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1 CONTEXT

The Strategic Spatial Vision Discussion Document (discussed at the external stakeholder workshop on 19 July) and the Workshop Report had been circulated to attendees in advance of the meeting.

A note of the meeting (this note) will be circulated by 15 September and any further comments following discussion/reflection welcome by the end of 22 September.

The intention is to incorporate comments from this meeting in to a Step 1 Consultation Statement, which will include UoK responses to the comments made.

Attendees to be sent links to the Concept Masterplan Consultation Statement, slideshow and digital copies of the aerial photos and maps that were at the meeting.

Staff comments:
• the transparent way in which the Masterplan process is unfolding was welcomed, and the group hoped it would continue to proceed in this spirit until final completion
• against the backdrop of this shared endorsement of transparency, it was agreed that the record of this meeting should be made publicly available (analogous to the decision already made to make the July Strategic Spatial Vision Workshop report publicly available)
• lack of meaningful and responsive consultation with staff and the wider community in the past – could mean there would be marked scepticism as to the weight that will be given to comments now unless they were clearly seen to be taken into account of in the decision making and policy approaches.

2 PRESENTATION

Similar presentation to that given to the external stakeholder workshop and included in the Workshop Report. Clarification provided on the following:

• UoK responded to Department for Transport consultation on renewing franchise for train services by (amongst other things) stressing the importance of a northern entrance to Canterbury West Station
• UoK did not acquire the former Franciscan Study Centre on Giles Lane (it is understood that it has been bought by a student housing provider (Empiric).

Staff comment:
• any proposals for development of the Parklands/Southern Slopes and the Northern and Eastern Landholdings are likely to be particularly contentious with local people.
3 STRATEGIC SPATIAL VISION

Comments:
- the first sentence of the ‘Vision Statement’ should make reference to this document relating to the UoK’s objectives/institutional plan
- reference should also be made to ‘research’ as a core University principle, as well as being “an outstanding place to learn, work, visit and live.”
- last paragraph of the ‘Vision Statement’ is welcomed, but it should read “The campus will demonstrably be an exemplar for environmental sustainability etc...” to show a clear commitment from the University. Reference was made to the student-led environmental network ‘People and Planet’ and the University of Kent’s poor performance in its University League table.

4 EMERGING PLACE-MAKING STRATEGY

Staff comments:
- the campus is not one entity, but a series or collection of places of different character
- the quality of its landscape and biodiversity should be exemplary – distinguishing the UoK and presenting it with a great marketing opportunity/competitive advantage
- different opinions were expressed on the relative attractiveness of different parts of the campus – the Campus Heart is drab and the edges are more attractive, or is it the other way around?
- question over the strategy point to create a sense of arrival. Is it possible to have a sense of arrival for a dispersed campus? Perhaps it should be “senses of arrival” – different for different people (staff, students, drivers, pedestrians, cyclists from different directions)
- the current lack of signage for people walking/cycling up from Canterbury West Station is a problem
- St Stephens Hill is steep and narrow and therefore dangerous for cyclists – and needs to be improved as a key arrival point
- need to improve the experience of arrival by Eliot (currently confronted by bins)
- access is easier today by public transport than it has been in the past
- Intensification of campus is a good thing up to a point – buildings could be higher (four-storeys) – but need to be careful not to destroy what is attractive
- Giles Lane is difficult to cross – could it become a “high street” – support for the UoK taking over management of this road in order to improve it/stop rat-running
- support for considering the spaces between the buildings as well as the buildings themselves
- value the campus being not being floodlit at night (unlike the cricket ground).

Clarification:
- the masterplan will consider redevelopment of existing buildings as well as new development integrated between existing buildings – particular focus on the spaces between buildings
- the UoK is not necessarily modelling the masterplan on other University masterplans and the level of specificity in the forthcoming masterplan options is still being considered.
5 EMERGING PLANNING & ENVIRONMENT STRATEGY

Staff comments:
• use of the word ‘fringes’ in G is misleading/ambiguous and should be remove/made clearer
• there should be no development on the Southern Slopes – to do so would be inconsistent with the notions of consolidation and intensification of the Campus Heart: it would also be seen as provocative and misguided by local residents as well as staff, students, local public authorities and relevant charities and societies, who evidently value the environmental/heritage character of the landscape and the wide range of activities it permits in its unspoilt form. It would be deeply counter-productive to ongoing efforts to foster stronger ties between the University and these constituencies to continue to threaten it with development
• environment and wellbeing section appears to suggest that physical and mental “wellbeing” only relates to buildings, but the wellbeing comes from the spaces between the buildings, the green space/the landscape/connection with nature – rewording needed
• concern at reference to a solar farm (in ‘O’) – the UoK should maximise use of roof space for PV arrays (solar/thermal more effective)
• add a bullet point about the types of building materials under consideration in relation to biodiversity and sustainability
• universities are places of innovation and therefore the UoK should consider using the expertise of researchers and innovators at the university (ie, School of Architecture, DICE etc)
• see also comments above on Strategic Spatial Vision.

6 EMERGING LANDSCAPE & BIODIVERSITY STRATEGY

• Concern about the loss of ancient woodland to develop the Sibson Building.
• Need to plan for planting and developing the landscape not just the buildings, but also the connection with nature, the opportunities that are there with the landscape.
• Recognising the differing character and value of different parts of the campus, the different landscapes- some could be enhanced, some should be left alone (noted that a Phase 1 habitat survey is being carried out at this stage).
• Noted that visual impact and views of the campus are being considered and that buildings are considered successful when they do not break the tree line.
• See relevant comments on other emerging strategies.

7 EMERGING MOVEMENT & TRANSPORT STRATEGY

• Support for a car parking strategy.
• Scope for digital signs or an app (for example) that indicate the number of spaces available in a car park to reduce the amount of driving around, fuel consumption, pollutions and damage to air quality.
• Support for some kind of inducement for staff not to drive (eg, collection of ‘green points’?).
• Support for better connectivity between Canterbury West Station and the campus for walkers and cyclists – focus on less environmentally impactful modes of transport (walking, scycling, buses etc)
• Support for big thinking – ski lift up Eliot hill, powered by the gym!
• See relevant comments on other emerging strategies.