

Extracts from the Building Committee Meetings

Composition of the Building Committee:

Prof. Michael Hui (Chairman until end of September 2008)

Prof. Fung Tung (Chairman from October 2008)

Prof. Cheung Chan Fai, Director, Office of University General Education

Mr. James Kinoshita, University Honourary Architect

Mr. Philip Leung, Director, ITSC

Dr. Colin Storey, University Librarian

Mr. Benny tam, Director of Estate Management Office

Prof. Hendrik Tieben, Department of Architecture

Prof. Wong Wing Shing, Dean of Graduate School

Mr. David Lim (Secretary), Director of Campus Development Office

1st Meeting of Building Committee (January 15, 2007)

“1.2 Submission to UGC

The Committee noted:

(a) The project had received UGC’s approval and was selected in the context of the Government’s 2006 Capital Works Resource Allocation Exercise (RAE)...

(d) The library extension would provide 6,100m² NOFA or 11,000 m² CFA.

(e) Consultants should be required to study and propose integration of the existing Tin Ka Ping Building and the University Library to form a central library of the University functionally...

2nd Meeting of Building Committee (June 5, 2007)

“2.3 Assessment of Consultants Submission

The Committee received and deliberated the presentation made by the 7 shortlisted Architectural Consultants. The Committee ranked the technical submissions in the following order:- ...

However, [a firm’s name] alternative proposal with a low building spanning over

Central Avenue was well received and it was decided to put forward the proposal to the University Administration for consideration.”

3rd Meeting of Building Committee (March 14, 2008)

“3.2 Matters Arising

.....CPC rejected the idea of building the Extension over the Library Boulevard or Central Avenue but appreciated the proposal for basement construction for book stacks... CDO wrote to and received from UGC/ASD approval of “site change” on 26/10/2007 and 11/2/2008 respectively.”

4th Meeting of Building Committee (June 10, 2008)

“4.3 Presentation by the Consultants

The Committee deliberated on the consultants’ presentation and agreed in principle in descending order below.....

[Post-Meeting Events :]

1. The Technical Assessment ... was submitted to UGC for approval on 2/7/2008.
2. After clearance from ASD on Technical Assessment on 25/7/2008, Fee Proposals were opened on 1/8/2008..
3. The combined Fee and Technical Assessment .. was submitted to UGC on 12/8/2008. Aedas Ltd. was the overall winner.
4. UGC approved the award of the contract to Aedas on 18/9/2008.”

5th Meeting of Building Committee (October 27, 2007)

“5.3 Architect’s Presentation

A. Presentation of Scheme by Aedas – Inception Design ideas: ...

B. Comments:

...

7. Excavation of basement must be commenced immediately after Congregation Ceremony in December 2009 in order to allow re-instatement of the Beacon, Forum and Garden for the ceremony in the following year...

8. Three elements – Beacon, Bushes and the Forum needed to be re-instated exactly as it was – consideration for their temporary storage, method of removal and re-instatement – survey record of existing Forum, Garden and Beacon.”

Extracts from the Library User Group Meetings

Composition of the Library User Group (LUG):

- (i) 8 Faculty Representatives, 1 professor from each of the 8 Faculties
- (ii) 6 Student Representatives, 1 representative from each of the 4 College Student Unions plus 2 representatives from CU Student Union
- (iii) 3 Library Representatives

19th LUG Meeting (June 7, 2007)

“LUG19/7/2 New Library Building Extension

Dr. Storey reported that the UGC had approved an extension of Library Building at the car park area next to the University Library. Although it was a very early stage, he was putting forward the needs of the Library for the new building for University management’s consideration.”

20th LUG Meeting (October 5, 2007)

“LUG20/5/3 New Library Building Extension

Dr. Storey noted that the new Library Building Extension would be finished in 2012 and was now under tendering process. Miss Cheung asked the Building Committee to consult students before making the final decision.”

21st LUG Meeting (December 19, 2007)

“LUG21/3/4 New Library Building Extension (Re: LUG20/5/3)

Dr. Storey informed members that Mr. David Lim, Director of Campus Development, will join a future LUG meeting to brief members about the planning of the new library building extension. Dr. Storey explained that the planning was still at a very early stage, neither a final design nor an architect had been chosen.

Miss Cheung asked whether the University would collect public opinion regarding the design of the new library building extension. Dr. Storey would convey any thoughts regarding the design to the architect.”

22nd LUG Meeting (April 18, 2008)

“LUG22/5/1 *Introduction to the New Library Extension Project*

...

Associate Pro-Vice-Chancellor, Professor Michael Hui, briefed the members about the planning of the new library extension. Prof. Hui explained that the extension was expected to provide an addition of 6,100 square meter net floor area at the car park side of Tin Ka Ping Building and the University Library. It is one of the “3+3+4” capital projects and has to be completed by 2012.

Several architectural firms had given oral presentations on their initial designs, and many of them pointed out a serious problem in the allocated plot of land. In order to provide 6,100 square meter net floor area, the extension building had to be built as tall as the tin Ka Ping Building. This would twist the “central axis” of the CUHK campus which was undesirable. After some extensive discussion, the Building Committee resolved that the extension of the University Library basement would be a realistic and effective solution to reducing the height of the new library extension building. Since the newly proposed building area was different from the original proposal, it had to be endorsed by UGC

Mr. Leung asked whether the Square would be closed for construction of the basement and whether the appearance of the Square would be changed after the basement was built. Prof. Hui responded that the Square might be closed during the construction period, but the outlook of the Square should remain the same after the construction of the basement.

Miss Cheung was concerned about the existing plant arrangement over the proposed skylight area; Mr. Li was concerned about the noise that might be produced in such a popular area; and Prof. Olson had proposed to have more skylights around “The Gate”. Prof. Hui commented that he understood members welcomed the idea of providing skylights to the basement but members should also wish to preserve the existing environment. Prof. Hui would convey the message to the consultant.

Mr. Leung asked whether there would be separate independent entrance to the basement. Dr. Storey commented that there would be a 24 x 7 Learning Commons in the basement, and there could be an independent entrance to this facility when the library was closed.

Prof. Wong was concerned about the noise produced during the construction period. Prof. Hui responded that noise would be unavoidable. However, the noise level should be reduced with new building and construction technology.

Mr. Li asked whether it was necessary to have 2 floors of car park in the new extension building. Prof. Hui restated that the design had not yet been finalized. Dr. Storey added that the provision of any car park area would not affect the total net floor area to be provided for the library extension.

Mr. Leung raised concerns about the closure of the existing car park during construction period. Prof. Hui commented that users might use the car park provided in the new teaching building or other parking areas in vicinity.

Prof. Hui invited members to send emails or call him if they have other comments to make regarding the new library extension project. Prof. Hui would come back to brief members when more details were available”

23rd LUG Meeting (October 17, 2008)

“LUG23/6/1 New Library Extension (Re:LUG22/5/1)

Members’ comments regarding the new library extension have been consolidated in Appendix 4. The comments have been sent to Prof. Hui. .../

An external architect has just been appointed and the Library will meet the architect in early November and will report to members at the next meeting. Mr. Ng asked whether there will be a public consultation process for the new library extension. Dr. Storey stated he would convey concerns about this to Prof. Hui....

Consolidated Feedbacks on New Library Extension

1. Design/Proposal Stage
 - (a) It is concerned that whether the outlook/appearance of the building match the style of the surrounding buildings?
 - (b) Whether the interior space allocation and facilities design match the needs of the users?
 - (c) We welcomed the idea of providing skylight to the basement, while concerning the possible problems that may arise from it.

- (d) It is worried that students' individual views may be neglected with the absence of general opinion collection process.
- (e) It is suggested that proposal be delivered, so that detailed explanations can be made by the committee members to the respective organizations.

II. Construction Stage

- (a) It is worried that the disturbance that may be caused to the nearby area (e.g.: the United College) during construction period; any contingency plan for those library users who are affected (including the user of the University Plaza outside the library)
- (b) Members also concerns the influence on students' activities in the Square regarding the temporary closure of it
- (c) Concerns have also been heard on whether the normal services of the University Library may be affected.
- (d) Care on the environment has also been noted, regarding whether too many trees may be cut down, as well as the compensatory measures, if any.

III. Completion Stage

- (a) Attention is being paid on whether the appearance and the public space that can be enjoyed by the public regarding the Square will be adversely affected by the project.”