

**立法會**  
**Legislative Council**

LC Paper No. CB(4)434/19-20

Ref : CB4/PS/2/16

**Panel on Transport**

**Report of the Subcommittee on Hillside Escalator Links  
and Elevator Systems**

**Purpose**

This paper reports on the deliberations of the Subcommittee on Hillside Escalator Links and Elevator Systems ("the Subcommittee") formed under the Panel on Transport ("the Panel").

**Background**

2. In view of the growing number of requests from the public for the provision of hillside escalator links and elevator systems ("HEL"), the Administration has taken forward the implementation of 18 HEL projects since 2009.<sup>1</sup> These 18 projects were ranked according to a set of scoring criteria for assessing HEL proposals received at that time to determine their merits and relative priority.<sup>2</sup> As of February 2020, five out of the 18 HEL proposals have been completed and open for public use and three of them were under construction.<sup>3</sup> The remaining 10 proposals are still under different stages of planning, investigation and design.

3. The Chief Executive announced in the 2017 Policy Address that the Administration would continue to take forward "Walk in Hong Kong" and develop Hong Kong into a walkable city. In this connection, the Transport

---

<sup>1</sup> The Administration has received a total of 20 HEL proposals by 2009. Two proposals were screened out in the initial screening stage due to the following reasons: similar facility had already been provided in close proximity for one proposal; and the level difference of the other proposal did not exceed six meters.

<sup>2</sup> The Administration advised the Panel in February 2010 that preliminary technical feasibility studies for the proposals ranked top 10 in the assessment would be conducted first by batches, and that the remaining proposals would be followed up after the smooth implementation of the top 10 proposals.

<sup>3</sup> The HEL Projects in Waterloo Hill and Cheung Hang Estate, Tsing Yi as reported in PowerPoint Slides Ref. CB(4)883/18-19(01) were completed and open for public use in November 2019 and February 2020 respectively.

Department ("TD") embarked on a consultancy study in December 2017 to review and improve the assessment and scoring mechanism for HEL proposals adopted in 2009 and, on this basis, carried out screening, shortlisting and prioritizing totally 114 HEL proposals that have been received by that time. The said consultancy study would take around 30 months to complete.

### **The Subcommittee**

4. The Panel agreed at its meeting on 19 May 2017 to form a subcommittee to study and follow up issues relating to the provision of HEL. The terms of reference and membership list of the Subcommittee are set out in **Appendices I and II** respectively.

5. Under the chairmanship of Hon CHAN Han-pan, the Subcommittee has held three meetings since its activation in March 2019.<sup>4</sup> The Subcommittee has also received views from 33 deputations in total on related issues at one of the meetings. A list of deputations which have given views to the Subcommittee is in **Appendix III**.

### **Deliberations of the Subcommittee**

6. The Subcommittee has focused its deliberation on the following areas:
- (a) provision of HEL to enhance hillside accessibility;
  - (b) implementation progress of the 18 HEL projects since 2009;
  - (c) the revised assessment mechanism for new HEL proposals;
  - (d) the setting up of a dedicated fund for taking forward HEL projects; and
  - (e) the inclusion of private estates and estates under Home Ownership Scheme ("HOS") and Tenants Purchase Scheme ("TPS") in the scope of HEL.

---

<sup>4</sup> The Subcommittee has originally scheduled a number of site visits for 18 June 2019 to understand more about the implementation progress of HEL projects and the assessment mechanism for HEL proposals at selected districts. The site visits were subsequently cancelled due to the staging of public order events in June 2019. Efforts were made to reschedule the site visits to 4 February 2020. However, on consideration of the spread of novel coronavirus infection after the Lunar New Year in 2020, the site visits were cancelled.

Provision of HEL to enhance hillside accessibility

7. The Subcommittee holds the views that there are immense needs in the community for provision of additional HEL to improve hillside accessibility and connectivity between hillside areas and major transport facilities. Citing the Central-Mid-Levels Escalator and Walkway System as an example, some members have pointed out that the system serves to link together various uphill locations and major transport hubs in Central and Sheung Wan through an automated pedestrian walkway. It has greatly improved the accessibility of the mid-levels area and reduced commuters' reliance on short-distance transport modes such as minibuses, thereby alleviates the traffic congestion problem in the districts. They strongly urge that similar systems shall be built in hillside areas especially hillside residential areas so as to offer greater convenience to the residents concerned and to ease the pressure on public transport.

8. Taking note of members' suggestion, the Administration has advised that it will continue to take forward the policy initiative of "Walk in Hong Kong" with a view to encouraging people to walk more for the first and the last mile connection between public transport interchanges and their places of work/residence, thereby reducing the use of public transport for short-distance commuting. It will also progressively take forward the 18 ranked HEL projects put forth since 2009 to enhance the accessibility of hillside areas. In addition, TD has commissioned a consultancy study to review the assessment mechanism for improving the assessment criteria and prioritization of the 114 HEL proposals and other new proposals received from the public. The Administration plans to consult the respective District Councils and work towards completing the entire scoring process so as to finalize the first batch of projects by 2020.

*Merging the Universal Accessibility ("UA") Programme and the HEL*

9. Noting that the Administration has been progressively taking forward the UA Programmes to provide more barrier-free access facilities and enhance the convenience of the public in using public walkways, a few members opine that as both UA and HEL programmes involve the construction or installation of a mix of pedestrian facilities, they consider that merging the two programmes or standardizing the implementation arrangements of the two programmes can facilitate experience sharing and resources consolidation by relevant works departments to improve operation efficiency.

10. In reply to the members' suggestion above, the Administration has explained that the scope and objective of UA Programme and HEL projects are completely different, and the two programmes involve different policy considerations. While the provision of HEL aims to offer convenience to the

public to travel to and from hillside areas and reduce commuters' reliance on road traffic, UA Programme cover projects relating to the retrofitting of barrier-free facilities at public walkways to facilitate the public, especially the disabled and elderly persons in using the walkways. In addition, since HEL projects are more complex and much larger in scale as compared to the UA Programme, it is not feasible to combine the two programmes. Having said that, the Administration will consider ways to consolidate experiences gained in constructing different types of HEL projects and maintain flexibility in deploying resources when taking forward future HEL proposals. It will also draw relevant experience from UA Programme for appropriate application to HEL projects.

#### Implementation progress of the 18 HEL projects since 2009

11. The Subcommittee has been closely monitoring the implementation progress of the 18 HEL projects which were put forward by the Administration since 2009, and expresses grave concern and dissatisfaction about their sluggish progress. Members find it totally unacceptable that as of May 2019, ten years after the Administration announced to take forward the 18-ranked proposals, only three projects were completed and opened for public use. In addition, all the three projects were constructed with the assistance of other public organizations including the Hospital Authority, Urban Renewal Authority and the MTR Corporation Limited who took on the HEL proposals while carrying out their own works projects concurrently at the relevant sites. Members have requested the Administration to seriously look into the reasons for the prolonged delay and to implement immediate measures to expedite the completion of the remaining projects.

12. The Subcommittee shares the deputations' views expressed at the meeting on 15 May 2019 on the unreasonably slow progress of HEL projects, and has asked for relevant information in particular on the implementation of the following proposals:

#### *Braemar Hill Pedestrian Link in the Eastern District*

13. The Subcommittee is aware that local views have been diverse on the construction of the Braemar Hill Pedestrian Link. Some residents have strong reservation on the alignment of the proposed link running through the Fortress Hill. They are worried that the construction works will have an adverse impact on the foundation of nearby buildings and create nuisance to the residents living there. Other residents express support to the project and call for the construction of the link immediately to solve the traffic congestion problem and to offer greater convenience to the elderly and persons with

disabilities living in uphill areas. Noting that the proposal is ranked the second amongst the 18 HEL proposals and thus has a higher priority for implementation, some members are alarmed to learn that the Administration has yet to obtain a consensus amongst the residents for the project during the past ten years, and question whether the Administration has conducted any thorough public consultation on the alignment and project scheme before putting it forward for residents' deliberations.

14. The Administration has advised that those living in uphill and downhill areas have contrasting views towards the proposal. Throughout the process, the Highways Department ("HyD") has been working in full force towards the objective of reconciling the diverse and long-established views of the parties concerned. Such efforts include consulting the Eastern District Council ("EDC") and attending the residents' meetings to explain the design scheme and address residents' concerns regarding the scheme. HyD has also arranged site visits with residents and other stakeholders such as schools to gauge their views on the alignment. Subsequent to the comments received, HyD has presented various new design revisions in 2018 and obtained the majority support from members of the Planning, Works and Housing Committee of EDC. HyD is currently proceeding to various pre-construction preparations, including detailed design and resolving objections under the Roads (Works, Use and Compensation) Ordinance (Cap. 370).

*Lift and pedestrian walkway system between Lai King Hill Road and Lai Cho Road in Kwai Tsing District*

15. The Subcommittee notes that the project involves two dangerous slopes on private land requiring further repair works which hinder the construction progress. Members ask whether the Administration will consider acquiring the two slopes for carrying out the necessary repair works so as to expedite the progress. They also enquire about the timetable for completing the project. The Administration has responded that the owners of the two private slopes have already completed the repair works of the two slopes in February 2018. Subsequently, HyD resumed the preliminary technical feasibility study which was completed in March 2019. The Administration is now working on other pre-construction works.

*Pedestrian Link near Chuk Yuen North Estate ("CYNE") in the Wong Tai Sin District*

16. Noting that CYNE is built on the hillside where a majority of residents in the Estate are elderly, the Subcommittee agrees that there is a genuine need to expedite the construction of HEL in CYNE. The Administration has

advised the Subcommittee that HyD submitted the preliminary design of HEL for consultation with the Wong Tai Sin District Council back in 2016 and 2017, but the proposal has met with opposition from some residents and schools at that time. Taking note of residents' views, HyD subsequently revised the design and consulted relevant stakeholders again and both TD and HyD are now collating and analyzing the views and revising the details of the proposal. Both departments will consult again the stakeholders on the latest development in due course.

17. Regarding members' concern on the implementation progress of other HEL projects, the Administration has explained that HyD has been progressively taking forward the development of different projects. As works for HEL often involve complicated considerations such as slopes, structures, soil properties, diversion of underground utilities etc., technical assessments are often required before proceeding to other pre-construction works such as consultation with District Councils and formulation of detailed design. In addition, projects which involve land ownership issues are more complicated and take a longer time to resolve. On the other hand, local communities very often have diverse views on the alignments and design on the projects. The Administration advised that the time required for individual project would vary according to its complexity and views from the public based on past experience, and hence cannot be generalized.

#### The revised assessment mechanism for new HEL proposals

18. The Administration has briefed the Subcommittee on 13 November 2019 on the revised assessment mechanism for screening and prioritizing the 114 new HEL proposals received. Under the revised mechanism, more comprehensive technical assessments will be conducted during initial screening to better ascertain the necessity and feasibility of the proposals. Also, proposals with any of the six conditions<sup>5</sup> will be screened out at the initial screening stage, while proposals passing the initial screening will be further appraised from the social benefits and cost-effectiveness aspects to determine their relative priority for implementation. Details of the revised assessment mechanism for HEL proposals are in **Appendix IV**.

19. Some members are of the view that the revised assessment mechanism

---

<sup>5</sup> The six sets of pre-determined criteria include (i) inadequate land/infeasible land resumption for construction of the proposed HEL; (ii) similar facility/facilities is/are already provided or committed within 300 metres of the proposed HEL; (iii) insurmountable technical difficulties in the construction or operation of the proposed HEL; (iv) the level difference to overcome is less than 6 metres; (v) the proposed HEL will affect heritage site(s) or important tree(s); and (vi) the gradient to overcome is less than 1:8.

imposes too many restrictions during the initial screening stage such that sound proposals with immense local needs may be easily screened out. For instance, if more than one HEL systems are actually required along hillside topography which is steep and inaccessible, HEL proposals that fall within 300 metres from an existing HEL system will be screened out. Also, members opine that it will be difficult to quantify the social benefits of a proposal.

20. In response to the above concerns, the Administration has advised that initial screening serves the purpose of screening out infeasible proposals at an early stage to streamline the whole assessment process for enhancing efficiency. In considering HEL proposals where similar facility has already been provided in the vicinity, the Administration will also consider factors such as level difference and gradient. Nearby HEL systems within 300 metres but linking to different destinations will also be considered if there is genuine need and keen local demand.

21. As regards the assessment of the social benefits of a proposal, the Administration has explained that the revised assessment mechanism will accord detailed scoring to a HEL proposal along three factors, namely the number of beneficiaries and target, implementation readiness and convenience. Each proposal will be appraised on a comparative basis without any threshold requirement with respect to the social benefits aspects so that all proposals will be assessed according to the same assessment criteria when determining their priority for implementation.

*Number of HEL proposals included in the first-batch implementation*

22. The Subcommittee notes with grave concern that of the 114 HEL proposals that have been received by the Administration, only around 20 proposals will be shortlisted under the revised assessment mechanism for first-batch implementation by the first quarter of 2020. Members consider that local residents have been waiting far too long for the provision of HEL systems. They strongly urge the Administration to consider and adopt a new approach to streamline the construction process, such as ways to speed up local consultation and technical feasibility study, and to set a target timeframe on different construction processes of a HEL proposal for better project management. They also request the Administration reviewing the procedures involved with regard to time, manpower and other resources required of in taking forward a HEL proposal, involvement and division of labour amongst different works department and difficulties encountered with a view to identifying bottleneck situations, and exploring ways to tackle them.

23. On the issue of implementation timetable, the Administration has advised the Subcommittee that the revised assessment mechanism will accord

priority to the implementation readiness of a proposal so that more ready proposals will be selected for earlier implementation. The Administration will shortlist at least 20 projects for first-batch implementation and strive to include more projects as far as possible. In addition, the Subcommittee notes that the Administration will collate local views from stakeholders on the design and alignment of the proposals before formal consultation so that their views will be taken into account in the detailed design to speed up the whole consultation process. The Administration advises the Subcommittee that it is expected to start the implementation of the first batch of HEL projects in 2021.

24. On members' enquiry regarding whether the Administration will consider other HEL proposals apart from the 114 proposals, the Administration has advised that it will select no less than 20 proposals for the first-batch implementation, and will evaluate the remainder of the 114 proposals together with other new proposals received for shortlisting the second batch of proposals for implementation.

#### The setting up of a dedicated fund for taking forward HEL projects

25. The Subcommittee has all along been urging the Administration to consider setting up a dedicated fund for financing HEL projects so as to minimize the administrative procedures required and expedite the whole funding approval process. Members argue that as there is a huge backlog for the Public Works Committee, and subsequently, the Finance Committee of the Legislative Council ("LegCo") to discuss and approve public works proposals, there are merits of setting up a dedicated fund in avoiding further delay in the funding process. Some members have cited the arrangement of the Hostel Development Fund which is set up under the University Grants Committee for the development of student hostels, and have requested the Administration to consider making similar arrangement for HEL funding proposals. In this connection, the Subcommittee has passed a motion expressing its views at the meeting on 13 November 2019.

26. The Administration has explained to the Subcommittee that a review on the feasibility of setting up a dedicated fund or a block allocation subhead for HEL projects as suggested by the Subcommittee has been conducted. In general, block allocation arrangement is more commonly used for minor works of smaller scale and lower cost. Yet HEL projects generally are more complex in nature and may involve upgrading works for slopes and building new public walkways. The works are thus of relatively larger scale and will incur higher expenditure. In addition, as the project scope, nature and complexity of each HEL project vary, so do their estimated project costs. It is therefore difficult to set a financial ceiling of expenditure for the proposed block allocation subhead.



27. Having taken into account the above factors, the Administration considers it more appropriate to take forward HEL projects following the established public works procedure. However, the Administration will give thoughts to members' views and has pledged to put in place measures on various fronts with a view to expediting the implementation of projects. On staffing resources, in addition to increasing manpower for implementing the projects through internal resource deployment, the HyD has also engaged engineering consultant firms to carry out work such as investigation studies, design, construction and supervision with a view to implementing multiple projects in parallel. On the design and construction of projects, the HyD will obtain records of underground utilities from utilities companies and excavate trial pits to ascertain the actual situations of underground utilities as early as possible and consider early commencement of utilities diversion works. Meanwhile, the HyD will also proactively look into the use of pre-cast components in order to reduce construction time. The HyD will continue to explore ways to further enhance the design and construction of projects by taking into account the experience in implementing HEL and similar projects.

28. Despite the Administration's explanations above, some members still consider that in view of the pressing needs for HEL systems in the community and the general support of LegCo members of the projects, the Administration should review critically and explore new approaches in simplifying funding allocation for HEL proposals, such as setting up fast track funding mechanism and convening special meetings to approve a list of projects in one go in order to expedite the implementation progress. The Administration has advised that it will in the meantime expedite the submission of funding proposals for LegCo's scrutiny as far as practicable and consider the proposals made by members.

#### Inclusion of private housing estates and housing estates under HOS and TPS in the scope of HEL

29. The Subcommittee is aware that for HEL proposals which entirely fall within or solely connect to private development or land, and estates under HOS and TPS Schemes will not be considered by the Administration. Noting that the Chief Executive has announced in the 2019 Policy Address that the ambit of UA Programme will be expanded to cover estates under TPS and the Buy or Rent Option Scheme ("BROS") and public housing estates with properties divested under the Hong Kong Housing Authority ("UAP Special Scheme"), some members have enquired whether the scope of HEL can be expanded accordingly to benefit more users.

30. The Administration reiterates that UA Programmes and HEL are completely different in terms of scope, nature and how projects are to be

implemented. Each UA project will cost about \$75 million at most, while the cost for HEL is much higher. Inclusion of housing estates under HOS, TPS and BROS will entail due consideration to ensure prudent use of public funds. Nevertheless, the Administration will draw experience from UAP Special Scheme to consider any appropriate arrangement that can be applied for HEL proposals.

31. Some members point out that for some HEL projects that fall within or connect to private development/land, there may be insurmountable difficulties in taking forward the projects due to complicated land ownership issues. In such cases, the Administration should actively consider land resumption in order to resolve the land issue problems. The Subcommittee passed a motion on 13 November 2019 requesting the Administration to include relevant factors in the assessment mechanism for considering HEL proposals that are connected to private land.

32. Responding to the above suggestions, the Administration has advised that if it is necessary and justified, it will resume land according to Road (Works, Use and Compensation) Ordinance (Cap. 370) in taking forward HEL projects. In addition, it will be stipulated in most land leases of private development that they shall provide 24-hour public access to major road connections that fall within private developments. Hence, the genuine need of land resumption for taking forward HEL proposals will be considered having regard to actual circumstances and on a case-by-case basis. If situation warrants, relevant works department will negotiate with private owners concerned for their agreement to construct HEL systems on the private lots.

### **Summary**

33. In gist, the Subcommittee has reviewed the implementation progress of the HEL proposals, taken note of the Administration's proposed revisions to the assessment mechanism for new HEL proposals, and made suggestions to the Administration on possible ways to expedite the implementation of the HEL proposals.

### **Advice sought**

34. The Panel is invited to note the work of the Subcommittee.

## **Appendix I**

### **Panel on Transport**

#### **Subcommittee on Hillside Escalator Links and Elevator Systems**

#### **Terms of Reference**

To study and follow-up issues relating to the provision of hillside escalator links and elevator systems.

**Panel on Transport**

**Subcommittee on Hillside Escalator Links and Elevator Systems**

**Membership list\***

**Chairman** Hon CHAN Han-pan, SBS, JP

**Deputy Chairman** (Vacant)

**Members** Hon Abraham SHEK Lai-him, GBS, JP  
Hon Mrs Regina IP LAU Suk-yea, GBS, JP  
Hon Paul TSE Wai-chun, JP  
Hon Frankie YICK Chi-ming, SBS, JP  
Hon Andrew WAN Siu-kin  
Hon CHU Hoi-dick  
Hon HO Kai-ming  
Hon LAM Cheuk-ting  
Hon SHIU Ka-fai  
Hon Wilson OR Chong-shing, MH  
Hon Jeremy TAM Man-ho

(Total: 12 members)

**Clerk** Ms Sophie LAU

**Legal Adviser** Mr Alvin CHUI

\*Changes in membership are shown in Annex to Appendix II

## **Annex to Appendix II**

### **Panel on Transport**

#### **Subcommittee on Hillside Escalator Links and Elevator Systems**

##### **Changes in membership**

<b>Member</b>	<b>Relevant date</b>
Hon Abraham SHEK Lai-him, GBS, JP	Since 13 November 2019
Hon CHU Hoi-dick	Since 13 November 2019
Hon Au Nok-hing	Up to 16 December 2019

**Panel on Transport**

**Subcommittee on Hillside Escalator Links and Elevator Systems**

List of deputations/individuals which/who have given oral representation to the Subcommittee

1. Mr LIU Michael
2. Mr CHAN Nok-hang, Sha Tin District Council Member
3. Mr Thomas PANG Cheung-wai, Sha Tin District Council Member (Vice Chairman), SBS, JP
4. Mr CHING Cheung-ying
5. Mr Rayman CHOW Wai-hung
6. 陳壇丹先生
7. Mr Ken CHAN
8. Mr Stanley TAM, Sai Kung District Council (Tsui Lam)
9. Mr Jason CHAN Ka-yau
10. Mr CHEUNG Pak-yuen
11. Miss LEUNG Po-ling, 穗禾苑業主立案法團主席
12. Mr MAK Tsz-kin, 公民黨新界東支部秘書
13. Mr TING Chi-wai, Wong Tai Sin District Council Member
14. Mr CHAN Lee-shing
15. 馮家亮先生, 中西區關注組召集人
16. 阮建中先生, 寶馬山區議員助理

17. 郭銳忠先生
18. Ms PANG Lai-ha, Committee Member of The Incorporated Owners of Fortress Garden
19. 梁志偉先生, 自由黨新界區地區執行委員會主席
20. Mr LAW Kwong-keung
21. 張紹民先生, 海天峰管理處代表
22. Mr Ronald HO
23. Mr Kent LAM Jing-kwok
24. Ms LI Chun-chau, Eastern District Council Member
25. Mr HUI Lam-hing, Eastern District Council Member
26. Mr PAU Ming-hong, Kwai Tsing District Council Member
27. Ms LO Yuk-kuen, 富澤花園「寶馬山行人通道系統」關注組召集人
28. Mr TAM Pui-tak
29. 何偉俊先生
30. Mr Frankie LAM Siu-chung
31. 潘秉康先生
32. Ms YAM Pauline, Southern District Council Member
33. Ms KWOK Fu-yung, Kwai Tsing District Council Member

### **Details of the revised assessment mechanism for hillside escalator links and elevator systems ("HEL")**

If a proposal solely involves crossing a single road or connecting to a single footbridge, it will be evaluated under the criteria for footbridge construction;<sup>6</sup> and if a proposal forms an integral part of another public works project, it will be considered under that respective project. Furthermore, the proposed revised assessment mechanism will not be applicable to proposals entirely falling within the boundary of hospitals or Public Rental Housing estates. Such proposals will be passed to the Hospital Authority or the Hong Kong Housing Authority for consideration. The proposed assessment mechanism is also not applicable to proposals entirely falling within or solely connecting to private development/land to ensure proper use of public funds.

#### **Initial Screening**

2. The Transport Department ("TD") proposes to retain Initial Screening in the revised assessment mechanism in order to screen out proposals which are obviously infeasible or unjustified for implementation. Different from the 2009 assessment mechanism, TD suggests conducting more comprehensive preliminary technical assessments in the Initial Screening Stage to better ascertain the feasibility of proposals. After conducting preliminary technical assessments and drawing up preliminary alignments, HEL proposals with any of the following conditions will be screened out –

- (a) inadequate land/infeasible land resumption (e.g. there is/are existing building(s) on the concerned land area) for construction of the proposed HEL;
- (b) similar facility/facilities is/are already provided or committed within 300m of the proposed HEL;
- (c) insurmountable technical difficulties in the construction or operation of the proposed HEL;

---

<sup>6</sup> The footbridge related proposals will be assessed according to the relevant criteria stipulated in the Transport Planning and Design Manual published by TD, including the anticipated pedestrian utilization, traffic speed, road safety, availability of alternative crossing facilities and so on.



- (d) level difference to overcome is less than 6m;
- (e) the proposed HEL will affect heritage site(s) or important tree(s); or
- (f) gradient to overcome is less than 1:8.

### **Detailed Scoring**

3. HEL proposals which pass the Initial Screening will be scored from the "Social Benefits" and "Cost-effectiveness" aspects such that TD may accord priority to HEL proposals with higher scores in both the "Social Benefits" and "Cost-effectiveness" aspects.

4. In terms of "Social Benefits", TD seeks to prioritize proposals which can serve the most residents and provide a more convenient walking route to the public. TD will assess the "Social Benefits" of HEL proposals along three factors: (i) Number of beneficiaries and target; (ii) Implementation Readiness; and (iii) Convenience. As for "Cost-effectiveness", TD will compare the HEL proposals based on their estimated project cost per user, i.e. the estimated project cost divided by the estimated number of users.

5. The assessment criteria for Detailed Scoring include:

#### Social Benefits

- (a) Number of beneficiaries and target (total score: 60) – with consideration to the following criteria–
  - Expected daily pedestrian flow of the proposed HEL (score: 40);
  - Population of 65 year-old or above and whether there is any hospital/rehabilitation centre/nursing home in the beneficial catchment<sup>7</sup> (score: 20);
- (b) Implementation Readiness (total score: 30)–with consideration to the following criteria –

---

<sup>7</sup> Beneficial catchment is defined as the area within a radius of 300m from entrance/exit points of the proposed HEL.

- Whether land resumption/creation of easement in accordance to the Road (Works, Use and Compensation) Ordinance (Cap. 370) is required (score: 10);
  - Environmental impact of the proposed HEL (score: 10); and
  - Visual impact of the proposed HEL and its distance between adjacent buildings (score: 10);
- (c) Convenience (total score: 10) – with consideration to the following criteria –
- Level difference of the proposed serving area to be overcome by the proposed HEL (score: 3);
  - Anticipated journey saving time (score: 3); and
  - Whether the proposed HEL connects with existing major public transport facilities or those that are to be implemented (score: 4); and

Cost-effectiveness<sup>8</sup> - estimated project cost per user, i.e. the estimated project cost, including construction cost and recurrent cost, divided by the estimated number of users.

---

<sup>8</sup> "Cost-effectiveness" of a HEL proposal is measured by dividing the estimated project cost (including capital cost and recurrent cost) by the number of users. A lower estimated project cost per user indicates that the proposal is more cost-effective. Hence, it will have a higher score. A HEL is expected to undergo major maintenance every 20 years and thus the operating cost is calculated based on a 20-year life cycle.