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1 INTRODUCTION

This report
This short report aims to be a factual summary and account of the discussions that took place at the Strategic Spatial Vision Workshop for external stakeholders at the Canterbury campus on 19 July 2017. It does not seek to analyse the comments nor draw conclusions from them. This will be done in a Consultation Statement that will be prepared in September 2017. This will also take into account written comments from invited stakeholders that were unable to attend the workshop.

Background
Following the publication of a Concept Masterplan¹ in 2016, the University of Kent is preparing a more detailed Framework Masterplan for the Canterbury campus in line with Policy EMP7 in the Canterbury District Local Plan².

The first step in this process is to prepare an overall strategic spatial vision of the type of place the Canterbury campus should be, and the strategies for delivering it.

Strategic Spatial Vision Discussion Document
A discussion document³ was prepared and sent to each of the external stakeholder organisations invited to take part⁴ in the week before the Workshop. It invited comment on the document either at the Workshop or in writing by the 18 August 2017.

The discussion document contained the following sections:

- The University and the emerging Strategic Spatial Vision
- The proposed Framework Masterplan
- An incremental approach (to the Masterplan development)
- Emerging Place-making Strategy
- Emerging Planning and Environment Strategy
- Emerging Landscape and Biodiversity Strategy
- Emerging Movement and Transport Strategy
- Implementation, monitoring and review
- The ‘building blocks’ for the draft vision.

1 www.kent.ac.uk/masterplan/concept-index.html
2 www.canterbury.gov.uk/planning/local-plan/
3 www.kent.ac.uk/masterplan/downloads/spatial-vision-discussion-document-20170713.pdf
4 See Appendix 1 – Invited external stakeholder groups.
2 ABOUT THE WORKSHOP

The Strategic Spatial Vision Workshop was held in the Sibson building on the University’s Canterbury campus on 19 July 2017.

The purpose of the Workshop was to enable a range of external stakeholders to discuss and shape the emerging overall Strategic Spatial Vision and the emerging strategies to deliver this vision, namely, ‘Place-making’, ‘Planning and Environment’, ‘Landscape and Biodiversity’ and ‘Movement and Transport’.

The Workshop was attended by 29 external delegates representing 21 organisations. In all, 36 organisations had the opportunity to send a representative to take part as well as both members and officers from both Kent County and Canterbury City Councils.

Following a welcome from Peter Czarnomski, the University’s Director of Estates, the day began with an overview of the day’s programme5 from Graham Harrington of CMA Planning, the University’s planning consultants, and continued with a presentation6 from John Letherland of JLL, lead architect and masterplanner on the University’s Masterplan project.

Following that first plenary session, delegates were placed in one of four groups7. As far as possible, each group was made up of a mix of representatives from all the different types of stakeholder groups together with one representative of the University’s Estates Department.

The four workshop sessions enabled each group to discuss each of the four emerging strategies. Discussion was facilitated by specialist expert consultants who are working with the University on the preparation of the Framework Masterplan. The consultants moved around the groups in turn.

- Place-making
  John Letherland, JLL
  Richard Portchmouth, Birds Portchmouth Russum Architects

- Planning and Environment
  Charles Moran, CMA Planning
  Graham Harrington, CMA Planning

- Landscape and Biodiversity
  Luke Engleback, Engleback Studio
  (assisted by Catherine Morris, University of Kent)

- Movement and Transport
  Ben Hamilton-Baille, Hamilton-Baille Associates
  (assisted by Teresa Curteis, University of Kent)

A member of the group acted as a scribe for each session, capturing the discussion in a series of bullet points on a flip chart.

Following the workshop sessions, a feedback session for all the delegates allowed each group to talk through their top three points on each emerging strategy in turn.

The draft Strategic Spatial Vision statement was on display and available throughout the event (including lunch) and delegates were encouraged to add their detailed comments and, if they wanted to, their name.

---

5 See Appendix 2 – Workshop programme
6 See Appendix 3 – Workshop opening presentation
7 See Appendix 4 – Workshop attendees by group
3 COMMENTS AND DISCUSSION

What follows is a note of the comments received on the day on the emerging Strategic Spatial Vision and reports from each of the facilitators summarising the discussions in the groups they ran on the emerging strategies.

The written notes of each group’s discussions as well as the top three points prioritised by the groups and presented in the final session are set out in full in the appendices. Comments and questions outside the parameters of the workshop have been noted and will be addressed directly with the individuals concerned.

3a DRAFT STRATEGIC SPATIAL VISION

In total, three written comments were made on the draft vision text as follows:

- ‘The University of Kent is a key attraction to encourage businesses to relocate to Kent. It would be helpful to consider the national reputation of the University as you plan the campus for the future.’
- ‘Building on the educational links between the university and primary/secondary schools through the campus design would be helpful. The environment could help raise school pupils’ aspirations.’
- ‘As general principles, all excellent – biodiverse landscape, priority for walking and cycling, protecting natural environment, safeguarding residential neighbourhoods, sustainability. Crucial now to keep these clearly in the forefront of implementation.’
  (Richard Norman)

8 See Appendices 5-8 for flip chart notes from each workshop group and Appendix 9 for notes from the final ‘Feedback and way forward’ session.
3 COMMENTS AND DISCUSSION (CONT)

3b EMERGING PLACE-MAKING STRATEGY

Set out below is a brief account from John Letherland and Richard Portchmouth of the discussions that took place on the emerging Place-making Strategy.

Group 1

All delegates agreed that one of the top priorities for the masterplan should be a focus on creating a safe environment on campus. Safety should be a major consideration without being intrusive. Concerns about personal safety tended to be highest in less dense areas of the campus, such as Park Wood. This was one of the top three issues for this group. Future plans should make sure that tall buildings do not dominate the public realm, that generous spaces are retained between buildings and that low-rise buildings front onto open spaces to avoid any feeling of overcrowding. It was felt that visual connectivity is also important, and that clear vistas giving a clear sight of destinations would increase a sense of safety.

The group felt that another priority for the University should be to make the campus more welcoming. Building entrances should be made more prominent to visitors, and servicing areas should become less prominent. Good linkages and connections should be created across the campus to make moving around the campus as easy as possible. More active frontages, well-lit paths and routes would help to make the campus more welcoming, and generate activity in existing and new spaces around the campus. The masterplan needs to reduce the impact of service vehicles and the negative effect of service areas, bins etc.

This group thought it should be a top priority to increase the range of opportunities for participation available to visitors to the University, including sport, entertainment and the enjoyment of green spaces. Everyone agreed that placemaking is important at the edges as well as in the heart. There was strong agreement that the Parklands should be retained and closer links with Blean should be forged. The University should consider new areas of shared activities around campus, and ideas for the mapping of walks and views around campus were discussed. It was suggested that the local community should be invited to be involved in how campus spaces might be used and managed.

The steep hill between Canterbury and the campus was felt to be a disincentive to cycling, but that a more cycle-friendly campus should be a priority. It was thought that cycling would be a great way to move around the large distances on campus. It was agreed by all that the campus needs to be more cycle-friendly, and there is a need for attractive and safe cycle routes. At present, the roads on campus are busy and dominated by fast moving traffic, all of which is intimidating to cyclists. Service vehicles are also a hazard and servicing hours should be restricted to make cycling on the campus safer.

All agreed that there is little or no sense of arrival at present, and that the campus needs well-defined arrival and departure points that are welcoming. The masterplan needs to establish a clear ‘front door’, that includes strong University ‘branding’ and a reception area, to welcome and encourage visitors and students, and to change the current experience of anti-climax. It was also felt that the shared surface outside The Venue does not work and that it is confusing and dominated by taxes. This was another of the top issues for this group.

Group 2

This group expressed the view that the existing architecture is somewhat hostile and inward looking, and that large, blank building facades do little to promote a sense of community. Other buildings do have active facades (like the new Sibson building) but are dispersed around campus and/or isolated by planting or adjacent car parks. They felt that it should be a priority for the masterplan to improve this, to ensure that future building faces are active and to make the spaces between the buildings more welcoming, beautiful and with more character. All agreed that existing active frontages and catering spaces at ground floor help to animate the public realm. The group agreed that green landscaping and the large, mature trees help to punctuate the built-up areas, and that views of the green landscape are a great asset to the campus.

All agreed that it is difficult to pinpoint the centre of the campus, and it was thought that the introduction of reference points or ‘markers’ in the landscape (eg a clock tower, fountains or a bandstand) would provide a focus for orientation and reinforce a greater sense of place. Clear pedestrian routes need to be defined around campus, and a hierarchy of streets and places is needed. A variety of uses should be encouraged in the open spaces and more seating areas provided.
Improved legibility was another big issue for the group, who felt that finding your way around campus is difficult and disorientating. It was agreed that the campus is not very welcoming, there is no central reception or front door/point of arrival and that you arrive by car at the ‘back’ of the campus. Also, existing pedestrian/cycle routes from Canterbury (eg Eliot path) are not easy to find, and generally arrive at the University in unimpressive locations rather than at a ‘front door’ or other significant places on the campus. The group agreed that a clear and more direct route connecting Canterbury with a strong front door to the campus would be a benefit and would encourage people to leave their cars at home.

The group agreed that movement needs to be better balanced between pedestrians, cyclists and car users. All thought that cars tend to dominate the existing roads, and that cycling is not encouraged in the centre of the campus. There was also a strong sense that Giles Lane is relegated to a service entrance, that service areas are too exposed and that existing signage is provided for motorists and not for pedestrians. The group agreed that the masterplan process should consult with the CCC Development Advisory Panel to ensure full mobility access for all, and to all areas, from the outset. It should also ensure that sufficient car parking is provided on campus to avoid a knock-on effect on Blean and others in the local area.

The group acknowledged that existing attractions such as the cinema, theatre, library, sports facilities, cycle and walking routes draw them to the campus, but they were keen to see a wider range of shared facilities open the local community. It was also felt that conference and library facilities should be expanded to have a changing programme of activities throughout the year.

The group felt there should be more transparency of processes surrounding development of buildings and other facilities on campus, and that decisions in the past have been made in isolation.

**Group 3**

The group agreed that students and the local community alike love the setting of the University within the natural environment, and that it is unique to this campus. Everyone agreed therefore that a strong principle of the masterplan should be to increase campus density rather than build on green field sites. Any increase in density of buildings on the campus heart should not erode the highly valued natural setting, but should be achieved by building within the curtilage of the existing campus, on land currently used for other uses (such as car parks). It was agreed that it will be important to preserve the rural character of Northern Land Holdings. The group promoted a ‘contained’ approach, building only within the existing University footprint to avoid ribbon development. Brighton and Warwick Universities were cited by the group as good examples where higher density campuses have successfully achieved good places.

It was noted that it is now adopted planning policy that student accommodation on campus should grow if University expansion generates additional student numbers. Park Wood was identified by the group as an area where a greater density of student accommodation might be accommodated, although this needs to be considered in relation to preserving the character and scale of the existing woodland setting. It was noted that purpose-built student accommodation is currently under construction in Canterbury, which may change the profile of how students are accommodated within the whole community of Canterbury.

Delegates agreed that the masterplan should articulate a strong and clear architectural vision; one delegate promoted following Holford’s original concept of a consolidated Tuscan hillside town set within a green landscape on the hilltop overlooking the city, where buildings are not too high and form a unified composition on the skyline. Another suggestion was to use local names for new spaces and places to further embed the campus into the local area. All agreed that making a unique and extraordinary place will protect the natural setting of the campus and create a place that people will value and make them want to come here.

The group agreed that the University should do more to welcome visitors from the local communities, through theatrical productions, concerts and other entertainments (eg the Gulbenkian Theatre), as well as promoting open lectures, restaurants and bars, to reflect the evolving and varied demographic of local residents. It was a surprise to many in the group to learn that the local community are welcome at University entertainment venues and open lectures, and that the University already promotes nature walks within the campus. It was agreed that greater community engagement (also with local primary, secondary and private schools) would be of benefit to strengthen relationships and help embed the University within the neighbouring communities.

One delegate reminded the group that the Canterbury’s principle business is ‘the manufacture of undergraduates’ and the University should be supported in adapting to future needs and becoming even more successful in the process. All agreed that flexibility in
planning and design should allow for new opportunities to emerge in teaching, research and enterprise, and to overcome uncertainty in the future. The masterplan will need to allow for a range of possibilities, including both expansion or contraction. It was agreed that the masterplan will need to provide as much certainty as possible on future development needs within the masterplan. There was also agreement that, by taking a big-picture overview of Canterbury and district, the masterplan might also generate opportunities to create city-wide benefits beyond the campus boundary as defined in the Local Plan.

**Group 4**

This group started with an interesting discussion about the need for more variety within the public realm, and the opportunity offered by the masterplan process to create a number of different character areas or ‘zones’ within the campus, in order to differentiate between the various external spaces. One delegate noted that the spaces between buildings lack identity and have no names. The group agreed that the new courtyards, garden squares and external auditoria created in the masterplan should have local names and a strong character to differentiate them. These spaces might also vary their character throughout the seasons. It was thought this might be a way to help students and visitors to find their way more easily around the campus without relying upon knowing the building names.

The group were also keen to investigate opportunities to introduce a masterplan narrative based on history. It was agreed there is a rich and fascinating history on which to draw, including the 16th century Beverley Farmhouse, the world’s oldest passenger railway, the Iron Age settlement under Turing College, Rutherford College built on former tiling and pottery kilns, and so on. There was a strong feeling that telling this story would help to enrich the campus and link it into the past. Ideas discussed included introducing ‘Knowledge Boards’ to disseminate information about a particular place on campus.

A lack of legibility in the campus was a view expressed by many of the delegates and a sense that there no recognisable street hierarchy. For example, the orientation of buildings is haphazard, and many of the back doors face front doors, etc. Also, there is a ‘grand approach’ (University Road) at the entrance to the campus from the city, but no ‘front door’ or destination or sense of arrival at the campus end. It was felt to be an important part of the masterplan thinking to create a better sense of arrival for students, staff and visitors.

It was also noted that the campus is very ‘walkable’ and that this is a characteristic of Canterbury in general. It was agreed that cycling and walking are to be encouraged, but not on busy roads. It was thought that permeability throughout the campus could be improved by creating new campus footpaths and connecting them with existing foot and cycle ways.

All agreed that we have to consider what might change in the next 50 years, and that in the future we might not need a campus accessed by cars. It was generally agreed that car parks should be moved to the edges of the campus heart and adjacent to the entrances to the campus, to get people out of their cars as soon as possible. Schemes that encourage the use of public transport, such as ‘Park and Walk’ or possibly ‘Park and Ride’, need to be explored in the masterplan thinking.

There was general agreement that any future expansion of the campus should be contained within the existing developed areas or campus footprint; also, that the Parklands to the south of the campus should be retained and not built upon.

The group also discussed what additional facilities might attract people to the campus and encourage visitors from the wider community. It was agreed that the green spaces are a big attractor to walkers and that these are highly valued and need to be retained. Also, many in the local community visit the University for the Gulbenkian Theatre and the variety of sports facilities. It was agreed that the masterplan process should investigate possibilities to widen the scope for potential attractions and activities.

**Feedback**

Group 1 went first in the ‘Feedback and way forward’ session in relation to place-making, identifying its ‘top 3’ points, with other groups identifying additional points. These are identified in Appendix 9.
3c EMERGING PLANNING AND ENVIRONMENT STRATEGY

Set out below is a brief account from Graham Harrington of the discussions that took place on the emerging Planning and Environment Strategy.

**Group 1**

Discussion started by the point being made that the masterplan should be led by the University’s academic strategy. There was support for Strategy point 6 E, including the need to encourage business start-up units, within the context of the University being a ‘Global Anchor’ – with reference also being made to the Government’s industrial strategy. It was requested that the meaning of the term ‘fringes’ to the Campus Heart in Strategy point 6 G (conference centre and hotel) be clarified and there was some discussion about the need for a hotel to help service conferences. Strategy point 6 D (student accommodation) was considered to be rather convoluted – the key link that should be stressed is between student numbers and purpose-built student accommodation.

The strategy was encouraged to focus on the Campus Heart and work outwards in concentric circles – considering what would be lost as well as what would be provided in these areas. There was some discussion about the extent of use by local people of existing cultural/sports uses and the need to improve availability/ access. The need to improve communications with local people was also stressed.

**Group 2**

The campus was considered to be somewhat of a mishmash, with poor layout and relationship between buildings/spaces and a lack of sense of arrival. A masterplan was seen as vital and it should follow good examples (e.g., Oxford or areas other campus cities). Quality of design was considered to be an important factor and local people wanted to keep green areas to the east of University Road.

There were a number of issues of concern in the Rough Common area, including the loss of a local pub to a student letting agency, through-traffic movements along Rough Common Road, coaches cutting through the village and students cycling on pavements (not noted by the scribe).

Tyler Hill Road is very narrow and it would be difficult to provide infrastructure to Northern Land Holdings. Improved crossing, security and safety needed on Tyler Hill Road (including pedestrian footways) and measures needed to prevent fly-tipping and speeding.

Blean school currently results in traffic movements through the campus as parents/ carers drive to and from the car park near Oaks Nursery to drop-off and pick up. A representative of the school should have been invited to the workshop. The possible relocation and re-building of the school was raised – to facilitate a vehicular access on to Whitstable Road, improve existing access issues, provide a new/larger school and vehicular access to Northern Land Holdings.

Three was the need to think outside of the red line to join up the city and campus through mixed use development – schools, accommodation and leisure. There was support for Strategy points 6D (student accommodation), 6E (business and research) and 6F (sports, community and cultural uses).

There was discussion about the need to extend the amount of student accommodation on campus and the need to talk with students (to ascertain their needs on and off campus, where they would choose to live and overseas students being offered accommodation for the duration of stay on campus). Reference was also made to the City Council proposal to refresh its housing strategy (not noted by the scribe).

There was some discussion about environmental considerations, including the need to ensure buildings are economically designed and properly heated and the need to encourage healthy lifestyles, exercise and sustainable travel. The need for Sustainable Urban Drainage was also referred to.
3 COMMENTS AND DISCUSSION (CONT)

Group 3
There was the need for flexible and adaptable Masterplan – which should be based on an open-minded approach so that investment can be allowed. The Masterplan needs to evolve through better public consultation; the first consultation was not great, but consultation has improved greatly.

Need to consider whether to use ‘Canterbury District’ as the reference rather than ‘the City of Canterbury’ in the vision statement. There was also some concern that the importance of the World Heritage Site was being over emphasised (not noted by the scribe).

The consultants’ brief was questioned and in response it was confirmed that the aim was to align the masterplan with the District Local Plan ‘plan period’ (up to 2031), with the short-term being seen as up to 2021 (greater degree of certainty), the medium term being up to 2031 and the longer-term beyond this.

There is the need to set the Canterbury campus in the wider context – Medway and Europe. The University is part of a national/international economy and is an ‘engine of economic activity’. In terms of economic macro-planning, the University will drive the knowledge-based economy, so need to take a flexible approach, recognising that all universities need to have a diversity of activities. The reference in the Concept Masterplan to possible business clusters in the Northern Land Holdings as being ‘early gains’ was a poor choice of words (provocative and misleading). The concept of allied businesses was good but, locating them requires careful consideration, including access and the need to fit in to the landscape.

A number of Tyler Hill residents have been approached to purchase land/houses. Was this by the University? (Note it can be confirmed that the University has not made such approaches) (not noted by the scribe).

Specific comment made about the wording of strategy point 6 O in relation to Sustainable Urban Drainage Systems (SUDS) – the words ‘where practicable and viable’ should be deleted (not noted by scribe).

There are approx. 20,000 staff and students now. No significant growth is expected in the next 3-5 years. The level of expected growth in the longer-term is not known – with this depending on a number of factors. The campus could get smaller, not bigger – whereas the perception is one of expansion only.

Feedback
Group 2 went first in the ‘Feedback and way forward’ session in relation to planning and environment, in identifying its ‘top 3’ points, with other groups identifying additional points. These are identified in Appendix 9.
3d EMERGING LANDSCAPE AND BIODIVERSITY STRATEGY

Set out below is a brief account from Catherine Morris of the discussions that took place on the emerging Landscape and Biodiversity Strategy.

**Group 1**

The workshop opened with a discussion around improvements to the existing rights of way that exist on campus with comments about how buildings on campus had been built over rights of way so there was no longer an intuitive route for walkers or cyclists. It was agreed that extending beyond existing rights of way into looking at how people could access and use the campus was a good idea through development of an access and amenity strategy.

It was then discussed how students use the campus and how this could be improved by involving student groups more in the development and use of the campus. For example, conservation students should be involved in planning green spaces on campus and both internal and external parts of the campus could be used as a living lab to test out research in a real-world environment. This engagement should be consistent to reduce the problem of initiatives collapsing over the summer when the cohort leaves.

The final point focused on what the ‘best garden campus in the UK’ would look like. The key point to emerge was to improve and develop vistas and encourage people outside to enjoy them. It was agreed that vistas were very important given our position at the top of the hill and that our views are key to attracting students. These vistas should be visible from buildings, from pathways and from transport routes as you arrive on campus. It was thought that more, varied and innovative seating and break-out areas would draw people outside. These should be designed for year-round use with shelter where appropriate and could incorporate elements of technology such as USB/Power outlets, renewable energy technologies.

Additional to the three key points, the group also discussed incorporating links to our cultural heritage through orchards and using the landscape for local food production and bringing back traditional crafts such as willow weaving. This could be linked to Local schools as well as students to provide teaching and possible apprenticeship opportunities.

**Group 2**

It was noted by this group that some of the older buildings on campus were not visually appealing, especially when viewed from the sides or back and that these could be softened with planting while maintaining the sight lines and lighting needed to ensure the campus remained a safe place from walking.

Again, it was discussed that the central campus has no discernible identity and that key landmarks could be built to allow people to navigate more easily. Ideas include a clock tower, water feature and bandstand. It was agreed that this should extend to the entrances to the campus to make them more visible as well as giving them their own identity.

Finally, it was agreed that there was a need to keep some car parking on central campus but that these car parks and any new ones built could incorporate planting to break up the paved areas and improve visual appeal as well as aiding with water run-off issues.

**Group 3**

This group were mainly concerned with land use north of central campus.

It was agreed that the crab and winkle way (walking/cycle path, not to be confused with crab and winkle railway line) was a beautiful, open and picturesque route and that the existing tranquillity should not be compromised by future developments and that the University should contain growth to the central campus.

As well as preserving open space, the possibilities to repair and reinstate landscape and woodland areas was discussed. It was thought there is opportunity to look at historical landscape features such as field patterns and boundaries, orchard areas and hedgerows to reflect the historical landscape and provide connectivity to the Blean woods.

The final key point was stated briefly but agreed that the masterplan and development of the campus should be conducted on a foundation of overarching sustainability taking into account environment, people, social and financial factors.

CONTINUED OVERLEAF
3 COMMENTS AND DISCUSSION (CONT)

Group 4
Discussion in this group mainly revolved around the three key points:

Consideration of major local infrastructure projects when developing the landscape strategy. A number of potential future projects in the wider area were discussed including construction of a large reservoir, Canterbury by-pass and the ‘Nemo’ link. It was thought these developments would have an impact on traffic, land use and resources around the University and should therefore be taken into account when developing plans.

Incorporating SuDS into the campus. It was noted that there are large areas of hard-standing on campus and that much of the surface water run-off ends up in the Sarre Penn with considerable scope for heavy metals and other pollutants from car parks etc... to enter this watercourse. It was agreed that this should be considered from the outset of any campus development and that SuDS could be used to protect watercourses as well as provide further opportunities to conserve water through utilisation of rainwater harvesting and greywater systems.

Reinstatement of historical landscape. Much of this discussion mirrored that from group 3 from using reinstatement of historical landscape patterns to provide reconnection of habitats.

Feedback
Group 3 went first in the ‘Feedback and way forward’ session in relation to landscape and biodiversity, identifying its ‘top 3’ points, with other groups identifying additional points. These are identified in Appendix 9.

3e EMERGING MOVEMENT AND TRANSPORT STRATEGY

Set out below is a brief account from Ben Hamilton-Baillie of the discussions that took place on the emerging Movement and Transport Strategy.

Group 1
From the start, a strong theme emerged to shift the campus movement hierarchy away from roads and motorised transport towards walking, cycling and lower impact modes. (This overriding theme was echoed by all four groups). The use of technology to promote and encourage greater car occupancy and car sharing was raised.

Parking strategy was raised, with some variation in views; some favoured focusing on closer visitor parking close to individual buildings, whilst keeping staff and student parking closer to the periphery.

The importance of improving links to the Railway Station for both pedestrians/ bicycles and buses came up. Similarly, enhancing routes to the City Centre was seen as vital. The relevance of the Crab and Winkle Way was discussed, and an important clarification made between the pedestrian/bicycle ROUTE of that name, and the Crab and Winkle Line. Generally, there was scepticism about the use of the old track bed due to impact on residential properties and its lack of continuity.

The problems of access to the University from the north, and particularly from the A229 (Thanet Way) was raised. There was strong consensus on the need to retain the rural qualities of the A290 through Pean Hill, Honey Hill and Blean. The unsuitability of Forty Acres Road as a strategic route was highlighted.

The group stressed the importance of continuing to understand and monitor the origins of trips to the University, and the places where faculty and students live (updating and expanding the University Travel Plan).
The group considered the potential and implications of a new route east to west, and the notion of an ‘Eastern Relief Road’ (as suggested as part of development proposals). Group felt that the City should not have to cope with increasing traffic generated by the University.

Finally, the need for monitoring and learning from best practice elsewhere was discussed, such as the work done in Bournemouth to integrate transport proposals and minimise car impact.

**Group 2**

Like Group 1, Group 2 started by emphasizing the importance of clearer walking and cycling routes. In addition, they stressed the potential value of such routes for the broader community (access to schools etc).

The poor quality of existing pedestrian signage, and the contrasting dominance of the motorway-style traffic signage, was felt to give entirely the wrong signals about priorities.

The problems generated by access to, and parking, around Blean School were highlighted.

The growing size of vans and trucks servicing the University causes concern, and there was discussion around the potential to keep service vehicles and deliveries to as small vehicles as possible.

Much discussion centred around the importance of the links between the campus and the Railway Station, and between campus and City Centre. The role of the existing No. 3 bus route was emphasised.

The National Express coach service, and its potential role as a long-distance method of transport to the University was discussed. It no longer makes a stop at Rough Common (?), and students have to reach the Bus and Coach Station to the south of the City Centre.

Finally, the critical issue traffic speeds on campus was highlighted, and the negative effect this can have on other, more appropriate, forms of movement and transport. This included buses, coaches and contractor vehicles, all of whom can be briefed and advised by the University.

**Group 3**

Speed again was raised as a key issue by this Group. This was raised especially in connection with the barrier effect of traffic routes across the campus, especially Giles Lane. There was support for arrangement that gave the University an opportunity to change the perception and environment of Giles Lane (to ‘humanise it’) to overcome its adverse impacts, whilst keeping it open as a key east-west route.

Blean School and its traffic implications was discussed, and the difficulties the school traffic generates for the surrounding community. Options for moving to a more appropriate alternative site, better suited to the growing size of the school were discussed, and the possibilities for new access routes.

The Group considered the potential for additional routes, either as a ‘link road’ around the campus, or as a means to link Sturry Road approach (A28) around the Hales Drive residential area.

The potential for greater use for the disused Crab and Winkle Line was discussed.

The strategy for campus parking generated much discussion, with the potential for multi-level parking, or underground parking that made use of the contours considered. Different views about the benefits / disbenefits of increasing parking supply were evident. Parking to the east of Darwin College (the Eastern land holdings) was raised by several group members. Further discussion focused on car parking in the Northern Land Holdings, perhaps linked to a new east-west connection to the north to relieve pressure on Giles Lane, Tyler Hill and Blean.

Congestion on Tyler Hill Road, with its numerous pinch-points, was raised, with questions considered about how any changes in road design might alleviate this. The issue surfaced on how to reconcile Tyler Hill Road and St. Stephens Hill with the key access route to the eastern side of the campus.

The critical importance of better access to Canterbury West Railway Station was highlighted, with the opportunity to purchase relevant land from Network Rail on Roper Road.
3 COMMENTS AND DISCUSSION (CONT)

Group 4
Group 4 structured their discussion around the different timescales inherent in a 50-year masterplan. This included interesting debate and discussion about whether there should be gradually less on-site parking in order to reduce car dependency, or whether a rationalisation and potential increase in spaces should be preferred.

In the short term, the priority was widely seen to be reduction in the impact of traffic on the campus and on local roads. There was general acceptance that motor traffic is likely to dominate transport activity to and around the campus, despite the welcome increase in walking and cycling.

For the medium (10-20 year) term, the Group saw the need for a much more coherent and cohesive transport strategy developed by the University, the City of Canterbury, Kent County Council and Network Rail, together with other players. Measures such as smaller, flexible public vehicles were considered. Direct and convenient access to Canterbury West Station is clearly seen as essential.

For the very long term, a value-based mission statement, setting out a clear set of objectives for the University, was seen as the most appropriate means to gather consensus. This might focus on reducing private car use to zero, and a zero-based emissions goal. The University was seen as an ideal generator of progress in the field of movement and transport, with the opportunity to become a leading innovator in the sector.

Feedback
Group 4 went first in the ‘Feedback and way forward’ session in relation to movement and transport, identifying its ‘top 3’ points, with other groups identifying additional points. These are identified in Appendix 9.
APPENDIX 1:
INVITED EXTERNAL STAKEHOLDER GROUPS

- Ashford Borough Council
- Blean Parish Council
- Blean Parochial Church Council
- Blean, Hackington and Tyler Hill Society
- Campaign for the Protection of Rural England – Kent Branch
- Canterbury 4 Business
- Canterbury Archaeological Trust
- Canterbury City Council – members and officers
- Canterbury Connected Business Improvement District (BID)
- Canterbury Heritage and Design Forum
- Canterbury Society
- Canterbury World Heritage Site Committee
- Crab and Winkle Line Trust
- Diocese of Canterbury
- Dover District Council
- Environment Agency
- Hackington Parish Council
- Harbledown and Rough Common Parish Council

- Highways England
- Historic England
- International Council on Monuments and Sites
- Kent County Council – members and officers
- Kent Cultural Transformation Board
- Kent Invicta Chamber of Commerce
- Kent Union
- Kent Wildlife Trust
- Natural England
- Shepway District Council
- South East LEP
- Southern Water
- SPOKES East Kent Cycle Campaign
- St Michael's Road Area & Harkness Drive Residents Association
- St Stephen's Residents Association
- Swale Borough Council
- Thanet District Council
- Whitstable Road Residents Association
APPENDIX 2: WORKSHOP PROGRAMME

08.30 – 09.15  Registration and breakfast – Sibson Foyer
09.15 – 09.50  Scene setting and presentation – Sibson Lecture Theatre 2
• Peter Czarnomski, University of Kent
• Graham Harrington, CMA Planning
• John Letherland, JLL
09.50 – 10.30  Introductions and Workshop Session 1
10.30 – 11.00  Workshop Session 2
11.00 – 11.15  Break
11.15 – 11.45  Workshop Session 3
11.45 – 12.15  Workshop Session 4
12.15 – 12.30  Break
12.30 – 13.30  Feedback and way forward – Sibson Lecture Theatre 2
• Graham Harrington, CMA Planning
• James Farrar, Farrar Planning
13.30 to 15.00  Lunch – Sibson Foyer

An informal opportunity to continue discussions
APPENDIX 3: WORKSHOP OPENING PRESENTATION

Framework Masterplan for the University of Kent, Canterbury Strategic Spatial Vision Workshop
19 July 2017

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Time</th>
<th>Session</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>9.15 to 9.50</td>
<td>Scene setting and presentation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9.50 to 10.30</td>
<td>Getting settled &amp; Workshop Session 1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10.30 to 11.00</td>
<td>Workshop Session 2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11.00 to 11.15</td>
<td>Comfort Break</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11.15 to 11.45</td>
<td>Workshop Session 3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11.45 to 12.15</td>
<td>Workshop Session 4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12.15 to 12.30</td>
<td>Comfort Break</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12.30 to 1.30</td>
<td>Feedback and way forward</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1.30 to 3.00</td>
<td>Lunch</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

1963 OS map: The pre-University Context

1965 Masterplan by Lord Holford
APPENDIX 3: WORKSHOP OPENING PRESENTATION (CONT)
APPENDIX 3:
WORKSHOP OPENING PRESENTATION (CONT)

Questions for the day:
What have we got right?
What have we missed?
What could be improved?

Framework Masterplan for the University of Kent, Canterbury Strategic Spatial Vision Workshop Programme

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Time</th>
<th>Activity</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>9.15 to 9.50</td>
<td>Scene setting and presentation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9.50 to 10.30</td>
<td>Getting settled &amp; Workshop Session 1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10.30 to 11.00</td>
<td>Workshop Session 2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11.00 to 11.15</td>
<td>Comfort Break</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11.15 to 11.45</td>
<td>Workshop Session 3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11.45 to 12.15</td>
<td>Workshop Session 4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12.15 to 12.30</td>
<td>Comfort Break</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12.30 to 1.30</td>
<td>Feedback and way forward</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1.30 to 3.00</td>
<td>Lunch</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Strategic Spatial Vision Workshop
Campus Boundary map
19 July 2017
Group 1
Helen Ellis (University of Kent)
Colin Finch (KCC Transport)
Cllr Barbara Flack (Blean Parish Council)
Richard Norman (St Michael’s Road Area Residents’ Association)
Sarah Nurden (South East LEP)
Craig Webster (Canterbury Heritage and Design Forum)
Ruth Wilkinson (Kent Union)

Group 2
Cllr Amy Baker (Blean Forest Ward)
Lorna Ford (CCC Head of Strategy)
Diana Holbrook (Canterbury Society)
Stephen Laird (Blean Parochial Church Council)
John Morley (University of Kent)
Simon Sharp (Southern Water)
Ryan Shiel (KCC Transport)
Cllr Beatrice Shire (Harbledown and Rough Common Parish Council)
Andrew Webster (Canterbury World Heritage Site Committee)

Group 3
Matt Banbury (SPOKES and Crab and Winkle Line Trust)
Ian Brown (CCC AD Planning and Regeneration)
Cllr Ray Evison (Hackington Parish Council)
Denise Horswell (Blean and Hackington Parish Councils)
Anthony Mooring (Blean Residents Community Group)
Robert Stevenson (Diocese of Canterbury)
Juliet Thomas (University of Kent)
Cllr Robert Thomas (Chatham and Stone Street Ward)
Tony Whiting (St Stephen’s Residents’ Association)

Group 4
Cllr Neil Baker (Tankerton Ward)
Paul Bennett (Canterbury Archaeological Trust)
Richard Cottam (University of Kent)
Cllr Georgina Glover (Sturry Ward)
Barrie Gore (CPRE)
Trixia Hulks (Blean, Hackington and Tyler Hill Society)
David Lane (CCC Planning)
Joseph Williamson (KCC Flood Risk)
APPENDIX 5:
GROUP 1 NOTES

Emerging Place-making Strategy

- Safe environment
- Low rise buildings fronting open spaces
- Generous space between buildings
- Well light paths/routes
- Accessibility - cycle ways
- Open ended routes with no focus
- Hierarchy of connections
- Arrival/departure points which are welcoming

Emerging Planning and Environment Strategy

- Planning
  - Focus on heart of campus with self-sufficient outer rings
  - Demonstrates a link with the academic strategy
  - Encourage business global
  - Start of units with Ukc as hub
  - Relationship between student numbers and floorspace (utilization!)
  - Availability to community and its communication
Appendix 5: Group 1 notes

Emerging Landscape and Biodiversity Strategy

Landscape workshop - Feedback from Group One

1. Rights of way improvement strategy
   - Sensory walks
   - Map of visible areas
   - Suggested walks
   - Change less attractive or off-putting
   - Increase access

2.G. Landscape work
   - Kent landscape
   - Cultural heritage
   - Traditional orchards

3. Links to students' conservation group - Greater engagement

4. Living lab - Using whole landscape approach

5. Arrival destination & branded entrance pts
   - Could the landscape support this? Link to our cultural heritage? Orchard/Out house/something else?

6. Garden campus needs visits

7. On transport routes to draw

8. Exit points in buildings to access outside

9. Garden furniture to use for rest, relaxation, etc.

10. Landscape with plants dotted along site

Emerging Movement and Transport Strategy

Movement + Transport workshop - Feedback from Group one

1. Welcome changing hierarchy - from car to walking/running

2. Move vehicle movements away from heart of campus to a "back route"

3. Link car parking usage to building usage - lecturers + students / frequent visitors encouraged to walk, but infrequent visitors from off campus will need park as campus is "only residential area visitors"

4. No direct bus from railway station - improved direct walking route required

5. Crab & winkle line - be clear with "long way"

6. Poor transport movement across

7. Forty acres/St Dunstan

8. Many people travel in from Thanet Way

9. Provide new road to north

10. East relief route

11. Car sharing - must encourage

12. Examining where lectures/students live

13. To promote greener transport such as walking, cycling

14. Consider best practice

15. Keep A290 - keep rural nature of this road

This controls traffic flow.
APPENDIX 6: GROUP 2 NOTES

Emerging Place-making Strategy

- Poor use of space - the existing architecture is somewhat hostile / large building blocks.
- Existing building dispersed / isolated in its space.
- Natural landscaping helps break up built areas.
- Hostility of buildings and car parks adjacent.
- Identify suitable pedestrian routes around campus - signage, wayfinding.
- All existing buildings are inward facing and do not look out on community.
- Encourage multiple uses of open space -节点 routes, seating areas.
- A hierarchy of streets / places needed.
- Giles Lane is seen as the service entrance.
- Reference point needed - clock tower, no existing reference point - fountain.
- Legibility & clarity

- Loss of parking on campus has knock on effect in local area.
- Existing routes (Elliot Path) generally come out on housing estates rather than places.
- Ensure mobility access to all areas.
- Campus not very welcoming, needs a focal point.
- Provide more community areas - cycle routes, facilities open to public.
- Existing conference facilities, library.
- Transparency of processes surrounding development and process. Decisions should not be made in isolation.
Emerging Planning and Environment Strategy

**GROUP 2: Planning + Environment**

- Mix match campus - poor layout
- Should follow good examples - Oxford or areas with campus cities
- Master plan is vital
- Public wish/ambition to keep green areas east of University Road.
- Local issues in Rough Common - Loss of local pub, student letting through movements along Rough Common Rd.
- Quality of design important factor.
- Tyler Hill Road very narrow, difficult to provide infrastructure to northern land holdings.
- Improved crossing, security, safety on Tyler Hill Rd. - Fly-tipping, speeding
- Relocation of Blein school - provide access to land holdings & reduce existing issues at school.

- Must think outside of red line.
- Joining city and campus through mixed use development - Schools, accommodation, leisure.
- Points 96/16, 6F very positive.
- Extend amount of student accommodation on campus. 1,800 units built in last few years.
- Talk to students - their needs on campus/off campus - where would students choose to live?
- Overseas students offered accommodation for duration of stay on campus.
- Ensure buildings are economically designed - properly heated
- Encourage healthy lifestyles - exercise, sustainable travel.
- Consider various options for drainage - SWD's
APPENDIX 6: GROUP 2 NOTES (CONT)

Emerging Landscape and Biodiversity Strategy

[Image of handwritten notes]

- LANDSCAPE
  - Note: Northern land holdings do not fit into the campus.
  - Opportunity to border with additional planting.
  - Focus on campus area - topical
  - Community resources - importance
  - Approach to order building portfolio - blending to new.
  - Security needs: sight lines/lighting, safe place
  - Focal points: features
    - Pathway
    - Orchards - linking to historical land use
    - Need to keep parks/treelines rather than reduce.
  - Landmarks - linkage (monument marker)

- ENTRANCES
  - Identity
  - Augmentation
  - Ease of navigation
  - National cycle route
Emerging Movement and Transport Strategy

- Access to All?
  - Cycling forums
- Signage: To city within campus, rough.
- Inconvenient parking: Impact on residents, parking restrictions.
- Vehicle movements: Clean school, less emissions?
- Large vehicles: Is there an option for re-location of school? (NB: No one present from relocation/authority school)
- Value of footpath, cycling routes to community
- Note: Other blocks in immediate area

- Linkage between campus & city.
- Railway station: Access route:
  - Buses: No 3 route.
  - Transport priority: R_Common: National Express
- Speed: No vehicle central theme
  - Bus coach contractors
APPENDIX 7: GROUP 3 NOTES

Emerging Place-making Strategy

- Natural Environment
  - Density of buildings on the campus heart
  - Entertainment
  - Walking access/freedom not published to local residents enough. Embedding the community within the University
  - Flexibility in terms of new opportunities coming forward
  - Create a space to make other people envious – make them want to come here
  - Teaching, research & enterprise

Emerging Planning and Environment Strategy

- Flexibility & scalability
- Need better public consultation: better advertised
- Think whether we use ‘Canterbury District’ or ‘University District’
- Embedding the community within the University
- Education
- Embedding the community within the University
- Flexibility & scalability
- Need better public consultation: better advertised
- Think whether we use ‘Canterbury District’ or ‘University District’
- Embedding the community within the University
- Education
Emerging Landscape and Biodiversity Strategy

- Biomes - Ancient woodland canopy
- Wood chips for local biomass change
- Energy is sustainable landscapes
- Provide greenspace, "excellent!"
- We lead the way
- Preserve the countryside/communities

* Take a long-term view
  * Blean Church, Crab and Winkle Way
  - Amenities
  - Preserve tranquility
  - Sunset & Sunrise
  - Open, picturesque

* University needs to grow where it already exists
  * Retain ancient woodland
  * Overarching sustainability
  * Landscape led development

* Protect, re-structure and grow woodland areas
* Land management is of prime importance
  (To not allow University to swallow up real area)

* Opportunity to look at historical landscape features - fields & boundaries, orchards, hedgerows, historic field patterns
* Traffic increase - major concern
APPENDIX 7: GROUP 3 NOTES (CONT)

Emerging Movement and Transport Strategy

- Acquisition of Giles Lane
  - Minimize barrier effect of roads
  - Keep traffic speed low
  - Enable look to design the road; make it more of a human environment (cars, bikes, pedestrians)
  - With walking & cycling avenues

- Car Parking
  - Where?
  - Northern landings (fields)
  - Multi-storey 3x sites, totaling 6,500 spaces?

- Tyler Hill Road
  - Access to main look or to Innovation Centre?
  - Widening THB? * Shuttle buses
  - Re-name road & whole way & line

- New link road between Whitstable Road & St Stephens Hill (to support Giles Lane & THB) "outside the box"

- People Road - land for sale

- Central car park for visitors

- Blean School
  - Could it be moved
  - Could a new access road be built (drop off/pick up made easier)

- Bypass Hales Place to Sturry

- "Bury West Station - easier access - station"
APPENDIX 8:
GROUP 4 NOTES

Emerging Place-making Strategy

1. Zoning campus ability to navigate by outdoor space, not just buildings. Creation of space using historical references. "Tell the story."

2. Hypothesize orientation of building backdoors from front doors, no street hierarchy - we have a grid approach (University Road) but no destination - consider 50 years, do we need destination point accessed by cars?

3. Only future expansion to be within existing development areas. Retain/cont-build on tower parking belt.

Emerging Planning and Environment Strategy

GROUP 4
PLANNING + ENVIRONMENT

1. Consultation on masterplanning with community critical. Moving forward, improved access required.

2. Community cohesion very important next integration required, example of vibrant summer fiddlesticks previously.

5. 2014 start and student move. 2-3 year expected numbers know-while 3-50? not known. Depends on a number of external factors. The campus could get smaller, not bigger. The perception is expansion only.

CONTINUED OVERLEAF
APPENDIX 8: GROUP 4 NOTES (CONT)

Emerging Landscape and Biodiversity Strategy

1. Consider impact of major infrastructure projects on the area within 50 years.
      "Nemo" link?
      Plan/Broadoak Reservoir

2. Hard surface water runoff impact on environment. Potential use for soaking water needs of the wider landscape.

3. Focus on re-establishment of historical landscapes/reconnecting habitats.

Emerging Movement and Transport Strategy

1. Short term - 5/10 years, vehicles as now...impact on local roads, traffic.

2. Medium term - Cohesive strategy working with CCC & National Rail on improvements, routes, station enhancing.

3. Long term - 50 years - Deliver a mission statement - zero car, be sector leader.
### APPENDIX 9: NOTES FROM ‘FEEDBACK AND WAY FORWARD’ SESSION

**Place-making**
Set out below are the notes of the feedback and way forward session of each Group’s ‘Top 3’ points.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Group</th>
<th>Place-making</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Group 1</td>
<td>SAFE ENVIRONMENT — LOW-RISE BUILDINGS FACING OPEN SPACES. GENERAL SPACE BETWEEN BUILDINGS. ARRIVAL DEPARTURE POINTS WHICH ARE WELCOMING.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Group 2</td>
<td>LEGIBILITY (VALID PATHS), TRANSPARENCY OF PROCESS, WALKING ROUTES AND REFUGE POINTS, MORE BEAUTY</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Group 3</td>
<td>DENSITY OF BUILDING ON CAMPUS — ALWAYS FLEXIBILITY, CREATING PLACE ON TOP OF MILL — ENHANCE HAVING MORE WELCOMING OPEN TO ALL</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Group 4</td>
<td>ZONING, PLANNING BY SPACES, HISTORY OF SITE, SOCIAL LAYOUT, CREATE DESTINATION.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Planning and Environment**
Set out below are the notes of the feedback and way forward session of each Group’s ‘Top 3’ points.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Group</th>
<th>Planning &amp; Environment</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Group 1</td>
<td>LACK OF THINKING ABOUT HOW UNIVERSITY RELATES TO AND IMPACTS UPON LINKS TO ITS (COMPLEX) NEIGHBOURS BESIDES THE BOUNDARY. GOOD TO HAVE OTHER USES, ALLOW COMMUNITY TO USE THE FACILITIES AND PROVIDE MORE STUDENT ACCOM ON CAMPUS AND FOCUS ON HEART.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Group 2</td>
<td>ACADEMIC STRATEGY AND MASTERPLAN, ENSURE BUSINESSES / CENTRE OF EXCELLENCE, PROFESSIONAL INCREASE IN ACCOM.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Group 3</td>
<td>THREE HILL ROAD — NEW ENV RD (MORE SCHOOL?) — LAND OOCULTURISM. UNIVERSITY PATRONISE ITSELF NATURALLY WHEN</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Group 4</td>
<td>ENRICHMENT (IMMIGRANTS), NOT JUST NEW BUILD, COMMUNITY COHESION (CHILDREN)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

(continued on the next page)
APPENDIX 9: NOTES FROM ‘FEEDBACK AND WAY FORWARD’ SESSION (CONT)

**Landscape and Biodiversity**
Set out below are the notes of the feedback and way forward session of each Group’s ‘Top 3’ points.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Group</th>
<th>Landscape &amp; Biodiversity</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Group A</td>
<td><strong>University needs to grow where it already exists</strong>&lt;br&gt;<strong>Ditching sustainability</strong>&lt;br&gt;<strong>Prevent, repair, rehabilitate &amp; grow landscape &amp; woodland areas</strong>&lt;br&gt;<strong>Access &amp; interpretation (understanding &amp; appreciation)</strong>&lt;br&gt;<strong>Planting &amp; bird gqling, Bats &amp; squirrels</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Group 2</td>
<td><strong>Historic Parks: Healing of the soul</strong>&lt;br&gt;<strong>Access to green space &amp; development of the park</strong>&lt;br&gt;<strong>Sustainable transport for students &amp; staff</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Group 3</td>
<td><strong>Incorporating green spaces &amp; schools</strong>&lt;br&gt;<strong>Developing green spaces &amp; parks</strong>&lt;br&gt;<strong>Enhancing the surrounding areas</strong>&lt;br&gt;<strong>Enhancement of space</strong>&lt;br&gt;<strong>Out of sight, out of mind</strong>&lt;br&gt;<strong>Reduction of access &amp; mobility strategies</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
| Group 4 | **Watermore: Climate change mitigation**

**Movement and Transport**
Set out below are the notes of the feedback and way forward session of each Group’s ‘Top 3’ points.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Group</th>
<th>Movement &amp; Transport</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Group 1</td>
<td><strong>Short travel - no IRS vehicles as non...impact on local roads/town</strong>&lt;br&gt;<strong>Medium term --come up strategy, working with CCC and NET on improvements, routes, station enhancement</strong>&lt;br&gt;<strong>Long term -750 yes, cycle &amp; public transport, 0% emission cars, zero emission</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Group 2</td>
<td><strong>Parking and impact on surrounding areas</strong>&lt;br&gt;<strong>Vehicle movements, particular school travel</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Group 3</td>
<td><strong>Walkable RO to St. Stephens RO (Edw)</strong>&lt;br&gt;<strong>Corporation parking strategy (mainstay)</strong>&lt;br&gt;<strong>East and west</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Group 4</td>
<td><strong>Orange research</strong>&lt;br&gt;<strong>Transport strategy (main shift)</strong>&lt;br&gt;<strong>North Emergency - Canterbury North Station</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>