12 instead of S13, because the residents of Wonderland Villas share common transportation facilities and concerns over living environment with those of Wah Yuen Chuen and Regency Park in S12.	The representation is not accepted because there has been a very strong and well established sense of affiliation of the residents of Wonderland Villas with the community in this DCCA.
9	S14 – Cho Yiu	1	The representation supports the demarcation proposals for S14.	The supporting view is noted.
10	S19 – Wai Ying S21 – Greenfield	2	The representations object to allocating Serene Garden to S21 because: (a) Serene Garden was in the same constituency with Greedfield	The representation is not accepted because: (i) if Serene Garden is not transferred out of the existing S19, the population of S19 would be 22,348, which

<i>Item no.</i>	<i>DCCAs concerned</i>	<i>No. of representations</i>	<i>Representations</i>	<i>EAC's views</i>
			<p>Garden in 1994, but was then transferred to the existing S19 in 1999. Putting it back to the constituency of Greenfield Garden would break the community ties established with the existing S19 over the past years;</p> <p>(b) the residents of Serene Garden and those of S21 use different transportation and community facilities;</p> <p>(c) the work of the Owners' Corporation would be more difficult with a consequential change of the responsible Area Committee;</p> <p>(d) the increase in population of the existing S19 is due to the recent completion of Tierra Verde but not Serene Garden; and</p> <p>(e) a low turnout rate for polling would be expected because there are residents not supporting the demarcation proposal.</p> <p>The representations also suggest retaining Serene Garden in S19 even though the resultant population of S19 would exceed the permissible limits, as this is also allowed for some other DCCAs.</p>	<p>exceeds the upper permissible limit (+29.98%); and</p> <p>(ii) geographically, Serene Garden is contiguous to Greenfield Garden and Grand Horizon in S21.</p>

<i>Item no.</i>	<i>DCCAs concerned</i>	<i>No. of representations</i>	<i>Representations</i>	<i>EAC's views</i>
11	S20 – Tsing Yi Estate	3	The representations support the demarcation proposals for S20.	The supporting views are noted.
12	S22 – Cheung Ching	1	The representation supports the demarcation proposals for S22.	The supporting view is noted.
13	S23 – Cheung Hong S24 – Shing Hong S25 – Tsing Yi South	1	This representation proposes to: (a) transfer Hong Fung House of Cheung Hong Estate and Ching Shing Court from S24 to S23; and (b) transfer Mount Haven and Cheung Wang Estate from S25 to S24 because: (i) the resultant population of S23, S24 and S25 would be closer to the population quota; and (ii) the proposal can cater for the sharp population increase of Cheung Wang Estate by the end of 2003.	The representation is not accepted because it would affect the unaltered boundaries of S23 and S24.
14	S25 – Tsing Yi South S26 – Cheung Hang	2	<u>Proposal (a)</u> One of these two representations objects to allocating Cheung Wang Estate and Mount Haven to S25 because: (i) the area covered by the existing S25 is the largest in the district, and the population of the proposed S25 is too large to be managed by one DC member;	The proposals are not accepted because: (i) although the proposed S25 covers a large area, its population of 21,222 (+23.43%) is within the permissible limits; (ii) if Cheung Wang Estate is not transferred out of the existing S26, the population of S26 would be 22,959, which exceeds the upper permissible limit (+33.53%); and (iii) there are supporting views for S26 (see item 15).

<i>Item no.</i>	<i>DCCAs concerned</i>	<i>No. of representations</i>	<i>Representations</i>	<i>EAC's views</i>
			<p>(ii) the population of S25 would further increase in the future upon completion of the remaining blocks of Cheung Wang Estate;</p> <p>(iii) because of the scattered population, there would be difficulties in allocating resources for community activities in the proposed S25; and</p> <p>(iv) it is difficult to find a suitable location for the polling station in S25 because of the scattered population.</p> <p><u>Proposal (b)</u> The other one representation proposes to maintain Cheung Wang Estate in S26 to preserve geographical integrity and improve the population distribution between the DCCAs.</p>	The REO will take note of the representations when identifying the location for the polling station in S25.
15	S26 – Cheung Hang	2	The representations support the demarcation proposals for S26.	The supporting views are noted.

Kwai Tsing 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>
16	S01 – Kwai Hing S02 – Kwai Shing East Estate	1	Same as item 1.	See item 1.
17	S06 – Shek Yam	1	The representation supports the demarcation proposals for S06.	The supporting view is noted.
18	S08 – Shek Lei Extension S09 – Shei Lei	2	The representations suggest to: (a) retain Shek Yan House of Shek Lei Estate in S09 so as to preserve the community integrity of Shek Lei Estate; and (b) if part of Shek Lei Estate in S09 is to be given to S06, it may be better to give Shek On House, Shek Tai House, or one of the two interim housing blocks instead of Shek Yan House, as the latter is far away from the major residential settlement in S08.	The representation to retain Shek Yan House in S09 is accepted because: (i) by retaining Shek Yan House in S09, the community integrity of Shek Lei Estate can be preserved; (ii) Shek Yan House is far away from the major residential settlement in S08; and (iii) if Shek Yan House is retained in S09 and Greenknoll Court is retained in S08 under item 5, both S08 and S09 can remain unaltered; notwithstanding that: (i) the population in S09 will become 21,611 (+25.69%), which is marginally over the upper permissible limit; and (ii) there are supporting views for the provisional proposals for S08 and S09 (see items 3 and 6).

<i>Item no.</i>	<i>DCCAs concerned</i>	<i>No. of representations</i>	<i>Representations</i>	<i>EAC's views</i>
19	S11 – Kwai Fong S15 – Hing Fong	4	Same as item 5.	See item 5.
20	S19 – Wai Ying S21 – Greenfield	1	Same as item 10.	See item 10.
21	S24 – Shing Hong	1	The representation supports the demarcation proposals for S24.	The supporting view is noted.
22	S25 – Tsing Yi South	1	This representation suggests that there should be one polling station for each of the four major housing estates in S25 because they are located far away from one another.	REO will take this into consideration when identifying the locations of polling stations for S25.
23	S25 – Tsing Yi South S26 – Cheung Hang	1	Same as proposal (b) in item 14.	See item 14.

**Views Expressed by District Council Members
at the Meeting of the Kwai Tsing District Council on 27 January 2003**

<i>Item no.</i>	<i>DCCAs concerned</i>	<i>No. of representations</i>	<i>Representations</i>	<i>EAC's views</i>
24	S01 – Kwai Hing S02 – Kwai Shing East Estate	2	Same as item 1.	See item 1.
25	S04 – Lower Tai Wo Hau	1	Same as item 2.	See item 2.
26	S06 – Shek Yam S07 – On Yam	1	The representation suggests to transferring the squatter area in S06 to S07 because: (a) the area belonged to S07 in the 1994 District Boards Election; and (b) it is geographically closer to On Yam Estate in S07 than S06.	The representation is accepted because: (i) the resultant population would be within the permissible limits and the distribution would be more even: S06: 19,889 (+15.67%) S07: 19,520 (+13.53%); and (ii) the geographical ties between the squatter area and On Yam Estate can be maintained.
27	S08 – Shek Lei Extension S11 – Kwai Fong	1	The representation objects to transferring Greenknoll Court from S08 to S11 because it has closer community ties with Shek Lei Estate rather than with Kwai Fong Estate.	See item 5.
28	S08 – Shek Lei Extension S11 – Kwai Fong	1	Same as item 5.	See item 5.

<i>Item no.</i>	<i>DCCAs concerned</i>	<i>No. of representations</i>	<i>Representations</i>	<i>EAC's views</i>
	S15 – Hing Fong			
29	S11 – Kwai Fong S15 – Hing Fong	1	The representation suggests to: (a) transfer Kwai Chung Police Married Quarters from S12 to S15; and (b) transfer Kwai Ching House of Kwai Fong Estate from S15 to S11.	<u>Proposal (a)</u> The proposal is not accepted as no substantial reason in support of improvements to community ties is given. <u>Proposal (b)</u> See item 5.
30	S12 – Lai Yiu S14 – Cho Yiu	1	This representation proposes to: (a) transfer Lai King Disciplined Services Quarters from S14 to S12; and (b) transfer Kwai Chung Police Married Quarters from S12 to S15, because Lai King Disciplined Services Quarters, as compared with Kwai Chung Police Married Quarters, are much closer to Lai Yiu Estate in S12.	The representation is not accepted because: (i) no substantial reason in support of improvements to community ties is given; (ii) it would affect the boundary of S14 which is unaltered; and (iii) there is one representation supporting the demarcation proposals for S14 (see item 9).
31	S19 – Wai Ying S21 – Greenfield	1	Same as item 10.	See item 10.
32	S22 – Cheung Ching	1	Same as item 12.	See item 12.
33	S22 – Cheung Ching S23 – Cheung Hong	2	These representations propose to: (a) transfer Mayfair Gardens from S25 to S22; and (b) transfer Ching Yeung House and Ching Mui House of Cheung Ching	The representations are not accepted because: (i) the boundaries of S22 and S23, which are both unaltered under the provisional recommendations, would be affected; and (ii) Cheung Ching Estate would

<i>Item no.</i>	<i>DCCAs concerned</i>	<i>No. of representations</i>	<i>Representations</i>	<i>EAC's views</i>
	S25 – Tsing Yi South		Estate from S22 to S23 if necessary because: (i) Mayfair Gardens is far away from Cheung Wang Estate in S25; and (ii) it would be difficult for the DC member of S25 to take care of the needs of all major estates therein.	then be split into two DCCAs.
34	S25 – Tsing Yi South	1	Same as proposal (a) in item 14.	See item 14.
35	S26 – Cheung Hang	1	Same as item 15.	See item 15.
36	Community considerations	3	These representations suggest that community integrity, local ties, community identities and geographical features should be considered in delineating constituency boundaries.	Due regard has already been paid to such factors.
37	Designation of polling stations	2	These representations suggest the following: (a) no more than one polling station should be designated for one housing estate so as to avoid confusion to residents; (b) the number of polling stations in S12 should not be increased even though the area covered is large, as candidates could hardly cope with the situation on the polling day in the event that there are too many polling stations; and	The REO will take these into consideration when identifying locations for polling stations.

<i>Item no.</i>	<i>DCCAs concerned</i>	<i>No. of representations</i>	<i>Representations</i>	<i>EAC's views</i>
			(c) the polling station to be designated for S23 should not be set up on the hilly slope as before and should be easily accessible and convenient to residents.	
38	Boundary Descriptions	1	This representation suggests that the estimated population of each major estate/area be included in the boundary descriptions for reference by DC members in the future.	The representation is not accepted because including the estimated population of only major estate/area in the boundary descriptions would not give readers a full picture of the DCCA, while it is impracticable to include the populations of all settlements therein.
39	District Boundary	2	These representations suggest that the district boundary between Kwai Tsing and Sham Shui Po, which bisects Nob Hill, should be reviewed.	The subject is outside the EAC's jurisdiction.
40	Working principles for demarcation	1	This representation suggests that the following two factors should also be included as working principles for demarcation: (i) designation of polling stations; and (ii) the effect on the voter turnout rate.	The location of polling station and voter turnout are not considerations in delineating DCCAs.

**Islands 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>
1	All DCCAs	2	These representations support the demarcation proposals for all DCCAs in the district.	The supporting views are noted.

Summaries of Representations Related to General Issues

<i>Item no.</i>	<i>Subject</i>	<i>No. of representations</i>	<i>Representations</i>	<i>EAC's views</i>
1	District boundaries	1	(a) <u>Central & Western and Southern</u> This representation suggests that the northern areas of Mount Davis Road should be moved from the Central & Western District to the Southern District.	The demarcation of district boundaries is outside EAC's jurisdiction.
		1	(b) <u>Wan Chai and Eastern</u> This representation suggests that the existing district boundary between the Wan Chai District and the Eastern District (which runs along the middle of Lai Tak Tsuen Road) should be altered so that the whole Lai Tak Tsuen Road would be included in the Eastern District.	
		5	(c) <u>Sham Shui Po and Kwai Tsing</u> (i) One of these representations suggests that Towers 2 and 3 of Nob Hill should also be moved from the Kwai Tsing District to the	

<i>Item no.</i>	<i>Subject</i>	<i>No. of representations</i>	<i>Representations</i>	<i>EAC's views</i>
			<p>Sham Shui Po District, as Nob Hill is very close to Mei Foo in Sham Shui Po District.</p> <p>(ii) One of these representations suggests that all three Towers of Nob Hill should be included in one district.</p> <p>(iii) One of these representations suggests that all three Towers of Nob Hill should be included in Lai Wah constituency of the Kwai Tsing District.</p> <p>(iv) Two of these representations suggest that the boundary between the Sham Shui Po District and the Kwai Tsing District should cut along Lai King Hill Road, so that Wah Lai Estate, Lai Yan Court and all three Towers of Nob Hill would be included in the Sham Shui Po District.</p>	

<i>Item no.</i>	<i>Subject</i>	<i>No. of representations</i>	<i>Representations</i>	<i>EAC's views</i>
2	Arrangements relating to Public Forums	1	<p>The representation opines that-</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> (a) the public forums should preferably be held nearer the end of the consultation period, so as to give more time for members of the public to consider the demarcation proposals before making oral representations; (b) one hour for two districts (eg Eastern and Central & Western) is considered not enough; and (c) most residents find it inconvenient to attend the forums as they are not held on public holidays. 	The points are noted for review.

**Changes Made to the Boundaries of DCCAs
as a Result of Public Consultation**

District	No. of DCCAs Affected	Code and Name of DCCAs Affected
Central & Western	3	A06 Kennedy Town & Mount Davis A07 Kwun Lung A08 Sai Wan
Wan Chai	2	B10 Southorn B11 Tai Fat Hau
Eastern	4	C04 Shaukeiwan C30 Sai Wan Ho C33 Hing Man C34 Lok Hong
Sham Shui Po	2	F05 Nam Cheong South F06 Nam Cheong Central
Wong Tai Sin	13	H01 Lung Tsui H04 Fung Wong H06 Lung Sing H07 San Po Kong H08 Tung Tau H09 Tung Mei H10 Lok Fu H11 Wang Tau Hom H13 Tsui Chuk & Pang Ching H15 Chuk Yuen North H20 King Fu H24 Chi Choi H25 Choi Hung
Kwun Tong	2	J21 Yau Tong Sze Shan West J22 Lai Kong

District	No. of DCCAs Affected	Code and Name of DCCAs Affected
Tuen Mun	5	L08 Shan King L09 King Hing L10 Hing Tsak L27 Prime View L29 Tuen Mun Rural
Yuen Long	2	M19 Tin Heng M20 Wang Yat
North	6	N02 Fanling Town N03 Cheung Wah N04 Wah Do N07 Ka Fuk N15 Tin Ping East N16 Queen's Hill
Tai Po	3	P10 Tai Po Kau P12 San Fu P13 Lam Tsuen Valley
Sai Kung	7	Q04 Hang Hau East Q05 Hang Hau West Q06 Wan Po Q15 Hau Tak Q16 Fu Yu Q17 Tak Ming Q18 Po Hong
Sha Tin	5	R10 Chun Fung R11 Sun Tin Wai R14 Mei Tin R18 Tai Wai R19 Chung Shing

District	No. of DCCAs Affected	Code and Name of DCCAs Affected
Kwai Tsing	8	S01 Kwai Hing S02 Kwai Shing East Estate S06 Shek Yam S07 On Yam S08 Shek Lei Extension S09 Shek Lei S11 Kwai Fong S15 Hing Fong
Total :	62	

**Changes Made to the Names of DCCAs
as a Result of Public Consultation**

District	DCCA Code	DCCA Name	
		EAC's Provisional Recommendations	EAC's Final Recommendations
Wong Tai Sin	H24	Ngau Tsuen	Chi Choi
Tsuen Wan	K17	Cheung Shan	Cheung Shek
Sai Kung	Q06	Po Ying	Wan Po
	Q16	Fu Ming	Fu Yu
	Q17	Tung Ming	Tak Ming
	Q18	On Hong	Po Hong
Sha Tin	R10	Chun Shing	Chun Fung
	R33	Yu Chui	Yu Yan

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

District	DCCA exceeding permissible limits	Population and deviation percentage	Reason
Eastern	C33 Hing Man	21,541 (+25.28%)	Because of the size, shape, accessibility and development of the area
	C34 Lok Hong	11,301 (-34.27%)	Because of the size, shape, accessibility and development of the area
Southern	D17 Stanley & Shek O	24,624 (+43.21%) (same as in the provisional recommendations)	Because of the need to preserve community identities and local ties
Wong Tai Sin	H07 San Po Kong	22,099 (+28.53%)	Because of the need to preserve community integrity and local ties
Kwun Tong	J22 Lai Kong	23,204 (+34.95%)	Because of the need to preserve community integrity
Tuen Mun	L08 Shan King	21,535 (+25.25%)	Because of the need to preserve community identities and local ties
	L24 Po Tin	22,072 (+28.37%) (same as in the provisional recommendations)	Because of the need to preserve community identities and local ties

District	DCCA exceeding permissible limits	Population and deviation percentage	Reason
Tuen Mun	L29 Tuen Mun Rural	21,510 (+25.10%)	Because of the need to preserve local ties
Yuen Long	M19 Tin Heng	21,913 (+27.45%)	Because of the need to preserve community integrity
	M23 Tin Yiu	23,882 (+38.90%) (same as in the provisional recommendations)	Because of the need to preserve community identities and local ties
	M24 Tsz Yau	23,807 (+38.46%) (same as in the provisional recommendations)	Because of the need to preserve community identities and local ties
	M27 Kam Tin	10,274 (-40.25%) (same as in the provisional recommendations)	Because of the need to preserve integrity or homogeneity of the community
	M28 Pat Heung North	9,297 (-45.93%) (same as in the provisional recommendations)	Because of the large area covered by this DCCA and the need to preserve community identities and local ties
Tai Po	P19 Sai Kung North	9,726 (-43.43%) (same as in the provisional recommendations)	Because of the large area covered by this DCCA and the need to preserve community identities and local ties

District	DCCA exceeding permissible limits	Population and deviation percentage	Reason
Sai Kung	Q03 Sai Kung Islands	10,303 (-40.08%) (same as in the provisional recommendations)	Because of the large area covered by this DCCA (over 70 islands), accessibility, and the need to preserve community identities and local ties
	Q06 Wan Po	21,559 (+25.39%)	Because the average population per DCCA in the Sai Kung District is higher than the population quota, there is a need to preserve local community ties, and the revised DCCA would only include estates that are physically close to one another
	Q14 King Lam	22,160 (+28.88%) (same as in the provisional recommendations)	Because the average population per DCCA in the Sai Kung District is higher than the population quota, and there is a need to preserve local community ties

District	DCCA exceeding permissible limits	Population and deviation percentage	Reason
Sai Kung	Q18 Po Hong	23,822 (+38.55%)	Because the average population per DCCA in the Sai Kung District is higher than the population quota, there is a need to preserve local community ties, and the revised DCCA would only include estates that are physically close to each other
Sha Tin	R03 Wo Che Estate	21,783 (+26.69%) (same as in the provisional recommendations)	Because of the need to maintain the homogeneity and local ties of the community
	R30 Heng On	22,443 (+30.53%) (same as in the provisional recommendations)	Because of the need to maintain the homogeneity and local ties of the community
Kwai Tsing	S09 Shek Lei	21,611 (+25.69%)	Because of the need to preserve community integrity
	S11 Kwai Fong	21,745 (+26.47%)	Because of the need to preserve community integrity
Islands	T03 Tung Chung New Town	24,404 (+41.93%) (same as in the provisional recommendations)	Because of the size, shape, accessibility and development of the area

District	DCCA exceeding permissible limits	Population and deviation percentage	Reason
Islands	T05 Peng Chau & Hei Ling Chau	8,342 (-51.48%) (same as in the provisional recommendations)	Because of the large area covered by this DCCA and the need to preserve community identities and local ties
	T06 Lamma & Po Toi	5,568 (-67.62%) (same as in the provisional recommendations)	Because of the large area covered by this DCCA and the need to preserve community identities and local ties
	T07 Cheung Chau South	12,027 (-30.05%) (same as in the provisional recommendations)	Because of the large area covered by this DCCA and the need to preserve community identities and local ties
	T08 Cheung Chau North	11,878 (-30.92%) (same as in the provisional recommendations)	Because of the large area covered by this DCCA and the need to preserve community identities and local ties

***Total number of DCCAs exceeding the permissible limits
of the population quota = 27***

建議概要
Summary of Final Recommendations

中西區 Central and Western		估計人口 Estimated Population	標準人口基數偏差百份比 +/- % of Population Quota (17 194)
建議選區 Recommended Constituency Areas			
代號 Code	名稱 Name		
A01	中環 Chung Wan	15 968	-7.13%
A02	半山東 Mid Levels East	19 321	12.37%
A03	衛城 Castle Road	19 846	15.42%
A04	山頂 Peak	19 375	12.68%
A05	大學 University	21 134	22.91%
A06	堅摩 Kennedy Town & Mount Davis	14 817	-13.82%
A07	觀龍 Kwun Lung	14 228	-17.25%
A08	西環 Sai Wan	15 824	-7.97%
A09	寶翠 Belcher	21 197	23.28%
A10	石塘咀 Shek Tong Tsui	17 018	-1.02%
A11	西營盤 Sai Ying Pun	17 534	1.98%
A12	上環 Sheung Wan	14 620	-14.97%
A13	東華 Tung Wah	13 097	-23.83%
A14	正街 Centre Street	13 030	-24.22%
A15	水街 Water Street	14 687	-14.58%

總數 Total : 251 696

建議概要
Summary of Final Recommendations

灣仔 Wan Chai			估計人口 Estimated Population	標準人口基數偏差百份比 +/- % of Population Quota (17 194)
建議選區 Recommended Constituency Areas				
代號 Code	名稱 Name			
B01	軒尼詩	Hennessy	13 277	-22.78%
B02	愛群	Oi Kwan	13 340	-22.41%
B03	鵝頸	Canal Road	13 525	-21.34%
B04	銅鑼灣	Causeway Bay	13 549	-21.20%
B05	大坑	Tai Hang	14 083	-18.09%
B06	渣甸山	Jardine's Lookout	14 682	-14.61%
B07	樂活	Broadwood	14 503	-15.65%
B08	跑馬地	Happy Valley	14 572	-15.25%
B09	司徒拔道	Stubbs Road	14 604	-15.06%
B10	修頓	Southorn	12 923	-24.84%
B11	大佛口	Tai Fat Hau	14 042	-18.33%

總數 Total : 153 100

建議概要
Summary of Final Recommendations

東區 Eastern			估計人口 Estimated Population	標準人口基數偏差百份比 +/- % of Population Quota (17 194)
建議選區 Recommended Constituency Areas				
代號 Code	名稱 Name			
C01	太古城西	Tai Koo Shing West	18 203	5.87%
C02	太古城東	Tai Koo Shing East	19 808	15.20%
C03	鯉景灣	Lei King Wan	16 308	-5.15%
C04	筲箕灣	Shaukeiwan	13 048	-24.11%
C05	愛秩序灣	Aldrich Bay	19 701	14.58%
C06	阿公岩	A Kung Ngam	14 731	-14.32%
C07	杏花邨	Heng Fa Chuen	19 666	14.38%
C08	翠灣	Tsui Wan	13 580	-21.02%
C09	欣藍	Yan Lam	16 692	-2.92%
C10	小西灣	Siu Sai Wan	14 761	-14.15%
C11	景怡	King Yee	17 683	2.84%
C12	環翠	Wan Tsui	17 022	-1.00%
C13	翡翠	Fei Tsui	13 925	-19.01%
C14	柏架山	Mount Parker	14 831	-13.74%
C15	寶馬山	Braemar Hill	16 028	-6.78%
C16	天后	Tin Hau	15 625	-9.13%
C17	炮台山	Fortress Hill	15 678	-8.82%
C18	維園	Victoria Park	14 178	-17.54%
C19	城市花園	City Garden	16 243	-5.53%
C20	和富	Provident	19 830	15.33%
C21	堡壘	Fort Street	15 294	-11.05%
C22	錦屏	Kam Ping	16 746	-2.61%
C23	丹拿	Tanner	16 667	-3.07%
C24	健康村	Healthy Village	17 350	0.91%
C25	鯪魚涌	Quarry Bay	15 304	-10.99%
C26	南豐	Nam Fung	14 975	-12.91%
C27	康怡	Kornhill	13 439	-21.84%
C28	康山	Kornhill Garden	14 019	-18.47%
C29	興東	Hing Tung	20 907	21.59%
C30	西灣河	Sai Wan Ho	18 307	6.47%
C31	下耀東	Lower Yiu Tung	18 533	7.79%
C32	上耀東	Upper Yiu Tung	14 672	-14.67%
C33	興民	Hing Man	21 541	25.28%
C34	樂康	Lok Hong	11 301	-34.27%
C35	翠德	Tsui Tak	13 646	-20.64%
C36	漁灣	Yue Wan	13 507	-21.44%
C37	佳曉	Kai Hiu	16 590	-3.51%

總數 Total : 600 339

建議概要
Summary of Final Recommendations

南區 Southern		估計人口 Estimated Population	標準人口基數偏差百份比 +/- % of Population Quota (17 194)
建議選區 Recommended Constituency Areas			
代號 Code	名稱 Name		
D01	香港仔 Aberdeen	14 549	-15.38%
D02	鴨脷洲邨 Ap Lei Chau Estate	15 297	-11.03%
D03	鴨脷洲北 Ap Lei Chau North	15 383	-10.53%
D04	利東一 Lei Tung I	13 234	-23.03%
D05	利東二 Lei Tung II	15 040	-12.53%
D06	海怡東 South Horizons East	14 615	-15.00%
D07	海怡西 South Horizons West	15 700	-8.69%
D08	華貴 Wah Kwai	17 098	-0.56%
D09	華富一 Wah Fu I	14 759	-14.16%
D10	華富二 Wah Fu II	16 454	-4.30%
D11	薄扶林 Pokfulam	15 416	-10.34%
D12	置富 Chi Fu	15 083	-12.28%
D13	田灣 Tin Wan	18 397	7.00%
D14	香漁 Heung Yue	16 360	-4.85%
D15	黃竹坑 Wong Chuk Hang	21 312	23.95%
D16	海灣 Bays Area	21 246	23.57%
D17	赤柱及石澳 Stanley & Shek O	24 624	43.21%

總數 Total : 284 567

建議概要
Summary of Final Recommendations

油尖旺 Yau Tsim Mong			估計人口 Estimated Population	標準人口基數偏差百份比 +/- % of Population Quota (17 194)
建議選區 Recommended Constituency Areas				
代號 Code	名稱 Name			
E01	尖沙咀西	Tsim Sha Tsui West	17 751	3.24%
E02	尖沙咀北	Tsim Sha Tsui North	14 927	-13.18%
E03	佐敦	Jordan	13 446	-21.80%
E04	油麻地	Yau Ma Tei	16 760	-2.52%
E05	富榮	Charming	17 707	2.98%
E06	旺角西	Mong Kok West	19 441	13.07%
E07	富柏	Fu Pak	15 201	-11.59%
E08	櫻桃	Cherry	18 890	9.86%
E09	大角咀	Tai Kok Tsui	16 249	-5.50%
E10	詩歌舞	Sycamore	16 571	-3.62%
E11	大南	Tai Nan	14 605	-15.06%
E12	旺角北	Mong Kok North	16 195	-5.81%
E13	旺角東	Mong Kok East	15 046	-12.49%
E14	旺角南	Mong Kok South	14 583	-15.19%
E15	京士柏	King's Park	14 354	-16.52%
E16	尖沙咀東	Tsim Sha Tsui East	18 503	7.61%

總數 Total: 260 229

建議概要
Summary of Final Recommendations

深水埗 Sham Shui Po		估計人口 Estimated Population	標準人口基數偏差百份比 +/- % of Population Quota (17 194)
建議選區 Recommended Constituency Areas			
代號 Code	名稱 Name		
F01	寶麗 Po Lai	14 344	-16.58%
F02	長沙灣 Cheung Sha Wan	15 994	-6.98%
F03	南昌北 Nam Cheong North	16 532	-3.85%
F04	南昌東 Nam Cheong East	17 854	3.84%
F05	南昌南 Nam Cheong South	18 043	4.94%
F06	南昌中 Nam Cheong Central	17 235	0.24%
F07	南昌西 Nam Cheong West	14 264	-17.04%
F08	富昌 Fu Cheong	17 306	0.65%
F09	麗閣 Lai Kok	17 532	1.97%
F10	元州 Un Chau	21 250	23.59%
F11	荔枝角 Lai Chi Kok	13 924	-19.02%
F12	美孚南 Mei Foo South	15 092	-12.23%
F13	美孚中 Mei Foo Central	14 728	-14.34%
F14	美孚北 Mei Foo North	16 927	-1.55%
F15	龍坪 Lung Ping	18 402	7.03%
F16	蘇屋 So Uk	15 568	-9.46%
F17	李鄭屋 Lei Cheng Uk	16 363	-4.83%
F18	白田 Pak Tin	21 269	23.70%
F19	大坑東及又一村 Tai Hang Tung & Yau Yat Tsuen	14 032	-18.39%
F20	南山 Nam Shan	13 799	-19.75%
F21	石峽尾 Shek Kip Mei	17 166	-0.16%

總數 Total : 347 624

建議概要
Summary of Final Recommendations

九龍城 Kowloon City			估計人口 Estimated Population	標準人口基數偏差百份比 +/- % of Population Quota (17 194)
建議選區 Recommended Constituency Areas				
代號 Code	名稱 Name			
G01	馬頭圍	Ma Tau Wai	17 177	-0.10%
G02	馬坑涌	Ma Hang Chung	17 259	0.38%
G03	馬頭角	Ma Tau Kok	14 967	-12.95%
G04	樂民	Lok Man	13 346	-22.38%
G05	常樂	Sheung Lok	18 259	6.19%
G06	何文田	Ho Man Tin	20 814	21.05%
G07	嘉道理	Kadoorie	19 450	13.12%
G08	太子	Prince	16 527	-3.88%
G09	九龍塘	Kowloon Tong	19 149	11.37%
G10	龍城	Lung Shing	14 956	-13.02%
G11	啓德	Kai Tak	16 511	-3.97%
G12	海心	Hoi Sham	15 934	-7.33%
G13	土瓜灣北	To Kwa Wan North	13 186	-23.31%
G14	土瓜灣南	To Kwa Wan South	15 109	-12.13%
G15	鶴園海逸	Hok Yuen Laguna Verde	18 562	7.96%
G16	黃埔東	Whampoa East	17 893	4.07%
G17	黃埔西	Whampoa West	17 040	-0.90%
G18	紅磡灣	Hung Hom Bay	19 990	16.26%
G19	紅磡	Hung Hom	14 440	-16.02%
G20	家維	Ka Wai	16 450	-4.33%
G21	愛民	Oi Man	16 033	-6.75%
G22	愛俊	Oi Chun	16 078	-6.49%

總數 Total : 369 130

建議概要
Summary of Final Recommendations

黃大仙 Wong Tai Sin			估計人口 Estimated Population	標準人口基數偏差百份比 +/- % of Population Quota (17 194)
建議選區 Recommended Constituency Areas				
代號 Code	名稱 Name			
H01	龍趣	Lung Tsui	15 391	-10.49%
H02	龍啓	Lung Kai	18 003	4.71%
H03	龍上	Lung Sheung	20 918	21.66%
H04	鳳凰	Fung Wong	15 768	-8.29%
H05	鳳德	Fung Tak	19 683	14.48%
H06	龍星	Lung Sing	20 429	18.81%
H07	新蒲崗	San Po Kong	22 099	28.53%
H08	東頭	Tung Tau	13 113	-23.74%
H09	東美	Tung Mei	13 333	-22.46%
H10	樂富	Lok Fu	16 659	-3.11%
H11	橫頭磡	Wang Tau Hom	21 130	22.89%
H12	天強	Tin Keung	16 521	-3.91%
H13	翠竹及鵬程	Tsui Chuk & Pang Ching	21 135	22.92%
H14	竹園南	Chuk Yuen South	19 072	10.92%
H15	竹園北	Chuk Yuen North	19 856	15.48%
H16	慈雲西	Tsz Wan West	20 763	20.76%
H17	正愛	Ching Oi	18 961	10.28%
H18	正安	Ching On	21 167	23.11%
H19	慈雲東	Tsz Wan East	21 388	24.39%
H20	瓊富	King Fu	21 393	24.42%
H21	彩雲東	Choi Wan East	16 278	-5.33%
H22	彩雲南	Choi Wan South	15 868	-7.71%
H23	彩雲西	Choi Wan West	13 272	-22.81%
H24	池彩	Chi Choi	14 596	-15.11%
H25	彩虹	Choi Hung	14 096	-18.02%

總數 Total : 450 892

建議概要
Summary of Final Recommendations

觀塘 Kwun Tong			估計人口 Estimated Population	標準人口基數偏差百份比 +/- % of Population Quota (17 194)
建議選區 Recommended Constituency Areas				
代號 Code	名稱 Name			
J01	觀塘中心	Kwun Tong Central	13 115	-23.72%
J02	九龍灣	Kowloon Bay	14 286	-16.91%
J03	啓業	Kai Yip	14 949	-13.06%
J04	麗晶	Lai Ching	17 386	1.12%
J05	坪石	Ping Shek	15 585	-9.36%
J06	佐敦谷	Jordan Valley	16 292	-5.25%
J07	順天	Shun Tin	19 975	16.17%
J08	雙順	Sheung Shun	21 127	22.87%
J09	利安天	Lee On Tin	20 470	19.05%
J10	寶達	Po Tat	16 712	-2.80%
J11	秀茂坪北	Sau Mau Ping North	20 553	19.54%
J12	曉麗	Hiu Lai	19 778	15.03%
J13	秀茂坪南	Sau Mau Ping South	18 293	6.39%
J14	興田	Hing Tin	14 257	-17.08%
J15	德田	Tak Tin	13 721	-20.20%
J16	藍田	Lam Tin	15 572	-9.43%
J17	廣德	Kwong Tak	16 754	-2.56%
J18	平田	Ping Tin	15 377	-10.57%
J19	康栢	Hong Pak	15 416	-10.34%
J20	油塘四山東	Yau Tong Sze Shan East	17 953	4.41%
J21	油塘四山西	Yau Tong Sze Shan West	15 979	-7.07%
J22	麗港	Lai Kong	23 204	34.95%
J23	景田	King Tin	18 698	8.75%
J24	翠屏南	Tsui Ping South	16 278	-5.33%
J25	翠屏北	Tsui Ping North	14 620	-14.97%
J26	寶樂	Po Lok	17 086	-0.63%
J27	月華	Yuet Wah	13 472	-21.65%
J28	協康	Hip Hong	21 060	22.48%
J29	康樂	Hong Lok	16 672	-3.04%
J30	定安	Ting On	18 380	6.90%
J31	牛頭角	Ngau Tau Kok	20 921	21.68%
J32	淘大	To Tai	17 890	4.05%
J33	樂華北	Lok Wah North	17 653	2.67%
J34	樂華南	Lok Wah South	13 872	-19.32%

總數 Total : 583 356

建議概要
Summary of Final Recommendations

荃灣 Tsuen Wan		估計人口 Estimated Population	標準人口基數偏差百份比 +/- % of Population Quota (17 194)
建議選區 Recommended Constituency Areas			
代號 Code	名稱 Name		
K01	德華 Tak Wah	15 375	-10.58%
K02	楊屋道 Yeung Uk Road	15 147	-11.91%
K03	海濱 Hoi Bun	17 794	3.49%
K04	祈德尊 Clague Garden	16 299	-5.21%
K05	福來 Fuk Loi	14 406	-16.21%
K06	愉景 Discovery Park	17 224	0.17%
K07	荃灣中心 Tsuen Wan Centre	13 787	-19.82%
K08	荃威 Allway	16 565	-3.66%
K09	麗濤 Lai To	16 206	-5.75%
K10	麗興 Lai Hing	13 741	-20.08%
K11	荃灣郊區西 Tsuen Wan Rural West	18 274	6.28%
K12	荃灣郊區東 Tsuen Wan Rural East	18 284	6.34%
K13	綠楊 Luk Yeung	17 112	-0.48%
K14	梨木樹東 Lei Muk Shue East	13 486	-21.57%
K15	梨木樹西 Lei Muk Shue West	13 912	-19.09%
K16	石圍角 Shek Wai Kok	15 465	-10.06%
K17	象石 Cheung Shek	13 639	-20.68%

總數 Total : 266 716

建議概要
Summary of Final Recommendations

屯門 Tuen Mun			估計人口 Estimated Population	標準人口基數偏差百份比 +/- % of Population Quota (17 194)
建議選區 Recommended Constituency Areas				
代號 Code	名稱 Name			
L01	屯門市中心	Tuen Mun Town Centre	17 596	2.34%
L02	兆置	Siu Chi	20 930	21.73%
L03	兆翠	Siu Tsui	17 172	-0.13%
L04	安定	On Ting	20 282	17.96%
L05	友愛南	Yau Oi South	16 541	-3.80%
L06	友愛北	Yau Oi North	15 577	-9.40%
L07	翠興	Tsui Hing	17 209	0.09%
L08	山景	Shan King	21 535	25.25%
L09	景興	King Hing	19 082	10.98%
L10	興澤	Hing Tsak	19 486	13.33%
L11	新墟	San Hui	16 307	-5.16%
L12	三聖	Sam Shing	21 132	22.90%
L13	恆福	Hanford	21 481	24.93%
L14	兆新	Siu Sun	21 107	22.76%
L15	悅湖	Yuet Wu	13 439	-21.84%
L16	兆禧	Siu Hei	13 576	-21.04%
L17	湖景	Wu King	17 276	0.48%
L18	蝴蝶	Butterfly	14 411	-16.19%
L19	樂翠	Lok Tsui	15 047	-12.49%
L20	龍門	Lung Mun	19 420	12.95%
L21	新景	San King	17 590	2.30%
L22	良景	Leung King	16 174	-5.93%
L23	田景	Tin King	19 040	10.74%
L24	寶田	Po Tin	22 072	28.37%
L25	建生	Kin Sang	18 527	7.75%
L26	兆康	Siu Hong	16 752	-2.57%
L27	景峰	Prime View	15 418	-10.33%
L28	富泰	Fu Tai	21 466	24.85%
L29	屯門鄉郊	Tuen Mun Rural	21 510	25.10%

總數 Total : 527 155

建議概要
Summary of Final Recommendations

元朗 Yuen Long			估計人口 Estimated Population	標準人口基數偏差百份比 +/- % of Population Quota (17 194)
建議選區 Recommended Constituency Areas				
代號 Code	名稱 Name			
M01	豐年	Fung Nin	17 927	4.26%
M02	水邊	Shui Pin	20 833	21.16%
M03	南屏	Nam Ping	15 967	-7.14%
M04	北朗	Pek Long	15 052	-12.46%
M05	大橋	Tai Kiu	20 502	19.24%
M06	鳳翔	Fung Cheung	19 771	14.99%
M07	十八鄉北	Shap Pat Heung North	21 273	23.72%
M08	十八鄉南	Shap Pat Heung South	20 537	19.44%
M09	屏山南	Ping Shan South	15 836	-7.90%
M10	屏山北	Ping Shan North	20 457	18.98%
M11	廈村	Ha Tsuen	14 336	-16.62%
M12	天盛	Tin Shing	21 239	23.53%
M13	瑞愛	Shui Oi	21 456	24.79%
M14	瑞華	Shui Wah	20 949	21.84%
M15	頌華	Chung Wah	20 428	18.81%
M16	悅恩	Yuet Yan	18 727	8.92%
M17	富恩	Fu Yan	19 967	16.13%
M18	逸澤	Yat Chak	21 369	24.28%
M19	天恒	Tin Heng	21 913	27.45%
M20	宏逸	Wang Yat	17 301	0.62%
M21	嘉湖北	Kingswood North	21 449	24.75%
M22	嘉湖南	Kingswood South	20 194	17.45%
M23	天耀	Tin Yiu	23 882	38.90%
M24	慈祐	Tsz Yau	23 807	38.46%
M25	錦繡花園	Fairview Park	15 888	-7.60%
M26	新田	San Tin	17 818	3.63%
M27	錦田	Kam Tin	10 274	-40.25%
M28	八鄉北	Pat Heung North	9 297	-45.93%
M29	八鄉南	Pat Heung South	14 166	-17.61%

總數 Total : 542 615

建議概要
Summary of Final Recommendations

北區 North			估計人口 Estimated Population	標準人口基數偏差百份比 +/- % of Population Quota (17 194)
建議選區 Recommended Constituency Areas				
代號 Code	名稱 Name			
N01	聯和墟	Luen Wo Hui	20 599	19.80%
N02	粉嶺市	Fanling Town	20 836	21.18%
N03	祥華	Cheung Wah	20 873	21.40%
N04	華都	Wah Do	20 359	18.41%
N05	華明	Wah Ming	20 074	16.75%
N06	欣盛	Yan Shing	21 087	22.64%
N07	嘉福	Ka Fuk	21 050	22.43%
N08	上水鄉郊	Sheung Shui Rural	20 776	20.83%
N09	彩旭太	Choi Yuk Tai	19 516	13.50%
N10	彩園	Choi Yuen	15 754	-8.38%
N11	石湖墟	Shek Wu Hui	16 132	-6.18%
N12	天平西	Tin Ping West	13 293	-22.69%
N13	鳳翠	Fung Tsui	16 199	-5.79%
N14	沙打	Sha Ta	14 439	-16.02%
N15	天平東	Tin Ping East	14 105	-17.97%
N16	皇后山	Queen's Hill	21 251	23.60%

總數 Total : 296 343

建議概要
Summary of Final Recommendations

大埔 Tai Po		估計人口 Estimated Population	標準人口基數偏差百份比 +/- % of Population Quota (17 194)
建議選區 Recommended Constituency Areas			
代號 Code	名稱 Name		
P01	大埔墟 Tai Po Hui	15 123	-12.04%
P02	大埔中 Tai Po Central	17 735	3.15%
P03	頌汀 Chung Ting	16 767	-2.48%
P04	大元 Tai Yuen	18 023	4.82%
P05	富亨 Fu Heng	19 780	15.04%
P06	怡富 Yee Fu	19 929	15.91%
P07	富明新 Fu Ming Sun	16 272	-5.36%
P08	廣福 Kwong Fuk	14 341	-16.59%
P09	宏福 Wang Fuk	14 411	-16.19%
P10	大埔滘 Tai Po Kau	14 236	-17.20%
P11	運頭塘 Wan Tau Tong	19 808	15.20%
P12	新富 San Fu	14 948	-13.06%
P13	林村谷 Lam Tsuen Valley	15 890	-7.58%
P14	寶雅 Po Nga	17 327	0.77%
P15	太和 Tai Wo	18 568	7.99%
P16	舊墟及太湖 Old Market & Serenity	15 209	-11.54%
P17	康樂園 Hong Lok Yuen	13 264	-22.86%
P18	船灣 Shuen Wan	15 330	-10.84%
P19	西貢北 Sai Kung North	9 726	-43.43%

總數 Total : 306 687

建議概要
Summary of Final Recommendations

西貢 Sai Kung		估計人口 Estimated Population	標準人口基數偏差百份比 +/- % of Population Quota (17 194)
建議選區 Recommended Constituency Areas			
代號 Code	名稱 Name		
Q01	西貢市中心 Sai Kung Central	13 478	-21.61%
Q02	白沙灣 Pak Sha Wan	14 699	-14.51%
Q03	西貢離島 Sai Kung Islands	10 303	-40.08%
Q04	坑口東 Hang Hau East	13 786	-19.82%
Q05	坑口西 Hang Hau West	14 565	-15.29%
Q06	環保 Wan Po	21 559	25.39%
Q07	將軍澳市中心 Tseung Kwan O Centre	20 409	18.70%
Q08	健彩 Kin Choi	20 745	20.65%
Q09	翠林 Tsui Lam	19 071	10.92%
Q10	康景 Hong King	20 332	18.25%
Q11	寶林 Po Lam	20 130	17.08%
Q12	欣英 Yan Ying	20 031	16.50%
Q13	運亨 Wan Hang	20 477	19.09%
Q14	景林 King Lam	22 160	28.88%
Q15	厚德 Hau Tak	21 461	24.82%
Q16	富裕 Fu Yu	18 454	7.33%
Q17	德明 Tak Ming	20 743	20.64%
Q18	寶康 Po Hong	23 822	38.55%
Q19	尚德 Sheung Tak	21 182	23.19%
Q20	廣明 Kwong Ming	19 044	10.76%

總數 Total : 376 451

建議概要
Summary of Final Recommendations

沙田 Sha Tin		估計人口 Estimated Population	標準人口基數偏差百份比 +/- % of Population Quota (17 194)
建議選區 Recommended Constituency Areas			
代號 Code	名稱 Name		
R01	沙田市中心 Sha Tin Town Centre	18 386	6.93%
R02	瀝源 Lek Yuen	17 433	1.39%
R03	禾輦邨 Wo Che Estate	21 783	26.69%
R04	第一城 City One	16 457	-4.29%
R05	愉城 Yue Shing	16 199	-5.79%
R06	王屋 Wong Uk	18 441	7.25%
R07	沙角 Sha Kok	18 852	9.64%
R08	博康 Pok Hong	20 128	17.06%
R09	乙明 Jat Min	14 072	-18.16%
R10	秦豐 Chun Fung	18 331	6.61%
R11	新田圍 Sun Tin Wai	19 636	14.20%
R12	翠田 Chui Tin	17 898	4.09%
R13	顯嘉 Hin Ka	15 511	-9.79%
R14	美田 Mei Tin	17 299	0.61%
R15	徑口 Keng Hau	20 468	19.04%
R16	田心 Tin Sum	18 150	5.56%
R17	新翠 Sun Chui	14 187	-17.49%
R18	大圍 Tai Wai	18 491	7.54%
R19	松城 Chung Shing	20 444	18.90%
R20	穗禾 Sui Wo	13 942	-18.91%
R21	火炭 Fo Tan	14 152	-17.69%
R22	駿馬 Chun Ma	15 477	-9.99%
R23	頌安 Chung On	21 034	22.33%
R24	錦濤 Kam To	15 295	-11.04%
R25	新港城 Sunshine City	21 470	24.87%
R26	利安 Lee On	19 381	12.72%
R27	富龍 Fu Lung	19 082	10.98%
R28	錦英 Kam Ying	19 388	12.76%
R29	耀安 Yiu On	18 627	8.33%
R30	恒安 Heng On	22 443	30.53%
R31	鞍泰 On Tai	17 881	4.00%
R32	大水坑 Tai Shui Hang	14 112	-17.92%
R33	愉欣 Yu Yan	14 910	-13.28%
R34	碧湖 Bik Woo	16 462	-4.26%
R35	廣康 Kwong Hong	13 352	-22.35%
R36	廣源 Kwong Yuen	17 388	1.13%

總數 Total : 636 562

建議概要
Summary of Final Recommendations

葵青 Kwai Tsing		估計人口 Estimated Population	標準人口基數偏差百份比 +/- % of Population Quota (17 194)
建議選區 Recommended Constituency Areas			
代號 Code	名稱 Name		
S01	葵興 Kwai Hing	16 609	-3.40%
S02	葵盛東邨 Kwai Shing East Estate	19 899	15.73%
S03	上大窩口 Upper Tai Wo Hau	13 394	-22.10%
S04	下大窩口 Lower Tai Wo Hau	17 041	-0.89%
S05	葵涌邨 Kwai Chung Estate	16 028	-6.78%
S06	石蔭 Shek Yam	19 889	15.67%
S07	安蔭 On Yam	19 520	13.53%
S08	新石籬 Shek Lei Extension	20 697	20.37%
S09	石籬 Shek Lei	21 611	25.69%
S10	大白田 Tai Pak Tin	21 307	23.92%
S11	葵芳 Kwai Fong	21 745	26.47%
S12	麗瑤 Lai Yiu	15 494	-9.89%
S13	荔華 Lai Wah	20 742	20.64%
S14	祖堯 Cho Yiu	19 768	14.97%
S15	興芳 Hing Fong	13 111	-23.75%
S16	荔景 Lai King	15 994	-6.98%
S17	葵盛西邨 Kwai Shing West Estate	18 801	9.35%
S18	安灝 On Ho	19 701	14.58%
S19	偉盈 Wai Ying	19 231	11.85%
S20	青衣邨 Tsing Yi Estate	16 888	-1.78%
S21	翠怡 Greenfield	18 371	6.85%
S22	長青 Cheung Ching	17 841	3.76%
S23	長康 Cheung Hong	14 878	-13.47%
S24	盛康 Shing Hong	15 658	-8.93%
S25	青衣南 Tsing Yi South	21 222	23.43%
S26	長亨 Cheung Hang	17 803	3.54%
S27	青發 Ching Fat	21 136	22.93%
S28	長安 Cheung On	16 174	-5.93%

總數 Total : 510 553

建議概要
Summary of Final Recommendations

離島 Islands		估計人口 Estimated Population	標準人口基數偏差百份比 +/- % of Population Quota (17 194)
建議選區 Recommended Constituency Areas			
代號 Code	名稱 Name		
T01	大嶼山 Lantau	16 413	-4.54%
T02	逸東 Yat Tung	19 781	15.05%
T03	東涌新市鎮 Tung Chung New Town	24 404	41.93%
T04	愉景灣 Discovery Bay	15 125	-12.03%
T05	坪洲及喜靈洲 Peng Chau & Hei Ling Chau	8 342	-51.48%
T06	南丫及蒲台 Lamma & Po Toi	5 568	-67.62%
T07	長洲南 Cheung Chau South	12 027	-30.05%
T08	長洲北 Cheung Chau North	11 878	-30.92%

總數 Total : 113 538