

立法會

Legislative Council

LC Paper No. CB(4)441/19-20

(These minutes have been
seen by the Administration)

Ref: CB4/PS/2/16

Subcommittee on Hillside Escalator Links and Elevator Systems

Minutes of the third meeting held on Wednesday, 13 November 2019, at 8:45 am in Conference Room 2 of the Legislative Council Complex

- Members present** : Hon CHAN Han-pan, BBS, JP (Chairman)
Hon AU Nok-hin (Deputy Chairman)
Hon Abraham SHEK Lai-him, GBS, JP
Hon Mrs Regina IP LAU Suk-ye, GBS, JP
Hon Paul TSE Wai-chun, JP
Hon Frankie YICK Chi-ming, SBS, JP
Hon Andrew WAN Siu-kin
Hon HO Kai-ming
Hon LAM Cheuk-ting
Hon SHIU Ka-fai, JP
Hon Wilson OR Chong-shing, MH
- Members absent** : Hon CHU Hoi-dick
Hon Jeremy TAM Man-ho
- Public Officers attending** : **Agenda item II**

Dr Raymond SO, BBS, JP
Under Secretary for Transport and Housing
Transport and Housing Bureau

Mr Raymond SY Kim-cheung
Principal Assistant Secretary for Transport and
Housing (Transport) 5

Transport and Housing Bureau

Mr Michael LAW Hing-sun
Assistant Commissioner/Urban
Transport Department

Mr Eddie LEUNG Siu-kong
Chief Traffic Engineer / Hong Kong
Transport Department

Mr Richard NG Chin-hung
Assistant Director/ Development
Highways Department

Mr CHU Shun-wah
Principal Project Coordinator/Pedestrian Hillside
Links
Highways Department

Ms Carmen CHU
Director
Ove Arup & Partners Hong Kong Limited

Mr Perry POON
Associate Director
Ove Arup & Partners Hong Kong Limited

Clerk in attendance : Ms Sophie LAU
Chief Council Secretary (4)2

Staff in attendance : Ms Angela CHU
Senior Council Secretary (4)2

Miss Mandy LAM
Legislative Assistant (4)2

I. Election of Chairman and Deputy Chairman (if necessary)

As both Mr CHAN Han-pan and Mr AU Nok-hin, the incumbent Chairman and Deputy Chairman of the Subcommittee, were not present at the appointed starting time of the meeting, members agreed to appoint Mrs Regina IP to take chair of the meeting during their temporary absence. Members noted that both of them were being delayed by traffic and would arrive soon.

2. Mrs Regina IP asked members about the need to re-elect Chairman and Deputy Chairman of the Subcommittee for the 2019-2020 legislative session. Members agreed that there was no need for the re-election.

II. Review of Assessment Mechanism for Hillside Escalator Links and Elevator Systems Proposals

LC Paper No. CB(4)105/19-20(01) -- Administration's paper on Review of Assessment Mechanism for Hillside Escalator Links and Elevator Systems Proposals

3. The Subcommittee deliberated (index of proceedings attached at **Annex**). The Chairman concluded that while Subcommittee members raised enquiries about the revised assessment mechanism which the Administration was to follow up and provide responses, there was no objection to the mechanism presented at the meeting.

Follow-up actions from the Administration

4. The Subcommittee requested the Administration to provide written response to the following issues:

- (a) in respect of the 20 or more hillside escalator links and elevator systems ("HEL") projects to be selected from the 114 proposals received by the Administration for first batch implementation by 2020, criteria for setting the number of projects to be implemented, how the Administration would select projects to be included in the first batch, timetable in implementing these

projects and measures that could be taken to include more projects in the first batch; and

- (b) elaborate each procedure involved in taking forward the implementation of a HEL proposal, viz. the conduct of technical feasibility study, assessment and scoring, consultation with stakeholders, detailed design and construction, etc. with regard to time, manpower and other resources required of, engagement of consultants if necessary, the involvement and division of labour amongst relevant works department as well as difficulties encountered in each of the above procedures with a view to identifying means to resolve the bottleneck situation for expediting the implementation of the proposals.

Motions

5. The Subcommittee passed the following motions at the meeting. The Administration was requested to provide written response to the motions passed.

Motion 1

本會要求上坡地區自動扶梯連接系統和升降機系統評審機制及推行機制：

- 1) 參考"人人暢道通行"計劃經驗，處理私人土地接駁，以納入考慮因素；
- 2) 加快落成進度，包括但不限於加入可行性作評分機制；及
- 3) 增加納入初審，推展項目。

動議人：區諾軒議員

(Translation)

This Subcommittee requests that with regard to the mechanism for assessing and implementing hillside escalator links and elevator systems ("HEL") proposals, the Administration should:

1. make reference to the experience of "Universal Accessibility" Programme to deal with HEL proposals connecting to private land so

as to include in the mechanism relevant factors for considering such proposals;

2. expedite the implementation progress, including but not limiting to incorporating feasibility as a factor under the scoring mechanism; and
3. increase the number of projects for implementation under the first batch.

Moved by: Hon AU Nok-hin

Motion 2

要求政府設立上坡地區自動扶手電梯和升降機系統基金，以獨立分目形式預留撥款，加快相關工程批款進度。

動議人：陳恒鑞議員

和議人：柯創盛議員

(Translation)

This Subcommittee requests the Government to set up a Hillside Escalator Links and Elevator Systems ("HEL") Fund so as to reserve funding under a separate subhead for expediting the allocation of funds for implementing HEL projects.

Moved by : Hon CHAN Han-pan
Seconded by : Hon Wilson OR Chong-shing

III Any other business

6. There being no other business, the meeting ended at 10:05 am.

Council Business Division 4
Legislative Council Secretariat
30 March 2020

**Proceedings of the third meeting of
Subcommittee on Hillside Escalator Links and Elevator Systems
on Wednesday, 13 November 2019, at 8:45 am
in Conference Room 2 of the Legislative Council Complex**

Running Time	Speaker	Subject(s)	Action required
<i>Agenda Item I – Election of Chairman and Deputy Chairman (if necessary)</i>			
000521 - 000616	Mrs Regina IP LAU	Members agreed that there was no need for re-electing Chairman and Deputy Chairman of the Subcommittee for 2019-2020 legislative session.	
<i>Agenda Item II – Review of Assessment Mechanism for Hillside Escalator Links and Elevator Systems Proposal</i>			
000617 - 001453	Mrs Regina IP LAU Administration Deputy Chairman	Introduction by the Administration and the consultant, Ove Arup & Partners Hong Kong Limited, on the latest progress of the review of assessment mechanism for hillside escalator links and elevator systems ("HEL") proposals.	
001454 – 001944	Deputy Chairman Mr HO Kai-ming Administration	<p>Mr HO enquired about –</p> <p>(a) the possibility of setting up a dedicated HEL Fund or using a block allocation arrangement to expedite the funding arrangement for HEL projects, similar to the Hostel Development Fund set up under the University Grants Committee for expediting the development of student hostels; and</p> <p>(b) for HEL projects located near major trunk roads and highways, any measures taken for ensuring the safety of pedestrians and motorists nearby.</p> <p>The Administration responded that –</p> <p>(a) given that HEL projects were of relatively large scale and that the project scope, complexity and estimated cost of each HEL project would vary, it would be difficult to set a financial ceiling of expenditure for the proposed block allocation subhead. Nevertheless, the Administration would give thoughts to Mr HO's suggestion in drawing experience from the arrangement of Hostel Development Fund; and</p> <p>(b) at present, there was no HEL project located across major trunk roads or highways. If there were such projects in future, adequate safety measures would be featured in the</p>	

Running Time	Speaker	Subject(s)	Action required
		design.	
001945 – 002744	Deputy Chairman Mr Wilson OR Administration	<p>Mr OR enquired about –</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> (a) the possibility of extending the coverage of HEL to estates under Home Ownership Scheme ("HOS"), and similar to the Special Scheme of the Universal Accessibility Programme ("UAP") announced in the 2019 Policy Address, estates under Tenants Purchase Scheme ("TPS") and the Buy or Rent Option Scheme ("BROS"); (b) the feasibility in seeking funding approval for a batch of HEL projects in one go in order to expedite the implementation progress; (c) whether the number of projects to be included in the first batch for implementation could be substantially increased, given that only 20 or more projects would be selected from 114 project proposals received by the Administration; and (d) timetable of implementing additional HEL proposals received. <p>The Administration responded that –</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> (a) HEL and UAP were two programmes of different scope, scale of works and cost, hence their implementation were also different. HEL projects that were within public housing estates would be considered by the Housing Authority. An individual UAP project would cost \$75 million at most while the cost for an HEL project could be much higher since it would involve building of new public walkways. To ensure proper use of public funds, the proposed revised assessment mechanism was not applicable to HEL proposals which entirely fall within or solely connect to private development/land. For HEL projects connecting to housing developments under TPS and BROS, the Administration would consider if any appropriate arrangement could be made drawing on the experience of implementing the Special Scheme of the UAP; 	

Running Time	Speaker	Subject(s)	Action required
		<p>(b) the Administration would bundle projects and seek for funding approval in one go as far as practicable, subject to the readiness of the projects;</p> <p>(c) with regard to the 114 HEL proposals received, after taking out projects that were technically infeasible, the Administration would select at least 20 projects for priority implementation in accordance with the revised assessment mechanism, and would report on the selected proposals in the first batch in due course. The Administration would strive to include more proposals in the first batch for early implementation as far as practicable; and</p> <p>(d) for new proposals received after first batch implementation, they would be reviewed together with the remaining proposals to determine priority for implementation during the next phase.</p>	
002745 – 003737	Chairman Mrs Regina IP LAU Administration	<p>Mrs IP expressed that –</p> <p>(a) she was very disappointed that only 20 out of 114 project proposals were selected for implementation, and it took too long to complete the consultancy study and assessments; and</p> <p>(b) as there were genuine needs for HEL systems in the community and most of the projects would not give rise to much debate in the Legislative Council, she urged the Administration to consider new approach, such as setting up fast track funding approval procedures and convening special meetings to approve a list of projects in one go in order to expedite the implementation progress.</p> <p>The Administration responded that –</p> <p>(a) the Administration would strive to take forward more projects in the first batch subject to the readiness of the proposals;</p> <p>(b) in order to speed up the progress for the benefit of the community, the revised assessment mechanism would accord higher scores to proposals of higher implementation</p>	

Running Time	Speaker	Subject(s)	Action required
		<p>readiness and expected pedestrian flow; and</p> <p>(c) according to past experience, considerable time was required for consulting District Councils and local community on the proposed alignments and conducting technical feasibility of the proposals. Much works were required in the pre-construction stage before the project could be taken forward.</p> <p>Mrs IP did not subscribe to the explanation given by the Administration and requested the Administration to provide written response in respect of the 20 HEL proposals to be selected, criteria for setting the number of projects to be implemented, how the Administration would select projects to be included in the first batch, timetable in implementing these projects and measures that could be taken to include more projects in the first batch.</p>	<p>The Administration to provide written response.</p>
<p>003738 – 004552</p>	<p>Chairman Deputy Chairman Administration</p>	<p>The Deputy Chairman expressed that –</p> <p>(a) the Administration should standardize the implementation arrangement of HEL and UAP as both programmes aimed at fostering a pedestrian-friendly environment; and</p> <p>(b) the Administration should not accord lower priority for those HEL proposals that fell within or connected to private development/land under the revised assessment mechanism, but rather, should actively consider land resumption if necessary.</p> <p>The Administration responded that –</p> <p>(a) HEL and UAP were two different programmes. The Administration reiterated that it would consider to draw experience from the Special Scheme of the UAP for relevant application to HEL projects if appropriate;</p> <p>(b) in respect of land resumption, HEL proposals were of larger scale and usually involved settling technical issues such as dangerous slopes and addressing complicated land ownership issues. If necessary and justified, the Administration would resume land</p>	

Running Time	Speaker	Subject(s)	Action required
		<p>according to the Road (Works, Use and Compensation) Ordinance (Cap. 370) for implementing HEL projects. Moreover, it was stipulated in some land leases of private developments that private property developers should provide 24-hour public passage within private developments for accessing nearby public transport facilities. The genuine need of land resumption for taking forward HEL proposals should be considered on a case-by-case basis having regard to actual site conditions and constraints.</p>	
004553 – 005703	Chairman Administration	<p>The Chairman reiterated the merits of setting up a dedicated HEL Fund for processing funding applications, as there was a huge backlog for Public Works Subcommittee and subsequently, Finance Committee to discuss and approve public works proposals. He also enquired about the reasons for according only 4 scores for proposals connecting with major public transport facilities and the division of labour amongst government departments in taking forward HEL proposals.</p> <p>The Administration responded that –</p> <p>(a) to supplement earlier responses on the setting up of a dedicated HEL fund, it generally took around 3.5 years to complete the construction of a HEL proposal. Considerable time was often required to reconcile different local views on the alignments and design of the HEL facilities, which affected the implementation progress;</p> <p>(b) under the revised assessment mechanism, in respect of beneficiaries and target, 40 scores would be attributed for the expected daily pedestrian flow, and another 20 scores would be attributed for (i) the proportion of 65 year-old or above population within the catchment area and (ii) whether there were nearby hospital, rehabilitation centre or nursing home in the vicinity of the HEL proposal. It was expected that the presence of major public transport facilities near the site of the proposed HEL would be reflected via a higher expected daily pedestrian flow in the relevant scoring criteria. In addition, scoring of expected daily pedestrian flow of</p>	

Running Time	Speaker	Subject(s)	Action required
		<p>an HEL proposal would be assessed without threshold requirement or passing score to ensure that all proposals would be weighed according to the same assessment criteria when determining their priority for implementation; and</p> <p>(c) the Transport Department would oversee the consultant in conducting preliminary technical assessments and drawing up preliminary alignments of the HEL proposals for determining their implementation priority, and the Highways Department would take the lead in conducting feasibility study, detailed design and consulting with stakeholders on individual HEL proposal for actual implementation.</p> <p>The Chairman requested the Administration to provide a written response to elaborate in detail each procedure involved in taking forward a HEL proposal with regard to time, manpower and other resources required of, and the involvement and division of labour amongst relevant works departments as well as difficulties encountered in each procedure with a view to identifying means to resolve the bottleneck situation for expediting the implementation of the proposals.</p>	<p>The Administration to provide written response.</p>
<p>005704 - 010157</p>	<p>Chairman Mr Paul TSE Administration</p>	<p>Mr TSE enquired about –</p> <p>(a) methodology adopted in projecting the estimated number of beneficiaries of a HEL proposal; and</p> <p>(b) in view of the recent public order events and vandalization of public facilities by radical protesters, safety considerations when designing HEL systems.</p> <p>The Administration responded that –</p> <p>(a) the Administration adopted a traffic model to estimate pedestrian flow of a HEL proposal, to be supplemented by questionnaire surveys to estimate the number of beneficiaries of a proposal;</p>	

Running Time	Speaker	Subject(s)	Action required
		(b) due considerations would be taken during detailed design of a relevant HEL proposal with regard to security and safety of the facilities.	
010158 - 011106	Chairman Mr Wilson OR Administration	<p>Mr OR reiterated the importance of setting up a dedicated fund to expedite funding approval for HEL proposals, and including private development/land in the scope of the assessment. He also enquired about –</p> <p>(a) whether the consultant engaged by the Administration had looked into ways to shorten the time required for conducting local consultation and technical feasibility study; and</p> <p>(b) whether a target timeframe was set for the pre-construction and construction processes of a HEL proposal for better time management.</p> <p>The Administration reiterated that it would consider drawing relevant experience from the Special Scheme of the UAP and submitting bundled funding applications in order to expedite the progress. In addition, the Administration would collect views from local stakeholders on the design and alignment of the proposals before formal consultation so that their preliminary views would be taken into account in the detailed design to speed up the whole consultation process. Furthermore, the readiness of HEL proposals for implementation would be considered in the prioritization process.</p>	
011107 – 011212	Chairman Deputy Chairman	Voting on the motion moved by Deputy Chairman.	
011213 - 011243	Chairman	Voting on the motion moved by the Chairman	
011244 – 012116	Chairman Administration	<p>The Chairman expressed/enquired –</p> <p>(a) there had been a case where owners of private slopes were required to undertake repair works before the Administration resume these land. Such arrangements were considered unfavourable to the owners concerned;</p>	

Running Time	Speaker	Subject(s)	Action required
		<p>(b) the Administration would screen out proposals during initial screening stage where similar facilities were provided within 300 metres of the proposed HEL, but this condition might eliminate proposals located at hilly topography which had steep gradient and keen local demands; and</p> <p>(c) whether the Administration would consider proposals falling within locations which were designated to provide 24-hour public access in the land lease despite the fact that they were private land.</p> <p>The Administration responded that –</p> <p>(a) for the case mentioned above, relevant government departments had already issued repair notice to the owners of dangerous slopes prior to the government's plan to resume the land concerned for constructing HEL proposal. The owners therefore had the responsibility to repair the slopes before handing them to the Administration;</p> <p>(b) in considering HEL proposals, the Administration would also consider factors such as level difference and gradient. For an HEL proposal falling within 300 metres of an existing HEL facility but linking to different destinations, the HEL proposal would still be considered in the initial screening process; and</p> <p>(c) the Administration would explore connecting HEL facilities to existing lifts/escalators nearby providing 24-hour public passage. However, if these lifts/escalators fell within private developments, the Administration would need to negotiate with the owners concerned for their agreement to providing 24-hour public passage.</p>	
012117 - 012259	Chairman Administration	<p>Conclusion</p> <p>The Chairman concluded that while Subcommittee members raised enquiries about the revised assessment mechanism which the Administration was to follow up and provide responses, there was no objection to the mechanism presented at the meeting.</p>	

Running Time	Speaker	Subject(s)	Action required
<i>Agenda Item III – Any other business</i>			
012260 - 012316	Chairman	Closing remark	

Council Business Division 4
Legislative Council Secretariat
30 March 2020