

**Appendix II - T**

**Islands 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	-	(a) Supports the provisional recommendations on T07 (Discovery Bay), T08 (Peng Chau & Hei Ling Chau), T09 (Lamma & Po Toi) and T10 (Cheung Chau).	<u>Item (a)</u> The supporting view is noted.
				(b) Holds reservation on the provisional recommendations on T01 (Lantau), T02 (Yat Tung Estate South), T03 (Yat Tung Estate North), T04 (Tung Chung South), T05 (Tung Chung Central) and T06 (Tung Chung North) because the populations of the DCCAs concerned are the highest in Hong Kong, far exceeding the statutory permissible upper limit.  Taking into account the future overall development plan of Tung Chung and Lantau, proposes that the EAC should request the Government to add at least two more seats in the Islands District in respect of the 2023 DC Ordinary Election so as to cater for	<u>Items (b) and (c)</u> In respect of the 2019 DC Ordinary Election, the Government has completed the review on the number of elected seats and the subsidiary legislation was passed by the LegCo in January 2018. There is no additional seat in the Islands District for the next DC Ordinary Election. 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. The EAC has no power to increase or decrease the number of elected seats/DCCAs in any administrative district.  As this proposal made in the representation is related to the

\* 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>the community problems caused by the increase in population and foster the development of district administration.</p> <p>(c) Proposes to amend the EACO and DCO to allow the EAC to increase or reduce the number of seats in every administrative district within the limit of 10% so as to cater for each administrative district's need on the basis of its population and community characteristics. Under the above proposal, the Islands District can add one seat to balance the situation that some of the DCCAs in Tung Chung have populations of more than 20 000 while those in the DCCAs of Peng Chau and Lamma Island are less than 7 000.</p>	<p>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>Besides, in drawing up the delineation recommendations, the EAC must strictly adhere to the statutory criteria under the EACO and its working principles. The delineation should be made on the basis of the projected populations, existing DCCA boundaries and relevant local factors. The EAC will continue to adhere to the above in future delineation exercises.</p>
2	All DCCAs	-	1	Holds no objection to the provisional recommendations on all DCCAs of the Islands District.	The view is noted.
3	All DCCAs	1	-	Hopes the EAC to review the delineation of DCCAs and number of seats in the present delineation exercise and no need to conduct the review in 2023.	As the matter mentioned 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.

<i>Item No.</i>	<i>DCCAs</i>	<i>No.*</i>		<i>Representations</i>	<i>EAC's Views</i>
		<i>W</i>	<i>O</i>		
4	All DCCAs	1	-	<p>States that there is a technical error in the provisional recommendations on the Islands District because among the 10 DCCAs, the populations of two DCCAs will be below the statutory permissible lower limit while five of them will exceed the statutory permissible upper limit. Moreover, the population of the Islands District is around 190 000 and so 11.18 DC members are required. The representation considers that the delineation of DCCAs in the Islands District has the following negligence:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• the CMAB did not take the unique geographical factors of the Islands District into consideration;</li> <li>• the REO did not provide advice to CMAB;</li> <li>• LegCo did not realise the profound effect that could be brought about by the calculation of the figures related to the DCCAs; and</li> <li>• the Islands DC has knowledge on the geographical and population distribution of the Islands District as well as the increase in population in Lantau and Tung Chung but it did not object to the number of DCCAs for the Islands District.</li> </ul>	<p>This proposal is <b>not accepted</b> because:</p> <p>(i) in accordance with the EACO, apart from taking into account the projected population, the EAC must also have regard to the other statutory factors including community identities, preservation of local ties and physical features (such as the size, shape, accessibility and development) of the relevant area. The EAC cannot adjust the boundaries solely with strict compliance with the statutory permissible range without considering the other statutory factors mentioned above. When drawing up the provisional recommendations, the EAC has examined the feasibility of combining T08 (Peng Chau &amp; Hei Ling Chau) and T09 (Lamma &amp; Po Toi). However, as these two DCCAs do not have any direct transport link, the EAC proposed that the boundaries of the above two DCCAs should remain unchanged and their populations be allowed to continue to deviate from the permissible range (the populations of the above</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>To solve the problem of the Islands District, proposes:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• to combine T08 (Peng Chau &amp; Hei Ling Chau) and T09 (Lamma &amp; Po Toi); or</li> <li>• the EAC to suggest to the Government amending the DCO for adding one DCCA to the Islands District. After that, to split T01 (Lantau) into T01 “Lantau” and T11 “North Lantau” and maintain the original boundaries of T02 (Yat Tung Estate South) and T03 (Yat Tung Estate North).</li> </ul>	<p>two DCCAs in the 2015 delineation exercise were also allowed to deviate from the statutory permissible range); and</p> <p>(ii) please see items 1(b) and (c).</p>
5	All DCCAs	1	-	<p>Supports the combination of Cheung Chau to free up a DCCA for creation in Tung Chung. Moreover, as the populations of T01 (Lantau), T02 (Yat Tung Estate South) and T03 (Yat Tung Estate North) will far exceed the statutory permissible upper limit and those of T08 (Peng Chau &amp; Hei Ling Chau) and T09 (Lamma &amp; Po Toi) will be far below the statutory permissible lower limit, proposes to combine T08 (Peng Chau &amp; Hei Ling Chau) and T09 (Lamma &amp; Po Toi) and change the name of the DCCA to “Peng Chau, Hei Ling Chau, Lamma and Po Toi”.</p> <p>On the basis of the above proposals, except that the</p>	<p>This proposal is <b>not accepted</b> because:</p> <p>(i) according to the proposal made in the representation to adjust the boundaries of T04 (Tung Chung South), T05 (Tung Chung Central) and T06 (Tung Chung North), the affected population will be larger than that in the provisional recommendations; and</p> <p>(ii) please see item 4.</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>provisional recommendations on T07 (Discovery Bay) remain unchanged, proposes to adjust the boundaries of other DCCAs as follows:</p> <p><u>T01 (Lantau)</u> includes the areas covered in the provisional recommendations but to exclude all the villages in the north of Shek Mun Kap.</p> <p><u>New DCCA T02</u> includes Mun Tung Estate, Yu Tai Court and all the villages in the north of Shek Mun Kap.</p> <p><u>T02 (Yat Tung Estate South)</u> includes Yat Tung (I) Estate. Changes the DCCA code to T03. Retains the name of the DCCA as "Yat Tung Estate South".</p> <p><u>T03 (Yat Tung Estate North)</u> includes Yat Tung (II) Estate. Changes the DCCA code to T04. Retains the name of the DCCA as "Yat Tung Estate North".</p> <p><u>T04 (Tung Chung South)</u> includes Tung Chung Crescent, Fu Tung Estate and Yu Tung Court. Changes the DCCA code to T05.</p> <p><u>T05 (Tung Chung Central)</u> includes Seaview Crescent and Coastal Skyline. Changes the DCCA code to T06.</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>		
				<u>T06 (Tung Chung North)</u> includes Caribbean Coast, Ying Tung Estate, The Visionary and Century Link. Changes the DCCA code to T07.	
6	All DCCAs	1	-	Considers that the number of DCCAs in the Islands District should not be decided by population alone as in other administrative districts. Its unique situation should be taken into consideration.	In drawing up the delineation recommendations, the EAC must strictly adhere to the statutory criteria under the EACO and its working principles. The delineation should be made on the basis of the projected populations, existing DCCA boundaries and relevant local factors. The EAC will continue to adhere to the above in future delineation exercises. Moreover, the recommendations of the EAC are made on the basis of overall consideration from a macro perspective. No special emphasis to any particular administrative district or DCCA will be given.
7	T01 – Lantau T02 – Yat Tung Estate South T03 – Yat Tung Estate North	2	-	(a) Propose the EAC to maintain the original boundaries of T02 (Yat Tung Estate South) and T03 (Yat Tung Estate North) and request the Government to add one DCCA in the area of Mun Tung Estate in T01 (Lantau), maintain Cheung Chau in two DCCAs and combine T08 (Peng Chau & Hei Ling Chau) and T09	<u>Item (a)</u> These proposals are <b>not accepted</b> because: (i) in respect of the 2019 DC Ordinary Election, the Government has completed the review on the number of elected seats and the subsidiary legislation was passed by the LegCo in January 2018. There is no

<i>Item No.</i>	<i>DCCAs</i>	<i>No.*</i>		<i>Representations</i>	<i>EAC's Views</i>
		<i>W</i>	<i>O</i>		
	T04 – Tung Chung South T05 – Tung Chung Central T06 – Tung Chung North T08 – Peng Chau & Hei Ling Chau T09 – Lamma & Po Toi T10 – Cheung Chau			<p>(Lamma &amp; Po Toi) so as to free up a DCCA for creation of a new DCCA in Tung Chung. Reasons are as follows:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• according to the provisional recommendations, the populations of all T01 (Lantau), T02 (Yat Tung Estate South) and T03 (Yat Tung Estate North) will be 40% higher than the population quota. Based on the figures, it is obvious that one more DCCA should be added;</li> <li>• the populations of T08 (Peng Chau &amp; Hei Ling Chau) and T09 (Lamma &amp; Po Toi) will be almost 60% lower than the population quota, and these two DCCAs are originally formed by different islands. Therefore, they could be combined into one DCCA. After combination, the population of the DCCA can still meet the statutory requirement and the characteristics of the DCCA will not be affected; and</li> </ul>	<p>additional seat in the Islands District for the next DC Ordinary Election. 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;</p> <p>(ii) according to the proposal made in the representations, the populations of T05 (Tung Chung Central) and T06 (Tung Chung North) will exceed the statutory permissible upper limit:</p> <p>T05: 20 845, +25.58% T06: 22 965, +38.35%;</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 consideration; and</p> <p>(iv) please see item 4.</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"> <li>having considered the actual geographical situation of Cheung Chau, its population distribution and the completion of new residential buildings one after the other in the foreseeable future, it is reasonable to delineate Cheung Chau into two DCCAs.</li> </ul> <p>On the basis of the above proposal for adding a DCCA, proposes the following adjustments to the boundaries of the relevant DCCAs:</p> <p><u>T01 (Lantau)</u> includes the areas covered in the provisional recommendations but to exclude Mun Tung Estate and all the villages in Tung Chung.</p> <p><u>New DCCA</u> includes Mun Tung Estate, the villages in the south of Tung Chung Road running from Lung Tseng Tau to Fui Yiu Ha, Chek Lap Kok New Village, Tei Po New Village, Ma Wan New Village, areas around Shan Ha, Yu Tai Court, North Lantau Hospital, Wong Nai Uk, Ma Wan Chung, Sha Tsui Tau and Shek Lau Po.</p> <p><u>T04 (Tung Chung South), T05 (Tung Chung Central) and T06 (Tung Chung North)</u> transfers Seaview Crescent</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>		
				from T04 (Tung Chung South) to T05 (Tung Chung Central). As the population of T05 (Tung Chung Central) will substantially exceed the statutory permissible upper limit, the Monterey Cove, Phase 1 of the Caribbean Coast should be transferred to T06 (Tung Chung North) while La Mer, which has less population be retained in T05 (Tung Chung Central).	
				(b) state that if the EAC and the Government will not add one DCCA as proposed in item (a), T08 (Peng Chau & Hei Ling Chau) and T09 (Lamma & Po Toi) should be combined so that a new DCCA can be created in the area of Mun Tung Estate.	<u>Items (b) and (c)</u> These proposals are <b>not accepted</b> . Please see item 4.
				(c) One representation proposes to maintain the original boundaries of T02 (Yat Tung Estate South) and T03 (Yat Tung Estate North) and combine T08 (Peng Chau & Hei Ling Chau) and T09 (Lamma & Po Toi) to free up a DCCA for creation in the areas of Mun Tung Estate, Yu Tung Court and the villages of the Tung Chung Rural Committee because: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• the boundaries of T08 (Peng Chau &amp; Hei Ling Chau) and T09 (Lamma &amp; Po Toi)</li> </ul>	

<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>should not be remained unchanged simply because they do not have any direct transport link. If the population of individual DCCA will be substantially low, it is inevitable to combine it with other DCCA even if they are not close to each other; and</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>the proposal could make the populations of T01 (Lantau), T02 (Yat Tung Estate South) and T03 (Yat Tung Estate North) fall within the statutory permissible range.</li> </ul>	
8	<p>T01 – Lantau</p> <p>T02 – Yat Tung Estate South</p> <p>T03 – Yat Tung Estate North</p>	1	-	<p>Objects to the provisional recommendations on T01 (Lantau), T02 (Yat Tung Estate South) and T03 (Yat Tung Estate North). In order to make the populations of the above three DCCAs in compliance with the statutory requirements and preserve the community ties, proposes to re-delineate the whole Yat Tung Estate and the villages such as Ma Wan Chung and Chek Lap Kok New Village of T01 (Lantau) into three DCCAs.</p>	<p>This proposal is <b>not accepted</b> because based on the 2015 original DCCA boundary, apart from the villages such as Ma Wan Chung and Chek Lap Kok New Village, the area of T01 (Lantau) also covers Mun Tung Estate, Mui Wo, Lantau South, Tai O, etc. According to the proposal made in the representation, after re-delineating the whole Yat Tung Estate and the villages such as Ma Wan Chung and Chek Lap Kok New Village in T01 (Lantau) into three DCCAs, the remaining areas of T01(Lantau) cannot be transferred to its adjacent</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>		
					DCCAs having regard to the population distribution and geographical as well as transport factors.
9	T01 – Lantau  T08 – Peng Chau & Hei Ling Chau  T10 – Cheung Chau	1	-	<p>(a) To narrow down the population deviation of T01 (Lantau) from the population quota, proposes:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• to transfer Tai Shui Hang, Kau Shat Wan and Man Kok from T01 (Lantau) to T08 (Peng Chau &amp; Hei Ling Chau) because they are closer to T08 (Peng Chau &amp; Hei Ling Chau) and there is kaito ferry serving Tai Shui Hang, Nim Shue Wan and Peng Chau;</li> <li>• to use Lantau South Country Park and Chi Ma Wan Road as the boundary and transfer Chi Ma Wan Peninsula to T10 (Cheung Chau) because most of the population in Chi Ma Wan Peninsula is at Chi Ma Wan Pier and the Sea Ranch. The residents mainly rely on the Cheung Chau kaito ferry instead of land transport to travel to South Lantau. According to the criterion of preservation of local ties, Chi Ma Wan</li> </ul>	<p><u>Item (a)</u> his proposal is <b>not accepted</b> because:</p> <p>(i) although the population of T01 (Lantau) (24 685) will still exceed the statutory permissible upper limit (+48.71%) under the provisional recommendations, the provisional recommendations have substantially improved the situation of the DCCA from exceeding the statutory permissible upper limit. According to the proposal made in the representation, after transferring Tai Shui Hang, Kau Shat Wan and Man Kok to T08 (Peng Chau &amp; Hei Ling Chau) and part of the areas in the Chi Ma Wan Peninsula to T10 (Cheung Chau), the population of T01 (Lantau) (24 237) will still exceed the statutory permissible upper limit (+46.01%). In terms of the deviation from the population quota, there is no apparent improvement over the provisional recommendations;</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>Peninsula should be put in T10 (Cheung Chau);</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>to transfer Shek Kwu Chau and Soko Islands to T10 (Cheung Chau) because relatively speaking, Cheung Chau is near to these two islands. Moreover, transferring Shek Kwu Chau and Soko Islands to T10 (Cheung Chau) will not increase its population drastically; and</li> <li>if Cheung Chau continues to be spilt into two DCCAs, then Chi Ma Wan Peninsula can be transferred from T01 (Lantau) to "Cheung Chau North" and the name of the DCCA can be changed to "Cheung Chau North and Chi Ma Wan". As for Shek Kwu Chau and Soko Islands of T01 (Lantau), they can be transferred to "Cheung Chau South" and the name of the DCCA can be changed to "Cheung Chau South and Soko Islands". The adjustments will also increase the populations of the DCCAs concerned.</li> </ul>	<p>(ii) Man Kok is under the Mui Wo Rural Committee. According to the proposal made in the representation, transferring it to T08 (Peng Chau &amp; Hei Ling Chau) will undermine the traditional village ties of the area concerned; and</p> <p>(iii) according to the proposal made in the representation, after transferring part of the areas in the Chi Ma Wan Peninsula to T10 (Cheung Chau), the population of the latter will further exceed the statutory permissible upper limit:</p> <p>Provisional recommendations: T10: 21 752, +31.04%</p> <p>Proposal made in the representation: T10: 22 131, +33.33%</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) With the continuous development of the Tung Chung New Town, in the long run, the villages in T01 (Lantau) can be split and transferred to other DCCAs with public housing estates or private housing estates to form a new DCCA.	<u>Item (b)</u> In drawing up the delineation recommendations, the EAC must strictly adhere to the statutory criteria under the EACO and its working principles. The delineation should be made on the basis of the projected populations, existing DCCA boundaries and relevant local factors. The EAC will continue to adhere to the above in future delineation exercises.
10	T02 – Yat Tung Estate South  T09 – Lamma & Po Toi	1	-	States that the population in T02 (Yat Tung Estate South) is around 20 000 while that in T09 (Lamma & Po Toi) is around 6 000. Apart from an elected member, there are also two ex-officio members, i.e. a total of three DC members in T09 (Lamma & Po Toi). On average, one DC member needs to serve only 2 000 people, just one tenth of the workload of the DC member in T02 (Yat Tung Estate South).	In drawing up the delineation recommendations, the EAC must strictly adhere to the statutory criteria under the EACO and its working principles. The delineation should be made on the basis of the projected populations, existing DCCA boundaries and relevant local factors. The workload of DC members is not the relevant factor of consideration.
11	T02 – Yat Tung Estate South  T03 – Yat Tung Estate North	1 <sup>^</sup>	-	Supports the provisional recommendations on T02 (Yat Tung Estate South) and T03 (Yat Tung Estate North). Reasons are as follows: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• with the intake of Mun Tung Estate, the population of Tung Chung West will</li> </ul>	The supporting view is noted.

<sup>^</sup> The representation contains 12 signatures from the public.

<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>increase by more than 10 000 people. The provisional recommendations have successfully distributed the increased population to T02 (Yat Tung Estate South) and T03 (Yat Tung Estate North) evenly;</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• there are 4 000 residents at Hong Yat House and Ching Yat House which are transferred to T03 (Yat Tung Estate North). If Ching Yat House is remained in T02 (Yat Tung Estate South), the population of the DCCA will exceed 25 000, resulting in a crisis to the system; and</li> <li>• disagrees on criticising the DCCA delineation on grounds of building types because there are quite a number of similar cases in other DCCAs across Hong Kong.</li> </ul>	
12	T02 – Yat Tung Estate South  T03 – Yat Tung Estate North	548 <sup>#</sup>	-	<p>(a) Object to the delineation of T02 (Yat Tung Estate South) and T03 (Yat Tung Estate North). Propose to maintain the original boundaries of these two DCCAs. Reasons are summarised as follows:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• originally, T02 (Yat Tung Estate South)</li> </ul>	<p><u>Item (a)</u> This proposal is <b>not accepted</b> because based on the 2015 original DCCA boundary, the population of T01 (Lantau) (36 109) will substantially exceed the statutory permissible upper limit (+117.54%) because of the completion of Mun Tung Estate. As there is no</p>

<sup>#</sup> Of which, 546 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>comprises Yat Tung (I) Estate while T03 (Yat Tung Estate North) comprises Yat Tung (II) Estate. The livelihood of the residents in these estates are distinctly separated and they are used to seeking assistance from the DC members of their respective DCCAs. The provisional recommendations proposed to transfer Hong Yat House and Ching Yat House of Yat Tung (I) Estate to T03 (Yat Tung Estate North). Such will undermine the integrity of the two communities;</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• it is unfair to the residents of Hong Yat House and Ching Yat House as they are deprived of their rights to vote in T02 (Yat Tung Estate South);</li> <li>• Hong Yat House has been transferred to different DCCAs in each election. This caused confusion to the residents and disregarded the community ties and integrity; and</li> </ul>	<p>additional seat in the Islands District after the review on the number of elected seats of each administrative district by the Government and Mun Tung Estate does not have any connection with other rural areas in Lantau, the provisional recommendations proposed to transfer Mun Tung Estate from T01 (Lantau) to the adjacent T02 (Yat Tung Estate South).</p> <p>After the above adjustment, the percentage deviation of T02 (Yat Tung Estate South) will be as high as 70%. To narrow down the difference among different DCCAs in terms of the percentage of population deviation from the population quota, it is proposed in the provisional recommendations to transfer Hong Yat House and Ching Yat House of Yat Tung (I) Estate to T03 (Yat Tung Estate North). The respective populations of the DCCAs concerned are:</p> <p>T01: 24 685, +48.71% T02: 23 475, +41.42% T03: 24 772, +49.24%</p> <p>Regarding the other issues as mentioned in the representations, the delineation recommendations must be based on objective data of population distribution. Arrangements</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"> <li>according to the provisional recommendations, the populations of the DCCAs concerned will deviate substantially from the permissible upper limit of the population quota.</li> </ul>	<p>on district administration matters or community services provided by DC members are not the relevant factors of consideration.</p> <p>Besides, there is a representation supporting the provisional recommendations (please see item 11).</p>
				(b) There are 546 template representations stating that the EAC did not consult the residents before making the provisional recommendations on transferring Hong Yat House and Ching Yat House of Yat Tung (I) Estate to T03 (Yat Tung Estate North).	<p><u>Item (b)</u></p> <p>The EACO stipulates that the EAC is responsible for drawing up the provisional recommendations and to consult the public thereafter. During the consultation period, members of the public can express their views on the provisional recommendations through different means. The EAC will consider every representation received during the consultation period objectively before making the final recommendations.</p>
				(c) Two representations state that the EAC has substantially overestimated the intake population of Mun Tung Estate. The population of Mun Tung Estate will not be as high as that estimated in the provisional recommendations. One of the representations proposes to transfer only Hong Yat House of Yat Tung (I) Estate to T03 (Yat Tung Estate North) and	<p><u>Item (c)</u></p> <p>This proposal is <b>not accepted</b> because according to the proposal made in the representation, the populations of T02 (Yat Tung Estate South) and T03 (Yat Tung Estate North) will deviate from the population quota. The representation is not obviously better than the provisional recommendations.</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 Mun Tung Estate to T02 (Yat Tung Estate South) as the representation estimates that the intake rate of Mun Tung Estate will only be 40% in 2019. According to this projection, after the above proposed adjustment, the populations of T02 (Yat Tung Estate South) and T03 (Yat Tung Estate North) will be 22 483 and 22 287 respectively. Although the populations of the DCCAs concerned will still exceed the statutory permissible upper limit, the populations in these two DCCAs will be more even when compared with the provisional recommendations. It will also be fair and just to the residents and future DC members of the two DCCAs.</p>	<p>Provisional recommendations: T02: 23 475, +41.42% T03: 24 772, +49.24%</p> <p>The proposal made in the representation: T02: 25 883, +55.93% T03: 22 364, +34.73%</p> <p>Regarding the view on the population figures, 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&amp;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</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>		
					housing development, and the data are highly-accepted generally. The EAC has all along relied on the statistical figures provided by the AHSI, which are the only data available for the delineation exercise.
13	T06 – Tung Chung North	1	-	Supports the provisional recommendation.	The supporting view is noted.
14	T04 – Tung Chung South T06 – Tung Chung North	1	-	Considers that the provisional recommendations on transferring Ying Tung Estate to T06 (Tung Chung North) will cause confusion to the residents.	Based on the 2015 original DCCA boundary, the population of T04 (Tung Chung South) (36 777) will substantially exceed the statutory permissible upper limit (+121.56%). To maintain the population of the DCCA within the statutory permissible range, adjustment to its boundary is required.
15	T04 – Tung Chung South T05 – Tung Chung Central T06 – Tung Chung North	1	-	Considers that the names of T04 (Tung Chung South), T05 (Tung Chung Central) and T06 (Tung Chung North) cannot clearly describe the Tung Chung New Town. Therefore, proposes to rename T04 (Tung Chung South), which is located at the town centre, as “Tung Chung Town Centre”, T05 (Tung Chung Central) in the east of the town centre and Tung Chung East interchange as “Tung Chung East” and T06 (Tung Chung North) as “Tung Chung Waterfront”.	The proposal is <b>not accepted</b> because the DCCA names in the provisional recommendations have already reflected the geographical locations of the DCCAs. Besides, the DCCA names “Tung Chung South” and “Tung Chung North” have been used since 2007 and the public are used to these DCCA names. Change of the DCCA names will cause confusion to the public.

<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	T04 – Tung Chung South  T05 – Tung Chung Central  T06 – Tung Chung North	1	-	<p>Disagrees to transferring the Seaview Crescent and La Mer, Phase 5 of the Caribbean Coast to T04 (Tung Chung South) and T06 (Tung Chung North) respectively because:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>the Seaview Crescent, Caribbean Coast and Coastal Skyline are geographically adjacent to each other and have all along been in T05 (Tung Chung Central);</li> <li>in the 2011 DC delineation exercise, the EAC did not accept putting the Seaview Crescent and Tung Chung Crescent in the same DCCA because these two estates were separated by the North Lantau Highway;</li> <li>La Mer, Phase 5 of the Caribbean Coast and the other four phases of the Caribbean Coast are put in T06 (Tung Chung North) and T05 (Tung Chung Central) respectively. The same housing estate will be served by two DC members; and</li> <li>the serving DC member has established a good relationship with the residents. The residents are shocked and dissatisfied with the change of the DCCA.</li> </ul>	<p>This representation is <b>not accepted</b> because:</p> <p>(i) in each DC delineation exercise, the EAC will review the boundaries of the DCCAs which were allowed to deviate from the permissible range in the past. If there are changes in the objective circumstances of those DCCAs allowed to depart from the permissible range in the past, such as the addition of new seats within the administrative districts or there is room for adjustment in the adjacent DCCAs, the EAC will appropriately adjust their boundaries in light of the actual situations.</p> <p>For the present delineation exercise, as based on the 2015 original DCCA boundary, the population of T04 (Tung Chung South) (including T06 (Tung Chung North)) (36 777) will substantially exceed the statutory permissible upper limit (+121.56%), the EAC proposed to create a new DCCA T06 (Tung Chung North) in the areas of Century Link, The Visionary and Ying Tung Estate. After transferring part 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>		
					<p>the population to the new DCCA, there is room for T04 (Tung Chung South) to absorb the excessive population of T05 (Tung Chung Central). Therefore, the EAC proposed to transfer Seaview Crescent from T05 (Tung Chung Central) to T04 (Tung Chung South);</p> <p>(ii) for the 2011 and 2015 DC delineation exercises, although the population of T05 (Tung Chung Central) exceeded the statutory permissible upper limit, taking into account its deviation from the population quota and the separation of T05 (Tung Chung Central) and T04 (Tung Chung South) by the North Lantau Highway, the EAC proposed to maintain the boundary of T05 (Tung Chung Central) unchanged and allow its population to exceed the statutory permissible upper limit. The respective population of T05 (Tung Chung Central) in 2011 and 2015 were:</p> <p>2011: 22 048, +27.58% 2015: 22 450, +32.34%</p> <p>However, for the present delineation exercise, the</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>populations of the DCCAs in Tung Chung will substantially increase making the population of T05 (Tung Chung Central) (24 546) to exceed considerably the statutory permissible upper limit (+47.88%). In spite of the North Lantau Highway between T05 (Tung Chung Central) and T04 (Tung Chung South), the EAC noticed that there is a footbridge between Seaview Crescent in T05 (Tung Chung Central) and Tung Chung Crescent in T04 (Tung Chung South). Therefore, the provisional recommendations proposed to transfer the Seaview Crescent from T05 (Tung Chung Central) to T04 (Tung Chung South). After the above adjustment, the population of T04 (Tung Chung South) (21 213) will only slightly exceed the statutory permissible upper limit (+27.80%); and</p> <p>(iii) the delineation recommendations must be based on objective data of population distribution. Arrangements on district administration matters or</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>		
					community services provided by DC members are not the relevant factors of consideration.
17	T10 – Cheung Chau	1	1	Support the provisional recommendations on combining Cheung Chau into one DCCA.	The supporting view is noted.
18	T10 – Cheung Chau	453 <sup>%</sup>	6	<p>(a) Object to the provisional recommendations on combining Cheung Chau into one DCCA. Propose to maintain Cheung Chau in two DCCAs. Reasons are summarised as follows:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• it is not reliable for the EAC to combine Cheung Chau into one DCCA by making reference to the result of the population by-census of the C&amp;SD as the actual figures. The projected population of Cheung Chau will not be less than 30 000;</li> <li>• Cheung Chau is a popular island among Hong Kong people and tourists around the world. It is facing a lot of issues about community and people's livelihood as well as tourism development. The</li> </ul>	<p><u>Item (a)</u> This proposal is <b>not accepted</b> because:</p> <p>(i) based on the 2015 original DCCA boundary, the populations of T04 (Tung Chung South) (including T06 (Tung Chung North))(36 777, +121.56%) and T05 (Tung Chung Central) (24 546, +47.88%) will substantially exceed the statutory permissible upper limit. As there is no additional seat for the Islands District after the review on the number of elected seats of each administrative district by the Government, under such circumstances, after examining the boundaries of all DCCAs and balancing the population distribution and geographical situation of the Islands District, the EAC proposed to combine Cheung Chau South with</p>

<sup>%</sup> Of which, 440 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>issues have to be handled by the DC members. If there is only one DC member, the residents have to wait longer time for assistance. This will lead to their dissatisfaction against the Government;</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• the provisional recommendations disregard the actual situation in Cheung Chau that many residents and slopes there without any public transport. The residents can only travel by bike or on foot. If there is only one elected seat, the residents will have to face many difficulties when seeking assistance; and</li> <li>• although Cheung Chau and Tung Chung are both in the Islands District, they are two places with different populations, community structures and living circles. Moreover, they are very far from each other and it takes about four hours for a round trip journey. One of the representations further states that Tung</li> </ul>	<p>Cheung Chau North, considering that they are geographically close to each other and both of their populations will be below the statutory permissible lower limit, and hence can free up a DCCA for creation in Tung Chung;</p> <p>(ii) in principle, combining DCCAs will not break any community integrity. Moreover, Cheng Chau is a Market Town and a single constituency in the Kaifong Representative Election. As such, the EAC did not agree with the notion that combining Cheung Chau South and Cheung Chau North will break the community integrity of the area or cause disharmony between the two places; 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> <p>Regarding the view on population figures, the projected population figures</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>Chung and Cheung Chau are not adjacent DCCAs. Combining Cheung Chau to free up a DCCA for creation of a new DCCA in Tung Chung violates the EAC's working principle – “where the population falls outside the permissible range, adjustments will be made to their boundaries and those of adjacent DCCAs”.</p>	<p>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&amp;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 data available for the delineation exercise.</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) 385 representations state that there was no consultation before drawing up the provisional recommendations and public opinion was ignored.	<u>Item (b)</u> The EACO stipulates that the EAC is responsible for drawing up the provisional recommendations and to consult the public thereafter. During the consultation period, members of the public can express their views on the provisional recommendations through different means. The EAC will consider every representation received during the consultation period objectively before making the final recommendations.
				(c) One representation states that even after consultation with the Chairman and Deputy Chairman of the Islands DC and the DO, the EAC still proposed to combine Cheung Chau. This will split the community.	<u>Item (c)</u> In order to comply with the statutory criteria, it is necessary for the EAC to have an understanding of the local characteristics, geographical environment and accessibility of the proposed DCCAs so that the feasibility of the various options be considered thoroughly. Taking into account that the DOs, being officers responsible for district administration, do have more comprehensive and in-depth knowledge on the local characteristics, geographical and transport matters of their administrative districts, as a long standing practice, the EAC will invite the DOs to provide factual information of their respective administrative districts on such matters for reference.

<i>Item No.</i>	<i>DCCAs</i>	<i>No.*</i>		<i>Representations</i>	<i>EAC's Views</i>
		<i>W</i>	<i>O</i>		
					Throughout the whole process of drawing up the provisional recommendations, confidentiality is preserved, including the consultation with the DOs and communication with other working partners. Before the provisional recommendations are made public, the EAC would not consult any members of the local community, nor disclose any details of the delineation exercise to any organisations or individuals beyond its working partners.
				(d) One representation considers that the area of Cheung Chau is bigger than the whole Wan Chai District but it has only one elected seat versus 13 seats in the Wan Chai District.	<u>Items (d) to (f)</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 these proposals made in the representations are 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.
				(e) Four representations consider that the EAC should increase the number of elected seats in the Islands District instead of combining Cheung Chau.	
				(f) One representation proposes to split Cheung Chau into three DCCAs just like the past.	

<i>Item No.</i>	<i>DCCAs</i>	<i>No. *</i>		<i>Representations</i>	<i>EAC's Views</i>
		<i>W</i>	<i>O</i>		
				(g) One representation states that according to the record, it is estimated that there will be more cases for Cheung Chau residents to seek assistance from the DC members. Therefore, it is necessary to have two DCCAs in Cheung Chau so that there will be sufficient manpower to assist the residents.	<u>Item (g)</u> 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.
				(h) One representation proposes to combine "Cheung Chau North" and T08 (Peng Chau & Hei Ling Chau) so as to maintain two elected seats in Cheung Chau.	<u>Item (h)</u> This proposal is <b>not accepted</b> because in accordance with the EACO, apart from taking into account the projected population, the EAC must also have regard to the other statutory factors, including community identities, preservation of local ties and physical features (such as the size, shape, accessibility and development) of the relevant area when adjusting the DCCA boundaries. In view of the inconvenient transport between "Cheung Chau North" and T08 (Peng Chau & Hei Ling Chau), the EAC did not propose to combine these two DCCAs in the provisional recommendations.
				(i) Another representation proposes to combine T08 (Peng Chau & Hei Ling Chau) and T09 (Lamma & Po Toi) for freeing up a DCCA and to maintain two elected seats for	<u>Item (i)</u> This proposal is <b>not accepted</b> . Please see item 4.

<i>Item No.</i>	<i>DCCAs</i>	<i>No.*</i>		<i>Representations</i>	<i>EAC's Views</i>
		<i>W</i>	<i>O</i>		
				Cheung Chau.	
				(j) The representation states that according to a survey conducted, majority of the Cheung Chau residents object to the provisional recommendations.	<u>Item (j)</u> The view is noted. Please see item 18(a).
19	T08 – Peng Chau & Hei Ling Chau  T09 – Lamma & Po Toi  T10 – Cheung Chau	-	2	Hold no objection to the provisional recommendations but hope that the EAC will explain why it proposed to combine “Cheung Chau South” and “Cheung Chau North” instead of other islands in the Islands District for freeing up a DCCA.	Please see items 4 and 18(a).