This masterplan is dedicated to the memory of Ben Hamilton-Baillie (04 July 1955 – 03 March 2019). Ben was a highly creative architect, transport thinker and street designer and an enthusiastic member of the masterplan team. Ben’s work for the University spanned much of the last decade and was always thought-provoking and highly-valued. More than anything Ben was just great fun to work with. Much of what the masterplan proposes in re-prioritising vehicle movement throughout the campus was inspired by him. I hope we are able to celebrate his life by implementing his ideas for the University.

“Ben was the UK's most influential and innovative voice promoting the idea of ‘shared space’ – that is, equal priority for all road users.”

Obituary by Laura Laker, The Guardian, 18 March 2019
Foreword

We are rightly proud of our home at the heart of Kent. For more than fifty years, our original and largest campus has been a fundamental part of the historic City of Canterbury, bringing energy, investment and expertise to the area. Since our foundation and the original Holford Masterplan, the University has evolved into a modern, high achieving institution where academic excellence and sociability combine. As the UK’s European university, we now have nearly 20,000 students at our centres in Canterbury, Medway, Athens, Brussels, Paris, Rome and Tonbridge.

The job of a university, however, is not to stand still but to look to the future. With the sector more competitive than ever, we know we must continuously adapt to meet the needs of future students and the city. We also know that the environment we work in is critical to this – from how our campus looks and feels to its impact on our neighbours around us. It is this sense of purpose that led us to produce a Framework Masterplan.

The Masterplan is not a strictly binding blueprint for future campus development but is rather a framework to guide long-term change. At its heart are a series of principles that allow us to evolve responsibly. Any future development is focussed in the existing core of the campus, while the University’s unique setting overlooking Canterbury is celebrated and preserved. The natural environment is also cherished, connecting us with Kent’s deserved status as ‘the Garden of England’. Above all, we are determined that our Canterbury campus is a place where academic excellence is celebrated, while also making a positive contribution to the lives of our neighbours and the city we inhabit.

This has been an extensive and, crucially, collaborative process. Led by the foresight of urbanist John Letherland, we have consulted widely and taken expert advice from key bodies including Kent County Council, Canterbury City Council and Highways Kent, plus the University’s own staff and students. We have also worked closely with local stakeholders throughout as plans have taken shape, seeking advice from residents’ associations, community groups, businesses and the wider public. Thank you to all of those who fed in through the extensive consultation process, and to John and the Masterplan project team for steering its delivery.

The end result is a truly inspiring document, letting us think deeply about the future role and presence of the University. Our aim for the years ahead is to be delivering one of the best education and student experiences, within an open environment at the heart of its community. The framework set out in this document will play a vital part in making this a reality. I hope you will join me in celebrating this pioneering work as we look ahead to the University of the future.

Professor Karen Cox
Vice-Chancellor and President
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Figure 1: Proposed Framework Masterplan April 2019
Executive Summary

This Framework Masterplan has been prepared in support of the ‘University of Kent Plan 2015-2020’ and ‘Kent 2025: Refreshing the University Strategy’. Its purpose is to provide a spatial framework to guide the future development of the University Campus over the next fifty years. The plan sets out a set of principles to guide where new buildings might be located and landscapes conserved. It is however a flexible plan able to accommodate many forms of new development when the particular future building needs of the University become known. The plan should not therefore be read as a strictly binding blue-print for the future campus development, but rather as an overarching structure or framework to guide long term change.

The plan draws heavily upon the inspirations that guided the Holford Plan prepared for the founding of the University of Kent in 1965. Holford’s central idea was that of a University in a landscape. This theme ensured that the selection of building locations and architectural forms was determined in response to views through landscape, the topography of the land and to pre-existing landscape features.

The success of Canterbury and the region are inexorably linked to the success of its Higher Education institutions; in the half century since its foundation, the University of Kent has enjoyed remarkable success and the campus has grown very considerably in consequence. The next half-century is likely to see significant further change in response to the urgent societal demand for the ideas, learning and research discoveries of University academic staff and alumni. The Framework Masterplan provides a structure to accommodate this change, whilst at the same time delivering a sustainable framework for future changes in the learning community.

Future speculation is an endeavour fraught with a very high risk of error and, with an organisation as complex as a University, the problem of future planning is complex indeed. One method that perhaps gives some leverage on this complex issue is to think of the organisation as being composed of many interrelated systems, each of which evolves and changes at different rates. In this model, the time horizon from future planning is particular to each issue at hand; for example, day to day planning for immediate needs, yearly planning for the academic year, five-year plans to set strategic goals and objectives etc. The campus has evolved gradually and relatively slowly, so to the casual observer it may appear permanent and unchanging. As such, it requires a long planning horizon as landscapes, buildings, shared spaces and economics evolve and change over long periods.

The Masterplan describes a spatial framework for the future of The University of Kent in the Garden of England. The title reflects the desire to renew a commitment to the founding landscape-led planning principles. It also expresses the University’s commitment to environmental conservation and to create a campus that is open and welcoming to neighbouring communities, the City of Canterbury and to the people of Kent who are all actively invited to utilise the campus and its facilities.

The Framework Masterplan is based upon the following Proposition, Principles and Protocols:

**Proposition:** A Framework Masterplan for The University of Kent in the Garden of England

**Principles:** The University of Kent Canterbury Campus will be a place where:
- Academic excellence is celebrated and communicated through architecture and landscape design
- Biodiversity and the natural green environment is cherished and cultivated
- Future development is focused in the existing core of the campus to promote and reinforce interaction between all members of the academic community
- The history of this unique agricultural landscape is celebrated as a consistent theme through the conservation of retained historic features and in the design of new facilities
- There is a sense of welcoming openness and security for all staff, students and visitors
- The environment contributes positively to the lives of neighbours, the local community and to the City of Canterbury
Protocols: To deliver this proposition in accordance with these principles, the University will work to deliver improvement to the campus in line with the following development protocols:

1 Planning & Environmental

- The masterplan will provide the framework within which future development (and other physical) projects within the campus will be bought forward, and will be a material planning consideration
- Ensure that the campus becomes a more welcoming and safer environment
- Reduce carbon emissions and move towards a low-carbon environment in accordance with the principles of environmental sustainability and the University’s Carbon Management Plan
- Improve energy and water efficiency and reduce reliance on fossil fuels
- Minimise energy consumption and overheating through use of landform, layout, building orientation, massing and landscaping
- Build flexibility and resilience into the Masterplan to increase adaptability to respond to climate change and other challenges

2 Campus Layout

- Create a more legible sense of place that celebrates the historical development of both the University and historic uses of the campus landscape
- Locate new development along the ridgeline; consolidate the areas of the Campus Heart and Park Wood, following the pattern established by earlier phases of the campus development
- Reconfigure and increase entry points to the campus that are more distinct and welcoming
- Ensure that the campus is made more ‘legible’, easier to understand and to navigate around
- Develop more attractions and facilities that local people can use and enjoy
- Respond to new opportunities to deliver excellence in teaching, research and enterprise

3 Landscape & Biodiversity

- Conserve and ecologically enhance all areas of the campus
- Promote healthy and sustainable lifestyles in the Campus, including creating a landscape that encourages walking and cycling, sport and play
- Clearly define and distinguish between the various Landscape Character Areas to enable a masterplan that supports and builds upon the variety of defining local characteristics

4 Movement & Transport

- Manage future development so that no net additional private car movements impact upon the wider network
- Works to relieve existing traffic congestion
- Reduce the demand for parking by provision of alternatives to the private car
- Locate car parking away from the campus core
- Create a better balance between pedestrians, cyclists and pedestrians
- Reduce the impacts of campus traffic by traffic calming and focus on pedestrian safety
- Improve pedestrian and cycle links to Canterbury by making routes clearer, more direct and easier to use
- Work to create a north-side entrance to Canterbury West station

The Framework Masterplan was commissioned by the University of Kent as part of their big-picture review of the future of the institution, and as such it will remain a University document. It has been prepared in collaboration with Canterbury City Council and other stakeholders and consulted widely in the surrounding communities. The Framework Masterplan has been prepared in line with Policy EMP7 of the Local District Plan. As such, it is intended that the Framework Masterplan will form the background guidance for Canterbury City Council to assess development proposals and will be a material consideration when determining planning applications, as defined in The Canterbury District Local Plan.

Peter Czarnomski
Director of Estates
Preface

In April 2005 at the invitation of the Vice Chancellor of the University of Kent, I founded Kent School of Architecture. From humble beginnings, the school has grown to become Kent School of Architecture and Planning (KSAP) with over 500 students, three research centres, and a range of postgraduate programmes running alongside the professionally validated architecture programmes. We have PhD students from all over the world involved in all aspects of architectural research. I am passionate about the role of architecture and planning in the University and remain an advocate for the growth of a learning environment which encompasses a high quality landscape and built environment, designed to promote delight and happiness among those who inhabit it.

In 2014 I supported the need for a masterplan review, ambitious for the University to continue to grow its profile and esteem in an increasingly competitive education market. The need to plan and improve the physical working environment as a place to attract the best students, staff and researchers was obvious to me – high quality places which nourish mind and body are not a luxury, they are essential to wellbeing, creativity and quality of life.

For these reasons, I recommended Sir Terry Farrell to undertake the role of developing a masterplan for the University. I was fortunate to know Terry as the country’s leading architect/planner, recognising his international work in placemaking, his authority as an architectural practitioner, his knowledge of, and commitment to Kent (he has a substantial Lutyens house there) and his ability to understand fundamental issues when rethinking the built environment.

I was delighted to support the study produced by Sir Terry and his team in 2015, and his vision for how the University could evolve over the next 50 years as a garden campus to distinguish it from other Universities in the sector.

The Farrell vision was much more than a development plan. What Sir Terry and his team proposed was an audacious reshaping of the whole campus environment that would help reposition the University as a centre for learning at the heart of the Garden of England, while laying the foundations for an academic environment appropriate for 21st century learning.

We should not forget that the University is the steward of an estate which is itself a present and future resource, and that it has a responsibility to manage and curate the landscape and buildings thoughtfully and with care. This approach has created one of the country’s most successful Universities, but that is no reason for complacency. The University has a responsibility to continuously innovate and regenerate its greatest resource. Holford had a potent and original vision for the University and his legacy is to be respected and celebrated, but it is also necessary to constantly review and refresh to provide an environment which will allow students and staff to thrive.

I have watched the masterplan mature and evolve under the guidance of John Letherland, who spent most of his career working alongside and collaborating with Terry Farrell. I have witnessed John’s commitment to the benevolent influence of landscape on the built environment from his teaching at KSAP, where his experience has been much sought after by students.

I am delighted that the clear principles that Terry Farrell established have been retained, strengthened and developed under John’s stewardship. For that reason, I have been a consistent and supportive advocate for the masterplan. As an architect and educator with 50 years of experience in the field, I understand the importance of the underlying philosophy applied to good placemaking and the emphasis placed on rebalancing the built environment within a dynamic landscape.

The University of Kent in Canterbury has the ability to become a truly remarkable environment, unique among University campuses in the UK and, if the masterplan guidance is followed, truly memorable placemaking will emerge.

I leave the University of Kent this year, proud that Kent School of Architecture and Planning is recognised as one of the leading schools of architecture and planning in the country. I have been a persistent and vocal advocate of the University and the school of architecture for nearly 15 years as head of that school, and I urge the Vice Chancellor to embrace and realise this vision for the UK’s first truly evolutionary garden campus.

Professor Don Gray
April 2019
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Figure 2: Aerial view of the Campus Heart from the north with Canterbury and the North Downs beyond
1 Introduction

1.1 The University’s Place in Canterbury

The University of Kent is a major influence on the social, economic, cultural, intellectual and public life of Canterbury; it is a leading contributor to the success of this historic city through its role in education, research and the talents of its staff and students. In short, the University of Kent changes people’s lives.

The Canterbury campus contributes more than £485m (Source: The Economic Impact of the University of Kent, by Viewforth Consulting Ltd, April 2018) to the economy in Canterbury, through direct expenditure on goods and services and spending by its students. It is the largest employer in the city and one in ten jobs here is dependent on its activities. The University’s research directly impacts its communities and it aims to grow its research and innovation activities for the benefit of the region. University academics work with local individuals, local groups and other organisations to increase its research impact and identify new ways in which its activities can benefit the region.

It is committed to leading initiatives that ensure it delivers benefits to the region as a whole. It is working with local health authorities and Canterbury Christ Church University to deliver significant health, well-being and social care benefits to the community through the creation of Kent and Medway Medical School. It partners with regional economic and development organisations to support economic growth and it will continue to engage with them to ensure its activities best meet the needs of employers and the local economy. The University’s contribution to Canterbury’s cultural and artistic life is extensive and it continues to engage local young people with a range of creative activities.

The University is seeking new ways to open up its campus as a resource for the local communities, to encourage more use of the Gulbenkian Arts Centre, conference and library services and its growing sports facilities.

The University of Kent has prepared this Framework Masterplan to guide the future development of its main campus in Canterbury. The Framework Masterplan is intended as a document to guide the development of the physical estate in support of the documents ‘University of Kent Plan 2015-2020’ and ‘Kent 2025: Refreshing the University Strategy’ and their core strategic objectives of research development, educational development and engagement with staff, students and the wider community.

The Framework Masterplan outlines a vision for the evolution of the Canterbury campus that aims to bring benefits to the University, the City of Canterbury, and to the wider region. Among the benefits that the University hope to realise are:

- Supporting the green economy strands of the Canterbury District Local Plan through the natural conservation and heritage building assets of the campus and a commitment to high environmental and sustainability standards for new buildings
- Supporting economic growth with a focus on knowledge-based services, through the creation of new business space and support services on campus
- Expanding Canterbury’s experience economy by providing additional leisure facilities focused on culture, sport and learning, and offering new community amenities
- Helping to grow Canterbury’s visitor economy by offering 20% more capacity for overnight stays with a new hotel and conference centre
- Relieving pressure on the city’s transport system by promoting green travel options, improving pedestrian and cycle access to the campus and proposing new public transport links
- Providing more purpose-built student accommodation on or adjacent to the campus to help relieve pressure on the local housing market
- Along with Canterbury Christ Church University, providing a home for the new Kent and Medway Medical School, which will attract aspiring doctors from within the local community and beyond, offering training and development opportunities that will help to keep that talent in Kent and Medway
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1.2 Why prepare a Framework Masterplan?

The University identified the need for a masterplan in 2014 to help shape the future of its Canterbury campus and ensure it realises mutual benefits for the University and the community. The Framework Masterplan builds on the principles established in the University’s original development plan, created by Sir William Holford (later Lord William Holford) in 1965.

The UoK is a leading UK University with proven excellence in research, teaching and the student experience. The Framework Masterplan will help the University to flourish and to develop its facilities as it continues to invest to create the best possible environment for its students, staff and the whole University community. It underpins the University’s commitment to secure its position as a top 20 UK University and to be a globally recognised research institution. It will reflect its reputation for excellent teaching and as a highly ambitious centre for knowledge exchange.

The need for a Framework Masterplan are manifest: there has not been a masterplan since 1965, and during this time Higher Education has evolved whilst the University and Canterbury Campus has grown significantly in size. Development of the campus in recent times has tended to be pragmatic rather than strategic and has not had placemaking at its heart. Good place-making is therefore more important than ever and a masterplan is needed to help deliver this. The need for a masterplan is also identified in Policy EMP 7 of the Canterbury District Local Plan.

In July 2015, the University published a study by Sir Terry Farrell as a first step in this process to help engage with stakeholders and local people over the future of the campus. This was the subject of an extensive consultation programme between April and September 2016; the results of which are set out in full in the Concept Masterplan Consultation Statement (April 2017). Since then, the University has tested and developed the principles set out in the Farrell Study in the process of preparing this more detailed Framework Masterplan that fulfils the requirements of Policy EMP7.

1.3 The Scope of the Framework Masterplan

The Framework Masterplan is intended to guide the future development of the campus in Canterbury. The resultant masterplan document sets out a flexible ‘spatial framework’ for the Canterbury campus, rather than a precise ‘blueprint’ for development. As such, it provides a strategic direction for the development of the campus that places an equal focus on the provision of excellent buildings and high-quality spaces that strengthen its character and respect for the rich landscape and ecology of the surrounding environment.

The overall purpose of the Masterplan is as follows:

1. Harness the role of the University as an economic driver for the city and region and maximise its potential to nurture business and innovation
2. Establish a stronger spatial relationship with Canterbury District and also with the University’s Medway campus
3. Provide a once in a generation opportunity to set out a planning and decision-making tool for the University by giving spatial expression to its Estate Strategy in the short-term, a strategy up to the end of the Canterbury District Local Plan period (2031) in the medium term and a long-term vision for the campus beyond this
4. Provide Canterbury City Council as Local Planning Authority with a framework for determining planning applications
5. Enable a broad mix of uses and their disposition within the heart of the campus and throughout the campus area to make the most of land and ensure that the campus is active all year
6. Maintain and strengthen the campus character of the University by establishing a clear place-making strategy – including layout, scale and massing
7. Ensure that future development respects, and where possible enhances, the setting of the site in the wider countryside, Canterbury’s World Heritage Site, the Scheduled Ancient Monuments, Conservation Areas, Listed and Locally-Listed buildings and the University’s other heritage assets
8. Establish a Landscape and Biodiversity Strategy that ensures that the landscape character and nature conservation interests of the whole site, including Ancient Woodland, trees covered by Tree
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Preservation Orders and important hedgerows, and the Blean Complex are safeguarded and wherever possible enhanced

9 Establish an effective Movement and Transport Strategy that enables updates to the University Travel Plan and sets the context for detailed Transport Impact Assessment as and when planning applications are made

10 Encourage healthy lifestyles and nurture well-being for staff and students

11 Set out a framework within which the University will make decisions about the future development of their estate in the short and medium-terms, covering the period defined within the Canterbury District Local Plan

12 Provide a bridge between Policy EMP7 (see Section 4 below) and planning applications establishing an appropriate balance between providing certainty whilst still allowing necessary flexibility.

The Framework Masterplan establishes a series of principles that will guide the future development of the campus to respect its setting within the wider countryside and heritage area, integrate effectively with the local transport system, align with Canterbury City Council and Kent County Council’s transport strategy and ensure that the University offers a more welcoming environment for visitors. It will also build upon several allied strategies for the management of specific aspects of the proposed campus developments. These include a Landscape and Biodiversity Strategy, a Movement and Transport Strategy, a Planning and Environment Strategy, and a Place-making Strategy.

The masterplan proposals themselves are generally limited to the ‘campus’ as defined in the Canterbury District Local Plan (the red boundary in the accompanying illustration), excluding the privately-owned houses along Giles Lane and Woodland Way. However, the Canterbury District Local Plan anticipates proposals beyond the campus boundary, stating that these could be dealt with through the planning process and that the boundary may also be reconsidered when the Local Plan is reviewed.

Given this, and in the interests of good planning, the Framework Masterplan offers ideas which stray beyond the strict campus boundary, including a new access route between the campus and Whitstable Road, an option for re-providing/redeveloping Blean Primary School and greater connectivity and links with Canterbury West Station and the surrounding area. The Campus boundary itself is addressed later in this document, and the University will fully engage with all relevant stakeholders, including Canterbury City Council and the local communities, over any proposals it brings forward for nearby land that it owns.

1.4 Preparing the Framework Masterplan: The Consultation Process

Consultation with the Wider Community: The ‘University of Kent Plan 2015-2020’ states that a strategic objective is that of engagement between the University, the community and wider society. The Framework Masterplan has set out to define a clear direction for the future development of the campus over the long term. In order for the masterplan to be successful and enduring, its endorsement by the immediate local community as well as by Canterbury City Council has been a major priority.

Taking account of CCC’s Statement of Community Involvement (SCI) (2007), the University has adopted the following consultation principles when engaging with a wide range of stakeholders during the development of this Masterplan:

- Be clear and transparent about the process and programme
- Seek to engage a wide range groups and individuals, including those that have relevant Local Plan Policies
- Employ a wide variety of methods to engage all concerned
- Make greater efforts to engage with key relevant ‘hard to reach’ groups
- Acknowledge receipt of comments and feedback, and
- Prepare a Consultation Statement at each stage to record comments and feedback received and explain how they have influenced the masterplan proposals
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The UoK has worked collaboratively with CCC and its consultants, Kent County Council (KCC) and a wide range of other stakeholders to ensure that a high-quality Framework Masterplan is fully informed by a wide range of knowledge, expertise and opinion (including from local residents, businesses and organisations). To ensure this, the Masterplan has been prepared in the following three steps:

1 Step 1: Strategic Vision

A Strategic Spatial Vision Discussion Document was created to enable a range of stakeholders to discuss and shape an overall spatial vision and the strategies for delivering it. This drew on a number of ‘building blocks’, including consultation feedback on the Concept Masterplan (as set out in the Concept Masterplan Consultation Statement). The Discussion Document was widely consulted on, including at a Strategic Spatial Vision Workshop held at the Canterbury Campus in July 2017. A Workshop Report providing a short factual summary and account of the discussions that took place at the event was published on the University’s website in August 2017. This was followed by publication of a note of a Staff Focus Group in September 2017 and then a Consultation Statement in November 2017, which set out details of all discussion and comments received, along with the University’s responses to them.

2 Step 2: Framework Masterplan Proposals

This step involved preparing proposals for specific areas of the campus. The proposals drew on the strategic vision and strategies, which were amended to take account of feedback received during Step 1 (as set out in the November 2017 Consultation Statement) and discussions with CCC, KCC and other technical stakeholders. The Framework Masterplan consultation material set out proposals for movement and transport and short and medium-term developments within four character areas: University Rise, Whitstable Road, Campus Heart and the Sarre Penn Valley. Consultation on the Masterplan Proposals took place in September to November 2018. In February 2019, the University published a Consultation Statement that sets out comments received and the University's response to them.

3 Step 3: Framework Masterplan Document

The third step involved reviewing feedback, revising the proposals to take account of the comments received and the results of on-going studies, and publishing a full draft Framework Masterplan document for comment for a 6-week period.

The Document has been published online at www.kent.ac.uk/masterplan with a limited number of hard copies in the Templeman Library, The Beaney, Blean Village Hall, The Tyler's Kiln and the City Council offices in Military Road. A Consultation Statement will be prepared showing how the final Framework Masterplan Document takes account of comments made.

Consultation Internal to the University: The Framework Masterplan has also been widely consulted on amongst the University Community. Consultation has taken various forms, including presentations to the Vice-Chancellor and the Executive Group, Deans, Heads of Schools, members of staff and representatives of the student body. Presentations and workshops have also been undertaken with representatives from staff, stakeholders and members of the wider community to help to determine the brief and direction of the masterplan, from which resulted the Strategic Spatial Vision set out later in this document.

1.5 The Structure & Status of the Framework Masterplan Document

The document explains the principles behind the masterplan and has been structured to take the reader through the influences that have been taken into account, the processes that have been undertaken and the conclusions that have been reached in the formulation of the Framework Masterplan.

The document contains the following sequence of chapters:
1 Introduction:

An explanation of the University’s importance to Canterbury and the region, the background and purpose to the masterplan, the broad aspirations for the masterplan and the status of the document.

2 The University of Kent in the Garden of England:

A brief description of the University and its campus from its beginnings in 1965, followed by a description of the development sequence that followed and a diagnosis of the campus today.

3 The Imperative for Change:

A diagnosis of the need for this Framework Masterplan, Terry Farrell’s 2015 vision and the requirement for a new approach in the context of the future of Higher Education.

4 Strategic Spatial Vision, Objective & Principles:

The masterplan brief from the University and the foundations on which the masterplan is built, a reference to the planning context and the strategic approach to placemaking.

5 The Masterplan Narrative & Continuity with the Past:

An explanation of the landscape context (including the historic, regional and local) which has determined the approach to the masterplan.

6 Landscape Character Area Descriptions:

A detailed description of each of the landscape character areas, including the landscape, heritage and built environments.

7 Landscape Character Area Proposals:

A synopsis of the design proposals included in each of the landscape character areas, which contribute to the overall masterplan areas, including outline design guidelines.

8 The Framework Masterplan:

A summary of the overall proposals, including the campus-wide components of the masterplan.

9 Consultation:

A brief summary to explain the public and internal consultation process undertaken.

10 The Way Forward, Potential Consolidation and Growth:

A brief description of the University’s aspirations for development in the short, medium and long terms.

11 Making It Happen, Implementation, Monitoring & Review:

How the masterplan will be implemented and possible future initiatives to keep it updated, monitored and reviewed.

12 Appendices:

The Framework Masterplan is intended to be a material consideration in planning matters and it is hoped that Canterbury City Council will endorse it as planning guidance for implementing CDLP Policy EMP7 and give it significant weight when determining planning applications. The University is keen to continue to engage in pre-application discussions with the local planning authority in all future planning applications.
Figure 4: Consultation event in the Sibson Building and the covers of the published Consultation Reports
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Figure 5: William Holford's plan for the University, June 1964
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2.1 Introduction

The University of Kent was granted its Royal Charter January 1965 and received its first cohort of five hundred students later that year. It is easy to assume that this new University campus emerged into the landscape fully-formed without respect for, or connection with, the past. This is very far from the truth, as the Canterbury campus emerged from the remnants of several large estates that pre-existed the University.

The University is one of a number of ‘plate-glass’ universities established in the post war era of new technology, optimism and increasing participation in higher education. After consideration of many alternative options, a large site was assembled for the Canterbury campus on a ridgeline overlooking historic city on open farmland along Giles Lane, a rural road connecting Whitstable Road with St Stephen’s Hill. After an extended selection process, the architect Holford was appointed in 1962 to masterplan the campus, and he immediately got to work on the urgent task of transforming the spectacular open site into a working University.

2.2 The 1965 Holford Masterplan

William Holford, RIBA gold medallist, RIBA president and a life peer, was appointed to plan the University of Kent Campus in Canterbury and presented his first outline plan in 1963. Probably due to the extraordinary pace at which the proposals were developed and delivered, no masterplan report seems ever to have been published. From the outset, Holford’s plan was heavily criticised for its fortress nature; to the critics it seemed there was never a proper plan and to this day the Canterbury campus is considered by many to be the least successful in terms of its architecture. However, further analysis suggests that an interesting and thoughtful concept was at the heart of this University campus.

The original expression of Holford’s founding University campus plan was one of widely spaced buildings set in expansive landscapes overlooking the Cathedral in the historic city below. This approach was an innovation compared with more ancient universities embedded within their parent cities and towns. For pragmatic reasons of cost, land availability and deliverability, the 1960’s universities were all to be ‘of the town but not in it’.

The University of Kent is unique among its contemporary new universities in being located on working agricultural land rather than being the development of a former great estate.

Holford’s masterplan for the Canterbury campus was both a product of his response to the University brief and also his response to the remarkable landscape setting. It was underpinned by two key ideas:

- First and foremost, the University plan was to be based upon a collegiate organisational model following the long-established tradition of much older institutions. The idea was to create compact, cross-disciplinary learning communities, in which students would live, work, eat and enjoy their social activities. The hope was to promote sociability and interdisciplinary exchange. Each college was designed as a self-contained building expressed through a rigorous geometrical plan of interlocking squares and spaces.

- The second idea was for the University campus heart to be placed on the ‘plateau’ along the Giles Lane ridgeline within an open parkland landscape. The college buildings were to be distributed strategically around the campus heart to emphasise their importance, and to frame significant views and vistas – most notably towards the ancient Cathedral in the valley below. At Canterbury, Holford’s concept was for individual colleges in a landscape setting, and in this respect the planning was a departure from the historic precedents of Oxford or Cambridge where college buildings are integrated into the town.

The original campus designed by Holford set out a clear vision. The Templeman Library was placed deliberately on the centre line of the ridge, with the college buildings distributed strategically around it to define the edge of the original campus and to emphasise their importance. Common academic facilities were to be housed in buildings located centrally around the library to be shared between all colleges. The working ‘heart’ of the campus core was to be surrounded by a collection of independent
college buildings, arranged around the perimeter of the core in such a way that the core could be ‘contained’ (and therefore defined) by the most important college buildings.

Individual college buildings were to be located in a landscape setting, a departure from the historic precedents of Oxford or Cambridge where college buildings are integrated into the town. Each college was to be designed as a self-contained building expressed through a rigorous geometrical plan of interlocking squares and spaces. Students would live, work, eat and enjoy their social activities. The hope was to promote sociability and interdisciplinary exchange.

There were to be three areas or ‘zones’ within the campus – central academic buildings, science buildings and colleges. There were to be at least eight contemporary colleges distributed around the campus heart on the hilltop ridge and down University Road, where they were most visible. Large landscape spaces in between were a response to the parkland setting. The science area was to be developed along the ridge to the west behind the campus and hidden within a belt of trees. The original widely dispersed campus layout no doubt came from a formula tried out in some North American campuses and left plenty of room between buildings to accommodate future intensification over time.

Holford anticipated expansion of a ‘science area’ to the north-west of the campus heart, and a gap was created in the otherwise regular disposition of college buildings around the perimeter of the core (between Woolf College and Keynes College) to allow for the campus to extend into Park Wood and Brotherhood Wood. Although this concept was followed through at first with the Electronics (now Jennison), Chemical (now Ingram) and Biological (now Stacey) Laboratories, the idea was seemingly abandoned in the 1980’s when the area to the north-west was developed instead for low-density student housing. Consequently, a good deal more of the original ancient woodland of Park Wood and Brotherhood Wood survives to this day.
Holford and his team delivered the first phase of the University, which opened to 500 students in 1965. Despite the dramatic landscape setting, this first phase of the masterplan can be described as very architectural in nature (indeed Holford never engaged a landscape architect as part of his team). The layout was composed of a central campus core of academic buildings, arranged around a largely orthogonal grid of streets and spaces that ran at right angles to St Stephens Hill and parallel to (the newly aligned) Giles Lane. At the centre of the core sits the Templeman Library, clearly expressed on the ridgeline as the backbone to the campus heart. Ironically, given the green landscape setting, the first phase of the campus conformed to a rather formal layout; Templeman Library, the Marlowe building and Eliot and Rutherford Colleges were arranged deliberately to define and enclose a large green space, no doubt intended to establish an impressive setting for the new library from the outset and to create a great ceremonial University space. In Holford’s vision, this space was to have been further distinguished by the Senate Building designed as a campanile located in front of the library and no doubt intended to grace the skyline along the ridge. Lack of funds was to blame for it never having been realised and, rather than a clock tower, the library remains the centre-piece of the campus heart.

This initial grouping enabled Holford to create a clearly defined hierarchy in which the library and the college buildings were expressed as the most important buildings. The college buildings are slightly taller than the library but set slightly apart and downhill, such that their height does not dominate. They are connected to the core but at the same time independent from it, located as they are at the threshold between the campus core and the surrounding green landscape.

Holford translated his campus idea into architecture and each building was designed in strict adherence to a geometric order. Like many of the 1960s UK universities, the architectural legacy of the early phases of the University of Kent in the Garden of England
The University of Kent in Canterbury is predominantly expressed by Brutalist and Modernist buildings, some of which were designed by Lord Holford’s own office. The founding buildings were built to Holford’s design and included Eliot & Rutherford Colleges, the Marlowe Building and the Templeman Library. The first Kent college buildings of Eliot and Rutherford draw strongly in their concept and form from the Bryn Mawr College buildings by Louis Khan, under whom Anthony Wade (Holford’s deputy) had studied at the University of Philadelphia.

Their expression is dominated by the panelisation and prefabrication that enabled them to be designed and constructed at great speed to meet the tight programme. These buildings were deliberately located and orientated to frame significant views and vistas most notably towards the ancient Cathedral in the valley below. Whereas the core is ‘urban’ in nature, the colleges were intentionally located as ‘objects’ in space; it is an architectural language of contrast between geometric order within a free-flowing picturesque landscape.

Holford anticipated expansion of a ‘science area’ to the north-west of the campus heart, and a gap was created in the otherwise regular disposition of college buildings around the perimeter of the core (between Woolf College and Keynes College) to allow for the campus to extend into Park Wood and Brotherhood Wood. Although this concept was followed through at first with the Jennison, Ingram and Stacey Buildings, the idea was seemingly abandoned in the 1980’s when the area to the north-west was developed instead for low-density student housing. Consequently, a good deal more of the original ancient woodland of Park Wood and Brotherhood Wood survives to this day.

Holford resigned from the project in late 1965 and did not guide the development of the masterplan beyond the first phase. Although his influence on the architectural expression of the college buildings waned, the masterplan proved flexible enough to allow each college to develop its own architectural personality and expression over time. Holford’s masterplan anticipated a relatively modest first phase, followed by gradual growth over time as demands and budgets allowed. This approach enabled the University to grow incrementally over time as funding became available. The relationship he established in the first phase between geometric forms within the campus heart and an informal campus edge to the parkland, set the pattern for subsequent phases and remains evident in the composition of the campus today.

New colleges were developed gradually, and the widely dispersed campus layout gradually intensified over time. Further colleges were developed around the campus heart according to the masterplan pattern, but interestingly (apart from the satellite Chaucer College) not down University Road as Holford had planned. Keynes and Turing Colleges to the east and Woolf College to the north were anticipated by Holford, and largely follow his space-positive template of overlapping squares forming courtyards and circulation routes, around which the functional spaces were arranged. However, not all subsequent college buildings adopted Holford’s suggested expression. Darwin College at the eastern edge of the campus heart breaks all Holford’s spatial guidance with its objective-positive expression, complex levels, zonal planning and deliberate divergence from the orthogonal grid of streets. However, as with all general rules there needs to be an exception and perhaps variety in the campus is strengthened for all that.

The original campus designed by Holford was of its time, and a thoughtful and dramatic response to post war needs; it could even be described in some senses as adventurous and innovative, exploring as it did new ideas and new models emanating from the urban and architectural theories of that era.

However, based as it was on symmetry of arrangement and grand axes centred on the Cathedral, the plan was not universally liked; its detractors criticised the bleakness of the setting and the “…curiously old-fashioned attempted grandeur and formality…”. Critics were also disparaging of the low-density nature of the campus in which the buildings were widely dispersed, leaving students large distances to negotiate whilst exposed to the weather: “…students trudge down endless unprotected paths from one monumental building to another…. There is none of
the interplay of buildings and the spaces between them that should make a university site an exhilarating place in which to move about."

There were other perceived shortfalls in the plan by Holford. Despite the significance of the landscape in the setting of the Canterbury campus, the landscape architect was a late appointment and therefore the design of the landscape was not developed until late in the masterplan process. As such, it was a rather open and raw landscape into which the first buildings were placed. In addition, the buildings are set as objects in this landscape and seen in the round – they therefore lack any hidden back yard space to deal with the pragmatics of servicing; as such these normally discrete essential activities are on full view to all.

Despite the criticism, the Holford Plan delivered a working University at Canterbury in a remarkably short planning period, and it laid the building foundations around which the University of Kent has grown and prospered over its first half century.

2.3 Architecture & Built Form

The University of Kent in Canterbury is well known as a very verdant campus with an abundance of open space, located as it is at the threshold between the city and open countryside. Indeed, the landscape patterns established well before the founding of the university are still vividly present in the form and functioning of the campus today despite the complete transformation of so many other aspects of the University and its organisation. The landscape was, for many centuries, a place for cultivation and growth of the sustaining necessities of life, and the past continues to shape the arrangement of the University today; the names of Brotherhood Farm, Beverley Farm, Hothe Court Farm, Park Wood, Brotherhood Wood and Hospital Wood suggest the very rural character of the area prior to the arrival of the University campus.

Furthermore, despite the outwardly modernist face of the 1965 University campus, there is no doubt that heritage influenced the layout and forms of the Holford masterplan; close examination of the founding Holford Plan reveals how he worked with the topography, the alignment of historic routes and the former agricultural features of the site to create a dramatic new university campus in a unique and ancient working landscape.

University Architecture and Built Form: Like many of the 1960s UK Universities, the architectural legacy of the University of Kent in Canterbury is distinguished by predominantly Brutalist and Modernist buildings, some of which were designed by Holford himself. This era, described by some as a ‘golden age’ of university building, is currently undergoing a reappraisal in architectural criticism. A more sympathetic view of this period is now emerging recognising the radically new approach taken to town planning in the 1960’s, the striking new architecture it generated, and the innovative use of modern building materials and new industrialised methods used in the construction. The writer and film-maker Jonathan Meades has described the Brutalist period as important because: “…it was one of those rare periods when British architecture abandoned its habitual stance of offensively inoffensive “good manners”, of strenuous politeness.”

Many buildings from this period are rightly considered to be unique and the finest of their type. Certainly, Holford’s concept for Eliot College (and later reprised for its near-identical ‘twin’ Rutherford College) is a fascinating exploration of a flexible, mixed-use building typology that simply would not have been created in the private sector or outside of a University campus.

Today’s campus has emerged from a (more or less) continuous process of design and construction, and yet the architectural character has remained relatively consistent in its height, scale and choice of materials. Although many of the buildings can be described as ‘iconic’ through their uniqueness, overall the architectural composition of the campus is delightfully modest and does not rely upon showy, over-scaled or extrovert architecture. This is a place where academic endeavour takes place in thoughtfully designed buildings within a predominantly green landscape setting.

The Canterbury Campus has evolved as a somewhat diverse collection of buildings since the University was founded in the mid 1960s, and this trend continues to this day. The development of the University can be divided into several quite discreet eras of development. In addition to
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Figure 8: The first phase of the University opened in 1965 and some of the first 500 students
remaining architectural fragments from the pre-University use of the land, each group covers a period of campus development of approximately one decade.

The 1960’s, and the Founding of the University: Holford’s central idea for the University was of a campus set in a landscape, yet interestingly the masterplan can be described as very ‘architectural’ in nature. It was composed of a central campus core of academic buildings, arranged around a largely orthogonal grid of streets and spaces that ran at right angles to St Stephens Hill and parallel to (the newly aligned) Giles Lane. At the centre of the core sits the Templeman Library, clearly expressed on the ridgeline as the backbone to the campus heart.

The working ‘heart’ of the campus core was to be surrounded in plan by a collection of eight independent college buildings, arranged around the perimeter of the core in such a way that the core could be ‘contained’ – and therefore defined by – the most important college buildings.

This approach to the masterplan enabled Holford to create a clearly defined architectural hierarchy in which the library and the college buildings were expressed as the most important buildings. These college buildings are generally taller than the other buildings but set slightly apart and downhill from the campus heart, such that their height does not dominate. They are connected to the core but at the same time independent from it, located as they are at the threshold between the campus core and the surrounding green landscape.

Whereas the core is ‘urban’ in nature, the colleges are intentionally located as ‘objects’ in space. It is an architectural language of contrast between geometric order with a free-flowing picturesque landscape. It is the landscape setting that dominates the final result, with the buildings carefully located to avoid breaking the ridgeline or dominating the natural setting. The relationship of geometric forms in landscape, together with the planned layout for Darwin and future colleges to the west and north, created an informal campus edge to the parkland to the south with views to Canterbury and beyond.

As with all general rules, there is of course an exception; Holford anticipated expansion of the masterplan to the north-west of the campus heart, so a gap was created in the otherwise regular disposition of college buildings around the perimeter of the core (now manifest between Woolf College and Keynes College) to allow for the campus to expand into Park Wood.

Holford translated his campus idea into architecture and each building was designed in strict adherence to a geometric order. The founding buildings were built to Holford’s design and included Eliot & Rutherford Colleges, the Marlowe Building and the Templeman Library. The planning of the colleges in particular was based on overlapping squares forming courtyards and circulation routes, around which the functional spaces were arranged.

The masterplan anticipated a relatively modest first phase followed by gradual growth. This approach anticipated the colleges to be developed gradually over time, and for the campus heart to be consolidated incrementally with additional buildings as funding became available. The Holford masterplan layout suggested that subsequent college buildings should also adopt the same overlapping courtyard expression.

Holford was not retained to guide the development of the masterplan beyond the first phase. Although his influence on the architectural expression of the college buildings waned, the masterplan proved flexible enough to allow each college to develop its own architectural personality and expression over time. It is instructive to note that patterns set out in the Holford masterplan at the foundation of the University, fifty years ago, are still evident in the form and functioning of the campus today despite the complete transformation of so many other aspects of the University and its organisation. Indeed, the landscape patterns from the period before the founding of the university are still legible and profoundly influence the arrangement of the University today.

The selection of materials in these early buildings, together with architectural modelling and detail, helped to embed them into their context. Windows in the Eliot and Rutherford College buildings were grouped in vertical
bands and recessed behind the sculpted concrete wall panels to reduce their impact on distant views. Earthy brick colours at the upper levels and chamfered corners softened the building outline against the landscape skyline and wooded backdrop. The Physics Laboratory, now the Marlowe Building made use of similar architectural techniques and façade modelling, with recessed narrow windows set within an earthy brick and an over-sailing horizontal upper storey supported on a cantilevered structure.

This collection of buildings began to create a garden setting on the plateau overlooking Canterbury, formed on its western edge by the Marlowe Building and loosely defined on its southern edge by Eliot & Rutherford Colleges, framing views back to the historic city. The definition of this space was completed by the Templeman Library on its northern edge, which echoed the forms of the neighbouring colleges but created a more formal, civic expression with heavily buttressed brick piers and intermittent vertical bands of glazing.

During the late 1960’s, the campus was further enlarged with the addition of the Chemical Laboratory (now adapted as Ingram), the Electronics Laboratory (Jennison) and Sports Hall to the north west of Giles Lane, the Cornwallis Building (a complex of buildings) & Gulbenkian Theatre in the central campus and Keynes College to the West of the junction of Giles Lane with University Road. The Cornwallis and Jennison buildings are both two storey horizontally expressed buildings, formed of textured concrete panels set parallel with (and at right angles to) the façades to provide solar shading. Keynes College is formed of twin courtyards and expressed stair towers reminiscent of more traditional university architecture. Fenestration patterns and building materials follow the precedent set by Holford’s founding Eliot & Rutherford College buildings.

All these buildings, whilst different in form, use, construction and appearance, share a family resemblance and sit comfortably as a coherent collection of buildings in the landscape, as Holford had envisaged.

1970’s Campus Expansion: During the 1970’s the University campus was enlarged eastwards up to St. Stephen’s Hill and exhibited the first departures from the founding masterplan principles. Darwin College, The Registry, The Senate building and the Rutherford Extension were added to the campus heart and the Stacey Building was developed to the north west.

The Registry, designed in the architectural language of the earlier Cornwallis building, together with the Templeman Library and Gulbenkian Theatre, frame an open landscaped courtyard, connected diagonally with the original central campus garden to the south west. The Senate, with its geometric octagonal form in concrete and brick, sits as a pavilion comfortably alongside this family of buildings.

The experimental ‘Y-plan’ used at Darwin College breaks with the courtyard form used elsewhere on the campus. The use of brickwork, with rectangular windows vertically aligned, is also a departure from the modular panelised architecture used elsewhere. The modelling on the façades is created by a regular rhythm of setback segments of the brick wall, to express a crenelated series of masonry blocks. Perhaps deliberately, Darwin College bears little relationship with the site or neighbouring buildings. The design ignores the symbiotic relationship of architecture and landscape that the Holford masterplan and early buildings had established.

1980’s Further Expansion: The 1980’s saw a great increase in amount of student residential accommodation on campus with the development of the Darwin Houses, and also with Park Wood as a satellite community away from the campus heart (effectively stretching the campus). The Darwin Houses form a continuous terrace that is set well back from Giles Lane, resulting in an awkwardly wide margin of ‘estate space’ along its northern face. The terrace does at least return on its west and east edges to enclose (with Darwin College) an expansive courtyard garden on the south side. By contrast, the Park Wood housing, planned as a series of suburban-style clusters arranged around car parking courts and cul-de-sacs within a woodland setting, is a complete departure from the collegiate forms of the earlier buildings. In addition to student housing, general academic and college extensions were developed in the campus heart at Cornwallis (Octagon), School of European Culture and Language (Cornwallis North West), Grimond and Eliot Extension.
Figure 9: The landscape prior to the construction of the University
Figure 10: Holford’s masterplan superimposed upon the landscape
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Figure 11: The University today superimposed upon the landscape
The idea of a unified campus architecture as envisaged by Holford was decisively abandoned during this period. Buildings were designed utilising an eclectic mix of different architectural languages constructed from a diverse range of materials. The resulting architecture is of varying quality.

1990’s: Further Expansion: This period saw the continued expansion of student housing on campus with the development of Becket Court adjacent to Eliot College, and Tyler Court (Phase1) to the east of Rutherford College. Becket Court is a cranked ‘L-form’ block, with folded roofs and expressed in a ‘modern vernacular’ style. Tyler Court is a long slab/finger block cut into the hill, and it’s siting significantly obstructs views out of the eastern end of the campus. The large-scale building massing, small windows, brick colour and texture create the appearance of an urban scale apartment block, alien to the landscape setting. Park Wood (Phase2) extended the phase one layout. The Sports Pavilion was also built at this time to the north side of Park Wood Road.

Also, during the 1980’s, additional academic buildings were developed in the campus heart in Cornwallis, together with the Templeman Library (Phase2), in an architectural language that refers to the earlier neighbouring buildings. North west of the campus core, the Canterbury (Kent) Business School (now Chipperfield Building) was the first building to be developed around a ‘garden circus’, in a woodland clearing within Brotherhood Wood at the termination of a diagonal footpath linked to the central campus garden.

2000’s: Further Expansion: Following the millennium, the process of adding new campus buildings established in the previous decades continued, and each building was designed independently without an apparent unifying architectural language. Additions included the Keynes College Extension lecture theatres, Cornwallis North East the extension of the Sports Centre and the extension to the Gulbenkian Theatre.

During this period, large student housing projects were also completed, including Tyler Court B. This development comprised two stepped long finger blocks cut into the landscape and set parallel to the first phase. The blocks step down the hillside creating unsatisfactory ambiguous landscaped spaces between them.

Woolf College, constructed in 2008, was first new college building to be competed since Darwin College in the 1970’s. The design of the new college revived the courtyard form of Holford’s original college buildings, although the layout is at a much larger scale than the original buildings. This, together with the flat and somewhat featureless architecture, creates the impression of a modern urban mansion block rather than the intimacy of a collegiate courtyard.

The Canterbury Innovation Centre (2009) (not a University building) sits upon the contoured hillside of University Rise commanding views south towards Chaucer College and Canterbury beyond. The building is distinctive, crescent in form and somewhat of an anomaly in relation to the more orthogonal buildings that inhabit the rest of the Campus. The low profile of the building, predominantly 2 storeys in height, minimises its presence in relation to the Grade II listed Beverley Farmhouse. Its modular elevation, comprising panelised glazing set within large projecting bays that express the individual units, is capped by an expansive oversailing mono-pitch roof. The elevation south towards University Road is animated by a ‘brise soliel’ of metal louvres which run the length of the elevation either side of a white rendered portal creating a framed centre piece. The car parking is concealed behind within segmented bays subdivided by landscaped bunds.

The Jarman Building (2009) is a large, square composition that dominates the western arrival space to the campus at the summit of University Road. Despite this gateway location, the facades lack animation and the building misses the opportunity to animate the spaces that surround it. Also, the unique design, using contemporary materials and detailing, makes little reference to other campus buildings.

2010 to the Present Day: During the last decade, the process of campus growth has continued with the addition of a number of notable buildings.

The Colyer-Fergusson (Music) building (2012) respects the form and scale of its neighbours, particularly the strong horizontal layering of the Marlowe Building. The building is finished in exposed washed aggregate concrete blocks similar to those used at Keynes College.
Figure 12: University building sequence (top) and predominant materials (bottom)
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Turing College is the latest college to be completed (2015), and further extends the campus along the ridgeline to the west. It comprises a series of parallel finger and ‘C-shaped’ blocks spaced apart to allow the garden spaces to pass between them. At the centre is a square, which contains communal and social facilities. The use of gabion walls, wood and dark cladding help to soften the impact of the buildings into the landscape, however the predominant use of lighter render and cladding does make the buildings a prominent feature on the skyline.

The Wigoder Building (2016), a small white frame clad block, is located next to Eliot College. Although modest in size, this building has a significant and negative impact on the architectural dialogue between Eliot & Rutherford Colleges and interrupts the landscape connection between the Parklands and the campus heart. Views to the historic city are also partially blocked by the building.

The Sibson Building (2017) fronts onto the circus garden at the end of the northwest link to the campus core and represents another one-off architectural innovation within the campus. The architectural language in this case is created from organic curvilinear forms, and irregular pattern of vertical fin louvres and rich mixture of coloured zinc cladding to reflect the natural woodland colours.

As a place of innovation, it is entirely appropriate that the University of Kent should continue to push architectural boundaries and support innovation in architecture, alongside an appreciation of the relevant issues of memory and continuity with the past in this particular location. These issues will continue to be explored as part of the Framework Masterplan process and flexible guidance provided on future development, layout, scale and massing of buildings that will distinguish, and reinforce the differences between, one character area from another. (N.B. A list of the architectural awards already bestowed upon the University is included in Appendix 5 to this report).

2.4 The University Today: Growth and Success

Today the University of Kent is among the most highly regarded and successful Universities in the UK. Whilst the Canterbury campus is where the University started and remains by far its largest base, it has another major campus in Medway, a centre for part-time study in Tonbridge, and postgraduate centres in Athens, Brussels, Paris and Rome.

Over the years, the University has also acquired land to the north and south of Tyler Hill Road and to east of St Stephens Hill. Consequently, the Canterbury District Local Plan (July 2017) increased the size of the designated campus to take in University-owned land to the north, up to Tyler Hill Road, at the request of the University. The designated campus (outlined in red) and other nearby University-owned land (outlined in blue) is outlined in the accompanying illustration.

The designated Campus encompasses almost approximately 450 acres (about 180 hectares) of land, buildings, roads, parkland, woodland and farmland. It is interesting to note that the walled Roman City of Canterbury is 130 acres, which is approximately the same size as the campus heart. For comparison, the Olympic Park in Stratford, London is 560 acres and nearby Sissinghurst Park is 460 acres.

The designated Campus extends northwards to Tyler Hill Road, a narrow, minor road which connects the villages of Blean and Tyler Hill with inadequate provision for pedestrians and cyclists. Blean is well-connected to the Campus and accessible for pedestrians and cyclists by the Old Salt Road (Sustrans Route 1). The Church of St Cosmus and St Damian on Tyler Hill, just outside the Campus, is a listed parish church and graveyard. The north eastern boundary of the Campus is formed by working farms and woodland between it and Tyler Hill, which are bisected by the University-owned former Crab and Winkle railway line. The village of Tyler Hill, although close to the Campus to the north-east, is less well-connected and a lack of significant footpaths and cycle routes mean that it is dependent upon busy minor roads to connect to Blean and to Canterbury.

To the west, the Campus extends to Hackington Road and St Stephen’s Hill, with Giles Lane forming the only vehicular access point from the east. The University owns land to the east of St Stephen’s Hill (accessed from a
private road known as Little Hall Farm Lane), which was formally important for the tile industry but is now farmed. To the south, grazing land falls down quite steeply to the Hales Place neighbourhood; a significant number of students that live off-campus choose to live in this area.

The southern boundary of the Campus is formed by the residential streets of Harkness Drive, Cadham Place and Damerham Close, with The Archbishop's School to the south east and Chaucer College to the south west. Canterbury West Station sits to the south-west of the Campus. Given the current lack of a northern entrance to the station, pedestrians and cyclists visiting the Campus must take a rather convoluted route from the station via Station Road West, Hackington Place and a series of paths/streets. This route is hard to find for the occasional visitor and relies upon a narrow, low-headroom tunnel which is intimidating to use after dark. The Station is served in its east and west approaches by level crossings; therefore, the road approaches to the University (i.e.: Whitstable Road and St Stephen's Hill) close when trains are entering or leaving the station, impeding the progress of buses and taxis along these routes.

The western boundary of the Campus is formed by St Thomas Hill and Whitstable Road; schools, housing and fields that border these roads. University Road joins St Thomas Hill in the south western corner of the Campus and sweeps up to meet Giles Lane in the heart of the Campus. St Edmund's School and its playing fields extend either side of Giles Lane, a public highway that forms the key east-west vehicular route across the Campus. The Old Salt Road public bridleway (and Sustrans Route 1) peels off from Whitstable Road and heads off north across the Campus up to Tyler Hill and beyond. A roundabout is just to the north, with the village of Rough Common to the west and the listed Blean House to the east. The rest of the western boundary is characterised by mainly two-storey housing and fields fronting Whitstable Road, with Blean Primary School fronting the brow of the hill before the road dips first down and then back up to Blean.

In overall terms, the elevated position of the Campus along the ridgeline provides a backdrop to the World Heritage Site and other heritage assets in the centre of the City. The Framework Masterplan has been shaped such that it will protect the special natural and semi-natural environment of the Campus to ensure that:

- Any future proposals do not significantly change the skyline and protect/enhance the visual amenity of people at important viewpoints
- Any development of the visually sensitive ridgeline does not introduce dominant features by way of careful siting, scale and massing, choice of external materials and colour and landscaping
- The masterplan seeks to conserve the scenic quality of important views from the surrounding area and the visual setting of the City, Blean, Tyler Hill and Rough Common
- Any external lighting introduced to create a safe environment or to floodlight sports pitches etc, will be designed to minimise glare and avoid a negative impact on the visually sensitive ridgeline

In addition, the Campus sits in a strategically important location from a landscape and biodiversity perspective, being encompassed by extensive areas of Ancient Woodland to the east, west and north. In combination, these woods form the Blean Woodland Complex, which is one of the largest areas of contiguous/semi-contiguous Ancient Woodland in England. There are also areas of Ancient Woodland within the Campus itself, together with a range of rich wildlife habitats.

The existing movement network across the Campus and in the surrounding area is summarised in the accompanying illustration.

### 2.5 The Campus in Numbers

The Campus provides about 49,000sqm of academic space for three faculties (Humanities, Sciences and Social Sciences) as well as professional services space, including retail and hospitality (34,500sqm), indoor (approx. 7,600sqm) and outdoor sports facilities and about 5,400 student bed-spaces. It is also home to the Gulbenkian Arts Centre (300-seat theatre and 340-seat cinema), the Colyer-Fergusson (Music) Building (400 seats), the Canterbury Innovation Centre (approx. 3,600sqm), the Oak's Children's Nursery and the University Medical Centre.
Figure 13: Photographs of the Canterbury Campus 2019
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The Campus and many of its facilities are open for public use, providing publicly accessible grounds and open spaces, a large number of Public Rights of Way and footpaths, together with a Community Garden. There are currently 2,165 University related car parking spaces spread across 62 separate parking areas, with additional spaces being provided for commercial uses.

The Campus is in use all year round. Clearly it is busiest during academic term-time (and particularly at the beginning and end of terms), but the University hosts conferences and events throughout the year and provides important tourist accommodation outside of term-time. The cultural, business and recreational facilities referred to above are also open throughout the year.

2.6 Relationship with the District and Wider Region

The University of Kent provides significant positive impacts for Canterbury District and the wider region which can be summarised as follows:

- The University directly or indirectly supports over 8,300 jobs in the region
- It provides almost 3,210 ‘full-time equivalent’ jobs and provides employment opportunities for over 5,000 of its students annually
- The University hosts the Canterbury Innovation Centre, which provides 3,600sqm of business space and the University’s Hub for Innovation and Enterprise, offering dedicated support for start-up
The University of Kent in the Garden of England

guidance and providing support to students, staff and graduates wishing to start a business

- Nearly 4,000 alumni have remained in the county of Kent
- The University offers workshops and activities with regional schools and colleges and a Student Ambassador Scheme has operated for more than 10 years
- Kent Law Clinic received 1,430 enquiries during the year; legal advice was provided in 360 of these matters and 178 other clients were formally represented during the year
- Students volunteered over 77,000 hours both on campus and in the local community during the 2015/16 academic year
- The Gulbenkian was awarded National Portfolio Organisation status with the Arts Council of England for three years from April 2015
- From June to September 2016, the University's Conference Office staged more than 4,350 events and booked over 145,000 overnight stays over a 13-week period, raising revenue of over £4m and providing a vital addition to the 219,000 bed nights provided elsewhere in the city throughout the year
- Kent Union’s ‘Raise and Give’ scheme raised £170,046.052 in the 2015/16 academic year

The University participated fully in the Council’s review of the impact that the Canterbury-based higher and further education institutions have on the Canterbury District. The Higher and Further Education Impact Review Report (January 2017) identifies a number of negative impacts associated with student rich parts of the District, as well as many of the positive impacts identified above. These include impacts on community living such as distortions of the local housing market, unkempt gardens and over flowing bins, letting boards, additional on street car parking, noise and anti-social behaviour. The Report makes 32 recommendations for action to reduce negative impacts and increase positive impacts. The University is working collaboratively with all relevant partners to do this and a number of the recommendations are referred to in subsequent sections of this Framework Masterplan.

The Impact Review goes on to note that University of Kent and Canterbury Christ Church University make a significant economic contribution to the district, with up to 28 per cent of all economic output in the district generated by the universities and four out of the top ten largest employers in the district are related to the higher education sector. It also acknowledges that during the recent recession, the district’s higher education sector helped to insulate Canterbury’s economy by providing a relatively stable and resilient supply of high value jobs locally.

It is also worth noting that the City of Canterbury is itself currently experiencing its own transformation and it is evolving in recent years physically, socio-economically and demographically. For example, future planned change at Mountfield Park will see an area south of Canterbury transformed into a mixed use site with 4,000 homes, 70,000sqm of employment floorspace, two primary schools, woodland, open space, local shops and community facilities. The project included options to improve sustainable travel with an enlarged park and ride, fast bus travel to the city centre and pedestrian and cycle connections.

Also, a number of projects are promoted under the ‘Canterbury Knowledge City’ banner. These aim to improve the supply of high quality business space and facilities in order to promote business development, high level skills and support productivity. These include:

- Kent Medical School and Research Complex – medical complex to deliver clinical capacity, training and research to support medical services across the county;
- Canterbury Innovation Centre Phase II – which replicates the successful formula of the existing facility, providing more serviced offices/workshops for innovative firms; and
- Makers Space and Hot House – specialist facilities and equipment for new makers, creatives, programmers, scientists and engineers.
Figure 15: Plan of the central part of the Campus today
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Figure 16: Images reproduced from the Farrelts Study, 2015
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3.1 A Masterplan Vision for the Campus

The University of Kent is an extremely successful organisation which, in the context of significant changes to the funding and direction of higher education in the UK, is now dealing with a great deal of uncertainty. In that context, the masterplan for the Canterbury Campus is intended to help and provide a framework for development that will enable the University of Kent to cope with change and to continue to be a success going forward. The masterplan is concerned with shaping and guiding the spatial organisation of the future campus, including the form and location of buildings, their landscape setting, the shared spaces they define and the whole environment that is created as a consequence. It is an issue which is perhaps the most protracted of all the many issues that the University’s Vice-Chancellor and the Executive Group is charged with managing for the future.

The 50th anniversary of the founding of the University of Kent provided an occasion to both reflect on the astonishing success of the University during its first half century and to speculate on its evolution over the next fifty years. It was at this important milestone in the evolution of the Campus that the University of Kent commissioned Sir Terry Farrell to provide a high-level blueprint for its future development and to articulate a vision for the next 50 years, recognising the critical relationship with Canterbury and the wider district.

3.2 The Farrells Study

The 2015 Farrells Study was significant in being perhaps the first overview taken of the campus since the first masterplan created by Holford in 1965. Whereas the Holford masterplan had, of necessity, focussed upon building functions and disposition, Sir Terry Farrell took the opportunity to review how the campus had evolved as a ‘place’.

The recommendations made in Farrell’s vision are wide-reaching in their scope and aspirations and, although they draw attention to a number of shortcomings in the way in which the campus has developed and sprawled in recent years, the study overall is optimistic in its appraisal of what the campus is capable of becoming.

It is interesting to note that Farrell emphasised the importance of landscape in the University estate, set as it is in Kent with its reputation as the ‘Garden of England’. There is no doubt that the green landscape setting is one of the most important and unique features of the Canterbury campus; indeed, it is significant to note that Farrell goes even further in his manifesto in advocating that the landscape is the University’s USP and suggests that the campus could perhaps become “…The Best Garden Campus in the UK…”.

It was Sir Terry Farrell’s vision which provided the foundation for a more detailed Framework Masterplan described in this report.

In building upon the 2015 Farrells Study, the development of this Framework Masterplan has placed particular emphasis upon analysing and understanding the nature of the University’s unique landscape setting. The approach has been to create a masterplan informed by (and which respects) the shapes and patterns in the landscape, the character and history of the campus, the landscape setting, the social history, and so on. The intention behind the Framework Masterplan has been to reinforce, and in some cases rediscover, the deep connection between the University of Kent and its landscape setting. Seeing the landscape in this way perhaps stands as powerful metaphor for the cultivation of new knowledge and growth of individuals through research and teaching that is the central mission of the University of Kent.

3.3 The Wider University Estate Today: Overall Challenges and Opportunities

The Canterbury Campus is one of a number of new suburban satellites that developed around the perimeter of the historic city in the post-war era, as Canterbury continued to grow well beyond the original city walls. Not only is the University of Kent considered to be the UK’s European university, it is also now within the ‘magic hour’ from London by train. While it is physically independent from Canterbury, it is only a mile away from the city centre. As a result, it is free from the hustle and bustle of the city, whilst being only a 25-minute walk away from the ‘cultural capital’ of Kent.
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1. A **plan** for future growth and development
2. Improved **potential & value** of the University Land Holdings
3. Make place-making a top priority
4. **Flexibility** to accommodate an evolving mixed-use, knowledge-based economy
5. Reinforcement of the University’s reputation for excellence in all aspects of sustainability
6. A coherent and unique **brand** for the University, recognising its reputation as the UK’s European University
7. An environment for social interaction
8. A stimulating, safe and supportive environment - home to a vibrant academic community
9. Strengthen the **symbiotic** relationship with the city
10. Create a remarkable **public realm**

Figure 17: Urban Design principles reproduced from the Farrells Study, 2015
The University is well known as a very verdant campus with plenty of open space, located within a semi-rural landscape setting, and the names of Brotherhood Farm, Beverley Farm, Hothe Court Farm Park Wood, Brotherhood Wood and Hospital Wood suggest the very rural character of the area prior to the arrival of the University campus.

However, a review of the Canterbury Campus today reveals a number of shortcomings both in the campus environment and in its relationship with the wider context, and the current University estate faces several issues that need to be addressed:

- The campus lacks coherence and a strong ‘mental map’: the buildings are arranged as ‘objects’ in the landscape rather than being arranged to define and enclose the ‘spaces’ between them. Consequently, it is a very difficult place for visitors to navigate around.

- Motor vehicles tend to dominate the University environment and car parks infiltrate into the very heart of the campus. The campus roads are not particularly urban, but are often busy and intimidating. The design of the roads does nothing to discourage high speeds, and Giles Lane and University Road are used by non-university motorists to bypass the city centre.

- The design of the landscape was not sufficiently well addressed in Holford’s day. Whilst blessed with an abundance of green spaces, the campus today still lacks a sense of coherence and an organised public realm. Furthermore, the green spaces within the campus are rather homogenous and repetitious, and this lack of variety means that the University under-achieves in terms of landscape character and personality.

- The hill-top location dictates that, for much of the academic year, the campus is very exposed to the weather. It is only in the Summer Term that students benefit from the green open spaces. The public realm and outdoor spaces would benefit from a more sheltered network of outdoor spaces.

- The low-density and dispersed campus environment means that paths that connect the core with the outer campus are long, lack animation or passive surveillance.

- Emerging tensions between the University and its neighbours where development pressure, traffic and other perceived nuisances provide the focus for potential dispute.

These criticisms should be set against the many delights of the current campus, which include a generous green landscape setting, the quality of many of the facilities and buildings and the spectacular views of Canterbury.

Through the Framework Masterplan process, the University has taken stock of the future potential of the University estate, not only to deliver future growth but also to evolve as a more inclusive and vital place. It is a time of great uncertainty, when growth has levelled out and universities are competing for more limited student numbers, so flexibility and adaptability are key.

With the benefit of fifty years of experience, based on the campus development to date, we may confidently predict that much of the campus of fifty years hence is already constructed and that the future campus plan will be in the form of an evolved version of the current spatial arrangements. Whilst the Framework Masterplan proposals themselves are strictly focussed upon the defined ‘campus’ as designated in the Canterbury District Local Plan, the Masterplan document also takes the opportunity to identify additional proposals for adjoining areas outside of the campus boundary; however, these are limited to infrastructure, transport and movement and not to development at this stage. By taking a big-picture and long term overview of Canterbury and district, the masterplan has looked for ideas and opportunities to realise wider benefits on land beyond the designated campus boundary.

3.4 The University of Kent in Canterbury: Campus at a ‘Tipping Point’

The Holford plan set out a clear vision for the campus as a collection of discrete colleges in a parkland landscape, with common facilities shared centrally between them. After half a century since the inception of the campus, the extent of tree cover has increased very significantly and is now a dominant feature, replacing the openness of the campus experienced on the opening day. Perhaps in this regard the setting is now closer to what Holford had
imagined in the early 1960’s. Future growth, in so far as it was known or anticipated, was to be accommodated by the addition of more college buildings distributed along the hill top ridge and down University Road, with large landscape spaces in-between creating the college settings.

However, the campus has evolved in quite different ways from that which Holford intended for several important reasons:

• The University of Kent experienced a thirty-fold increase in academic areas and student numbers since its inception in 1965.

• The original collegiate system has been replaced by a more subject-based School system, along with a wide range of alternative ways to accommodate residential students, including shared apartments, town houses and many students living off campus in Canterbury.

• Season-by-season the landscape has matured and developed, such that large areas of planting and maturing woodland now distinguish the formerly bleak and exposed ridgeline.

• Finally, and perhaps most importantly, the approach to providing accommodation has been much more pragmatic and tactical than envisaged by Holford. Buildings have been added within the confines of the original Holford campus heart, as well as on available sites within the wider campus as the estate has grown in size. Some original structures have been extensively modified or replaced, and many of the buildings that have been realised are good works of architecture. At the same time, the focus has been on developing good buildings perhaps at the expense of developing spaces of equal quality between them, and the ever-pressing demand for car parking has seen large surface parking areas retained and expanded. The main point here is that growth and the dramatic other changes have been delivered without strict adherence to an overall guiding plan.

Since the inception of the Holford Masterplan in 1965, the University has experienced great success and the campus has grown significantly as a result. The process of land acquisition has continued over the decades since the University first opened, and this has led to a substantial growth in the estate; for example, the University estate now includes significantly more land to the north of the campus heart up to and beyond Tyler Hill Road and a large area of land to the east of St Stephen’s Hill, as well as the corridor of land once occupied by the former Crab & Winkle rail line (between the campus heart and Tyler Hill Road). Conversely, the area of land to the south of the campus heart (designated on Holford’s plan as playing fields) was never acquired.

During this period of growth and evolution, the planning of the campus has largely followed a pragmatic project-based approach to development, utilising available sites within the wider campus outside the confines of the original Holford masterplan to deliver the quantum of space required. This raises an interesting question: if such a tactical approach has served the University well to date why should it change to a masterplan guided approach to accommodate future change?

The answer to that key question is that the University of Kent Campus has arrived at a ‘tipping point’ in its evolution; the investment in new buildings, spaces and facilities is eroding functionality and legibility of the campus as a whole. This in turn is beginning to erode the functionality and quality of school and student experience of learning and living at the University of Kent. This approach has followed a much more tactical development of the campus than envisaged by Holford; the demand for space has resulted in the gradual expansion of the built environment and the consequent erosion of the open parkland setting, without an overall guiding plan. As a result, there has been a loss of coherence – or ‘sense of place’ – and a subsequent loss of identity offered by the original masterplan; continuing to follow this approach will result in a gradual decline in the quality of campus facilities and experience.

In this time of greater uncertainty in further education, when growth has levelled out and universities are competing for more limited student numbers, the University has taken the brave but important decision to take a big-picture overview of the Canterbury campus, including projections for future growth, appropriate use of the larger land ownership, and the quality of the campus as a place. Through this Framework Masterplan, the University is taking stock of the potential of the campus,
not only to deliver future growth but also to evolve as a more inclusive and vital place.

Urban theorists worldwide now recognise the positive and measurable impacts of good placemaking, including its relevance to productivity, economy, health, well-being and the desirability of a location. Future emphasis on campus planning must therefore be focussed on growth balanced with flexibility and good placemaking.

“Place is actually more important to the world’s economy than ever before”

Professor Richard Florida, Urban Studies Theorist, University of Toronto

The Canterbury Campus Framework Masterplan is therefore focussed upon arresting and reversing the erosion of campus quality, in order to ensure that future capital and estate management investment is channelled towards delivering cumulative improvement to the campus environment for the benefit of the whole University and the wider community.

3.5 The Aspirations and Drivers behind the Framework Masterplan Study

This Framework Masterplan document is intended to guide the development of the physical estate in support of the ‘University of Kent Plan 2015-2020’ and ‘Kent 2025:..."
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Figure 19: Aerial view of the Designated Campus
Figure 20: Plan of the Designated Campus (the red line denotes the campus boundary)
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Refreshing the University Strategy’, key documents which set out the future direction of the University and which include the core strategic objectives of research development, educational development and engagement with staff, students and the wider community.

In planning the strategic direction of the University of Kent over an extended planning horizon of the next few decades, there are three categories of future change that the Framework Masterplan has addressed:

1  The Knowledge Economy:

Development of a knowledge-based economy in Canterbury, with the University of Kent playing a central role in partnership with the Canterbury City Council, along with other regional, national and international agencies. The economy of the UK is increasingly based upon knowledge, information and creativity, and the role Canterbury plays as a ‘City of Learning’ is a key provider in that marketplace. Formulation of campus development plans that will enable the University to successfully address and fulfil the economic imperatives of the Knowledge Economy, will require ever closer collaboration between the University and the City, to develop a shared economic vision that will benefit both organisations and make both stronger.

2  Strategic Planning:

The long-term strategic planning of the campus over an extended planning horizon has inevitably needed to address a variety of complex issues beyond the campus boundary. Canterbury City Council have identified Movement and Transport, Education and Air-Quality as some of the most significant issues to resolve in preparing a Framework Masterplan for the Canterbury Campus. Other issues are likely to include strategic land acquisition, infrastructure development (both within and beyond campus), defining and influencing patterns of growth beyond the designated campus boundary, long term policy strategies on sustainability, the environment, heritage, health and well-being. Taking a 360° overview across Canterbury and the District has therefore been essential in developing long-term partnerships of trust with local communities, businesses and the City of Canterbury.

3  Adaptability & Flexibility:

The Framework Masterplan also needs to deal with the unforeseen, and to respond to urgent or unexpected contingencies that might arise, such as:

- Developing facilities for research into new areas of knowledge or technology that require innovative specialist facilities
- Responding to unexpected peaks and troughs in the demand for space
- Diversifying and broadening the University’s economic base
- Responding to opportunities to form partnerships with commercial businesses
- Accommodating new facilities supported by grants and endowments

These issues, and those related to them, have been carefully considered as part of assembling the Framework Masterplan, and this report describes the form that an evolved campus masterplan should take. It sets out a framework in which the University can flexibly plan for the future, whilst acknowledging a lack of detailed knowledge about what quantum and type will be needed in the years to come. The masterplan has been based upon sound ‘placemaking’ principles, in order to achieve a successful and enduring environment that will enrich the experience of working, studying and visiting the campus, and that will allow for the future accommodation needs of the University to be met.

The Framework Masterplan has therefore set out to fulfil the following objectives:

1  A Plan for future Growth
2  Enhance the Potential and Value of the University Estate
3  Make ‘Place-Making’ a Top Priority
4  Ensure Flexibility to accommodate an Evolving, Mixed-use, Knowledge-based Economy
5  Reinforce the University’s Reputation for Excellence in all aspects of Sustainability
6 Promote a Coherent and Unique Brand for the University
7 Develop an Environment where Social Interaction will thrive
8 Create a Home for a Vibrant Academic Community
9 Strengthen the Symbiotic Relationship with the City
10 Create a Practical and Enduring Public Realm

As noted above, today the campus is at a tipping point between fulfilling the need for built space balanced against the resulting quality of environment in the public realm, requiring a new and long-term vision to be determined for the future campus development. This Framework Masterplan represents a new approach and provides a more strategic plan-based alternative, in order to ensure that all future capital and management investment in the campus results in cumulative improvement to the campus environment as a whole. The masterplan builds upon the findings of the Farrells 2015 Study and sets out a strategy based upon consolidation and intensification for the future development of the campus.

The Vice-Chancellor and Executive Group recognise that, by taking a big-picture overview, the Framework Masterplan is a once-in-a-generation opportunity to create a campus environment of enduring and unique quality, and one which has a positive impact upon wider Canterbury and the region.
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4.1 The Strategic Spatial Vision

In the preparation of this Framework Masterplan for the Canterbury Campus in line with Policy EMP7 of the Local District Plan, the University and its masterplan team undertook to work collaboratively with Canterbury City Council, Kent County Council and a wide range of other local stakeholders.

The Strategic Spatial Vision for the Campus draws on a number of building blocks that have helped frame it. The key building blocks are identified in the accompanying illustration.

In order to set the strategic direction for the Framework Masterplan, the University of Kent developed a narrative concept for its Canterbury Campus during the consultation process with neighbouring local communities and the resultant ‘Strategic Spatial Vision’ of the Canterbury Campus can be expressed as follows:

The Canterbury campus will be defined by a strong high-quality landscape that helps to create an outstanding place to teach, learn, work, undertake research, live and enjoy. It will form an integral part of Canterbury District by providing educational, cultural, recreational, sporting and employment opportunities for people in the District and the wider Kent region and will use the University’s national reputation to help improve economic prosperity.

Roads on the campus will be transformed into attractive streets that prioritise walking and cycling and buses and public paths and bridleways will be enhanced to provide a welcoming and legible network of routes.

The campus and nearby University-owned land will be developed in ways that support its special natural and semi-natural environment, the setting of the Canterbury’s World Heritage Site and local heritage assets.

Figure 22: The key building blocks of the Strategic Spatial Vision for the Campus
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Future development will respect the quality of life and day-to-day activities of people living and working in the surrounding villages and residential neighbourhoods and seek to mitigate any change to the wider surrounding area in terms of traffic, car parking, air quality or demand for recreation. The campus and development on nearby University-owned land will be outward facing and seek to improve the lives of local people as well as being an exemplar for environmental sustainability by reducing energy use and carbon emissions, adopting high standards for water usage and waste and recycling and creating an environment that promotes healthy living and physical and mental wellbeing.

The University’s ownership will enable the long-term stewardship of the campus and ensure that it is managed and maintained in ways that sustain the outstanding place that is created.

4.2 Strategic Objectives

A number of key Strategic Objectives were identified by the University to guide the development of the campus and to help deliver the Strategic Spatial Vision. These objectives take account of the findings of a series of studies and strategies developed by the University and regional partners, as well as the feedback provided during consultation on the Farrells Study and at Step One of the Framework Masterplan process:

1 A Plan for Future Evolution:

A flexible plan to accommodate growth of the Canterbury Campus, taking account of future plans for the Medway Campus, including:
- academic and research facilities
- student housing
- much needed new shared amenities
- facilities that encourage year-round use and contribution to local economy (including, cultural and sports uses, visitor accommodation a hotel/conference facility)
- infrastructure

2 Enhance the Potential and Quality of the University Estate:

Make best use of the existing built resources in order to:
- deliver future growth balanced with flexibility and good placemaking
- evolve as a more inclusive and vital place
- locate new facilities to enhance the Estate as a whole
- deliver the positive and measurable impacts of good placemaking
- improve the quality of spaces between buildings to enhance productivity, economy, health and well-being and encourage healthy lifestyles
- develop the campus to enhance the interface with neighbours and improve linkages with local communities as well as Canterbury

3 Make ‘Place-Making’ a Top Priority:

The masterplan should:
- nurture and enhance the renown and appeal of the University and its campus as a ‘Place’
- strengthen the University’s reputation as a great place to be, through the quality and diversity of its overall environment
- inspire a greater celebration of arrival at the campus from all directions

4 Ensure Flexibility to accommodate an Evolving, Mixed-use, Knowledge-based Economy:

The campus Framework Masterplan must be sufficiently flexible to:
- allow the campus to accommodate a wide range and mix of uses
- create partner space for companies in the knowledge-based and commercial research economy
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5 Establish the University’s Reputation for excellence in all aspects of sustainability:

Facilities should be consolidated to:
- promote energy efficiency and limit heat waste
- provide conditions for cogeneration of power
- take advantage of natural light, shading and shelter in the design of the buildings and landscape
- promote the creation of a walkable campus to encourage a safe, healthy connections to all facilities
- nurturing the biodiversity value of the Campus and surrounding area
- taming traffic to limit the impact on a predominantly pedestrian environment and rationalising car parking to make it more efficient/reduce impacts on air quality

6 Strengthen the University’s Unique Attributes to Distinguish it from its Competitors:

Recognising its reputation as the UK’s European university, the masterplan should:
- Evolve the Campus as a more inclusive and vital place
- Strengthen academic and physical links with the University satellite campuses
- Reinforce the Campus as a varied and verdant green landscape in the ‘Garden of England’
- Develop the University as a place of innovation, continue to push architectural boundaries and support originality

7 Develop an Environment for Social Interaction:

The masterplan must help deliver an environment that will enable and encourage:
- spaces and facilities that support student societies, group working, activities and volunteering
- the character of Kent students as socially aware members of the community to prepare them for post-university careers

8 Create a Remarkable Public Realm:

The Framework Masterplan should enable the development of a safe and sustainable public realm that:
- encourages social interaction and leisure activities
- supports university events and commercial activities
- can be used for formal and informal teaching and learning activities

9 Strengthen Connections with the Surrounding Context:

The preparation of a masterplan provides the opportunity for:
- a holistic and considered approach towards the campus as a whole
- integration with the Canterbury District Local Plan and influence its review and refinement to guide future development needs
- maintaining the campus character whilst respecting the setting of the wider countryside
- establishing key facilities within the campus that will serve the needs of the wider city

10 Create a Home for a Vibrant Academic Community:

The Campus should:
- foster intellectual exchange
- allow its students and staff to develop their careers and academic pursuits within a stimulating, safe and supportive environment

11 Create a Compact & Consolidated Campus Heart:

The Campus Heart should be the first choice for:
- locating new academic and other uses
- creating space and places of quality in the public realm
12 **Safeguard the potential of adjoining land:**

The masterplan must ensure that:

- proposals for the Campus enhance and complement adjoining land
- proposals benefit surrounding local communities wherever possible
- proposals do not prejudice access to adjoining land and facilitate future access wherever possible

### 4.3 Policy Context and Evidence Base

**Policy Context:** The Framework Masterplan incorporates the spatial expression of the ‘University of Kent Plan 2015-2020’ and ‘Kent 2025: Refreshing the University Strategy’ and the Estates Strategy (2015-2025) that supports them. The Institutional Plan was refreshed in 2019 and its key messages are as follows:

- **Local Plans:** The Canterbury District Local Plan (CDLP) was adopted by CCC in July 2017 and is supported by a number of relevant planning guidance documents. Kent County Council adopted the Kent Mineral and Waste Local Plan (KMWLP) in July 2016 and this is supported by the KMWLP Safeguarding Supplementary Planning Document, adopted in April 2017.

- **Policy EMP7 (University of Kent):** This provides in-principle support for development within the defined Campus of educational buildings for teaching and office space; student accommodation; business accommodation (compatible with the University’s role in research and development and business innovation); sports facilities and other facilities directly related to the University’s core business. The Proposals Map defines the Campus boundary, as identified in Figure X, and designates the land for the above purposes. The full text of this policy and other key local plan designations and guidance is set out in Appendix 1

- **Economic Strategies:** The importance of higher education to economic growth and prosperity made clear in the Government’s Industrial Strategy White Paper (November 2017). At a regional level, the Thames Estuary Growth Commission is investigating opportunities for growth based upon creating internationally-competitive centres of excellence, connectivity and communities and the South East Local Enterprise Partnership is reviewing its Strategic Economic Plan and is encouraging closer links to be forged between business and the higher and further education sectors.

At a sub-regional level, Kent County Council and the five East Kent districts of Ashford, Canterbury, Dover, Shepway and Thanet have developed the East Kent Growth Framework which sets out an overarching strategic approach for identifying investment priorities to achieve long-term economic growth across East Kent between 2017 and 2027. The Framework (December 2017) identifies higher education, tourism, creative, healthcare and professional services as the main growth sectors for Canterbury. It also identifies four key objectives as the ‘building blocks’ for driving continued and sustained growth and focusing future investment across East Kent:

1. Unlocking growth through infrastructure
2. Delivery of business space
3. Supporting productivity within business, and
4. Place-making and shaping.

The document goes on to identify 70 projects or interventions across East Kent, including:

- Road infrastructure projects (Milton Manor roundabout, A2 slip at Bridge, A2 off slip and park and ride relocation and the Wincheap Traffic Management Scheme) and more strategic new roads (Sturry Link Road and a longer-term Canterbury Eastern by-pass – which would link the A28 near the Sturry Road Park and Ride with the A2 at a new interchange near Bridge)

- A number of projects are promoted under the ‘Canterbury Knowledge City’ banner aimed at improving the supply of high-quality business space and facilities in order to promote business development, high level skills and support productivity. These include: Kent and Medway Medical School (KMMS); Canterbury Innovation Centre Phase II; and Makers Space and Hot House (specialist facilities and equipment for new makers, creatives, programmers, scientists and engineers)
Drawing on the Growth Framework, in January 2018 the East Kent authorities published ‘East Kent – The Gateway to UK plc’ which highlights the national importance of East Kent to the UK economy and the opportunities for growth.

Canterbury District Transport Strategy (2014-2031)

The headline aim of the strategy is “…to improve access to services, goods and opportunities and tackle the negative impacts of traffic by promoting sustainable modes of transport, achieving reliable vehicle journey times and supporting sustainable development.”
Traffic modelling undertaken as part of the evidence base for the strategy forecasts that, based on known development proposals and in a ‘Do Minimum’ scenario, travel demand (person trips) would increase up to 17% and traffic growth (vehicle trips) would increase by 18%. The strategy contains four key strands to reduce these increases, improve journey time reliability and meet the target that traffic levels in the centre of Canterbury do not increase by 2031. These are (1) encouraging sustainable travel by encouraging the use of alternatives to the private car; (2) managing the availability of car parking to balance the impact of car use with the need to provide access to services and opportunities; (3) managing the (road) network to achieve reliable journey times across the network; and (4) reducing the demand to travel by reducing the overall number of journeys undertaken.

Drawing on the Strategy, the transport infrastructure priorities for Canterbury are identified in the CDLP (paragraph 5.17) that supports Policy T1 (Transport Strategy) are as follows:

- Sturry Link Road
- Herne Relief Road
- Wincheap: A2 off-slip, relief road and new traffic management scheme
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- South Canterbury: fast bus link and improved walking and cycling links
- New A2 interchange at Bridge
- A28 Sturry Road bus link completion, and integrated transport package
- Vauxhall Road / Broad Oak Road junction capacity improvements
- Expansion of park-and-ride sites
- Extension to the Crab & Winkle Way in Whitstable
- Tourtel Road roundabout improvements
- Canterbury West Station: improved access
- Expansion of the Urban Traffic Control system
- Herne Bay to Canterbury Cycle Route (part of National Cycle Network Route 1)
- Whitstable traffic management improvements

In addition to the above, in April 2018, CCC and KCC announced that it also wanted a new A28 bypass linking Sturry Road (near the Sturry Road Park and Ride) to the A2 at a new interchange near Bridge to take through traffic away from the ring road to help tackle poor air quality and support economic growth.

Several of these priority measures are directly relevant to the Framework Masterplan, especially, the extension to the Crab and Winkle Way (part of National Cycle Network Route 1) and the access improvements to Canterbury West Station. The key relevant priorities are identified in the accompanying illustration.

Evidence Base: The Framework Masterplan has been informed and supported by an appropriate and proportionate evidence base, including the following studies and strategies:

- Preliminary Ecology Appraisal and Guidance (February 2018) (reporting on a habitat survey carried out in August 2017)
- University of Kent’s Travel Plan and Parking Management Strategy, which are updated regularly and informed by campus surveys
- Technical note on existing traffic flows in and around the Campus (February 2018), drawing on traffic counts carried out in May 2017 and January 2018
- Building Analysis Schedule (January 2018): an assessment of all campus buildings and their contribution to architectural character and public realm
- Benchmarking Study: University & Campus Landscapes (February 2018)
- Historical Evolution (November 2017) – mapping out how the campus has evolved over time
- Baseline Mapping (November 2017) – including all relevant planning and environmental designations
- Landscape Setting and Views Appraisal by LUC, dated December 2018
- Stand-alone spatial strategies, including Place-making, Planning & Environment, Landscape and Biodiversity and Movement and Transport.

This Framework Masterplan also draws on the findings of a number studies undertaken to support planning applications for individual buildings (including archaeology, ecology and transport). Going forward, subsequent planning applications will be supported by more detailed studies, strategies and assessments in accordance with CCC’s reasonable requirements and be the subject of Environmental Impact Assessment, where necessary.

4.4 Landscape Setting and Views Appraisal

Planning Context: In 1988, Canterbury Cathedral, St Augustine’s Abbey and St Martin’s Church were inscribed as a Cultural Site on the World Heritage List. Local Plan Policy HE2 (World Heritage Site and Buffer Zone) states that Canterbury City Council will protect and enhance the Universal Value of the inscribed Canterbury World Heritage Site (WHS). Policy HE3 (Significant Views of the City and WHS) also makes clear that Canterbury City Council will seek to protect views, including from the Canterbury Areas of High Landscape Value. Both are supported by the World Heritage Site Management Plan (2002).

Amongst other things, Policy HE3 (Significant views of the city and World Heritage Site) makes clear that ...
4 Strategic Spatial Vision, Objectives & Principles

“Through the careful siting and design of buildings and appropriate landscaping, developers should demonstrate how their proposals will respect or enhance the landscape and topographical features which contribute to the Outstanding Universal Value of World Heritage Site.”

Justifying text 9.24 goes on to state that: “Canterbury’s valley location results in a large number of viewpoints that allow broad vistas across the City’s rooftops and some of the most important viewpoints are described in the Canterbury Conservation Area Appraisal.”

The primary aim of the Management Plan is the sustainable protection, conservation and presentation of the Site; the Plan sets out objectives and a programme of actions to protect and maintain the Site’s overall significance. Paras 2.2.15 to 2.2.17 of the Plan outline the approach taken to establishing a ‘buffer zone’ to highlight the importance of and help protect, the WHS’ setting. This notes that at Canterbury, statutory protection is afforded by the current designations and local plan policies, but that the Management Plan is useful to draw attention to the significance of the historic and visual links and the areas which form the immediate setting of the World Heritage Site.

The World Heritage Site is located to the south east of the campus; the nearest part of the UoK campus is some way from the ‘Buffer Zone’. The Plan makes clear that the ‘Buffer Zone’ does not have statutory status, nor does it bring with it any additional controls or restrictions. However, it highlights the need to take into account the impact on the WHS of any proposals or developments in this area.

A number of other Local Plan Policies (but not limited to those listed below) also place a high priority on the protection of the landscape character and setting:

1 Policy LB2 (Areas of High Landscape Value)

This designates most of the Campus Heart and University Rise as part of an Area of High Landscape Value (AHLV). Policy LB2 and its sister Policy LB4 (Landscape Character Areas) both set out criteria for considering development proposals in relation to landscape and biodiversity and the justifying text for both refer to the intended role of the Canterbury District Landscape and Biodiversity Appraisal in determining planning applications.

2 Policy LB4 (Landscape Character Areas)

Proposals for development, and associated land use change or land management, must demonstrate that they are informed by, and sympathetic to, the landscape character of the locality. In considering development proposals, the Council will take every opportunity to reinforce, restore, conserve or improve, as appropriate, the landscape character of the area in which development is proposed.

3 Policy LB5 (Sites of International Conservation Importance) (Blean Complex Special Area of Conservation (SAC), Thames, Medway and Swale Estuary two Special Policy Area (SPA) and the Thanet Coast and Sandwich Bay SPA)

Sites of international nature conservation importance receive the highest levels of protection. No development will be permitted which may have an adverse impact on the integrity of a Special Area of Conservation. For example, suitable planting is encouraged around visually prominent farm buildings (particularly large, modern sheds) to soften the visual impact.

4 Policy LB8 (Landscape Scale Biodiversity Networks) (Areas of Ancient Woodland)

States that new development will need to (amongst other things):
- avoid the fragmentation of existing habitats and support the creation of coherent ecological networks through both urban and rural areas, and
- retain, protect and enhance notable ecological features of conservation value such as ancient woodland, neutral grassland, hedgerows, trees, wetlands, river corridors and other water bodies, and habitats that offer breeding or feeding sites of local importance to populations of protected or targeted species.
5 Policy LB11 (The Blean Complex)

The Council will support projects that restore, enhance and connect the valued woodland habitat complex of the Blean. The Council will give particular support to projects that benefit the landscape through sensitive and traditional woodland practices and which support the timber market and wider local economy. The City Council will refuse proposals for development that would result in the loss, deterioration or damage to the character or and integrity of the Blean Complex. Development should provide or which would will prevent important opportunities for biodiversity improvement within the identified Biodiversity Improvement Areas.

The Framework Masterplan therefore has a responsibility to protect the local landscape character and setting, demonstrate the impact on the local townscape character and the skyline and ensure that the backdrop of the World Heritage Site is protected. Furthermore it must demonstrate that any development proposals (and any associated land use or land management change) are informed by, and sympathetic to, the World Heritage Site.

Long distance view locations have been identified for their accessibility from a public space and their advantage of providing the best views to illustrate the historic significance of the city and the World Heritage Site. The locations are described and depicted in detail in the Canterbury Conservation Area Appraisal, but include the view from specified locations at Tonford Meadows, Harbledown, St. Thomas Hill, St. Martin's Hill, St. George's Field, New House Lane, Neal's Place, the University Road/University Slopes and Beaconsfield Road/St. Stephen's playing fields.

Consequently, as a component part of preparing the Framework Masterplan, Land Use Consultants (LUC) were appointed to undertake an initial Landscape Setting and Views Appraisal to assess the impact of the masterplan proposals upon the long distance views identified above to ensure that there is no detrimental impact upon landscape interests, protected species, sites or features of nature conservation interest or sites of archaeological or historical importance.

In order to facilitate this study, building plots were identified from the masterplan proposals and projected into three-dimensions to create a rudimentary model of the development proposals. Assumptions were made about the likely use and height of each of the identified building plots. These assumptions are identified on the accompanying illustrations.

In overall terms, this study demonstrates that new development in the masterplan is situated within the wooded university slopes and does not form a prominent feature on the wooded skyline. The proposed buildings do not impose on the backdrop to views of the Cathedral or compete for prominence of the Bell Harry Tower. The proposed locations of buildings do not compete with the Cathedral for prominence, and woodland retained as part of the Framework Masterplan will continue to contribute to the wooded backdrop. Where filtered views are achieved through hedgerows in the winter, proposed buildings would be seen set within the wooded skyline and would not form prominent features on the skyline.

As noted above, the Framework Masterplan sets out a flexible spatial framework for the Canterbury campus and not a precise blueprint for development. Any new development brought forward in the future will conform to the principles of the masterplan and will be submitted as planning applications; they will therefore be subject to more detailed Landscape & Visual Impact Assessment testing as part of the usual planning process.

The results of this study are published in full in an accompanying appendix to this report.

4.5 Placemaking Principles

Good placemaking is becoming more relevant to the global economy and to our individual lives than ever before, so it has been an overarching aspiration throughout the Framework Masterplan process.

The choice of where to live, work and play is arguably the most important decision we make and exerts a powerful influence over the jobs we have access to, the people we meet, and our ability to lead happy and fulfilled lives. It is also recognised as a key driver for the desirability or
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‘liveability’ of an area. Consequently, the University Campus must be the most powerful expression of the academic, cultural and civic life of the University, an enduring expression of the University’s aspirations and achievements.

Considering all of the above, the Framework Masterplan will follow a set of guiding principles and strategies to ensure that the University of Kent Campus will become a place where:

- Academic excellence is celebrated and communicated through architecture and landscape design
- Biodiversity and the natural green environment are cherished and cultivated
- A sense of place is created working with the aspirations of the Holford masterplan
- The landscape celebrates the historic past and former human endeavours
- The campus is made more ‘legible’ to ensure it is easier to understand and to navigate around
- New development is focused along the ridgeline in keeping with the landscape pattern established by earlier communities in the historic landscape
- The existing heart of the university campus is consolidated and intensified to create a more welcoming and safer environment and to sustain a vibrant and vital heart

Whilst new University buildings will provide an environment for enhanced learning and academic excellence, the masterplan concept advocates a wider diversity of landscaped spaces to broaden the opportunity for the interaction of the University community. The places and spaces between the buildings will be the public ‘living rooms’ where all members of the University community can gather to exchange ideas, where formal events take place and informal encounters are made possible.

Overall, the University Estate must adapt and evolve in order to satisfy a range of contemporary expectations that have developed since the time of the Holford master plan: a growing reliance upon public transport by environmentally and financially sensitive students and staff, the academic and business worlds moving towards shared flexible, inclusive and inspiring working environments, and the evolution of retail and other commercial activities leading to a growing interest to co-locate with the University.

Considering all of the above, the following place-making principles were identified to deliver a successful ‘place’:

1 Masterplan Principles

- Be informed by the landscape character and the history of the site, and respect for the setting of the site, the landscape and the social history
- Focus development along the ridgelines in line with the historic landscape character of the area, and in order to preserve the open landscapes in the valleys
- Increase density within the Campus Core and the Whitstable Road Character Areas to sustain a vibrant and vital heart
- Focus new development (including student accommodation) within the Campus Heart and the Whitstable Road Character Areas to consolidate the ‘core’ of the University and Park Wood

2 Heritage Principles

- Ensure that future development respects, and where possible enhances, the setting of the University Estate in the wider context, including Canterbury Cathedral World Heritage Site, the Scheduled Ancient Monument to the south-west of St Cosmus and St Damian’s Church, Conservation Areas, Listed and Locally-Listed Buildings and structures
- Clearly define the places, spaces and built development of high quality within the masterplan, that has been tested and informed by a visual impact assessment
- Bring University-owned buildings and structures of historical or heritage value back to life by giving them appropriate new uses wherever possible, and undertaking sensitive conservation-led interventions where necessary
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• Enhance and strengthen the architecture and built form within the character areas
• Provide flexible guidance on the future development, layout, scale and massing of buildings that will distinguish, and reinforce the differences between, one character area from another

3 Land Use Principles

• Academic space: Where possible, facilitate the co-locating of related academic disciplines and encourage the sharing of spaces to foster inter-school communication and collaboration. Consider the Campus as a ‘living lab’ to allow opportunities for students to engage with spaces as part of their taught curriculum – for example, using appropriate parts of the campus for archaeological studies, such as University Rise, the Sarre Penn Valley and St Stephens Hill
• Student Housing: To avoid undue pressure on the local housing market, net increases in academic or administrative floorspace that result in increased student numbers may where appropriate be matched by a corresponding increase in purpose-built student accommodation on the campus to be focused within the Campus Heart and Whitstable Road Character Areas
• Community and Cultural Facilities: Continue to provide sports, community and cultural facilities that are open to local people and look for opportunities to increase such provision by improving and expanding existing Campus facilities and investigating other opportunities to work in partnership with the City Council to improve the City’s cultural leisure and tourism offer
• Commercial Uses: Facilitate full commercial use of the Campus throughout the year, including residential conferences and tourist-related accommodation outside of term times by managing and promoting accommodation for these uses, particularly over the 13-week summer period
• Business and innovation: Continue to promote business and research opportunities to foster the knowledge-based economy by safeguarding and promoting the Canterbury Innovation Centre and the University’s Hub for Innovation and Enterprise. Develop the designated Business Innovation Park land for either Business (B1) or a hotel and conference centre
• Agricultural uses: Aim to keep in productive use farm land that exists in the Sarre Penn Valley and other parts of the University Estate until such times as it is needed for development

4 Environment and Wellbeing Principles

• Passive Design: Take account of landform, layout, building orientation, massing and landscaping when master planning and during detailed design to minimise energy consumption and overheating, taking account of climate change
• Flexibility and Resilience: Build flexibility and resilience into the Masterplan to increase adaptability to respond to climate change and other challenges
• Heating and Cooling: When master planning, prioritise good air quality. During detailed design, attention should be given to providing natural ventilation and a comfortable indoor temperature to ensure well-being and incorporate adaptable spaces and furniture to promote collaborative learning and social connection
• Air Quality: Play its part in improving air quality in the District, in line with CCC’s draft Air Quality Action Plan (April 2018) and ensure that there are no significant adverse impacts on air quality from future development. This includes promoting walking and cycling, managing car parking provision
• Healthy Lifestyles: When master planning and during detailed design, apply holistic sustainable development principles across the Campus to promote healthy and sustainable lifestyles including creating a landscape and
incorporating facilities that encourage walking and cycling, sport and play and buildings that encourage use of stairs rather than lifts for those that can use them

- District Heating Network: Expand the network to serve any new buildings within the Campus Heart where practicable
- Photovoltaics: Incorporate to generate low carbon electricity for the Campus
- Incorporate appropriate renewable energy technologies within specific developments where feasible and viable
- Incorporating Sustainable Urban Drainage Systems (SUDS) to help manage run-off rates and reduce the risk of pollution reaching sensitive controlled waters on campus
- Implement the University's Carbon Management Plan and set new targets for the future including, in line with CDLP Policy DBE1, requiring new buildings to meet BREEAM 'Very Good' as a minimum

5 Landscape and Biodiversity

- Create a University Campus rooted in the geology, geography, topography, history and biodiversity of the landscape that it inhabits
- Clearly define and distinguish between the various Landscape Character Areas to enable a masterplan that supports and builds upon the variety of defining local characteristics
- Acknowledge and respond positively to the sensitive context and setting of Ancient Woodlands and diverse historic landscapes, and seamless integration with the Blean Living Landscape
- Restore and expand the existing ponds and drainage features to create a network of wetlands facilitating the movement of great crested newts and other amphibians, dragonflies etc.
- Create a new, large attractively planted, biodiverse, wetland feature to become a centre-stage landscape attraction, creating a true 'living' heart for Campus.
- Reveal and express the natural water courses and run off areas through the man-made landscape including swales; rain gardens, retention ponds etc
- Establish a landscape that clearly defines the edge of the Campus Heart and distinguishes it from the rest of the University Estate
- Reinforce the network of cycle and footpaths throughout the campus to maximise access to new, and newly revealed, landscape attractions

6 Legibility and Coherence

- Create a clear, coherent and hierarchical network of legible, attractive, safe pedestrian and cycle routes to connect all parts of the campus
- Routes within the Campus Heart and throughout the University Estate, giving priority to walking and cycling routes
- Create clear entry places to highlight the points of access onto the Campus to contribute towards a distinctive, low-speed environment and placemaking principles to highlight key buildings, landmarks, and intersections with the pedestrian and cycle route network
- Create an east/west West/East promenade as a campus ‘High Street’, extending from Darwin College in the east to Turing College in the west
- Reinforce the significance of NCN Route 1 as the principal pedestrian and cycle route through the University Estate, connecting the City Centre and Canterbury West Railway Station to the campus core and continuing northwards towards Whitstable
- Increase north-south connections through the Estate, making maximum use of existing paths and routes, and bringing back into use elements of the track bed of the former Crab & Winkle Railway
- The masterplan should make connectivity between Canterbury and the Campus and the surrounding district as clear and legible as possible, and should anticipate the introduction of a north-side entrance to Canterbury West Station
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7 Movement and Transport

- Improve connectivity between the University, the City and the surrounding district through enhanced physical links and improved route legibility for sustainable modes.
- Enhance the accessibility of the main campus.
- Improve the quality and safety of the transport infrastructure related to the University.
- Promote a stronger connection between the campus and Canterbury West Station and support and promote a new northern entrance to Canterbury West Station in the long-term.
- Improve the sustainable mode accessibility of the campus for visitors.
- Reduce the demand for highway capacity and for centralised parking by building upon the successes of the existing Travel Plan
- Provide a framework for bringing forward future planning applications

As will be evident, these strategies are concerned with exploring the spatial organisation of the future campus, including the landscape settings, the shared spaces and the form and location of buildings, and it is on these strategies that the Framework Masterplan has ultimately been based. The strategic spatial vision and the placemaking principles were developed after much discussion and debate, and in the light of comments made at public consultation events, in order to identify a set of guiding principles and strategies to deliver a successful ‘place’. The Placemaking Strategies are set out in full in Appendix 2 of this document.

4.6 Summary

The issues outlined above are amongst the most important concerns of the framework Masterplan, yet perhaps some of the slowest changing of all the many issues that the University are charged with managing for the future.

Inevitably, the University Campus must adapt and evolve in order to satisfy a range of contemporary expectations that have developed since the time of the 1965 Holford masterplan: the imperative for a more sustainable attitude toward our planet, greater competition between Universities and therefore greater demand for ‘placemaking’ in University environments, the academic and business worlds moving towards shared flexible, inclusive and inspiring working environments, a growing reliance upon public transport by environmentally conscious and financially sensitive millennial students and staff, and the evolution of retail and other commercial activities leading to a growing interest to co-locate with the University.

In conclusion, the masterplan as a whole will be the most powerful expression of the academic, cultural and civic life of the University, an enduring expression of the University’s aspirations and achievements.
Figure 25: Walking and cycling is popular within the pedestrianised parts of the existing campus
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5.1 Introduction

This chapter describes the background context of the University of Kent Campus in Canterbury, and the approach taken in the preparation of the Framework Masterplan for the future evolution of the campus on behalf of the University of Kent.

The University of Kent Strategic Plan 2015-2020 opens with a re-statement of the commitments made in the University’s Charter: ‘The objectives of the University are to advance education and disseminate knowledge by teaching, scholarship and research for the public benefit.’

The plan goes on to restate the University’s core values that enshrine academic freedom, integrity and accountability, sustainability, critical thinking and intellectual creativity.

If the Framework Masterplan is to be successful therefore, the University campus must evolve to become the expression of these commitments and values ensuring that the entire University community, as well as those who visit the campus, are inspired by the high ideals and values of the University of Kent. If the objectives of the Strategic Plan are to be realised, where staff and students work in accord with these core values, it is the campus on which the University’s Strategic objectives of delivering excellence in research, education and engagement with society can be made operational and visible. The University of Kent Canterbury Campus must therefore be considered as more than merely the sum of the buildings and the spaces between them.

The chapter explains the concept and design principles behind the masterplan and has been structured to take the reader through the influences that have been taken into account, the processes that have been undertaken and the conclusions that have been reached in the formulation of the Framework Masterplan. This process has been extensive and thorough in its execution, involving all parties.

5.2 Continuity with the Past

The future is never a direct extrapolation from the past, and new circumstances demand new approaches, or at least adjustment, to ‘best-laid’ plans. However, an understanding of history is an important part of placemaking in respecting continuity with the past and in the preserving of memory. There are lessons we can learn from the past that will enrich the Framework Masterplan and the pre-University era, as well as the thinking behind the original masterplan for the campus, needs to be factored into our thinking.

In preparing a masterplan for the future campus development, it has been necessary to address many pressing practical issues including:

• The shapes and patterns ingrained in the existing landscape and the origins of the settlement pattern
• The original intent of the 1965 Holford masterplan
• The campus today and what it is capable of becoming
• The future provision of sufficient space of the appropriate type
• The design of open spaces
• The protection and enhancement of the landscape
• The conservation of the natural environment and scope for greater biodiversity
• Access and traffic arrangements
• Compliance with local community, statutory and town planning policies, and so on
• The conservation of heritage areas

It is also essential that the campus as a whole, during every phase of its development, becomes a coherent expression of the University’s objectives and values.

The land on which the campus has been developed over the last half century includes three former farms: Brotherhood, Beverley and Hothe Court. The names of these farms and some of the former farmhouses and other agricultural buildings remain embedded in the University estate as a palimpsest of past use. In addition, former field lines, tracks and paths, woodlands and evidence of agricultural workings can be seen in the open spaces of the campus. Beneath these layers of historic land use, the underlying topographical features of landform and watercourses shaped both the former agricultural use and campus plan. The villages of Blean and Tyler Hill, once housing the working communities of the area, are the immediate close neighbours of the University.

Figure 26: Plan of the Canterbury Campus and the wider University Estate (the red line denotes the designated campus boundary)
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5.3 The Regional Context: Geology, Topography & Patterns in the Landscape

The development of successful human habitat – wherever in the world that may be – has invariably been influenced by the natural landscape in which it is located; landscape is the primary infrastructure of our lives and culture. The natural landscape is indelibly ingrained in the urban landscapes we create. Everything is there for a reason; the shapes and patterns of human settlement and embedded in (and derived from) the landscape and if we are to design successful communities for the future, it is important that we understand the ways in which landscape and urbanity relate and fit together.

The origins of the University of Kent estate are rooted in the geology, geography, topography and history of the landscape that it inhabits. An understanding of the distinctive geology of Kent, and the way it has influenced the topography of this region is very revealing.

Few places are defined so markedly by its geology as Kent, where dramatic landscape is an expression of one of the most famous rock formations in the world. A large Cretaceous era chalk ‘dome’ once existed across this part of the UK and connected the UK to mainland Europe via a land bridge. The White Cliffs of Dover and the Alabaster Coast of Normandy are both part of the same geological system. Only 10,000 years ago, at the end of the last major ice age, rising sea levels in the North Sea cut a path through the land bridge and disconnected this western peninsula from the rest of mainland Europe.

Over time, the cretaceous dome was eroded to reveal the sands and clay of The Weald, an extremely fertile and productive landscape from which Kent gained its reputation as the ‘Garden of England’. The geological formation that results gives rise to Kent’s distinctive ‘saw-tooth’ topography of ridges and valleys, which represents a cross section through a time period of some 70 million years.

The environmental assessment prepared at the time of the Turing College development describes the geology of the area as characterised by marked discontinuity, composed of various tertiary bedrock outcrops of a variety of sands, silt and clay, including London Clay Formation capped within the estate by superficial deposits of Head Brickearth. This geological formation largely follows an east-west orientation between the Thames Basin in the north and the south coast of England. This pattern is very evident in the landscape around Canterbury, which sits on the threshold of the Thames Estuarine Belt to the north and the North Downs to the south; the Great Stour river flows eastward along this geological junction.

Between the valley of the Great Stour and the North Kent Coast, the landscape is expressed as a series of parallel wooded ridges and valleys. Traditional rural settlements in this area (such as Blean Common, Rough Common and Tyler Hill) took root along these east-west ridges, where the high-ground was well-drained and flooding-free, where long-distance routes could be established for year-round use, and with the added benefit of long-distance views of approaching invaders. The forests would have provided food from hunting and foraging, as well as building materials and level building land in woodland clearings. By contrast, the valleys between these ridges are largely settlement-free; the valley sides provided difficult building land but, cleared of trees, the south facing slopes were more valuable for fruit and hop-growing. In contrast, the valley floors were occupied by watercourses, wetlands, streams and ponds and were liable to flooding.

Figure 27: The Relationship between the Geology and the Topography of the Kent Peninsula
Until the medieval period, the landscape of east Kent was characterised by the presence of the Wantsum Channel, which separated the Isle of Thanet from the mainland and into which the streams running through University land ran, rather than into the River Stour. The resultant hydrology of today’s campus is highly localised, with some springs and dug pools, underground water courses and overland streams running roughly west to east in relation to ridges of the same orientation that rise and fall between Canterbury and Whitstable. Some local springs and wells are very old – even on campus – with the possibility that they were venerated at some stage in history. A perched water table across the university land preserves organic remains, which indicates the potential for early human occupation of the current campus (on post glacial deposits buried below the current land surface) but does not relate strongly to any current landscape features.

5.4 The Landscape History of the University of Kent Campus, Canterbury

Our knowledge of landscape history has traditionally been accumulated by piecing together what is learnt from the jig-saw of archaeological excavations and by understanding the nature of the better preserved landscapes in the surrounding context. The development of new technologies, such as LiDAR laser scanning, is enabling the landscape to reveal its secrets more coherently and in more depth, which is gradually providing a better understanding of the broader landscape context of the land which the University inhabits.

Early Prehistory (prior to 2,350 BC): Evidence of settlements prior to the Bronze Age are scarce in the region, although the archaeological remains of human settlement within early prehistory has been found within the campus. Random scatters of some very early finds include a Palaeolithic hand axe (found at St. Stephen’s Road in 1946), flint implements (found in 1925 north of Forty Acres Road), and a Neolithic Polished flint axe (found in 1952 in a garden to the east of St. Edmund’s School).

Bronze Age (BC 2,350 to BC 700): Although there is a paucity of substantial landscape or settlement remains from the Bronze Age period on campus, burial mounds found in the vicinity confirm that human occupation of the landscape is likely to have been intense and total. Massive numbers of these are found within the Island of Thanet, on the Sutton Wedge and at Thanet Earth, based on ring-ditch cropmark identification and excavation. Some features of settlement archaeology from the Later Bronze Age have been recorded recently at Lees Court, with rubbish pits, hoards and some traces of buildings being recovered, and Bronze Age material also coming from the slopes of Bigbury Hill in recent years. Some late Bronze Age pottery and fire cracked flints and a cremation burial were found during the construction of Turing College in 1998, suggesting that industrial activity and settlement took place here.

Iron Age Landscape (BC 700 to AD 43): In this period we can envisage a fully exploited open landscape of lightly-defended agricultural settlements formed of ovoid-shaped enclosures with rectangular field boundaries and lanes, a picture that is supported by finds revealed in a recent geophysical survey near Blean Church. Much of today’s landscape seems to have been derived from this period, although there were changes in alignments dating from the late iron age. In 2012, a farm settlement from this period was discovered at St Edmunds School to the west of the campus, revealing ditches, lanes and a circular settlement enclosure with pits and traces of wooden buildings. This settlement most likely extended into the area now occupied by Turing College, where a massive oval enclosure with loom weights and spindle whorls indicates that textile production took place.

A large nucleated hillfort at Bigbury Hill in the late Iron Age (approx BC 300) has recently been revealed in woodland to the west of the campus. Also, an extensive system of large-scale linear double-ditch earthwork defences and landscape boundaries have been found which mark a major change in the landscape and doubtless constrained access to land now owned by the University. These earthworks suggest that a centralised political authority was exercising total control over the landscape in property terms, although perhaps not in terms of defence. The hillfort at Bigbury seems to have been abandoned around
the time of Julius Caesar’s visit to Britain. Whether it was the site of Caesar’s first major battle with the Britons in BC 54 is not certain, although fortifications identified east of Bigbury may yet turn out to relate to this encounter as recorded in Gallic Wars 5:

“We marched by night for about 12 miles before coming in sight of the enemy forces. They had moved with their cavalry and chariots down from the higher ground to a river and were trying … to engage us in battle. When our cavalry drove them back, they hid in the wood where they enjoyed a position with extremely good man-made defences … because many trees had been cut down and used to block entrances to it [the fort]. The Britons came out of the woods in small groups to fight …. But the men of the Seventh Legion holding up their shields to form a protective shell, piled up earth against the fortifications and captured the place.”

What is certain is that Caesar’s early incursion into Britain coincides with onset of major socio-political change, of which the foundation of Canterbury is the most obvious landscape intervention.

The development of the settlement at Canterbury comes after Bigbury was abandoned around BC 50; the southern slopes of the University campus are likely to have been strongly affected by the emergence of the large urban settlement developing at its foot and the radial pattern of roads that emanated from it. A defensive enclosure has been identified from this period before the Roman conquest of AD 43, with metalled roads in some areas, craft production, sanctuary sites developing, and surrounding burial grounds; the Dane John mound is the most obvious survivor of a high-status burial in a tumulus.

The Roman Occupation (AD 43-410): The Roman occupation from AD 43 sees the continued development of the Iron Age landscape, including the fort at Canterbury, military roads that began to connect East Kent and the development of a civitas capital with new streets and public buildings. Cemeteries were developed outside the city on the north side of Canterbury and along the roads leading to London and Reculver, which pass close to the campus. Roman building materials and building types made an appearance within landscape and large well-to-do farms or villas became common across this part of Kent, including the Roman villa identified south of Blean Church. A range of agricultural and industrial activities were carried out around Canterbury during the Roman period and archaeological finds suggest that these were spread across campus, where land use would have been strongly influenced by proximity to the city.

The Late Roman period (AD 250-410) saw end of the open Roman city of Canterbury, with the construction of city wall in AD 260; local militarisation of the region began and forts built at Reculver and Richborough to defend against incursions by the Gauls. The silting of Dover harbour led to the port traffic moving to Richborough, which may have resulted in significant trade coming through Canterbury via river craft, at least as far as Fordwich. Some new villas were built in east Kent during this period and others destroyed. Certainly this was now a more militarised and less civilian landscape than some other parts of lowland Britain, but it was still strongly connected in landscape character to that of the first three centuries AD.

The Arrival of the Anglo-Saxons (AD 410-1066): The sharp deterioration of Canterbury as an urban centre in the years around AD 400 undoubtedly changed the landscape greatly. The city remained something of a centre of political continuity if not population; its theatre was reused by the Anglo-Saxon kings of Kent, whilst a royal centre was established and ecclesiastical communities developed beyond its walls. The surrounding landscape is likely to have been less intensively used in this period, giving rise to the re-forestation of Blean Woods in AD 500 to 600, which covers over some Iron Age and Roman settlement sites. However, some areas of settlement continued outside Canterbury, and Blean Church may date from the early Anglo-Saxon period as does St Stephens, Hackington.

The Medieval Period: Medieval settlements found in and around the campus reflects a mixture of types, including dispersed farms such as Beverley Farm (a 15th century Wealden Hall with 16th and 17th century additions), the potential medieval manor house at Blean (an isolated compound of large buildings adjacent to Blean Church), as well as nucleated villages such as Harbledown, mentioned in Chaucer’s Canterbury Tales. The existing networks of lanes, hedgerows, field and terrace systems
date from this period. The presence of medieval industrial activity is most obvious in the tile kiln sites excavated at Tyler Hill, Darwin College and elsewhere within the University estate, where copious tile debris has been recovered. There are likely other (yet unknown) craft activities or medieval farms within and around the campus, as revealed in the excavation at Turing College and also in finds of medieval pots from under the campus library.

The post-Medieval Period: The post-medieval era was a period of relative contraction for Canterbury, losing its major pilgrimage focus, with the removal of religious orders from the area. The development of the seats of wealthy families characterise this era, such as Beverley Farm (a well-to-do 16th century hall-house), Hothe Court, a timber-framed house and Manor Court dating from the 16th century, whilst Hales Place to the east of the campus was a major aristocratic residence. The present pattern of flora and fauna may strongly relate to land use in this period, as hedgerow plants can survive up to 400 years or more. Organised management of the surrounding woodlands continues up to the present-day.
The Industrial Era: With industrialisation came the railways, and in 1830 the Canterbury and Whitstable Railway line was opened. This was extremely early in the history of railways; it is thought to be the first ever railway in the south of England and possibly the first railway in the world to convey both passengers and goods traffic regularly by mechanical power. Nicknamed the ‘Crab and Winkle Line’, it was built primarily to carry fish and seafood to market in Canterbury. Earlier industrial uses have been identified and are significant in the evolution of this landscape - for example, the geological formation provided a useful resource and gave rise to the extensive production of pottery and tiles in the Roman and Medieval periods.

The Modern Era: Since 1945, the land that now comprises the University estate has been either intensively farmed or developed for building; both can be described as industrial processes which have had a massive impact upon the development of the landscape, and which has involved some disturbance or removal of ancient land surfaces. This has led to a number of archaeological discoveries which have contributed to our understanding of the evolving picture of the history of this landscape. The construction of the University itself involved the removal of trees, hedgerows and other field enclosures, as well as the large-scale levelling and making-up of ground, profoundly modifying the landscape to create the idealised modernist landscape of the early University. Subsequent planting and growth of trees and the gradual maturing of the landscape has had the effect of softening and masking the starkly modernist environment, contributing to the continuing evolution of the landscape, and once again re-inventing the landscape as a local place with a story to which people might become more connected.

5.5 The District Context: Routes through the Landscape

Historically, Canterbury was developed to defend an important bridging point of the Great Stour, once a navigable river, at an important intersection of trade routes across the county; its subsequent role as a major market town and religious centre grew from there. Traditionally, this river (which flows to Pegwell Bay on the east coast of Kent) was Canterbury’s principal line of communication and supply for goods. Land routes leading in and out of Canterbury emerged in a strongly radial pattern following the lines of least resistance through the landscape; along the valley floor (now the A28), Watling Street (now the A2) and the ridgeline route of the North Downs Way.

To the north of Canterbury, the east-west ridgelines (high ground that was free from flooding year-round) provided a convenient network of movement to early settlers. Subsequently ridgeline routes became farm tracks, which in turn evolved into roads (such as Giles Lane and Tyler Hill Road) that connect between the radial routes emanating out of Canterbury. Interestingly, two very historic routes also cut their way north-south across the open landscape of ridges and valleys:

1. The Old Salt Road: An ancient route between Canterbury and Whitstable used to transport the valuable commodity of salt from the village of Seasalter on the north coast. Seasalter did not impress Edward Hasted, who in his 1799 History of Kent described it as: “in an obscure out of the way situation, bounded by the sea northward, but the large tract of marshes which adjoin it westward, as well as the badness of the water, make it very unhealthy”.

2. The Canterbury to Whitstable Rail Line: The six-mile-long, single-track railway followed a straight line between Canterbury and Whitstable and ingenious engineering techniques were employed to climb the hills and to tunnel under the Giles Lane ridgeline. It was closed to all traffic in 1952 and parts of the line were then sold off (the University owns the tunnel and former track bed north of the Tyler Hill tunnel entrance). The railway and tunnel were largely forgotten until 1974, when the University’s Cornwallis Building experienced a partial collapse of the tunnel, after which all but a short length at the south end of the tunnel was filled in.

The Crab & Winkle Line and the Old Salt Road became publicly prominent again in 1997-99, when The Crab & Winkle Line Trust was founded and a seven-mile footpath and cycleway (now called ‘The Crab & Winkle Way’) was
opened. This now forms part of National Cycle Route (NCR1). In spite of its name, the popular route uses only a short length of the abandoned track bed through Clowes Wood and combines that with parts of the Old Salt Road.

Significantly for the Framework Masterplan, two important radial routes also emerge north from Canterbury: Whitstable Road to the west (the A290) and St Stephen’s Hill to the east. These routes sit to the east and west of the two historic routes described above and define a segment of the north part of the city in which the University Estate figures most prominently, and on which the Framework Masterplan is focussed.

It was into the distinctive and unique landscape pattern described above that the University of Kent arrived in 1965. Unsurprisingly, after consideration of many alternative options, the new university found a suitable home on the relatively flat, well-drained land along the ridgeline overlooking the historic city of Canterbury.

5.6 The Local Context: Land Ownership, Field Patterns and Land Use

Comparisons between today’s maps and those of the 19th century are very interesting indeed and they confirm that, in large part, the historic pattern of rural field boundaries survive, both within and outside of the University Estate. They also confirm a strong relationship between historic and present-day field boundaries and land ownership boundaries, and that little has changed in that respect over a long period of time. They indicate that a very limited number of landowners existed historically and show clearly that the University ownership is based largely upon land once owned by the Brothers of St John's Hospital and Mary Ann Baker.

A substantial part of the University Estate was pieced together over time from the three existing farms (Brotherhood Farm, Beverley Farm and Hothe Court Farm) that survived from the pre-Conquest era, as well as three existing woodlands (known as Brotherhood Wood, Park Wood and Bluebell Wood/Hospital Wood). Not an historic estate in itself by any means, but certainly the productive land of earlier estates that existed to the north of Canterbury.

Certainly, there would have been a strong and symbiotic relationship between the city, the church and these productive estates, and it is interesting to note that the tradition of productivity carries on today – putting the land to the productive growth of knowledge. There remains a strong link therefore between the existing University Estate – and continuity with – the estates that preceded it.

Perhaps not surprisingly, the use of the land became more intense with closer proximity to Canterbury, with market gardens, orchards and hop fields occupying south-facing slopes and helping to feed the growing city. Conversely, this land-use pattern reverses with greater distance from the city, where enclosed fields, pasture and woodlands predominate, and where one of the largest areas of Ancient Woodlands has survived in Blean Woods.

5.7 The Historical Context: Estates, Place Names & Land Use

Looking at the campus today, it is easy to imagine that one day in 1965 the University appeared fully formed. However, we know from our research that this is far from the truth and that the process of selecting the host city, followed by choosing a suitable site for the University and building it out, was a long and carefully considered process. During the 50 years since its emergence, the University has grown considerably; today the University is the custodian of an estate that continues to grow, partly to provide future building or amenity land and partly to protect and control the estate as an asset.

As highlighted earlier in this document, many (possibly most) of the universities that emerged in the 1960’s were located in the former grounds of grand houses, often gifted to the host cities by estate owners who lacked the funds to maintain them. This was not the case at Canterbury, where the land chosen for the campus was farmland and woodlands deliberately chosen for its proximity to its host city, on land considered to be of low-grade agricultural quality.

The Saxon (or even earlier) roots of many of the places and geographical features are revealed in the etymology of the names we find today. For example, the Sarre Penn, the stream that flows along the valley between the Giles...
Lane and Tyler Hill ridgelines, means the ‘head or top’ of the River Wantsum (into which it flows); Tyler Hill is named for the former tile-making industry in this location; Blean in early English meant ‘rough ground’; Beverley Farm is thought to refer to a field or a patch of cleared land (rather than a naturally open meadow); Hothe (from Hothe Court) meant wood or ‘heath’. The parish of Hothe was described by Edward Hasted in his 1799 History of Kent as: “situated in a lonely unfrequented country, both unwholesome and unpleasant, the soil being for the most part a deep stiff clay”.

Blean is mentioned in the Canterbury Tales, when the pilgrims were overtaken by a canon and his yeoman in “Boughton under Blee” (now Boughton under Blean). The names Brotherhood Farm, Brotherhood Wood and Hospital Wood refer to the religious order that once owned them and who founded places of healing and asylums in the area in the 1080s. Hale’s Place Estate (to the east of the University) was purchased by the Hale family in 1675, and a Carmelite convent, a church and farm offices were established (designed by Pugin) in 1863. It was sold to the Jesuits in 1880 (as ‘St Mary’s College’), but the buildings were demolished in the late 1920’s. The property was subsequently developed with houses, but a memory of the estate is preserved in the formal layout of some of the streets.

5.8 The Landscape Components of the University Estate

In summary, it is clear that there is a rich and complex relationship between the shapes and patterns in the landscape, and the pattern of human intervention and settlement through time in this segment of north Canterbury.

From the analysis above, the following list is a summary of the components that make this landscape distinctive and unique, and which have become the main ‘ingredients’ of the landscape and biodiversity thinking within the evolving Framework Masterplan:

- The forests and woodlands
- The settlement of the ridgelines and open landscape in the valleys
- The network of tracks, footpaths on year-round flood-free routes
- The valley-bottom watercourses, wetlands, streams and ponds
- The field patterns and land use
- Fruit and hop-growing on south facing slopes
- New cycleways on historic routes and the disused rail line
- The public realm, open space, squares, gardens and allotments
- The buildings and structures
- The network of roads
- The network of services and utilities

If the University community is to be truly sustainable, we must understand and apply the landscape character that shaped it in the first place and apply that knowledge in guiding and shaping its evolution. Understanding and balancing the relationship between the built environment and the landscape in which it makes its home will be the key to a successful University Estate of the future.

The settlement of the ridgelines was shaped directly from the landscape character of this particular area, and this pattern remains very strong and clear in the area north of Canterbury. The pattern of settlement remained intact throughout the medieval period and changed little between the 19th century and the development of the University in the 1960s. Even today these hill-top settlements remain largely separated by swathes of open landscape and the rural nature of the area north of Canterbury holds to the original pattern.

This analysis of the relationship between the landscape and the communities that came to inhabit it described above, provides us with a direction for the future. It represents the genius loci of this landscape, and there is a compelling argument for following this pattern of sensitive, incremental development along the ridgelines north of Canterbury in the future evolution of the University Estate.
Figure 29: Concept drawings defining the various landscape character areas that characterise the Canterbury Campus
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5.9 Summary: The Emerging Landscape Character Zones

The built environment of the Canterbury Campus today is set within a variety of distinct but connected landscape characters described below:

- The ‘Heart’ of the University campus sits astride Giles Lane, an historic ridgeline road that once ran through open farmland overlooking Canterbury and the Great Stour Valley. Giles Lane connects between two of the radial routes which emanate from Canterbury – Whitstable Road with St Stephen’s Hill – and which are described in the section titled ‘Routes through the Landscape’ above. In choosing to consolidate future University development along the ridgeline, the campus heart will continue to take advantage of exceptional views both to the historic city to the south and the Kent Downs beyond, as well as the views north over open countryside towards Whitstable and the coast. Distant views of the campus on the ridgeline are moderated by its setting amongst, or adjacent to, mature (and in some cases historic) woodlands. The location of new building footprints in the masterplan have been carefully considered to avoid breaking the landscape silhouette along the ridgeline and to avoid dominating the natural setting.

- To the west, development such as the Park Wood student housing, the Sibson Building, the Chipperfield Building (previously Kent Business School) and so on are set predominantly within long-established ancient woodland.

- Parkland and open grasslands embellish the campus to the south and offer attractive and extensive views over historic Canterbury. The landscape reaches down to meet the residential suburbs of north Canterbury.

- Enclosed and active agricultural land to the north and east of the campus heart provides yet another landscape character within the extensive Canterbury campus.

The landscape setting dominates the University Estate, and our understanding of landscape character offers a clear direction to the Framework Masterplan proposals. The following Landscape Character Zones have therefore been identified and form the framework around which the evolution of the masterplan thinking has been based: The Tyler Hill Ridgeline, the Sarre Penn Valley, The Giles Lane Ridgeline and University Rise.

Within each of those character zones, smaller areas of landscape character have been identified within the Framework Masterplan and on which more detailed masterplan proposals have been developed. The next stage of the masterplan thinking has been focused upon ideas which develop (and differentiate between) these character areas, and these are described below.
Figure 30: Aerial view of the Campus Heart from the south-east with Blean Village and Blean Forest beyond
Figure 31: Tithe map with layers combined and superimposed over the current OS map
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Figure 32: Tithe maps showing field patterns, agricultural land use, parish boundaries and historic land ownerships in the context of the contemporary University Estate
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Figure 33: Top left: Farmer George Keir’s 1963 monument to leaving Brotherhood Farm Top right: Beverley Farm
Bottom left: Farmer Ella Kier at Brotherhood Farm c. 1960 Bottom right: Hothe Court 1969
Figure 34: Historic views of pre-University Canterbury
Figure 35: Figure ground drawing of the University campus superimposed over a contour map. The Campus buildings are clearly arranged along the ridgeline along with the settlement of Rough Common to the west. The villages of Blean and Tyler Hill both sit on the ridgeline to the north.
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Figure 36: The layers of geological strata beneath the Campus gives rise to the undulating topography in the area.
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Figure 37: Canterbury OS Sheet 179: 1816-19
By comparing these two images it is possible to determine the east-west grain of the landscape emphasised by the Great Stour and the north coast. The close relationship between the topography, the settlement patterns and land-use is also evident.
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Figure 39: Plan of the Canterbury Campus and the wider University Estate showing the landscape character areas denoted by circles.
6.1 Introduction & Context

A Landscape Character Area is identified as a portion of the campus which has a specific identity and attributes which distinguish it from other parts of the campus. Every element of the landscape and the built environment contributes to the distinct identity and personality of the place.

Each landscape character area has been analysed and described in order to allow the evolving design and development of these areas to be informed by the existing context and its function, and the inherent landscape qualities of each individual character area.

The overall University Estate has been broken down and categorised into eight individual Character Areas:

- University Rise
- Whitstable Road
- Campus Heart
- St Stephens Hill
- Little Hall Farm
- Sarre Penn Valley
- Blean
- Tyler Hill

The four character areas that form the core of the University Campus are the subject of the current masterplan study as these form the campus boundary as defined by the CCC Local Plan: University Rise, Whitstable Road, The Campus Heart and the Sarre Penn Valley. The following chapter provides an illustrated description of each of these four character areas and their inherent landscape qualities, plus an assessment of the opportunities to enrich the character areas through the gradual evolution and implementation of the masterplan.

6.2 Landscape Character Area 1 Description: University Rise

Character Description: University Rise is located to the south of the ridgeline along which Giles Lane travels. This predominantly ‘Parklands’ landscape is characterised by areas of open grassland and punctuated by belts of woodland. It overlooks the Great Stour Valley, occupying the slope below Keynes and Turing Colleges and reaching down to meet the residential suburbs of north Canterbury.

The open landscape of the University Rise character area provides a green setting to the University as well as a landscape demarcation from the city, which is part of the University’s attractiveness to students, academic staff and visitors to the University. University Rise provides an impression to visitors of a verdant campus and offers views across the historic city of Canterbury. Similarly, University Rise provides a backdrop to Canterbury in views from the south in a reciprocal and complimentary way. Bluebell Wood and remnant hedgerows and orchard contribute to the diversity of the parkland that forms the setting for this part of the campus.

From an ecological perspective, this character area contains a range of habitat types and is home to populations of the protected Great Crested Newt. Aside from the obvious advantages of a biodiverse ecological landscape, this landscape character area provides a number of additional ecosystem services. For example, green space is freely accessible to the University community and visitors alike. The network of footpaths extending across this character area mean that staff, students and the local community enjoy amenity value from the grasslands, woodlands and parklands. Remnant hedgerows provide a glimpse into the areas past, and fruit-bearing species remain from larger orchards that once provided food for the people of Canterbury. University Rise also notably contains the ‘South Portal’ to the historic Crab and Winkle railway tunnel, although this is not located within the University Estate.

University Rise is characterised by sloping ground overlooking the Great Stour Valley and the historic city of Canterbury. Existing fragments of the former agrarian use of the land remain, including Beverley Farm; although the farm itself was closed, the historic building was retained and the farmland was absorbed into the campus.

Holford’s vision of the University extending down University Avenue as a series of satellite colleges was never realised, and neither was the plan to locate the sports facilities at the foot of University Rise. The land that was formerly orchards & greenhouses was given over to housing as Canterbury expanded northwards in the mid-1960’s. Instead, the campus expanded predominantly along the ridgeline with the introduction of Keynes College (late 1960’s) and Turing College (2012). Residential
Figure 40: Landscape character areas defined in plan (top) and section (bottom)
buildings set out as terraces of finger and L shaped blocks extended the development of the ridgeline through to the University’s western boundary. The exception to this rule was Chaucer College which was developed privately within a belt of mature trees to the south of University Avenue. Also at this time, the Canterbury Innovation Centre was developed privately, on the slope just north of University Avenue adjacent to the Grade II listed Beverley Farmhouse.

**Existing Habitat Types:** There are five broad types of habitat present within this Landscape Character Area:

1. **Grasslands**

The grasslands which make up much of this character area, whilst not botanically rich, are especially important to the setting of the University and its context in the wider landscape and provide some ecological interest as a large continuous feature.

The majority of the grassland in University Rise is species-poor semi-improved meadow. *Yorkshire Fog* and *False-Oat Grass* are generally dominant, while *Meadow Barley*, *Red Fescue*, *Cock’s Foot*, *Sweet Vernal Grass* and *Common Bent* are all frequent. Recently-sown wildflower meadows have been created to the south of Turing College and the Innovation Centre. The former has established less well however with more weed species characteristic of disturbed ground. The most flower-rich area is located towards the top of University Rise to the west of Bluebell Wood.

The ecological value of these meadows is enhanced by the fact they form one component of a wider habitat mosaic including woodlands and scattered trees. Freestanding trees can be found across these meadows and provide substantial local cooling around buildings towards the north of this character area.

Meadow habitat in University Rise also contributes to attenuating rainwater run-off from the campus. In addition, some Sustainable Drainage System (SuDS) features to the north of the site around Turing College (including swales, French drains and permeable green paving to the Innovation Centre car park) are all important for managing and controlling rainwater run-off from this highly sloping site. These meadows are mown annually for hay by the University Estate maintenance team.

2. **Woodlands**

**Bluebell Wood:** A 4ha hillside woodland (known historically as Hospital Wood) reaching from the edge of the campus heart at the north, to the boundary of the campus to the south. Large Oak trees are present along with frequent *Hornbeam* and the occasional *Sweet Chestnut*. *Silver Birch* appears to be the dominant canopy species, allowing higher light levels to penetrate to the ground flora. Towards the bottom of the slope, pollarded *Hornbeam* and *Norway Maple* dominate, casting more shade and inhibiting the development of shrub layer and varied ground flora. As the name suggests, much of the woodland’s ground flora is dominated by *Bluebells* with occasional *Wood Anemone*. Remnant hedgerow, ditch and bank features are also present within this woodland and further ecological interest is provided by the ponds at both the top and base of the hill and from seasonal wet ditches and gulleys.

**Chaucer College Woodland:** A 1ha *Norway-Maple* dominated woodland south of University Road and the Innovation Centre. Dense shade cast has inhibited development of a shrub understorey, whilst ground flora species are also limited.

**Other Woodlands:** A number of smaller woodlands within this character area add to the ecological diversity and provide easy access to woodland habitats. To the south of University Rise, an area of secondary woodland abuts the lower section of the Eliot Path, where Sycamore dominates the canopy while *Oak*, *Norway Maple*, *Ash*, *Wild Cherry*, *Hornbeam*, *Field Maple* and *Grey Willow* are all frequent to occasional. Although some patches of *Bluebells* are present, *Ivy* and *Nettle* dominate much of the ground flora. A large steep-sided hollow (historically a clay pit) is present in the southern extremity.

These areas of woodland provide an important role in sequestering carbon from the atmosphere.
3 Hedgerows

A number of historic hedgerows remain from the estate's agricultural past; a recent campus hedgerow survey identified several hedgerows which are designated 'important' as set out in the Hedgerow Regulations 1997:

**Chaucer Fields:** A double hedge enclosing a track extends through Chaucer Fields. The track is a historic landscape route between Canterbury and Blean. A variety of woody species are present including *Privet*, *Field Maple*, *Elm*, *Ash* and *Rose*. Standard trees also occur including *Oak*, *Ash*, *Sycamore* and *Yew*. Ground flora is present along the hedge bottom including a range of species such as *Plantains*, *Bedstraws*, *Ivy* and a variety of grasses.

**Chaucer College:** This unmanaged tree line on the edge of a woodland just north of Chaucer College is bordered on either side by a double chain link fence at the western end. The canopy is approximately 8m with mature trees at approximately 12m high. Woody species include *Field Maple*, *Sycamore*, *Hawthorn*, *Oak*, *Rose*, *Hornbeam* and *Lime*. Ground flora is present along the length of the tree line. There are no gaps, but the vegetation is thin in places where trees are tall.

**Innovation Centre:** This hedgerow forms a boundary to a triangular area of amenity grassland to the north of University Road and the hedgerow widens to become a shelterbelt in places. The main height is 8-10m with tall canopy trees of up to 18-20m. There is a ditch along the north-eastern section and one gap of 4m. The dominant woody species include *Sycamore*, *Field Maple*, *Ash*, *Alder*, *Dogwood*, *Hazel*, *Elder*, *Yew*, *Holly* and *Hawthorn*. There is one mature coppice of Hazel and a very mature Oak with potential as a veteran tree. The ground flora is dominated by Nettle and Bramble with a few herbaceous species.

**South-Western:** This hedgerow in the far south-western edge of the site forms a boundary around a square area of semi improved grassland. The hedgerow is approximately 2m high, trimmed to shape. There is one 2m gap

**Turing College:** This is a line of trees and shrubs located north of Turing College. Trees reach a height of approximately 10-12m. At the eastern end the hedgerow becomes shrubby and is clipped to a height of 2m. Woody species include *Crack Willow*, *Oak*, *Rose*, *Hawthorn*, *Field Maple*, *Holly*, *Hazal*, *Ash*, *Sycamore*, *Gorse* and *Goat Willow*. Varied herbaceous vegetation is also present; a section of approximately 30m of Cotoneaster is present. One mature Sycamore is located at the eastern end. There are two gaps of several metres along its length.

In addition, an unmanaged tree line south of Keynes College and north of University Road represents the boundary of a small field adjacent to Beverley Farm. Only the north and west sides of the field are represented by the existing trees and nothing of the hedgerow itself.

4 Watercourses

University Rise contains four of the University's ponds and the two ponds located within Bluebell Wood are known to support populations of Great Crested Newts (as well as various other amphibian species) and are arguably the most important for biodiversity on campus. Unfortunately, all of the ponds are in a neglected state, being silted and overgrown by trees and shrubs, which inhibit their ecological and amenity potential. The ponds include:

**Lower Eliot Pond (Bluebell Wood):** This is an attractive circular shaded pond approximately 10m in diameter and 30cm deep. Historically some areas have been cut back. Aquatic/riparian vegetation includes *Yellow Iris*, *Water Lily*, *Water Starwort* and *Soft Rush*. This pond is known to be the main breeding pond for the *Great Crested Newt* on campus, with a medium population identified from the last survey (2014).

**Upper Eliot Pond (Bluebell Wood):** Similar in size and shape to Lower Eliot Pond, this pond is attractive from an amenity perspective being located adjacent to Beckett Court halls of residence. Aquatic/riparian vegetation includes abundant *Yellow Iris*, plus occasional *Gypsywort* and *Soft Rush*. Some Giant Hogweed can also be found in one area of the pond bank. This pond is also known to support the *Great Crested Newt*. 
Figure 41: Landscape Character Area: University Rise existing layout
Beverly Farm Pond: A rectangular (10m × 5m) shallow, shaded pond at the southern end of the copse at the south of Tuning College. This pond was recently dredged and cleared resulting in a lack of aquatic/riparian vegetation.

Keynes Pond: Located on the southern edge of Keynes College, Keynes Pond provides a well-used social space and forms an important natural landmark in this area, being in close proximity to the café within Keynes College. The pond is not well maintained however, and the overgrown vegetation reduces the opportunity to take advantage of the views across Canterbury. Whereas the other ponds above are considered to be ‘natural’, Keynes Pond was constructed as a large, deep S-shape of approximately 25m × 8m. The southern edge consists of trees and bramble including Grey Willow, Crack Willow and Sycamore. The pond supports a large population of ducks.

5 Built Environment

Context: As noted in the summary above, University Rise is characterised by sloping ground overlooking the Great Stour Valley and the historic city of Canterbury. Existing fragments of the former agrarian use of the land remain, including Beverley Farm; although the farm itself was closed, the historic building was retained and the farmland was absorbed into the campus.

Holford’s vision of the University extending down University Road as a series of satellite colleges was never realised, and neither was the plan to locate the sports facilities at the foot of University Rise. The land that was
formerly orchards & greenhouses was given over to housing as Canterbury expanded northwards in the mid-1960’s. Instead, the campus expanded predominantly along the ridgeline with the introduction of Keynes College (late 1960’s) and Turing College (2015). Residential buildings set out as terraces of finger and L shaped blocks extended the development of the ridgeline through to the University’s western boundary. The exception to this rule was Chaucer College which was developed privately within a belt of mature trees to the south of University Avenue. Also at this time, the Canterbury Innovation Centre was developed on the slope just north of University Avenue adjacent to the Garde ll listed Beverley Farmhouse.

Heritage: Beverley Farmhouse is a designated Grade II listed building located on the south-facing slopes of University Rise. The origins of this two-storey timber-framed building are 15th century, with adaptations surviving from the 16th and 17th centuries. The old part of the house is L-shaped on plan, but a further wing of 3 storeys was added to the west in the 19th century. Although the setting today is open grassland close to the University approach road from Canterbury, the building reminds us of the agricultural past of this part of the Campus.

Beverley Farmhouse is well-maintained and in beneficial use as overnight accommodation for visitors to the University and to Canterbury, and within 15 minutes walking distance of the city centre. The building enjoys views overlooking the World Heritage Site of historic Canterbury located some way to the south east of the Campus.

Architectural Character: The predominant architectural character of the contemporary University buildings is of prefabricated modular construction using repetitive material components. In Keynes College, this economy of construction was achieved using robust concrete-based materials, whereas the later Turing College buildings use a mixture of lighter weight cladding; render, block, timber & metal panels.

Overall the built sections of University Rise do not respond sympathetically to the agrarian or cultural patterns in the landscape. Whilst the design of Keynes College responded strongly to Holford’s lead in building height and choice of materials, the light colours of the cladding of Turing College sit rather uncomfortably in the landscape and are visible from long distances. Some older sections of hedgerows and native trees remain around the buildings, but the more recent introduction of swales etc in the landscape design for Turing College will have made drainage more sustainable and improved ecology.

Within the built environment of University Rise the landscape is predominantly ornamental planting, with the exception of the SuDS planting between building blocks, where the species have mostly been selected to survive in wet winters as well as dry summers and provide good ground coverage year round. Most notable of the ‘vegetated architecture’ is the sedum roofs covering the Turing College Restaurant and Turing College Store, which provide good habitats for insects and support smaller species of wildlife.

6.3 Landscape Character Area 2 Description: Whitstable Road

The character area of Whitstable Road is located to the north of University Rise and sits squarely along the Giles Lane ridgeline to the west of the main campus heart. This landscape character area is mainly comprised of the historic woodlands of Park Wood and Brotherhood Wood, plus the remnants of Hothe Court Farm; consequently, it is the woodland environment which dominates and distinguishes this part of the campus from the remainder of the University.

From an ecological perspective, this character area is incredibly important as it contains a large area (approximately 4 hectares) of protected Ancient Woodland, so there is a particularly strong natural dimension to this part of the campus. Originally one large contiguous woodland, Park Wood and Brotherhood Wood have been somewhat fragmented as a result of the development of the University buildings and activities. Overall, the dominance of the woodland has not been completely sacrificed to development.

In terms of present-day University functions, Park Wood contains low-density student housing in the westernmost
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Figure 43: Landscape Character Area: Whitstable Road existing layout
part of the campus. Given its adjacency to (and good connectivity with) the campus heart, science-based academic buildings predominate in Brotherhood Wood along with other functions such as the Sports Centre, the Business School and the recently completed Sibson Building.

The built environment in this part of the campus shows variety of character as development has taken shape incrementally over a long period. Notably this area comprises strong evidence of the former agrarian use of the land within Hothe Court Farm, Brotherhood Wood and Park Wood. The landscape character of woodland, farm fields and rural lanes (Giles Lane & the Old Salt Road), together with historic and enduring places and place names, all form part of the personality of this part of the campus.

Hothe Court Farmhouse is a 15/16th century building, extended and refaced in the 18th century on the site of an earlier Manor House and is Grade II listed. It was purchased by the University in 1969 together with 66 acres of farmland, as well as the farmyard and associated buildings. Subsequently, the farmhouse was adapted for residential use whilst the surviving farmyard buildings were used for estates maintenance activities. Due to its location on flat (formerly agricultural) land along the ridgeline, the farmland to the north has provided the open space necessary for the Sports Fields, Sports Pavilions and the Nursery. More recently, the Hothe Court kitchen garden has provided the space for the recently-opened Community Garden.

The Whitstable Road character area also notably contains the historic Salt Road which links Canterbury with Whitstable and Seasalter. Today this route is a public bridleway and forms part of National Cycle Route 1, which links Dover with the Shetland Isles (knick-named the ‘Crab and Winkle Way’).

**Existing Habitat Types:** There are five broad types of habitat present within this Landscape Character Area, and no ecologically significant grassland habitats:

**1 Woodlands**

**Park Wood:** This 5.2ha ancient woodland is located on the western edge of the main campus and contains a low-density development of student housing has been integrated into the most western part of this wood. Shrub layers such as Hazel and Holly are prevalent, whilst Bluebells are also frequent and locally dominant. Coppicing management has recently begun in this woodland, starting at the southern edge. In the west, a number of individual and groups of trees around Hothe Court Farm are subject to tree protection orders (TPOs). The southern section of the wood has been bisected in recent years by a cycle/footpath which has created a woodland ride that may indeed be to the benefit of certain woodland edge species.

**Brotherhood Wood:** This shaded 5.0ha area of ancient woodland abuts the western side of the Campus Heart and, although more heavily developed by academic buildings and structures, it is similar in size and landscape composition to Park Wood. The upper canopy is dominated by Oak standards, while overgrown Hornbeam and Sweet Chestnut coppice is also present. Bluebells and Wood Anemone are present as ground flora, with Common Cow-Wheat (the larval food plant of the rare Heath Fritillary Butterfly) present along the northern boundary. Coppice management began in this woodland recently, starting at the easternmost edge. Two small ancient woodland copses also extend down to Giles Lane between the Sports Centre and the Ingram Building. Once clearly part of Brotherhood Wood, these copses have become somewhat detached by expansion of the University over the years. This part of Brotherhood Wood contains a number of Oak standards and Bluebells are dominant in the ground flora; Bramble is also present and becoming more dominant through lack of management.

**Summary:** Not surprisingly, the woodlands are the dominant feature in this landscape character area. Their role, particularly Brotherhood Wood, is invaluable in attenuating and improving the water quality of run-off entering the important Sarre Penn stream, and ultimately the River Great Stour. In addition to sequestering carbon from the atmosphere, woodland and free-standing trees also provide substantial local cooling. This has been
harnessed to good effect in the new Sibson Building development, as well as in the student housing within Park Wood.

2 Hedgerows

A number of hedgerows are present within the Whitstable Road character area. A recent campus hedgerow survey identified a number of hedgerows of significance, including several important, historic hedgerows that act as important wildlife corridors along the western boundary of the campus; these are designated ‘important’ as set out under the Hedgerow Regulations of 1997.

Community Oasis Garden: The north boundary of the Community Oasis Garden is marked by a shrubby Hawthorn hedgerow with two mature trees along the western boundary of the University Estate, which is mostly complete (there is one gap of approximately 2m.) The height of the hedge is approximately 1-1.5m high and 0.5-1m wide. The northern section is dominated by Blackthorn, Field Maple and Goat Willow with a short section of 5m high Cypresses, Rosa sp., Laurel and Birch trees. The main woody species are Hawthorn, Blackthorn, Elder, Field Maple and Goat Willow. Mature trees include Sycamore and Horse Chestnut. The ground flora includes Ivy, Bramble, Hogweed, Cleavers and Deadly Nightshade. The main hedgerow is trimmed and forms a boundary around the sports field and along the internal road.

Western Sports Pitch: This is a shrubby hedge with mature trees. There is one gap of 2m. The height of the hedge is approximately 15m with a width of 5m. The woody species are mixed, including Ash, Oak, Sycamore, Hazel, Field Maple, Holly, Privet, Elder and Blackthorn. The hedgerow is not trimmed but creates a wooded boundary on the western side of an area of amenity grassland.

3 Watercourses

The Whitstable Road character area contains two of the University’s ponds located in the area of Jennison and Woody’s buildings. Unfortunately, these ponds are both in a neglected state and under-utilised for both biodiversity and amenity. Neither pond is currently considered ecologically important due to the presence of non-native species of flora and fauna.

Jennison Pond: Originally constructed as a reflecting pool for telescopes mounted on the roof of the Jennison Building, this pond is now no longer in use and somewhat neglected. Rectangular in shape and measuring approximately 30m × 15m with a depth of 50cm. The pond is currently overgrown, although recent construction of the new Economics Building to the north includes a footpath to ease access to this pond. There is a large population of non-native Goldfish, a legacy of unwanted student pets. Alpine Newts and New Zealand Pygmy weed have also been recorded, previously further reducing the ecological value of this pond.

Woody’s Culvert: Located in the north-wester corner of Park Wood, this rectangular 20m × 5m pond is heavily shaded and relatively inaccessible. It has been largely ignored from the estate management regime, due to a recorded presence of the Chytrid Fungus which is extremely infectious in UK amphibians and a major factor in their recent decline in numbers.

GCN Experimental Ponds: This area under the control of DICE contains eight lined ponds, each 1m × 2m in size. Although the site is not managed by the University Estates department, the Great Crested Newt population may restrict activities in areas adjacent to the site at certain times of year due to the foraging activities of the GCN.

4 Hothe Court Community Garden

Current conservation policies form part of a comprehensive strategy to retain and protect the remaining important features of the farmhouse and its setting.

The development of the former Kitchen Garden to the west of Hothe Court Farm into a lively community garden space has significant potential to contribute to improved health and wellbeing, as well as opening up that area of the campus for socialising, creating a sense of place and identity. Remnants of the former glasshouse structures that belonged to the house and the University Observatory are also located adjacent to the recently established Kent Community Oasis Garden (KentCOG).

This area also contains the Old Salt Road, the bridleway that forms part of NCN Route 1, which is well used by pedestrians and cyclists.
5 Built Environment

Context: The built environment in this part of the campus shows variety of character as development has taken shape incrementally over a long period. Notably this area comprises strong evidence of the former agrarian use of the land within Hothe Court Farm, Brotherhood Wood and Park Wood. The landscape character of woodland, farm fields and rural lanes (Giles Lane & the Old Salt Road), together with historic and enduring places and place names, all form part of the personality of this part of the campus.

Park Wood: The 1980’s saw the development of Park Wood as a satellite community of student residential accommodation set some distance away from the campus heart. Holford’s original masterplan concept for this as the Science Area was decisively abandoned with the development of the Park Wood housing, which follows a traditional Radburn layout of suburban-style, homogenous clusters around courts and cul-de-sacs. Car parking dominates the spaces between buildings. In developing this student housing at a deliberately domestic scale, the University may have been acting expediently to give themselves the flexibility to dispose of the buildings as private housing if not required as student accommodation. The 1990’s second phase of Park Wood housing extended the phase one layout with a more orthogonal arrangement of buildings and courts. The Sports Pavilion also built at this time extended the campus development to the north side of Park Wood Road. Further south, the woodland character is stronger with mature trees and some remnant hedges.

Brotherhood Wood: Closer to the campus core the size and scale of development increases. Brotherhood Wood was developed more in line with Holford’s concept for science-based academic buildings and structures. From the late 1960’s onwards, the campus was enlarged with the addition of the Chemical Laboratory (now adapted as Ingram), the Electronics Laboratory (Jennison), Sports Hall & Department of Biosciences (Stacey) to the north west of Giles Lane. These buildings were largely formed of prefabricated modular components, using materials such as brick, block and textured concrete panels to enable economic and speedy construction. Their construction and fenestration patterns follow the...
precedent set by Holford’s founding Eliot & Rutherford College buildings. More recently Ingram and the Sports Hall have been extended and over-clad with different materials including powder coated aluminium cladding panels. The Kent Business School now Chipperfield Building was the first of a number of buildings to be developed around a ‘Garden Circus’ formed in a clearing in Brotherhood Wood. An axial footpath links this circus directly to the campus heart. The more recent Sibson Building similarly fronts onto this circus, although this building stray significantly from the traditional University palette of materials, and like Darwin and Woolf Colleges it represents another tradition of one-off architectural expression within the campus. The architectural language in this case is created from organic curvilinear forms, and rich mixture of coloured zinc cladding to reflect the natural woodland colours.

Heritage: A number of designated and undesignated heritage assets are located in close proximity in this character area, all owned by the University. The Grade II Hothe Court Farmhouse is the centre of a group of buildings, including a Grade II listed barn to the north and associated minor farmyard buildings, including the East and West Oast Houses that survived demolition in 1970’s (a coach house and stable did not). Hothe Court: Characterised by the Kentish vernacular farmhouse, oast houses, cottages & barns, this area in the far west of the campus includes Hothe Court Farmhouse is a 15/16th century building, extended and refaced in the 18th century on the site of an earlier Manor House. It was purchased by the University in 1969 together with 66 acres of farmland, as well as the farmyard and associated buildings. Since that time, the farmhouse has been used for a variety of uses, including residential, whilst the surviving farmyard buildings are used for estates maintenance activities. The farmhouse was taken out of use in 2010 due to some structural instability. Structural repairs are imminent and the building exterior continues to be maintained and protected. The surrounding farmland was redeveloped as sports fields.

Current conservation policies form part of a comprehensive strategy to retain and protect the remaining important features of the farmhouse and its setting. However, the development and expansion of the University since the 1970’s has affected the coherence of the immediate landscape and has effectively isolated the farmhouse and associated buildings from the farmland. The setting of the farmhouse as a farm, and as a manorial site, has therefore been all but lost.

Giles Lane: Characterised by the Kentish vernacular cottages along Giles Lane and the southern fringes of Park Wood, University buildings include Woodlands, Rothford, Olive & Tanglewood Cottages. Nos 1&2 Olive Cottages, Tanglewood & Giles Cottage (formerly Conway) are locally listed. The built environment along Giles Lane sits within the remnants of the original woodland, although few mature trees remain.

6.4 Landscape Character Area 3 Description: Campus Heart

Character Description: The heart of the University is located to the west of Whitstable Road character area, along the ridgeline overlooking the Great Stour Valley. In the main, it sits to the south of Giles Lane as it was realigned by Lord Holford as part of his original 1965 masterplan. This character area takes advantage of exceptional views to both historic Canterbury to the south and the Kent Downs beyond, as well as the views north across open countryside towards Whitstable and the coast.

Excluding the woodland section, the campus heart is rather weak in representing the original natural landscape. While some mature trees remain, overall the landscape today is managed for amenity. Hedgerows are predominantly species poor with high proportions of non-native species and, aside from the meadow grasslands to the south of Eliot and Rutherford Colleges, there are no ecologically significant grassland habitats. The majority of grassland in the campus heart is intensively managed as amenity grassland.

Holford conceived a vision for the University Campus Heart sitting along the prominent ridgeline overlooking Canterbury, set within an open parkland landscape, with the college buildings distributed strategically around it to emphasise their importance. The site chosen for the Campus Heart had formerly been open farmland overlooking the Stour Valley. In order to achieve this vision,
Brotherhood Farm was closed and demolished and the farmland used to form the core of the campus.

The southern part of the character area is criss-crossed with formal and informal footpaths following desire lines which connect the north of Canterbury to the Campus Heart. A set of steps below Tyler Court form an eastern entrance from St Stephen's Hill for pedestrians.

To the north of the Campus Heart, one of the most significant historic components within the campus heart is the ‘North Portal’ entrance to the historic Crab and Winkle railway line. Running north from the edge of Giles Lane car park, this pathway follows the line of the old railway; more details are provided within the Sarre Penn Valley character area.

Existing Habitat Types: There are six broad types of habitat present within this Landscape Character Area:

1. Amenity Grassland

The landscape of the Campus Heart is predominantly tightly-mown amenity grassland, with a reasonable area of ornamental planting. Amenity grassland predominates between the Campus Heart’s buildings, carparks and roads. This is mostly species-poor and regularly tightly mown. While species have mostly been selected to provide good ground coverage and year round colour, some non-native species are favoured by pollinating insects. Such species include Lavender, Verbena Bonariensis and Elephant Ears Bergenia Cordifolia.

Within the Campus Heart built environment, the landscape is predominantly ornamental planting. While species have mostly been selected to provide good ground coverage and year round colour, some non-native species are favoured by pollinating insects. Such species include Lavender species Verbena Bonariensis and Elephant Ears Bergenia Cordifolia. The Campus Heart also includes many free-standing tree species. Many of these have been relatively recently planted although there are a good number of mature oaks which may be remnants of the former more widespread Ancient Woodland that was present prior to the University’s development and expansion.

The Campus Heart also includes a few species-rich lawn areas; these are found mostly on roadside embankments where thinner, poorer soils has enabled a greater diversity of herbs to establish including Bird’s-Foot Trefoil, Daisy, Creeping Buttercup, Field Bindweed, Creeping Cinquefoil, Black Medick, Hawkweed, Crane’s-Bill, Selfheal and White Clover.

Examples of green roofs and green façades are also in evidence in a few locations within the Campus Heart. Most notable of the more recent ‘vegetated architecture’ is the living wall to the Grimond Building and Clematis Vines on the Cornwallis storage building and the stairs to the Jarman Building. Arguably most impressive examples of green façades are the Ivy-clad walls of Rutherford College, covering a pre-cast concrete façade.

The Campus Heart also includes many free-standing tree species. Many of these have been relatively recently planted although there are a good number of mature oaks which may be remnants of the former more widespread Ancient Woodland that was present prior to the University’s development and expansion.

2. Parkland Grasslands

Although not botanically rich, as a single continuous feature the grasslands in this character area provide some ecological interest. They also have considerable landscape interest, being important both to the setting of the University and to the context of the University in its surrounding landscape.

The majority of the parklands grassland in the southern part of the Campus Heart character area is species-poor semi-improved meadow. Yorkshire Fog and False-Oat Grass are generally dominant, while Meadow Barley, Red Fescue, Cock’s Foot, Sweet Vernal Grass and Common Bent are all frequent. Recently-sown wildflower meadows have been created to the south of Eliot and Turing Colleges.

The most flower-rich area is located towards the top of the southern slopes between Eliot path and Bluebell wood. The ecological value of these meadows is enhanced by
Figure 45: Landscape Character Area: Campus Heart existing layout
6 Landscape Character Areas: Description

the fact they form one component of a wider habitat mosaic including woodlands and scattered trees.

Free standing trees can be found across these meadows and the north-eastern component of this area is described as the University’s Arboretum. These meadows are mown annually for hay.

3 Woodlands

To the north of the Campus Heart, Brotherhood Wood and Foxborough Wood extend around and behind the University buildings as far as the eastern boundary of the campus. Further south are smaller patches of this woodland which have been fragmented over the years by the development of the campus. A small copse of trees around the boiler house is protected by historic tree protection orders.

Woof College Wood: Along the northern side of Woof College, a small (0.6 hectare) woodland links the former Crab & Winkle Rail Line woodland shaw to the west with a block of ancient woodland to the east which sits outside the University’s boundary. There are Oak standards, and Bluebells are frequent in the ground flora. Woof College pond also sits in the centre of this woodland parcel. Although not classified as ancient woodland, this area is subject to a planning condition from the development of Woof College that prohibits the removal of any significant trees without planning permission.

St Stephen’s Hill Woodland: Adjoining the far eastern boundary of the University Estate, an area of secondary woodland extends between the eastern side of Woof College and St Stephen’s Hill Road. Ash, Sycamore and Silver Birch are most frequent in the upper canopy although there are some Oak standards present, particularly along the western margins. Ivy and Common Nettle dominate much of the ground flora.

Tree Protection Orders: Two areas of woodland are subject to tree protection orders (TPOs) or other restrictions. These include the trees surrounding the boiler house, which are subject to a tree protection order listing specific trees, and the woodland north of Woof College, which is protected subject to planning.

4 Hedgerows

A number of hedgerows are present within the Campus Heart character area, although these are generally species poor and include many non-native species such as Leyland Cyrus. A recent campus hedgerow survey identified only one hedgerow designated as ‘important’ as set out in the Hedgerow Regulations 1997:

Giles Lane: This is a section of shrubby hedgerow with trees that extends from the rear of the Marlowe Building to the south to the Boiler House area to the north, where it widens to become a small copse. These trees are of significant height at approximately 15m, and they form a tall, green corridor along Giles Lane. The hedgerow is dominated by Hornbeam with further woody species within copse of Rowan, Oak, Holly, Sweet Chestnut, Hawthorn, Roses and Field Maple. The hedgerow is trimmed back on the road side.

5 Watercourses

Woof Pond: Located in the woodland behind Woof College, this pond is circular in shape with a diameter of c.15m. It is heavily shaded with a large amount of leaf litter and no aquatic or riparian vegetation.

6 Built Environment

As described earlier in this document, in his 1965 masterplan Holford conceived a vision for the University Campus Heart sitting along the prominent ridgeline overlooking Canterbury, set within an open parkland landscape, with the college buildings distributed strategically around it to emphasise their importance. The site chosen for the Campus Heart had formerly been open farmland overlooking the Stour Valley.

The founding buildings included the Templeman Library, Eliot and Rutherford Colleges and the Physics Laboratory, now Marlowe Building. The Templeman library was positioned on the ridgeline as the main, central focal point to the campus, a symbol of the cultural and civic purpose to the University from the outset. This group of founding buildings were strategically conceived in a formal arrangement to define and enclose a green space into which the Senate Building was later added. The Marlowe
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Figure 46: Views of the Campus Heart today, including the Grade II listed ‘Father Courage’ sculpture by FE McWilliam
Building was also located on the ridgeline but was restricted to two-storeys in height to ensure the library was given due prominence. The taller Eliot and Rutherford Colleges were positioned slightly down the southern slope to avoid their silhouettes rising above the ridgeline so as the further accentuate the prominence of the library.

The planning layout was based on overlapping squares forming courtyards and circulation routes, around which the functional spaces were arranged. It is an architectural language of contrast between geometric order with a free flowing picturesque landscape. The relationship of geometric forms in landscape, together with Holford’s planned layout for Darwin and future colleges to the west and north, created a formal layout of buildings and squares within the central campus with an informal edge to the parkland to the south and views to Canterbury and beyond.

The selection of materials in these early buildings, together with architectural modelling and detail, derived from the political and economic circumstances of the time. The necessity to deliver the buildings within demanding time and budget constraints to meet the Government’s education programme lead to prefabrication and modular construction. This is manifest in the geometric building plans, modular repetition and appearance with windows grouped in vertical bands and recessed behind sculpted concrete wall panels. Earthy brick colours at the upper levels and chamfered corners soften the building outline and help embed them against the landscape skyline and wooded backdrop.

Since the University was first opened in 1965 the central campus has expanded, generally following this early pattern of development but without a clear hierarchy or order to the public realm or architecture. This has resulted in permeable but poorly defined areas of public space with a lack of overall legibility for pedestrian movement and a lack of clear definition of public space. With the exception of the original set-piece of Templeman Library, Eliot and Rutherford Colleges and the Marlowe Building noted above, which do provide some sense of Holford’s original plan for the Campus Heart, the layout of buildings in the landscape and lack of character in the spaces between buildings mean that this character area has a moderately weak cultural dimension with little relationship with its historical past. Notwithstanding this, the over-riding character is a Campus Heart that enjoys a dramatic garden setting on the ridgeline overlooking Canterbury, framing the views back to the historic city.

Heritage: The Campus Heart contains a designated heritage asset located close to the centre of this character area; this is the Grade II listed ‘Father Courage’ Sculpture. FE McWilliam’s totemic sculpture symbolises the political and social change of the post-war era. It refers to the play ‘Mother Courage’ by Berthold Brecht, which denounced the horrors of war and as such it embodies themes explored by several sculptors in this period.

To the east of the Campus Heart is the site of the Tyler Hill Medieval Pottery and Tile Industry, which has recently been designated as a Scheduled Monument. The Tyler Hill ceramic industry was based on the local availability of raw materials including London Clay and timber from the surrounding woods. It is possible that the first kilns were located here in about 1150. An extensive fire in Canterbury in 1174, which destroyed many timber houses and badly damaged Christ Church Priory, had proved an impetus to tile production at Tyler Hill, because as a result it was determined that future roofs in Canterbury should be tiled. The Tyler Hill industry dominated Kent, especially east Kent, producing everyday house tiles as well as decorated floor tiles and pottery. In the summer of 2000 Channel 4’s Time Team excavated one of the kilns which proved to be one of the best-preserved medieval tile kilns ever found in England.

Built evidence of the former agrarian use of the Campus Heart also still exists and contributes greatly to the quality of place that the Campus has become. The built heritage includes the houses and cottages along Giles Lane – Rothford, Olive Cottages, Tanglewood, the latter two being locally listed.

In addition, underneath the Campus Heart runs the disused Crab and Winkle tunnel, which opened in 1830 as the first steam-powered railway in southern England, and the first in the world to operate a steam-hauled passenger service.
6.5 Landscape Character Area 4 Description: Sarre Penn Valley

The Sarre Penn Valley is located between the ridgelines of Giles Lane and Tyler Hill Road in the northernmost part of the University Campus. In broad terms, the southern boundary of the Sarre Penn Valley is Park Wood Road and the northern boundary is Tyler Hill Road. This area is characterised by areas of enclosed fields and punctuated by small belts of woodland.

Dominated by the Sarre Penn stream (a tributary of the Great Stour River), this character area occupies the small valley north of the Campus Heart/Whitstable Road character areas and consists predominantly of enclosed and active agricultural land, with remnant original hedgerow features. The River Wantsum is also a tributary of the River Stour; combined they formed the Wantsum Channel that once separated the Isle of Thanet from mainland UK. The Saxon name ‘Sarre Penn’ translates as the ‘head or top of the River Wantsum’ (into which it flows). Sarre is also a place-name of a village located on what was once the mainland (west) coast line of the Wantsum Channel.

The valley slopes are an agrarian landscape and there are few built elements to this character area. They include the historic (12th century) Church of St Cosmus & St Damian in the north-west, the Sports Pavilion buildings in the south, the Oaks Nursery in the south-west, the historic Crab & Winkle rail line in the east and the working Hothe Court Farm buildings in the north.

The landscape and built environment in this part of the University campus is little touched by recent development and is used by the University as a research facility for archaeological exploration, surveying and building conservation.

Existing Habitat Types: There are five broad types of habitat present within this Landscape Character Area:

1. **Arable Fields**

Despite its rural agricultural feel, the overall natural dimension of the character area is weak, although the habitat complexity is enhanced considerably by the Sarre Penn stream. Whilst the stream provides a vegetated watercourse with some important hedgerow corridors, the hedgerows have many gaps and the lack of connectivity between the numerous small woodland areas reduce the ecological value of the landscape. Remnant hedgerows provide a glimpse into the areas past, and fruit-bearing species remain from larger orchards that once provided food for the people of Canterbury. This area also notably contains the northern entrance, the ‘North Portal’ to the Crab & Winkle railway tunnel, which is also forms part of the University Estate.

2. **Woodlands**

The woodlands and surrounding vegetation are extremely important in attenuating and improving the water quality of run-off entering the important Sarre Penn stream and ultimately therefore the River Stour:

**West Triangle Wood**: Located on the western edge of the landholding, this 0.5ha woodland is dominated by oaks with Hazel coppice forming the shrub layer. Bluebells and Wood Anemone dominate the ground flora. Further ecological complexity is provided by the Sarre Penn stream which bounds the woodlands northern edge.

**Sarre Penn Shaw**: An east-west aligned woodland shaw extending along the Sarre Penn stream between West Triangle Wood in the west and the former Crab & Winkle rail line in the east. This shaw is noteworthy for providing connectivity between Brotherhood Wood, West Triangle Wood, Foxborough Wood and the woodland of Blean Pastures Local Wildlife Site. The canopy is dominated by Oaks and Ash, while Hazel, Hawthorn, Blackthorn, Dogwood, Field Maple and Grey Willow are all frequent in the understorey. Bluebells and Wood Anemone dominate the ground flora in Foxborough Wood.

**Foxborough Shaw**: A north-south aligned c.0.5ha and 10-35 m wide woodland shaw extending between Hothe Court Farm in the north and the Sarre Penn stream and Foxborough Wood in the south. Oak dominates the canopy whilst Hawthorn, Blackthorn and Elder frequent the understorey. A narrow stream or ditch (dry in summer) extends the length of the woodland feeding into the Sarre Penn at the valley bottom.
Figure 47: Landscape Character Area: Sarre Penn Valley existing layout

1. Brotherhood Wood
2. Blean Primary School
3. Whitstable Road
4. Sarre Penn

5. Roman Villa Remains
6. St. Cosmas & St. Damien Church
7. Hothe Court Farm
8. Disused Crab & Winkle
Figure 48: Views of the Sarre Penn Valley today; top: Blean Church, bottom: the Old Salt Road (NCR 1) crossing the Sarre Penn Stream
Tree protection Orders: A section of Brotherhood Wood that forms the southern edge of this character area is subject to a tree protection order (TPO).

3 Hedgerows

A large number of hedgerows are present within the Sarre Penn Valley character area as a legacy of the agricultural land use. A recent campus hedgerow survey identified six hedgerows designated as 'important' under the terms of the Hedgerow Regulations 1997.

North West Arable: This hedgerow borders an arable field. The eastern section is a shrubby hedgerow of approximately 2.5m in height dominated by woody species of Hawthorn but also includes Oak, Goat Willow and Rose. Along the northern boundary by Tyler Hill Road, Blackthorn is dominant and interspersed with Holly, Hazel, Elm, Field Maple, Birch, Poplar and Ash. The eastern section is trimmed low in contrast to the northern section, which is untrimmed with mature trees over 12m. The western section is approximately 6-7m high with several individual mature trees. Woody species include Goat Willow, Pear, Rose, Elder and Plum. The herbaceous layer includes Yarrow, Dock, Scentless Mayweed, Fleabane, Hairy Willowherb, Rosehip, Hogweed and Nettle. The southern end of the western section becomes a shelterbelt with a wide belt of mature trees. An area of rough grassland and trees is located west of the western section.

Western Footpath: This is a section of trimmed hedgerow along the western side of the Crab and Winkle Way bridleway. It is approximately 2.5m high and stock proof, bordering a grassland field to the west. The dominant woody species is Hawthorn with Holly, Rose, Field Maple, Elder, Oak, Ash and Willow. The northern section is dominated by Ash. Herbaceous species of Nettle, Fleabane, Thistle and grasses can be found, along with Gatekeeper Butterflies.

Farmlands: This hedgerow separates two fields; to the north is an arable field and to the south is a grassland field. There are two gaps along its length. The average height is 3-4m and the hedgerow is open at the base and not stock proof. The dominant woody species is Hawthorn with Elder, Blackthorn, a mixture of small and large Oak trees, Goat Willow, Rose and Holly. The herbaceous layer is dominated by Thistle, Hogweed, Dock, Nettle, Scentless Mayweed, Poppy, Bramble and grasses.

Farmhouse: This hedgerow borders Tyler Hill Road and arable fields. It is a trimmed and approximately 2m high. The dominant woody species are Field Maple and Dogwood, with Rose, Blackthorn, Hawthorn, Elm, Holly and Hazel. The western end is dominated by Blackthorn. There are two gaps along its length and several animal runs through it. It is trimmed and dense at the base. The herbaceous layer is narrow along the arable field and includes Ivy, White Briony, Bracken, Mugwort, Hogweed, Bramble and grasses.

New Woodland: This is a section of 4-5m high hedgerow to the east of the newly planted woodland. It forms a section of the eastern boundary of the bridleway/cycle path near the bottom of the hill where the path crosses the stream. Woody species include mature and young trees of Goat Willow, Oak, Rose, Hawthorn, Field Maple, Blackthorn, Crack Willow and Mature Ash. The field layer is dominated by Bramble, White Briony, Hairy Willow Herb and Nettle. The hedgerow is likely to be trimmed back occasionally away from the cycle path.

Oaks Nursery: This hedgerow is dominated by tall, mature trees and is at times wider than 5m. It creates a boundary around a rough grassland field north of Oaks children’s nursery. Trees vary in height from 5-6m up to 10-12m. The western boundary widens to 10m at the northern end where it becomes woodland. The main woody species are Hornbeam, Hawthorn, Sycamore, Field Maple, Dogwood, Hazel, Tree of Heaven, Cherry, Oak, Blackthorn and Rose. The ground flora includes Cow Parsley, Hedge Bindweed, Hogweed, Nettle, Ivy, Red Campion, Mallow, Spear Thistle, Creeping Thistle, Cleavers, Rye Grass and Meadow Foxtail. This hedgerow/shelterbelt is not trimmed but creates a dense wooded boundary around the field. Eleven woody species were identified and, although it is in places wide enough to be woodland, it has the characteristics of a hedgerow, which was present over 30 years ago.

In addition to those identified above, a further hedgerow exists in this character area:
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Sports Fields South: This is a shrubby hedgerow with occasional adjacent trees forming the southern boundary of the main sports field. It is approximately 1m in height and 1m in width. Two gaps of approximately 5m occur along its length. The main woody species are Hawthorn with Elder and Ash. Occasional Cherry, Holly, Elm and Rose also occur. The hedgerow is trimmed and dense to the base.

4 Watercourses

The Sarre Penn Stream, a section of which flows through the University’s landholdings, is a 13km tributary of the River Stour. Flowing west to east across the centre of the character area, the Sarre Penn has formed a shallow sided “V” shaped valley. For virtually its entire journey across the University’s landholding, the Sarre Penn is densely shaded by mature trees and shrubs and thus there is little in the way of riparian herbaceous vegetation. Woody debris is a key feature within the channel, generating organic matter that contributes to the overall productivity of the river system. This debris, along with overhanging canopies and submerged roots and limbs, provides refuges for fish and invertebrates and diversifies flow and the range of species that can inhabit the varied current velocities. Tree roots also stabilise the banks that may otherwise be vulnerable to collapse. For this reason, South East Water generally recommends retention and restoration of the stream’s wooded character, although advises against fully enclosing vegetation.

The westernmost section of the stream forms part of the Blean Pastures Local Wildlife site. The stream and adjoining habitat are therefore likely to function as important wildlife corridors for wildlife moving between these important habitats and the campus.

5 Built Environment

The valley slopes are an agrarian landscape and there are few built elements to this character area. University-owned buildings include the Sports Pavilion buildings in the south, the Oaks Nursery in the south-west, the historic Crab & Winkle rail line in the east and the working Hothe Court Farm buildings in the north.

The landscape and built environment in this part of the University campus is little touched by recent development and is used primarily by the University as a research facility for archaeological exploration, surveying and building conservation.

Heritage: A number of designated and undesignated heritage assets are located in this character area, including a designated Scheduled Monument within the Campus immediately to the south and west of St Cosmus and St Damian’s Church. This monument includes the remains of a dispersed medieval settlement and an earlier Roman building situated on the southern slope of the valley. The Roman remains are represented by below ground archaeology and have been identified as a villa. Analysis of associated pottery fragments indicates that the building was in use during the first to third centuries AD. The dispersed medieval settlement survives in the form of earthworks and associated buried remains, and part of a roughly north-south aligned track runs along the eastern side of the monument. Documentary evidence, including an entry in the Domesday Book, suggests that the settlement was in existence by the 11th century. Analysis of pottery fragments found within the settlement suggests that it had fallen into disuse by the early 15th century.

Immediately beyond the monument to the north and east, on land adjacent to the Campus but not owned by the University, is the associated parish church of St Cosmus and St Damian. The church is Listed Grade II* and the standing fabric dates mainly to the 13th century. The Grade II listed Church Cottage sits close by, also on Tyler Hill Road. The church and its churchyard, both of which remain in use, are not included in the scheduling noted above.

In addition, the following designated heritage assets are located within this character area in the west of the Campus on land owned by the University:

- Former Canterbury & Whitstable Railway Trackbed north of campus (unlisted)
- Tyler Hill Tunnel including the North Portal (former Canterbury & Whitstable Railway), Grade II*

All of these historic structures are considered to be of great importance in defining the agrarian character of this area.
Figure 49: Views of the former Crab & Winkle railway
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Figure 50: Contemporary photos showing the green and biodiverse landscape setting of the University Campus
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7 Landscape Character Areas: Proposals
7.1 Introduction: Enriching the Built Environment, Landscape & Biodiversity

Whilst existing and new University buildings within the Framework Masterplan will provide an environment for enhanced learning and academic excellence, the masterplan concept advocates a wider diversity of landscaped spaces through enhancement of the landscape character areas. This approach aims to create a framework for the further evolution of the built environment whilst at the same time diversifying the landscape and enhancing its ability to support a richer biodiversity.

The intention behind the Framework Masterplan is that gradual evolution and implementation of the proposals will take place in a way that is sensitive to the individual landscape character areas such that it will enrich the individual parts of the campus. In doing so, it will help to grow a wider diversity of places and spaces, thereby broadening the opportunities for interaction between staff, students and the surrounding local communities. The places and spaces between the buildings will become the public ‘living rooms’ where all members of the University community can gather, exchange ideas, and where the sense of community is supported through formal events taking place and where informal encounters are made possible.

Overall, the University Campus must adapt and evolve in order to satisfy a range of contemporary expectations that have developed since the time of the Holford masterplan:

• the academic and business worlds moving towards shared flexible, inclusive and inspiring working environments
• a growing reliance upon public transport by environmentally and financially sensitive millennial students and staff, and
• the evolution of retail and other commercial activities leading to a growing interest to co-locate with the University.

In conclusion, the estate as a whole will become the most powerful expression of the academic, cultural and civic life of the University, and an enduring expression of the University’s aspirations and achievements.

Considering all of the above, the Framework Masterplan will follow a number of aspirational and clearly defined Urban Design Principles that represent a set of guiding principles and strategies aimed at delivering a successful ‘Place’.

7.2 Landscape Character Area Proposals: University Rise

The Framework Masterplan, whilst acknowledging that the University Rise character area must continue to play a role in providing a green setting to the south of the campus as well as a landscape demarcation from the city, also recognises that there is still significant potential to improve both the natural, built and cultural dimensions of this character area.

The Masterplan respects the open ‘Parklands’ character of this part of the campus and acknowledges the opportunities for landscape & biodiversity enhancements and more clearly defined and legible routes. Significantly this includes creating a new promenade connecting east with the Campus Heart through Turing and Keynes College courtyards, as part of a wider initiative to create a unified, connected campus along the ridgeline.

Furthermore, new built development is limited to the area to the south of the Turing College student hub building, modest infill development along Giles Lane and some larger new buildings framing the south and west side of a new, central ‘University Square’. The masterplan also identifies a location for a new hotel with conference facilities, thus taking the opportunity to diversify uses and to broaden commercial activity within the campus.

1 Landscape Enhancements

Overall, the open nature of University Rise is maintained in the masterplan, in order to provide a green setting to the University as well as a landscape demarcation from the City. More variety could be achieved in the more homogenous grassland areas through the planting of wildflower meadows, orchards and reinstatement of hedgerows. In particular, several important hedgerows exist in Chaucer Fields, and the masterplan proposes to re-establish the ones that have been removed to

Figure 51: Proposed Framework Masterplan for the Canterbury Campus showing the landscape context and the character areas denoted by circles
Figure 52: Aerial view of the existing University Rise character area
acknowledge the former agricultural use and the importance of this land in helping to provision the growing population of Canterbury.

The masterplan proposes to connect different areas of grassland by footpaths and tracks to help with wayfinding for pedestrians and cyclists, and reinstated hedgerows will provide a new network of ‘eco-highways’ for native animals and wildlife.

The masterplan proposes to extend the network of woodland paths through Bluebell Wood. The existing paths are well used by students, staff and visitors all year-round, but are especially popular in the spring months due to the impressive display provided in Spring by the woodland’s Bluebells. The efficient and well-established woodland maintenance regime that cares for Bluebell Wood should be extended into the smaller woodlands and shaws, in order to extend this leisure and biodiversity amenity in this part of the campus.

The network of ponds and watercourses has been extended in the masterplan through the creation of a third pond west of Lower Eliot pond, in order to provide greater ecological and amenity interest in this section of grassland and also to provide an important alternative breeding area for the Great Crested Newt. A large biodiverse and ecologically designed wetland feature such as this, created in a prime location, would become a focal landscape attraction. showcase the University’s greater aspirations for biodiversity. Access to the water and its wildlife could be maximised through multiple seating areas and boardwalks winding around the margins and even across the wetland.

Keynes Pond could also be transformed into a more attractive duck pond by cleaning and filtering the water that feeds it and by cutting back vegetation to enable long views across Canterbury. Enhancements can also be made to the dry ponds south of Turing and north of Beverley Farm. SuDS features should be used as both an attenuation and amenity feature in all future developments, and the existing complex extended and planted to enhance the landscape.

2 Public Realm & Network of Movement

Connections form the foundation of a successful University. The expansion of knowledge and skills depends upon the ability of individuals and organisations to connect and interact with one another and to engage with an ever-expanding body of knowledge. The links that provide such connections, both physical and virtual, provide the University with the essential structure for its activities of learning and knowledge distribution.

In terms of movement, the University Rise character area is bisected by University Road, which provides the main road entrance to the University; it is likely that University Road will remain the principle approach for traffic approaching the University from the City Centre to the south but its form and character change to become more of a formal avenue reinforced by linear tree planting.

Holford intended the experience of arrival along University Avenue to be a spectacular entry point to the campus and very much in the English picturesque tradition. However, the entrance to the campus from Whitstable Road is poorly defined and the road itself is a rather utilitarian length of highway. The existing unremarkable junction between Whitstable Road and University Road provides an opportunity to create a notable, generous entry space and gateway between public highway and University Estate. Such a transition space could create a landmark on Whitstable Road, highlighting the transition into the City. A new gatehouse building, or sculpture will also help to establish the ‘front door’ characteristics of this space, combing surface treatments, lighting and other framing techniques (such as an actual gate) will clearly signpost entry into a distinct environment and combine to establish a highly recognisable landmark place, without needing to interfere with the flow of slow-speed traffic.

From this new entry square, the road climbs gradually up the hill and the landscape has been conceived to use the change in the level to gradually reveal glimpses of the University buildings beyond through the trees. The Framework Masterplan takes the opportunity to restore Holford’s vision, emphasising the beauty of this route to impress visitors with the beautiful green landscape setting of the University.
7 Landscape Character Areas: Proposals

Figure 53: Landscape Character Area: University Rise existing layout
7 Landscape Character Areas: Proposals

Figure 54: Landscape Character Area: University Rise proposed masterplan layout
University Road itself will transform from a standard estate road to respond more sympathetically to the parkland character of University Rise in its approach to the campus heart along the renamed ‘University Avenue’. A sequence of distinct spaces will punctuate the route, aligned to interrupt the linear continuity. Road markings and conventional highway signs will be minimised, and the apparent width of the carriageway kept to a minimum. The approach from Whitstable Road will be a rich experience, as the road emerges from dense woodland at the bottom of the hill into open parkland enhanced by the backdrop of Bluebell Wood. A sense of arrival to the University as a whole will be greatly enhanced by a new public square at the heart of the University Campus and described in the Campus Heart Character Area. There will be a close connection between people and the landscape surroundings as views of historic Canterbury emerge across the parklands to the south, as visitors pass through a variety of green landscape environments, curving up through the parklands along a spectacular, tree-fringed avenue as the setting for one of England’s greenest Universities.

One of the founding principles of the Movement & Transport Strategy is to reduce reliance upon the motor vehicle, particularly for short journeys that could quite easily be undertaken by other means (eg: public transport, walking and cycling). The University benefits from close proximity to Canterbury city centre and to Canterbury West rail station, yet current circumstances legislate against making this journey by more sustainable means.

The masterplan encourages opportunities for walking and cycling by the use landscaping and planting to emphasise clearly defined and legible routes and proposes a significant growth in the role and status of two established footpath routes converging to the south of the University towards Canterbury West Station. The western arm links to Salisbury Road, running close to Chaucer College; this route is likely to retain the character of an upgraded footpath, with surfacing and discrete lighting to promote direct connection to the Station. By comparison the existing easterly route is likely to be busier and a major opportunity exists to enhance the use and status of this through improvements in the alignment of this route (see the Campus Heart Character Area). This route will transform into the principal traffic-free approach to the University (a key section of Route 1 of the National Cycle Network) by improved signing, lighting and paving that will be highly distinctive and visible from the station exit into the centre of the University. This route anticipates the opening of a northern entrance into Canterbury West Station from Roper Road at some point in the future, as well as the regeneration and re-use of disused sections of the Crab & Winkle Line trackbed (south section) as a sustainable transport route. To achieve these goals, both initiatives will require productive partnership working with Network Rail, the new Train Operating Company, CCC, KCC and relevant land owners.
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will also form a component part of a much longer pedestrian/cycle route through the campus heart between Turing and Darwin Colleges, that will provide a key axis and a backbone to a much clearer and legible network of movement around the campus.

3 Built Environment

In the Framework Masterplan, the setting of Beverley Farmhouse will remain largely unchanged to the south in its Parklands setting, although the following proposals will have some positive impacts upon its setting:

- The masterplan proposes that the pedestrian and vehicle approach to Beverley Farmhouse will be made more prominent in order to emphasise the ease of access to this direct footpath between the Campus and Canterbury to encourage walking and to discourage the use of the car. There is therefore likely to be more footfall on this route
- A new conferencing/hotel will be located up the hill to the north in Turing South. The masterplan assumes that this new intervention into the Campus will have a positive effect upon Beverley Farmhouse in creating a visitor focus in this part of the Campus. It is also hoped that this will provide an opportunity for a symbiotic relationship between the two buildings to emerge. For example, Beverley Farmhouse might provide some related, luxury type of overnight accommodation which is complimentary to the hotel, with additional meeting space and/or a restaurant that brings more life and visitors to this historic building.
New buildings on the University Rise ridgeline will be highly visible from Canterbury and the hills to the south, which in turn may impact upon the setting of the Canterbury World Heritage Site. Any new development within University Rise will therefore need to achieve a careful balance between additional built space and enriching and extending the public realm. Rather than spreading buildings throughout this area, new development within the Framework Masterplan has therefore been strategically focused on fitting in with the landscape and creating a more consolidated and coherent campus in the area of the ridgeline to maintain the significant areas of open space to the south.

New buildings are arranged to more clearly define useable spaces between the buildings that will be able to support a variety of activities and create a sense of place. Whilst the University buildings provide an environment for learning and academic excellence, the places and spaces between the buildings will become the public ‘living rooms’ where all members of the University community can gather, exchange ideas, and where the sense of community is supported through formal events and informal encounters. A wider diversity of spaces will broaden the opportunity for interaction within the University community. At the same time, the masterplan proposals also take the opportunity to vary the uses and commercial opportunities within University Rise.

Several new buildings are proposed within Turing College to reinforce the campus location along the ridgeline (or on flat land within the ridgeline ‘plateau’) in gap sites where development will provide more enclosure or help define the new central square and the east-west promenade. A new conferencing hotel is introduced into the masterplan immediately to the south of Turing College and north of the existing Canterbury Innovation Centre. In harmony with Keynes and Turing Colleges, this development is envisaged as a courtyard development with the courts enclosing space for a hotel garden and to hide staff carparking and servicing. The masterplan envisages that the hotel development will take advantage of this close proximity to Turing College, where unused student bedrooms in the summer will provide additional overspill accommodation. In addition, a hotel development in this location will provide an opportunity to introduce hotel-related uses into the historic Beverley Farmhouse, such as a fine-dining restaurant, additional seminar space and bedroom suites on the first floor. To the south of University Rise, an open-air theatre is proposed in a former clay-pit at the bottom of Bluebell Wood. As the character area is fairly exposed, this woodland edge location will provide shelter for this new cultural component, that might be curated by the existing Gulbenkian Theatre. A facility such as this might also be considered for use as meeting/teaching space to extend the use of the outdoor environment for socialisation outside the summer months, further increasing its amenity value.

A new two level carpark is also introduced to the west of the hotel to provide car parking for hotel guests. This carpark should take advantage of the sloping ground that exists in this location to nestle into the landscape; separate entry points for cars at both levels will avoid the need for internal ramps and so keep the building footprint as small as possible. New University-related parking space is provided in the masterplan proposals in two parcels of land screened within dense pockets of trees and tall screening hedges on either side of the University Avenue north of Chaucer College. These areas of parking are intended to replace the multitude of small carparks currently occupying valuable space in the campus heart; Their strategic location will ensure that car users in future will leave their cars close to the perimeter of the campus; the short journey into the campus heart can quite easily be undertaken by public transport, walking or cycling.

4 Design Guidelines

The Framework Masterplan proposes the following principles and improvements:

1 Public Realm:
   • University Square, a new arrival square at the junction between University Avenue and Giles Lane
   • University Road replanted to create avenue with lofty tree canopies that maintain Cathedral views from road and southern slopes
   • A new arrival forecourt (‘Beverley Court’) created as a punctuation point along University Avenue to symbolise visitor arrival at the new
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conferencing hotel. This court will give access to the new hotel as well as a new viewing platform created to provide a view of Canterbury and the Cathedral

- An east/west promenade ("Turing Walk") between the western boundary of Turing College and University Square, through Keynes College
- A north/south route from Bluebell Wood and University Avenue to the new Hotel Garden Court, Turing College student hub and Turing College ‘central square’
- A new, improved setting for Tanglewood Cottage within its own small garden square, at the junction of the route between Keynes College and Park Wood
- Spaces & Places for Education:
  - There is significant opportunity for the landscape in this character area to be used more widely for education purposes
  - Sheltered outdoor learning spaces would allow the ponds, woodland and parkland areas to be used as outdoor classrooms, not only for students in subject relevant areas such as wildlife conservation but across all areas of study

2 Architecture:
- New buildings to reinforce the established architectural character and share a family resemblance
- The predominant architectural character of the buildings should continue the pattern in this area of prefabricated modular construction using repetitive components
- Front doors must address the main public spaces, pedestrian and cycle routes
- Light service deliveries and recycling collections should be made from shared surfaces into main entrance; heavier goods via service areas accessed from University Avenue, Giles Lane or Turing Road

3 Building Uses:
- Building uses should vary and enrich the existing pattern of uses
- Appropriate uses include hotel/conferencing facilities, commercial workspace, University academic uses, student support and student housing
- More public uses and places of entertainment (such as a Student Union building) would ideally be located adjacent to the new Central Square
- There is an opportunity to create an open-air theatre in the clay pit to the south of Bluebell Wood, designed by students of the University’s own School of Architecture
- Car parking screened within dense pockets of trees and tall screening hedges on either side of the University Avenue north of Chaucer College

4 Building Height:
- Building heights should vary between 2 to 4 storeys and should sit comfortably within their neighbouring context.
- Buildings should sit within the existing treeline/skyline when viewed from middle and long distances

5 Building Form:
- Buildings should be developed along the ridgeline or on flat land within the ridgeline ‘plateau’
- Buildings should be particularly responsive to the parklands setting and the historic landscape context of this character area, and sit comfortably as a coherent collection of buildings in the landscape
- Buildings should be arranged in clusters or as courtyard developments to enclose and define a coordinated and coherent public realm of streets, squares, courtyards & gardens

6 Building Materials:
- Building materials to be responsive to the parkland setting in texture, colour and hue and should be predominantly ‘natural’ in appearance, including brick/masonry/timber/natural metal finishes
- New buildings should be finished in muted colours to lessen any impact on distant views
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Figure 57: Landscape Character Area: Whitstable Road existing layout
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Figure 58: Landscape Character Area: Whitstable Road proposed masterplan layout
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- The light colouring of the existing Turing College buildings should be mitigated by the introduction of Gabion walls on the most exposed surfaces, which would help to soften the impact of the buildings into the landscape
- Roofs should be flat or pitched and incorporate (wherever possible) green and/or blue roofs, roof gardens, photovoltaic/solar/thermal collectors for sustainable energy provision
- The design of the hotel roof should be carefully considered as a medium to large building, and its design should acknowledge its presence as foreground to the western campus ridgeline development; a stepped/garden/landscaped roofs could help sit and integrate the building within the landscape

7 Potential Early Wins:
- The east/west promenade ('Turing Walk')
- The new hotel arrival forecourt ('Beverly Court')
- Landscape and biodiversity improvements to SuDS & ponds

7.3 Landscape Character Area Proposals: Whitstable Road

The Framework Masterplan acknowledges the unique woodlands character of this part of the campus, along with the fragments of the former agrarian use of the land and includes Hothe Court; it also recognises the opportunities for landscape & biodiversity enhancements and more clearly defined and legible routes. Significantly, public realm proposals provide the key to a wider initiative to create a unified, connected campus along the ridgeline:
- a more prominent diagonal promenade connecting Brotherhood Wood with the campus heart
- a more significant and actively used pedestrian and cycle route between Gildes Lane and the Old Salt Road
- a new ‘Centre of Excellence’ based around the historic Hothe Court buildings which respects their setting and significance

While it is vital that the remaining Ancient Woodland is protected from major development, there is still significant potential to improve both the natural and cultural dimensions of this character area.

1 Landscape Enhancements

Overall, the predominant woodlands character of the Whitstable Road character area is maintained and reinforced in the masterplan, in order to ensure that this valuable woodland is not further harmed and to amplify the sylvan setting enjoyed by the student housing of Park Wood and the academic buildings in Brotherhood Wood.

This character area is situated in a strategically important location with respect to the Blean Living Landscape initiative and the Campus woodlands and other semi-natural habitats are viewed as integral elements of the wider Blean Woodland Complex – one of the largest areas of remaining Ancient Woodlands in the UK. The masterplan proposes to emphasise the original footprint of the pre-University woodland and the gradual intensification of trees throughout Park Wood and Brotherhood Wood. In this context, there is great opportunity to work with the Blean Initiative to create new woodland, meadow and wetland habitats within the Campus to help strengthen connectivity between fragmented components of this internationally valuable landscape and ecosystem.

In addition to creating new habitats, traditional coppice management of the woodlands is already beginning to be practiced in these woodlands to the benefit a wide range of woodland species. These existing woodlands have the potential to attract iconic species such as the Nightjar, the Nightingale and the Heath Fritillary Butterfly, and the masterplan recognises that effective woodland maintenance regimes need to be established throughout the woodland areas. Recently coppiced areas are vital to encourage the growth of Cow-wheat, the Heath Fritillary butterfly’s primary larval food (NB: the butterfly was locally known as ‘Woodman’s Follower’ as it followed the traditional coppice cycle). Wider coppice management would also benefit other woodland ground flora including Bluebells and Wood Anemones, and coppicing will generally attract a greater diversity of woodland fauna including Dormice and a variety of shrub-nesting birds.

This landscape character area provides an abundance of woodland which can be extremely beneficial to good health and wellbeing and the footpath/cycle way bisecting Park Wood enables good public access to the Ancient
Woodlands and links to more informal woodland footpaths that follow desire lines to other parts of the campus.

The area around Hothe Court at the high point of the Giles Lane ridgeline, would once have been a more open landscape overlooking farmland to the north and south. This landscape has gradually been eroded by the growth and development of the University and the colonisation of the area by new trees, but the historic building and remnants of its kitchen garden and the farmyard still remain. In the masterplan proposals, the former garden surrounding the existing house is restored to something close to that indicated on the OS Map of 1870 with clearly defined tree planting and hedging, lawns and approach driveway. The masterplan also attempts to re-establish something of the former agricultural and heritage context once enjoyed by Hothe Court by linking it to the open field to the south without the loss of too many trees. The former kitchen garden is also returned to beneficial use in the masterplan as the Kent Community Oasis Garden (KentCOG), managed as a community/education facility by a small group of enthusiastic and environmentally conscious University staff, locals and students. With support from the University, the garden will expand into the small field to the south and attract greater participation. A new use will be found for the historic farmhouse, most likely as a residential dwelling, respecting its original purpose. The University could even develop targets to produce an increasing proportion of its own food from these food growing areas and from the nearby farmland; perhaps one day the University could begin selling UoK honey and other produce.
The network of ponds, swales and watercourses that intersects this character area are retained and enhanced in the masterplan and rerouted to provide natural/sustainable drainage integrated with buildings and landscape. This will extend the masterplan principle of sustainable drainage and provide greater ecological and amenity interest in this character area. The network of ponds and watercourses is further extended through the creation of a ‘Hothe Court Pond’, in order to provide greater ecological and amenity interest in this character area and also to provide an important alternative breeding area for the Great Crested Newt. This large biodiverse and ecologically designed wetland feature will provide a new focal landscape attraction in this rather forgotten and neglected part of the campus and will showcase the University’s commitment to enhanced biodiversity. Access to the water and its wildlife will be maximised through multiple seating areas and boardwalks winding around the margins and even across the wetland.

2 Public Realm & Network of Movement

Due in large part to the dramatic change in landscape character in this area and the circuitous nature of Park Wood Road skirting the northern edge of the Ancient Woodlands, Whitstable Road character area is considered psychologically to be somewhat remote from the Campus Heart. Although this does reinforce a separate identity and personality for the Whitstable Road character area as a result, there is also a tendency amongst the University community to use motor vehicles to access this part of the campus, which adds to the traffic passing through the campus heart.

The masterplan proposes measures to deter people from driving short-distance journeys such as these and to encourage the people to use healthier and more sustainable forms of movement such as walking, cycling or public transport. For example, the masterplan proposes to create a new controlled vehicular entrance to the campus within the Whitstable Road character area at the junction of the Old Salt Road and Park Wood Road. A new carpark is located adjacent to the Oaks Nursery and close to the new western campus entrance. This carpark will accommodate vehicles entering the campus via this route and a University-control gate will prevent them from penetrating further into the campus. The journey into the University...
The campus will then continue on foot or by bicycle through Park Wood itself, or along Park Wood Road by shuttle bus or by public transport.

The masterplan further proposes to encourage more use of the existing traffic-free woodland paths and cycle routes through positioning of interpretation/wayfinding boards to create a safer pattern of movement. The existing east-west footpath/cycleway linking Jennison Pond and Hothe Court through Park Wood is a great asset and maximising safe 24-hour access through the woodlands in this way is a priority for the masterplan. For example, this route will become even more prominent by becoming new route for NCN1.

At present, part of NCN1 shares Park Wood Road with fast-moving vehicles; in the masterplan, it is proposed to divert this important cycle route away from the road and along the existing cycle route through Park Wood itself to encourage more people to cycle. Also the masterplan proposes a new ‘Centre of Excellence’ based around Hothe Court, which (along with the new carpark at the Oaks Nursery) will help to activate the east-west spine route.

Within Park Wood, the masterplan proposes greater legibility by the creation of ‘Park Wood Circus’ as focal hub as part of the redevelopment of Park Wood student housing. This will vary the uses in Park Wood by providing a mix of new facilities such as a shop, a café/bar and a wi-fi hub, meeting space as well as event and activity spaces as a focus for the new student housing and provide a new heart around which the new student housing can grow. In addition, an entrance forecourt is created to the proposed new sports facilities along Park Wood Road and a pedestrian/cycle connection to the student residential community in Park Wood and Hothe Court to the south. To the south of this area, the University Medical Centre has been reconfigured in the masterplan to provide a new courtyard space for visitors to this facility, and to create a more attractive and legible route to link Whitstable Road and University Rise character areas. All these proposed routes and spaces will be well-lit to ensure 24-hour safety for the University community as well as visitors.

Similarly, in Brotherhood Wood the masterplan proposes to reinforce the strong, diagonal pedestrian/cycle route between Giles Lane crossing and the Sibson/Business School precinct, and new building footprints and new front doors are arranged to reinforce this route. The conclusion of this diagonal route will be an enhanced definition of the woodland clearing – ‘Brotherhood Circus’ – that will form a shared forecourt to the Sibson Building, the Business School and the School of Economics. This is intended as a sheltered and well-used public space onto which the building entrances face, with a shared surface to slow traffic and accommodate drop-off and pick-up. Further south, the masterplan also promotes a new rectilinear square – Jennison Square – to be created between the Jennison and Ingram buildings, between Park Wood Road and the Jennison Pond. A new landscaped space created around Jennison Pond will be developed as green space within a woodland clearing at the threshold between Park Wood and Brotherhood Wood.

3 Built Environment

The Framework Masterplan seeks to celebrate the built heritage and its setting in this part of the campus, and to breathe new life into the historic structures.

At Hothe Court, the development and gradual expansion of the University since the 1970’s has affected the coherence of the original cluster of historic buildings and
their immediate landscape context. This has effectively isolated the farmhouse and associated buildings from the farmland that once provided its historic context. The sense of Hothe Court as a farm, and as a manorial site, has therefore been all but lost and the setting altered out of all recognition. In order to create a new sense of place and purpose to this part of the campus, the masterplan therefore proposes the development of a new ‘Centre of Excellence’ at Hothe Court, as a destination in this part of the campus.

The built form for this Centre for Excellence is articulated in the masterplan as series of courtyard developments that replicate the original farmyard to the north of the original Hothe Court Farmhouse. This intervention would provide a destination in the west of the campus at the highpoint of the ridgeline. It would also add a diversity of new uses to (the otherwise mono-cultural) Park Wood as part of the placemaking agenda for the masterplan and help Hothe Court to play a more important role in the overall campus.

An architecture derived from contemporary agricultural buildings could provide an appropriate and effective architectural response in this part of the Campus.

This concept will also integrate the reuse the existing listed and historic buildings such as the farmhouse, the barn and the oast houses, and transform historic Hothe Court such that it once again plays an important role in the University Estate. The agricultural setting of the house itself will to some extent be restored by the restoration of the original garden to the south of the house, with its elliptical carriage drive leading off from the Old Salt Road, and by careful thinning out of the undergrowth, provide an enhanced outlook over the fields to the south. To the east, a tree-lined green space will be created as a green landscaped link to Park Wood that incorporates a pond with wetlands as an enhancement to biodiversity.

This concept for the regeneration of Hothe Court will sit comfortably alongside the restoration of the former kitchen garden and orchard to the west, currently undergoing a transformation as part of the development of the Kent Community Oasis Garden.

New buildings in the Whitstable Road character area must respond to the historic woodland character and enhance these characteristics and qualities that make it a special place.

In Park Wood for example, the masterplan proposes the incremental replacement of the older stock of Park Wood student housing with a more structured layout of buildings and spaces and introduce a wider variety and mix of uses. Higher density student housing in this area would achieve a more efficient use of space by creating more housing within the same area. The more structured and formal layout proposed has been conceived to work within the existing layout of trees to preserve the woodland environment.

In Brotherhood Wood, the existing pattern of development of academic buildings within clearings in the woodland is continued in the masterplan. The masterplan sets out to ensure that this part of the campus becomes more coherent and valued and is identified more strongly as an individual ‘place’ within the campus. The name ‘Brotherhood Wood’ is adopted in the masterplan to respect the historic woodland with its roots in the origin of the place. As noted above, ‘Brotherhood Circus’ will be created as a shared forecourt around which existing and new buildings are located. Similarly, immediately to the south ‘Jennison Square’, another redefined woodland space, will give identity to several new buildings including the new Kent & Medway Medical School.

Design Guidelines

The Framework Masterplan proposes the following principles and improvements:

The Framework Masterplan recognises there are a variety of sub-areas within the overall, Whitstable Road character area, so the design guidelines are structured accordingly:

1 Brotherhood Wood
   Public Realm:
   - Diagonal route from Campus Heart to Brotherhood Circus established as a direct pedestrian/cycle route
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- Jennison Square created between Jennison and Ingram, with adjoining green space around Jennison Pond
- Jennison Pond to become an attractive amenity hub at the entrance to the Park Wood east-west route
- Square and green space to become key connection node between the Campus Heart, Park Wood and Brotherhood Circus
- New courtyard development proposed to replace the temporary Estates Management structures with car parking below taking advantage of sloping site gradient

Architecture:
- Buildings, whilst different in form, use, construction and appearance, to share a family resemblance and sit comfortably as a coherent collection of buildings in the landscape, as Holford had envisaged
- Front doors to address main public spaces, pedestrian and cycle routes
- Servicing by light deliveries etc from shared surfaces to main entrance; heavier goods via service area and road connection to Park Wood Road

Building Height:
- Building height 3 to 4 storeys
- Heights conceived to sit comfortably with neighbouring context & treeline/skyline when viewed from middle and long distances

Building Form:
- Continue existing pattern of development of academic buildings within clearings in the woodland
- Buildings arranged to enclose landscaped courtyards and a defined public realm

Building Materials:
- Building materials to be responsive to the woodland character setting in texture and colour/hue
- Predominantly natural materials; brick/masonry/timber/natural metal finish
- Roofs should be flat or pitched and incorporate (wherever possible) green and/or blue roofs, roof gardens, photovoltaic/solar/thermal collectors for sustainable energy provision

Potential Early Wins:
- Clear out and clean up Jennison Pond
- Fit filters to surface water drainage system to improve water quality to enable biodiversity
- Prune trees and bushes to open up space around the pond
- Create a new green landscaped space all around Jennison Pond with tables, seating and grassed areas under existing trees for meeting, picnicking, etc

Park Wood
Public Realm:
- East-west route through Park Wood to Hothe Court strengthened as a direct and very active, safe pedestrian/cycle route
- New circus to create a ‘heart’ to Park Wood student housing

Architecture:
- Buildings, whilst different in form, use, construction and appearance, to share a family resemblance and sit comfortably as a coherent collection of buildings in the landscape
- The masterplan facilitates an increase in density for student accommodation upon the previously developed plots to create an enhanced and more efficient use of space, increasing legibility whilst maintaining the woodland
- Front doors to address main public spaces, pedestrian and cycle routes
- Servicing by light deliveries etc from shared surfaces to main entrance; heavier goods via service area and road connection to Park Wood Road
- The sports facilities are enlarged and expanded with the enlargement of the Tennis Centre, a replacement leisure/sports hall and a new swimming pool complex
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Building Uses:
- Student residential, sports & leisure
- Park Wood housing to contain a mix of new facilities such as a shop, cafe and wi-fi hub, bar, meeting space, etc

Building Height:
- Park Wood student housing: 4 storeys
- Sports Halls: single 13m storey
- Heights conceived to sit comfortably with neighbouring context & treeline/skyline when viewed from middle and long distances

Building Form:
- Incremental replacement of the earlier phase and older stock of Park Wood housing with a more structured layout of buildings framing routes and enclosing courtyard gardens
- Buildings arranged to enclose landscaped courtyards and a defined public realm

Building Materials:
- Building materials to be responsive to the woodland character setting in texture and colour/hue
- Student Housing: Building materials to be responsive to woodland character predominantly brick/masonry and timber. Alternative materials may be considered if sympathetic with context (EG: the colour and hues of the anodised aluminium cladding to Sibson)
- Greater use of timber in buildings within Park Wood, and less timber outside Park Wood
- Roofs should be flat or pitched and incorporate (wherever possible) green and/or blue roofs, roof gardens, photovoltaic/solar/thermal collectors for sustainable energy provision

Potential Early Wins:
- East-west route through Park Wood to Hothe Court route to become even more prominent by becoming new route for NCN1

Hothe Court
Public Realm:
- East-west route through Park Wood to Hothe Court strengthened as a direct and very active, safe pedestrian/cycle route
- Old Salt Road reopened to controlled University traffic to improve connectivity and footfall by University community, public and visitors
- Courtyards created within new development to provide external teaching areas and University community interaction spaces
- Swales retained, enhanced and rerouted to provide natural/sustainable drainage integrated with buildings and landscape
- Use planting to enhance the existing SuDS feature; use SuDS as both an attenuation and amenity feature in any future developments
- Garden to Hothe Court farmhouse linked to fields to south to restore heritage setting
- Carparking area created in field south of Nursery within dense green landscape setting, with access from Salt Road/Whitstable Road and Park wood Road
- Visitor parking area to be created in field adjacent to Whitstable Road junction within dense green landscape setting, with access from Salt Road/Whitstable Road

Spaces & Places for Education:
- Community Garden to be expanded and opened as visitor centre/produce market, with controlled access from Salt Road/Whitstable Road

Architecture:
- Characterised by the Kentish vernacular farmhouse, oast houses, cottages & barns
- This area includes the Grade II listed house and garden on the site of the former 16thC Farmhouse and the Grade II listed barn to the north of the farmhouse
- Buildings, whilst different in form, use, construction and appearance, to share a family resemblance and sit comfortably as a coherent collection of buildings in the landscape
7 Landscape Character Areas: Proposals

- Building should be particularly responsive to setting and historic context arranged to restore agrarian setting of Hothe Court
- The masterplan builds on the historic character of the area to reinforce the prominence of this historic site and creating an appropriate setting for the listed buildings.
- The masterplan creates a new 'Centre of Excellence' established at Hothe Court such that it plays an important role in the University Estate and a destination in the west of the campus at the highpoint of the ridgeline
- Entrances – front doors address main public spaces, courtyards, pedestrian and cycle routes
- Servicing – light deliveries etc from shared surfaces to main entrance; heavier goods via service area and road connection to Park Wood Road

Building Uses:
- A variety of sympathetic uses integrated into existing buildings
- New buildings to be academic and/or research-based

Building Height:
- Building height 1 to 2 storeys including single 8.5m storey workshop spaces
- Heights conceived to sit comfortably with neighbouring context & treeline/skyline when viewed from middle and long distances

Building Form:
- Buildings arranged to enclose landscaped courtyards and a defined public realm
- New building layout arranged around courtyard spaces at a scale of former farmyard as a reference rural scale of original farm development

Building Materials:
- Building materials to be responsive to the agrarian character neighbouring woodland setting in texture and colour/hue

- Predominantly natural materials; brick/masonry/timber/natural metal finish
- Roofs should be flat or pitched and incorporate (wherever possible) green and/or blue roofs, roof gardens, photovoltaic/solar/thermal collectors for sustainable energy provision

Potential Early Wins:
- Hothe Court Pond and Wetlands

4 Giles Lane (North)

Public Realm:
- A new courtyard square created around and maintaining the mature existing tree line is proposed between the Sports Hall site and Stacey as a linking space between University Square and Jennison Square
- An existing footpath to the west of the sports centre site creates an additional north south link from the newly formed public realm around Tanglewood Cottage to Park Wood
- A new courtyard on route of public footpath is created at the University Medical Centre to create a more legible route between Turing College and Park Wood

Architecture:
- Characterised by the Kentish vernacular cottages along Giles Lane, Woodlands, Rothford, Olive Cottages & Tanglewood and the southern fringes of Park Wood
- Buildings, whilst different in form, use, construction and appearance, to share a family resemblance and sit comfortably as a coherent collection of buildings in the landscape
- Building should be particularly responsive to setting and historic context
- Entrances – front doors address main public spaces, courtyards, pedestrian and cycle routes
- Servicing – light deliveries etc from shared surfaces to main entrance; heavier goods via service area and road connection to Giles Lane
Building Uses:
- New buildings to be academic and/or support buildings

Building Height:
- Building height 3 storeys
- Heights conceived to sit comfortably with neighbouring context & treeline/skyline when viewed from middle and long distances

Building Form:
- Buildings arranged to enclose landscaped courtyards and a defined public realm

Building Materials:
- Building materials to be responsive to the agrarian character neighbouring woodland setting in texture and colour/hue
- Predominantly natural materials; brick/masonry/timber/natural metal finish
- Roofs should be flat or pitched and incorporate (wherever possible) green and/or blue roofs, roof gardens, photovoltaic/solar/thermal collectors for sustainable energy provision

Potential Early Wins:
- Improved setting of Tanglewood Cottage

7.4 Landscape Character Area Proposals: Campus Heart

To fully describe the masterplan proposals for the campus heart, it is necessary to diagnose the thinking behind the original campus from its founding in 1965 and to understand what the original masterplan was seeking to achieve.

The heart of the campus originated on the open farmland on the ridgeline overlooking the Stour Valley and the historic city of Canterbury. The founding buildings – the Templeman Library, Eliot and Rutherford Colleges and Physics Laboratory, now the Marlowe Building – were strategically arranged in a semi-formal grouping to enclose a large green space. The Templeman Library was located on the ridgeline at the academic heart of the campus and as an important civic component in the first phase of buildings. With the library in a central position, the various college buildings were arranged around the outer edge of the campus heart, slightly downhill from the ridge; in this way, they appear to be subservient buildings and give the library even more prominence. The very distinct geometry of the Eliot and Rutherford College buildings were deliberately oriented to capture views to historic Canterbury and beyond and formed an informal edge to the parkland to the south. Holford originally intended to complete this composition with a tall tower on the skyline (the original design for the Senate Building) sitting within the central green space.

The selection of materials in these early buildings, together with architectural modelling and detail, derived from the political and economic circumstances of the time. The necessity to deliver the buildings within tight time and budget constraints to meet the Government’s new education programme dictated the choice of prefabrication and modular construction. This is manifest in the geometric building plans, modular repetition of materials and windows, grouped in vertical bands within concrete wall panels. Earthy brick colours at the upper levels and chamfered corners help soften the building outlines against the wooded backdrop and skyline.

Holford was not retained to guide the development of the masterplan beyond the first phase. Since this structure was established in the original masterplan, the campus heart has grown somewhat incrementally over the past fifty years, as the demand for space and size of budgets have allowed. Over time, subsidiary academic buildings have been arranged less formally within the campus heart, but without a clear hierarchy or order to the public realm or architecture. Furthermore, numerous car parks occupy space between the buildings, allowing vehicle users easy access to the buildings at the expense of pedestrians and cyclists and adding little to the quality of the public realm. It is an architectural language of contrast between geometric order surrounded by largely unresolved, free-flowing contiguous landscape. This ad hoc policy has resulted in some fine buildings set in poorly defined and windswept areas of public space, with a lack of overall coherence, legibility and shelter.
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Figure 62: Landscape Character Area: Campus Heart existing layout
Figure 63: Landscape Character Area: Campus Heart proposed masterplan layout
Although Holford’s influence on the architectural expression of the college buildings waned, the masterplan proved flexible enough to allow each college to develop its own architectural personality and expression over time and the overriding character is a University with a very green garden setting on the ridgeline overlooking Canterbury, framing the views back to the historic city. It is instructive to note that patterns set out in the Holford masterplan at the foundation of the University, fifty years ago, are still vividly present in the form and functioning of the Campus Heart today, despite the complete transformation of so many other aspects of the University and its organisation. Indeed, the landscape patterns from the period before the founding of the University are still legible and profoundly influence the arrangement of the Campus Heart today. Taking all this into account, the masterplan has returned to Holford’s 1965 vision for inspiration but tries to resolve the shortcomings that have emerged over time.

1 Landscape Enhancements:

The University is well known as a very verdant campus with plenty of open space, with great views of historic Canterbury and located within a semi-rural landscape setting; the Framework Masterplan provides an opportunity to reconsider the relationship between the University and its landscape in order to create the reputation of Kent as the ‘greenest’ campus of all those in the UK.

The Campus Heart is already blessed with an abundance of green spaces, but these are rather homogenous and repetitious; many of the existing areas of green landscape are ill-defined, under-used and lacking variety and it is difficult to navigate around without undue reliance on signage. Furthermore, the hill-top location dictates that, for much of the academic year, the Campus Heart is very exposed to the weather. It is only in the Spring and short Summer Terms that students benefit from the green open spaces. For these unfortunate reasons, the Campus Heart rather under-achieves in terms of its landscape character and personality. The masterplan therefore proposes that an increase in built development is carefully balanced by the development of a well-defined public realm and a network of outdoor spaces within the heart of the campus.
The masterplan proposals for the Campus Heart will create spaces between buildings which are more coherently defined, and which will further reinforce the overall landscape qualities of the University. The Campus Heart will benefit from a new linked network of civic spaces and high-quality squares, gardens, courts and quads with a greater degree of shelter provided by carefully located surrounding buildings. New green and hard-landscaped landscapes are formed to bring a greater variety of user experience and landscape delight to the Campus Heart. The reconfigured public realm will include formal gathering spaces as well as informal spaces, recreational spaces, performance spaces as well as quiet spaces, avenues of trees and fruit blossom, landscapes that change character with passing seasons, along with more open wildflower meadows and so on. As part of this more ‘space positive’ approach, a clear and legible ‘mental map’ is created for the Campus Heart through the delivery of a coherent pattern of streets and spaces, landmark features as well as distinctive and varied spaces. This approach will help to diversify the use and personality of new external spaces across the campus.

This Character Area has the opportunity to develop a more ‘urban’ ecosystem being a fairly homogenous built-up area. Green spaces within the Campus Heart are not reaching their full potential in terms of biodiversity and associated landscape and recreational value, so the masterplan proposes more trees in the Campus Heart to provide protection from wind and heat gain in direct sun. As well as sequestering carbon from the atmosphere, woodland and free-standing trees also provide substantial local cooling. There are still a number of mature trees surrounding buildings which provide substantial local cooling, and these are retained in the masterplan proposals.

A tiered and more formal landscape is introduced to the sloping land between Eliot & Rutherford Colleges to create a transitional space between the more formal garden layout of the Campus Heart and the parklands to the south. The new tiered garden gives improved connections between the Campus Heart, the new entrance square and Tyler Court student residences.
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The open spaces to the south of the Campus Heart are retained in the masterplan to provide a green setting to the University as well as a landscape demarcation from the City. Greater variety in flora and habitats is proposed in some of the more homogenous grassland areas through the creation of zones of meadows and by planting orchards; low-mown amenity grassland, new wildflower areas and natural wooded zones will also reduce the management impact on this landscape. Like the University Rise character area, connectivity between grassland zones would assist and encourage the movement of fauna. These zones could help create a pattern of eco-highways and connectivity between landscape zones and act as natural wayfinding guidance for pedestrians and cyclists.

Woodlands: It is vital that the remaining pockets of woodland to the north of the Campus Heart are protected from major development and woodland maintenance regimes should be established in the smaller areas of woodland.

2 Public Realm & Network of Movement:

Whilst the University buildings provide an environment for learning and academic excellence, the places and spaces between the buildings should be the public ‘living rooms’ which broaden the opportunity for interaction within the University community and where all members of the University community can gather, exchange ideas, and where the sense of community is supported through formal events and informal encounters.

The master plan concept for the Campus Heart starts by establishing a simple grid of streets, spaces and places based around a main east-west route along the ridge-line, which will connect between Turing College and St Stephen’s Hill. In addition, a main north-south route will also be established through this character area by closely following the former Crab and Winkle railway line, to connect the Campus Heart with the city centre. Within this overall organisational structure, the heart of the campus is composed around a simple grid of streets, spaces and places, out of which are identified a pattern of building plots, which in turn are arranged around a new layout of squares, gardens and other public spaces which will form the new public realm.

Figure 66: Sketch view showing Marlowe Square, and route east along Holford Walk toward Rutherford College
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These new routes in the masterplan will align and link with a network of new spaces to ease connectivity through the Campus Heart and support journeys to and from its surroundings. A first step in this more ‘space positive’ approach will be the development of two new ‘Gateway Squares’ along the primary east-west route to define clear entrance points to the Campus Heart, to ensure a sense of arrival to the heart of the campus and to provide a more welcoming approach for visitors.

The first new square – ‘University Square’ – will be established at the western edge of the Campus Heart at the junction of University Road and Giles Lane. University Square will be a lively and predominantly hard-landscaped space that will provide space for markets and become a gathering place for pop-up shops and cafes. This would be the place where festivals are celebrated, so we would imagine this as the place for the annual Christmas Tree and carol singers, Autumn Harvest festivals, wine and beer festivals etc. This space will be surrounded (and defined) by new and existing buildings, with shops and cafes on their ground floor facing the square; cultural and leisure buildings, student services and a variety of other buildings will all provide similarly active frontages.

The second new square will be located at the east of the Campus Heart at its junction with St Stephens Hill to form a new eastern pedestrian entrance to the campus. St Stephen’s Square will not only provide a new ‘front door’ from the east but will also provide an entry point into the newly-designated Scheduled Ancient Monument to the east.

These two important new squares will serve as new landmark spaces to organise and orientate within the campus and provide a location for new landmark buildings at the ‘gateway’ to the heart of the campus. Both of these new squares will be composed of a traffic-calmed table to provide space for taxi drop-off and pick-up, bus stops and bus turning and cycle parking.

Between those two important new spaces, Holford Walk will serve as the main pedestrian way through the core. In this way, a clear coherent and hierarchical network of routes is created within the Campus Heart that will link with the rest of the University Estate and establishing a greater priority to walking and cycling routes.

In addition, a secondary network of east-west and north-south tertiary links will complete a grid supporting a very legible and pedestrian-dominant public realm throughout the campus. In order to facilitate this transformation, the numerous existing car parks will be relocated to the perimeter of the Campus Heart. Greater coherence in the layout of the campus will enable ease of movement through streets and spaces and between University buildings, reduce the reliance on signage, as well as facilitate a more efficient servicing and management of the campus. This clear network of routes will include primary streets, secondary streets and back streets to help the functioning and servicing of the campus by helping to define different uses; different paving types will define clear pedestrian routes from vehicular routes, provide appropriate locations for front doors as well as servicing routes, clarify the appropriate location for utilities and other infrastructure and improve maintenance cost efficiency.

The Campus Heart will be linked directly with the existing parklands to the south, and to the other character areas to the north and west, through a clear and coherent arrangement of new pedestrian and cycleways that emanate from the Templeman Library. Existing walking routes between Canterbury and the campus, although plentiful, are not well-defined or easy to find, especially for the occasional visitor. This is not helped by the fact that the entrance to Canterbury West train station is on south side of the rail lines, facing away from the University. These circumstances legislate towards greater unnecessary use of motor vehicles to undertake the journey between Canterbury and the campus.

The masterplan encourages opportunities for walking and cycling by the use landscaping and planting to emphasise and realign the established footpath and cycleway that runs south from the Campus Heart to Canterbury West Station. This existing route will form the principal traffic-free approach to the University (a key section of Route 1 of the National Cycle Network) by improved signing, lighting and paving. The route will be highly distinctive and visible from the station exit right into the heart of the University campus. As noted in the University Rise proposals above, this route anticipates the opening of a northern entrance into Canterbury West Station from Roper Road at some point in the future, as well as the regeneration and re-use of disused sections of the Crab &
Winkle Line trackbed (south section) as a sustainable transport route. To achieve these goals, both initiatives will require productive partnership working with Network Rail, the new Train Operating Company, CCC, KCC and relevant land owners.

Underneath the Campus Heart runs the disused Crab and Winkle tunnel, which local walking and cycling groups are keen to see re-opened up as a pedestrian and cycle route. This initiative has not been included within the scope of the current proposals and emphasis has been placed on keeping pedestrian and cycle routes on the ground surface. The viability, cost and engineering of a project such as this has not been explored within the scope of this masterplan study and the initiative will depend upon longer-term changes to the campus. However, the Framework Masterplan does nothing to prevent it happening in the future and we are happy to explore the views of the local community to assess whether this is something we should consider in the future.

To reinforce this master plan concept, other major spaces are created in the masterplan proposals. For example, the open space to the south of the University library – Templeman Gardens – will become a space where public events and gatherings can take place in Spring, and where students and staff can continue to take advantage of the incredible views over historic Canterbury. In addition, in the east of the Campus Heart a new square oriented north-south – Registry Court – will create a clearly articulated space to connect Woolf College, Darwin College and Tyler Court. This space will also make an important link to Darwin Gardens and the St Stephens Square beyond, which will create a new entrance sequence to the
University for arrival from the east. Both Darwin Gardens and Registry Court are defined by new infill development and new buildings to the north and south. Holford Walk continues east until it meets St Stephens Hill on the original (pre-1965) alignment of Giles Lane.

3 Built Environment:

It is instructive to note that the shapes and patterns set out in the Holford masterplan are still vividly present in the form and functioning of the campus today, despite the complete transformation of so many other aspects of the University and its organisation. The initial grouping of buildings that Holford created in the first phase still form the centre of the Campus Heart and the most important buildings still dominate and define the Campus layout today. The formal set-piece of Templeman Library, the Marlowe building and Eliot and Rutherford Colleges, arranged as they were as the ‘working heart’ of the University, established an impressive setting for the new library from the outset; the resultant large green space that these buildings enclose remains the great ceremonially space of the University which is retained and celebrated in today’s masterplan.

The later college buildings anticipated by Holford were also developed over time – including Darwin, Woolf and Keynes – and these are distributed strategically around the original campus ‘core’ to define the edge of the Campus Heart and contain the ‘core’ as the original masterplan envisaged. In addition, common academic and administrative buildings were subsequently developed around this original core, to be shared between all colleges. FE McWilliam’s totemic ‘Father Courage’ sculpture sits at the heart of this set-piece. The Framework Masterplan recognises the significance of this original grouping of buildings, sculpture and spaces and the heritage value that it brings to today’s Campus and retains it at the heart of the evolving Campus.
In overall terms and in support of the landscape and public realm improvements, the masterplan proposes that future growth is consolidated within the Campus Heart rather than continuing to allow development to spread across the land holdings, in order to protect and preserve the existing open space and to create an accessible, inclusive and more coherent campus.

The masterplan recognises that proposals for new development need to achieve a careful balance between built space to provide additional capacity and open space to enrich the campus. As part of the masterplan policy of consolidation therefore, the masterplan adopts a ‘space positive’ approach to the planning of the Campus Heart. Creating positive spatial relationships between the buildings in the masterplan is intended to enable a variety of characterful places, spaces and high quality external environments at the same time as defining the opportunities for new buildings to gradually increase the capacity of the University. New buildings should be located to create clearly define and activate the new legible routes described above.

This rethink of the masterplan strategy has created the chance to exploit a significant amount of under-utilised space within the area between the Jarman Building and Darwin College. The current ‘loose-fit’, low density character of the campus offers an opportunity to unlock significant development capacity at its heart and to allow sympathetic growth through its consolidation and reorganisation. Also, several of the existing buildings were only ever anticipated to provide temporary accommodation, and others are reaching the end of their useful life. This offers an opportunity for beneficial change. The masterplan identifies the potential to redevelop several existing buildings in the Campus Heart that are nearing the end of their practical life, into higher density up-to-date facilities. In addition, consolidation offers a number of benefits, including significant savings in energy, maintenance and management costs, while unlocking capacity in an environment mostly free of outside constraints.

Within the proposed building plots, the masterplan only proposes a very broad definition of future uses, but the masterplan aspiration is that an extensive mix of uses will be incorporated to include not only academic facilities, student housing and other related amenities, but also meeting spaces, leisure uses, shops, cafes and so on. The Holford Walk for example will be lined with shops, cafes, cultural and leisure buildings and a variety of other active frontages to support its role as a lively and active thoroughfare. In a complementary way, Holford Walk should also be considered as a priority location for new University ‘Centres of Excellence’ which will reinforce and support the Campus Heart as a centre of learning and privileged place for social interactions. A mix of uses in the campus heart will be of great benefit in creating activity and vibrancy throughout the public realm across a broad spectrum of the day/night and annual academic cycle.

Each plot should have a purpose that takes into consideration its location in the overall campus and its relationship to nearby spaces and amenities. To illustrate this point, our concept anticipates that new academic and student residential buildings will predominate in the heart of the campus, whereas we suggest a location for hotel and conferencing facilities outside the heart, to take advantage of an association with the University whilst at the same time maintaining a degree of independence.

4 Design Guidelines:

The Framework Masterplan proposes the following principles and improvements:

1 Public Realm:
   • East/west promenade route – Holford Walk – connecting University Square with Registry Court including replacement of the Locke shopping parade and Rutherford Annex
   • North/south promenade route through the centre of the Campus Heart from Woolf College West/Giles Lane car park to Eliot/Rutherford Colleges along alignment of Crab & Winkle line from Canterbury & Canterbury West station
   • Link with diagonal route to Sibson/Brotherhood Square
   • University Square, a new arrival square at the junction between University Avenue and Giles Lane
   • St Stephens Square, a new arrival square adjoining Darwin Gardens with bus/taxi stop/pull in
7 Landscape Character Areas: Proposals

- New Square in front of Library – Templeman Square to become a more formal University gathering space
- New garden square at Darwin Gardens created with the replacement of the 1980’s Darwin Houses
- New Registry Court, linking with Darwin Gardens/St Stephens Square
- New square created at Woolf West framed by new residential and academic buildings and set above Giles Lane decked car park set into the slope

2 Architecture:
- Buildings should be particularly responsive to setting and Holford’s original context
- New buildings should reinforce the established architectural character and share a family resemblance
- The predominant architectural character of the buildings should continue the pattern in this area of prefabricated modular construction using repetitive material components
- Front doors must address the main public spaces and pedestrian/cycle routes
- Light service deliveries and recycling collections should be made from shared surfaces into main entrance; heavier goods via service areas accessed from Giles Lane east

3 Building Uses:
- Building uses should vary and enrich the existing pattern of uses
- Appropriate uses include University academic uses, a Students Union and student support, student housing, shops, cafes, cultural and leisure buildings
- Decked carpark at Tyler Court accessed from Old Giles Lane junction with St. Stephens Hill

4 Building Height:
- Building heights should vary between 3 to 4 storeys and should sit comfortably within their neighbouring context.
- Buildings should sit within the existing treeline/skyline when viewed from middle and long distances

5 Building Form:
- Buildings should be developed along the ridgeline or on flat land within the ridgeline ‘plateau’
- Buildings should be particularly responsive to the setting in the Campus Heart and the historic landscape context of this character area
- Buildings should be arranged to enclose and define a coordinated and coherent public realm of streets, squares, courtyards & gardens

6 Building Materials:
- Building materials to be responsive to their setting in the Campus Heart in texture, colour and hue
- They should be responsive to modular construction/character, including brick/masonry/timber/natural metal finishes
- New buildings should be finished in muted colours to lessen any impact on distant views
- Careful attention and detailing to larger areas of glazing should be given to avoid reflectance/glare in long and medium views from the historic city
- Roofs should be flat or pitched and incorporate (wherever possible) green and/or blue roofs, roof gardens, photovoltaic/solar/thermal collectors for sustainable energy provision
- Stepped/garden/landscaped roofs could be employed to sit the buildings comfortably within the landscape

7 Early Wins:
- East/west promenade route: Holford Walk
- New arrival square: University Square

7.5 Landscape Character Area Proposals: Sarre Penn Valley

The Sarre Penn Valley is a great asset to the campus in providing a green setting to the north of the University as well as a more rural landscape character, which is a major part of the University’s attractiveness to students, academic staff and visitors to the University. The Sarre Penn Valley contributes to the University’s reputation of a very verdant campus and offers an attractive alternative landscape character to University Rise. Similarly, the Sarre
Penn Valley provides a punctuation in the landscape between the campus and the outlying villages of Blean and Tyler Hill.

reaching its full potential in terms of landscape and recreational value; the abundance of green space within the Sarre Penn Valley is relatively inaccessible with the exception of the existing bridleway along the Old Salt Road. Whilst the Sarre Penn Valley lacks any significant built development, there is still significant potential to improve both the natural, built and cultural dimensions of this character area. In terms of amenity value, the Sarre Penn Valley could provide a much more valuable resource for exercise, good health and wellbeing if the green spaces were made more freely accessible to the University community and visitors alike.

The masterplan proposals therefore maintain the overall agricultural landscape whilst developing and improving the natural, built and cultural dimensions of this character area. It is also interesting to note that the University hitherto has naturally orientated itself towards Canterbury and the parkland slopes of the Stour Valley. The University somewhat turns its back on these communities and the approach from Blean and Tyler Hill at present is through the University’s ‘back door’. The masterplan opens up another aspect to the north such that the University has two frontages, which gives the University a more open outward looking aspect. Likewise, the masterplan aims to create strong connections with its neighbouring communities all four sides of the University.

1 Landscape Enhancements:

The Sarre Penn Valley is one of the key landscape and ecological features within the Campus and yet many of the students appear unaware of its presence. This is unsurprising judging by the relatively overgrown condition of the public footpath that follows the stream as it flows across the campus.

At present, the slopes of the Sarre Penn Valley is primarily given over to agricultural food production. In terms of biodiversity, the existing meadows and hedgerows provide extensive foraging opportunities for pollinators which in turn help pollinate various crop species. However, the existing historic hedgerows that surround these fields are fragmented and disconnected. The masterplan proposes to restore the hedgerows to create wildlife corridors from the Blean Woodlands to the west and across the campus to the fields south of the village of Tyler Hill. Management and restoration of the hedgerows will enhance the historic landscape character of the area as well as enhance the potential biodiversity. Existing woodland pockets should also be managed to diversify habitats and promote biodiversity.

There is also a need for better eco-connectivity between areas of wildlife habitat through reinforcing and conserving the hedgerow and shelterbelt networks. For example, the Sarre Penn stream itself is also a major asset for wildlife and it provides a refuge for a variety of fish and invertebrates. The masterplan proposes to preserve the connectivity of the bankside vegetation along the Sarre Penn Valley as an eco-highway for fauna in the area. Good management of the bankside vegetation in the future should avoid full-tunnel shading to the stream which currently exists. Designating the stream as a UoK nature reserve would provide it with identity and increase usage.

The masterplan also proposes to create connected ponds and wetlands to better reconnect the stream to its floodplain, diversifying the wetland environment, and also helping attenuate flood water along the stream. These will create new wildlife habitats and promote biodiversity. A larger pond will provide a reservoir for irrigation of the sports pitches during summer months, thereby reducing the requirements for mains water; careful consultation will be required with the Environment Agency and no measures should be undertaken that might diminish the stream’s existing value for Bullhead, Eels and potentially spawning Trout.

Many opportunities exist to ecologically enhance this land in terms of biodiversity and showcase the principles of sustainable farming. In keeping with local strategies, the ambition is for Skylarks and Yellowhammers to be singing from every field and hedgerow respectively. Perhaps even the Turtle Dove and Brown Hare, two of the England’s rarest farmland species, could be attracted to the campus.
Figure 69: Landscape Character Area: Sarre Penn Valley existing layout
Figure 70: Landscape Character Area: Sarre Penn Valley proposed masterplan layout
Figure 71: Landscape Character Area: Sarre Penn Valley proposed masterplan layout showing option to re-provide Blean School within University land
2 Public Realm & Network of Movement:

The Movement & Transport Strategy seeks to reduce dependency on private cars, to minimise the impact of road traffic, and to promote a wider range of options for movement that are less constrained by the limitations of road transport. Furthermore, the technology of vehicles is changing rapidly. Advances in electric power for vehicles is causing a blurring of boundaries between different forms of private or personalised transport. This rapidly expanding spectrum of vehicles, covering all types of movement, from wheelchairs to delivery vehicles to people transporters, requires a new vocabulary to predict and describe a new generation of route types.

The new shared routes that will provide access to the small clusters of development shown in the Sarre Penn Valley will therefore be designed principally for pedestrian and bicycle use, plus lightweight electric vehicles. Provision will be made for parking for people with disabilities and their vehicles, also for vehicles delivering goods and removing waste/recycling. Parking will be restricted to these particular functions. The low-key nature of these buildings would determine that all vehicular access could be achieved using the small-scale, electronic University vehicles or the occasional specialist disabled/delivery vehicle as appropriate.

More generally, existing movement to and within this character area for members of the University community and the people who live locally is limited, and access must be improved to the land for amenity, sustainable transport and other health and wellbeing benefits.

Fortuitously, this character area is bordered in the west by historic routes which have the potential to increase access. To the west, the bridleway along the Old Salt Road (part of NCR 1) is well-used and well-maintained and is very popular with students and members of the public.

The remaining network of footpaths extending across this character area are often badly signposted or overgrown; the masterplan proposes that this network footpaths are cleared and extended, and new cycle routes introduced so that staff, students and the local community gain significant access to, and additional amenity value from, the whole of this character area.

The Sarre Penn stream could also become a major public amenity. Although an existing public footpath follows the course of the stream across the University campus, the valley bottom is heavily overgrown and densely shaded by mature trees and shrubs, and there is limited access to this part of the campus. The masterplan proposes to improve access to the footpath along the stream, and to upgrade it to include a cycle route, so it can become part of the wider network of walking and cycle routes within the campus as part of a policy to provide a wider range of health and wellbeing benefits. The footpath across the centre of the Sarre Penn Valley would remain modest in scale, with a surface treatment to allow use in all weathers. Minor modifications to steeper sections, and the detailing of bridges and culverts, will allow the route to be used for bicycles, electric wheelchairs and maintenance vehicles. In the wider context, these proposals will also provide a safe, traffic-free connection for walking and cycling between Tyler Hill, the campus and Canterbury city centre.
Wider afield, the masterplan recognises that Tyler Hill Road, the existing road along the University’s northern boundary, is unsafe for pedestrians and cyclists because of the narrowness of the lane and the numerous bends in the road that make long-distance visibility difficult. The masterplan therefore proposes a series of new linked footpaths adjacent to Tyler Hill Road. These footpaths will be created on University-owned land just inside the existing fence-line and hedgerows alongside Tyler Hill Road as a safe walking and cycling route between the villages of Blean and Tyler Hill. The footpath will cross the road at two points to enable a continuous route between the two villages.

To the north of Blean Church, a new network of paths is proposed on University-owned land to connect between Blean Village and Blean Church. It is hoped that by doing this, it will be possible to walk and cycle between the village and the Church. In addition, these footpaths will connect to the existing bridleway along the Old Salt Road with a pedestrian-crossing across Tyler Hill Road, making it possible to walk and cycle between Blean Village and Blean School along a traffic-free route.

The Circular Cycleway: By connecting all these routes together, the opportunity exists to create a new ‘Circular Cycleway’ encompassing the northern half of the University landholding.
Figure 74: Concept drawing of the proposed ‘Circular Cycleway’, a 5 kilometre walking, jogging and cycling route around the Campus. Inset: An alternative 7.5 kilometre route
7 Landscape Character Areas: Proposals

By linking the Old Salt Road, the former Crab & Winkle railway line, the existing cycle route through Park Wood and the new cycle route along the Sarre Penn stream, a new linked cycleway, walking and jogging route is created across this character area. The northern section of the ‘Circular Cycleway’ will be completed by the new cycle route alongside Tyler Hill Road. Various attractions including picnic areas, viewing points, signage and pocket nature areas (small areas of habitat enhancement between the cycleway and adjoining farmland) will all add variety and interest. This will ultimately link to much larger circular cycleway, walking and jogging route linking with dedicated routes created through the Campus Heart and the other character areas.

3 Built Environment:

The Framework Masterplan recognises the high value of this character area as predominantly open amenity space and agricultural land, to balance with the consolidation and intensification of the Campus Heart. The masterplan is intended to conserve and enrich the natural landscape features of our campus, including in the areas identified within the Sarre Penn character area; the proposals therefore include only very limited development within the Sarre Penn Valley as follows:

- Small-scale buildings intended for use as quiet academic activities slightly apart from the campus heart; appropriate activities in this area might include a centre for quiet study, a writer’s retreat, remote meeting/seminar spaces that could be leased commercially, spaces for nature/agricultural studies and hides for wildlife observation.
- Small-scale buildings intended for use as start-up business clusters.
- Greater environmental and ecological diversity as part of the University’s offer of a green campus environment to attract students, staff and visitors.
- A wider network of walking, cycling and jogging routes as part of providing for greater health and well-being for students, staff and the local community.

For these reasons, only modest clusters of built development (plus a modest provision for parking for those with disabilities and delivery vehicles) have been included in the Framework Masterplan to fulfil these ambitions, along with the opening up of new and existing footpaths and cycle routes, the establishment of new eco-habitats such as ponds and wetlands, restored hedgerows and more tree planting. Income generated by such accommodation might in turn help to pay for improvements to this part of the campus, such as new footpaths and cycle tracks and ecological improvements. The most northerly of the 3 new development areas on the masterplan represents the possible re-planning/rebuilding of Hothe Court Farm, which sits adjacent to Tyler Hill Road. Such a proposal does not necessarily mean the closure of the farm but might include improvement and closer links to academia. Either way, development of this area would be designed so as to not generate any addition traffic on Tyler Hill Road.

The Masterplan also includes an option for a new Blean Primary School on land that is currently within the ownership of the University. The new school in this option would be located further east from its current position, and therefore further away from the traffic-noise and air-pollution of the Whitstable Road. The school would face a new entrance square on its west side which would accommodate drop-off and pick-up by parents and their cars, which would obviate the need to access the school via Park Wood Road (as many parents currently do) and thereby reduce non-University traffic travelling through the campus. To the east, the new school would look over the University playing fields, which could be used by the school by arrangement with the University. Under this option, the new school would be funded in part by income generated by new housing built on school land adjacent to the Whitstable Road.

This option could also provide the benefit of a new vehicle link between Park Wood Road and Whitstable Road. This would provide controlled access for buses from Blean to Canterbury on a regular basis to create more efficient access for public transport and reduce journey times and distances. It would also provide an additional access route for emergency vehicles and provide more direct and temporary access to the University sports facilities.
Heritage: The clusters of development proposed in the masterplan have been located some distance from the existing Roman/Medieval Scheduled Monument and Listed Church so as not to affect the setting of these structures.

To the east, the masterplan proposes that the vegetated strip that represents the route of the former Crab and Winkle railway line is opened up for greater amenity use and to provide a pedestrian route to Tyler Hill to the north. By bringing back into use this part of the former Crab and Winkle Railway, connectivity will be increased and improved between the northern and southern areas of the campus, and access improved between the Campus and the surrounding local communities.

We recognise that for many residents the disused railway forms part of a valuable natural habitat and local wildlife site. Because this route has been largely disused by people for many years, the footpath along the dismantled railway line is currently heavily overgrown and unsuitable for walking and cycling. Also, it has become populated by wildlife and Nightingales are regularly heard in the wooded shaw. In opening up this route to easier access for people, excessive paving and lighting will be avoided and planting should be dense to minimise the impact on wildlife; advice will be sought from local nature groups with detailed knowledge of the area’s flora and fauna on how this might be achieved successfully.

The use of the former railway trackbed north of the tunnel depends upon longer-term changes to the main Giles Lane car park, and the ability to provide a lift or other vertical connection between Giles Lane and the trackbed level. With such a connection, the route has the potential to provide a pedestrian and bicycle link to Tyler Hill. Our proposals would transform this historic feature into a new, dedicated sustainable transport network to link the northern areas with the Campus Heart and to encourage more people to connect with the natural environment by making use of the route.

4 Design Guidelines:

The Framework Masterplan proposes the following principles and improvements:

1 Public Realm:

- A new north/south route to connect the three new development clusters between Hothe Court Farm and Park Wood Road adjacent to the new Sports Centre
- Track surfaces will be formed of compressed hogging or gravel, or asphalt/paving on steeper gradients
- Track widths will typically be between 2-4 metres and divided by central median on steep sections with barriers to limit use by larger vehicles
- The opening up and improvements to existing footpaths generally to enhance access by all
- A new east/west cycle route created alongside the Sarre Penn stream between Canterbury Hill Road and the Old Salt Road
- New routes on University land following Tyler Hill Road to create a safe east west pedestrian and cycle connection between Blean and Tyler Hill
- New routes on University land to create safe pedestrian and cycle connection between Blean and Blean Church and Blean School
- Front doors must address the main public spaces, pedestrian and cycle routes
- Light service deliveries and recycling collections should be made from new shared surface route connecting to Park Wood Road

2 Spaces & Places for Education:

- Clusters of development identified on the masterplan located in the Sarre Penn Valley

3 Architecture:

- New buildings to reinforce the established rural architectural character and share a family resemblance as coherent clusters of buildings in the landscape
- Building should be particularly responsive to the rural/agricultural setting and historic context
4 Building Uses:
- Building uses should vary to enrich the existing network of University buildings.
- Appropriate uses include University academic use such as a centre for quiet research/study, writer's retreats, remote meeting/seminar spaces that could be leased commercially, commercial workspace, spaces for nature/agricultural studies and hides for wildlife observation.
- Car parking for people of disability screened within pockets of trees and screening hedges.

5 Building Height:
- Building heights should vary between 1 to 1.5 storeys and should be designed to sit comfortably within their neighbouring context when viewed from middle and long distances.
- Buildings should nestle comfortably into the existing contours and use pockets of trees and hedges for screening.

6 Building Form:
- Building form should be particularly responsive to the rural/agricultural setting and the historic landscape context of this character area, and sit comfortably as a coherent collection of buildings in the landscape.
- Buildings should be arranged in clusters or courtyard developments to echo farmstead environments.

7 Building Materials:
- Building materials to be responsive to the rural/agricultural setting in texture, colour and hue and should be predominantly 'natural' in appearance, including brick/masonry/timber/natural metal finishes.
- Roofs should be pitched and incorporate green and/or blue roofs, roof gardens, photovoltaic/solar/thermal collectors for sustainable energy provision.

8 Potential Early Wins:
- A new north/south route to connect Hothe Court Farm and Park Wood Road adjacent to the new Sports Centre.
- A new east/west cycle route created alongside the Sarre Penn stream between Canterbury Hill Road and the Old Salt Road.
- New footpaths/cycle routes on University land following Tyler Hill Road between Blean and Tyler Hill.
- New footpaths/cycle routes on University land between Blean and Blean Church and Blean School.
Figure 75: Concept sketch: The masterplan incorporates a new and more legible ‘mental map’ of the Campus.
8 The Framework Masterplan
8.1 Summary Overview of the Framework Masterplan

In preparing the masterplan for the future campus development, it has been necessary to address a wide variety of issues, ranging from the many pressing practical issues facing the University day by day to the bigger picture of the future of Universities in our education system. As noted above, the future University Campus must adapt and evolve in order to satisfy a range of contemporary expectations that have developed since the time of the 1965 Holford masterplan: the imperative for a more sustainable attitude toward our planet, greater competition between Universities and therefore greater demand for ‘placemaking’ in University environments, the academic and business worlds moving towards shared flexible, inclusive and inspiring working environments, a growing reliance upon public transport by environmentally conscious and financially sensitive millennial students and staff, and the evolution of retail and other commercial activities leading to a growing interest to co-locate with the University.

In describing the masterplan proposals, a good deal of focus has been placed upon the relationship between the Campus and the landscape within which it is set; the variety of distinct but connected landscape character areas described has provided us with a direction for developing the future proposals. This approach has enabled us to give regard to a wide range of issues such as the future provision of sufficient space of the appropriate type, the design of open spaces, improvements to the landscape and its biodiversity, improving access arrangements for pedestrians and traffic locally and addressing the experience and aspirations of the surrounding local communities. It is also essential that the campus as a whole, during every phase of its development, becomes a coherent expression of the University’s objectives and values.

However, there are also a number of holistic masterplan issues that need to be addressed, which are over-arching across the whole University and which need a whole-campus overview. Such issues include:

- The University Academic Strategy
- The Approach to Legibility and Coherence, and
- The Movement and Transport Strategy

8.2 The University Academic Strategy

The recent document published by the University titled ‘Kent 2025: Refreshing the University Strategy’ includes an important section itemising the challenges facing the higher-education sector in relation to the University of Kent and why they need to respond. The document reaffirms a commitment the founding University mission to become a great civic University, with a distinctive and fresh approach to high calibre teaching, learning, inclusion and inter-disciplinarity in a modern, collegial environment. The document goes on to set out an inspirational vision for 2025 to support education and research as well as social, economic, cultural, intellectual and public life in ways that will make Kent one of the leading civic Universities.

For the Framework Masterplan to be successful therefore, the University Campus must evolve to become the expression of these commitments and values ensuring that the entire academic community, as well as those who visit the campus, are inspired by the high ideals and values of the University of Kent. For the high objectives of the University Strategy are to be realised, where facility and students work in accord with these core values, it is the campus on which the University’s Strategic objectives of delivering excellence in research, education and engagement with society can be made operational and visible. The University of Kent Canterbury Campus must therefore be considered as more than merely the sum of the buildings and the spaces between them.

Figure 76: Proposed Framework Masterplan for the Canterbury Campus showing the landscape context
8.3 The Architectural and Heritage Strategy

Consideration of the rich landscape and built heritage and how it is embedded in the Campus has been an important factor in the composition of the Framework Masterplan. The importance of this component of the masterplan can only be appreciated and understood by taking an overview across the full history of the area, including the evolution of the pre-University landscape in which it is located through to the contribution made by the University Campus itself.

The landscape patterns dating from before the founding of the University are still legible and profoundly influence the arrangement of the University today, almost as a printer’s palimpsest. The origins of the University are clearly rooted in the geology, geography, topography and history of the landscape that it inhabits, and revealed in the etymology of the place names. Everything is there for a reason, and in order to shape the future direction of a place successfully.

The University campus was created in 1965 in open farmland on the ridgeline overlooking the Great Stour Valley and the historic city of Canterbury. However, evidence of the pre-University habitation of this landscape goes back into pre-history, evidenced by the remains from the Bronze Age and Palaeolithic eras found during the construction of Turing College. More detailed evidence of habitation locally in the Roman and Medieval eras is acknowledged in the Scheduled Monuments and Listed Buildings within the Campus, noted at length earlier in this document.

The landscape setting of woodlands, farm fields, hedgerows and country lanes, together with some enduring place names, are all part of a memory of the past that were integrated into the campus and continue to endure today in the University environment. The built heritage from the areas agrarian past includes Beverley Farmhouse and Hothe Court Farmhouse and accompanying field pattern, plus the houses and cottages along Giles Lane (Rothford, Tanglewood & Olive Cottages). The group of buildings that remains includes a record of Kentish vernacular farmhouses, farm buildings, oast houses and cottages all of which were integrated within the original masterplan vision. Many of these
buildings were adapted to provide some of the first University accommodation, including offices and administrative space in Beverley Farm and living space in Hothe Court. As part of Holford’s original plan, the eastern section of Giles Lane was relocated to divert traffic around to the north of the campus heart. Sadly, as part of this realignment of Giles Lane, Brotherhood Farm was sacrificed; it was this farm that provided much of the land on which the early campus was developed.

The industrial era is also represented by the Canterbury and Whitstable Railway line which dates back to 1830; this is thought to be the first ever railway in the south of England and possibly the first railway in the world to convey both passengers and goods traffic regularly by mechanical power. Part of this line runs under the Campus in a disused tunnel owned by the University. Holford’s masterplan made little or no reference to this important historic feature. Indeed, little attention was paid to this structure until a collapse in a part of the tunnel caused severe damage to the Cornwallis Building in July 1974. The tunnel was subsequently filled with cement/fly ash grout to prevent further damage to the campus.

Although this landscape has been inhabited for thousands of years, the landscape and built heritage is enriched by the dramatic intervention of the University itself, conceived as it was by one of this country’s leading architects and town planners. This rich heritage contributes greatly to the quality of place that the campus has become and the result is much greater than the sum of its parts.

The Holford masterplan was of its time, and a thoughtful and dramatic response to post war needs; it could even be described in some senses as adventurous and innovative, exploring as it did the fusion of traditional models with new ideas emanating from the urban and architectural theories of that era. Individual college buildings were to be located in a landscape setting, a departure from the historic precedents of Oxford or Cambridge where college buildings are integrated into the town. Each college was to be designed as a self-contained building expressed through a rigorous geometrical plan of interlocking squares and spaces. Students would live, work, eat and enjoy their social activities. The hope was to promote sociability and interdisciplinary exchange.
Figure 79: Collapse of the historic Canterbury and Whitstable railway tunnel in July 1974 that caused extensive damage to the Cornwallis Building
Figure 80: William Holford’s plan for the University, June 1964
Figure 81: Buildings impacted by the masterplan; buildings with historical status and those buildings to be removed or replaced
It is instructive to note that patterns set out in the Holford masterplan are still vividly present in the form and functioning of the campus today, despite the complete transformation of so many other aspects of the University and its organisation. However, recent growth in the campus has been delivered without strict adherence to the Holford’s original guiding plan; although buildings have been added to the campus within the confines of the original campus heart, they have also begun to appear on available sites within the wider campus. In the process, investment in new buildings, spaces and facilities is eroding functionality and legibility of the campus as a whole, and this in turn is beginning to erode the functionality and quality of faculty and student experience of learning and living at the University of Kent. The current Framework Masterplan is therefore taking a big-picture overview of the Canterbury campus, including a consideration of what is of value in the original masterplan, projections for future growth, appropriate use of the larger land ownership, and the quality of the campus as a place:

1. Holford’s proposal for the Campus Heart (with Templeman Library at its centre) as the working ‘core’ surrounded by independent college buildings remains the core idea and is reinforced in the Framework Masterplan. The masterplan also retains most of the current buildings.

2. Holford’s overall organisational structure of a simple grid of streets, spaces and places at the heart of the campus is also retained, supporting a very legible and pedestrian-dominant public realm throughout the campus heart.

3. The grouping of Templeman Library, the Marlowe Building and Eliot and Rutherford Colleges is retained as the core of the Campus Heart.

4. The large green space defined and enclosed by this grouping of buildings is celebrated in the masterplan and expressed as the major green space in the campus – ‘Templeman Gardens’ will become a space where public events and gatherings can take place in Spring, and where students and staff can continue to take advantage of the incredible views over historic Canterbury.

5. A tiered and more formal landscape is introduced to the sloping land between Eliot & Rutherford Colleges to create a transitional space between the more formal garden layout of the Campus Heart.
Figure 82: Figure ground drawing of the University campus superimposed over a contour map
Figure 83: Figure ground drawing of the University campus superimposed over a contour map; the masterplan proposals will consolidate future development along the ridgeline.
and the parklands to the south. The new tiered garden gives improved connections between the Campus Heart, the new entrance square and Tyler Court student residences.

6 The open spaces to the south of the Campus Heart are retained in the masterplan to provide a green setting to the University as well as a landscape demarcation from the City. Holford’s proposal that the layout of colleges should extend down University Road has been abandoned in preference for intensification of development along the ridgeline.

7 Lord Holford intended the experience of arrival along University Road to be a spectacular entry point to the campus. Under the Framework Masterplan proposals, University Road will be transformed from a standard estate road to respond more sympathetically to the parkland character of University Rise in its approach to the campus heart along the renamed ‘University Avenue’, very much in the English picturesque tradition.

8 Beverley Farmhouse will continue to enjoy an open aspect of green landscape to the south; the introduction of a new hotel and conference centre nearby (to the south of Turing College) will provide an opportunity for Beverley Farmhouse to develop its existing overnight accommodation into a boutique adjunct to the hotel and perhaps also a restaurant in this unique historic environment.

9 At Hothe Court, in order to create a new sense of place and distinct purpose to this part of the campus, the masterplan proposes the development of a new ‘Centre of Excellence’ as a destination at Hothe Court. This concept will preserve and reuse the existing listed and historic buildings such as the farmhouse, the barn and the oast houses, and transform historic Hothe Court such that it once again plays an important role in the University Estate. This concept will sit comfortably alongside the restoration of the former Hothe Court kitchen garden currently underway with the development of the Community Oasis Garden.

10 The re-opening of the historic Crab and Winkle tunnel as a pedestrian and cycle route has not been included within the scope of the current proposals and emphasis has been placed on keeping pedestrian and cycle routes on the ground surface. However, the Framework Masterplan does nothing to prevent it happening in the future and we are happy to explore the views of the local community to assess whether this is something we should consider in the future.

The Heritage Trail: In addition, the masterplan proposals include a major new promenade – ‘Holford Walk’ connecting east-west along the ridgeline to create a more unified and connected campus. As part of this new pedestrian/cycle link, the original (more southerly) alignment of Giles Lane east will be restored. This promenade will be emphasised by an avenue of blossom trees that will celebrate Spring and the approach of the conclusion of the academic year. The promenade will also form part of a circular network of pedestrian and cycle routes that will link the heritage assets and celebrate the landscape and built heritage of the Campus.

This circular route will begin in the core of the Campus Heart, where Holford’s Legacy is retained and celebrated by the restoration of Templeman Gardens framed by the Templeman Library and Eliot and Rutherford Colleges. The route will take the visitor in a clockwise direction along the new promenade to the west, past the original Physics Laboratory (Marlowe Building), through the new central University Square and on through to Keynes College and Turing College, where the route will divert to visit Beverley Farmhouse and to enjoy the magnificent view of Canterbury Cathedral. Moving northwest, the route will pass through the Ancient Woodland of Park Wood on its way to historic Hothe Court Farm, Barn, Oast Houses and kitchen garden. The route will then travel north along the Old Salt Road and cross the Sarre Penn Valley, where the visitor can enjoy the Listed Blean Church and the adjacent Scheduled Monument. The heritage route will then turn eastwards across the farm fields until it connects with the footpath and cycle route along the trackbed of the former ‘Crab & Winkle’ Railway Line. Travelling south along this route, the visitor will see the Grade II* listed North Portal of the former Canterbury & Whitstable Railway tunnel. Re-entering the Campus Heart at Woolf College, the route will continue down to the entrance to the Gulbenkian Theatre, where it will turn eastwards and pass through the gardens of Darwin College. On arrival at St Stephens Hill, the route will pass through a new entrance square welcoming
Figure 84: Proposed Heritage Trail around the Campus
Figure 85: Contemporary views of the University Campus emphasising the importance of quality spaces between buildings
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visitors to the campus, and also forming an entrance portal to the new Scheduled Monument of the Tyler Hill Medieval Pottery and Tile Industry. The route will continue from here along the historic alignment of Giles Lane, where it will return the visitor to Templeman Gardens in the heart of the Campus, surrounded by the legacy of the 1965 Holford planning and architecture.

Holford’s masterplan concept was to create a new built environment independent from its host city. The University was conceived as an idealised academic community upon the Giles Lane ridgeline overlooking Canterbury to the south. There is visual connectivity between the two communities at the same time as physical separation. This relative isolation has been eroded over time as the University has consolidated on the ridgeline and the neighbouring communities around the University have edged ever closer to the University. Also, a significant number of University students and staff have settled in the area. As a result, the University has become inextricably linked with the city and with the surrounding communities. A very important part of the masterplan thinking is a direct response to this evolutionary process, in that it makes the campus more welcoming and accessible to all. Legibility is improved within the University itself and connectivity is opened up in every direction around the campus perimeter. Through this process, Holford’s masterplan and the University as a whole are more fully integrated with the city, the surrounding communities, the outlying villages and the wider landscape.

8.4 A Rich Mix of Spaces & Uses

The masterplan provides a clear ‘framework’ or ‘template’ within which buildings and spaces can be developed as and when needs dictate and budgets allow, and the right balance between built development and open space can be struck at every stage of growth and development. By developing the character areas and emphasising the differences between them, the masterplan will deliver a more structured and coherent campus layout, as well guiding the creation of a great variety of new spaces and places between buildings for the enjoyment and productivity of the whole University community.

The key will be to create a green campus of great variety and diversity, and might include some or all of these:
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- Formal spaces for ceremonial use
- Planting that frames views of Canterbury and the Cathedral
- A ‘high street’ of shops and cafes along ‘Holford Walk’
- Informal, relaxed spaces, quiet quadrangles and spaces for social interaction and debate
- A ‘Speakers Corner’
- Spaces for outdoor gymnasia, children’s play and outdoor performances of drama and music
- Spaces for displaying art, which are ‘curated’ as an outdoor gallery
- Spaces for outdoor festivals, markets and entertainment
- Spaces for outdoor study and teaching spaces
- Eco-spaces that generate greater ecological and amenity interest
- A biodiverse and ecologically designed wetland feature to provide a new focal landscape attraction and where a diversity of flora and fauna could thrive
- Gardens of floral displays
- ‘Productive’ gardens, such as allotments and orchards
- Planting that change with the seasons
- Trees with strong autumnal colours to welcome students to a new academic year
- An avenue of blossom trees to celebrate graduation in Spring
- Trees and shrubs decorated with lights to brighten the dark winter nights
- Spaces and courts for a wider variety of outdoor sports and games

By bringing a focus on the laying out of a wonderful new and enhanced public realm, the masterplan will distinguish the University of Kent as a campus of unparalleled landscape character. Already one of the greenest campuses around, set in the most wonderful parklands and surrounded by some of Kent’s most attractive countryside, the University is taking the opportunity to create a clear and unique brand as a great place to be for potential new students and staff in an increasingly competitive market. In this way, the University has the potential to not only secure sufficient expansion space to suit its future needs, it also has the opportunity to build a reputation as ‘The University of Kent in the Garden of England’.

Figure 86: Sketch view showing Templeman Gardens in the foreground retaining important views of historic Canterbury between Eliot and Rutherford Colleges
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Figure 87: Sketch view showing the new University Square at the junction between University Avenue and Giles Lane. This space will mark an important arrival square within the Campus and provide a space for gatherings for the University community.
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8.5 The Approach to Legibility and Coherence

The University of Kent's Canterbury campus was developed around a network of roads, routes and paths. This network has evolved over time and covers a spectrum of lines of movement ranging from the busy strategic roads such as Whitstable Road, to informal paths criss-crossing the University Campus and extending to the surrounding landscapes. During the lifetime of the campus, the simplicity and coherence of Lord Holford’s original plan has inevitably become compromised by the imperative for growth experienced over the 50+ years since the University was established.

In considering how such a network might evolve and extend in future years, and in the process become better connected and more legible, it is necessary to consider how to adapt the underlying movement structure, as well as which parts of the network are likely to remain fully trafficked roads, and which routes are capable of adaptation to different roles and character:

- University Road is likely to remain the principle approach for traffic approaching the University from the City Centre to the south
- The major east-west ridgeline route through the estate, Giles Lane, is a publicly adopted highway and likely to remain an integral part of the surrounding public highway network. Changes to the surface treatment, edge detailing and signing may enhance the relationship between Giles Lane and the surrounding University context, but the nature of Giles Lane as a road, open to general traffic, is likely to continue
- There is little appetite and few opportunities within the immediate surroundings for new large-scale, strategic highways to change the pattern of traffic movement. None are planned or proposed, and the topography, landscape and pattern of routes limit the likelihood of significant new road building in the immediate surroundings for the foreseeable future
- As we have already identified, vehicles dominate the campus both in terms of roads and areas parking. The apparent lack of alternative transport modes means that visitors and many members of staff drive to the campus on a daily basis. Car parks are distributed across the campus, including many in the campus heart. The daily search for a
The Framework Masterplan proposal for improvements to the University movement network is designed to create a clear and legible structure of key lines of connectivity, which will help visitors to easily form a ‘mental map’ of the campus and anticipate emerging and predicted changes in future vehicle use, design and controls. These can be summarised as follows:

- **A change in character for University Road from a largely utilitarian length of highway to ‘University Avenue’ – a distinctive tree-lined street, interspersed and punctuated by a sequence of places where routes intersect with the avenue.**
- **The extension and completion of a consistent east-west traffic-free pedestrian and cycle route across the campus heart from Turing College in the west to Darwin College in the east.**
- **A new and largely traffic-free north-south pedestrian and cycle route running at ground level (and as far as possible) along the former ‘Crab & Winkle’ railway line, to connect the campus heart to Canterbury in the south and Tyler Hill Road in the north.**
- **More prominence for, and greater use of, the Old Salt Road as a coherent traffic-free pedestrian and cycle route link between Blean Village, Blean Church, Blean School and the Oaks Nursery.**
- **A new controlled vehicular connection into the campus from Whitstable Road, linking the south end of the Old Salt Road to Park Wood Road. This will allow buses to enter and leave the campus using Park Wood Road, and allow vehicle entry to the carpark south of the Oaks Nursery.**

The Framework Masterplan therefore envisages the adaptation of the campus to create a clear and legible structure of movement along key lines of connectivity and a new generation of route types. Such routes respond to a movement strategy that promotes greater connectivity for all throughout the University Estate, giving much greater emphasis and status to walking, bicycling and small-scale, slow-speed vehicles, with less reliance on conventionally-powered cars and lorries. The approach takes account of current changes in technology, and the potential for a secondary fleet of electric vehicles managed by the University Estate. Many of the routes will be capable of carrying occasional conventional motor traffic, but such use will be subject to access control systems.

### 8.6 The Movement, Transport & Car Parking Strategy

Connections form the foundation of a successful University. The expansion of knowledge and skills depends upon the ability of individuals and organisations to connect and interact with one another and to engage with an ever-expanding body of knowledge. Such connections, both physical and virtual, provide the University with the essential structure for its activities of learning and knowledge distribution.

The Framework Masterplan addresses such connections to achieve a variety of goals:

- to support the long-term aspirations of the University
- to align the future development of the University’s estate with the broader transport objectives of the Canterbury City Council and Kent County Council, and
• to maximise opportunities for connections within the University, between the University and the City, and within the wider regional, national and international context

Whilst recognising that the motor vehicle in its various forms is likely to continue to play a major transport role well into the future, the Framework Masterplan seeks to reduce dependency on private cars, to minimise the impact of road traffic, and to promote a wide range of forms of movement that are less constrained by the environmental, spatial and capacity limitations of road transport. In seeking to reduce dependency wherever possible on the private car, the masterplan also builds upon the long-established and considered University Travel Plan.

Shifting the Movement & Transport Narrative:

The Movement and Transport strategy that underpins the Framework Masterplan places sustainable travel firmly at the top of the travel hierarchy. It contains a suite of walking, cycling and public transport improvements all aimed towards reducing the historic dominance of the car within the campus. These schemes are listed in full in the Movement and Transport Strategy and in summary they include (amongst others):

• new and improved east-west and north-south walking and cycling routes and crossing points within the Campus and wider Estate
• implementation of infrastructure, wayfinding and signage that increases the visual prominence of non-car modes within the Campus
• creation of a closer visual relationship between the bus turnaround and the Campus Heart, delivering high quality modal interchanges
• supporting wider connectivity improvements for walking and cycling beyond the Campus, for example routes to Canterbury West Rail Station and Sturry Road Park and Ride
• a new link to Whitstable Road to deliver improved permeability of the Campus for bus services, and
• a commitment to harness opportunities provided by technology as it develops and expands, for example electric vehicles, electric bicycles and in the long term, autonomous transit opportunities

The timing of these measures are summarised in the supporting Movement and Transport Strategy document by PBA/Stantec.

In the recent past, the University of Kent Travel Plan has played a significant role in facilitating growth, shifting staff and student travel towards sustainable non-car modes, thereby creating the headroom for growth. The University are also currently developing a Parking Management Strategy that will inform and support the Travel Plan. Both documents will be regularly reviewed and updated and will continue to play an integral role in realising the ambitions of the masterplan, actively monitoring and managing the impacts of growth through the timely delivery of appropriate proposals set out in the Movement and Transport Strategy.

Addressing a Legacy of Car-Dominance

One of the major issues facing the quality of the public realm in today's Campus is that motor vehicles tend to dominate the University environment. There are currently 2,234 car parking spaces spread across some 70 separate parking areas. Car parks infiltrate into the very heart of the Campus, a legacy of the 1965 Holford masterplan, created in an era when the private motor car was seen to be the answer to our transport needs and growth in car ownership increased dramatically.

As noted earlier in this document, the Campus has grown considerably since the University was opened in 1965 and the focus has been on developing the built environment, perhaps at the expense of developing spaces of equal quality between them. The ever-pressing demand for car parking has seen surface parking areas retained in the Campus Heart and others constructed with each new phase, resulting in the prevalence of car parks we see today. Furthermore, the campus roads are not particularly urban, often busy in peak times and intimidating to pedestrians and cyclists due to vehicle speeds.

The design of the roads does nothing to discourage high speeds and these circumstances legislate towards greater unnecessary use of motor vehicles to undertake journeys of even modest distances. Giles Lane and University Road are used by non-university motorists
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to bypass the city centre and Park Wood Road is used by non-university motorists to deliver and collect Blean Primary School pupils. Because of the large number and wide distribution of different car park locations across the Campus, journeys are often extended by searching for a parking space, causing driver frustration, higher speeds, greater fuel consumption and consequently a reduction in air quality.

The main point is that growth and other changes made to the University in Canterbury over time have been delivered in the absence of a policy to balance growth with quality of environment. Future emphasis on campus planning must therefore be focussed on growth, balanced with good placemaking.

The Framework Masterplan proposes to redress this imbalance by introducing the following measures to limit car use and to deter people from driving short-distance journeys:

- The 70 car parking areas that currently exist on Campus (excluding the Innovation Centre and Estates Management Maintenance Vehicle Car Park) will be consolidated into 8 principal car parking areas for University staff, students and visitors; an additional car park will be provided for the exclusive use of the proposed conferencing hotel. These are identified in the accompanying illustration.
- The new consolidated car parks will be located close to 5 vehicle entry points into the Campus (ie: Whitstable Road/University Avenue, Whitstable Road/Giles Lane West and St Stephens Hill/Giles Lane East) to discourage car usage and to reduce congestion within the Campus and thereby improve air quality.
- Encouraging cars to be left at vehicle entry points will make the Campus a safer environment for pedestrians and cyclists, and encourage car drivers to use healthier and more sustainable forms of travel such as walking, cycling or public transport.

Figure 88: Car parking locations across the existing Campus; currently parking is spread across 70 separate car parks within the Campus Heart.
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Figure 89: In the masterplan, new car parking locations will be located around the edge of the Campus Heart, reducing the number of carparks from 70 to 8 principal parking areas for staff, students and visitors.
Sizes of car parks will be as equal as possible in order to ensure that access to car parking spaces are distributed as evenly as possible, to prevent any single entry point from attracting more traffic than another, to discourage unnecessary car usage within the Campus and to reduce search time and travel for spaces.

Car parks will generally be at grade and at one single level wherever possible to assist with accessibility for all. Rapid advances in personal transport technology and the increasing trend away from private car ownership means that multi-storey car parks may become obsolete in the near future, with pool vehicles and car clubs becoming increasingly popular in University locations. Furthermore, this approach will ensure that the high costs of multi-storey car park construction does not divert funds inappropriately away from the primary objective of education. Neither will it limit the University’s ability to deliver the car parks as and when they are needed, as well as protecting the Campus from the visual blight of tall car parking structures.

The phased delivery of these spaces will require careful management to ensure an adequate amount of car and coach parking at any one time. These 8 principal car parks do not, of course, represent all the car parking associated with University uses, as spaces will also be required for those with disabilities who need to park close to their place of work or study or venue they are visiting.

The proposed consolidation strategy will remove car parking areas from the Campus Heart and create space for the development of new buildings as well as squares, gardens, courts - the public ‘living rooms’ where human interaction can take place. This will invest the University with a greater ‘sense of place’ and encourage greater productivity, attractiveness, economy, health and well-being.

The reduction in the number of car parks across the Campus will be accompanied by the use of electronic signage and satnav technology to direct drivers to available spaces. This will help to improve...
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Figure 90: Where new car parks are located in areas of particular heritage or landscape quality, the impact will be mitigated by dense screening planting.
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Shrub screening up to 1.5m such as dog rose, hawthorn, beech blackthorn to give all year round screening

Shrub hedges can be planted which achieve 3-4m high screen

Small ornamental trees and shrubs may be combined to give greater screening and shade
the management of vehicles on the estate, to reduce distances and time spent looking for a space to park. In the medium and longer term, opportunities to introduce Electric Vehicle Charging Points will be considered to encourage and support the use of electric cars to improve air quality.

Developing the Long-Term Strategy for Consolidation of Parking Spaces:

The locations of the proposed new car parks have been chosen with great care in order to deliver the strategy described above, and to fit comfortably into the rest of the masterplan. Despite the large size of the Campus, the choice of where car parks can be reasonably located is relatively limited:

1 University Rise: The open landscape of the University Rise character area plays an important role in providing a green setting to the University as well as a landscape demarcation from the city, which is a major part of the University’s attraction to students, academic staff and visitors to the University.

The exposure of this area as the northern backdrop to historic Canterbury and the World Heritage Site also suggests that the location of a car park in either the open grassland of Chaucer Fields, or in Bluebell Wood, would be totally inappropriate. The intense local opposition to earlier proposals to build a conferencing hotel in this location bears this out. Similarly, the location of car parking on the apron of space to the south of Beverley Farmhouse would be inappropriate in its impact on the setting of this historic listed building. Available space for
parking in Turing South is limited by the proposed intervention of the conferencing hotel; also the requirement for hotel expansion and its own parking will consume the remaining space in this part of the Campus. The remaining space in this character area is already taken up by Keynes and Turing Colleges, and by the private housing along Giles Lane West.

The proposed location of a new car park at University Avenue West provides an opportunity for a discreet area of parking close to the entrance to the Campus from Whitstable Road, in an area of developing woodland in an unobtrusive space between Chaucer College and St Edmunds School, already screened by high hedges on each side. This car park location is already in close proximity to a network of existing tracks and footpaths that criss-cross this area and link it to other parts of the Campus. The sensitive introduction of high hedges and green landscape screening, along with perforate paving and load-bearing grass reinforcement, will enable vehicle parking here for daily or overspill use without interrupting the flow of rainwater into the ground. In addition, ‘swales’ could be introduced to filter out contamination from vehicles.

2 Whitstable Road
This landscape character area is mainly comprised of the historic woodlands of Park Wood and Brotherhood Wood, plus the remnants of Hothe Court Farm; consequently, it is the woodland environment which dominates and distinguishes this part of the campus from the remainder of the University.

The masterplan proposal to create a new controlled vehicle entry point in this location, with associated areas of car parking, provides a significant opportunity to solve some of the serious problems of vehicle circulation and parking that blight the Campus today. At present, there are only two vehicle entry points to the Campus from the west, and neither serve the north-west area at all well. Consequently, those needing to access this area by motor vehicle (for example, parents delivering children to and from Blean School and the Oaks Nursery) must drive through the centre of the Campus to reach them. Visitor coaches wishing to gain access to the sports pavilions and sports fields in this part of the Campus must also drive through the centre of the Campus to reach them. These factors are currently also adding to traffic in the centre of the University. A new vehicle access point here, with access onto Park Wood Road restricted to buses only, would obviate the need for all these motorists to access the main part of the Campus.

The predominance of Ancient Woodland means that the location of a car park in either Park Wood or Brotherhood Wood would be totally inappropriate. Available space for parking in the Whitstable Road character area is therefore limited to its western edge.

The proposed location of a new (albeit modest-sized) car park immediately adjacent to the new entry point from Whitstable Road provides an opportunity for a discreet area of parking close to the entrance to the Campus. In addition, the proposed car park directly to the south of the Oaks Nursery provides an opportunity for an area of parking where it is most needed - close to the nursery, Blean School and the sports fields. A car and coach park in this location will obviate the need for vehicles to drive through the Campus Heart to reach these facilities. Furthermore, an additional small area of car parking is proposed adjacent to the relocated sports pavilion and new swimming pool just north of Park Wood Road to serve the needs of day-to-day visitors to these facilities.

This area is already extremely well-served by the network of existing cycle tracks and footpaths that link it to the heart of the Campus. Although close to the listed Hothe Court Farmhouse and Barn, the sensitive introduction of high hedges and green landscape screening, along with screening by the existing and proposed buildings and the Community Garden would enable vehicle parking here for daily or occasional use without interrupting the enjoyment or setting of these historic structures.

3 The Campus Heart
The heart of the University sits in an exposed location along the ridgeline overlooking the Great Stour Valley. This character area takes advantage of exceptional views to both historic Canterbury to the south and the Kent Downs beyond, as well as the views north across open countryside towards Whitstable and the coast.
The proposal to greatly diminish the scale of car parking in this area is an underlying principle of the Framework Masterplan to create space for the development of new squares, gardens, courts and other spaces as well as new buildings. It would seem inappropriate therefore to create new car parking facilities in this area. However, the existing Giles Lane car park and the Estates Department site do provide opportunities to expand parking on sloping ground at the edges of this part of the Campus, by providing car parking at low level that will be screened in due course by new developments built above them. Also, decking over part of the existing Giles Lane car park will provide approximately an additional 250 spaces. These car parking areas both benefit from being close to the Campus entry point from St Stephens Hill.

Another location for parking in the Campus Heart is provided by the sloping ground in the east of the Campus to the south of Darwin College and north of Tyler Court student housing. This car park will have its own entry point for traffic turning left as it travels up St Stephens Hill. In this location, this new car park will again take advantage of a slope in the site to accommodate a simple two-storey decked structure.

Otherwise, the role of this area as the northern backdrop to historic Canterbury and the World Heritage Site means that locating a car park elsewhere in the Campus would be very challenging. The exposed open grassland to the south of Eliot and Rutherford Colleges would not be an appropriate location, and neither would it seem sensible to devote space in the heart of the Campus for car parking.

We have therefore concluded that it would be inappropriate for car parking to be included in the Sarre Penn Valley, other than parking for those with disabilities and delivery vehicles associated with the small clusters of development proposed in this area.

Summary: It is worth noting that some of the proposed parking locations will have an impact upon certain landscape and heritage assets. It is also clear that the car parking locations proposed in the Framework Masterplan have been chosen with care and sensitivity and that alternative locations have been considered and discarded as inappropriate.

The proposed new access from Whitstable Road (if not provided as part of any reconfiguration of Blean School) will have some impact upon the heritage setting of Hothe Court. The University has always taken its responsibilities toward the heritage of the Campus very seriously. At an appropriate point in the future (and prior to the vehicle connection from Whitstable Road being implemented), the University will study the impact upon Hothe Court in more depth and undertake a more detailed design exercise to determine appropriate measures of mitigation. Amongst the issues that will be considered, the University will investigate options to determine the best way to maintain the setting, including the character, width and scale of the existing route (the Old Salt Road) and the appropriate location and type of controls to be installed to limit vehicle types, speed, size and quantum.

Such impacts have to be balanced against the benefits of opening up this part of the Campus to become more active and productive, enabling the University to establish...
Figure 92: Concept drawings showing the impact of the masterplan upon the Movement & Transport patterns
appropriate and sensitive new uses for the heritage structures to ensure their long-term future. The masterplan proposals will also help to re-balance traffic movement and its impact on the heart of the Campus, discouraging car use and thereby ensuring a safer and less polluted environment overall.

Concerns have been raised about possible visual intrusion resulting from the introduction of car parking near the south-west vehicle entry point from Whitstable Road on University Avenue. Once again, at an appropriate point in the future, this issue will be studied in depth and detailed proposals brought forward for an appropriate level of screening and planting supported by reasoned justifications to determine that this is the best strategy. These proposals and their impacts have to be considered in balance against the negative impact that motor vehicles currently have upon the Campus Heart, including traffic speeds, congestion and air pollution, and the visual intrusion of the numerous open car parks that currently exist without screening or visual protection.

The University of Kent’s Parking Management Strategy

Whilst the Framework Masterplan advocates consolidation of the car parking, the strategy for managing these parking areas is important to the success of the proposals. A review has recently been undertaken of the current parking management practices at the University and recommendations prepared for changes in the short, medium and long term. These findings are reported in PBA’s ‘Parking Management Strategy’ document dated April 2019. It is proposed that the Parking Management Strategy becomes a ‘live’ document that works in conjunction with the Travel Plan and reviewed on a regular basis, thus ensuring movement and transport issues across the Campus and the implementation of the Masterplan measures are considered jointly.

The parking management strategy is intended to implement measures that seek to reduce the demand for car parking within the site in the short-term, which will rebalance the costs of travel more in favour of sustainable modes of transport. The measures focus on managing the conflicts between staff and student parking alongside the demands of associates and visitors. These measures include:

- Increasing current parking permit prices to bring the pricing structure for staff, students and associates to be more comparable with sustainable mode costs and with other Universities
- Introducing a management system and booking process for visitor parking supported by a charging system for visitors not using the pay and display facilities (for example when large events occur or for coach parking)
- Increasing the effectiveness of parking enforcement through the use of credit control procedures where necessary
- Establishing a set of key performance indicators that can be used to measure the success of the strategy

As the Framework Masterplan anticipates gradual growth in capacity at the University, a failure to address the existing management and pricing issues will not only increase the financial deficit occurred by operational and maintenance costs of the provision of parking, it may also limit the ability for growth within the masterplan due to unacceptable impacts on the local road network.

Medium-Long Term: In the medium and longer-term, the Parking Management Strategy focuses on supporting the rationalisation and consolidation of vehicle parking across the campus primarily through stricter criteria for all permit holders. This includes a review and extension of the existing student exclusion zones, the gradual introduction of staff exclusion zones and/or restrictions with differential pricing, increased permit prices and a cap on the number of permits issued. As consolidation occurs, barrier technology will be implemented alongside variable message signs to direct permit holders and visitors to appropriate spaces.

As part of the medium to long term strategy, a Trip Management System is also proposed. This would be a development planning and programming tool for Estates Management that comprises a spreadsheet that will indicate the current and future trip demand and the adequacy of facilities. Over the course of the masterplan, this will enable assessment of the quantity of car parking provision and any of the anticipated deficiencies. By forecasting vehicular demand, temporary provision may be provided, and the need for further incentivising or
encouraging sustainable travel modes may be identified to ensure the traffic impacts of new proposals are managed.

The Parking Management Strategy will require an ongoing review of the University permit systems and promotion of sustainable modes of travel through the Travel Plan, in order to ensure there are suitable alternatives available to car travel. Strategies are also required to monitor and manage the movement of servicing and delivery vehicles within the campus, to consolidate these to reduce their impact on key roads and other movement corridors, particularly those intended for sustainable modes of transport. New buildings will need to ensure that servicing and deliveries are generally rear-of-building activities and do not encroach on the enjoyment of the Campus walking and cycling networks.

Overview of the Framework Masterplan:

The masterplan aims to outline wider initiatives relating to movement and transport, to support the diversity of the individual identified character areas and to find solutions to the key challenges associated with the existing campus. It builds on a clearer picture of current traffic flows and explores options for alleviating the most pressing areas of concern both within the University campus and on the surrounding road network.

To deliver this proposition in accordance with these principles, the masterplan delivers improvements to the campus in line with the following development protocols:

- Existing entry points to the campus will be reconfigured to be more prominent and welcoming, and new entry points will be created.
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• Car parking will be moved away from the centre and relocated on the periphery of the campus heart
• New buildings in the campus heart will be deliberately arranged to define a network of clear and coherent routes
• A variety of places and spaces of different scale will be created - gardens, courts, quads and squares - to promote and reinforce interaction between all members of the academic community
• The intensified campus heart will accommodate more cultural attractions and visitor facilities for local people to use and enjoy
• New buildings will also create opportunities to deliver excellence in teaching, research and enterprise
• The masterplan will achieve a balance between welcoming openness and sheltered enclosure for all faculty, students and visitors

Technological changes in vehicles and fuel types, especially the shift towards electrical power and autonomous vehicles, will influence the infrastructure and requirements associated with public transport during the timescales covered by the Framework Masterplan. The Campus-wide options are generated, in part, around a shift towards a greater reliance on walking and cycling, combined with the use of smaller, low-speed electric-powered vehicles to connect the Campus Heart with peripheral areas. This wider range of transport options will continue to form an important part of the University’s travel planning.

Other Opportunities for Movement and Transport:

A Northern Park and Ride Service: The Park and Ride services provided in the Canterbury District are outside of the scope of the Framework Masterplan, as they fall within the responsibilities of Canterbury City Council rather than the University. The current District Transport Strategy proposes no additional provision of Park and Ride services to the north of the city. The University are willing to work with partners to explore the provision of a North Canterbury Park and Ride facility to help ease traffic pressures on the North Canterbury road network to benefit the University, the City and the nearby communities of Blean and Tyler Hill. This work would align well with the Framework Masterplan objectives to improve and promote sustainable transport options.

One option worthy of further exploration would build upon the potential and spare capacity of the Old Salt Road and promote it as a key component of the transport and access opportunities for both the University and the City of Canterbury. To this end, the feasibility of a new Park and Ride car parking site could be explored within close proximity to the A299. This would allow drivers seeking access to the University and Canterbury from the M2, the A299 and the urban areas of Whitstable and Herne Bay to park close to the main highway network. Park and Ride buses could provide a shuttle service to the City Centre on the A290, via the University. As an alternative to the bus service, drivers and passengers could transfer to bicycles (either their own or from a hire centre), or to smaller electric vehicles, to the 3 to 4 mile journey to the University.

Connectivity with the Wider Area: The Movement and Transport Strategy places strong emphasis on the need to radically improve links between Canterbury West Station and the University; the creation of passenger access into the Station from the north is included within this aim. Such an improvement will provide the opportunity for a new public space to serve as a welcoming lobby for north Canterbury as a whole, as well as for the University. In the interim, minor measures could greatly improve wayfinding along the existing (and circuitous) route under the railway. The longer-term strategy is predicated on the need to create of a strongly modelled arrival space, served from Roper Road. The space would follow a route using the former Crab & Winkle Line as much as practically possible and would incorporate a range of transport options from bicycle and scooter hire, buses, taxis, and electric University shuttle vehicles. The station arrival point aims to establish a major ‘front door’ to the University from the south, providing information, waymarking and a high standard of public realm design.

The Movement and Transport Strategy also supports the provision of improved links on foot, by bicycle and by bus to the existing Park and Ride sites at Wincheap and Sturry Road. The University is keen to work in collaboration with Canterbury City Council to help facilitate these wider connections where possible within the University landholdings.
Figure 94: Proposed Framework Masterplan for the Canterbury Campus highlighting the creation of a more legible and coherent Campus Heart through consolidation of development along the ridgeline.
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9.1 Overview

The Framework Masterplan is intended to provide a direction for the future evolution of the ‘physical’ campus to best meet the needs of the University of Kent and of the wider city and region; it will provide the University with a template to enable decisions about the future of the campus.

Future development will respect the quality of life and day to day activities of people living and working in the surrounding villages and residential neighbourhoods and avoid any significant negative impacts upon the wider surrounding area in terms of traffic, car parking, air quality or demand for recreation. The masterplan will enable the long-term stewardship of the campus and ensure that the estate is managed and maintained in ways that sustain the outstanding place that is created. The campus and development on nearby University owned land will be outward facing and seek to improve the lives of local people as well as being an exemplar for environmental sustainability by reducing energy use and carbon emissions, adopting high standards for water usage and waste and recycling and creating an environment that promotes healthy living and physical and mental wellbeing.

Whilst some areas in the masterplan might appear to be full of proposed buildings, that is meant to demonstrate how much the University could look to intensify the campus should they need to. It is important to note that much of that capacity would be met by replacing buildings that are reaching the end of their usual life, as well as by building on land currently occupied by open car parks; to enable this, car parking is consolidated in the masterplan and moved to the edge of the campus heart.

This document is also intended to describe to the City Council and the people of the district how the University might use their land should the need and necessary funding be identified, although it is important to note that the Framework Masterplan is a University document and not a planning application within itself. The masterplan will provide a framework within which future planning applications can be assessed by Canterbury City Council; when and if aspects of the plan are funded, they will go through the usual planning process and members of the public will be able to provide feedback in the usual way as part of that process.

This document therefore describes the framework within which the University will make decisions on the future development of their estate in the short-term (2018 to 2021) and medium-term (2021 to 2031), covering the period defined within the Canterbury District Local Plan.

9.2 Possible Early Building and Public Realm Projects in the Short/Medium Term

The University is currently in a period of consolidation, characterised by limited growth in academic facilities and student accommodation, although a new student social and study facility was completed in Park Wood in 2018. At present within the estate development strategy, emphasis is being placed upon the refurbishment and improvement of existing buildings and the re-organisation, consolidation and improvement of car parking, creation of new and improved cycle and pedestrian routes and landscaping and conserving parts of the Campus.

Looking ahead the University has ambitions to deliver a number of building projects along with a variety of public realm improvements and projects. As part of this aspiration, planning permission is being sought for a new building to house the Kent and Medway Medical School (KMMS). This three-story building will be situated between the Ingram and Sibson buildings on the Park Wood Road; it will provide teaching space for up to 300 students as well as offices for clinical, academic and administrative staff. If the planning application is successful, construction of this building will commence in the summer of 2019. In addition, the University is currently working with Kent Enterprise Trust and others on the creation of a community garden in the former kitchen garden of Hothe Court Farmhouse (in the west of the Campus).

Mindful of the District Plan’s plan period (2017 to 2031) and the need to set out a framework for the Campus that goes beyond this period, the anticipated programme for masterplan implementation is set out below and framed around the following time periods: 2017 to 2021 (short-term); 2022 to 2031 (medium term); and 2031 onwards (long-term):
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9.2.1 Priorities for the short term (2019 to 2021) are as follows:

- In the short-term the University’s approved Capital Programme will see the development of around 12,000sqm of academic and administrative floorspace, representing an investment in excess of £100m. This period of investment will include the development of major projects and associated public realm, such as a new Economics Building (work underway on site), a Life Sciences Building, a new Kent and Medway Medical School Building (noted above), a new student social and study facility, a Science Student Hub building, plus an additional floor to the Jennison Workshop.

- In 2020 the University will be hosting the Lambeth Conference (an assembly of bishops of the Anglican Communion convened by the Archbishop of Canterbury that takes place every 10 years) and in preparation for this the tennis court enclosures will be upgraded to provide a facility for this conference as well as making it suitable to become a major exhibition conference facility for the East Kent region (planning permission already granted).

9.2.2 In addition to this, the University has identified a number of projects that it would like to realise (subject to funding) on its Canterbury Campus in the medium-term (2022-2031) as follows:

- The development of a high-quality conference centre and hotel, which could have a major positive impact on the local economy and augment the already significant contribution the University makes to providing visitor accommodation outside of term-time. The University already has an award-winning conference business, which this year welcomed more than 200,000 people from around the world to its residential provision. It is clear that there is an ever-increasing demand for a high-quality conference venue. The proposed location north of University Road and south of Turing College offers maximum flexibility for the size of building and scale of conferences that could be held there.

- £6.5m has been allocated for additional innovation facilities in the medium term, which could help deliver a Canterbury Innovation Centre Phase II, or alternative business space to help start-ups.

- The provision of up to a further 2000 student bed spaces to provide overseas students with a three-year guarantee of a student accommodation during the whole of their course.

- New Student Services and Kent Union buildings near to Keynes College.

- New teaching and academic buildings.

- Additional leisure and sports facilities (including a swimming pool).

- A possible new road, cycle and pedestrian link between Whitstable Road and Park Wood Road to include a controlled bus link onto campus and improvements to footpaths and cycle routes.

- The possible re-provision of Blean Primary School, to include improved car parking and up to 30 additional new homes as part of a funding package.

- The University will continue to consolidate and improve the management of its car parking.

- The University also intends to work with utility companies in assessing and providing any necessary upgrades to utility services.

The possible early building and associated public realm projects proposed in the short and medium-term identified above, are set out in the accompanying illustration.

9.3 Proposals for the Longer-Term

Clearly, given the many social, economic and political factors that are currently influencing Higher Education, the degree of certainty of development decreases over time and the University has not identified any specific projects post 2031. The indicative masterplan studies set out above incorporate the expected development in the short and medium-terms and also explore the longer-term development capacity of the various Landscape Character Areas.

In the longer term, there may be the need to upgrade existing foul sewerage or provide a private sewer to Canterbury Waste Water Treatment Works (Sturry Road) and (working with others) it may be possible to provide a ‘park and ride’ facility to serve the University and the City Centre. Given this uncertainty, the Framework Masterplan seeks to provide a flexible framework, so that the UoK can take advantage of development opportunities as and when they arise.
Figure 95: Possible early built and public realm projects in the short-medium term
Figure 96: The Sibson Building in Brotherhood Wood; an example of a building designed to sit comfortably into the landscape
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10.1 University Decision-Making

The primary purpose of this Framework Masterplan is to inform how the University of Kent will identify and define projects and develop the Canterbury Campus, given consideration of the Strategic Spatial Vision, Objectives and Principles embedded within the University’s decision-making processes regarding future development.

Detailed master planning will continue through the life of the Framework Masterplan and will involve the detailed design of the landscape, movement and infrastructure across the site. Future masterplanning will define the phasing of the infrastructure and landscape works to coordinate with phased building construction. Detailed cost checking and value engineering will also form part of this stage of the work.

The University’s decision-making process will also include:
- Preparing Design Guidelines that direct and shape the development of buildings, places and spaces, in order to provide a flexible framework for the local planning authority when judging the merits of future design proposals
- Selecting individual building designers taking into account their understanding of and commitment to the Framework Masterplan objectives and principles
- Individual designers preparing Design and Access Statements as part of future planning applications that explain how their proposals conform with the Framework Masterplan, with any deviation from the masterplan being fully justified and agreed with the University, the master planner and Canterbury City Council in advance of submitting a planning application
- Responding positively to relevant Development Plan and other designations, with any departures being justified in Planning Statements that support future planning applications
- Creating additional detailed mini-masterplans that are deliverable in phases, and yet delivers places of high quality at every stage

10.2 Partnership Working

The University will work collaboratively with a wide range of partners in the public, private and voluntary sectors to bring about positive change and to implement the Framework Masterplan, including:
- The University’s business partners, including the University Partnerships Programme in relation to the provision of student housing
- Existing tenants and businesses within the Campus
- Neighbouring institutions, businesses and landowners
- Canterbury City Council as the Local Planning and Housing Authority, and in its key roles in relation to economic development and transport
- Kent County Council as the Highway, Public Rights of Way, Education, Lead Flood, Waste and Minerals Authority and in its key roles in relation to economic development, biodiversity and archaeology
- The Environment Agency in relation to flooding and drainage
- Canterbury Sustainable Transport Forum on transport related matters
- Network Rail and the relevant train operating companies in relation to Canterbury West Station
- Kent Enterprise Trust, Whitstable and Herne Bay Bee Keepers and others in relation to the Community Garden Project
- Kent Wildlife Trust, Woodland Trust, CPRE, Natural England in relation to landscape and biodiversity
- Local Residents’ Associations, Parish Councils and community organisations to minimise negative impacts locally and to maximise local involvement in the Campus
- Canterbury City Council and others in implementing the recommendation of the Higher and Further Education Impact Review.
10.3 Phasing and Triggers

As outlined earlier in this document, given the many social, economic and political factors that impact Higher Education, the degree of certainty surrounding University projects decreases over time and the UoK has not identified any specific projects post 2031. The accompanying table includes the expected phasing of short-term projects, setting out when these projects are expected to be completed. This table also identifies the proposed and possible key medium-term projects. However, the size and scope of these proposed projects need to be defined and the possible projects are to be the subject of further investigation with partners. As such, the University is unable to set out with any meaningful degree of accuracy when and in some cases whether the medium-term projects will happen. The University will provide updates to Canterbury City Council, other partners and local people as to the progress of these proposed/possible projects.

10.4 Development Management

The Framework Masterplan is intended to be a material consideration in planning matters and it is hoped that Canterbury City Council will endorse it as planning guidance for implementing CDLP Policy EMP7 and give it significant weight when determining planning applications. The University is keen to engage in pre-application discussions with the local planning authority.

10.5 Detailed Assessment

Where planning permission is required to implement a project, applications are expected to be assessed in relation to their contribution (or otherwise) to the Framework Masterplan. Projects that are the subject of planning applications will need to be supported by more detailed studies, strategies and assessments in accordance with Canterbury City Council’s reasonable requirements and an Environmental Impact Assessment where necessary.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Short-Term 2017-2021</th>
<th>Medium-Term 2022-2031 (subject to funding)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>• Creation of a community garden (underway)</td>
<td>• Development of new Student Services and Kent Union buildings near Keynes College</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Student Social and Study Facility (completed August 2018)</td>
<td>• New teaching and academic buildings</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Kennedy Building (completion April 2019)</td>
<td>• New innovation facilities and business space</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Science Student Hub building (completion June 2019)</td>
<td>• Additional leisure and sports facilities, including a swimming pool</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Upgrade and extension to the tennis court enclosures (planning permission granted)</td>
<td>• Additional 2,000 student bed spaces</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Kent and Medway Medical School building (complete September 2020)</td>
<td>• Possible development of a conference centre and hotel</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Life Sciences Building (completion end of May 2021)</td>
<td>• Possible re-provision of Blean Primary School, to include improved car parking and up to 30 additional homes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Consolidation and improvement of car parking, creation of new and improved cycle and pedestrian routes</td>
<td>• Possible new controlled road, cycle and pedestrian link between Whitstable Road and Park Wood Road</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Landscaping, planting of woodland, conservation of existing sites (ongoing)</td>
<td>• Continued improvements to footpaths and cycle routes</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Figure 97: Table of potential early built and public realm projects in the short-medium term
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10.6 Good Stewardship

The University is the custodian of a major estate at the Canterbury campus. The potential for successful placemaking is inevitably improved when estate owners take a long-term view. At each stage of Campus development going forward, manuals will be prepared that set out a sustainable management and maintenance regime of the buildings, places and spaces as a whole, to ensure that they are looked after in a positive way to help ensure the creation of high-quality places.

10.7 Construction Impacts

The University will ensure that when letting contracts for development, contractors put in place suitable strategies and plans to manage demolition and construction works in ways that reduce adverse impacts on traffic on the Campus and wider road network and safeguard air quality and residential amenity.

10.8 Monitoring and Review

The University will monitor progress on implementing the Framework Masterplan and review and update it as and where necessary.

10.9 Campus Designation

The Canterbury District Local Plan recognises that the extent of the Campus boundary may be reconsidered when the Local Plan is reviewed. The University has not identified a need to extend the designated Campus area at this stage, although it will keep this under review as part of reviewing and updating the masterplan and will feedback into a future review of the Local Plan where necessary. In any event, the University will fully engage with all relevant stakeholders, including Canterbury City Council and local people, over any proposals it brings forward for land that it owns.

Figure 98: The Sibson Building in Brotherhood Wood nearing completion in 2017. Brotherhood Square is gradually taking shape in the top of the photograph
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<td>1</td>
<td>Concept Masterplan Study</td>
<td>Farreills</td>
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<td>Baseline Studies:</td>
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<td>3 Historical Evolution</td>
<td>JLL/BPR/Harvey Van Sickle</td>
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<td>4 Benchmarking Study: University &amp; Campus Landscapes</td>
<td>JLL/BPR/CMA</td>
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<td></td>
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<td>CMA</td>
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</tr>
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<td></td>
<td>2 Placemaking Strategy</td>
<td>JLL/BPR</td>
<td>Mar 18</td>
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<td></td>
<td>3 Movement &amp; Transport Strategy</td>
<td>Hamilton-Baillie Associates</td>
<td>Mar 18</td>
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<td>1 Concept Masterplan Consultation Statement</td>
<td>University of Kent/CMA Planning</td>
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<td>2 Step 1 Strategic Spatial Vision Consultation Statement</td>
<td>University of Kent/CMA Planning</td>
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<td>3 Step 2 Draft Framework Masterplan Consultation Statement</td>
<td>University of Kent/CMA Planning</td>
<td>Jan 19</td>
</tr>
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<td>Masterplan Drawings:</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
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<td></td>
<td>1 Primary Masterplan Drawings</td>
<td>JLL/BPR</td>
<td>Apr 19</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>2 Supplementary Masterplan Drawings</td>
<td>JLL/BPR</td>
<td>Apr 19</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>3 Baseline Mapping</td>
<td>JLL/BPR</td>
<td>Apr 19</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>4 Explanatory Concept Sketches</td>
<td>JLL/BPR</td>
<td>Apr 19</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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Appendix 5: Canterbury Campus Architectural Awards

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>No</th>
<th>Building</th>
<th>Award</th>
<th>Year</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>Colyer-Fergusson Music Building</td>
<td>• RIBA Regional Award for Architecture</td>
<td>2013</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>• RIBA National Award for Architecture &amp; Stirling Prize mid-list</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>• Wood Awards: Commercial &amp; Public Access</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>Digital Crit Space</td>
<td>• RIBA South-East Award</td>
<td>2013</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Kent School of Architecture</td>
<td>• World Architecture Award for Best Facade</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>Templeman Library Extension</td>
<td>• Canterbury Society Design Award, New Building</td>
<td>2016</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>• Concrete Society Award, Highly Commended</td>
<td>2017</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>Sibson Building</td>
<td>• RIBA South East Award, Building of the Year</td>
<td>2018</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>University of Kent’s Business School, School of Mathematics, Statistics and Actuarial Science</td>
<td>• RIBA National Award</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>• Kent Design and Development Award, Project of the Year</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>• Canterbury Society Design Award, New Building</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>