

Appendix C: Result of View Collection Form



Appendix C: Result of View Collection Form

Result of View Collection Form for Stage 3 Stakeholders' Engagement

I. Conserving the Places of Value

To manage changes to best preserve or enhance the values, interpret or present the significances, and sustain the cultural resources for the long term cultural development of the campus, the Consultant suggests the establishment of a mechanism to conserve and assess the places with cultural significance, and the adoption of a methodology to establish the main criteria for evaluating the results of intervention.

| | Support | Neutral | Not Support | Other Comments/ Suggestions |
|---|-------------|---------|-----------------|---|
| 1 Would you support the Consultant's proposal on establishing an assessment mechanism? | 80.0% | 20.0% | 0.0% | |
| 2 Would you support the Consultant's proposal on establishing and maintaining a list of "Place with Cultural Significance" basing on the views collected from the previous Stakeholders' Engagement activities? | 100.0% | 0.0% | 0.0% | |
| | Appropriate | Neutral | Not Appropriate | Other Comments/ Suggestions |
| 3 Would you consider it appropriate for the University to conduct assessment for interventions on architecture and cultural landscapes? | 72.2% | 22.2% | 5.6% | • Assessment shall be conducted by independent consultant |

II Places for Academic & Recreational Activities

To formulate a comprehensive plan for the CUHK campus for future development, the Consultant strives to preserve and enhance the identities and the usefulness of existing academic facilities, strengthen connectivity between existing and new facilities, promote walking by providing vertical transportation devices, give priority to pedestrians over vehicles and create faculty zones to achieve physical proximity and obtain the benefits of interdisciplinary collaboration.

The Consultant's Specific Proposal has identified 6 potential development areas within the main campus and two off-campus areas for consideration of future development.

- 1 After hearing the presentation by the Consultant on the long-term development of the University and his proposals on the scale, orientation, and density, etc on the following potential sites, would you consider the Consultant's proposals appropriate for the future development of the University?

| | Appropriate | Neutral | Not Appropriate | Other Comments/ Suggestions |
|--|-------------|---------|-----------------|--|
| <u>Potential Development Areas within the Main Campus (Site A to F)</u> | | | | |
| (a) Site A- Romney Stores (indoor sports complex) | 95.7% | 4.3% | 0.0% | • Sport halls can also be used for exhibitions, conferences, or congregation |
| (b) Site B- Village Path (academic facilities cascading down to a new plaza at the end of Clinic Road) | 56.5% | 26.1% | 17.4% | |
| (c) Site C- Academic Building 1 (Academic Facilities with Garden Court and Green Roof) | 65.2% | 30.4% | 4.3% | |
| (d) Site D- Open carpark outside John Fulton Centre (Administration and Amenity Facilities, Carpark for Shuttle Bus and Visitor, and a new University Plaza) | 82.6% | 13.0% | 4.3% | |
| (e) Site E- Arts and Humanities Hub (Please go to Question 2) | 56.5% | 34.8% | 8.7% | |



| | | | | |
|---|---------|---------|-------------|---|
| (f) Site F- Staff residence (forming a more comprehensive staff neighborhood) | 59.1% | 31.8% | 9.1% | |
| <u>Future Potential Areas (Site G to H)</u> | | | | |
| (g) Site G- University Station Site (Academic and Community Facilities, Shuttle Bus Station, and Carpark for Visitor) | 87.0% | 8.7% | 4.3% | |
| (h) Site H- Area 39 (Research Facilities and Student Hostels) | 66.7% | 23.8% | 9.5% | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> The student hostel may be too far away from Central Campus |
| 2 The Consultant suggests two options for the future development of the Arts and Humanities Hub. Would you consider it appropriate to: | | | | |
| i enhance the landscape to provide a new anchoring space and implement addition and alteration works to the existing building to provide more space for the Arts and Humanities Hub? | 65.2% | 34.8% | 0.0% | |
| ii explore the possibility of redeveloping existing building to provide a new anchoring space and additional space for the Arts and Humanities Hub? | 43.5% | 43.5% | 13.0% | |
| | Support | Neutral | Not Support | Other Comments/ Suggestions |
| 3 Would you support the Consultant's proposal to set up Learning Commons for more effective communication and learning? | 82.6% | 17.4% | 0.0% | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Learning Commons is essential in providing spaces for group project and study. It is especially important for non-resident students Some of the non-circulation common areas within existing buildings can be converted into study areas |

III Enhancing College Life

With the objective to strengthen the identity of the individual colleges, giving each a further sense of being a distinctive place, the Consultant has made the landscape, pedestrian routes and facility sharing proposals for future development

| | Support | Neutral | Not Support | Other Comments/ Suggestions |
|--|---------|---------|-------------|-----------------------------|
| 1 After hearing the Consultant's proposal, would you support the idea of strengthening the pedestrian routes by providing additional linkage (such as footbridge and express lifts) between colleges? | 69.6% | 17.4% | 13.0% | |
| 2 After hearing the Consultant's proposal on setting up of Learning Commons, would you support the idea of developing new College facilities at the high-level precinct for shared management and use by the neighboring colleges? | 65.2% | 17.4% | 17.4% | |

IV A Landscape of Vital Importance

The Consultant is targeting to create a "Green and Humanistic Landscape Framework for CUHK". He presents greening strategy, natural trail and new open spaces proposals to the University and stakeholders.



1 After hearing the Consultant's presentation on this precept, would you support the idea of developing the following potential natural trails in future?

| | Support | Neutral | Not Support | Other Comments/ Suggestions |
|--|---------|---------|-------------|--|
| (a) Natural Trail from United College to Area 39 | 80.0% | 15.0% | 5.0% | • Substantial level differences between UC and Area 39 shall be considered |
| (b) Natural Trail from Eastside outlook (new plaza at Clinic Road) to Eastern Campus | 80.0% | 5.0% | 15.0% | |

2 After hearing the Consultant's presentation, would you consider it appropriate to enhance the landscape in the following areas?

| | Appropriate | Neutral | Not Appropriate | Other Comments/ Suggestions |
|---|-------------|---------|-----------------|-----------------------------|
| (a) Integrating courtyards, piazza and roof gardens into the potential developments | 80.0% | 15.0% | 5.0% | |
| (b) Main Entrance at Tai Po Road | 50.0% | 40.0% | 10.0% | |

V Pedestrian -Friendly Campus

The Consultant has assessed the current, 2012 and 2021 scenarios and presents in this precept A number of present and future solutions.

1 After hearing the presentation on this precept, would you support the following proposals about providing additional pedestrian links in the campus?

| | Support | Neutral | Not Support | Other Comments/ Suggestions |
|---|---------|---------|-------------|-----------------------------|
| (a) Provide a new pedestrian link at campus east, from the University Station through the New Integrated Teaching Buildings giving connection up to the Mall. | 80.0% | 10.0% | 10.0% | |
| (b) Provide connection between United College, Shaw College and the new colleges to the Central Campus through a series of express lifts and footbridges. | 65.0% | 10.0% | 25.0% | |
| (c) Provide another new pedestrian link from Pond Crescent through the new Student Amenity Centre | 60.0% | 15.0% | 25.0% | |

2 Would you support the Consultant's proposal on reconfiguring existing shuttle bus route for a more effective circulation of shuttles and better utilization of resources?

| | Appropriate | Neutral | Not Appropriate | Other Comments/ Suggestions |
|--|-------------|---------|-----------------|-----------------------------|
|--|-------------|---------|-----------------|-----------------------------|

3 Would you consider the Consultant's proposal to widen the footpath at Pond Crescent by changing all the vehicular traffic into anti-clockwise direction appropriate?

| | Necessary | Neutral | Not Necessary | Other Comments/ Suggestions |
|--|-----------|---------|---------------|-----------------------------|
|--|-----------|---------|---------------|-----------------------------|



| | | | | |
|---|---|-------|-------|-------|
| 4 | After hearing the Consultant's presentation, would you consider it necessary to relocate the existing shuttle bus stop at Station Road to Site B (the land next to University Station and existing Public Transport Interchange (PTI))? | 31.6% | 42.1% | 26.3% |
|---|---|-------|-------|-------|

VI Making a Sustainable Campus

The Consultant aims to create a "model for a sustainable campus that reduces energy use, minimizes waste and reduces the dependency on transport for CUHK. He presents the sustainability framework which refers to overall reduction in and benchmarks for energy consumption across the campus, as well as providing design guidelines for the sustainable development of individual buildings.

| | Support | Neutral | Not Support | Other Comments/ Suggestions | |
|---|---|---------|-----------------|-----------------------------|--|
| 5 | After hearing the Consultant's presentation, would you support the proposed design guidelines to minimize energy use and to reduce the impact of any new structures to the existing campus? | 95.7% | 4.3% | 0.0% | |
| | Appropriate | Neutral | Not Appropriate | Other Comments/ Suggestions | |
| 6 | Would you consider it appropriate to set a target for reduction of energy intensity within the University? | 73.9% | 26.1% | 0.0% | |
| 7 | Would you consider it appropriate to set a target for reduction of green house gas emission within the University? | 91.3% | 8.7% | 0.0% | |

Personal Profile

| | Student | Teaching Staff | Non-teaching Staff | Alumni | |
|---|--|----------------|--------------------|--------|---------------------------|
| 1 | 22.2% | 33.3% | 11.1% | 33.3% | |
| 2 | I have attended the Stage 1 Stakeholder Engagement Activity. | | | 18.5% | |
| | I have not attended the Stage 1 Stakeholder Engagement Activity. | | | 81.5% | |
| 3 | I have attended the Stage 2 Stakeholder Engagement Activity. | | | 37.0% | |
| | I have not attended the Stage 2 Stakeholder Engagement Activity. | | | 63.0% | |
| | I have attended the Stage 3 Stakeholder Engagement Activity. | | | 55.6% | (please go to question 4) |
| | I have not attended the Stage 3 Stakeholder Engagement Activity. | | | 44.4% | |
| 4 | I have attended Seminar on 20 Jan 2009 | | | =9 | |
| | I have attended Seminar on 21 Jan 2009 | | | =11 | |
| | I have attended Seminar on 22 Jan 2009 | | | =12 | |
| | Not Answered | | | =12 | |

Number of View Collection Forms Received

| Source | No. of Respondents |
|---------------------------------|--------------------|
| - Engagement Events | 6 |
| - Website (as at 28 Feb 2009) | 22 |
| - Fax/ Mail (as at 28 Feb 2009) | 4 |
| Total: | 32 |

