

Appendix II - C

Eastern District
Summaries of Written/Oral Representations

<i>Item No.</i>	<i>DCCAs</i>	<i>No.*</i>		<i>Representations</i>	<i>EAC's Views</i>
		<i>W</i>	<i>O</i>		
1	All DCCAs	1	-	Holds no objection to the provisional recommendations on all DCCAs of the Eastern District.	The view is noted.
2	All DCCAs	1	-	(a) Supports the provisional recommendations on C03 (Lei King Wan), C04 (Sai Wan Ho), C05 (Aldrich Bay), C06 (Shaukeiwan), C07 (A Kung Ngam) and C28 (Hing Tung).	<u>Item (a)</u> The supporting view is noted.
				(b) Holds reservation on the provisional recommendations on C01 (Tai Koo Shing West), C02 (Tai Koo Shing East), C15 (Mount Parker), C24 (Quarry Bay), C25 (Nam Fung), C26 (Kornhill) and C27 (Kornhill Garden). Although the provisional recommendations are more practicable having regard to community integrity and population distribution, according to the aggregate population of the above DCCAs, their total number of elected seats is currently one more than that of their entitlement. Proposes to delete one seat in 2023 for reasonable deployment of DC resources.	<u>Item (b)</u> In accordance with the EACO, the EAC must follow the number of elected seats stipulated for each DC under the DCO in delineating the DCCA boundaries. As this proposal made in the representation is related to the enactment of the primary legislation, which does not fall under the purview of the EAC, the EAC has referred the relevant view to the CMAB for consideration.

* W: Number of written representations.

O : Number of oral representations.

<i>Item No.</i>	<i>DCCAs</i>	<i>No.*</i>		<i>Representations</i>	<i>EAC's Views</i>
		<i>W</i>	<i>O</i>		
				<p>(c) Holds reservation on the provisional recommendations on C10 (Yan Lam), C12 (King Yee), C13 (Wan Tsui), C14 (Fei Tsui), C31 (Hing Man), C34 (Yue Wan) and C35 (Kai Hiu), and objects to the provisional recommendations on C08 (Heng Fa Chuen), C09 (Tsui Wan), C11 (Siu Sai Wan), C32 (Lok Hong) and C33 (Tsui Tak). According to the aggregate population of the above DCCAs, their total number of elected seats is currently two more than that of their entitlement. Proposes to delete one seat in 2023 for reasonable deployment of DC resources.</p>	<p><u>Item (c)</u> In accordance with the EACO, the EAC must follow the number of elected seats stipulated for each DC under the DCO in delineating the DCCA boundaries. As this proposal made in the representation is related to the enactment of the primary legislation, which does not fall under the purview of the EAC, the EAC has referred the relevant view to the CMAB for consideration.</p>
				<p>(d) Proposes to transfer the area of the Hong Kong Institute of Vocational Education (“IVE”) from C08 (Heng Fa Chuen) to C09 (Tsui Wan) and maintain the boundary of C11 (Siu Sai Wan) because IVE and the Technological and Higher Education Institute of Hong Kong in C09 (Tsui Wan) are both managed by the Vocational Training Council and affected by the industrial and cargo working areas in C09 (Tsui Wan), sharing the same community characteristics and issues of concern.</p>	<p><u>Item (d)</u> This proposal is not accepted because:</p> <p>(i) the affected population under the proposal made in the representation (246) will be larger than that in the provisional recommendations (179) by 67;</p> <p>(ii) IVE located in C08 (Heng Fa Chuen) is geographically further away from the buildings in C09 (Tsui Wan) as compared with Fu Ming Court as proposed for</p>

<i>Item No.</i>	<i>DCCAs</i>	<i>No.*</i>		<i>Representations</i>	<i>EAC's Views</i>
		<i>W</i>	<i>O</i>		
					<p>transfer to C09 (Tsui Wan) in the provisional recommendations. There are also park and Citybus depot in between; and</p> <p>(iii) the delineation recommendations must be based on objective data of population distribution. Arrangement on district administration matters is not the relevant factor of consideration.</p>
				<p>(e) Proposes to transfer Koway Court instead of Wah Ha Estate from C33 (Tsui Tak) to C32 (Lok Hong) because:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • the car park of Koway Court is located at Tai Man Street, which affects the transport near Neptune Terrace and Greenwood Terrace located also at Tai Man Street in C32 (Lok Hong); and • Wah Ha Estate is close to MTR Chai Wan Station and belongs to a community different from Neptune Terrace and Greenwood Terrace located at the mid-levels in C32 (Lok Hong). 	<p><u>Item (e)</u> This proposal is not accepted because:</p> <p>(i) according to the proposal made in the representation, the population of C33 (Tsui Tak) (11 100) will be below the statutory permissible lower limit (-33.13%); and</p> <p>(ii) the delineation recommendations must be based on the population distribution and relevant local factors. It is inevitable that a DCCA is composed of more than one community.</p>
				<p>(f) Holds reservation on the provisional recommendations on C16</p>	<p><u>Item (f)</u> The proposal made in the representation involves</p>

<i>Item No.</i>	<i>DCCAs</i>	<i>No.*</i>		<i>Representations</i>	<i>EAC's Views</i>
		<i>W</i>	<i>O</i>		
				(Braemar Hill), C17 (Fortress Hill), C18 (City Garden), C19 (Provident), C20 (Fort Street), C21 (Kam Ping), C22 (Tanner) and C23 (Healthy Village). Considering the differences in area and population between the Eastern and the Wan Chai DCs, proposes to transfer the above DCCAs from the Eastern District to the Wan Chai District in 2023 and to rename the Wan Chai District as the Harbour District to reflect that Wan Chai and North Point are located at the bay area in the central part of the Hong Kong Island.	alteration of administrative district boundaries, which does not fall under the purview of the EAC. The EAC has referred this view to the Government for consideration.
				(g) Same as item 16.	<u>Item (g)</u> Please see item 16.
3	C03 – Lei King Wan C04 – Sai Wan Ho C28 – Hing Tung	1	-	To strengthen community ties and bring the populations of C03 (Lei King Wan) and C04 (Sai Wan Ho) closer to the population quota, proposes: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> to transfer Les Saisons from C04 (Sai Wan Ho) to C03 (Lei King Wan) as it has closer community ties with C03 (Lei King Wan); to transfer the old residential blocks (except Tai On Building) from C03 (Lei King Wan) to C04 (Sai Wan Ho), so that the population of C03 (Lei King Wan) can continue to fall within the 	This proposal is not accepted because the populations of C03 (Lei King Wan), C04 (Sai Wan Ho) and C28 (Hing Tung) will fall within the statutory permissible range. According to the established working principles, adjustments to their existing boundaries are not required.

<i>Item No.</i>	<i>DCCAs</i>	<i>No.*</i>		<i>Representations</i>	<i>EAC's Views</i>
		<i>W</i>	<i>O</i>		
				<p>statutory permissible range; and</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> to transfer 18 Upper East and Shing On Building, or even Parker33, The Oakridge, Fortune Court, Tai Sing House and Truecourse Tower from C04 (Sai Wan Ho) to C28 (Hing Tung), depending on the population figures. 	
4	C04 – Sai Wan Ho C29 – Lower Yiu Tung	1	-	<p>Proposes to transfer Sun Sing Centre, Lok Kwan House and Belleve Court from C04 (Sai Wan Ho) to C29 (Lower Yiu Tung) because:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> there will be new residential developments with imminent population intake and a lot of residential projects are in progress in C04 (Sai Wan Ho). Expects that the population of the DCCA will increase significantly. The EAC should have foreseen the above situation and adjust the boundary of the DCCA concerned as soon as possible to avoid future adjustment and causing confusion to the residents without knowing who is their DC member; it will be hard for the DC member to manage if the DCCA is overpopulated, and it is also unfair to residents; and 	<p>This proposal is not accepted because:</p> <p>(i) the populations of C04 (Sai Wan Ho) and C29 (Lower Yiu Tung) will fall within the statutory permissible range. According to the established working principles, adjustments to their existing boundaries are not required;</p> <p>(ii) it is an established practice that the delineation exercise for a DC ordinary election should be conducted on the basis of the latest projected population figures as at 30 June of the election year. Developments thereafter will not be taken into consideration; and</p> <p>(iii) the delineation recommendations must be based on objective data of</p>

<i>Item No.</i>	<i>DCCAs</i>	<i>No.*</i>		<i>Representations</i>	<i>EAC's Views</i>
		<i>W</i>	<i>O</i>		
				<ul style="list-style-type: none"> C29 (Lower Yiu Tung) has the capacity to absorb more population. 	<p>population distribution. Community services provided by DC members is not the relevant factor of consideration.</p>
5	<p>C04 – Sai Wan Ho</p> <p>C29 – Lower Yiu Tung</p> <p>C30 – Upper Yiu Tung</p>	3	-	<p>(a) Propose to transfer both Yiu Fung House and Yiu On House from C29 (Lower Yiu Tung) to C30 (Upper Yiu Tung) and the private residential buildings near Sun Sing Street from C04 (Sai Wan Ho) to C29 (Lower Yiu Tung). Reasons are summarised as follows:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Yiu Fung House and Yiu On House are next to each other geographically; query that the EAC is under pressure and political considerations not to transfer Yiu Fung House and Yiu On House together to C30 (Upper Yiu Tung); activities of the residents living along Sun Sing Street are mainly centralised in the area of Shau Kei Wan; residents have always regarded Hoi An Street as the boundary of Sai Wan Ho. Across Hoi An Street is Shau Kei Wan; 	<p><u>Items (a) and (b)</u> These proposals are not accepted because:</p> <p>(i) the number of affected DCCAs under the proposal made in the representations will be one more than that in the provisional recommendations. The affected population under the proposal will be larger, too;</p> <p>(ii) if both Yiu Fung House and Yiu On House are transferred from C29 (Lower Yiu Tung) to C30 (Upper Yiu Tung), the affected population (2 028) will be larger than that in the provisional recommendations (983) by 1 045;</p> <p>(iii) it is an established practice that the delineation exercise for a DC ordinary election should be conducted on the basis of the latest projected population figures as at 30 June of the election year. Developments thereafter will not be taken into</p>

<i>Item No.</i>	<i>DCCAs</i>	<i>No.*</i>		<i>Representations</i>	<i>EAC's Views</i>
		<i>W</i>	<i>O</i>		
				<ul style="list-style-type: none"> consider that the EAC has underestimated the population of C04 (Sai Wan Ho). As there will be new residential developments with imminent population intake at Sun Sing Street, expect that the population of C04 (Sai Wan Ho) will increase substantially. The above proposal can relieve the population growth of C04 (Sai Wan Ho); the above proposal can resolve the problem of insufficient and persistent decrease in population of C30 (Upper Yiu Tung) over the years and allow C29 (Lower Yiu Tung) to absorb part of the population of C04 (Sai Wan Ho) as early as possible as its population will go up significantly; and the above proposal can even out the populations of C04 (Sai Wan Ho), C29 (Lower Yiu Tung) and C30 (Upper Yiu Tung). It will be more fair to the residents if the populations served by DC members of different DCCAs are similar. 	<p>consideration; and</p> <p>(iv) the delineation recommendations must be based on objective data of population distribution. Community services provided by DC members or political factors will not be taken into consideration.</p>

<i>Item No.</i>	<i>DCCAs</i>	<i>No.*</i>		<i>Representations</i>	<i>EAC's Views</i>
		<i>W</i>	<i>O</i>		
				(b) One representation further proposes to transfer buildings such as Sun Sing Centre and Bellevue Court from C04 (Sai Wan Ho) to C29 (Lower Yiu Tung).	
6	C05 – Aldrich Bay C06 – Shaukeiwan C07 – A Kung Ngam	2	-	<p>Object to the provisional recommendations on C05 (Aldrich Bay), C06 (Shaukeiwan) and C07 (A Kung Ngam) because:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • the provisional recommendations on the above DCCAs do not have regard to the community integrity and local ties; • Aldrich Garden has been included in C07 (A Kung Ngam) since 2011. However, the residents of Aldrich Garden share the community facilities and the same needs with residents in the area of Aldrich Bay, and hence have a weaker sense of belonging towards C07 (A Kung Ngam); • there are different types of residence in C07 (A Kung Ngam). It is difficult for the DC member to serve residents of different social standings. As the DC member of the above DCCA also has different stances, it is hard to reach a consensus on community issues; and • frequent changes in DCCA 	<p>This representation is not accepted because:</p> <p>(i) the populations of C05 (Aldrich Bay), C06 (Shaukeiwan) and C07 (A Kung Ngam) will fall within the statutory permissible range. According to the established working principles, adjustments to their existing boundaries are not required; and</p> <p>(ii) the delineation recommendations must be based on objective data of population distribution. Community services provided by DC members is not the relevant factor of consideration.</p>

<i>Item No.</i>	<i>DCCAs</i>	<i>No.*</i>		<i>Representations</i>	<i>EAC's Views</i>
		<i>W</i>	<i>O</i>		
				boundaries make it hard for electors to adapt to and seek help from DC members.	
7	C06 – Shaukeiwan C07 – A Kung Ngam	1	-	<p>Proposes to transfer Eastway Towers from C07 (A Kung Ngam) to C06 (Shaukeiwan) because:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • the proposal can even out the populations of the above DCCAs so that the DC members of the two DCCAs can provide better services for residents; • there will be new residential developments with population intake in C07 (A Kung Ngam) starting from 2019, but the increase in population may not have been accurately reflected in the population of the DCCA concerned; and • considering geographical factors and the preservation of community integrity and local ties, the above proposal is the most beneficial one to the two DCCAs. 	<p>This proposal is not accepted because:</p> <p>(i) the populations of C06 (Shaukeiwan) and C07 (A Kung Ngam) will fall within the statutory permissible range. According to the established working principles, adjustments to their existing boundaries are not required;</p> <p>(ii) the projected population figures as at 30 June 2019 are used for the delineation exercise for the 2019 DC Ordinary Election. As in the past, the projected population figures are provided by the AHSG, set up specially for the purpose of the delineation exercise under the Working Group on Population Distribution Projection in the PlanD. The current population distribution projections are derived by using scientific and systematic methodology based on the results of the 2016 population by-census carried out by the C&SD as well as the up-to-date official data kept by the relevant</p>

<i>Item No.</i>	<i>DCCAs</i>	<i>No.*</i>		<i>Representations</i>	<i>EAC's Views</i>
		<i>W</i>	<i>O</i>		
					<p>government departments. Members of the AHSG are all professional departments which all along have been responsible for territory-wide population census and projections on population distribution. They possess the most up-to-date information on the population and land and housing development, and the data are highly-accepted generally. The EAC has all along relied on the statistical figures provided by the AHSG, which are the only data available for the delineation exercise; and</p> <p>(iii) the delineation recommendations must be based on objective data of population distribution. Community services provided by DC members is not the relevant factor of consideration.</p>
8	C09 – Tsui Wan C10 – Yan Lam C11 – Siu Sai Wan	1	-	Considers it appropriate in the provisional recommendations to make relevant changes to DCCAs in Chai Wan and Siu Sai Wan with populations below the statutory permissible lower limit given that the number of elected seats cannot be changed. However, in the long run, proposes to reduce the number of DCCAs in Chai Wan	This proposal is not accepted because in accordance with the EACO, the EAC must follow the number of elected seats stipulated for each DC under the DCO in delineating the DCCA boundaries. As this proposal made in the representation is related to the enactment of the primary legislation, which does not fall

<i>Item No.</i>	<i>DCCAs</i>	<i>No.*</i>		<i>Representations</i>	<i>EAC's Views</i>
		<i>W</i>	<i>O</i>		
	C12 – King Yee C13 – Wan Tsui C14 – Fei Tsui C31 – Hing Man C32 – Lok Hong C33 – Tsui Tak C34 – Yue Wan C35 – Kai Hiu			<p>and Siu Sai Wan from 11 to nine, including the deletion of C33 (Tsui Tak) and C35 (Kai Hiu) and re-delineation of C09 (Tsui Wan), C10 (Yan Lam), C11 (Siu Sai Wan), C12 (King Yee), C13 (Wan Tsui), C14 (Fei Tsui), C31 (Hing Man), C32 (Lok Hong) and C34 (Yue Wan) so that the populations of these DCCAs will be closer to the population quota. Details are as follows:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • to delete C35 (Kai Hiu) and transfer the relatively independent Kai Tsui Court to C12 (King Yee); • to transfer Sui Shing House and Sui Fat House of Siu Sai Wan Estate from C11 (Siu Sai Wan) to C10 (Yan Lam); • to merge Siu Sai Wan Estate (except Sui Shing House and Sui Fat House) in C11 (Siu Sai Wan) and C35 (Kai Hiu) with Hiu Tsui Court in C35 (Kai Hiu) to form C11 (Siu Sai Wan); • to transfer the seven housing blocks at Hong Ping Street from C09 (Tsui Wan) and C11 (Siu Sai Wan) to C34 (Yue Wan) as the seven blocks have closer community ties with C34 (Yue Wan); • to transfer Winner Centre, Walton Estate, Gold Mine 	<p>under the purview of the EAC, the EAC has referred the relevant view to the CMAB for consideration.</p>

<i>Item No.</i>	<i>DCCAs</i>	<i>No.*</i>		<i>Representations</i>	<i>EAC's Views</i>
		<i>W</i>	<i>O</i>		
				<p>Building and Yee Tsui Court from C33 (Tsui Tak) to C09 (Tsui Wan); and Bayview Park and Koway Court from C33 (Tsui Tak) to C32 (Lok Hong);</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • to delete C33 (Tsui Tak); • to transfer Hing Man Estate from C31 (Hing Man) to C14 (Fei Tsui); • to merge Moon Wah Building, Man Wah Building and Fire Services Department Married Quarters in C14 (Fei Tsui) with Hing Wah (1) Estate, Wah Tai Mansion and Chai Wan Cinema Building in C31 (Hing Man) and New Jade Garden and Wah Ha Estate in C33 (Tsui Tak) to form C31 (Hing Man); and • to retain the DCCA boundary of C13 (Wan Tsui). 	
9	C09 – Tsui Wan C11 – Siu Sai Wan C33 – Tsui Tak	-	1	Proposes to transfer Yee Tsui Court from C33 (Tsui Tak) to C09 (Tsui Wan) and retain the DCCA boundary of C11 (Siu Sai Wan).	This proposal is not accepted because according to the proposal made in the representation, the population of C33 (Tsui Tak) (11 735) will be below the statutory permissible lower limit (-29.30%).
10	C16 – Braemar Hill	1	-	Proposes to transfer eight DCCAs namely C16 (Braemar Hill), C17 (Fortress Hill), C18	The proposal made in the representation involves alteration of administrative

<i>Item No.</i>	<i>DCCAs</i>	<i>No.*</i>		<i>Representations</i>	<i>EAC's Views</i>
		<i>W</i>	<i>O</i>		
	C17 – Fortress Hill C18 – City Garden C19 – Provident C20 – Fort Street C21 – Kam Ping C22 – Tanner C23 – Healthy Village			<p>(City Garden), C19 (Provident), C20 (Fort Street), C21 (Kam Ping), C22 (Tanner) and C23 (Healthy Village) (except Model Housing Estate) from the Eastern District to the Wan Chai District because:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> the populations of the Eastern District and the Wan Chai District have decreased. Based on the aggregate populations, both of their total number of elected seats are two more than their entitlement, resulting in too many DC members. It leads to a wastage of resources and adverse impact on efficiency; the difference between the numbers of DC members of Wan Chai DC and Eastern DC is 22, to which appropriate adjustment should be made; the above DCCAs have already been transformed into commercial districts in recent years and become the extensions of Wan Chai and Causeway Bay; and the resources of the two administrative districts can be evened out after adjustments, which will be beneficial to the development of district administration. 	<p>district boundaries, which does not fall under the purview of the EAC. The EAC has referred this view to the Government for consideration.</p>

<i>Item No.</i>	<i>DCCAs</i>	<i>No.*</i>		<i>Representations</i>	<i>EAC's Views</i>
		<i>W</i>	<i>O</i>		
11	C17 – Fortress Hill C18 – City Garden	1	-	Proposes to transfer the area in the south of Electric Road from C18 (City Garden) to C17 (Fortress Hill) because there will be new residential developments in C18 (City Garden) and C19 (Provident) and the populations and workload of DC members will increase significantly.	This proposal is not accepted because the populations of C17 (Fortress Hill) and C18 (City Garden) will fall within the statutory permissible range. According to the established working principles, adjustments to their existing boundaries are not required.
12	C19 – Provident C23 – Healthy Village C24 – Quarry Bay	1	-	As the population of C19 (Provident) is approaching the statutory permissible upper limit, while that of C24 (Quarry Bay) is approaching the statutory permissible lower limit, proposes: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • to transfer Mansion Building, Lido Apartments and Wah Shun Gardens from C23 (Healthy Village) to C24 (Quarry Bay); and • to move the DCCA boundary between C19 (Provident) and C23 (Healthy Village) westwards from Kam Hong Street to Shu Kuk Street. 	This proposal is not accepted because the populations of C19 (Provident), C23 (Healthy Village) and C24 (Quarry Bay) will fall within the statutory permissible range. According to the established working principles, adjustments to their existing boundaries are not required.
13	C21 – Kam Ping C22 – Tanner	1	-	Proposes to transfer The Tanner Hill from C22 (Tanner) to C21 (Kam Ping) because: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Fleur Pavilia in C22 (Tanner) was completed in the third quarter of 2018 and there has been a gradual population intake. However, the population increase has not been included in the population of 	This proposal is not accepted because: <p>(i) the populations of C21 (Kam Ping) and C22 (Tanner) will fall within the statutory permissible range. According to the established working principles, adjustments to their existing boundaries are not required;</p>

<i>Item No.</i>	<i>DCCAs</i>	<i>No.*</i>		<i>Representations</i>	<i>EAC's Views</i>
		<i>W</i>	<i>O</i>		
				<p>the DCCA;</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> the proposal can even out the populations of the above two DCCAs and render resource allocation to neighbouring areas more even; and for residents of The Tanner Hill, except a roadway which passes through C22 (Tanner), most of the residents only use Kam Ping Street and Shu Kuk Street for access to the housing estate. The community needs of residents of The Tanner Hill are closer to those of C21 (Kam Ping). 	<p>(ii) the projected population figures as at 30 June 2019 are used for the delineation exercise for the 2019 DC Ordinary Election. As in the past, the projected population figures are provided by the AHSG, set up specially for the purpose of the delineation exercise under the Working Group on Population Distribution Projection in the PlanD. The current population distribution projections are derived by using scientific and systematic methodology based on the results of the 2016 population by-census carried out by the C&SD as well as the up-to-date official data kept by the relevant government departments. Members of the AHSG are all professional departments which all along have been responsible for territory-wide population census and projections on population distribution. They possess the most up-to-date information on the population and land and housing development, and the data are highly-accepted generally. The EAC has all along relied on the statistical figures provided by the AHSG, which are the only</p>

<i>Item No.</i>	<i>DCCAs</i>	<i>No.*</i>		<i>Representations</i>	<i>EAC's Views</i>
		<i>W</i>	<i>O</i>		
					<p>data available for the delineation exercise; and</p> <p>(iii) the delineation recommendations must be based on objective data of population distribution. Arrangement on district administration matters is not the relevant factor of consideration.</p>
14	C29 – Lower Yiu Tung C30 – Upper Yiu Tung	1	-	<p>Agrees to the provisional recommendations on the transfer of Yiu On House from C29 (Lower Yiu Tung) to C30 (Upper Yiu Tung) because the population of C30 (Upper Yiu Tung) has been decreasing over the years and approaching the statutory permissible lower limit. The DCCA only includes six public housing and Home Ownership Scheme estates, and geographically Yiu On House is only separated from C30 (Upper Yiu Tung) by a road.</p>	The supporting view is noted.
15	C29 – Lower Yiu Tung C30 – Upper Yiu Tung	30 [^]	-	<p>Object to the transfer of Yiu On House from C29 (Lower Yiu Tung) to C30 (Upper Yiu Tung) and consider that the boundaries of the two DCCAs should remain unchanged.</p> <p>Two representations consider that:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> the provisional recommendations will break 	<p>This proposal is not accepted because:</p> <p>(i) according to the proposal made in the representations, the population of C30 (Upper Yiu Tung) (12 166) will be below the statutory permissible lower limit (-26.71%);</p>

[^]Of which, 28 are template letters.

<i>Item No.</i>	<i>DCCAs</i>	<i>No.*</i>		<i>Representations</i>	<i>EAC's Views</i>
		<i>W</i>	<i>O</i>		
				<p>community integrity of C29 (Lower Yiu Tung);</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • geographically, Yiu Hing Road is the dividing line for Yiu Tung Estate: the hill-facing side is “Upper Yiu Tung” and the sea-facing side is “Lower Yiu Tung”. The transfer of Yiu On House, which belongs to the sea-facing side, alone to another DCCA will confuse the residents and break the community integrity; • residents of Yiu On House usually conduct their activities in the old housing area at the foot of the hill and seldom use facilities in C30 (Upper Yiu Tung); • residents of Yiu On House have always been included in C29 (Lower Yiu Tung) and hence have an ingrained concept of “Lower Yiu Tung”. Changing their DCCA and polling station will easily cause confusion; and • wish to follow the arrangement of 2015 DC Ordinary Election that residents of Yiu On House will not be allocated to vote at Yiu Wa House in 2019 DC Ordinary Election. 	<p>(ii) C29 (Lower Yiu Tung) and C30 (Upper Yiu Tung) both belong to Yiu Tung Estate. There is no sufficient objective information and justification to prove that the provisional recommendations will break the community integrity of C29 (Lower Yiu Tung); and</p> <p>(iii) the delineation recommendations must be based on objective data of population distribution. Arrangements on district administration matters and polling station are not the relevant factors of consideration. The EAC has referred the relevant view concerning polling station to the REO for consideration.</p>

<i>Item No.</i>	<i>DCCAs</i>	<i>No.*</i>		<i>Representations</i>	<i>EAC's Views</i>
		<i>W</i>	<i>O</i>		
16	C29 – Lower Yiu Tung C30 – Upper Yiu Tung	5	-	<p>Propose to transfer Yiu Fung House and Yiu On House together from C29 (Lower Yiu Tung) to C30 (Upper Yiu Tung). Reasons are summarised as follows:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • according to the provisional recommendations, the population of C30 (Upper Yiu Tung) is still relatively low and hence able to absorb the population of Yiu Fung House at the same time; • the population of Yiu Tung Estate is ageing and that of C30 (Upper Yiu Tung) has been decreasing; • Yiu On House and Yiu Fung House were completed in the same period and adjacent to each other. Geographically, they are closer to other parts of C30 (Upper Yiu Tung) but further away from other buildings of C29 (Lower Yiu Tung); • the two blocks are situated on the same platform and use the same fire services access; • same as the residents of C30 (Upper Yiu Tung), residents of the two housing blocks habitually take mini-buses and buses, and regard themselves as living in Upper Yiu Tung. Putting residents of both housing blocks into the same DCCA 	<p>This proposal is not accepted because:</p> <p>(i) the affected population under the proposal made in the representations (2 028) will be larger than that in the provisional recommendations (983) by 1 045;</p> <p>(ii) Yiu Fung House and other buildings of Yiu Tung Estate in C29 (Lower Yiu Tung) belong to the same housing estate. They are interconnected by footbridge and roads and therefore have certain degree of connection. Geographically, Yiu Fung House will not be isolated in the provisional recommendations; and</p> <p>(iii) the delineation recommendations must be based on objective data of population distribution. Arrangements on district administration matters or community services provided by DC members are not the relevant factors of consideration.</p>

<i>Item No.</i>	<i>DCCAs</i>	<i>No.*</i>		<i>Representations</i>	<i>EAC's Views</i>
		<i>W</i>	<i>O</i>		
				<p>can facilitate DC member to handle the same traffic needs;</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • retaining Yiu Fung House alone in C29 (Lower Yiu Tung) will isolate the residents of that housing block; and • the proposal made in the representations will bring the populations of C29 (Lower Yiu Tung) and C30 (Upper Yiu Tung) closer to the population quota and the DCCA boundaries clearer, and can avoid causing confusion to members of the public about which DCCA they belong to. 	