

APPENDIX 5 – LIST OF ALL COMMENTS

APPENDIX 5A – COMMENTS FROM GROUPS

This appendix contains feedback received by hand, post and email from the start of the consultation period until the end of 2016. The feedback has been anonymized by the removal of name and address information and any additional personal information within the feedback that may unintentionally lead to the identification of an individual.

Blean Parish Council

Initial Response from Blean Parish Council September 2016

This first response has been written after consultation with the Parish Councillors and attendance at two presentations held by the University of Kent.

Blean Parish Council welcomes the publication of the Concept Master Plan, it has given an opportunity to enter into dialogue with the University and has ended speculation and rumours. At first sight the plan would appear to have severe implications to the village and the Tyler Hill Road, however at this point in the consultation we should be mindful that this is a conceptual plan – not a concrete indication of potential developments in our parish.

The Northern Holdings [as named by the University] are, to a greater extent, agricultural in nature and reflect the rural aspect surrounding the village of Blean. Blean Parish Council have, and will continue, to strongly oppose, the building on and the loss of agricultural land in and around the village. The land provides a positive rural border between Tyler Hill village and Blean village.

The area is served by a rural road, in places very narrow, named Tyler Hill Road. This road is not able to sustain any further traffic without causing danger to pedestrians, cyclists, farm vehicles and cars. This was illustrated recently with the Stagecoach bus diversion along the road, numerous skid marks, near misses and a considerable disruption to the quality of life for the residents of both

villages took place. Blean Parish Council would strongly oppose any development that impacted on the traffic using the road.

Due to the conceptual nature of the Master Plan there has been much speculation regarding wordings such as 'Park and Ride', 'shuttle bus services' and 'utilising existing public roads'. All of these aspects if taken forward would have to be the subject of discussion with Blean Parish Council, Hackington Parish Council and Canterbury City Council. It should also be acknowledged that any move forward regarding development in this area would have to be accurately tested through Traffic and Transport Assessments, Ecological Impact Assessments, Sustainability Assessments etc. and further public consultations.

To summarise, Blean Parish Council do strongly oppose any change in the usage of Tyler Hill Road from its present link between the villages and as a means of access to the agricultural land bordering its sides. We would strongly oppose any development in and around the historic building of St Cosmus and St Damian in the Blean Church. We would also be strongly opposed to any 'carpet' development along the boundaries of Tyler Hill Road. We would be strongly opposed to any development, be it building or transport links, that disrupted the ecological balance that exists at present.

In conclusion, although the above outlines our potential opposition, Blean Parish Council would welcome the opportunity to continue in an open dialogue with the University of Kent regarding all proposals for the Northern Land Holdings. It is our hope that a balanced expansion of the University which would benefit the community of Blean and open up new opportunities for recreational, cultural, sport, economic and educational activities for all, can be achieved.

Hackington Parish Council

Response from Hackington Parish Council on the University of Kent Concept Master Plan Consultation Final Report Stages 1, 2 & 3 dated November 2015.

Hackington Parish Council has considered the above document and submits this response to the consultation process. The Council appreciated the opportunity to consider the various elements behind the Master Plan at the formal presentation held at the University Business School on 7th September 2016 and appreciates that it is clearly at a very early 'Concept' stage.

Given that the University has confirmed that the submission to date is an indication of what could be considered over the long term strategic development of the University owned land, potentially covering a 50-year period.

Accepting this early 'visionary' approach, the key comments of the Council are considered thus:

- The Masterplan that is in circulation is very much an initial 'Concept' at this stage and has not addressed any environmental or land use based assessment during this stage and that these would be required in the event of a planning application being submitted;
- The Council appreciates that the continued development of the University is strategically important to Canterbury City and brings many benefits to the local business communities within the District;
- The Council accepts the fact that a change in thinking relating to architectural developments within the University lands is a worthwhile exercise;
- The Council supports the concept of maximising the potential for both educational and commercial interests of the University within the existing campus footprint as described in the 'Campus Heart';

APPENDIX 5A – COMMENTS FROM GROUPS (CONT)

- The Council appreciates the development of the 'Parklands' concept in order to protect and enhance the wider open spaces to the south of the existing Campus provided that any environmental, landscape and conservation aspects are fully assessed and any negative impacts adequately managed. The Council is conscious that the present document seeks to include development, in some form, on lands to the east of Giles Lane and St Stephens. At this stage, this is only briefly commented upon and appears to be an 'Extended Campus Heart' (as indicated on Page 93 of the Plan). Very clearly, the Parish Council would seek to limit any extension on to the existing greenfield landscape until such time as the existing Campus is fully developed in line with the Campus Heart concept.
- In relation to the 'Northern Landholdings', the potential end uses for this area are less clear and Farrell has indicated some creative thinking around satellite hubs, transport links, research and potentially commercial activities. Some of these could develop into smaller satellite developments linked to the wider University research opportunities – including, as an example, links to the rural economy. However, any such development would require detailed assessments covering potential highway impacts, environmental and biodiversity aspects and any further technical assessments that would be required to support a future planning application. We expect therefore that any potential development within the Northern Land Holdings would be the subject of detailed scoping exercise, determined by Canterbury City Council as the Planning Authority.
- The Council has concerns as to the inclusion of a number of aspects relating to both pedestrian and vehicular movements between the Campus and any suggested 'satellite' sites within the Northern Land Holdings and whilst we support the potential development of rural economy research and

development 'hubs', there is simply too little detail within the Concept Plan to provide any level of consultation response.

- The Council has accepted that the inclusion of a 'Park and Ride' facility near Blean was, as is stated in your letter to us, wrongly presented and was actually meant to suggest some form of linked transport system between these outlying areas and the Campus itself and not a 'Park and Ride' facility like others around the city.
- The Plan currently recognises that extension of University interests in to the Northern area "is not considered viable or a desirable part of the growth of the University in the short to medium term" (Page 102) and we therefore see no reason to support the inclusion of this element within any strategic Planning document at this stage.

Summary

It is very evident, from the presentation attended by HPC Councillors that the currently circulated Master Plan is in a design concept stage. The presentation made it very clear that there have been no technical assessments on any environmental impacts that could be generated by the proposals and therefore there remains an obligation to undertake appropriate assessments in order to assess existing characteristics and potential future impacts. This will include all of the usual assessments including but not limited to highway, ecology, landscape, hydrology and flood risk etc. as part of any future planning application.

Hackington Parish Council is very aware that the stakeholder engagement process relating to residents within Tyler Hill fell very short of what we should expect and that the intended circulation of the proposals did not take place. HPC recommends that this is very clearly addressed at the next phase of consultation including the potential to

hold direct consultation meetings with Tyler Hill residents and Hackington Parish Council.

The Council does not support the case that any element of the proposed University lands require inclusion in the current Canterbury City Council District Plan (presently at a very advanced stage) and seeks to ensure that anything that is proposed in the longer term does not benefit from any supportive document in terms of District or County Planning.

The justification for any development within the Northern Land Holdings requires full justification in terms of a Case of Need argument and, particularly, in relation to highways and land use policies. In particular, any proposed increase in traffic movement on Tyler Hill Road will need to be rationally justified against a backdrop of an initial almost wholly hostile reaction to the proposals for the Northern Land Holdings as expressed in the Masterplan.

St Stephens Residents Association

As Chair of the St Stephens Residents Association committee, I would like to make a series of comments which I believe represent the views of our group:

We welcome the aspiration mentioned on page 75 of the Master plan to '...enable the creation of the UK's Best Garden Campus... and allow its development as a walkable environment'

We believe that it is important to maintain a 'green gap' policy so that the 'Parklands' act as a 'landscape demarcation from the City' (p94). In that respect, we would not want to see further inappropriate development of the southern slopes. It is noted that any new buildings will be designed as 'pavilions in the landscape' (p94) and wondered if the proposed conference centre that has been mentioned on previous occasions as a long-term plan for

the University could be based around the Beverley Farmhouse as part of its preservation and enhancement as a historic site. (p 94) This would enable the green setting of the southern slopes or 'parkland' to be preserved.

We are pleased that 'the proposed rethink of the campus heart will ... offer the opportunity to develop more (residential) accommodation through a more efficient use of space' as we would prefer more purpose built accommodation to be available on campus in order to reduce the high concentration of private housing in our neighbourhood used as student accommodation. (ie, Hales Place) The accommodation on campus needs to be accompanied by sufficient car parking spaces to relieve the use of residential streets for all day parking by members of university staff and students. (Residents of Manwood Avenue have mentioned that they are bothered by this)

We would welcome a new station entrance in Roper Road 'to the north side of Canterbury (West) station' to help relieve traffic at the St Dunstan's level crossing and 'avoid the bottleneck of the existing pedestrian tunnel under the...railway line'.

St Michael's Road Area Residents' Association

Response to the University of Kent Concept Masterplan August 2016

We appreciate the opportunity to comment at this early stage of developing a Masterplan for the campus of the University of Kent and we are pleased that representatives of our Association were invited to a preview of the Masterplan exhibition. As close neighbours our members are inevitably affected for better or worse by decisions made by the University management. While individual residents will wish to make their own representations we will

confine our comments to issues that affect the majority of our members.

We welcome the intention to conserve the Southern Slopes as parkland. We believe that the southern aspect of the campus ranks among the University's greatest assets. The environmental features and views from the various aspects are virtually unparalleled on UK university campuses. A commitment to protect these features is welcomed and could be strengthened.

A concerning feature of the University's vision of the parkland is its persistent intention to build a 'conferencing hotel' and 'pavilions' on that section of the Southern Slopes referred to as Chaucer Fields. Although manifestly scaled down from previous proposals, which received huge numbers of objections at the planning application stage, we contend that development on this section of the parkland is inappropriate. Reference is made in the Masterplan to the work of Capability Brown at Stowe. However, the designs of Brown were intended to enhance and develop vistas. His genius lay in how he was able to vary the vistas across a limited landscape. Currently, Chaucer Fields serves as a delightful enhancement to the existing grassland, bluebell woods and trickling streams that grace the Southern Slopes. Occupying possibly the most historic part of the campus, the remains of orchards and the unusual double hedges (markers of the ancient boundary between St Stephen's and St Dunstan's parishes) are merely the most obvious traces of the previous character of the land. We suggest that this, together with the ancient farmhouse now part of the University buildings should be better recognised and enhanced. Needless to add that the diversity in landscape produces diversity of habitat which, in turn, encourages greater diversity of species, a feature which may be more apparent to those of us who live in the vicinity than those who commute in to work here. The suggestion of

wildflower meadows elsewhere in the Masterplan is one that would sit easily in this area and enhance views already recognised as iconic across a diverse pastoral landscape towards the cathedral. Again, the contrast with the views across the green, tree-rimmed landscape of the Southern Slopes below Eliot College would be true to Brown's intent. It would be overlooking this latter part of the slopes that any 'pavilion' type structure would be appropriate in the style of Capability Brown- and maybe this should be borne in mind when the time comes to replace the existing college buildings which, we are informed, are reaching the end of their serviceable lifetimes.

We welcome the intention to concentrate further building towards the centre of the campus while commenting that attention needs to be paid to the impact of any further buildings on the skyline. The ridge above the city is already becoming increasingly cluttered with incoherent styles of university buildings, visible particularly in winter when the foliage screen is less effective.

The proposal to use the 'bomb crater' as a theatre is intriguing and attractive, providing that the structures facilitating this are temporary; for instance such as those used at ancient monuments by the National Trust, English Heritage etc. Such temporary structures would not require permanent changes to the natural environment around the Eliot footpath.

We are concerned about the proposal to open up the route of the disused railway line to the south of the University towards the City. A vehicle route along the route of the Crab and Winkle line appears to us to be impractical, necessitating as it would the demolition of several houses and gardens in Beaconsfield Road and the reconstruction of the missing railway embankment across Beaconsfield Road, not to mention severe disruption and loss of privacy

APPENDIX 5A – COMMENTS FROM GROUPS (CONT)

to residents whose homes and gardens back on to this historic route. Further, this would open an additional corridor of disturbance through a residential area. In any case, increased vehicle access from this direction would put enormous pressure on a narrow access route at the point of Beaconsfield/Forty Acres Road.

In conclusion we are pleased to be in dialogue with the University over the future of these important issues which will affect us and Canterbury as a whole. We look forward to continued participation and would welcome a greater role for the local community to be involved in responsible stewardship of this land.

Views across Chaucer Fields

Images supplied by St Michael's Road Area Residents' Association



Images supplied by St Michael's Road Area Residents' Association



Canterbury Society and Crab and Winkle Line Trust and the Canterbury Heritage Design Forum

University of Kent Concept Master Plan
Presentation by Architect John Letherland, at UKC on
26 July 2016

Present

19 representatives from Canterbury bodies including the Canterbury Society and Crab and Winkle Line Trust

Robert Palmer, Craig Webster, Clive Bowley, Val Harris, Janet Scott, Aldwyth Garside and Paul Bennett, all members of the Canterbury Heritage Design Forum.

Introduction

Set up in 1965, and now celebrating its 50th anniversary, the University of Kent is reappraising its estates strategy, and commissioned Farrells to undertake a concept Master Plan.

The aim is to review its estate and wider land holdings and plan for another 50 years. There needs to be good quality student and staff accommodation.

The 1965 Holford Master Plan took advantage of the hilltop location through distributing the original college buildings along the ridgeline. This allowed dramatic views.

There has been rapid expansion over the last decade and this has spread beyond its tighter original boundaries. This has resulted in a low density and dispersed campus environment which does not provide shelter from the elements.

The continuous outwards growth and sprawl of the campus area has led to a decreasing green periphery leaving empty pockets of space in the centre of the campus. Therefore, there is opportunity to accommodate growth without further sprawl.

The dilemma is to allow for future capacity needs and how to enrich the campus in the process. The Plan is about creating quality public realm and being part of Canterbury and support the aims of the City to retain graduates.

Student numbers

2015 saw a removal of the student cap and this allows greater competition amongst Universities. Canterbury is ranked in the top 20 Universities but it is still in great competition to attract students. There are over 6,500 student rooms on the Kent and Medway campuses (which is quite a high number) and 15,000 students overall.

In answer to a question it was confirmed that many of the founding colleges/buildings are no longer fit for purpose, and in the short to medium term the university still sees itself as a residential university – but there is a need to be flexible and think about how land and/or the buildings could be used, if things and priorities change.

The development proposals

Development is to be focussed in strategic areas to create accessible, inclusive and efficient cores.

It is important to understand patterns of movement (by pedestrians, vehicles, buses and cycles) to develop a proposal to enhance the campus.

Rather than pursuing a policy of horizontal expansion and spreading, the opportunity to consolidate the heart of the campus where possible will be undertaken.

Key points:

- To exploit the under-utilised space between the Jarman building and Darwin College
- Redevelop several buildings nearing the end of their practical life into higher density up to date facilities (without needing building taller than currently existing)
- With the density uplift this can accommodate both the committed and medium term projects and the additional 2000 planned bed spaces
- Intensification offers savings in energy, maintenance and management costs
- The creation of high quality external environment – the current spaces are all very homogenous with all areas looking the same
- The objective behind the Master Plan concept is to create the UK's Best Garden Campus
- Funding in the short term will constrain development

Signage

It is currently hard to find your way around campus so as a result there are a lot of signs. A greater coherence in the layout will reduce the reliance on signage.

Car parking

The campus is dominated by cars

Giles Lane is used as a rat run and is in poor state

Car parking is puncturing the campus heart

Car parks are to be pushed to the edge of the campus – this will unlock significant development capacity within the heart and deliver a safer walking environment.

Views

There is tension between the University and the City. The views will be nurtured – the views of historic Canterbury are a feature of the Campus and a selling point.

Proposal ideas

The overall site is divided into three district character areas:

- The Campus Heart** – sympathetic growth and place making, to develop more academic and residential accommodation through more efficient use of space (a gradual replacement of buildings as they reach the end of their useful life)
- Parklands** – (the outer campus) – develop as a landscape resource.
- The Northern Land Holdings** – ideas for the development of a 'satellite campus' that will provide a template for further development and enable growth for the next 50 years

The Master Plan starts by establishing a simple grid of streets, spaces and places based around a main east-west route along the ridgeline, which will connect between the Whitstable Road and St Stephen's Hill.

In addition, a main north-south route will be established along the Crab and Winkle Way which connects between the city centre and Tyler Hill Road in the Northern Land Holdings.

Links into the surrounding Parklands will emanate from these two principal cross routes.

This approach will establish a clear and simple connectivity throughout the whole campus.

Campus Heart

- The proposal pushes car parks to the periphery of the campus heart or even completely outside of it.
- Two Gateway Squares will be developed along the primary East-West route – the first new square will be at the junction of University Road and Giles Lane at the

heart of the campus. The second square will be located at the east end of the Campus Walk at its junction to St Stephen's Hill – this will form a new Eastern pedestrian entrance to the Campus.

- Between the two squares the "Campus Walk" will serve as the main pedestrian way through the core.
- In addition, two secondary north-south routes will cross the Campus Walk
- The two new Gateway Squares and Campus Walk should be lined with shops, cafes, cultural and leisure buildings, student services and other active frontages.

Chaucer Fields and Parklands

The proposal is for the Parklands and the historic buildings to be preserved and enhanced.

New streets will emanate from the Campus Walk in to the Parklands.

Northern Land Holdings

Dispersal of University facilities in the Northern Land Holdings is not considered viable or desirable as part of the growth of the University on the short to medium term. Consolidation and intensification of the Campus Heart is the fundamental initial growth.

In developing the Northern Land holdings, in order to retain a physical separation from the campus heart and Parklands, a new link between Tyler Hill Road and the Campus Heart will be created. Three different ways to create a convenient link could be:

- To upgrade the Crab and Winkle Way and widen it from a pedestrian and cycle route to take vehicles
- The dis-used rail line which runs to the west of St Stephen's Hill could be acquired and upgraded for re-use

- A completely new and direct street could be created through the existing fields.

Further consultation

This is just a concept for a Master Plan – there is still a lot of work to do.

The University is to consult at other meetings with other stakeholders, residents' groups and also to hold two public exhibitions:

At the Abode Hotel, Canterbury on 2 and 3 August 2016, and Blean Village Hall, 12 and 19 August 2016

Q&A and comments from the floor

- Everyone was very pleased that the University has created this concept Master Plan – it is very welcomed
- It is very pleasing to see its urban design and principles of space and layout
- Building on the southern slopes – there is still some severe reservation about building here – if the development is to have a hotel or a building in Chaucer Fields it must be a very high quality building and be very special and have a budget to match its superb location
- People of the City feel like the Chaucer Fields should be kept undeveloped and not built on – it is a gap between the campus and the City.
- Canterbury Archaeological Trust has done some Environmental Statements including of Chaucer Fields and Turing College – there are patterns in the landscape already that can be drawn on, for example, the ancient field system to the south and the Crab and Winkle Line.
- Also, if there is any building on the other side of St Stephen's then these would be building over historic tile kilns.
- The built environment needs coherence and sympathetic materials – it needs one material to bring it all together.
- There is a need to think about the roads a little more
- Landscape considerations are very much appreciated
- The active frontages are linked
- Wildlife input will obviously need developing if not done already.
- Art could be used to identify spaces.
- The original builder of the Joyce Green hospital had some different botanical trees- something along those lines might be a possibility to consider
- Electric buses to help disabled in from the outer car parks would be great.
- The Colyer-Fergusson music hall and Gulbenkian Theatre do need to retain parking outside nearby.
- The CCCU proposals for new development of the old prison site incorporate an outside seating space that could also work and be incorporated into UKC.
- The University could help deal with the businesses of Canterbury – with innovation centres and business centres – and possibly an energy centre. (We believe the proposals include small individual business centres located on a few sites on the land holdings north of the main 'core' area.)
- Representatives of the Crab and Winkle Line Trust appreciated the Master Plan and the consultation. They supported the relocation of the car parks and a greater emphasis on pedestrians and cyclists. In 2000, the Trust got engineers to do a survey of the tunnel that runs under University land – the resulting findings advised that it would be relatively easy to re-open this tunnel, as it is filled with a soft concrete. To re-open the tunnel would be of benefit as an access, it would open-up an historical element and it would also take off the current steep gradient.

APPENDIX 5A – COMMENTS FROM GROUPS (CONT)

SPOKES East Kent Cycle Campaign

Dear Sir/Madam,

University of Kent Master Plan – Response from SPOKES East Kent Cycle Campaign

SPOKES are an active campaign group set up to encourage cycling and publicise its benefits. We are based in the East Kent area of the UK but have an interest in better conditions for cyclists everywhere.

The objective of SPOKES is to promote cycle use by people of all ages and abilities. An overriding criterion from our perspective is whether as a parent you would be happy to send your 12-year old son or daughter out on a daily journey by bike unsupervised on a given route. We do not underestimate the care needed in balancing the competing demands for road space, but SPOKES seek to ensure the needs of cyclists are considered in full.

Spokes has contributed to a great many active transport schemes in East Kent including the Crab and Winkle Way which crosses the University property. Spokes often takes as advisory role in local council planning decisions. Spokes members also speak at planning meeting for or against proposals based on their inclusion of sustainable transport infrastructure. We have regular communication with council members and officers. Our committee includes an ex university lecturer and other members who regularly use the existing cycling and other facilities at the University.

We have studied the University of Kent, Canterbury Concept Master Plan and have formulated the following response.

It is very welcome that the University has decided to share the long-term plan at such an early stage. From a sustainable transport perspective, it is very exciting as it gives the opportunity to explore ideas with the knowledge of how they might fit in with the bigger picture over time.

We agree with and support your 10 high level objectives. Of course, we are particularly interested in your fifth objective 'REINFORCEMENT OF THE UNIVERSITY'S REPUTATION FOR EXCELLENCE IN ALL ASPECTS OF SUSTAINABILITY'. SPOKES would very much like to be involved with the plan going forward. We would be very happy to discuss further any of the points we have raised in this response. We think that our local knowledge, and also experience in local planning and sustainable transport projects, will particularly help with the delivery of objective 5. By its nature, we think that a campus that prioritises sustainable travel will also directly contribute towards many of the other objectives, particularly 3,7,8,9 and 10.

Although the Concept Master Plan is very high level we have addressed some aspects of the report in some detail, this is because we think that it is relevant to the larger picture even at this early planning stage.

Canterbury has a slightly higher cycle commuting rate than the average for the county of Kent, 2.7% vs 1.7% [1 – Canterbury District Transport Strategy 2014-31 – page 9]. This may well be partly attributable to the contribution made by the University in allowing sustainable routes to pass through its property as well as providing cycling facilities on site such as secure cycle parking and segregated cycle paths. However, the level of cycle commuting is much lower in Canterbury than it is in some other cities such as Oxford with 17.6% and Cambridge with 29.9% [2]. On the continent Groningen in the Netherlands has between 31

and 55%, and Freiburg in Germany has between 13 and 28%. Although improvements have already been made, there is clearly a lot of potential for further improvement.

With substantial planned residential development to the south of Canterbury and lack of space or public appetite to widen or build more roads, there is talk of achieving a transportation modal shift. This is so the growing population will be able to travel around Canterbury without causing further congestion. The plan mentions the symbiotic relationships between universities and their host cities. The future development of the University, as it has been in the past, could be a big driver of this modal shift.

The plan mentions an increasing of density rather than a sprawling development. From a sustainable transport point of view this makes it more attractive for people to travel via foot or bicycle within the campus as potential journeys are shorter.

The plan mentions 'an efficient and clear mental gap'. This is very important not only for pedestrians but also for people on bikes. People often get lost trying to follow the existing routes through the University, it would be great to have clear direct routes, such routes not only easy to remember but often shorter.

Current campus road infrastructure

We agree with the assessment that the plan makes about the current road infrastructure within the University campus and how it is used. We agree that the current campus is "Dominated by roads, vehicles and by car parking". It is a prime example of somewhere that was built in an era when they thought that the private motor car would become the solution for nearly all travel requirements. We agree with the plans aim to 'Tame' the existing roads.

The following paragraph from the report is a very accurate appraisal:

“Motor vehicles tend to dominate the campus layout – car parks infiltrate into the very heart of the campus and the campus roads are not particularly urban, but are often busy and host fast-moving traffic. The appearance of the roads does nothing to discourage high speeds, and they are subject to rat-running by non-university motorists with consequent impact upon surface repair.”

Further, in an effort to make Giles Lane safer for pedestrians, extensive railings have been installed at the edges of the road to try and corral pedestrians to the near-by pelican crossing. This ignores the natural desire line of the pedestrians but also serves to give drivers the illusion that the road is safe and they can therefore drive faster. This effect is described in risk compensation theory. Because of potentially faster moving traffic and lack of safe escape route, the risk of getting squashed against the railings, makes cycling along the road even less attractive. The consequence of this is that people on bikes tend to use the pavement where there is no cycle path available.

Current active travel infrastructure

From the north NCR1 enters University near Tyler Hill road and exits from the Campus at Whitstable Road, the plan does not mention this westerly route that NCR1 takes in to Canterbury (page 45). The plan does mention the Crab and Winkle link that branches from the main NCR1 route at Park Wood Road. It is routed along Park Wood Road, then it travels along alternate sides of Giles Lane, down the side of University Road where it follows the service road to Eliot College, here it becomes a segregated pedestrian/cycle path down the hill to Lyndhurst Close. It then Follows Salisbury Road and St Michael's Road down to

Beaconsfield Road where it crosses and doglegs back to the side of the Crab and Winkle Embankment. It then passes over Beverly Meadow. Joins the St. Stephens Path way (Cyclists should dismount here) which emerges near to Station Road West. There is also a piece of segregated pedestrian/cycle path that goes from the edge of the Park Wood accommodation to the Gym.

The current infrastructure is a credit to those who fought for it and is well used. However, it is very disjointed and inconsistent, and could be greatly improved. There are many accounts of people getting lost when trying to use it. It is encouraging that the plan recognises the need to create ‘an efficient and clear mental map’.

The present Crab and Winkle Way route is quite effective for pedestrians and cyclists, it's incredibly busy in the mornings and evenings. This plan mentions the hazard of cycles going fast down the hill but this section already has segregation between cyclists and pedestrians, we think that reporting of the hazard here may be an exaggeration. Straightening and enhancing this route and clearly joining it in at the Campus will however be very welcome.

Cycle parking has improved greatly over the years with open, enclosed and lockable bike storage in many places, often in very prominent places and close to the buildings they serve. This send out a clear message to all the convenient, secure cycle parking is available and that people are using it.

Current routing of NCR1

The routing of NCR1 away from the original Crab and Winkle Way was no doubt because of the land ownership at the time of its construction. However, its current routing does have some advantages.

- It runs closer to the more populous area of Blean and Rough Common vs the less populous Tyler Hill.
- There are a number of routes that join it to Blean.
- It runs right behind the Blean Primary School and The Oaks Day Nursery.
- It joins directly with Whitstable Road opposite Kent College where the main NCR1 route then goes back off road into Canterbury (not mentioned in the plan).
- As well as cycle commuters, this section attracts quite a few parents from both Blean and Canterbury to the Nursery and School. They walk or cycle with their children.

Routing of the Crab and Winkle Link across campus

As mentioned before the Crab and Winkle Link is routed along Park Wood Road. Despite Park Wood Road being a 20MPH zone it is particularly busy and not that attractive to normal people who may wish to cycle. It attracts a lot of traffic in the morning to Blean School and to The Oaks Day Nursery. Could the segregated pedestrian/cycle path that goes from the edge of the Park Wood accommodation to the Gym be extended at each end to form a motor traffic free East/West segregated cycle pedestrian route? It could fork at the Gym and join the existing Eliot Path via a new Toucan crossing (if cross traffic remains), the other fork could also carry on through the centre of the campus to the accommodation to the East. Here it could cross and join with the path from the original Crab and Winkle Railway Route. This in-turn could form part of the proposed east west routes like the ‘Campus Walk’.

Tyler Hill Road – Northern Hub proposals

The plans indicate that this road may become access for the satellite developments, for access to a park and ride, and even access to the existing campus. This road is very narrow and twisty, there is no foot path. At each end, it is

APPENDIX 5A – COMMENTS FROM GROUPS (CONT)

flanked by properties so it appears there is very little scope for widening or adding a footpath. This road is already a rat-run as it is the first opportunity to transfer between the East to West of Canterbury when approaching or leaving via the North. Will it be expected to take extra traffic? Could an alternate route be found? Further, allowing traffic in from the north may make this trip easier for people commuting by car in to the University. Or even using it as access to Canterbury beyond if that was possible.

Page 97 states that: In developing the Northern Land Holdings, this physical separation will necessitate the creation of a new link between Tyler Hill Road and the Campus Heart. If the Northern Hub is occupied by independent business then, do they need to have motor vehicle access to the main campus? What is the expected traffic generation Northern Hub proposals? Is it sufficient as suggested on Page 105 of the report, to use existing public roads to service the Tyler Hill Road developments.

When developing transport systems that encourage sustainable transport a proven successful approach is to use the carrot and stick approach to car use. Safe, direct routes are made available for active travel. Conversely, routes are made more indirect for cars. The plan includes this principles in moving car parks to the edge and providing walkways. This principle has been used in towns where cross town motor traffic is stopped, you have to drive out and round, whereas active travel is allowed direct routes. Instead of having motor vehicle connection to the campus there could just be sustainable traffic free routes like the existing NCR1 and that original Crab and Winkle Line path. This could achieve less induced demand on Tyler Hill Road (motor traffic using the new link to access campus), and encourage trips from the Tyler Hill Road to the main campus, or Canterbury, to be made on foot or by bike. Of course, disabled drivers could still drive round via

the existing roads and into one of the central disabled only car parks, giving them a clear advantaged over able bodied drivers who would have to park on the edge and walk.

By connecting the northern hub to the campus by road does it become part of one big super campus and part of the building density calculation? It would lower the overall density of the campus which might be seen as being at odds with the desire to increase the building density rather than sprawl out.

The upgrading or building of a road near the Blean Church or Sarre Penne or on the 'Ancient Salt Road' that connects them (now NR1), could be environmentally and archaeologically sensitive. SPOKES are aware that in the area around Blean Church the farmer is not allowed to plough deep because of archaeology – Blean Manor of Hemo de Crevecoeur. Putting a 'road' with decent foundations and the sports buildings there would also require serious investigation before diggers ventured onto the land. [5 – The Blean: The Woodlands of a Cathedral City by the Blean Research Group P49 Ch 5].

These areas of environmental and archaeological sensitivity should be considered carefully and any development should be carried out in a careful manner whilst still meeting the high-level objectives of the plan.

If the current NCR1 route was converted to a road then even if it had segregated cycle/walking paths it would still lose a big part of its current inherent safety. If parents were able to use this new road it would attract a lot of school run cars. Using the original crab and winkle route would add 2km to the journey from Blean to the School and/or Nursery. The car would have a clear advantage in terms of convenience.

Currently where this section runs between the Blean Church and private house it is too narrow for a road. So, it looks like the road would have to deviate here. Perhaps if this road was deemed necessary then the option suggested in the plan of building it away from the current NCN1 and Blean Church, and also the original route of the Crab and Winkle railway line, could be taken.

Is the section of currently shared use cycle/foot path from Whitstable Road to the end of the Park Wood road (NCR1) also being considered for upgrade to a road? As mentioned before this is very popular with parents and school children walking and cycling to the Blean School and Oaks Day Nursery.

If development does proceed along Tyler Hill Road then could the University please work with KCC to reduce the speed limit for this road and consider other improvements, like pavements or an alternative traffic free route. As mentioned, this road is narrow, twisty and it also has an inappropriate 60MPH speed limit, it crosses the Crab and Winkle Way and is also used by walkers from the local villages.

Finally, is it necessary to build the northern hub along Tyler Hill Road, could space be found within the current campus by a further increase in density or by using the land holding to the east of St. Stephens Hill?

Reinstate the Original Crab and Winkle Route and Preserve the existing

As mentioned the current NCN1 route has a number of things going for it. However, adding the original railway line route for walking and cycling could be of great benefit.

- Tyler Hill Village would get a traffic free link into Canterbury, currently there is no safe route for cyclists of all ages and abilities.
- There are plans for a Crab and Winkled Style route to Herne Bay, this Tyler hill route would make it more direct. The local plan shows one potential Herne Bay route coming in from the East of Canterbury Hill, however there is another route that would bring cyclists into Clowes Wood from Herne Bay [1 – Canterbury District Transport Strategy 2014-31 – A291 To Clowes Wood p147].
- Some university staff and student would have a more direct and safer route into work.
- Some non-University commuters would have a more direct route.
- The two routes would provide university staff and students an amazing recreational resource. Many walk or jog or cycle into Clowes Wood for recreational purposes. This would help in the aims of creating “THE BEST GARDEN CAMPUS IN THE UK” and “REINFORCEMENT OF THE UNIVERSITY’S REPUTATION FOR EXCELLENCE IN ALL ASPECTS OF SUSTAINABILITY”
- By providing routes that are popular not only with the university staff and students but also non-university users the University is helping to mitigate some of the motor traffic and other disturbances that the University generates. This benefits both the University and the local community.

Herne Bay to Canterbury Cycle Route

University Land Holdings to the East of St. Stephen’s Hill are adjacent to the proposed main route of the Herne Bay to Canterbury route proposed in the transport plan [1 – Canterbury District Transport Strategy 2014-31 – Herne Bay to Canterbury (REF 19) (3 of 3) p143, A291 To Clowes Wood p147]. This might present some opportunities:

- The University could help to drive the implementation of the path forward, the Crab and Winkle to Whitstable is very popular, particularly with university staff and students, the roads between Herne Bay and Whitstable are not attractive for cyclists so a Herne Bay route should be just as popular. Herne Bay’s population is approximately 30% larger than Whitstable’s.
- This path and/or development could be joined by a traffic free route into Hales Places, Hales Place houses quite a few students. (Subject to further land availability)

Parking

The plan mentions that parking will be moved to the edges. We support this idea in principle but have a few questions at this stage.

- There is already a car park at the end of Park Wood Road, it is incredibly popular as it provides a convenient drop off point for Blean Primary School and the Oaks Day Nursery. It is already at the edge but access to it requires driving through the middle of the campus, how will this be addressed by the plans?
- Is there an overall plan to reduce or maintain the number of parking spaces despite growth in people accessing the site? Growth in parking spaces is likely to induce demand, Canterbury is already very congested at times. These plans should seek to maintain or reduce overall parking, not increase it.
- How will disabled drivers be catered for? Will they have parking that is close to the centre? On Page 86 there doesn’t appear to be disabled parking anywhere near the Gulbenkian Theatre, Cinema, and Colyer Ferguson Concert Hall all of which hold events that are open to the general public including disabled drivers. Currently, the number of disabled driver spaces for events is most inadequate and inconsiderate parking is rife. How will this feature of central campus be dealt with?

- On Page 80, some of the parking appears to be moved to the parkland between the Campus and the City. Would this compromise the parkland?
- Exactly where will the car parks on the edges go?

Park and ride

A park and ride for the north of Canterbury does sound attractive. If traffic modelling show that this will lead to reduced (or not increased) congestion levels in the Centre of Canterbury then this is a good idea. However, should access to this be from Tyler Hill Road or could it be from Blean Road / University Road of Giles Lane? Could a new way to it be created?

Can it be confirmed that the Park and Ride would be open to the public? Will it give the public access to Canterbury town centre of just the University?

Using space around Tyler Hill Road for car parks begs the question of how those car parks will be accessed by traffic. From the north, there are two main flows of traffic; one to the West on the Whitstable Road (Faversham, Whitstable) and one to the East Hackington Road (Herne Bay / North Thanet). Where these car parks are placed will influence where these flows get re-directed. Further, there are also similar if not greater flows of traffic from the south, if these flows are directed to the northern car parks then Tyler Hill Road, Whitstable Road and Canterbury Hill would experience increases in traffic. As mentioned above, Tyler Hill road is not currently suitable and upgrading would require extensive work. Perhaps the car parks could be distributed to the East and West. The Easterly car park could be to the East of St. Stephens Hill, the Westerly car park may be harder to site. This East/West split of car park could reduce the need for University generated traffic to travel East/West along Tyler Hill Road. Walking distances could be reduced and existing bus routing could be

APPENDIX 5A – COMMENTS FROM GROUPS (CONT)

enhanced to give quick links to town. These East/West car parks may well be closer to the campus heart than the northern car parks and may therefore not require a shuttle bus service to campus.

Bus routing

We noted that on page 95 of the report that there is a picture of a coach on the proposed sustainable route from the campus into Canterbury which follows the original Crab and Winkle Railway Line. The proposed route here is just to the west of the existing segregated cycle/foot path which comes down from Eliot College to Lyndhurst Close. This route is already incredibly popular with pedestrians and people on bikes. SPOKES would strongly encourage this particular route to remain motor traffic free. We would also like to see it follow the original railway line if possible. We would be interested to see more detail if fast-track bus routes or similar if they are proposed. Currently the route from the bottom of Eliot Hill via bus to the City would be much harder to gain acceptance or engineer than a purely active travel route. The active travel route is already there and successful, there could be a number of options to enhance it with varying cost and complexity.

Giles Lane adoption

SPOKES supports the idea that Giles Lane is adopted by the University if this would enable the University to lower the speed limit to a maximum 20MPH and also decide if through traffic is allowed to continue.

Giles Lane/University Road through traffic

It appears from the high level conceptual drawings that Giles Lane may no-longer allow traffic across the campus. SPOKES would want to encourage this idea.

- If it is not already the case, could closing the narrow western section from Whitstable Road to University Road to motor traffic be considered?
- Any roads on the campus should have an absolute maximum speed limit of 20MPH, 10MPH is already applied to some service roads.
- The section which runs past the Gulbenkian has no segregated cycle path, could one be added?
- This section also has extensive barriers along each side, could these be removed?

A proven method of reducing motor traffic use is by filtered permeability [6- Steve Melia]. Through routes are closed to motor traffic but kept open for other forms. Cars trips are reduced, not just redirected, because they are made harder (Vanishing Demand). The reduction in motor traffic combined with a direct route makes active travel more attractive. Will the detailed plans examine how much non-University traffic passes along Giles Lane / University Road and to think about if the University could be closed to East/West private motor through traffic? Depending on how much of the current traffic simply passes through and the ideas already in the plan of moving parking to the edge there may be potential for a complete transformation in the environmental quality at the centre of the campus in terms of safety and air quality.

The plan shows how the new 'Gateway Squares' will be created. These look to be a great improvement on the existing road infrastructure and may address our concerns above. However, careful consideration should be given to how these squares are implemented. Will they use the principles of Shared Space or Filtered Permeability? Shared space has become a popular tool but it does not always work out and it is attracting some controversy and opposition. Guide Dogs for the Blind have some useful

resources on shared space [4]. Shared spaces can fail to eliminate rat running and produce environments that are still vehicle dominated like Exhibition Road in London, this has resulted in the improvements for non-motorised traffic being much smaller than was initially anticipated. Clearly, the St. Stephens Hill Gateway Square would have to allow through traffic, but the University Road/Giles Lane gateway might not have to.

Active travel within the campus

It is very welcome that the plan talks about creating strong, defined pedestrian and cycle routes. The plan also stated that the pedestrian will be king, this is also very welcome. However, it does not give many details about how cycling will be catered for.

The plan goes into some detail about walking and driving. Cycling sits in the middle and offers some of the benefits of both. This is why it is currently booming in popularity in cities where good facilities are provided. This not only helps with local pollution, health and sustainability but it is an incredibly efficient way of moving large numbers of people across cities very quickly, it is often the quickest form of transport in a busy city.

Commuters need to be able to cycle right up to their building, as many already do. Trips within campus need to also be possible by bicycle. A cycle user may cycle in from halls to a lecture, park outside, then cycle into town afterwards. Similarly, a member of staff may cycle in from Whitstable along the Crab and Winkle, across campus to their building, then cycle into town at lunch time. Indeed, a big benefit is being able to cycle from door-to-door. When this aspect is limited or interrupted the attraction of cycling is reduced. For cycling to be an attractive proposition for

regular people to consider as a transport option, it's full benefits need to be realised.

If cycling infrastructure was limited and cyclists were forced to walk from external bike parks this slowing of their journey removes one of the key attractions of cycling. The University has already, despite the problem of the busy roads, achieved a cycleable campus, with key segregated cycle routes, cycles not being actively banned from shared spaces and a number of secure, highly visible cycle parking facilities close to the buildings they serve. The master plan must build on this to achieve its sustainable objectives.

The gateway squares and campus walk sounds like an excellent idea. It is very important that cycling is allowed here as well as along the main east-west route along the ridge-line. Indeed, it should be allowed along all the main east west and north south routes. How this is achieved will require a careful assessment of the use of shared and segregated facilities. Current, best practice as well as inspiration from existing schemes should be drawn upon.

Hopefully the position of and route between car parks will strongly discourage (or make impossible) the use of cars for cross campus travel. Interestingly, it has been reported by bus drivers, students currently use the buses to cross campus! The distance or some other factor must put them of walking. Wouldn't cycling be better for them and the air quality? Is this lack of desire to walk or cycle because the complex routes that paths take? A lack of clear mental map?

Delivery of goods to and within the campus

Currently many of the building around the campus have their own service areas to accept deliveries. Perhaps a

study could be carried out to see if a central distribution hub of hubs could be created. Cargo bikes or electric vehicles could be used for last stage delivery within the campus. This would not only reduce the need for large vehicles to penetrate multiple destinations within the campus but would also free up space used by the present service roads for walking, cycling, public space or increased building density.

Sustainable travel routes beyond the campus

As mentioned before, the 'Crab and Winkle Link' takes quite a complex route to the West Station and the City Centre Beyond. Despite this the route is very popular with both cyclists and pedestrians. It is a major route for students and university staff as well as city centre commuters and school children. It would be great if the master plan could contribute here.

- As the plan suggests; route the pedestrian path/cycle route back down the St. Michael's embankment, this is not currently practical due to the location of private houses in Beaconsfield Road.
- The plan also mentions the proposed Roper Road Station Entrance. Could the University help to make a bridge over the railway line here that included cycling and walking? Enhancing the cycling and walking options for its staff and students well into Canterbury and therefore lowering the attraction to driving in to campus? This bridge would bypass the St. Dunstan's level crossing and pedestrian only St. Stephens tunnel. Canterbury City Council's Joint Transport Board is currently discussing the potential Roper Road Entrance.
- The potential Canterbury West Station Roper Road entrance may also have some potential for a fast-track/shuttle bus service to the campus. Again, avoiding the St. Dunstan's level crossing.

- Foot and cycle travel between Tyler Hill and Blean villages to each other and the Crab and Winkle Way, due to the narrow Tyler Hill Road is currently risky, there have been a number of recorded accidents. Could the master plan include a traffic free route here? It may go some way to mitigate some of the other effects of the scheme.
- As mentioned before, the University could help drive the planned traffic free route to Herne Bay. As well as park and ride, how about considering park and pedal?
- If shuttle buses are implemented, could they have racks for bikes?
- Taming of St. Stephens Hill at and beyond the proposed gateway square. There have been accidents here including a fatality in recent years.
- Taming of Forty Acres and Beaconsfield Road. The Crab and Winkle Link and other paths cross here. School run and commuting traffic can be fats.
- The land holdings to the East of St. Stephens Hill when developed, could have a new connection to the proposed Sturry A28 bypass road. This could feed all university traffic from the Thanet direction straight up to the new University car parks, rather than it having to come in on the Sturry Road via Kingsmead or Broad Oak Road and often rat running through Hales Place residential streets to avoid traffic at Kingsmead or the level-crossing at St. Stephens Road.

Potential for cycle hire / cycle shop on campus

There is already a cycle hire facility by the Park Wood residences. Canterbury also has a few other cycle hire facilities:

- Kent Cycle Hire – <https://kentcyclehire.com/> (Limited hours of operation)

APPENDIX 5A – COMMENTS FROM GROUPS (CONT)

- biketart – www.biketart.com/bike-hire-i47
- Brompton Dock at Canterbury West Station – www.bromptonbikehire.com/
- Dr Bike and Bike Hire at UoK – www.facebook.com/DrBikeatUoK/ (Occasional or Limited hours of operation)

The current Bike Hire facility does major business at and shortly after the start of term in October and at the start of other terms too. The University Sustainable transport officer (Teresa Curteis) could help here.

The plan could give such facilities centre stage in the development. Services like those listed above could be brought into the centre of campus and operated with normal shop opening hours.

Summary

We feel that this plan offers an exciting opportunity for both active and sustainable transport not only within the campus but for Canterbury and surrounding towns. SPOKES are in agreement with the high-level objectives of the plan. We would be grateful if you would not only consider our comments at this stage but also involve us with the plan going forward. We are very happy to meet and discuss in detail any of the issues we have raised, or indeed any other sustainable/active travel ideas that may arise.

As the plan progresses we would welcome more detail in the following areas:

- Explore with other developers, Canterbury City Council, and Kent Country Council how a co-ordinated plan to drive modal shift toward active and public transport within the Greater Canterbury area in order to efficiently transport more people in the available space without major disruptive road building scheme.

- More mention of cycling within the campus and how it will allow uninterrupted door-to-door cycle commuting.
- Mention of both routes taken by NCN1.
- How the Crab and Winkle Link will be preserved and enhanced.
- Best practice use of segregated cycle/pedestrian routes where appropriate.
- Mention of cycle parking locations, current or planned.
- Bringing cycle retail, repair, hiring facilities into the centre.
- Exactly how Gateway Squares will work, will they use shared space or filtered permeability.
- Traffic generation projections for the northern hub.
- Re-consideration about the need to connect the northern hub by a new road that takes motor vehicles.
- Detail on the positioning of park and ride car park(s).
- If park and ride will be available to the general public to access the campus and Canterbury beyond.
- Adequate provision for disabled drivers in car parks next to key buildings.
- Evidence that any new roads will not create new rat-runs.
- Projection of generated traffic for more populated campus, and how this fits in with potential traffic generated by other developments around Canterbury.
- Detail on car park capacity and how this will or won't cause more private motor vehicle use by induced demand.

Thank you in advance for considering our response, we look forward to hearing from you.

Yours sincerely,
SIGNATURE

Matthew Banbury
On behalf of SPOKES East Kent Cycling Campaign

References

- 1 Canterbury District Transport Strategy 2014-31 <https://www.canterbury.gov.uk/media/949413/Canterbury-District-Transport-Strategy-with-addendum.pdf>
- 2 2011 Census Analysis – Method of Travel to Work in England and Wales Report http://webarchive.nationalarchives.gov.uk/20160105160709/http://ons.gov.uk/ons/dcp171766_299766.pdf
- 3 Cycling Mode Share Data for 700 Cities www.cityclock.org/urban-cycling-mode-share
- 4 Shared Spaces Research by Guide Dogs for the Blind www.guidedogs.org.uk/supportus/campaigns/streets-ahead/information-for-the-street-designers-and-councils/reference-documents
- 5 The Blean: The Woodlands of a Cathedral City by the Blean Research Group P49 Ch 5
- 6 Urban Transport Without the Hot Air – Steve Melia www.stevemelia.co.uk/transport.html

SPOKES objectives

- 1 To encourage cycling and publicise its benefits for the community and for individuals.
- 2 To ensure that local authority and government policies actively encourage cycling and make full provision for it as part of an overall transport strategy through which all members of the public can enjoy cheap, safe and environmentally sound travel for work and leisure.

SPOKES East Kent is affiliated to the Cyclists' Touring Club and Cyclenation

The Blean, Hackington and Tyler Hill Society

The Blean, Hackington and Tyler Hill Society, *****¹, met last night and discussed the University's Master Plan. We found it ironic, not to say hypocritical, for the University to state in the plan that one of its objectives was to respect 'the setting of the countryside' while at the same time proposing to damage the countryside by the construction of innovation centres along the rural Tyler Hill Road. It would appear that the University, while seeking to 'green' its own campus by closing its car parks, is prepared to shift its traffic to the green gap between Blean and Tyler Hill, thus urbanising what has always been a pleasant country road.

Crab and Winkle Line Trust

I have read your comprehensive master plan for the university with great interest. As the *****² of the Crab and Winkle Line Trust (a registered charity) *****³, I have had many positive conversations with UKC staff, including a former Vice Chancellor, over many years regarding the route of the old railway line that runs through and under your land.

I would very much like to continue that dialogue as you develop your thinking and consult on your plans for the university in the future. In particular, trustees and I would like to discuss how you intend to use the existing Crab and Winkle Way as a connection to your proposed northern developments, how you might also bring in the currently overgrown route of the original line to the north as a potential footpath and cycle route to improve access and sustainability, how you might capitalise on the nearly 200-year history in the tunnel (the world's first ever passenger railway tunnel) beneath your buildings, including its northern

and southern portals, and how the Crab and Winkle Line Trust and our members across the district and beyond can work effectively with you to develop a detailed scheme that we can publicly support.

I very much look forward to hearing from you.

Crab and Winkle Line Trust

As *****⁴ of the Crab and Winkle Line Trust, we welcome the overall approach, particularly the prioritisation of pedestrians and cyclists, rather than car users. The focus on the Crab and Winkle link itself is right and we would encourage that – though these routes need to focus on non-car users. There are more opportunities to use the tunnel under the university too. It is part of Canterbury's industrial heritage and a potential attraction for the university too. It is technically possible to open it.

But the most important thing for us would be to retain and prioritise even more the off-road cycle route between Canterbury and Whitstable which is already voted regularly as one of the top 10 in the country.

Kent Wildlife Trust

Please add my contact details to your database for future correspondence and any future stages of consultation for this concept masterplan.

Kent Wildlife Trust would like to be involved in any future consultation exercises.

We would like to express our disappointment at this stage that this masterplan is based only upon an urban design/architectural approach. There is no reference made to the need for an assessment of the biodiversity value of

the area covered by the masterplan. There is also no reference to the need to evaluate this or indeed to embrace and enhance the biodiversity value on site. This would be expected in any planning process or submission to the Local Planning Authority and any omission would contravene the National Planning Policy Framework.

There should also be reference made to the Local Wildlife Site, CA15, present to the west of the landholdings and the considerable amount of ancient woodland within the masterplan area.

We look forward to contributing further at the earliest opportunity.

Council for the Protection of Rural England

I write as *****⁵ of the Canterbury branch of CPRE. CPRE is a National Organisation that for 90 years has been campaigning to protect the English countryside.

We are concerned that you are no longer accepting comments on this Plan, despite having failed to send your leaflet to people in the CT2 area (which includes members of my committee). You also publicised the wrong date for your public meeting at Blean, resulting in a very small attendance on the correct date. It is hardly surprising that you have had such a limited response from the public and from amenity bodies such as ourselves.

In the circumstances, it would in our view be wrong for you to proceed with the next stage of the Plan on the basis of such a flawed attempt to engage the public. We therefore request that you start the consultation again in a proper manner, and ask that you kindly confirm this will be done.

1, 2, 3, 4, 5 Personal information redacted to protect an individual's identity.

APPENDIX 5A – COMMENTS FROM GROUPS (CONT)

We should also mention that we are reliably informed that Serco has been removing notices drawing attention to the plan erected locally mostly on private property, presumably following dialogue between you and the City Council. We have seen the notice which seems to us to be inoffensive, and which merely alerts people to the Plan, which is what you were supposed to have done. Can you please instruct Serco/the City Council not to remove such notices from private land in the future?

My committee has only just seen the consultation document and we will wish to comment. We will try to do this in the next 4 weeks. I trust that, with the time required for the repeat consultation, this will be in time to meet your deadlines.