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 anonymised by the removal of name and address information and any additional information within the feedback that may unintentionally lead to the identification of an individual.

Three items are not included here. Two contained only personal contact details in order for us to keep in touch with the respondents. One contained many references that could identify the respondent and we were unable to gain their permission to publish it. Their comments were however taken note of, included in the earlier feedback summaries and will be used to inform our thinking for future phases.

I'm a local resident who has lived most of my adult life in Canterbury and what I like about the campus is that it is green and it doesn't feel cramped and urban.

So it just seems plain confused to call the new design a "garden campus" when so much of the green space has been filled in with concrete.

It would seem to be far better to spread out towards Blean and continue with the same density of buildings. Don't push down towards the hill because we need a buffer between your students and ourselves.

I use Christchurch library because it is such an inspiring space. The new Kent extension is plain rubbish by way of comparison, and it would be good if Kent could have some inspiring buildings too. I do like the metal building by the shops, that shimmers in the breeze. You need a few more buildings like that if you're not going to be left behind by Christchurch.

Also, there does not seem to be enough car parking. This is boring I know, but you need to properly consider it otherwise we'll have more and more of your students parking at the bottom of Eliot footpath.

Overall: confused and lacklustre.

Yours and other Uni's in Canterbury have partially destroyed surrounding communities with the influx of Uni let and other student accommodation. Suggest you build more accommodation on site and free up housing for young families!

The plan has some fine words but I see it as a continuation of the development (now termed "intensification") of the campus since my time (73-76) towards a more urban campus as opposed to a garden campus with great views which is supposedly the prime goal of the plan. The positives I detect are the ostensible favouring of public transport and cycling and towards a lower, more sustainable energy usage. Where are the innovations such as roof gardens, wildlife spots, solar panels, building on car parks instead of greenfield?

I am sorry but I do not see this. There are some good ideas such as the creation of core spaces and new transit routes making the site more integrated and navigable. Other proposals range from corny (they had to mention "Silicon Valley") through to ridiculously expensive. The new gateway on St. Stephens hill? I do not see how that is supposed to work since it is only for pedestrian traffic or how it will be safe given traffic flows on St Stephen's Hill. There is also little to do with 'sustainability.' I would have liked to have seen proposals that included greater use of solar power (you have a lot of unused roof space at the moment with more proposed) and rain water collection (could be used to help the garden project). Here's a thought, cherry blossom is lovely if short-lived. How about making them trees that actually produce fruit?

This is all based on a quick review of the plan, but since there are no concrete (Sorry! No plans giving firm details of how they might be actualized), it is difficult to comment in more detail myself.

The University claims via its website to promote stakeholder engagement yet I am surprised and disappointed that it has not chosen to contact its closest neighbours directly to discuss its plans for expansion.

The plan states the University's aim to minimise sprawl yet this is contradicted by its plan to develop greenbelt (Conservation Area) farmland to the East of St Stephen's Hill when by its own admission there are freely available "brownfield" plots within the existing campus.

Any development of this farmland would constitute a dangerous precedent for further development of the extensive land holdings owned by the University in this area and would need to be strongly opposed for a range of reasons including, a) the impact of any such development on the city skyline, b) the impact on traffic congestion and footfall in the area, c) the implications for planning law given the land's current status and the implications for wildlife and the environment (not to mention the archaeological significance of the site).
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I enjoyed completing my undergraduate degree and PhD with Kent, alongside employment as a research associate and assistant lecturer. I feel I know this campus very well from all points of view. Overall I can understand the need for a master-plan and development of the university site as it continues to grow and prosper as an academic institution. However, I remain, along with many others, firmly opposed to the development of the conferencing hotel on the Chaucer Fields site. Having spent a huge amount of time in this beautiful open space, and enjoyed it alongside families, residents young and old, students, university staff I am surprised at the lack of consideration given to this aspect of the development. I therefore echo and support the words of the Chaucer Fields Picnic Society representatives:

- the intention to keep alive the idea of developing on these fields is inconsistent with the Conceptual Master Plan (CMPS)’s own design principles, including the idea that development should be focussed “at the heart” of the campus, and that it is crucial to “safeguard existing views of historic Canterbury”

- the CMPS idea of potentially locating development on these fields directly contradicts Canterbury City Council’s proposal to give the fields enhanced protection as expressed through the “Green Gap” status specified in the pending District Plan

- the idea of developing on the fields in this way is conspicuously out of line with a wide range of established indicators of local and university community (staff and students) priorities and values. As such, if pursued in practice, it would be a massive own-goal to the University authorities in terms of managing its public face, and its internal and external relations. It would undermine the credibility of any claims it might wish to make about its willingness to listen to, and work with, these communities

The key principles seem sound; i.e. to concentrate building largely on the ‘Campus Heart’ and to pedestrianise it. I would like to suggest it could be timely to re-visit some ideas from Holford’s Master Plan which could not be afforded at the time. These are:

- A clock tower;
- A pedestrian bridge (which would have a clearer purpose now in linking buildings on both sides of St. Stephen’s Hill);
- a geodesic dome, which seems a better bet than an open-air theatre, given the East Kent climate. This might be located just below Rutherford & Tyler Court. (See p. 102 of Graham Martin’s book “From Vision to Reality” for an illustration.

The clock tower might well be named after St. Anselm who lost out repeatedly in the naming of the early colleges, but was probably the most distinguished scholar to actually live in Canterbury. Also, as the site of Holford’s College E is unlikely to be built on, it could be planted as woodland, replacing trees removed elsewhere on the campus.

I am emailing you to advise you not to develop the Chaucer Fields and Southern Slopes. While checking out universities for my potential study abroad during university (I’m from the states) I picked UKC over a school in France strictly due to the fact that the University of Kent had more green space. I didn't really care too much about the university itself. I could get a generally good education at either school, and since it was a study abroad, it wasn't going to make or break my degree, and both were in Europe which is which continent I was looking at.

I chose to spend a year of my life in Canterbury because you had more green space (between Parkwood and the rest of camps, at Chaucer Fields, campus is close to the Blean, etc). Consider that if you put up more buildings and cut away the green belt you are not only angering local residents and de-beautifying your campus for current students, but you may be turning away potential students you never even knew you lost. I wouldn't have come if there wasn't Chaucer Field.

The overall presentation was very clear and to the point and obviously at this stage didn't carry too much detail.

It is great that there is a concept plan as it shows everyone that the University is looking forward all the time and fully aware of its ever-growing footprint. Being someone that both works at the University and is a resident I sometimes have to discourage too much discussion with my friends and neighbours about the University at time of naturally heated discussion and uncertainty. For me it is the start of an extremely exciting period at work. Realising that for us to compete with other Universities we most certainly can't stand still. Having seen all the details involved with the Master Plan I am still concerned that the majority of buildings on site do require a high level of TLC to bring them in line with all the new plans. Money is everything and there is certainly a limited supply of it, which must be used systematically to ensure that our overall image is good rather than have a clear divide between old and new builds. Some of our buildings are looking very tired and it is these that need to be reviewed before we consider the master plan.
Firstly, I welcome the opportunity to be able to participate in the Concept Master Plan Consultation.

I attended the presentation made to representatives of local Residents’ Associations at the University on 26th May, and I was very pleased to hear that the University authorities wish to engage with local residents about the future of the campus.

I was very impressed with the way in which John Letherland set out Farrell’s approach to constructing a Masterplan, starting with the original 1965 Holford Plan and the relationship between the University and the City.

The aspiration to create the UK’s best garden campus is ambitious, but seems to be in part realistic, although some of the ideas seem hard to envisage in the shorter term but not impossible over a much longer period.

The 10 objectives set out on pages 16 to 19 are a clearly defined set of principles as a starting point from which a Masterplan can be developed.

I agree with the statement on page 31 that “the continuous outward growth and sprawl of the area occupied by the campus has led to a decreasing green periphery leaving empty pockets of space in the centre of the campus”. This has surely come about because there hasn’t been a working Masterplan in existence for many years as the Holford Plan has not been updated and long since become redundant.

I believe that there has been a waste of valuable land over the years which will now make it more difficult to develop a Masterplan efficiently, an example of which is the positioning of the Innovation Centre in 2007, that used up a much larger footprint than was necessary.

In 1962 when the land was acquired for the purpose of building a new university at Canterbury, the expectation was that it would be required to provide 3,000 places by 1973, and gradual expansion to 6,000 places and ultimately to 10,000 places. It was on this basis that the 1965 Masterplan evolved, but the fact that the University has now expanded to 15,000 places has required the rate of construction of permanent and temporary buildings to accelerate to try to meet the demands with little regard for the Masterplan, resulting in the sprawl described by Farrells. I therefore agree with the challenges faced as set out on page 37.

Dividing the whole campus into three distinctive parts: The Campus Heart, The Parklands and the Northern Land Holdings makes the rationale easier to follow, but as I will describe later there are some confused cross references which I would like to see clarified.

THE CAMPUS HEART – Page 74

As a local resident without connection to the University in terms of study or work, my use of the University is recreational; walking, jogging, visits to the theatre, cinema, and occasionally to an open lecture, so it is not appropriate for me to comment on the layout of academic buildings and work places.

However I do observe that over the past twenty years, since I have lived adjacent to the University, there has been a large amount of development, much of which has no architectural consistency, some lack of good quality appearance and finish, and makes for a rather hotchpotch appearance.

I very much like the idea of two Gateway Squares, connected by a Campus Walk and the secondary network of north-south and east-west tertiary links.

Unfortunately the image of the outline of the Campus Heart on page 79 is out of date and does not include Turing College, and is therefore at variance with the defined Campus Heart on pages 88 to 91.

The description of the mix of possible uses of space in the Campus Heart on page 74 includes reference to “also meeting and conference venues, business and incubator spaces and even hotels, leisure and shops”. This is in direct contradiction to the statement on page 69: “our concept anticipates that new academic and student residential buildings will predominate in the heart of the campus, whereas we suggest a location for hotel and conferencing facilities outside the heart of the campus”.

I agree that the key to the success of the Masterplan concept is that a correct balance is struck between the creation of buildings and the creation of public open space. However, in planning for a mix of buildings and open spaces, it should be considered that the overall area comprises the Parklands. It appears on the maps that the area is to the south of the Campus Heart, but the narrative on page 94 seems to include the playing fields and the Estates Maintenance facility at Hothe Court Farmhouse, which are west and north-west of the Campus Heart. A better defined area should be outlined in a similar manner to the Campus Heart on page 79 to avoid confusion.

THE PARKLANDS – Page 94

It is not clear on the maps on pages 92 and 95 what area comprises the Parklands. It appears on the maps that the area to the south of the Campus Heart, but the narrative on page 94 seems to include the playing fields and the Estates Maintenance facility at Hothe Court Farmhouse, which are west and north-west of the Campus Heart. A better defined area should be outlined in a similar manner to the Campus Heart on page 79 to avoid confusion.

The image on page 95 of a large white coach arrowed to the disused railway at the end of the bridleway is both
confusing and controversial. A number of local residents have asked me if the idea is to open up the route of the disused railway from the University to Canterbury West station as a road.

I understand that the architect is trying to convey the idea that some development on the Southern Slopes could actually enhance the landscape, but the image of Stowe School on page 96 is not at all realistic given the actual space available.

The narrative on page 97 is also confusing. The Master Plan sets out to clearly define three separate areas of the whole campus for specific consideration, but on this page proposals for the Northern Land Holdings get muddled into The Parklands.

I think that it is important to better define the following in their correct contextual part of the Masterplan:

1. “The existing Crab & Winkle Way could be upgraded and widened from a pedestrian and cycle route to provide a route for vehicles” - I take this to mean the old Salt Road running from Hothe Court Farmhouse north to Blean Church and beyond? (Northern Land Holdings). At present this Bridleway has a very rural feel to it and is used by large numbers of locals and tourists for recreational purposes, including walking, dog walking, jogging, cycling as well as being a direct route for families taking their children to and from Blean Primary School. Opening up this route into a vehicular access to the University from the Northern Land Holdings and Tyler Hill Road would be damaging and I feel certain would meet a huge amount of public resistance.

2. “The disused railway line which runs to the west of St. Stephen’s Hill”. This seems to be an unlikely proposition because of the numerous landowners in addition to the University, namely: Mr. Paul Roberts, The Archbishop’s School, Kent County Council, Canterbury City Council and the owners of private residences on Beaconsfield Road. However in the much longer term I suppose that this could be possible but there would be concern from local residents about the removal of trees in the conservation area and the loss of privacy to back gardens in Leycroft Close, Lyndhurst Close and St. Michael’s Road.

3. “A completely new and direct street could be created through the existing fields”:- I take this to mean north of the Campus Heart, but it’s not clear if this is on the route of the disused railway or a completely new route running through Park Wood, past the sports pavilion as indicated on page 109. In any event if this is the case it shouldn’t be described within The Parklands section.

The suggestion on page 99 of creating a direct route from the University to Canterbury West station appears to be a further reference to point 2 above. This will be very difficult to achieve. The “wonderful tree lined boulevard with a public transport system” as described on page 99 is not realistic, and the idea of a new link to the north side of the station ignores the existence of established homes in Beverley Road and Hanover Place. The images of the Long Walk at Windsor Castle on page 99 are not an appropriate comparison to illustrate this scheme.

The narrative for future development on The Parklands is very limited and ambiguous. “However, The Parklands will also provide a location for continued development of new buildings” (page 94) is completely open ended and I think that a more defined analysis is required.

The location of the conferencing hotel is obviously controversial. The image of the hotel on the map on page 95 appears to be a much smaller footprint than would actually be required to accommodate a 150 bedroom hotel and conference centre when compared with the schemes proposed in 2011 and 2012. Also, the hotel has been positioned at the northern end of the twin hedges and the plan shows the hedges removed and only the path remaining. When the University submitted a planning application for removal of the hedges in 2011, (CA/11/00531/HDG), there were 309 individual letters of objection and a petition of more than 1,000 signatures against the proposal. Many people regard the twin hedges as an important historical feature of the landscape and I believe that there would be substantial objection to any new proposals to remove them.

I have in the past stated to representatives of the University and Planning Officers at the City Council, and I reiterate my continued belief that Beverley Farmhouse could be an ideal administration facility and main reception for a low rise hotel constructed on the adjacent land. The views across the City from this location are spectacular, it is close to the bus stops and only a few minutes’ walk to central campus, the “Campus Heart”.

I note on the plans on pages 89, 90, 91 and 95 and recently constructed Turing Road has been removed. When the University gave a presentation of the revised scheme for Keynes 3 and the reduced development on Chaucer Fields in September 2012, it was clearly stated that the road would be funded and constructed as part of the Keynes 3 development which would then open up the opportunity to expand the Innovation Centre / Business Park. It seems odd that this once considered essential road has disappeared from the plans, but I do note that a new road has been indicated running directly north, towards Turing College past the innovation Centre.

I am aware that for some years there has been an idea to develop the “bomb crater” into an open air theatre. I would support the principle subject to seeing more detailed
proposals and giving consideration to how it would impact on local residents. But, there will be a major flooding problem to resolve before any type of permanent structure could be considered.

There is no mention of enhancing the other crater and waste land on the opposite side of the Eliot path that is partly fenced off, having been used as a green waste dump for many years. It would be nice to see some enhancement as a wildlife area included in the Masterplan as it is currently a somewhat ignored and derelict area.

In preparation of the new Draft Local Plan in 2012, Canterbury City Council commissioned Jacobs to undertake a landscape and biodiversity appraisal of the Canterbury District.

The landscape character of the Southern Slopes below the University is dealt with in the “Stour Valley Slopes” section of the report.

The report identifies the important views over the City from the south facing slopes, but generally in terms of traditional landscape, the condition is considered to be poor. “The site is well maintained although more recent planting adds little structure to the landscape”.

In its guidelines the report recommends “strengthen the structure of the field pattern on the slopes beneath the University resisting the further introduction of scattered ornamental planting”.

This Masterplan offers the ideal opportunity to consider the historic landscape and include proposals for enhancing the slopes as recommended in the Jacobs report. In the past few years many ornamental trees have been felled because of rot or disease, and many Horse Chestnuts currently are diseased. Maybe some of the historical field patterns could be recreated with new hedge planting and orchards reintroduced alongside wild flower meadows, thereby increasing the ecological value of the landscape.

THE NORTHERN LAND HOLDINGS – Page 100

I note that on page 102, dispersal of University facilities in the Northern Land Holdings is “not considered to be viable in the short to medium term”. However I think that the creation of small commercial hubs and some off campus car parking is a good idea.

In the section entitled Implementation of The Vision, there is a direct contradiction to the statement on page 102, as “the opportunity for early wins” on page 122 goes on to describe how the first phase of the Northern Hub could be developed, indicating that this could take place in the shorter term. I think that it is important to clarify the situation to enable people to give an informed contribution to the consultation.

Park Wood Student Accommodation Village

This extensive area of the campus doesn't get a mention in the Masterplan. It seems implausible that during the next 30 to 50 years this area will remain as is with no further development. But in any event it should be included in the Masterplan.

In a study carried out in 2011, whilst preparing an objection to the planning application to develop on Chaucer Fields, the Save Chaucer Fields Group found that up to 130 five person units could be inserted into the existing layout, without any demolition, adding an additional 650 bed places.

In the past couple of years Portakabins have been installed as study space. Surely a long term solution is needed to improve facilities for a better student experience that will involve demolition and rebuilding the older parts of the residential accommodation, make use of redundant car parks and generally increase the population density.

Conclusions and Recommendations

It is often difficult to envisage a long term plan, most people tend to concentrate on what affects them in the short term, so I commend the quotation from Sir Terry Farrell “Think long term, plan for the future, take many small steps and hold true to the vision”. I also like the summary of recommendations on page 127.

Overall I think this Concept Master Plan is a good start, I would like to see the anomalies and contradictions sorted out in the presentation of the preferred option in the Autumn, after further technical and design work as well as giving consideration to the responses received during phase one.

-----

General plans look very exciting BUT still big concerns over parking on-site. This has got successively worse over the last few years and can now take up to 20 minutes to find somewhere to park on a busy day. I have no real alternative to a car as I live in a village in East Kent so public transport would take over an hour. New plans need to add a clear and pragmatic plan for parking which I could not see in the drafts whatsoever.

-----

When I came to the cathedral city to live in 1998 it was still an attractive bustling but not crowded place to live. The citizens of Canterbury who were independent of the university still felt they had a pleasant and ancient city to
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enjoy, bring up their families and maintain their various businesses. Within two years, due to unfortunate circumstances, I had to look for a new home within the city – it was an impossibility – all the appropriately size homes had been bought by student landlords and prices for the few remaining properties risen out of reach. Hence, I now live in Sandwich. I visit Canterbury every week and have friends who live there – it is now overcrowded with students, in summer almost suffocating with tourists [not a bad thing we have something extremely beautiful and rare to offer them] and the small businesses and unique stores are out of business because they do not meet the students need for trendy, cheap clothes and affordable, ‘fashionable’ food.

It is time to stop ruining a beautiful old city which put its warm welcoming walls around you and embraced you – now it is bursting at the seams and crying out because it no longer is comfortable in its surroundings.

Not only is the university strangling the city, so too are the councillors who are building innumerable ‘rabbit hutches for the few reaining properties’ all the appropriately size homes had been bought by student landlords and prices for the few remaining properties risen out of reach. Hence, I now live in Sandwich. I visit Canterbury every week and have friends who live there – it is now overcrowded with students, in summer almost suffocating with tourists [not a bad thing we have something extremely beautiful and rare to offer them] and the small businesses and unique stores are out of business because they do not meet the students need for trendy, cheap clothes and affordable, ‘fashionable’ food.

The university as it stands and the grounds and facilities it has now has grown larger than anyone could have envisaged in such a short period of time. Many of the young people opt for University due to the fact that there are no apprenticeships and very few businesses left in the city to employ them, despite it being their home town.

Please think twice about removing the rich diversity of people living here and reducing it to just the young scholars and the feckless hangers on. A city is made up of many valuable talents and facets not to, at times, warring factions.

Your plans look beautiful, but in reality, such beauty rarely translates into

While being in wholehearted agreement that “the green open space that surrounds the existing heart of the University are a great asset in providing a green setting to the University & as a landscape demarcation from the City”, I would strongly disagree with the proposal that “the Parklands will also provide a location for the continued development of new buildings & other facilities as & when appropriate”. A better location for a conference centre would be north of University Rd or at another location so as not to encroach on the southern slopes. They are an asset to the University, local residents and wildlife with a worth that is incalculable and once lost will not be regained.

As a direct neighbour to land owned by UKC, I was surprised not to have been notified of the Masterplan, but to come across a leaflet which was handed to me by a concerned local resident.

Following the revelations regarding expansion of the campus east across the main road (St. Stephen’s Hill) the residents of properties along the **** **** leading to **** **** arranged a meeting in which we all studied the Masterplan together.

I would like to put forward my objections;

1) There is no justifiable reason to expand the campus into new boundaries, in fact this sprawl only heightens the fear and repulsion to the constant green space consuming development of UKC. There are many similar-sized spaces

within the ‘developed zone’ of the campus which could house the proposed development to the east of St. Stephen’s Hill.

2) The recent planning proposal, which was objected to by many local residents and organisations, for a crematorium to be built on this piece of land was withdrawn. Many reasons were cited, most prominently the traffic and safety concerns on an already dangerous road. A development of this sort would be irresponsible with the knowledge we have of the most recent student fatality on this road, leaving aside the chaos which would be caused by a large increase of student footfall across this road.

3) Access is not made clear on the plans. The lane up to Littlehall Farm is not owned by the University.

4) By building on this site, a president is set of development across the open, unspoilt countryside towards Broad Oak, fields which are owned by UKC. With regards to point 1, this seems to be the main advantage to UKC of such a development.

5) St Stephen’s Hill road has served as a ‘natural’ and sensible boundary to UKC development for many years, protecting the valuable green spaces overlooking and surrounding the beautiful green city of Canterbury. Development along the ridge would ruin the views from and to the Cathedral, and destroy the natural heritage of this area.

Thank you for your consideration.

I am very happy to see some thought being put into the future development of the campus. The University has a beautiful location which has significant potential to be one
of the best campuses in the country. I've had a look at the plan and have a few key points to communicate:

(1) The focus on making campus easily navigable is an important issue and the idea of named paths and two major avenues makes good sense. I do worry that one of the major paths cuts through the middle of the Templeman and Rutherford appears to almost overlap one of the walks. This makes me worry about feasibility of this plan given current development and the fact that it doesn't explicitly address whether we should be looking to remove some of the original buildings (perhaps we should!!) rather than be constrained by them.

(2) The development of the two entrance squares and related reduction in traffic cutting through campus is very welcome.

(3) The focus of the plan is on the organization of space within the campus. However, I do think that some guidance about the buildings is also key. If the buildings are ugly or not well integrated the increase in density could compromise the campus. I think that this should not be left completely open and that a plan should be made for style/character of buildings that will be built. This doesn't require specifying individual buildings but rather general principles about how they should look and key design features that unify across buildings. In my opinion, the appearance of the buildings are a key negative issue right now. Unless this plan addresses it, it will miss a critical element of planning. The buildings should be inspirational places from outside and inside.

(4) The plan clearly indicates that the spaces formed between buildings should have character. I agree that this is key but without concrete plans, I worry that this challenge will be lost to practicalities when development actually happen. I would prefer to see more specific and realistic plans now.

(5) Although cycling is mentioned as important, I do not see concrete plans for a cycle network that will not interfere with pedestrian traffic. I think that this should be more explicitly dealt with.

(6) The idea of satellite developments in land north of campus is good. One idea is to have a village of subsidized housing for staff which will help with recruitment as Canterbury house prices increase.

Thank you for the opportunity to contribute to this process.

-----

Are there guidelines on how buildings, centres and room can be assigned names that reflect gender equality and inclusivity in general? And if so, will this form part of the master plan?

-----

One of my main concerns about the plan is the lack of parking. It is unreasonable to expect staff to use public transport or car-share, it just isn't practical for many. Parking has been reduced radically over the years as it is so to put it even further out of the picture is, in my mind, impracticable and will do nothing to make for happy and productive staff.

To increase greatly the number of buildings in the Heartland will spoil the whole feel of the campus and be detrimental to the idea of it being a ‘garden University’. Heavily built-up campuses become soulless.

Overall I don't like the plan at all I'm afraid.

-----

Whilst ultimately aesthetically pleasing I found the images provided in the displays and the document confused and difficult to apply to my working knowledge (25 years) of this University campus!

Aesthetics should not overwhelm function, eg large atriums do not solve teaching and staff space shortage or parking stress. Staff deliver the University's ‘business’ but often their needs and effectiveness are overlooked. We may initially attract with a pretty campus but our reputation is built on research, value for money, good facilities (catering) etc. and these are delivered by happy, engaged, included staff, not a harassed work force who has had to endure a fraught and lengthy journey on poor public transport or searching for a parking space followed by a lengthy trek in changing weather conditions. This is actually discriminatory against working parents with a school run to negotiate or those who have caring responsibilities and may have to reach someone in an emergency, a wait for a bus or lengthy walk is not always an option. People choose to work as well as study somewhere because of its accessibility (I have experienced both!!) It will certainly be a challenge to maintain the history of the institution, its integrity and identity with these plans!

-----

I agree that car parking could be more dispersed but not all to the Northern lands.

The conferencing hotel/pavilion does not need to be in such a prominent place and would exacerbate relations with residents given the long standing and correct concept of keeping the slopes undeveloped.

The area between Registry, Library, Eliot, Rutherford and Architecture should be left undeveloped. As the photos make clear this is a small but essential green area given the enormous size of the campus and there is no reason to intensify its use. The land use statistics suggest we are the campus least in need of intensification. High land values do
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not force this on us as in a city uni – we should keep this
advantage not abandon it.

What the maps omit is the height of the buildings and the
hemmed-in effect that creates, e.g. more buildings the
height of the Library would transform the feel of the central
area. Intensification of the central area would destroy the
best feature of the campus.

The buildings planned for the central area can easily be
placed around it e.g. Giles Lane car park.

1) I would really like to see a swimming pool as part of the
campus. It would promote health and fitness for staff and
students and complement the other sports facilities here. It
is not practical or convenient to drive/walk to the Kingsmead
pool, where parking has to be paid for by those travelling by
vehicle. Additionally, having a pool on site could aid

2) The grounds are extensive and great for walking. It would
development in those new ly developed areas and which crosses the
device to drive/walk to the Kingsmead
parking has to be paid for by those travelling by
vehicle. Additionally, having a pool on site could aid
generating an income for the university. It would encourage
staff to swim before/after/work, possibly during lunchtime
and raise fitness levels/reduce health issues. A swimming
pool was in the original plans for the campus and it is a
great pity it wasn’t built. It is a now excellent opportunity to
incorporate on this site.

3) Parking for staff IS an issue – there isn’t enough of it,
especially when car parks are closed to staff for events.
This really needs addressing, in light of the vastness of the
surrounding land, it seems unnecessary for staff stress
levels if they spend time trawling car parks trying to find a
place, hence unable to get to work on time or are late. Or I
see people coming in early, then sitting in their cars, as
otherwise they would not get a parking space. Apparently
over the years parking has been reduced in areas. Not
everyone can walk/cycle/bus to work. Canterbury city
centre is a nightmare for parking. It is not practical to park
anywhere within walking distance of the campus because
parking is in very short supply especially near. Hence
parking is a priority. Much as I dislike taking up green land,
this is necessary and could sympathetically be
incorporated. I would imagine there are staff who travel
some distance to work and not having enough parking on
site is really not good for the health and well-being of
employees and impacts on everyone.

An exciting plan and great to see the vision coming about.

1) provision for cycling and cyclists seems to be a
disappointing (glaring/embarrassing) omission. Looking
ahead, a green and healthy agenda should be one of the
big-ticket aspects of the plan! It really should incorporate a
cross-campus network of cycle ways to support and
encourage cycling for students and staff. It would also tick
big boxes for the council for their green agenda.

2) Given the very strong recent negative feedback from the
community, staff and students about plans to build on
Chaucer fields, having the conference centre pencilled in
for the heart of it is disappointing, unnecessary and

provocative. Evidently the University owns lots of adjacent
land and surely an alternative location should be found.

3) vehicle access on/off campus is often very busy, getting
busier and clearly insufficient. A 50-year plan should surely
include plans for an addition, properly designed entrance
for traffic. The extra 3G pitch at Park wood generates even
more traffic from the community down the park road.
Giles lane is far too narrow and positively dangerous as a
junction for vehicles, cyclists and pedestrians and not fit for

100% wrong.

The main attraction of the campus is the central (and other
green) areas.

What is the problem to which densification of the central
area is the solution? None is identified.

Densification might be appropriate for a campus with very
little land, e.g. in the middle of a city where land costs are
major concern.

At UoK we have very ample land especially since the
purchase of farmland to the north. All the more reason
therefore to avoid densification of the central area.

Thanks very much. It is a concern that all 10 references to
cycling are either to the existing Crab and Winkle route,
which crosses the campus (one of these, p 97 – is to widen
this for vehicles on some of its length, no justification given) or in two cases to the target of “Create strong, defined pedestrian and cycle routes”. This occurs on p78 as a target and then on p82 where the plan to implement it makes no reference to cycle ways but only to walks.

In short, the plan does not recognize cycle users at all and will deter some by making the C and W more dangerous. This is not a good or sensible way to achieve a friendly and environmentally safe campus. It’s hard not to feel that the University wishes to reduce cycle use.

Or am I wrong and have missed something? Please tell me if I have,

-----

I am very supportive of this plan, particularly the idea of increasing the density of the central campus and the move of parking to the periphery. It has often struck me that the face that some key buildings put to the world, for example Jarman, is actually their backside.

I have four comments

1) An essential step in realising this plan is the early adoption of Giles Lane so that through traffic can be stopped or at least curtailed

2) Development of the business hubs on the northern land holdings, most particularly if parking is to be moved out there, will need to go hand-in-hand with the development of better access routes through or by-passing the villages of Blean and Tyler Hill. At the moment, the road between the two is narrow and very winding. Its entrance on the Blean end is reasonable, but at Tyler Hill it is problematic for traffic travelling from the coast.

3) As someone who cycles to work 3-4 times a week I was disappointed not to see more about the potential development of cycling routes through campus.

4) I was disappointed that the plan to include housing at Blean as one of the early ‘gains’ was not trailed earlier in the document. To mean at least it did rather appear to be snuck in at the end as though hoping that few people would notice it. I don’t object to there being housing proposed, it would be up to the residents of Blean and the City Council to approve it. I just think it would have been better to mention it more up front.

Having been to one of Peter’s presentations I do realise that this is an outline vision. Clearly there is very important work that needs to be done to produce a comprehensive travel plan that supports this vision.

-----

Car Parking:

Pushing parking to the edges of the campus may unintentionally discriminate against those who have children or are not disabled but find walking that distance ‘challenging’. Those with children often have greater time constraints to fit in the school run and therefore may not be able to accommodate the additional walking time. In addition, emergency calls from school or childcare providers mean that parents need to be able to travel flexibly. A sensible solution may be to utilise the Park & Ride system already within Canterbury by providing a Unibus from those locations directly to the university. The KC Hospital already does this and it is most effective. This would increase links with Canterbury and bypass the current need to go directly into the centre of the city in order to make use of the bus service.

In addition, a ‘Boris’ bike scheme enabled at an outlying car park and the stations (bus & train) might encourage drivers to park further away from the campus.

If both of these ideas were to be implemented prior to movement of car parks, it may reduce traffic and prevent the need for greater expenditure on moving car parks and changing the road usage dramatically.

Outdoor Spaces:

Defined spaces with names would be good but in order to be used, they need to reflect the gardens within the city, both functionally (so that one may find secluded nooks to read/chat without being ‘on display’ and also aesthetically, so that we mirror the charm that the City’s green spaces hold.

Northern Hub:

I have concerns over innovation being so distant to the ‘heart’ of the campus. Trying to ensure that knowledge transfer partnerships are initiated and thrive is challenging enough with the addition of increased distance between academia and business. I think that to develop innovation away would be a huge mistake.

With regards to housing, it would make sense to provide more student accommodation North of campus, but of course be done in such a way that it would not depreciate the value of housing in the adjacent villages. Student housing usually fills residents with dread. If the housing were predominantly designed with PhD students, or higher stage undergrads with a movement towards independence for aforementioned, with central campus housing being reserved for 1st years (is that already the case?) then it would serve to provide a more traditional collegiate atmosphere within the new development without concerns of residents for noise pollution etc that may come with newer recruits.
I would also hope that residential housing may provide gender specific groupings in small number. Many females, especially from Islam backgrounds, find it hard to attend university as some families do not wish their children to live in mixed accommodation. This is a significant barrier to females (both UK and abroad) who have had to overcome family gender stereotypes in order to attend university.

PS Distance from the University to the Centre of City stands at 3miles (0dp).(pg99

---

Thank you for the opportunity to respond to this consultation. It’s great to see that the University is looking so far ahead and looking to protect one of its best assets – its green campus. I am an alumni and current research collaborator (based at Imperial College) who still occasionally visits the campus, and I’m keen to see it developed in a sustainable way. Please find my comments below:

1) The report proposes a central campus where buildings are either immediately adjacent or separated by small squares or gardens. I believe that the current large open spaces in the campus heart are a distinctive and valuable feature and should be maintained wherever possible. Lightly managed green spaces are an important component of the semi-rural feel of the place – some buildings feel as though they are nestled in woodland. I recognise that some intensification is needed to prevent further sprawl over countryside, but that we shouldn’t start from the assumption that higher density = better. After all, the UK is full of Universities are found with strikingly different campuses, and that we shouldn’t expect the design of the campus to drastically alter this one way or the other. It’s true that some plate glass Universities have a denser core than Kent, but are they generally considered better for it?

2) The penetration of countryside into the heart of the campus brings wildlife right up to University buildings. This is an attractive feature of the campus that is not present elsewhere, and I feel was ignored by the report. I have great memories of the rabbits who sunbathe on the grass by the library, the ducks in the Engineering building, and the coots and moorhens in Keynes Pond, and I hope that this can somehow be maintained.

3) I believe that the presumption should be against development in the parklands, since this is at odds with the strategy of intensifying the core. This is especially true for Chaucer field, given the strength of local opinion against this.

4) It would be helpful to see some example maps of how the campus might look in 10, 20, 30, 40 years’ time. Many of the proposed developments, such as the north-south walk-way that cuts through the central atrium of the library, or the eastern developments that require the demolition of Darwin, are presumably a long way in the future. It’s important that the vision allows for the campus to remain a pleasant place while on this journey.

5) There are a lot of claims in the report that are presented as fact, when these are really opinions that may not be shared by all. Some are reasonable, but still need evidence from opinion surveys (e.g. that the current green spaces lack variety), while others stretch the bounds of credibility (e.g. Digital connectivity could attract a major knowledge economy and business innovation cluster in this part of Kent similar to California’s Silicon Valley!!!).

6) The maps of pre-existing transports on p44 contains some errors. The primary pedestrian route into Canterbury runs to the west of Eliot. The marked route on the map, between Eliot and Canterbury, is (unless recently changed) unpaved and appears on this map to run straight into the grounds of the Archbishop’s School. On the road map, there is vehicle access to St Stephen’s Hill incorrectly shown South of Darwin College.

7) The section on comparison with other universities, beginning on p46 is very confusing. What is the argument here? The league tables show, if anything, that good Universities are found with strikingly different campuses, and that we shouldn’t expect the design of the campus to drastically alter this one way or the other. It’s true that some plate glass Universities have a denser core than Kent, but are they generally considered better for it?

8) I don’t see the advantage of having remote car parks to the north of the campus, linked to the main campus by a shuttle bus (p104). This would very inconvenient for staff and offers no environmental benefits (we still have the loss of green fields, all the cars, and now a shuttle bus as well).

9) The provision of housing near Blean is not really discussed in the master plan, and then is suddenly brought up as a key short-term step on Page 122. Given how contentious this is likely to be, I think the report should be upfront about this.

10) The plan for a cricket ground at Blean could do with some more explanation. Is there a demand for this? If the University intends to build a cricket ground, students might well ask why this isn’t being built close to existing sports facilities on the campus.

11) It’s difficult to see the benefit of the West Square in the short term (p118). As the surrounding building don’t yet exist, this wouldn’t be a “square” but really an extension of the existing paved area in front of the Venue over the Giles Lane/University Road junction. It’s not clear how this could possibly be largely vehicle-free, as claimed, when it will sit over the main (and busy) road access point to the central campus and contain a bus station.
12) The innovation park in the Northern Hub: what is the University’s vision for this? Is it to be an incubator exclusively of for technology start-ups/University spin-outs, or is it meant as a more general business park without restrictions on the type of business that can be based there. If the former, then shouldn’t this be based closer to the University, where these companies can take advantage of university facilities and collaborators? If the latter, then I think you need to provide clear justification for building this in open countryside, far from public transport links. Is there a large demand for this kind of space in the Canterbury area, given the developments at the former Pfizer plant?

---

I welcome most of the concepts behind this ambitious master plan and am pleased that the University has opened a dialogue with local residents and others. I like the fact that the central area will be consolidated and made more attractive. This has allayed some fears about sprawl into the neighbouring areas.

However, I am still concerned about the development of the southern slopes, particularly the intention to site a large (300 bed) conference centre in a prime position, much prized by local people. I am also concerned about the generation of traffic and hope that, before new car parks are constructed and new roads applied for, a team of transport planning experts will be consulted and green travel plans developed. I would not welcome the opening up of the original crab and winkle line into a vehicular route into town. The existing pathway runs along my garden boundary and I would oppose the intrusion into our privacy as well as the attendant noise and pollution.

---

The proposed plans all look great.

There are some things that several of my fellow students have pointed out, and it’s the slightly out of balance contrast between the old and the new in the university.

The library is at the forefront of this, with the difference between the exterior of the East side and the West side, where one is made of glass and the other of brick. Then next to the West side is Marlowe, which is closer to resembling the East side, and also in front of the West side is Eliot, which has long been compared to a ‘prison’ because of its long, confusing and confining halls.

New students have also pointed this out, and not just with learning facilities but with the housing. There is a massive difference between Tyler A and its sister houses B and C. Though there is an understandable price difference, A looks out of place next to the two newly renovated buildings.

The university should perhaps factor in a more affordable version of Tytlers B/C, Turing and Keynes accommodation, as the difference between the high-end and low-end accommodations is quite stark.

Also elevators. Many of my friends in Turing and Keynes have complained of the difficulty of walking up four flights of stairs, sometimes whilst suffering from a leg or back injury.

Otherwise, the plans all look incredible. I appreciate that the university is trying to preserve the USP of its views of the Cathedral and the nature around it.

---

Hello, I find the current proposals very interesting. A great concern to me is that the land between Rutherford and Eliot and towards the Cathedral remains as it is today, mainly a wide open area. It really was a great experience to look outside my bedroom window in Rutherford and see the Cathedral & empty area. It’s great if you plan for the coming decades, ensuring the campus becomes even nicer.

---

I welcome the opportunity to provide feedback on the Concept Master Plan for the expansion of the University and to establish the vision for the next 50 years. I studied at the University of Kent between 1993 and 1997 and had the opportunity to spend a year in Lyon (France) as part of my degree. I have fond memories of my time at University, not least due to the fact that it was there where I met my wife. When I applied to the University of Kent, besides the academic component, I was really attracted by the idea of living on a campus nearby a small city, with open and green spaces. I felt that London was in any case within reasonable travel distance and that this too made Canterbury an ideal place to study and live in. Out of my three years at the University, I lived two on campus. During my first and final years I had a room in one of the small houses adjacent to Darwin College. I spent the majority of time on campus walking from one place to another, attending lectures and meeting friends over coffee, lunch and dinner.

I have had the opportunity to review the Concept Master Plan. The document clearly sets out why the University must work to expand itself for the years to come. It also touches on key points which I feel are part of the University’s essence: campus life; green spaces; proximity to the city centre; and even a European style. With this in mind, I wanted to propose several points for your consideration:

The document calls for an expansion to the North where it seems that the University has already secured land. As the campus grows, it will be more difficult to go from one place to another walking. It would be useful to explain how this will
addressed. Personally, I would limit the use of cars inside campus and would implement a bus service.

The document also explains that new buildings will be required and that the majority of these will be built using open spaces available within the current boundaries of the campus. In my view, this could impact the University’s brand as a green campus university and would propose that additional building is considered in planned areas of growth as well as in residential areas such as Parkwood. The concept of a macro-campus sounds appealing to me and in my view, would allow University to consolidate its values.

Finally, I would like to suggest that more detailed plans with specific proposals are prepared so that additional feedback can be provided. In my case, it has been almost 20 years since I left Canterbury and I have only returned once (that was 10 years ago) so it is not always easy to remember the campus layout.

I hope you find this feedback useful.

-----

Having read the plan and visited the associated exhibition, I wanted to add my support to the proposals. I found the master plan to present an exciting and compelling vision for the University of Kent of the future.

There are specific aspects which I have trouble visualising (such as the extension of the University over the road beyond Darwin College), but am intrigued by the scope and ambition of the proposals, and am excited to imagine how the University will develop as a result in the future.

I like it. However, we are missing another key differentiator and huge positive which is Colleges. New buildings should be colleges, not simply student accommodation or subject blocks: attach these to a new college.

Parents (who are increasingly influential in the choice) love colleges with an identity. It’s about time students chose a college when they applied. The colleges should each have a different look, feel and character.

Also, bringing the university into the town as much as possible is a great positive.

Large lake area is very positive.

-----

As a concept, the idea of producing the Best Garden Campus in the UK (world?) is fantastic. However, I would recommend that consideration is given to several areas with regard to the ‘garden’ aspect of the proposal:

1) Garden maintenance – an early commitment to employing suitably qualified horticulturalists to ensure all planting is maintained to the highest standards

2) Choice of plants – to include ‘garden’ plants not simply those routinely seen in council car parks, but those which the best publicly accessible outside areas are able to provide (if referring to Sissinghurst consider the type of planting which is included there – is there scope for a ‘long border’ of herbaceous plants somewhere on site? Can you include avenues of pleached hornbeam etc? Landscaping can include open spaces and even provide amphitheatre facilities, framing views and enhancing new buildings if sympathetic consideration and commitment to maintenance are included). Refer to recent work at RHS Wisley for how the public move through garden spaces.

3) Budget – a realistic budget for the planting and maintenance of a Garden Campus

4) Sympathetic use of street furniture to compliment the ‘gardens’ and history of the campus including waste bins, lighting columns, benches etc to be specifically included in order to ensure a cohesive ‘garden’ is achieved

I am a University of Kent graduate in history (including local and garden history) and run my own small garden design practice in Mid-Sussex having completed a post-graduate diploma in garden design. I would be pleased to offer my help to Farrells in this exciting project and invite them to contact me if I can be of any assistance on ***** *****.

In the meantime may I wish everyone good luck with this exciting project.

-----

Please make available hard copies of the master plan to me which I’d collect from Kent Uni to save Kent the cost of paying postage.

There are many people in this area who are very interested in the masterplan but aren’t able to see it as they’ve not connected to the internet/online and therefore unable to be comment, participate or review the proposal as part of this inclusive, comprehensive and open public consultation process.

-----

1) Great that you are doing this. I went back to Kent after 30 years or so last summer and thought the campus was haphazard and veering towards a light industrial collection of units and car parks.
2) I like the Campus Heart – couldn’t you turn the core into a Hexagon? you have the shapes on the west side but not on the east. That would almost be heart shaped if you have an open ended south side!

3) The plan is good. A lot will depend on the quality of the buildings. Will these reflect the surrounding county in terms of design and history. Flint and stone, towers and oast houses rather than the anonymous concrete and glass.

4) I like the collegiate system – bringing that style along the street will add to the sense of community. Oxford and the like makes it work.

5) The walkways are wonderful. The hike up the hill from Canterbury could be a bit strenuous and demanding in cold weather. A funicular railway perhaps to help?

It’s a clearly visionary plan worthy of the University’s still young but none the less impressive heritage. In the 30 years since I left the university the landscape of higher education in the UK has changed beyond recognition and has become a huge contributor to the UK economy. This plan for the next 50 years has the potential to ensure the University of Kent, in its physical presence as a campus, has a global relevance and lure. It’s clear that the delivery of knowledge and education is becoming more digital, virtual and distributed in nature but the place for human interaction and collaboration in the physical world will always play an important part in the knowledge acquisition and creation process. This plan and vision, if adopted and executed, would ensure Kent can compete for talent on a global scale. I think it’s fantastic.

I think the proposals are very impressive, fitting and timely. One aspect which stands out for me is the idea of removing the car parks to the outer edge. I appreciate the considerations given to the existing strengths of the campus.

Many congratulations to the architects for providing the usual one dimensional analysis to justify bringing their ‘vision’ and hefty bill to the table.

This document is a one sided interpretation of the history of the campus filled with derogatory comments solely to justify the planned expansion and changes to the campus. I simply do not recognise any of the statements made (that seem to be passed off as an accepted truth that we all agree on).

The fundamental failure to carry out a robust analysis considering alternative views, opinions and beliefs from a range of stakeholders (and this form I am sorry, does not count as engagement) means this ‘vision’ is predicated on nothing more than the dollar signs in the eyes of the architects and empire building by the university leadership. The governing body at the university is risking damaging what is unique about Kent and clearly do not understand their responsibilities to students past, present and future.

Presumably the cost of this masterplan will not be made available as the usual trite exemption of “commercially sensitive information” will be invoked. Shameful folks.

-----

I was horrified at the 50th anniversary celebrations to see that the view of Canterbury Cathedral from Eliot dining room has been obscured by trees. Sheer vandalism! the trees should be felled or drastically thinned.

-----

I agree with all of it especially the intensification of the heart of the campus. It does feel spread out and we regularly referred to parts of it as ‘outposts’. Students should feel very appreciative that everything they need is in Canterbury BUT the aim should be that they never NEED to go to Canterbury as everything is on campus. A ‘street’ would fill the gaps and offer more services, maybe even jobs for students.

I whole heartedly support the idea of making it the leading garden campus but I’m surprised you aren’t pushing the concept further. The university should make itself inseparable with the plight of the bee. Contact the Royal Entomological society and tell them about the new garden sections. Plant bee friendly areas (rooftops and ground level). It will gain huge amounts of public interest and respect. It’s a very important cause. Being the number one garden campus isn’t exactly an aimless goal but it’s too bland a goal. I was at Kent 2013-2014 and will return 2015-2016 due to my love of the university. I’d be very happy to help in any way that I can.

-----

Brilliant concept, don’t forget the other campuses when it comes to paying for this lot!

-----

I am happy for working in this mater.

-----

If a hard copy of this plan is available, please send me a copy at the above address.
Hello

There are some nice ideas in this plan (gardens and enhancing non-motor access). However, although I do not wish to be impolite, I think the architects need to go back to the drawing board; I do not think the plan should have been circulated in its current form. I am fairly new to the University, and I work in Kent Law Clinic. I am not closely acquainted with the whole campus though reasonably familiar with it. The most striking aspect to me is that the plan completely ignores the existence of the new Kent Law Clinic building and is therefore fundamentally flawed in sating the new central access route for pedestrians and cyclists on the site of the new Law Clinic and central ‘gravitation’ around this; the current plan is impossible/unworkable if the Law Clinic building stays, which it must. The new building is financed through a massive special fund-raising campaign, largely through huge private donations, and the building is nearly finished. Given this (in my view) big flaw, I don’t think people’s time should be taken up (wasted) in considering the plan as it is, it should be withdrawn and revised. Given this rather significant flaw, I fear there may be others but I feel it is almost inevitable the plan will be withdrawn so I don’t feel inclined to spend more time looking at it, I regret to say.

-----

Hello,

I wonder whether you have considered impact of the concept master plan on the day to day practicalities of staff, particularly those who have childcare responsibilities who may have limited time at the beginning and end of each working day to trek to their vehicle on the outskirts of campus. School drop off and picking up times are likely to remain constant, so I hope that senior managers will accept (and continue to cover the cost of) a shortening of some individuals working day to travel between their offices and their vehicles. Surely any design should meet the needs of all users of the space not just those of the pedestrian.

-----

Make the campus smoking free and reinforce the rules. Cigarettes butts everywhere last time I came. At the entrance of the library despite a non-smoking sign a lot of people were smoking. Not a good first impression

-----

Are you suggesting knocking down the brand new (and currently being drastically refurbished/rebuilt!) central core of the Library and splitting the Library in half, making way for the tree-lined path through the middle?

Just wondered if that was a serious suggestion, as that’s what the drawing depicts.

Thanks very much.

-----

I attended the presentation given by the architect in the Gulbenkian cinema and overall was very impressed by the concepts and vision for the master plan. I look forward to being able to give feedback on the next stage when the proposals are more concrete.

-----

Hi there,

I attended the talk at the Gulbenkian.

This is just a huge thumbs up from me. I think it sounds brilliant even though the feedback at the end of the session seemed a bit negative.

I’m really pleased to see a long-term, strategic approach to the development which ultimately protects and enhances the beautiful landscape, created thoughtful spaces for people and pushes out cars.

I love the grand High Street concept. Could there be consideration for increased cycle paths integrated as a part of the strategy?

-----

Mostly fine, BUT.. don’t build anything on the South side. Leave it alone! Put your hotel/conference centre, amphitheatre etc. on the North side.

We’re about to suffer the loss of green space on the South side of Canterbury to 4,000. Don’t ruin the North too.

-----

Pushing the car parks to the edge of campus is an excellent idea. As is infill.

-----

I really like the main ideas of the master plan. I particularly like the plan to put the main entrances along a single route, and to make the map readable (I’ve been here 6 years and still am not sure where Darwin is). As a pedestrian (I walk to work) I am happy with moving the parking out in order to keep spaces in. However, I want to be sure that there is consideration given to the public with respect to parking. In particular, in Psychology, we frequently have members of the public in to participate in our research. This generally includes infants and children (the Kent Child Development Unit has over 200 children visiting the labs every year), patients (including those with brain injuries), and older people (the Kent Adult Research Unit). These special populations will need easy access to the building – we
cannot have these volunteers crossing busy streets, parking a long distance from the building (risking getting lost), etc. These individuals have prams, screaming kids, mild confusion, etc., etc. Please do consider some special parking access for these types of individuals – I don’t know whether SPSSR has similar concerns but it is vital that we keep access for our main populations of study.

-----

Will a full assessment be done of the impact on wildlife? For example, I have observed sky larks in the fields between the sports pavilion and Blean Church.

-----

I have read the online document and been over to the Colyer Ferguson presentation.

I very much like the concept of a garden campus. It could make Kent a really special and unique campus in the UK and tying it in to the county so closely is a great idea. As a graduate of Lancaster I also appreciate the importance of squares and paths with cars pushed away from the centre. Reclaiming the whole of the crab and winkle way into Canterbury is also a great idea – the current path is not great at all. I think this is a good direction for the university as we totally underuse the open space we have. The square by Essentials is horrible and underused and the campus has no clear ‘entrance’. The idea of a more joined up vision for new builds is overdue, at the minute the one off projects that are given the go ahead do not necessarily work with one another. The Law Clinic is a case in point – a beautiful new building but sitting amongst old deteriorating buildings.

So happy with the concept – it looks a delightful place to work. However I think more detail is needed. There is a major problem with the old estate on campus and although some of this can be achieved through landscaping and the ‘quick wins’ the plan outlines, old buildings – mine included – look awful. They will continue to look awful unless major investment is made in rebuilding or at least refurbishing (exteriors and interiors) to make campus look attractive and keep us competitive. Many of our closest rivals are investing in new build...our buildings are looking increasingly embarrassing and this is going to become a major problem in terms of recruitment and student experience. I think at the next iteration of the master plan the short and longer term building plan needs to be shown in more detail. I recognize this is more of a ‘vision’ but the university is already dealing with a very challenging reality which needs addressing.

-----

Think the presentation in Colyer Ferguson and ideas are fantastic. Love the idea of developing a ‘garden campus’.

I knew the university owned a lot of land but hadn’t appreciated how far reaching it was. I think the area to the East of St Stephens Hill would make a perfect spot for expansion, particular for its views down to the Cathedral but also for its close vicinity to the edge of campus and the bus link... although the neighbouring private property may not think so.

I’m also pro the ideas for a Park and Ride but there is a strong parish community in Blean so feel dubious about how feasible that would be with potential for strong objections.

Also support the idea to develop Crab & Winkle Rail Line as a ‘substantial new route’. Great opportunity to build links with the local community/tourism to sell our university.

Big fan of the open air theatre proposal too but not so much the idea of developing on Chaucer Fields as feel that hill creates such a great platform to stage the university and a shame to encroach on it.

The master plan also notes reuse of Beverley Farm but not detail on what?

-----

As both local residents and university staff, we find much of the plan excellent. The garden campus theme is well thought out and the reason many students come to Kent. However, two things need changing.

The proposal for a huge (estimated 50m from the map) Conferencing Hotel Pavilion right in the centre of Chaucer Fields would destroy the iconic view of the Cathedral from the University Road, and also destroy much of the 200-year-old hedged lane from Beverley Farm. It would sit directly below where I saw a Kestrel hovering just a week ago, sticking out like a sore thumb in the middle of the beautiful fields, visible from every direction. It also goes against the City plan to preserve the green space between the campus and the town. Local residents would (rightly) fight this proposal fiercely and it would increase local resentment of the university. Why not simply move this 100m to the North side of University Road where it would be unopposed, or to the Northern Lands where there would be room for a car park for delegates?

“The Crab and Winkle Way utilises dimly lit alleyways and a tunnel which are not overlooked and which are intimidating after dark.” But the tunnel is the ONLY way over or under the railway line except for the two road crossings much further away, so would still have to be used, as would most of the path to the city centre: there is simply no other route, although it could be better lit.
APPENDIX 5B – COMMENTS FROM INDIVIDUALS (CONT)

“tree-lined embankment ...This disused line provides a splendid Master Plan opportunity to provide a new and more direct alignment for the Crab and Winkle Way, which in turn would be more generous in width as a shared pedestrian and cycle route.” Er, no it wouldn’t: the embankment is 8 feet wide (I’ve measured it) and couldn’t be widened – it runs narrowly between back gardens at Salisbury Road/Leycroft Close and elsewhere and would simply move student noise from the front to the back of houses. As for the buses pictured in the plan using it, they would need to fly! It would be no shorter than the present route and would be nowhere near the West Square (the planned campus entry point) whereas the present footpath up the hill goes directly to the West Square.

-----

I understand that the University is not obliged to provide parking for staff. However if in the plan parking was still provided but located outside of central campus, it is going to add I guess an extra 20 minutes to peoples commutes to and from work. Which is fine if you do not have any outside commitments i.e. dropping children off at school/nursery. At the moment people find it a struggle trying to fit everything in and arriving on work on time, without extra travel time being added on to everyone’s journeys before and after work. The plan does look great, I just think it is going to have quite an impact on staff. Also if you had to dash off home in an emergency but have to either get a shuttle bus or walk, you’ll not going to be able to get home as quickly as you can now. If you did provide a shuttle bus for the parking, I presume during the day it would not run as frequently as they would first thing in the morning.

-----

Thank you for the excellent presentation today!

I think in general the ideas are fantastic, more named open spaces, streets and icons would be brilliant.

There is clearly a “spine” as someone put it running east to west, that route is currently very heavily used and any plans to enhance it would be very well received. There is also another very busy route running right from Canterbury city centre, along the new library extension, past Jarman and down to Parkwood. I’d very much like to see this route get a bit of love, along the lines of the main spine and an enhancement of the space around Jarman/sports centre.

I also love the idea of moving car parks away from the centre of campus! Though I can see it being met with a lot of resistance... people are lazy! Perhaps mentioning it could mean MORE car park spaces would help with that ;)

On a more personal note, as a regular hiker I really value the crab and winkle route up to Whitstable, please look after it when designing the “new sustainable path”!

-----

Opening up avenues and planting different foliage will be a good idea, but I am concerned that there is mention of a hotel and conference building labelled on Chaucer Fields. If car parks are to be built on the edge of campus, this facility would be more beneficial in the centre of campus, perhaps on the current Giles Lane car park.

I do hope that this encouraging master plan is progressed as there are buildings with leaky, rattling windows with poor designs, such as Cornwallis South, Rutherford.

-----

On the whole I think the plan is an excellent one, as it would make the campus more coherent, easier to navigate and create some excellent links with the wider community.

However, I do think the university would be missing a trick by not including a swimming pool in its plans. I understand that pools are expensive to build and maintain, but for a university of this size, the absence of a pool is surprising.

I’d make the case for a pool as follows:

1) lots of staff members swim to keep fit and a fair few are very keen swimmers. At the moment it’s only possible to swim for fitness before or after work, as it’s not possible to get to either of the pools in town, have a decent swim session and get back again in your lunch break. This means that the only time to swim is very early morning or evening, when the lanes are often used by clubs.

2) Any prospective student who is at all keen on swimming will be put off by the absence of a pool on campus.

3) The Kent swim team have to train in local public pools (and at one time only had the use of Faversham pool) which makes it very hard to establish a decent swim team at Kent.

4) Lots of students are unfit and would benefit from having access to a pool on campus.

5) I imagine having a pool on campus would add to the attractiveness of the visitor accommodation during Easter and summer.

6) You could optimise income from the pool by renting it out to swimming clubs and triathlon clubs, who often have trouble getting pool time. You could also run triathlon training camps at times when accom is available on campus and link the pool to a full tri training prog with the
sports centre, involving strength training, running, cycling and swimming.

-----

I understand the various built space pressures and the need to optimise our use of space. I like the suggestion of more imaginative use of open spaces BUT the overall feel of this is very urban and the open spaces too contrived and controlled for a semi-rural campus. I would prefer something which works to enhance the existing open spaces rather than replace them with inner-city type open spaces. Also the density to the south of Giles lane pretty much obliterates open spaces with views that make one look beyond and tend to reproduce the fortress Kent effect of the Cornwallis / Colyer Ferguson and Woolf end of campus.

Also please can I make a plea for the retention of the Sports Hall/ Jennison pond -- it is beautiful (irises at the moment) and relaxing and a tranquil spot that keeps one from touching the pound.

Just a couple of suggestions: 1. The expansion of the student/staff body for the next 10 years will require strategic thinking on how to integrate communities, so they do not develop separated and alienated. A university campus relies on integration of its communities. What I observe is that currently there is very little social space to enable integration. Is the master plan developing social space? what type of space? Social space is something that requires special careful thinking. Currently the communities are not interacting in a collegial manner because the physical environment unfortunately does not provide the necessary special, carefully planned, space. Today we are developing as an urban space without an integral- inclusive- dynamic- synergetic- confluent centres (study rooms, lecture theatres, cinemas and shops have not had a master plan, until today). A city within the city. A university is more than a small city. If we do not plan carefully the social space we will grow without a soul, and this could be developed by what the Greeks called the Agora for meeting and discussing which it is what University is about. If we manage to include the social meeting space we will develop an Alma mater, and integrate to what Canterbury was and is (a city of encounters of different nationalities for the enlightenment of the soul and the body. Social space is very important. PIs do not leave it outside the master plan.

2. We will need broaden the narrow corridors and stairs in all buildings. They are inadequate already to support the body mass of 20K students and staff. Thanks for reading this.

-----

The idea of creating a beautiful "garden campus" is great. However, when implementing this idea, immense care has to be taken not to repeat the same mistake that was made when building the current campus. This mistake is EXTREMELY POOR PROVISION FOR PEDESTRIAN ACCESS cross-campus. This tends to happen when a lot of small buildings are scattered everywhere, and serve as obstacles if one simply needs to walk from A to B. It is not too bad if your destination is on the main campus walkway. But try to walk from Keynes college to the Sports Pavilion, or Park Wood car park (I recommend this to Farrells just to get the feel for the current state of affairs). The walk is twice as long as the direct distance, and one is lucky not to break his/her leg while hopping between random pavements, car parks, back yards, bins, woods, bits of grass and mud etc.

It is so frustrating that pedestrians are not cared for on this presumably "green campus". There is a lack of pavements (the most striking example – Giles Lane). The existing pavements and crossings are often dangerous.

Please consider these issues very seriously. If we want to turn the campus into a “garden”, we must make sure people can actually walk around it, and enjoy it too.

-----

The extension part of the Sports Centre is very new. Tearing it down for new buildings may not be a smart move.

Currently, there is a pound in front of Jennison. In that area, it may be good to design the new buildings without touching the pound.

-----

I have been connected with The University of Kent since I enrolled as an undergraduate in 2004. I am currently a PhD student and assistant lecturer.

Whilst in general I welcome the proposed plans, I must register my strongest possible opposition to the ‘Parklands’ element.

-----

Register my strongest possible opposition to the ‘Parklands’ element.
I am utterly and completely opposed to the construction of a ‘conferencing hotel’ on the southern slopes, or, as I have come to know them since first arriving at Kent in 2004, Chaucer Fields.

When I first visited the University on an open day, before enrolling as an undergraduate in 2004, the view down to Canterbury over Chaucer Fields as we turned onto campus from the Whitstable road was a huge factor in the positive picture that I built of the University that day and had a significant part to play in my decision to choose Kent.

If the proposed development goes ahead, this will have a seriously detrimental effect on the attractiveness of Kent to future undergraduates. Everyone from Kent that I have ever spoken to, amongst my alumni friends and also current under- and postgraduates, have all passionately expressed how the southern slopes and views that they afford had a similarly substantial role in their decision to become a student at Kent.

The development between Eliot and Rutherford have already greatly dismayed both current and past students with whom I converse. The phrase ‘cutting off your nose to spite your face’ is commonly uttered during these conversations.

I understand that the proposed development is further from this area, yet it will have no less damaging an effect on the overall character of the campus, especially given the proposed intensification of development within Central Campus.

I urge you to drop the plans to develop the southern slopes and remove them from the master plan (this includes the proposed building to the north-east of Chaucer Fields, as yet with no explanation as to its purpose). Their inclusion runs completely counter to the ‘design principles’ espoused by Farrells and also appears to be in stark opposition to Canterbury City Council’s proposals to include the Chaucer Fields area in the ‘Green Gap’, as expressed in their upcoming District Plan.

I look forward to your response

Many thanks and best wishes.

Thank you for the opportunity to hear how UKC hopes to grow, thrive and develop over the next decades to enshrine UKC’s culture into the heart of Canterbury and beyond.

As an undergrad I chose UKC because it was a slightly radical university and it taught me not to be afraid to challenge rather than to accept the status quo and this philosophy has stood me very well over the years and I hope that culture will continue.

After a bit of reflection I wanted to add the following comments to the notes I handed in on the night:

1) Developing a relationship with residents – this is an area where I think UKC currently fails as it is seen as a big monolith who can poke its fingers up at residents and carry on – I’m not saying this is true it’s just the perception and some steps to build a stronger bridge between local communities and the uni would help long term relationships all round.

2) Developing relationships with local businesses – I’m sure much of this is already done but again the Cambridge local business model could enhance the bonds between the uni and local businesses.

3) The Heart plan is great, as it will hopefully mean that schools and colleges don’t sit in silo’s only interacting with their own but will help to engender a wider integration among students and teachers. This will become more important if the growth from post grads and overseas (non eu) students is to be successful. Integration of non-eu students has always been difficult at UKC.

4) Moving parking away from the centre and helping all staff and students to walk a bit or take some exercise will also help and is a great idea.

5) The north land is the most problematic to make happen with an eye to the future – businesses want to work together, just look at the estate agents, coffee shops, banks, lawyers, accountants in Canterbury so having many small sites several miles apart will need significant thought as to how to connect separate ‘hubs’ both physically and electronically.

6) Finally – the design and build quality – Canterbury has some incredible examples and UKC has some pretty monstrous carbuncles as well as some incredible buildings (Eliot hall windows!) and I think the look, feel and design of the grounds and any new buildings have the potential to be fantastically brilliant or terrible and this will be UKC’s and your legacy for the next few generations – what an opportunity!

I really appreciate how much work has gone into this plan, the presentations and it was a shame that only 20-30 people turned up to something that will affect the whole community over the next decades – the lack of community involvement until something directly affects them or their houses is quite embarrassing but anyway thanks again for making the effort, I wish you all the best with the plan and if I can help in any way please ask.
This looks good to me, very good.

-----

I am submitting these comments as a long-term local resident and member of the University staff.

While the plan is at this stage still too vague and nebulous to allow for any informed comment, I would like to make the following points.

Page 2: The University of Kent benefits from a unique location on a hilltop overlooking the historic City of Canterbury and set in a generous parkland landscape. The 1965 Holford master plan took advantage of the location through distributing the original college buildings along the ridgeline. This allowed the dramatic views and very green setting to infiltrate right into the heart of the campus resulting in a theatrical character.

Page 39/40 refer to the "incredible views over historic Canterbury" that would be lost if this building were to be constructed.

Page 59 specifically commits to "safeguarding views of historic Canterbury" and states that "special care should be taken to nurture the views of historic Canterbury, which are one of the most delightful features of the Campus". In this light, it is to be hoped that the statement "the development of new spaces and buildings should be seen as an opportunity to offer additional scenic views" does not refer to the construction of new buildings (such as the "conferencing hotel") that will obscure these existing views and offer views only from the building itself.

Many arguments have been put against the conference centre proposal over the past few years and, although the recent Village Green application was dismissed on a technicality, the strength of these arguments and the feeling in the local residential community should not be underestimated.

Page 74 attempts to justify the location of this hotel on the grounds that it will "take advantage of an association with the University whilst maintaining a degree of independence to cater for the non-University market, and to benefit from proximity to public transport routes". There are significant flaws in this statement:

1) The "non-University market" is predominantly made up of academic conferences and language schools, which would wish to be in the centre of University facilities and activity rather than on the periphery. Other visitors to the city prefer to be located in the city centre rather than two miles outside.

2) Surely students and staff would also wish to be in "proximity to public transport routes".

The suggestion of a central "campus grid" (page 67) seems reasonable, although specific detail on the proposed layout of this grid and the integration of new and existing buildings into it is yet to be put forward.

It would be interesting to be told which buildings in the area between the Jarman Building and Darwin College are "nearing the end of their practical life" (page 52) and upon what grounds this assessment has been made.

Page 56: "Currently many of the existing areas of green landscape are 'organic' in nature, and are ill-defined and under-used whilst lacking variety". These so-called "ill-defined organic spaces" have their own value and "unofficial" and "unstructured" spaces are important as they allow individuals to create their own interpretation and allow users to engage in a variety of activities. The University should not seek to classify, manicure and allocate a defined purpose to every area of green space on campus. The picture of the "Gibbs Green Park" used as an illustration on this page is a very bog-standard piece of open space with a few token trees and patches of lawn that lacks any of the individuality and character that Kent's ancient woodlands and open fields add to the campus. The more detailed proposals on page 94 claim that "many of [the existing] buildings add to the character of the Parklands". I would dispute that more recent buildings have added anything beneficial to this character and the existence of a few scattered buildings that pre-date the University should not be taken as a licence for further development in these areas.

Page 77: the proposal for "an avenue of cherry blossom to parade new graduates in Spring" displays an ignorance of either the academic year or the flowering cycle of the cherry tree.

Page 95, which makes suggestions for new routes to link the campus and the city, includes an alarming illustration of a large bus parked in the approximate vicinity of the end of Lyndhurst Close. There is no scope for creating access for vehicles of this type through the residential area between the campus boundary and the city centre and it is to be hoped that this is not a serious suggestion. Even the more modest proposal for the creation of a "wonderful tree-lined boulevard" along this route for pedestrian and cycle use appears problematic to anyone who is familiar with the existing path along the embankment.
APPENDIX 5B – COMMENTS FROM INDIVIDUALS (CONT)

It would seem difficult to develop the proposed “West Square” as an arrival and focal activity point (page 118) when it is located at a considerable distance from the “campus heart”

While personally I would welcome the move to locate car parks away from the campus centre and to encourage walking and cycling routes, another area of concern is that the plan makes no mention of disability or of accessibility in the context of facilitating access to the campus, its buildings and services, for students, staff and visitors with disabilities (which includes sensory as well as mobility disabilities). This seems an inexcusable omission and I trust that the next stage of the plan will redress it by considering the impact of these proposals on users with disabilities.

In summary, I believe the most realistic way forward is for the plan to focus on the development of the central campus and on parking and public transport solutions before getting carried away with concepts for the peripheral areas.

Re plan for ‘Parklands’. The green, open spaces are acknowledged as an asset to the university, appreciated by students, university staff and community alike. A few paragraphs on, however, reference is made to ‘development of new buildings’ (a conferencing hotel), undermining the very idea of green, open spaces.

While the plan focuses on the nice things to have it omits some critical elements. While making unjust criticisms of the Holford plan’s provision for motorists, which in the 1960s was on a much smaller scale, it says little about car parking in 2050. There are several mentions of cars being moved to the periphery but where that is left is unclear. It seems to assume it someone else’s problem.

The other issue with the plan is the landscaping. The current park style is relatively cheap to maintain. I cannot see the University ever being able to afford anything of the likes of Sissinghurst proposed in the plan. It would require a huge amount of labour on a windswept site with poor soil. We could end up with an overbuilt site of cheap buildings and neglected courtyards and lose the current strength of the central campus which is so important for student recruitment and as a social hub. The plan even drives a road through this space. I remain unconvinced by the proposed aesthetic juxtaposition of 60s brutalism (which is coming back into fashion) and Gertrude Jeckyll.

The most inadequate part of the current site is Giles Lane with uninspiring buildings (Cornwallis, Woolfe, Estates + the area near Jarman). It gives a poor impression of the University for the many that pass through and is over-ripe for re-design. If we want an intense bit of building perhaps we could take inspiration from the streets of Bologna for this part of our site.

The plans for the heart of the campus look good to me. Conceptually engaging and persuasive. And a big statue of a unicorn would be charming!

However, the idea of more buildings on the Parklands seems to me incompatible with their preservation. I note that the Master plan shows a ‘?’ on the page that addresses the distance between the university and the city – that, and the photograph of Stowe as an example of pavilioned parkland, suggests that the planners have not got their heads around what this space is actually like and what it means.

The relatively wild appearance and atmosphere of the Parklands is, I would argue, a rarer and more special amenity for the university and the city than any of the suggested landscape buildings or pavilions-including-commercial-and-academic-buildings could be. Those buildings, like the conference hotel mentioned in the plan, will destroy the green belt effect we currently have, and seriously change the nature of the space around, and indeed change the neighbourhoods surrounding the space.

The open-air theatre idea, to take one example, seems to me unrealistic in terms of its actual potential for use by the university and city community, and would destroy a large area of green open space that is visible and influential for their sense of the campus to people arriving on foot by Eliot pathway. Building here would also affect the green unbuilt area around it. It would bring evening noise and traffic to those using the green space as an amenity and to local residents.

A route from the station to the university already exists. With international expert advice telling us that we need to eliminate use of the internal combustion engine within the lifetime of our current students, the idea of building a new road for vehicular access up the hill seems unwise and unnecessary. Let people walk, and make sure there are decent transport links and proper access for those using wheelchairs, pushing buggies, etc. Some tree-planting along the way would be lovely.

I broadly welcome the plan for the heart of the campus but would not like to see more large buildings or roads in the area between the heart and the campus boundaries.
Once you have checked exactly where my house is, you will have an understanding of what I think. Which is to say that if this goes ahead, my view of your land will be restricted to the back of three large buildings.

-----

University Master Plan – Consultation Response 15th July 2016

First, I greatly welcome the initiative to begin a conversation between the University and its neighbours about the future of the campus and the University’s estate. The recognition of the need to “ensure we deliver long-term benefits for our local communities, and improve our intellectual, physical, economic and cultural connections with the city of Canterbury”, is the right starting-point for an on-going dialogue, and I hope very much to see that dialogue continue. I attended a presentation to local residents’ associations, and the spirit in which that meeting was conducted, both amicable and honest, augurs well for a new relationship between the University and local residents. I also welcome the overall approach of the Master plan – an attempt to develop the estate as a coherent pattern of spaces and buildings, rather than simply a collection of buildings sited in whatever locations happened to be available at the time.

The rough division of the estate into three main components – the built heart of the campus, the southern parkland, and the northern landholdings – is a useful starting-point for thinking about the plan. I think it leaves out some important features, and I’ll come back to this, but I’d like first to offer some comments on those three components.

I strongly concur with the core idea of creating two new entrance squares and a connecting boulevard. The availability of the land which was formerly the day nursery next to Keynes, the eminently disposable nature of the Tanglewood buildings, and the beginnings of a space beside the School of Arts building, provide the scope for a West Square as a new ‘front door’ to the University. Most visitors to the University come via St Thomas’s Hill, and the drive up the University Road with its unfolding vista of the city and the Stour valley is a huge asset but at present leads to a terrible anti-climax. Instead it needs to arrive at an impressive new ‘gateway’, which in turn should be, as envisaged, the fulcrum of a pedestrian boulevard running westwards to Keynes and Turing colleges, and eastwards past the central buildings to the Registry and Darwin. Grouped around and along this, the central buildings and spaces could acquire a much-improved coherent overall shape and character.

I would therefore support the suggestion that the “new gateway squares in the campus heart” would be the ideal “opportunity for early wins” (p.117). The exact nature and location of the East Square would need to be thought through. If it were to be located where it is proposed on the map, this would require the demolition of the existing main building of Darwin College in the near future. There is a case for that, but there are other possibilities. Rather than create a new entrance from St Stephen’s Hill, it might be easier to retain the existing entrance from Giles Lane and Darwin Road, creating a new square which would incorporate the existing entrance to the Registry and the existing Visitor Reception.

The Southern “Parkland”

This is of course part of the estate of most immediate concern to neighbouring residents, and as such it offers the opportunity to move on from recent history. The reiterated emphasis on retaining this area as parkland, and the recognition that the green setting is the University’s greatest asset, is greatly to be welcomed. In this context it has to be said that the map showing a ‘conferencing hotel as a pavilion in the park’, located on the southern slopes, is needlessly provocative. I appreciate that this is at present simply a ‘concept’ and that there are no immediate plans to proceed with such a development. All the more reason, then, to leave it off the map. I hope it will be recognised that the idea of building a conference centre on the southern slopes has come to epitomise an antagonistic relationship between the University and local residents. If the new commitment to dialogue and cooperation is genuine – and I believe that it is – then by far the best way to foster that new relationship would be to drop talk of a conference centre in the fields.

If there is still felt to be a need for a conference centre which could also cater to the need for short courses for a particular category of students, then I would suggest that the ideal place for it in the Parklands would be next to Beverley Farm. The Design Principles on p.51 include a commitment to “reveal the historic narrative of the campus linking together its past, present and future”, and on p.94 it is noted that “very often the existing Parklands buildings are some of the most historic of all the campus buildings, such as Beverley Farmhouse...”. It is an under-utilised asset. There is great potential for linking it to a new conference centre on the northern side of University Road, imaginatively designed to blend in with the architecture of the historic farm building.

Another historical asset which was mentioned is the old Crab and Winkle railway line. I am sceptical about this, not least because most of the line on the University estate is inaccessible in the tunnel. There may be possibilities north of the tunnel, but the suggestions for using the railway embankment south of the tunnel are impractical (see below). Better, I suggest, would be to enhance the Eliot footpath as the existing north-south axis. The large pit to the right surrounded by trees at the start of the path, and the
land immediately behind it, could be landscaped and improved. The idea of an open air theatre in the so-called ‘bomb crater’ also has potential, though it would need to be a temporary facility as the pit becomes badly flooded in winter.

There were, at the presentation, frequent references to ‘enhancing’ the parkland. This would be good – but despite the allusions to Stowe and Capability Brown, building a conference centre is not the way to do it! There are other and better ways. There are references to “new green landscapes” which “might include… avenues of trees and fruit blossom” (p.56), and orchards are mentioned on p.61. At the presentation one local resident suggested restoring the orchard in the south-east field on the southern slopes. This, I think, is a great idea, and another example of the scope for drawing on the history of the area. There are one or two old fruit trees still in that field, but mostly it has been replanted with other trees. The oaks are flourishing but the horse chestnuts are in poor shape, badly affected by bleeding canker. They could be removed and replaced by fruit trees in the central area of the field. Recreating a traditional Kentish orchard, and designating it as a community orchard, would be an ideal way of forging the right sort of link with the local community, at the same time revealing the historical narrative of the campus. Other enhancements could also be considered, such as some selective tree-planting (provided it doesn’t obviate the view), and the improvement of the woodland at the top of the western field. The important principle is that it should be enhanced as semi-natural parkland, not turned into something else.

Wildflower meadows are proposed on pp.56 and 61, and these too would be an attractive enhancement of the parklands. The field immediately below University Road on the southern slopes would make a wonderful wildflower meadow, further enhancing the already magnificent panorama. Alternatively, wildflower borders on either side of University Road, from Beverly Farm to the West Gateway Square, would be a perfect approach to the new “front door”. If projects such as an orchard and a wildflower meadow on the southern slopes were to be pursued, I believe that members of the local community would welcome an opportunity to be actively involved in promoting and achieving them.

The Northern land holdings

I don’t have a great deal to say about these, but the basic idea of retaining the rural character of this part of the estate, and creating some judiciously landscaped ‘rural business clusters’, sounds sensible. Much will depend, however, on discussions with, and feedback from, Blean and Tyler Hill residents.

Parkwood student accommodation

The Parkwood student accommodation doesn’t seem to fit into any of the three areas of the estate. It is not part either of the central heart or the northern land holdings, and it needs to be considered in its own right. Analogously to the central heart, it should be envisaged and developed as a student village with its own coherent village pattern, perhaps with an improved frontage looking onto the road and the sports fields. Thought should also be given to the utilisation of Park Wood itself, the surviving woodland between the existing Parkwood accommodation and the Business School. Additional student accommodation could be provided here in an attractive setting, consonant with the idea of a Garden Campus.

Car parks

It is suggested on p.57 that the car parks should be pushed to the edges of the estate instead of cluttering up the campus heart. This point was briefly raised at the presentation, but after that it was scarcely mentioned. I doubt whether that aim is achievable. The brief reference to tunnelling into the hillside was implausible. A better approach might be to accept that some at least of the existing car parks will remain in their present locations, and to look for ways of integrating them into the campus more successfully. A possible approach might be to build on top of them, and hide them behind attractive frontages. The aspiration to ‘tame’ the roads and make the campus more pedestrian-friendly is commendable, but it can be achieved in other ways. The excellent bus services to the campus, especially to the bus stop and turning point near Keynes College, are a great success, and something to build on. The fact is that University Road is and will continue to be the main vehicle access route to the campus, and it is best to plan around that. If there is to be any new car parking it could perhaps be north of University Road near Turing College, keeping more cars out of the Campus Heart.

Crab & Winkle Way and railway line

There are various references to making use of the Crab & Winkle cycle route between Canterbury and Whitstable which runs through the campus, and of the route of the old Crab & Winkle railway line. These references are somewhat confusing and, in some respects, not properly thought through. It is suggested that the Crab & Winkle Way cycle path on the north side of the campus could be upgraded and widened from a pedestrian and cycle route to provide a route for vehicles from Tyler Hill Road (p.97). This would be a bad idea. It would blight the attractive route down the hill from Blean Church. There also appears to be a reference (though this is unclear) to making the disused railway line north of the tunnel into a new route between the central campus and Tyler Hill Road. This certainly has potential. The old track is extremely muddy and overgrown, and could be turned into a fine pedestrian and cycle route, but again making it a vehicle route would destroy the rural character of
this land. There are also rather confusing references to the walking and cycling route between Canterbury and the University:

Although it is a great asset, the Crab and Winkle Way follows a slightly circuitous route through existing residential streets which some residents find noisy and disruptive, especially when used by students late at night. The route utilises dimly lit alleyways and a tunnel which are not overlooked and which are intimidating after dark. In addition, the shared route is often quite narrow, and fast moving cyclists (downhill at least) are often a hazard to pedestrians. (p.99)

I presume that this means the route along St Stephen’s Pathway, Hackington Place, Hackington Terrace, St Michael’s Road, and the Eliot pathway. The recognition of the problem of night-time noise and disruption is welcome, but I am afraid that the suggested alternative, of acquiring the old railway embankment and turning it into a “tree-lined boulevard” for a public transport system linking the campus to the north side of Canterbury West station, is a non-starter. It would involve demolishing several houses in Beaconsfield Road and most of Hanover Place, and would in any case merely transfer the night-time noise from the front to the back of local houses. Better to make the most of the existing pedestrian and cycle route, and tackle the problem of night-time noise in other ways which are already being explored.

Conclusion

I welcome the general approach of the Master Plan, the Design Principles on p.51, and the aspiration to create “the best garden campus in the UK”. I hope that the further refinement of the Master Plan will fully take on board the feedback from the local community and will seek to enlist and harness the support of local people.

-----

I have already submitted my comments, but I would like to add one further point, please. I have been thinking further about the reference to a “conferencing hotel as a pavilion in the park” and the accompanying picture of Stowe on page 96, which is NOT a photo of a ‘pavilion’ but of the massive frontage of the main building! I decided to explore further what a genuine ‘pavilion’ would be in Stowe Park, and found a good example at http://www.geograph.org.uk/photo/4850215. It is not a 300-bed hotel! It could act as a venue for a meeting of, say, a dozen people. A building of that nature could, perhaps, enhance the landscape of the University parklands. It would sit nicely within a setting of trees. If, as some of us have suggested, a new conference centre were to be built just above University Road, utilising the proximity of the historical buildings of Beverley Farm, a pavilion-type structure just below, nestling in the grove of trees at the top of the slope, might function as a location for small break-out groups from a conference. Personally I would not object to a small building of that kind at an appropriate location in the parklands, on the southern slopes if necessary. But please can I urge that the fudge in the phrase ‘conferencing hotel as a pavilion in the park’ is removed from the plan. A conference hotel is one thing, a pavilion in the park is something totally different, and it is extremely important, I suggest, that you come clean on which is meant.

-----

I studied at UKC (as was) between 1989 and 1993. Since then I have returned to visit on a number of occasions, most recently for the 50th anniversary celebrations and then a few weeks ago for a long weekend with friends. I’m struck by how mature the grounds have become, which helps to compensate for the loss of vistas due to the additional building which has gone on. I read the master plan in full a few weeks ago and it gets my broad support, however I would ask you to give greater consideration to the impact on those remaining private residents in Giles Lane who are not part of the University.

-----

I like the concept and have often thought that the areas between the central buildings could be filled in while still giving plenty of breathing space around them. Indeed, I seem to remember discussing just that at old Estates Board meetings!

One thing I found missing was any mention of accessibility for people with mobility problems. Some parking/access to the central buildings, especially the Library and lecture theatres, is vital. Especially, if the university is not to alienate the local community – or indeed alumna.

-----

Thank you for consulting the residents of St Michaels Road Area in a more appropriate way than last time. I broadly and enthusiastically support the concepts outlined in differentiating between the three areas of campus, parkland and northern farmland. I have always believed the main campus can be strengthened and consolidated and pleased this is now recognised. The one concern I have is for car parking. I raised this at the consultation and was advised that this may go underground. I personally think that this would prove to be too costly and therefore needs to be looked at as it could impinge upon parkland and farmland.

I broadly support the parkland concept especially with the desire to enhance this beautiful area. I am happy that the “bomb crater” could be used as an open air theatre as long as the building around it was kept minimal and the noise was not intrusive in any production. I assume it could also be used as a summer attraction for residents with a good programme of plays (but not music concerts). I have two
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concerns on the parkland. Firstly that the idea of restoring the crab and winkel pathway down behind St Michaels road would not be acceptable to local residents and also not be feasible. The second and biggest concern is the placement of the conference centre within the parkland. This is shown as being a relatively small footprint when in fact a 150 bed conference facility would be anything but and I feel it disingenuous to show it as taking up minimal space. I would fiercely oppose the building of this in this location as it would directly impinge upon my family with noise and outlook. I would recommend you putting this facility next to incorporated within and around the Beverly Farmhouse. This would enhance a fine building and make full use of it; it would be in an area that already has some form of planning permission and hopefully would be designed to take the eye from the ugly and poorly landscaped Innovation Centre. I believe the parkland is a point of difference for UKC and most students (and parents) would believe it should be maintained and enhanced. It also remains a gap between the residents and their lives and the life of “students” (even those attending a conference facility).

The parkland development does not seem to restrict the number of buildings and is very open ended. This needs to be firmed up with specific proposals even in a concept masterplan. The parkland location also needs to be more clearly defined.

I do not understand why Park Wood has not been mentioned. This area is in desperate need of development and consolidation. There is clear evidence that even with just infills, 650 more beds could be produced and even now with many portakabins on site there is room for building when they are removed.

I have concerns about the farmland in that initial small developments will just proliferate but I do not have enough knowledge of this area to comment further.

Thank you once again for engaging with the City in this way.

The ambitious plan for the central campus of the University is most interesting and if implemented would enhance what is already a most attractive place to work and live.

I am less enthusiastic for what is planned for the southern slopes where new buildings will impinge negatively on the beautiful landscape. On the other hand, the open air theatre in the ‘bomb crater’ could well be a new facility that serves the University’s cultural mission.

The one proposal for the southern slopes that I am totally against is the suggested acquisition and upgrading of the ‘Crab and Winkle Line’ south of the southern tunnel portal and along the embankment that lies between St. Michael’s Road and Leycroft Close. Leycroft Close is a quiet cul-de-sac already used by walkers and cyclists, many bound to or from the University. Any level of change to the amount and type of traffic along the existing route let alone a new one will destroy the quality of life enjoyed by the residents, all of whom will have bought their homes for the privacy, peace and quiet that is afforded by gardens that back onto the embankment.

I do not agree with the overall contents of the University Master Plan and am continuing to oppose any form of future building development on the area of Kent University land known as the Chaucer Fields site.

I do not recognise that the proposed University Plan will in any way protect the Chaucer Fields site now or in the future from development. Any form of building will destroy the character of the existing environment.

The proposed “Conferencing Hotel as Pavilion in the Park” will in my opinion completely undermine the “Green space and Buffering Zone” of the Chaucer Fields.

I do not agree with the University Master Plan and am continuing to oppose any form of future building development on the area of Kent University land known as the Chaucer Fields site.

I and my family have used and continue to use this space for recreational purposes; we have been unchallenged in this use for a period of over 30 years and hope that this continues to be an invaluable community asset for ourselves, students staff and other residents.

I was one of the original members of the local residents who opposed any building development on the Chaucer Fields site and am sure that my past historic in-depth objections are available on file with the University.

A commendable attempt to show the people of Canterbury and other parties what UKC is planning for the Canterbury campus.

BUT, the master plan retains the plan to build a hotel cum conference centre on the southern slopes. This is despite two similar plans that UKC withdrew after much local opposition. I am not fooled by the “Pavilion” concept. This is a large structure. I see the historic double hedge will also be destroyed. So much for conserving the southern slopes.
Can I first you complement you on the Master Plan and giving the neighbouring residents the opportunity of responding. My family and I have lived as neighbours to the campus for over 25 years and have seen first-hand the affect its expansion has had on our community. The completion of the Master Plan will hopefully clearly document future expansion in a more structured manner. I am not sure previous developments within the campus have fully understood the impact they would have on their neighbours. We very much welcome the statement of creating the best garden campus in the UK as this mirrors our thoughts as neighbours. The existing green spaces need to be carefully protected as once gone they will never return. Any construction on The Parklands should be kept to a minimum. We are more than happy to continue as Neighbours but have strong reservations about any construction that effectively makes us feel like part of the campus. We currently share our road with your students and hope that you understand there is a balance that needs to be maintained so that we are not a campus within a campus. This needs to remain as a residential area suitable for families to enjoy. Please continue to engage with your Neighbours and the relevant Resident Associations, engagement builds a mutual understanding and together we can all welcome a continued relationship.

-----

The universities announcement of this plan should have been given much greater public notice including a mail shot to all affected residents surrounding the area. I was made aware of the Blean village hall presentations only by a small mention in the local paper which not every resident reads.

The University bought agricultural land from the Eastbridge Hospital Trust clearly with the long term idea of using it for development and expansion of the University campus and by producing this plan assumes that not only will this be acceptable to the rural community it will engulf but that planning permission will be a mere formality. The university is a private unelected for profit organisation that gives itself by producing this plan privileges that no other land owner would have the arrogance to do. With the declared intention that student numbers will not be increased it seems unnecessary that the campus needs to expand to the very extremities of of the land holdings and looks much more like an exercise of boundary marking.

-----

The section of this plan that I wish to comment on is the part relating to the northern parklands and the northern lands. I am absolutely opposed to the proposed developments particularly the development along the Tyler Hill road.

These will inevitably result in destroying the character of the area, joining Blean to Tyler Hill and in the end joining Canterbury to Blean. You will turn us from a pleasant pair of villages on the outskirts of Canterbury into full blown suburbs.

All this to fund vanity changes to the central campus.

-----

Please send copy of Final Report Concept Master Plan

Thank you

-----

I have just been made aware of your plans for the university and more importantly the development around the Tyler hill road.

I have not received any notification from you in what I presume is the consultation period around this proposal even though my farm abuts most of the northern development.

Could you please let me know what the timetable for comments on this draft plan are and whether there will be a further period for comment once the final plan is complete.

I understand that mail shots were sent to CT4 and 5 and would like to inform you that the area affected by your plan is encompassed entirely by CT2.

-----

Whilst I commend the campus heart idea I have the following concerns relating to the master plan.

I do not believe the planned conferencing hotel could have a footprint as small as is indicated within the master plan and consequently I have grave concerns for the beauty of the existing woodlands in Chaucer Fields and what effect on the topography and ecosystems this would have. This is an area which has been enjoyed by residents and students alike and it would be sacrosanct to see it destroyed. There are few remaining green spaces in Canterbury and those fields have outstanding natural beauty.

As a local resident I would have concerns about potential increased traffic if a direct route of the disused railway line with vehicular access were created as I cannot see how there is space for new roads and therefore it would potentially add more traffic to the existing routes. Roads like 40 acres already have parking either side and speedbumps making them slow to traverse.

-----
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In response to Kent Universities masterplan.

1) There has been a minimal attempt to make the residences most affected by this proposal aware of the plan, a mail shot to the CT2 local area should have been a priority and not even a poster announcing the village hall exhibition had been placed beforehand. The majority of the residents in Blean and Tyler Hill appear to be completely unaware of this plan.

2) The Land was knowingly purchased as agricultural land but obviously with the long term intention of Campus expansion and as a land development opportunity. The core function of KU should be to deliver degree graduates not be a land developer.

3) The public announcement of the plan although under the guise of a consultation document clearly assumes that planning permission is a mere formality and that the existing community will just accept the proposals as they have been given minimal priority.

4) The rural business clusters are placed at the extremities of the land holding as boundary markers with the probable intent to infill the blank areas at your leisure. The main access route of Tyler Hill Rd to these sites is not suitable to take increased traffic.

5) If start-up businesses need to be associated with the University then they should be on designated commercial business parks not in a rural community.

6) The park and ride areas are clearly unnecessary in the locations shown as with the amount of land you hold parking could be so much closer to the campus as to become “park and walk”.

7) The proposed cricket ground as shown has no access, is replicating a facility that KU already has, the pavilion buildings are on a much larger scale than needed just for cricket so will probably be used as an events venue with the inevitable noise and light pollution to the existing residents.

8) The small scale business space at the rear of St Cosmos and St Damian 17th century church is totally inappropriate without any evidence of need.

9) Much of the area you wish to build on is designated a Conservation area.

10) No other land owner would make the assumption that because they own land they should build on it.

11) With the declared intention that the student numbers will not increase this is an exercise in land development under the guise of a requirement for the future standing of the University.

12) Kent University is not a public body but an unelected for profit private organisation that offers a public service, it should not assume because of this it has special rights to blanket the area with developments that blight existing properties.

13) I suggest that future developments be kept within the boundary of the existing campus and the Sarre Penn stream which gives ample space to expand that will create minimal impact on the surrounding community.

I look forward to your response.

-----

I support development of the heart of the campus in line with the master plan, and expansion of the campus on either side as shown on the plans.

I am totally opposed to business development along Tyler Hill Road, which is a country lane winding through pristine countryside. This arable land and pasture is a green belt round Canterbury and is full of wildlife, both animal and plant, which would be destroyed by the proposed developments. In contrast, the university parklands are already depleted of wildlife by being close to the university, subject to noise and light pollution and much used by students, dog walkers etc. These areas are therefore more suitable for development because there will be less environmental impact. The Chaucer College is a fine example of an existing development which fitted well into the parklands with little environmental impact.

I object to the idea that the countryside be destroyed in order to preserve parkland. I also object to park and ride car parks being sited along Tyler Hill Road, in order to remove parking from the university campus. Why should the countryside be destroyed to remove car parks from an urban area? I am sure most university staff would not want to use park and ride and would prefer to park on the campus. Car parks could be created on the edge of the campus within walking distance of the buildings, as suggested in the campus part of the master plan. These could even be multi-storey to allow more parking on the same space.

While the university needs to develop, it must not do so at the expense of the surrounding countryside.

-----
Hi, my neighbour is a Kent University lecturer and has viewed the master plan in your library. My neighbour believes that the master plan would involve taking some of our gardens away. If this is true, I would object. I would object to any of my land or my neighbours’ land being taken. I would object to noise and development within say 100 yards of my property. I telephoned your advice line today and was not entirely clear from that telephone call about the exact plans relevant to my property.

-----

I have seen your proposals for a cricket pavilion and business centre with park and ride on fields close to Blean church. Apart from the fact that the whole area would be spoilt by such a building, Tyler Hill road is a small country road which has already seen an increase of its traffic by at least tenfold in the last few years and surely could not cope with the vast number of cars a park and ride would cause. Surely the University has enough land already without encroaching on our countryside and spoiling the whole ambience of Blean. After all this should not just be about the University but also the residents of the area who do not deserve to have their environment destroyed by yet more University buildings.

-----

I welcome the vision of Kent University as a garden campus and the intention to preserve views of the Cathedral and surrounding countryside. I also like the plans to consolidate development on the main campus.

However, I would not support the erection of any permanent buildings on the southern slopes which, in my opinion and that of the Residents’ Associations would not be an enhancement. Also, as residents of Leycroft Close whose gardens back on to a remnant of the old Crab and Winkle Line, we would vigorously oppose any future attempt to open up the line for vehicular access.

Thank you for inviting us to comment.

-----

The road between Tyler Hill and Blean. I am amazed and appalled to see the planned intrusion of business parks; why five separate ones instead of just one? and park and ride, into the heart of the countryside. If these developments are considered essential to our continuing prosperity they should be immediately adjacent to the existing university buildings. Why blight the countryside?

-----

Let’s keep this simple: your plan highlights a CONFERENCING HOTEL AS PAVILION IN THE PARK and, on the other side of the diagram it says VIEWS OF HISTORIC CANTERBURY PROTECTED AND ENHANCED. Those views may be ‘protected’ from the point of view of the University but they are definitely not from my or any other resident in the Northern part of the City. Those of us who have used the Southern Slopes for decades have already campaigned for ages against this idea. It is simply a development too far and does not enhance anything except, possibly, your revenue. It certainly shows little regard for your neighbours.

-----

The concept master plan is beautifully prepared and exciting vision of what the university could be and in general I agree with it but would comment as follows.

1) The local residents of which I am one have fought hard to preserve the Southern slopes (Parkland) and I am pleased that the idea of building blocks of flats on it for student accommodation has been dropped, however the idea of using it even for ‘pavilion’ buildings is not acceptable. This is a small but really beautiful area and I strongly oppose any building on it moreover the term pavilion implies something modest and beautiful not a university conference centre.

2) I regularly walk the Crab and Winkle path north of the university through the orchards and woods towards Whitstable. This is another beautiful area which should be preserved especially as it is one of the few tracks in the area that are passable all the year round. I believe it would be much better to improve the existing road links which I accept are poor.

-----

Back in the sixties Ralph Nader said universities study almost everything under the sun except themselves. Less true now than then, but your Masterplan reminded me of it. I miss any fundamental reflection on the nature of growth, its connection with expansion, the likely nature of university education several decades down the line and on optimal relations, in terms of quantity and quality, between a university and its immediate environment. So, many questions are begged in your plan. The result: self-contradiction and lack of clarification.

I moved to Canterbury only last November – to a house immediately adjoining your “parklands”, so lack the depth of knowledge needed for a detailed critique. I have, however, been here long enough and lived close enough to value strongly aspects of my new – and your familiar – environment. Long enough and close enough to endorse
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the critiques submitted to you by SM R AR A and, on his own behalf, by ***** ***** 9.

Your Masterplan contains good ideas for the campus heart. Last summer I arrived for the University’s 50th anniversary open day. The parkland location on a commanding hill were instantly impressive. The campus core was instantly very disappointing. It shouted an unplanned accretion of too many mediocre buildings with no integrating aesthetic concept. Your plan contains ideas to help rectify this.

Where the plan is particularly faulted for me is in entertaining two damaging proposals.

One is to ruin the Crab and Winkle pedestrian path to the town with metalled road and motor vehicles. The historical vandalism involved would defy the national concern to have a healthier population with less obesity – mens sana in corpore sano? It is an example of the contradictions and inconsistency (e.g. between proposals for the campus core and for the surrounding parkland) referred to above, for elsewhere your plan professes:

“cars out feet in!”

a healthy and walkable campus (p. 16)

(an objection to) the continuous outward growth and sprawl (31) today education and business facilities are expected to be walkable (36) motor vehicles tend to dominate the campus layout (37) only a 25 minute walk from the city centre (39) Make the pedestrian king of the public realm (51) close proximity to the Canterbury city centre, which means that the distance is very walkable (58) reveal the historic narrative (60)

All are brushed out with the presumably justifying, but unspecified label of “a new sustainable route”, the need for which is asserted, but not substantiated.

The other damaging proposal is, to use your architects’ euphemisms, the possible implanting of “pavilion-like features”, “landscape buildings”, “pavilions in the landscape” and “a conferencing hotel as pavilion in the park” in the university parklands (What would they do without the word “pavilion”?) These glib ideas appear without apparent underpinning or testing. What need, for example, is there (likely to be) for an additional ‘conferencing hotel’? Are the large indoor spaces in some of the existing buildings not suitable or adaptable for large conferences? Is the existing on-campus accommodation not sufficient, suitable or adaptable in vacation time and in the examinee-oriented summer term for conference visitors? Can some of those existing buildings with little life expectancy not be replaced with more flexible multi-function buildings to cater for emerging needs? What exploration has there been into facility-planning and sharing with Christ Church? And so on.

I look forward, as a new but very immediate neighbour of the University, to engaging constructively in the future debate. Meanwhile would you please acknowledge receipt of this submission.

-----

Most of the people I have spoken too are against this type of development of our local area and seem to think that responding with their feelings would be pointless, I hope this is not the case and here offer you mine.

My concern is for the area titled “northern land”, the road has blind spots and is not fit for purpose for the traffic use at the moment with the road closure towards Chestfield, what will it be like with more traffic? Where is the proof that more business parks are required off a small road that already has access problems?

I disagree with Farrells that the business clusters will have minimal environmental impact. The area has surface water problem for most of the year, pouring 6 large areas of concrete etc onto the fields will only make this flooding problem even worse, is it not possible to build 6 of these and have a minimal impact, there knowledge of the area appears very weak, I know Lords cricket ground has a slope but the one they suggest is beyond belief!

The original 1965 plan shows a leisure area which the presenter at the Blean village hall expo told me was not built but sold off as building land to pay for finishing the uni building work, he could not offer me guarantees this will not happen again.(This same person did not see the irony of the uni not wanting to expand on the east of St Stephens hill as “other developers will try and expand onto the area once they had”!) The desire not to spoil the views of Canterbury is an impossible statement to take as only recently the uni was seeking building permission for the “view” shown in your expo!

Many housing areas in Canterbury are student dominated and this has had a hugely negative effect on community because of student behaviour, this problem of accommodation needs addressing before expansion, where will all these new students live?

There is more to Canterbury than the uni, my parents tell me it was a fantastic area before the 1960’s development let’s make sure this planned work hails the impact it has made on the area, and improve on the area already altered.

Yes, this Master Plan will have a huge impact on me and my surroundings and hence I am against the desire to develop the game of thrones style named Northern land holdings.

-----
The part of the plan that interests me is the Northern Land Holdings because I enjoy walking in the area near Blean Church. It appears that the plan involves changing a beautiful rural farmland landscape into car parks, although oddly, you haven't produced 'before and after' images to illustrate this. How about including a photo of the fields by the church alongside a 'mock up' of a vast expanse of tarmac and hundreds of cars?

I find it ironic that our university students – whom I'd like to think of as the protectors of the environment – are the ones for whom vast areas of countryside will be paved over.

-----

As resident living in Tyler Hill Road **** ****** ****** ******* I was alarmed to see proposals for business clusters and a 'park and ride' scheme along Tyler Hill Road. I also see the Crab & Winkle railway line shown as a sustainable new route (unclear whether for traffic or pedestrians) and the cycle path widened to take traffic. Tyler Hill Road is winding, unclassified road, too narrow for cars to pass comfortable in several places and used by pedestrians, cyclists and horse riders. It has no footways.

I was pleased to hear at the meeting this evening that there are no plans for car parking on Tyler Hill Road. If this is the case, you must amend your plans to make this clear. Local residents are outraged at this proposal and until they see this amended in print they will be dubious. If the 'vision for the future' goes into District Planning with a massive car park between Tyler Hill and Blean how can we know that assurances made today will not be overlooked should it prove convenient in the future?

As for the business clusters, one may blend into the landscape. Several would not. Both Parish Councils have always made it clear that the 'green gap' between our neighbouring villages is sacrosanct and that any development on farmland in between should be opposed. The creation of business clusters would also create more traffic on an already dangerous road with no speed limit. Allowing traffic on the existing cycle path would also mean extra traffic using Tyler Hill Road.

Plans for re-designing the Campus on the existing footprint look good, but PLEASE clarify your proposals for the Blean/Tyler Hill area so that residents have accurate information.

-----

I am totally against the developments along Tyler Hill Road. I live in that road and those developments would make the road much busier plus it would ruin the environment.

-----

Whilst it is a good idea to re-emphasize the central walkway linking the colleges, PLEASE could any greenery removed, be transplanted to the Medway campus – the poor relation to the Canterbury site. Plans for a children's playground & boules area (the present one by the way, is apparently never used) surely cannot be a necessary expense when Medway students have difficulty finding a blade of grass to sit on & eat a sandwich? Admittedly they have the benefit of a large plastic cow standing on shingle & weeds & a few big planters outside the library but that is about it. Not surprising Medway students are more depressed than their Canterbury counterparts. The Medway campus, Liberty Quays and Gillingham itself, offer so little whereas Canterbury is already magnificent. Could not a small proportion of the vast sum planned for this project, be spent improving Medway? Have you ever seen it? It's a depressing place to visit & some greenery could really help.

-----

I am a local resident and local walker of the Crab and Winkle I am horrified by these plans, this will ruin the route. The current walk is delightful and peaceful the last thing this area needs is development. The infer structure is just not suitable the small roads between Tyler Hill and the University need preserving in their current way, not being built up. The traffic will just not be able to manage in that area.

I strongly oppose any development to this area.

-----

Having been a resident of Blean all of my childhood and a lot of my adult life, with my family home in the middle of the Northern Land Holdings I find the plans presented deplorable.

When the University started buying up the rural land in Blean and Tyler Hill in my opinion I think all those that live there, use the Crab & Winkle Way and enjoy walks and the beautiful countryside feared one day plans would be sprung on us that would not fill our hearts with joy.

Reading the vision for the Northern Land Holdings, which I find outrageous, I also feel that you must think we are all a little naive.

This 145 page document talks of a shared cricket pitch right next door to a place where many in the Parish worship in exchange for innovation business centres, park and rides likened to that of California’s Silicon Valley plus more housing. Do you think that this cricket pitch may soften the blow of all the other proposed development? One can only
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assume that access to this Cricket Pitch would be via the current Crab and Winkle route as plans seem to be rerouting this completely.

Many local people who use the Crab and Winkle Way will have walked/cycled along this route and will have noticed that the University’s amazing sports facilities don’t spend much time in use so why the need for a cricket pitch away from these already incredible facilities. Plus there are accessible cricket clubs and pitches very nearby at Tyler Hill and Chestfield.

Is this not a bargain ploy...green land for housing?
The rather oversimplified plan on page 101 shows none of the houses in existence between Blean and Tyler Hill or the church. The plan makes it look like a void of open space when in fact this road houses many people, a church, farms, etc.

It talks in detail how this development with provide us with so many things for the better all I can see is it taking away the much loved Crab and Winkle way and rerouting it, the tranquillity we as locals and many not local to the area diminished, the destruction of more green belt land not for the good of the environment but for pockets of the University which has already taken over so much of the surrounding land as the plan shows on page 33.

One of the problems the University Campus states it has is, is too many cars. This plan just moves the cars away from the Campus and make them someone else’s problem. The residents of Blean and Tyler Hill.

This road link couldn’t cope with recent closure of the Radfall Hill Road due to roadworks. The knock on effect being both dangerous due to the amount of traffic having to use Tyler Hill Road and jams both heading into Canterbury and towards Whitstable.

To build more houses and an “Innovation Parks” would take away so much from the local community who enjoy the open space and being able to walk along Tyler Hill Road without a constant stream of traffic.

There are people that may read this and think I am one of those people who don’t like change. You would be right but I realise sometimes you have to embrace it. On this occasion I don’t feel I do. These plans are an outright intrusion on all those that live in Blean, Tyler Hill and beyond. I understand UKC want to make this University one of the best in Country but Canterbury isn’t just about the University it is as much about the rural areas and villages that surround it. Also something that should be considered is the future use of the University in a time where rising student costs are making University a less attractive prospect for young people.

Everything that is being proposed for the areas surrounding Blean and Tyler is not to enhance the University but booster their coffers. How they can justify building on this farmland, talking about expanding roads to cope with this which I can’t see how they can as most of land that borders Tyler Hill Road belong to family homes. Their arrogance that this development will enhance these two beautiful Parishes is frankly inconceivable.

During term time the City changes so much due to the influx of the University’s students a fact we all accept but when it starts to affect our lives by building on land that is cherished by many surely someone has to say enough is enough.

-----

Impressed with the concept of the University’s ideas so far, especially the green feel to it all. Also like the ideas for the centre of the campus with the squares and ideas of following the seasons and the road structure.

The idea of using the Crab and Winkle line for the type of use it was first constructed for is great, rather than leaving it as a neglected overgrown path.

One thing that concerns me is the lighting which will come with any development as the Northern Land Holding at present is a dark area at night; so much so that a local astronomy group use the church car park for public meetings. Please can the type of lighting used cause the least light pollution as possible.

Like the idea of making the footpath down the hill from the main campus to the City a special feature, a double row of trees would be nice.

The idea of electric trams, or similar vehicles running up the hill.....how about a cable car service. It would be a unique feature for the University.

-----

It is somewhat alarming to discover that there are some plans to build on the area known as ‘Chaucer Fields’. As is generally known, this was mooted some time ago and has caused distress to and even, perhaps, friction with those who live nearby. In my view, irrespective of other considerations, the maintenance of good relations with the city in which the University is situated should be paramount in the minds of the planners and I would therefore urge you to reconsider seriously this aspect of your ‘masterplan’.

-----
This is a terrible idea, I completely oppose the suggestions. This area of Kent is an area of beauty and should not be developed in this way.

-----

Dear ***** 11, thank you. I still maintain that your whole “communication process” has been insufficient and totally falls short of what anyone would consider adequate. Indeed one could wonder whether there has been a serious effort by Kent University to try to engineer as little feedback as possible – knowing that is likely to be negative. We were never notified either by post, announcement or whatever. Not everyone buys local newspapers.

In any event, I quickly add to my formal feedback (this is based on a very quick read of the master plan).

It was drawn up before Kent uni announced its fees were to be increased – consequently you will attract even less domestic students

It was drawn up before Brexit- so surely it will no longer be such a player in the European uni market – it claims to be trying to be the no 1 European University! I would guess then far less students.

It emphasises a desire to be more green with more lovely open space for students to enjoy. trees shrubs seasonal plantations, less traffic BUT this will clearly and unashamedly be at the expense of local people, not only the residents on the Northern holdings side as it is referred to, but the many many users of the cycle path! This I think is disgraceful – Kent uni cannot pretend to appreciate and value all that is best in the countryside by selfishly trying to introduce it on campus so that students may be able to enjoy it (will they?!) but to destroy it for everyone else by bulldozing and concreting over an area of lovely countryside (that happens to be in a conservation area)

It would seem that someone has forgotten that it was and remains “agricultural land” that was purchased and there were many covenants attached to it!

-----

We are very concerned about the possible proposal of the University acquiring land from the Crab and Winkle line in order to make more of a direct link to the city for University students. As residents of Leycroft Close with our garden backing onto the embankment we see it as a major change to the natural environment around us, especially as The Crab and Winkle Line Trust with the Council designated the line ‘a conservation area protecting the route for future generations’.

-----

Please don’t ruin the beautiful countryside with commercialised profit based businesses. Keep Canterbury beautiful.

-----

1) We are concerned about the destruction of large areas of productive farmland and would guess that with the event of Brexit, the country may need more facility for food production rather than less.

2) We are particularly concerned about the establishment of park and ride facilities. Tyler Hill Road is narrow and twisting. The impact of possibly dozens, if not hundreds of cars on this road is quite unimaginable. Shouldn’t reduction in car usage be an aim, rather than increasing it?

3) Associated with this would be a rise in noise and especially pollution levels. Blean is a clean environment, air quality is generally good.

4) The presence of a series of business parks on Tyler Hill Road would completely destroy the nature of Blean. Very high levels of traffic on the A290 are already a problem. Adding more traffic to this to access the park and ride and the business parks would exacerbate the problem.

5) Land between the University and Tyler Hill Road is open, quite and pleasant for recreation, a transport link between park and ride facilities and the University would destroy this.

-----

I would like to oppose the enlargement of the university as the roads are not sufficient to accommodate all of the proposed traffic. Also, the building would mean there would be little green land between Tyler Hill and Blean; expansion is not wanted by the local residents who would have to endure more traffic, people and noise. The city of Canterbury is losing its identity as there are so many students in the town; this can have a negative impact on student areas around the city. Furthermore, the industrial units are not required; you have asserted there is a need for them and they will have little impact but there is no evidence. There is already a problem with flooding in the area and the development would make this situation worse. Industrial units must go where they already exist and not in this rural area. It must be remembered that the proposed expansion is a money-making initiative. Let’s put the character of our city before profit. We only have one chance. Once the buildings are granted permission, all is lost.

-----

11 Personal information redacted to protect an individual’s identity.
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More effort required to eliminate student parking in local roads.

More effort required to drastically reduce number of students living in the community.

Proposed conference hotel & open air theatre are too close to local housing.

-----

As a resident of Blean, I consider this will place a heavy burden on the existing supporting roads (Whitstable road and Calaise Hill) whilst also affecting the natural beauty of the area. The proposition of the park and ride in my opinion is completely ridiculous, the resulting traffic would be increased dramatically which I believe has not been thoroughly assessed by yourselves. We live in a peaceful environment which should not be disturbed by any of your plans.

-----

I am very disappointed to see that the university which should be applying its skills to teaching future generations, as its charter states, is determined to set up as a commercial business in a rural area. The prospect of multiple park and ride schemes and business hubs along the narrow Tyler Hill Road, shows a complete disregard for the local population.

Along with other universities endowed in the 1960’s Kent was given a generous plot of land on which to set their premises. Surely it would be better to use the existing plot in the most efficient way, keeping a barrier of agricultural land between itself and the small rural communities it is now trying to destroy. In case the university has forgotten (along with most of the public) food comes from the land (and sea) not supermarkets!

Thank you for sending the Concept Master Plan, Final Report which I have read and also downloaded the electronic version on www.kent.ac.uk/masterplan

I hope my comments are in time, as I was delayed after the exhibition in Blean by holidays and family matters.

I attach them to this and hope they are self-explanatory.

I would be very pleased to expand on or provide specific details for any aspects if that would be helpful to you.

I would be very happy for you to contact me, preferably by email, about the University development.

University of Kent Draft Masterplan- response from

Note:
A) For clarity I have used the ancient name of “Old Salt Road” for the Sustrans bridleway route from Blean Church southwards behind Blean School to the A290, and “Crab and Winkle Way” for a route following the actual old Crab & Winkle railway line, as labelled on page 65.

B) Page numbers refer to the ‘Draft work in progress: Concept Master Plan, Final Report’. As the Draft Master Plan has a lot of repetition it has been difficult in some cases to identify all the references in the document.

Page – Issue – Comment

– Drainage & Flooding – The soil is primarily London Clay which leads to drainage problems. Indeed for many years there was an embargo on development in Blean for this reason, and with climate change this issue is going to be of increasing concern. However there appears to be no recognition of this issue, although it is a major restriction in the area.

The planners should be very wary of this issue especially as the Maths building collapsed due to clay shrinkage, and experience with the new Thanet Way which caused a home in Whitstable to be re-built twice because it altered the drainage shows the huge potential risks. This is not to mention the impact on watercourses, such as the Sarre Penn, and its tributaries.

2 – Student numbers – It should be made very clear in the Plan that the intention is to maintain student numbers around current levels, as stated at the Blean exhibition. The phrase: “We recognise that a sense of ‘place’ will increasingly play its part in differentiating between competing universities and attracting students.” suggests that UKC wishes to have more students, rather than its intention as verbally expressed to me, of having no increase in total numbers, but with more students resident on site, especially for non-UK students.

20 – Delivery Plan – “5. Reinforcement of the University’s reputation for excellence in all aspects of sustainability”. It is unclear how the draft plan will achieve this. For example, as shown below, the proposals for the Northern Holdings are not sustainable. As is so often the case, this seems to be a slogan without substance. As a minimum I would expect the University to implement an environmental management system to ISO14001 standard – there may be a standard for sustainable development too, but I have not had time to research this.

29, 31, 38 – Undeveloped areas – A comparison of the maps of existing with 1920 map, already shows considerable intrusion into former ancient woodland, which is a very scarce resource. The proposals show increased
intrusion, especially north of Giles Lane and south of Darwin, and this is unacceptable because it is impossible, by definition of ancient woodland, to create ‘new’ ancient woodland. The recent loss caused by the new buildings means that the limit has been reached.

37, 42 – Vehicles – The draft plan says that “vehicles tend to dominate campus”. If it is already bad on the campus, then there is even more reason not to spread the blight to the Northern Holdings. When I was a student at Leeds University, I lived in an off-campus hall, and used the public bus service to reach the campus. This benefitted the public, by increased patronage of the bus, and also enabled accommodation to be spread around the area.

43 – Green Spaces – I disagree that all green spaces are homogeneous – there are lots of different trees & shrubs etc. The variety could be increased by having ‘species areas’ or ‘geographic plant areas’, together with more imaginative management for wildlife.

It should be noted that 30 years ago the University of East Anglia maintained its 13 hectares of encircling grasslands as if they were a golf course, so were useless for biodiversity. Subsequently only the trails were cut, and it now has flower rich vegetation with 5,000 species, including more than 900 moths, and makes it the most important university campus for these aspects. For UKC, which hosts the Durrell Institute, one would expect much higher aspirations for improving ecology than appears in the draft Master Plan.

44 – Bus routes – This helpful map only shows on-site bus routes. What is needed is the larger picture, for example the No 5 service from Whitstable via Tyler Hill goes to east of campus, with stop beside Darwin, and needs increased frequencies, especially for UKC people to reach Tyler Hill, Chestfield, Swalecliffe, Whitstable etc. Also access to Canterbury West station by this bus, and others, is very poor. (see also page 99, below).

48, 49 – Plot ratios – These seem to be self-selected choice of ‘peers’ – more informative to have all similar universities, such as Bath etc.

51, 57, 80 – Design principle 6 – ‘Pedestrians to be king’- would be better to say Non-Motorised Users to be king.

The Design Principles includes the need for pedestrian access, which is welcomed, but it should also include access for None Motorised Users (NMUs), such as bicycles (even if they are Electrically assisted cycles [EACs]) and horse riders.

Car parking needs to include reduction of car parking too. For a Plan lasting to 2050 much more imagination is needed, as transport will be very different then. I am researching some forward looking scenarios of what that may look like, and can forward this, if that would be helpful.

There needs to be a greater recognition of the requirements of disabled users.

Pushing car parking to the east of St Stephens Hill would be very intrusive, as that position is very visible from a wide area of Canterbury.

65, 80 – The proposed East Campus developments are of great concern, primarily because of the transport implications created by the movement of people between the east campus and the main campus. In addition this area is a sheep and other farming area, which should be maintained. The Big Dig also showed that the land has medieval tile kilns which would be damaged, if not destroyed by the proposed development. A recent application for a crematorium in this area showed significant wildlife making development here unacceptable. That Application was refused because of transport, visibility and ecology issues, so an East Campus would be no more acceptable, especially as it would make more noise. So the East Campus is an unacceptable expansion of the main campus.

85 et seq – Units – Surely metric units should be used- not square feet?!

7 – – Welcome the proposal to continue the route of the old Crab & Winkle Railway Line further north as a cycling and pedestrian route to join the existing route at Winding Pond in Clowes Wood.

97 – New road link – “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.”

I strongly oppose any idea of having a new road or upgrading existing links.

In addition, the Old Salt Road bridleway, nor the proposed Crab & Winkle Way are not intended as a 24 hour route so that changing their status to 24 hour usage and/or vehicular routes would be severe urban intrusion into a rural area. It is well known that introducing street lights alters the bio-rhythms of birds, for example, and would also be likely to affect the biodiversity of the adjoining hedgerows etc. hence I strongly oppose such upgrading to these routes.

The Crab & Winkle route is an historic monument, so conversion to vehicular use would destroy its characteristics, but conversion to a pedestrian and cycle
route could be done while maintaining the original structure, and indeed would provide a shorter (and safer route for cyclists) from Tyler Hill to the university.

Note that similar strictures apply to the line south of the campus.

The Plan needs to recognise that Giles Lane and University are important vehicular routes for local people and businesses. For example travellers from the Tyler Hill direction going to Rough Common use Giles Lane, or University Road if going to West Gate Cemetery.

99 – Route to station – I would strongly support NMU access to the north of the railway station with a new entrance there. Hence I would appreciate your promotion of this to both the City Council and the relevant railway bodies.

100 et seq. – Northern holdings – This area and the proposed developments would just exacerbate the existing problems.

I am very concerned about the proposed separate developments in the Northern Holdings. Not only would this be urbanisation of the countryside, but also it is proposed that “they will provide car parking to relieve the pressure on the main campus” which is completely unacceptable.

It has long been a good planning principle to put development where the existing transport links are good – not out in the countryside with inadequate public transport and roads.

Access to the Business Clusters would be along the Tyler Hill- Blean road which is unsuitable for such traffic, and ‘improving’ it would again just be urbanisation of the countryside, and unacceptable.

In addition these proposals appear to be related to the proposed widening of the existing pedestrian route for vehicles

Development north of the Sarre Penn stream at Hothe Court Farm, would preclude the farming activities there. These farming activities include facilities for the cattle, which are a vital part of the local biodiversity, providing increased insect activity for bats and birds, as well as maintaining the ecology of the grazing areas. Likewise the harvesting of the field east of the old railway line next to Tyler Hill is another essential process of the local ecosystem carried out from Hothe Court Farm. The Hothe Court Farm site also provides storage for farm machinery, which is required for these activities.

Hence the Hothe Court Farm site is unacceptable for the proposed changes and must be retained for farming use.

Larks regularly nest in the fields east of Blean church – the proposed developments and associated activities would be likely to deter them.

Noise from existing University is already heard at Tyler Hill and Blean – extension into those villages would make the situation worse.

The facilities for horses north of Tyler Hill Road could be enhanced by enabling bridleways throughout the area.

104 – Park & Ride – “To provide space for car parking for staff, students and visitors to relieve the pressure on space in the heart of the campus. This might take the form of a ‘Park and Ride’ scheme in discreet parking areas in the northern land holdings, which would be connected to the heart of the campus by means of a shuttle bus service.”

This execrable idea may benefit UKC, but is a gross intrusion into the rural parishes of Blean & Hackington

Park and Ride is an outdated idea which increases vehicle miles travelled and hence increases emissions as well as other pollution. For detailed reasoning showing the damage caused by Park & Ride, please see CPRE Kent’s response to the Canterbury City Local Plan, and also its Transport Strategy. I can provide details if necessary.

The idea of a shuttle bus is nearly as bad as Park & Ride– there is a very frequent service along Whitstable Road, and increasing the No 5 service through Tyler Hill could provide a similar, but slightly less frequent, service, with the advantage that it would provide links to the City and the coast as well.

107 – New businesses – I do not know the origin of the claim that: “entrepreneurs are now more likely to start a new business in a rural area”, but usually it is through the conversion of redundant old buildings, and often conversion to holiday lets etc. It would only be acceptable in the rural parishes if it were such re-use, rather than new development in the countryside. As all farmland is needed for growing food and protecting the associated wildlife, conversion of Hothe Court Farm for example would be unacceptable, as it is needed for the farming use.

108 – Footpaths – There is a lack of information about existing footpaths in the area. For example the footpath south west of Blean Church to the A290 by the Sarre Penn is visible in the picture, but footpaths other than the Old Salt Road and Crab and Winkle Way are not identified, and this is a major omission, as closing footpaths is unacceptable. This footpath goes across the proposed ‘cricket field’ and through the proposed buildings. So the revised Plan needs to have less verbiage and fewer otiose repetitions of pictures or graphics and more details of important aspects such as footpaths.
109 – ‘Cricket field’ – The picture of the cricket field ignores the fact that it is on top of an ancient earthwork, so conversion to such use would damage the earthwork, and so out of keeping with preserving our heritage.

109 – ‘Barn’ – The picture of the ‘Barn’ type building appears out of keeping with the ancient church and looks very intrusive.

122 – Northern Lands – “Farrells Vision for the Northern Hub assumes that this land could contribute both to the evolution of the University as well as assist in the growth of wider Canterbury.” Two objections to this vision – it is the wrong area for University expansion and expanding Canterbury out of its existing area is strongly opposed, particularly as the proposed area is rural farmland used for agriculture with a strong biodiversity.

Within 50 yrs many more UK and international students may choose to use a distance internet access to learning/teaching programme to study from home for a degree due to increasing annual course fees and the impact of huge debts incurred for the duration of study.

The proposed plan to expand and increase the university site and footprint would not be needed in this case scenario.

What research has been undertaken to identify trends in this respect and what alternative choices of study are offered to students who wish to undertake distance learning at Kent University?

Brexit means withdrawal from the E.U. and their funding opportunities for research, collaboration with other international universities which currently provides the means for departments to fund and support academic excellence via University Staff.

Loss, limitation, withdrawal of EU funding for research and collaboration is likely to reduce the appeal for international and UK students to study @ Kent on site. The results of the best research work undertaken from each discipline is submitted every 4 years for grading in the research/academic/excellence exercise when all UK universities are graded and compared. This is their hallmark of success and if high scores are achieved this then attracts high achieving students to apply for undergraduate, Masters and PhD programmes which secures the university(s) future.

Shortage of funding from Gov’t or Research grants would impact, blight and compromise Kent Uni’s Masterplan vision over the next 50 yrs.

Businesses and other Organisations may fill the gap if funding is short and they may provide funding for programmes and scholars. However, as paymaster, they could “choose” the programme(s) and/or subject that complements their identity and profession, Kent Uni would then lose the range of subject offered to students.

The proposed park/rides (3) + 6 start up business units along Tyler Hill Road on each side with changes to existing country road and rural nature of the environment would blight this part of Blean, as a “northern parkland” site.

The site of the Grade 1 listed Blean Church is in a conservation area, the Crab and winkle Way is equally precious and any attempt to detract or destroy the natural settings by creating major road systems either side of Tyler Hill Road would be considered an act of vandalism by Blean residents, in respect of the unique architecture, local heritage and rural setting which is agricultural based and not a built/developed site.

I pleased that you have allowed us to be able to pass comments on the proposed Master Plan.

Having attended the last consolation at Blean, the presentation I found to be informative, although complex at times the staff members I found to be more than helpful.

The Plan in its own right is having to look forward to the next fifty years of development, something hard for any group to do, it showed willingness to inform us all of the true thinking that the University has towards the land they currently own.

I may also like to add I spent time talking over the wishes of the University to improve their relationship with all the local resident’s groups, associations and of course the residents themselves. I now look forward to seeing those changes and I know we have a few projects already in place and the results are clearly beginning to show.

However, looking at the Plan it is ironic that proposals are still in place on the Chaucer Fields. All rather nebulous as I was told it is only just an idea, and only a concept at present. This land has nothing planned for at least five years, it now keeps us all guessing the its final outcome.

We have to remind ourselves the residents have battled long and hard to protect this land. It’s cost us all dearly. We cannot lose sight many contributed to the funds to fight for what they wanted to protect. To many Chaucer Fields has become a personal issue and not one spoken in part for by Resident Associations. These residents are now the silent majority, the very same people you are now trying to improve that all important relationships with.
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It's sad that you have included the Fields in the Plan. Within the Plan it really is the only proposed development we can say has existed for a number of years. It's caused no end of problems to us both and I do need to ask that any development on the Fields be removed.

I'm asking simply we just can't have a division between us, living side by side in a City we love and share with so many. Powerful you may be, but let's not pretend others never have a voice also.

-----

Route between university and town

My wife and I live in one of the row of houses in Salisbury Road that have gardens backing on to the old railway embankment which was once the route of the Crab and Winkle line, running south of the campus towards the city.

We strongly object to the suggestion on pages 97 and 99 of the Master Plan to develop the footpath along this embankment into a main student thoroughfare between the university and the town. The plan seems to envisage either a "shared pedestrian and cycle route" or even its development as the route of a public transport system.

At present the path is lightly used, by a few students, school pupils and dog walkers, which does not inconvenience us. But the university's scheme would mean at the very least a regular traffic of pedestrians and cyclists along this path, and presum ably there would have to be lighting at night. This would be extremely intrusive. Because the pathway is raised, this would all be at the level of upper floor bedroom windows. During the daytime the gardens, which are not large, would become much less peaceful and secluded.

As the university knows from the representations of the local residents' association, SMRARA, this area already suffers from a good deal of student noise and disturbance, especially at night, but at the moment this is at least confined to the road. The prospect of further disturbance behind the houses would be extremely unwelcome.

Houses in Leycroft Close, Lyndhurst Close and St Michael's Road would also be adversely affected. There would also be probable implications for property values.

I do not in any case see how the scheme would work, since at its southern end the path does not actually lead down to St Stephen's Road, but is blocked by housing and gardens, and ends with a flight of steps down into St Michael's Road. It is not a more direct route than the one currently used by students, i.e. down the Eliot footpath and towards the city via Lyndhurst Close, Salisbury Road and St Michael's Road, which is virtually a straight line for both pedestrians and cyclists. From the city centre there is also currently a very frequent dedicated bus service.

-----

May I express my opposition to the proposed siting of a conference hotel on Chaucer Fields / Southern Slopes. In addition to my strong opposition as a member of the University since 1976 who cherishes the view:

1) In maintaining and building its relations with the local community the University should take seriously the strength of local opposition.

2) green campus near to but clearly separated from town and the wonderful views towards the cathedral are surprisingly major factors in overseas student recruitment. This is very apparent to me from extensive recruiting experience for us in Canada but I imagine is equally a factor in other markets.

-----

Concept of focusing development within existing building perimeters is a good one.

Agree that vehicle access on campus would be severely limited.

When building, consideration must be given to underground parking to avoid wastefully utilising space for car parking.

A separate pedestrian/cycle path must be retained.

Proposals to open up the Crab and Winkle Way to vehicle traffic cannot be a suitable solution for access.

There must be a moratorium on any further development on the “parklands area”. The Southern Slopes should be retained as they currently are in order to provide amenity to students, staff and local residents. Building proposals here – irrespective of any architectural commitment – would lead to a severe detriment of amenity, damage the important setting of the city as a World Heritage Site.

-----

The proposed conferencing hotel should not be built on Chaucer Fields. It seems likely to ruin the loveliest open view of the Cathedral that all who come to the campus find stunning. The walk through the fields is also valued by staff, students and local residents. A large building there would
I am deeply unhappy with all these developments. First, there is never any sense of peace and quiet on campus which has been turned into a giant, disruptive building site. Second, it is disingenuous to say that UoK wants to create green areas by building on existing green areas. Finally, as an academic I am deeply disturbed by all the expansion, as it focuses on buildings not resources; e.g., study spaces instead of books and journal subscriptions are the aim of the library “expansion”. At the same time, UoK has one of the lowest expenditures per student. What I would like to see is less “expansion” and more focus on improving the quality of existing facilities and resources. Buildings like Rutherford are an utter disgrace, it is embarrassing to have visitors when you work there (piles of rubbish all over throughout the day are a favourite feature). The mixture of classrooms, offices and dorms in the old buildings just doesn’t work (how about having class while listening to a student drop some 20 wine bottles in the recycling bin just outside the classroom? It happens in Darwin). The library is the worst resourced library I have ever had to use and still you feel you can just push us over.

We have had to put up with so much in our community from the university and your students for years. Many Families have had to move house simply because of your students living in our area and now you add insult to injury with this plan by pushing you closer to the residents.

We all know the Master Plan is something you just like to slip in under the table as if nobody cares, sadly many do.

I should like to express support for keeping the green area around the University and to oppose any commercial building, structures, etc., including hotel and conference ‘centres’, especially on Chaucer fields.

In my opinion the concept master plan has many excellent aspects: I particularly like the approach to the centre of campus with the vision for improved architectural cohesion to the centre of campus. The visions for grand walkways and a higher density in the middle of the campus are both welcome.

There are three aspects to the concept master plan that I would criticise: energy, transport and further expansion into the green areas.

Energy

The concept master plan talks about using “soft” design measures to deliver sustainability and energy efficiencies. In my opinion this aspect of the master plan lacks vision. Over the next 50 years surely some of Kent’s energy consumption will be produced on site using renewable energy sources? Based on 10 W/m² power density from a solar array and 2014/15 electricity consumption, a 50% reduction of power consumption over 25 years, then around 100,000 hectares of solar photovoltaic array would be required to provide this electricity. Kent’s gas consumption is currently double the electricity consumption, so let’s say that also reduces by 50% in 25 years, with 2 W/m² power density from a wind turbine array, then about a million hectares of wind turbine array would be required to produce the equivalent power requirement. So clearly there are huge power needs for the university and at around 200 hectares, the university cannot generate enough power to cover its needs using wind and power alone. The university’s Carbon Management Plan 2010-20 published in 2010 has an objective of 23% absolute reduction in CO2
emissions 2006-2020 and states that the university will invest in such renewable energy solutions and states that decarbonising will be achieved through biomass heating plant, renewable energy systems such as photovoltaic arrays and solar thermal panels, and developing large scale wind turbine generation of electricity. Land is going to be required to deliver this. The roofs of buildings are not enough area and only account for a tiny part of the space needed. I think that the concept master plan needs to show that sustainable energy solutions will be implemented and are part of the plans for now and the future.

Transport
The current campus has very poor across-campus bicycle routes. I expect that cycling will continue to grow as a primary form of transport for many students and staff, and that effective cycle routes across campus would help facilitate this transition to more sustainable transport. The concept master plan explains about cycling to campus, and not across campus. It talks about the heart of campus as being exclusively pedestrianised. The reality of using a bicycle is that cycling across campus as part of a journey with multiple stop off points – e.g. attending a lecture, travelling to another class at another point on campus, then going on to town before returning to accommodation – so that the person travels by bicycle between campus destinations rather than being parked at the edge of campus centre and walking across the campus. This might seem a minor point, but other campuses have made cycling and walking coexist as the core methods of travelling around campus, and I think that Kent should do the same.

Expansion into green areas
I think that the concept master plan should avoid building in green parkland areas around the campus heart. The value of these areas for the wellbeing of the communities that use them is in my opinion more important than building for economic activity. Continuous growth of the university is not a necessary paradigm. Kent can and, in my opinion, should choose to exist at a size that works as a community and scale in harmony with the city. For me, this means not overwhelming the city with numbers of people and not encroaching on the city by removing the green space between the campus and the suburbs.

-----

The plan at 137 pages seems overblown in terms of the diversionary material about links and historic houses and gardens. It has many strong principles but much of it also seems a bit vacuous. Despite numerous graphics and curiously irrelevant comparisons the basic idea appears to amount to a lot of infilling of campus spaces and business related development. Despite the very lengthy document, the actual specifics of this development are not laid out so it is hard to evaluate.!

Second, there is very little if any attention to the university’s wider impact and engagement) and the needs, impacts or indirect costs and benefits involved. This omission seems rather significant. Just a few examples of relevant questions: What are the implications for locating Schools? How will they develop or expand if all spaces are filled in? – How will people work effectively if they are increasingly boxed in? Crowding has significant impact on stress and productivity. Years of construction work in close proximity also will take a toll and disrupt other work. How many years will the campus be on life-support while awaiting its heart transplant? Without much fuller consideration of these aspects the plan seems a bit like conceiving a hospital around its accessibility, peripheral businesses and space efficiency but without reference to its primary functions and the implications for the work of staff and outcomes for patients who will use it! – It is hard to identify a strong case for building pavilions as such structures are not in keeping with either the university’s or the town’s architecture or history.

There is no obvious case for building on the parklands either and clearly such a plan will deeply antagonise a very large number of people. Instead there might be an argument for dealing with inadequate quality of exiting campus accommodation such as Keyes extension Wolf etc so that it can be used more fully for conference or business trade! The University seems to have substantial difficulties with its existing estates and project management (too many examples to list) so it would be good to address the causes of these failures before embarking on further ambitious plans.

-----

This is a very thorough and well thought out plan. I greatly approve of many of the ideas to increase the density of the campus, make it more pedestrian-friendly, and so on. I also feel sensitive building on the northern slopes is an option certainly worth considering. However, in both you “maximum density” and “medium density” plan, you include proposals for buildings to the south of the current campus heart, on the north-eastern part of the parklands. As both a university employee and local resident, I oppose this and will do all I can to help make sure this doesn’t happen. Any attempt to build anything more on the parklands is bound to face huge public opposition and is a PR disaster waiting to happen. My objective advice would be not to even go there. There’s plenty of space for increased capacity elsewhere.

-----
These are exciting and ambitious plans that will ensure that the University of Kent grows in important and realisable ways. I would like to urge the University to take into consideration the views of local residents to ensure that the Chaucer fields remain as an important green space ‘buffer’ between the town and the University.

-----

Canterbury is already a student ghetto, and now you are considering ruining the village lives of Tyler Hill and Blean as well. I doubt if any of the managers, planners, architects and anyone else with a vested-interest live in the vicinity. I do, and have done for more than 20 years. I have also lived in Canterbury for 54 years. You may be impressed with the uni development over that time, but a lot of long-term residents of this once beautiful part of Kent, are not.

As you might have gathered, I am not in favour of this monstrous expansion of car-parking into the countryside, on roads not fit for the volumes of traffic that you clearly envisage using them.

-----

I wish to express my strong support for the proposal in the draft Masterplan for a new shared pedestrian and cycle route along the Crab & Winkle line from the University Campus to the north side of Canterbury West Station, and a new Station entrance off Roper Road.

It is also the declared intention of the City and County Councils to open up a new access to Canterbury West Station from Roper Road, with parking, passenger drop-off and taxi facilities.

And a plot of land in Roper Road, backing onto the Station, has just become vacant and would be very suitable for creating this access.

It is clear that a second access to the Station is sorely needed, as the existing access, parking and taxi facilities in Station Road West are under huge pressure already, and the popularity of the High Speed Trains is growing rapidly.

Also, the Station Road West access, parking and taxi facilities are on the wrong side of the railway from the University, such that everyone travelling between the Campus and the Station has to cross the railway.

So an access from Roper Road to the Station would be of great benefit to the University, and would increase opportunities for walking and cycling to the Station from the Campus, thus aiding its sustainable travel credentials as well as reducing traffic queues and pollution at the Level Crossing in St. Dunstan's Street.

So this new access from Roper Road is an excellent idea, given the large amount of long-distance travel generated by the University’s students, graduates, staff, and conference and academic guests.

Therefore, please would the University retain and emphasise this new cycle and pedestrian route and access to the Station in the final version of the Masterplan, and press on with it before Network Rail sells off the vacant plot of land in Roper Road, which is the only available land that could be used for it.

-----

We welcome the publication of this long-term master plan for the development and management of the University’s estates. Although there have been previous versions of an Estates Strategy, developments on campus have been piecemeal without a sufficiently long-term underlying strategy.

However we are very disappointed that the University continues to make proposals for the development of the western area of the Southern Slopes (Parklands) known as Chaucer Fields, and has included a “conferencing hotel” on this site in the draft version of the Master Plan. The University’s application in 2011 to build a conference centre and student accommodation on Chaucer Fields resulted in over 400 formal letters of objection. It caused serious long-term damage to the relationship between the University and local residents, which have only recently begun to be repaired. The continued intention to develop a conference centre on this site, albeit smaller in scale than the original proposal, can only harm this relationship again.

All the previous objections to the siting of a conference centre on Chaucer Fields (damage to World Heritage landscape views; importance of preserving the hedgerow marking the historic mediaeval filed boundaries; remoteness from other buildings in the campus heart; etc) are still fully valid today. The University’s site evaluation document of 2011 attempted to justify development of Chaucer Fields by ruling out several other potential sites as unsuitable. However, some of these sites have in fact since been built on – notably the site to the north of the Innovation Centre, used for the major Turing College project which replaced the student accommodation part of the original Chaucer Fields proposal. The Giles Lane car park, which it was claimed in 2011 could not possibly be built on, is now recognised in the draft Master Plan as a highly suitable development site. Clearly the 2011 site evaluation has been completely superseded. There are many other potential sites for a “conferencing hotel” on the University’s extensive landholdings, which are much more suitable than Chaucer Fields.

We are also concerned by the inclusion in the draft plan for further buildings on the Southern Slopes, in the form of
“pavilions” of unspecified purpose. This seems to be a crude attempt to earmark these sites for future major developments. The photograph of Stowe School on p36, which is claimed to show how such pavilions “enhance” a parkland environment, is in fact notable for the complete absence of any pavilions. It shows only a beautiful sweep of unspoilt grassed landscape below the main buildings – similar, in fact, to the current appearance of the University’s Southern Slopes.

The Southern Slopes, including Chaucer Fields, are a very precious landscape asset to the University, and are extremely highly valued by students, staff, residents and visitors. We urge the University to abandon plans to develop this area for commercial gain, and accept in its 50-year Master Plan that the Southern Slopes should form part of a permanent “green gap” between the University and nearby residential areas, as is already in place on the boundaries with Beale and Tyler Hill.

I am concerned by the plan to develop the southern part of the campus.

As a Canterbury resident and member of staff I greatly enjoy this part of the campus; I walk through it on my way to and from work every day. The fact that this is such an unspoilt part of campus helps motivated me to commute by foot, which is healthier and more environmentally friendly. I am convinced many more staff, students and residents benefit in the same way.

Therefore I would urge you to reconsider the planned development.

I am a resident of Tyler Hill. My property is on the ***** as it ***** just before it become Tyler Hill Road.

I have accessed online the University’s Master Plan and read it in full. I am very concerned about the plan to move the car parking away from the centre of the campus and push it into car parks in “The Northern LandHoldings”

“To provide space for car parking for staff, students and visitors to relieve the pressure on space in the heart of the campus. This might take the forum of a ‘Park and Ride’ scheme in discreet parking areas in the northern land holdings, which would be connected to the heart of the campus by means of a shuttle bus service. This shuttle bus could either access the campus utilising the existing public roads (ie Tyler Hill road, Whitstable Road and St Stephens Hill) or take advantage of a new cross-campus route that could be created to link to Giles Lane and the new Campus Walk.”

I am horrified at the thought of all the extra traffic travelling along Calais Hill/Tyler Hill Rd from Canterbury to access the parking in the Northern LandHoldings. Even worse, traffic coming from Herne Bay via Green Hills or from Whitstable via Chestfield would use Link Rd as a rat run to cut through to Tyler Hill Rd and access the parking. This junction of Link Rd and Calais Hill/Tyler Hill Rd is a dangerous junction and I have heard/witnessed several accidents here because there is a “blind” spot on a bend in Tyler Hill Rd which cannot be seen from Link Rd. So far none has been fatal but it only a matter of time. As it is, people travel too fast on these narrow roads. Calais Hill/Tyler Hill Rd has a weight restriction and several very blind and awkward bends. There is no pedestrian footpath along it nor Link Rd. Aside from full-time residents of Tyler Hill wanting to walk along these roads several of the University’s students also lodge in properties in Tyler Hill and walk the roads. We have already experienced the horrors of heavy traffic when major utility roadworks have caused the redirection of traffic along these roads for periods of several weeks. It has been a
nightmare. If ‘park and ride’ buses were also to travel along these narrow, twisty roads this would magnify the problem.

The masterplan also envisages a possible ‘satellite development which might accommodate a commercial hub or research and innovation campus which is linked to the campus’ also proposed to be linked to the campus by a shuttle bus service. This would again increase the traffic along the narrow roads both of vehicles going to the satellite development and possible shuttle buses.

One has to wonder if the architects who drew up the plan ever visited the road infrastructure which they were proposing should support their plans or were even capable of reading the maps they included in the plan to see just how narrow the existing roads are and how unsuitable they would be for a major increase in traffic caused by the master plan proposals.

I very strongly feel that the proposals I have referred to above are totally unsuitable for our road infrastructure and will completely ruin life for the residents of Tyler Hill.

I will be copying this email to our local Parish Council.

-----

Dear Sir,

I would like to support your pedestrian cycle route to Canterbury West Station at Roper Road. This would be beneficial and help with regards to get the level crossing in St Dunstans. Thank you

-----

I think it is a great idea to have a pedestrian and cycle route from the campus to West station, but am concerned that it will be a waste of money if the property in Roper road is going to be developed for housing, so would hope that the university can put pressure on both the council and Network rail to implement an access to the station from that side of the line

-----

I would welcome anything that makes it easier to find one’s way around the campus buildings.

-----

I like and support every aspect of this plan.

The possible creation of employment is vital to the community.

The proposed route into the City must be an aspect everyone will be delighted about and support.

It is refreshing to see some well researched and carefully presented planning.

-----

Links between Canterbury and the University p99:

My property is situated adjacent to the St Stephens underpass footpath, near the Beverly meadow, that is a main route into the Station Road West area from the university via cycle and foot to avoid traffic.

It is my understanding that the underpass area and the Station Road West area has a consistent level of anti-social behaviour as well as some violent crime. Even in daylight this route seems fairly unsafe and is more threatening at night.

I feel that this could be easily rectified even if another new route is eventually developed to provide a quick solution and a longer term alternative.

The St Stephens underpass area and the cycle path should be improved, by widening it using some of the council owned land in Station Road West, (perhaps setting it to grass to improve visibility and greenery), cutting back overgrowth of brambles and weeds, improving lighting and possibly putting up cctv cameras along the route.

As a house owner along this route which is prone to occasional graffiti I am indeed willing to have one put on the side of my house, as I am sure other similarly affected owners would be.

-----

I am concerned that the university is still pursuing the idea of developing the Lower Slopes. These are one of the most attractive aspects of the university, and give the site a uniquely attractive and open feel. It is vital that the university does not mess up a wonderful asset by leaving open the easy option of development.

You have only got to look at universities like York to see what a mess unthinking development can make to what was once a beautiful site. Do not let's do that here too.

-----

I am an advocate of the University of Kent and wish to support the University and City to grow and prosper. The majority of the Master Plan looks terrific. I think the focus on space between and the interaction within the University campus is the correct focus. I also agree that the university potentially suffers from sprawl and becomes more of a warren of unrelated buildings and spaces. A proper strategy and vision can correct this.

I think the re-opening/restoration of the now overgrown original crab and wrinkle way railway line is a good idea, although this should be done with care, and in consultation
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with some of the conservation experts in DICE as the old railway line has re-wilded and is a haven for wildlife. I would like to see the University remain a green campus, and although tree planting as suggested is good, there are experts within the University staff in conservation and environmental management and it would be good to see a proper biodiversity plan that maximises opportunities for incorporating and encouraging wildlife into campus life, rather than purely ornamental shrub and tree planting. This is a real asset and unique selling point of UKC and it should be enhanced and preserved to attract future students and staff.

My major area of concern, to which I must admit that I am opposed, is the suggested creation of business clusters north of the University between Blean and Tyler Hill Villages. As a former Parish Councillor and current resident, I know the area well. The land is rural and recognised as a biodiversity opportunity area for the protection and enhancement of the Blean Woodland Complex. On a more practical level, the Tyler Hill road as well as main road to Whitstable, along Blean Common suffers from traffic congestion (particularly at school times), has a very high traffic and fatality rate (including pedestrians), is too narrow in places, and suffers from ongoing speeding problems. I cannot envisage a situation where encouraging and creating new traffic to this location between Blean and Tyler Hill will be a good thing for either community.

As a father of two young girls, we already have difficulty walking to Blean School along Tyler Hill road and down the cycle path due to narrow roads and busy traffic. The road also crosses the national cycle path and is used by horses. It is a rural location, and is not suitable to development into multiple business clusters.

In addition to the road and traffic issues, Blean suffers from well-known drainage, flooding and sewerage issues due to insufficient infrastructure. Additional strain on this system could not be accommodated without significant investment.

In terms of landscape character, the development of park and rides, car parks, and business clusters is totally out of keeping with the rural nature of the parish, the landscape character area, and the community.

The proposed developments would represent a major urbanization of Blean and Tyler Hill, creating a conurbation by effectively linking the two villages. As a professional consultant I have worked on development projects across the UK. I know that once these business clusters are constructed they would permanently change the character of the area and start a process of in-fill and expansion, with the result that over the longer term the areas between the clusters would grow with housing and further business clusters, creating an urban sprawl from Blean Common to Tyler Hill.

In summary I do not believe the expansion of the University via business clusters and park and rides to the north of University is appropriate. Expansion should, as suggested by the architect, focus on intensification of the university campus. If business clusters are required, then they should be located on campus, immediately adjacent, or within the city itself.

Looks potentially good for everybody to me although not sure about the phrase “Greater Canterbury” and it didn’t give much detail (unless I missed it) re. the possibility to “upgrade (part) of the existing Crab & Winkle Way to allow vehicles ...” ie what part and assume a cycle path would be retained.

Dear Sir/Madam,

after reading your masterplan, I must admit to being shocked that you are considering proposals that will have such a detrimental effect on your local community. You suggest opening up the Crab and Winkle way, part of the UK Cycle Network Route 1 and a popular path for runners and walkers, to cars. In your document you state that this will improve the sustainability of the proposal. So, for clarity, you propose to destroy one of the most heavily used, sustainable, routes in Kent and allow cars to use it – in the name of sustainability? This is a nonsense.

Secondly, you propose to construct a series of car parks and business units, all to be accessed via a small country road, (Tyler Hill Road). This road can hardly cope with the amount of traffic that already uses it, and weight and width restrictions make this inappropriate for shuttle buses to support a Park and Ride scheme.

Additionally, this road, (and the Crab and Winkle Way), are used by children walking to local schools in the morning. Your plan presents a considerable risk to their continued safety.

Finally, in addition to destroying some of the most beautiful countryside in Kent, your proposal poses a risk to potentially important historic sites such as the Old Salt Road, and unexcavated ruins / villa near Blean Church.
It appears as though this plan is designed to open up land currently used for farming and recreation, for commercial, (and potentially residential), development.

I am happy to meet with any of your team to discuss this development in more detail, and would welcome a real engagement with the community your plan will impact so significantly.

-----

Thank you for giving local residents the opportunity to comment on the Masterplan. I am a local resident and university alumna (1965).

I welcome the plan for the Southern Slopes to be retained as parkland, and the intention to safeguard the existing views of historic Canterbury across the parkland. As stated in the plan these are a USP of the campus at Kent, and are highly valued by local residents and by visitors to the city, as well as by university staff and students.

I am disappointed, however, that the plan is to continue to develop buildings on the parklands, albeit described as “pavilions in the landscape”. It seems to me that the analogy with Capability Brown and Stowe to justify this is inappropriate. Brown created a focus for a view or vista where there was none before, whereas the views from the campus towards the city already have a focus: the cathedral rising above the historic city in the valley. Buildings of any size will compromise these views.

This inconsistent approach to the views of the city from the campus is already demonstrated all too well by what has happened at Eliot College. William Holford designed the building to frame the view of the cathedral from the huge window in the dining hall. The view is now almost totally obscured by trees planted in the foreground.

I am concerned that there is still an intention to build a hotel/conference centre on Chaucer Fields. A building large enough to fulfil this function cannot be disguised as a “pavilion”. Far from enhancing the views of the city, it will irrevocably damage them. Built where proposed in the plan, it will also destroy the double hedge (which is the parish boundary), and compromise the setting of Beverley Farm.

I do agree that the parklands could be better used by members of the university for leisure, play etc, rather than just somewhere to walk through en route to the campus. The suggestions of a maze, children's play area, and open air theatre are good.

I welcome the plan to concentrate new buildings at the centre of the campus and the aim to design a more coherent centre. While I agree with the aim of removing much of the existing car parking to the periphery of the campus, I wonder how this would work in practice. If much of the green space which surrounds the central campus becomes disfigured by car parking this would not necessarily be an improvement. Would underground car parks built under some of the new buildings be an alternative?

-----

We have read the Kent Master Plan and, as residents of Blean village, we would like to raise a number of strong objections to the plan. These objections are as follows:

1) Conservation area. Blean is situated in a conservation area which means that the land surrounding the village is to be reserved for agricultural and not commercial use. The envisaged Kent Plan would destroy this objective in a way that would impact adversely upon the nature of the landscape and the wild life. It appears from the plan that the historical core of Blean village, around the church and Tyler Hill Road, would be swallowed up into university campus.

2) Infrastructure. Tyler Hill Road is a relatively narrow route that is not capable of supporting heavy traffic. The envisaged Plan, involving the building of several new roads, opening out onto Tyler Hill Road, which is too narrow to allow for pavements, would massively increase motor vehicle traffic which would not only impact upon the quality of village life but increase the risks of personal and property injury damage. The idea that Kent University should feel that, in pursuit of its own commercial interests, it can adversely and seriously affect the health and property interests of the inhabitants of Blean village is unreasonable. The construction of social housing projects is one thing; but the construction of commercial sites which would radically affect the nature and quality of life for the Blean village population is an imposition that requires a very serious and detailed consideration of these commercial interests as against the long standing interests of the villagers. The Master Plan contains no rationalised and detailed consideration of Kent’s commercial interests for the next half century. It contains only vague generalities.

3) The Cycle Path. The plan to make the existing Crab and Winkle path/cycle route into a route for vehicles would make this an impossible route for Blean school children to use as a Walking Bus route. The school has worked hard to encourage more children to walk to school and this change would severely affect this good practice. The planned new route for the cycle path would not run near to Blean School.

4) Commercial assumptions. Indeed it could be argued that the Kent Plan is based on assumptions that are by no means solid. The Plan assumes that Kent, as a commercial institution (all universities are now commercial institutions),
will continue to expand. There is no evidence that, in the long term, this is actually likely. In fact the idea of a campus university where students pay huge fees over three years to gain a degree is arguably likely to become increasingly obsolete in this age of the Internet. On-line degrees, of increasing quality and much lower costs, are likely gradually to prove more attractive to an increasing percentage of the young (and perhaps mature) population. It is just as rational, therefore, to foresee Kent University as a commercial institution likely to contract over the next half century. Indeed, it is perfectly rational to predict that by the end of this century the university will no longer be a financially viable institution. The Plan gives no serious consideration to the likely direction of higher education in this Internet age and is thus a Plan that quite possibly has no commercial credibility. That the interests of the Blean population should be menaced by a commercial plan with questionable credibility is grossly unreasonable.

5) Conclusion. Accordingly the Kent Plan ought to be strongly resisted not just by the Blean population but equally by many outside of Blean, including those responsible for (or interested in) the financial interests of Kent University itself. The Plan makes few concessions to the interests of those likely to be affected by the physical expansion and it is based on assumptions about the future which are at best questionable. It is socially, financially and intellectually very weak indeed.

I am writing to express my dismay at the Conceptual Master Plan for the University of Kent which includes the development of a possible conference centre or hotel on Chaucer Fields. Aside from the obvious need to preserve this historic open space for not only local residents but students, visitors, wildlife (the list is endless and the arguments manifold) the development of the fields would produce huge noise nuisance to the residents who live down the hill.

This Saturday the Fresher's Ball will take place and the University Student Union has felt the need to mailshot all local residents to warn in advance of the noise that this event will generate. There will even be a manned telephone line for complaints (which has never happened) before because the anticipated noise will be considerable. The geography of Chaucer Fields means that any noise created here rolls down Whitstable Road and amplifies as it does so. Residents who live above the University have not received this letter which would indicate that the University is aware of the particular issue of the downhill noise. Whilst we are happy to suffer occasional nuisance for exceptional events such as the Freshers or Graduation Balls – we have had windows in our house shaking as a result of noise at previous university events – it would be totally inappropriate for the University to construct permanent hospitality centres in this location. The precedent of a noise nuisance has been acknowledged by the University's own Student Union in their letter relating to the event on 24th September – this cannot become a permanent feature of life in Whitstable Road.

On the whole I am in favour of the Plan. I think its appraisal of the campus is very accurate: ie the lack of coherence, dominance of the car, difficulties of getting around and the limited use of its green spaces (especially compared to Exeter). I think the design principles are broadly right. I like the attitude to the car and the idea of two green squares. Whether it will be possible to provide places for all the activities etc proposed must be open to doubt, there will have to be more selectivity. And I would strongly support the master Plan being linked with the City's Plan, though doing that at this stage of the Plan's development is going to be hard.

However, the devil is in the detail. Thus there is reference to replacing buildings at the end of their useful life, but which? And while I would strongly support better access to Canterbury West from the north (preferably with new facilities in Roper Road) I am not sure that using the old Crab and Winkle Line is wise as it could well impact unfavourably on residents of adjoining houses. By the way the train shown on p 40/4 is not the Javelin.

Residents will also rightly be concerned that there is no mention of the Green gap. Equally, while there is talk of preserving the parkland, the reference to possible buildings there is ill advised and likely to produce conflict which will prevent the Plan achieving its aims of better town/gown relationships. The treatment is, in fact, dangerously transparent.

And how will an avenue of cherry blossom be able to process graduates? Will they be Kentish cherry trees?

I wish to apprise you of my views on the Masterplan document that you have circulated (rather quietly) and the effects it will have on the area where I and my family live.

I wish to object to these plans on the strongest possible terms. The effects on the rural areas of Blean and Tyler Hill will be devastating and irreversible. In particular, the building of 3 park and ride car parks in the locality of the ancient church St Cosmus & St Damian. This church has stood in a unique position with uninterrupted views of the surrounding farmland, unchanged for centuries, which is very special to the local population and clearly this will be
changing to satisfy what I can only surmise is the greed of the university.

Also, why is such a large cricket pitch needed? If KCCC are not planning to relocate from the St Lawrence ground, why such a large pitch and viewing facilities necessary? You are not a sports college. I think you should provide detailed explanations as to why this is necessary.

Time and time again the university is seeking to ride roughshod over the feelings of the local population; not content with the fact that you have already expanded at such a rate that local people have to suffer such effects as sleepless nights caused by student neighbours; the degradation of gardens and homes which are not looked after by students or landlords alike; whole areas being turned into student ghettos drastically reducing house prices and isolating those too poor to move away; you are planning to extend even further. These are all the effects of large numbers of people living in our community who are simply passing through and have no stake in it; no pride in the surrounding area, and they have destroyed communities. You may argue that the expansion has benefited the local area financially, but it is the greedy few and the opportunists who have benefited, not the population as a whole.

-----

Thank you for making your masterplan of future development of Kent University available online, so that as residents we are able to communicate our opinions as to how this could affect us.

As always, the possibility of more and more student accommodation being built will inevitably impact directly upon all the residents of the Salisbury Road, St Michael’s Road etc. estate. Having lived in Salisbury Road for 27 years, we have witnessed so many people leaving their family homes, often due to student disruption and noise. As we all know, students always move out of university accommodation into off-campus residential houses after their first year, so the building of new student accommodation does not alleviate the long-term situation.

The aspect of the plan that greatly concerns us is the mention of new vehicle routes from the University to the city, possibly via our estate. The possibility of continuous traffic going up and down this estate would inevitably cause a great deal of noise and pollution to this area. This would also encourage students to park in our roads, taking up more residents’ space and causing a great deal of inconvenience, congestion and noise. One of the main reasons we moved here was due to the peace and quiet of this area. We would therefore be very grateful if all roads could be kept well away from this estate.

Extensive university building, in whatever form, is particularly worrying on the Southern slopes. As green spaces turn to concrete, what are the possibilities of our homes on this estate being flooded due to insufficient drainage?

The introduction of open air theatres, and in particular the one situated at the crater which is very close to residential homes, would ultimately lead to further noise and disturbance due to the proximity of the site to our homes. Similarly, open air “social areas,” mazes and gazebos, will encourage student noise outside, particularly at night. This is especially true due to people walking up our streets at night to get to existing venues at the university. Expanding such spaces closer to our homes will only make the problem worse.

The introduction of a conferencing hotel at northern end of the twin hedges, as well as a small block of buildings to the west of Bluebell wood, could destroy a great deal of the green landscape.

To conclude, the further down the southern and northern slopes towards the twin hedges the buildings, theatres, pathways and roads etc. are developed, the more the residents of this area will encounter noise and disturbance. The beautiful views and walking areas which are so much part of the attraction of Kent University campus to students, staff, visitors and residents alike, could be lost forever.

The current situation allows for a respectful distance to be drawn between residents of this estate and those experiencing university life. Bringing those two ways of life closer together is bound to cause friction on both sides which we can agree is not the way forward.

Thank you for considering these points.

-----

I concerned about proposed development on Tyler Hill Rd. This is a narrow country lane, frequently used by walkers and cyclists. Any further development along the lane involving an increase of traffic will mean increased danger to these groups.

I am also concerned about development that erodes the small green ‘breathing space’ between the current University campus and Blean – whether through increased private housing or other developments. My sense is that once that space is broken by traffic links – for instance making that stretch of the Crab and Winkle way also available to vehicles – its quality will be lost. To keep that sense of green garden campus I think it also matters to keep those two fields width of space – for students as well as those who live in Blean.

-----
It is good to see this. A concern is that the Masterplan takes account of the planting of trees across the Campus that makes a massive contribution to the quality of the environment. Whoever did the tree planting was a genius and it would be a tragedy if these trees were not preserved.

The insertion of the metal thing outside the Marlowe Building (referred to as an iconic structure) shows the need for a Masterplan and consideration of adaptations.

-----

I wish to express my support for the part of the University’s masterplan for a new shared pedestrian and cycle route from the Campus to the north side of Canterbury West Station and a new Station entrance off Roper Road.

-----

I run and cycle regularly along the Crab and Winkle. It is one of the most scenic, beautiful and clean areas in the local area. Hundreds of people from young children to elderly walkers use the track and to think that part of the planning will result in heavier traffic and building in this area is a huge concern to me.

In a day and age when sedentary lifestyles are increasingly an issue, this area represents a healthy lifestyle option for so many people.

I understand from the plans that the university seeks to place a cricket oval in Blean. I find this surprising as they have a fantastic green site already which hardly seems overused considering the university term ends in late May. What purpose would another venue hold? Residents of Blean have several local clubs to look at if keen on playing. Harbledown and Tyler Hill are very close so do we really need another ground?

I do feel that the scope of the proposals is too vast and there needs to be a rethink on how this area will be impacted.

-----

The main concept is clear enough, although ‘garden campus’ is a very twee expression. If you consider how vast the impact of the library expansion has been, then further construction is likely to impact on the atmosphere of the campus. LARGE SCALE construction projects are invasive to the community, in general.

It is clear that transport to and from the UNIVERSITY is currently a problem, and that attempts to remove cars and other vehicles from the main campus area are to be welcomed. I also understand the intention to improve the walking and cycle route into Canterbury, which is sensible, and may additionally benefit from some device e.g provide a tram or similar for less physically able members of the community to get into town.

Secondly, I welcome the confirmed protection of the UNIVERSITY parklands on the southern slopes. This area enhances the campus in terms of relaxation and natural beauty. The open air theatre is also a good idea here.

To the north, the proposals sound reasonable, although it is more likely to be a mini industrial estate than the description of KENT’S Silicon Valley! Comparison with California sounds rather overblown and demented.

The insistence on more and more parking seems to ignore the fact that other transport solutions are possible and in fact more sustainable i.e. to improve bus services and take a more positive approach to restrict car use for staff. This requires further attention before more land is destroyed merely for car parking.

-----

I believe the ideas will enhance the surrounding area and add value to both residents and students.

-----

I am overall very encouraged by the vision of the masterplan, especially the central campus. As this is only an overall plan it is the details that I would await with interest.

My concerns would be the possibility of the conference hotel still sited on Chaucer fields as the details of that are vague. Also the idea of pushing the parking to the edges of the campus is great to make it car free, however where would the car parks be sited? For those of us who live in the roads below the University we already suffer with too many cars and any further car parks would not be welcome.

-----

In my opinion the Masterplan does not reflect the actual land it intends to build upon.

It does not show any houses along the Tyler Hill Road. It seems to me that the plan is about enhancing UKC’s students’ lives with no thought or respect for those that are currently living in the dwellings missed off the plan 365 days a year.
I have lived in my house, again not shown on this plan, for 36 years and love the peace and beauty that surrounds it and enjoy watching the many, many people who walk, run and cycle past my house on The Crab and Winkle Way.

You will not only be taking away my enjoyment of the surroundings I adore but also so many other people who not only use the current Crab and Winkle Way but also the many other footpaths you plan to obliterate.

It beggars belief how or why the UKC would want to do this to such an area of beauty. It seems inconceivable that this beautiful country road could even cope with more traffic that this development suggests it would encourage.

As for the construction of more houses I, for one, cannot possibly see how this could help the two Parishes. I speak from experience when one of my out buildings was reported to Canterbury City Council as a passer-by thought it was a dwelling. The CCC investigated this and this was just one dwelling.

Hoe on earth CCC could possibly consider your proposal for numerous dwellings when such a fuss was made about one!

As for the construction of more houses I, for one, cannot possibly see how this could help the two Parishes. I speak from experience when one of my out buildings was reported to Canterbury City Council as a passer-by thought it was a dwelling. The CCC investigated this and this was just one dwelling.

My reasons for stopping the expansion of the UKC are threefold:

1) I grew up in Blean and worked at Blean school for 7 years. I used the crab and Winkle as a walkway and as a cycleway along with other footpaths and cycle paths around the University of Kent area. I’ve watched with sadness over the years the UKC’s expansion over so many of these areas turning what used to be beautiful green areas of the outer city of Canterbury into a concrete jungle. I cannot believe anyone would want to see the end of the only carless pathway from Whistable to Canterbury destroyed by roads and more buildings. A safe pathway that is used by so many locals and also UKC’s own students destroyed will change the village of Blean.

2) I am staggered more importance is seen to provide parking in a park-and-ride in the Blean area for students who are not even there all year round than the safety and well-being of locals who live there 365 days a year is seen as more important than the safety of locals who live there 365 days a year. The recent effects of the Chestfield bus which has been rerouted along Tyler Hill Road which has caused traffic problems and reduced the safety of families and older people walking to the church from the shops gives a glimpse of the carnage a park and ride will cause.

3) I am somewhat bemused by UKC’s need for a new cricket pitch. As a local teacher I have spent the last few summers taking school teams to play cricket matches – we are inundated with offers from local cricket teams offering us their pitches to play matches and to train. This is generally because they’re under used and there is the need to promote their use to local teams and clubs. If the UKC is so desperate to have a cricket team playing locally then maybe they should use some of the underused cricket pitches in the local area or maybe they shouldn’t have built on their own perfectly good cricket pitches in the first place!

Can we assume that this new cricket pitch will also eventually be built on in years to come like the ones they have built on the main pitches at the main UKC site.

For me there is an element of when is it going to end – with the constant building and developing of the UKC site. There seems to be a belief these days that “bigger is always better”, however I am a believer that “quality is more important than quantity” and maybe the UKC should consider that by making the University larger it is actually losing the appeal that many people were originally attracted to. I am not against change and I believe in improvement however I do not believe that the enlarging of the University of Kent should be to the detriment of the rest of Canterbury. Blean or any other local green areas or that any of this development will actually improve the University or the lives of the locals living its surrounding areas.

Please do not destroy the Southern slopes/Chaucer fields by building a hotel, conference centre, parking lot or any other large structure.

Good afternoon,
I am very concerned about the plans regarding the Crab and Winkle way. My daughter has just started at Blean Primary School, and I consider this route the only safe option to get her to and from school. During school run hours, the main road leading up to the school (i.e. Tile Kiln Hill etc.) is overwhelmed with traffic and in my opinion dangerous for cyclists/pedestrians. I fear that opening up
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the Crab and Winkle way to vehicles (and all associated plans for this area) will take away this peaceful and safe option from parents and children who choose to walk/cycle to school.

Consultation:
The Masterplan – Next Steps states ‘...this work is a vision aimed at inspiring and gathering stakeholders around a clear project’. The University state on their website that they are ‘committed to maintaining and developing the good relations we have without local community’. The University’s efforts to engage with the community on this occasion have been extremely poor. If you are genuine in your desire to consult, the period for receiving comments should be extended by at least 4 weeks after properly notifying all residents of the proposals. I certainly did not receive the leaflet and neither did every other person I have spoken to; Also, I understand that signs erected by a resident to help notify local residents were removed by the Council? Finally, when I visited the Beaney library and asked to see the documents the staff hadn’t heard of it.

Car parking and access:
One of the principal objectives of the Masterplan is to change the character of the main campus by removing all car parking and traffic (other than servicing requirements and disability spaces). The intention of this appears to be to free up the existing car parks for development allowing an increase in student numbers and to drive revenues presumably.

This part of the strategy cannot be implemented without first providing replacement car parking. Effectively the car parking has to be an early part of Phase 1. My understanding is that all the “Park and Ride” (6500?)spaces are shown to be off Tyler Hill Road and your response, I believe, when questioned, was that this was just an option and no definite decisions have been made? In my view this is the most controversial aspect of the entire proposal as the number of car journeys generated along Tyler Hill Road will completely change the character of Beany and Tyler Hill. Given that the replacement car parking sites unlock the entire Vision on the main campus site, the lack of attention given to this in the Masterplan makes me feel extremely uncomfortable.

Added to this, the inadvertent labelling of the replacement car parking as “Park and Ride” (I understand this was an error?) throughout the Masterplan doesn’t promote huge confidence in the thought given to the whole exercise unless it is slightly more calculated! Clearly the University need the City Council’s support for the re-zoning of the land uses and it is not difficult to appreciate that an extension of Park and Ride could be very attractive to the Council in implementing its own Parking Strategy which states that “The principle is not only to provide for future sustainable growth at Park and Ride sites, but at the same time reduce the amount of car parking available in the city centre. It is this shift in parking provision that produces the traffic reduction and congestion benefits. To meet that aim, the Canterbury District Local Plan (2006) has allocated a number of city centre car parks for mainly housing and/or employment use to 2011. An allocation does not necessarily mean the loss of all car parking, as options for building over and retaining all or some of the spaces will be considered. This policy meets two key objectives: To continue the shift in parking from the city centre to Park and Ride car parks situated at the edge of the city. To maximise housing development on land that has been previously developed within the urban areas”.

The Masterplan recommendations include an aspiration to “work with the City Council and Kent County to improve parking and transport linkages in the area” and it’s hard to imagine that the architect would not be aware of this link and the relevance of a “Park and Ride” labelling in engendering support from the City Council.

A proper consideration of alternative, more suitable, locations for the parking needs to be carried out. There must be more suitable alternatives nearer the campus (under-croft, underground or discreet multi-level car parking?).

What other options have been considered and why were these discounted in favour of the current proposal?

Giles Lane:
Admittedly the conceptual plan is not sufficiently detailed. However, it appears that Giles Lane will be truncated from both ends at a new square (where Giles Lane meets University Road) and it will not therefore be possible to drive from St Stephens Hill to Whitstable Road along Giles Lane. It also appears that University Road will be closed to traffic? Wilist the Concept Plan on Page 7 of the Masterplan states that Giles Lane is to be adopted, this may only apply to part of the existing length? In my view maintaining this east/west route is essential. If it is closed off the nearest alternatives are Tyler Hill Road/Calais Hill/Link Road or Forty Acres Road.

Crab and Winkle Way:
The Masterplan states that this will become a sustainable new route and will be made suitable for vehicles (from Tyler Hill road to the campus): It appears that the intention is to force as much traffic as possible onto Tyler hill Road and off Giles Lane/University Road?
Conclusion:

The underlying changes to support the development of the main campus appear to be to move the majority of traffic from Giles Lane to Tyler Hill Road, to limit use of Giles Lane, and to provide vehicular access from Tyler Hill Road to the campus via the Crab and Winkle Way. Whitstable Road and St Stephen's Hill. In addition, a main north-south route will also be established along the “Crab and Winkle Way”, which connects between the City Centre and Tyler Hill Road in the northern land holdings of the campus.

Page 67 – The master plan concept starts by establishing a simple grid of streets, spaces and places based around a main east-west route along the ridge-line (Tyler Hill Road?), which will connect between the Whitstable Road and St Stephen's Hill. In addition, a main north-south route will also be established along the “Crab and Winkle Way”, which connects between the City Centre and Tyler Hill Road in the northern land holdings of the campus.

Page 97 – 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. Although public roads (Whitstable Road and St Stephens Hill) already enable connectivity with Tyler Hill Road, these options are circuitous and prone to congestion at peak times of the day. Three different ways to create a more convenient on-campus link are suggested below: 1. The existing Crab & Winkle Way could be upgraded and widened from a pedestrian and cycle route to provide a route for vehicles, 2. The disused rail line which runs to the west of St Stephens Hill could be acquired and upgraded for reuse, and 3. A completely new and direct street could be created through the existing fields.

Of course, none of these need be considered as options, and all three routes might be constructed to enable good pedestrian, cycle and vehicular connectivity for University students, staff and visitors. Such links could form part of a new “Park and Ride” scheme, utilising land in the ownership of the University on both sides of Tyler Hill Road for open car parks. Such a scheme would not only release space for development or for new squares and gardens, but it would also enable a more eco-friendly pedestrian dominant environment in the Heart of the Campus.

Whilst it is understood that the development of the main campus is a very attractive and financially beneficial option for the University, the current proposals will destroy the character of Blean and Tyler Hill villages by moving the vast majority of the traffic generated by the University along Tyler Hill Road. A more practical alternative needs to be pursued which utilises existing access roads (i.e. Giles Lane) and landholdings where the fundamental character has been established.

Proper consideration of alternative options needs to take place. There is no real reference to the consideration of other options in the Masterplan document. It is absolutely unacceptable to divert the vast majority of traffic movements generated by the University to the detriment of local residents in order to maximise the development potential of the main campus. A genuine attempt to engage with local residents to formulate the conclusions of the Masterplan is essential.

I support the Masterplan for a shared pedestrian and cycle route from the Uni Kent campus to the north side of Canterbury West rail station.

Equally, I agree with the proposal to create an entrance to the station off Roper Road, together with parking, a drop-off point and taxis. This would relieve Station Road West of the huge amount of traffic and parking pressure and save time by not queuing at the level crossing gates.

I welcome the outline of a master plan for comment and many of the proposals. Some require further comment:

The park lands to the south of the university still seem vulnerable to development and lessening (or even removal) of the open space between residential areas and the university. The proposals include a statement about the open space that is a considerable landscape asset to north of the university with the belief that this should be retained as a distinct northern edge to the heart of the university campus. This, or similar, is not stated for the southern edge and the “vagueness” of the position of the conference hotel as a pavilion in the park could threaten an edge to the south. An open air theatre could also contribute to this dependent on size, overall purpose and frequency of use.

An edge is potentially further compromised by the proposals for the north/south highway which has no natural route that would provide access without disruption to or even destruction of community residential areas.

I was invited to a presentation by your architect from Farrells who talked about using the campus more intensively and limiting sprawl. He then mentioned and the value to the university of its beautiful setting, which has now been re-christened “the Parklands”. I was therefore surprised when I noticed a small triangle had been marked...
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just above the historic hedgerow by Chaucer Fields. On further questioning of the pro VC I was dismayed to learn, that it was still part of their plan to site a conference centre on this spot (which for our presentation was misleadingly indicated as some kind of garden feature.) She added there was nothing to worry about as they didn't have the budget for it “in their five year plan”. I would like to think that we are looking further ahead than this This unspoilt space should be saved for future generations and I would definitely oppose this encroachment. A conference centre would take up much more space than the small triangle is indicated, would increase traffic and be a blight on this extraordinarily beautiful view of Canterbury.

Further comments.
1) The proposed banishment of cars – whereabouts are you planning to site the carparks you are intending to build at the edge of the campus?

2) proposed shuttle service at the base of the cycle path. This would have a negative impact on the local area because people would (I’m afraid) start driving and leaving their cars at the base of that route.

3) With relation to “sprawl”, the University has bought up extensive lands towards Blean, and are planning to spread themselves outward in this direction. There are dangers that satellite campuses and institutes would increase traffic on country roads.

I am very concerned that the developments planned along the Tyler Hill Road to Blean will greatly increase the traffic along this narrow and winding lane. This will be especially dangerous for cyclists and walkers, particularly in dark mornings and evenings. I am also worried that the junctions at Fleets Lane and Link Road which are already hazardous enough, will be further compromised by increased traffic on Tyler Hill Road.

I would like to express support for the new shared pedestrian and cycle route from the Campus to the north side of Canterbury West Station, and a new Station entrance off Roper Road, as proposed in the Masterplan

A neighbour showed me the master plan. He said that we should have received the leaflet delivered to all the houses in Tyler Hill. The leaflet seems very vague, a little like a child’s drawing – oh look a space we can put a car park here! It seems poorly researched. The university has always discouraged student cars as most universities do. There is a good public transport link to the university from Canterbury City. There are impressive wildlife corridors which seem to have been ignored. There are historical byways and the Crab and Winkle line that there importance historically has been ignored.

There has always been a good relationship with the university and the surrounding areas the roads around Tyler Hill and Blean are already very busy it seems that the plan has not taken this into account.

There was I believe a talk at Blean but there has been nothing arranged for Tyler Hill.

I found your recent presentation given to the Parish Councils including Blean interesting. It was good to hear about some of the original concept from the Architect Much of what was planned for the campus was exiting and will help to make the campus itself better set out Re your Northern Holdings You were able to clarify misconceptions that had seemed part of your plan i.e. that there was not to be a major car park around Blean nor development around the church which is a conservation area. However I think that the scattered developments you are planning are inappropriate as isolated developments as shown will not function well. The Tyler Hill road is unable to cope with any increase in traffic and any connecting road for transport along the old salt road or crab and winkle cycle way would be disastrous for the history and beauty of this route Tyler Hill road and Blean are still part of a precious rural environment. Development here would change this for ever and would cause a public outcry.

On the whole a well-planned and sensible project that can only help the local community, though no doubt it will run into a lot of nimbyism. This is short-sighted – we (Kent & UK as a whole) need the sort of hi-tech businesses and employment that the proposed northern development could bring. My only concern – and it’s a serious one – is about increased traffic, especially on Tyler Hill Road.

I have seen the plans and met with your representatives. It appears that you have various plans (park/ride – industrial – sports etc) in various places.

My concern is that agriculture has moved on and small areas of land are no longer viable, fortunately in this area
we do not massive fields but have retained many of our hedgerows to the benefit of wildlife and the countryside in general.

Your plans appear to take up approx 50% of numerous areas, thus leaving the remainder of each field not viable for farming purposes.

My suggestion would be to concentrate your plans on one or two specific areas leaving the remainder of your land for farming for as long as possible.

My suggestions would be – land to the east of the giles lane / st stephens hill / canterbury hill junction, which already has a reasonable road access – or land to the north of your sports field, there are two large fields here leading down to the sarre penn river, both fields are north facing so not ideal for agriculture, again a road link is already there, or a new access could be easily built next to existing maintenance workshop block.

on a separate note, please do much more research before considering a cricket area, blean parish council bought some land for cricket/football purposes, no one wanted it, the clubs preferring to stay at tyler hill & rough common pitches, the intended land is now a dog walking area.

I fine, please consider our countryside and retain as much of it untouched for as long as possible.

thank you.

-----

We strongly oppose the provision of a Park and Ride having access from Tyler Hill Road. This would irredeemably alter the character and lives of Blean and Tyler Hill.

There are already a number of housing developments in Whistable and Herne Bay finished, in progress and planned which will impact on our villages.

In addition to this there is to be a Herne village bypass, in conjunction with Strode Park development with roundabouts on Bullockstone Road which will encourage an increased use of Thornden Wood Road and increase traffic through Tyler Hill and potentially Tyler Hill Road.

-----

The Conceptual Master Plan contains some sensible and welcome ideas, especially where the University’s willingness to follow the consultant’s recommended design principles is manifested in the ideational proposals: so, concentrating development in the centre of campus, enhancing a sense of place through better signage and structure, recognising the green asset value of the campus, and protecting the views from campus of the Cathedral and cityscape are all sound ideas. However, there are six major problems too. First, central campus’s potential to better meet conferencing needs is not considered, but it is arbitrarily assumed that ‘parklands’ is an appropriate site. This undermines the whole logic of the conceptual plan (see sixth point below). Second, the proposals in relation to the Crab & Winkle seem to exhibit a lack of understanding of the landscape, and are apparently disconnected from the reality of how this route is used in practice, and how it is valued and enjoyed in everyday use (without the need for costly hands on “development”) in its current form. Third, the fuzzy representations of building possibilities on some parts of campus implies the loss of significant swathes of woodland, and alarmingly when presenting the proposals the consultants admitted in this context that they were not sufficiently familiar with the campus to be aware of these consequences (University officials remained silent on this point). Fourth, there is bizarrely little consideration of the situation regarding already-developed Park Wood, where there is scope for heightened meeting of accommodation need (hence relieving pressure on other sites) by efficient replacement of existing dilapidated and poorly designed stock. Fifth, the plans are weak on the issue of parking. The opportunity for imaginative thinking here, including underground options for parking zones, is left unrealised. (To anticipate the routine response that the costs of this are prohibitive: why is this a standard option for meeting parking needs in many other situations where space pressure is intense? Also note that underground parking goes with the logic of the plan in relation to consolidation of a quasi-urban core). Sixth, the plan’s contemplation of the idea of situating development (a “conferencing hotel” and two other structures) on chaucer fields and the southern slopes (now relabelled as part of “Parklands”) is a disastrous misjudgement. There are several reasons for this. It undermines the integrity of the conceptual plan, because it demonstrably violates that plan’s own design principles in relation to strategic views, spatial concentration of development, and green asset recognition and protection – priorities that give the plan coherence. It therefore makes the exercise look cynical, ad hoc and inconsistent a fundamental historical problems which the whole notion of the Master Plan was meant to address. Furthermore, the “Parklands” element directly contradicts the priorities and values of the local (geographical) community, the university community, and expert opinion made known to the university authorities on several occasions over the past 5 years across a range of consultative, legal and planning arenas. In addition, it also contradicts the democratically mandated designation of this space as a green gap in the draft District Plan – a designation which has made clear that preservation of this place as unspoilt shared green space is a priority not just for immediate residents and the university community, but for the District as a whole. It must
be concluded that to carry this element of the proposals forward into the substantive Master Plan would be inconsistent with the basic function of that Plan; spectacularly undermine any claims University authorities might wish to make as to their good stewardship of one of the most attractive of English university campuses; and damage profoundly the University authorities’ relationship with each of the aforementioned geographical, workplace and expert communities.

-----

I’m writing with some feedback on the Masterplan document. My general points are these:

1) I’m very concerned about development of the southern slopes of the University. This space really should be kept as a green lung.

2) It’s very disappointing that there is still no plan for a swimming pool on the campus – there is a need for this.

Below are some more specific points relating to particular points in the document:

p. 16, point 4: “the evolution of retail into proximity commerce” – the meaning of this is unclear. To what extent will the university community be consulted as to what its shopping preferences and needs are?

p. 18, point 6: “Recognising and building upon its reputation as the UK’s European University, the master plan should strengthen the University’s ability to distinguish itself from other competitor universities, essential to attracting the best students and staff.” There is no substantive information here about what is understood by “the UK’s European University”. If the European tagline is to be deployed, this should be done in a meaningful way. If, as the masterplan states (goal 6, p. 20), one of the priorities is to deliver “a coherent and unique brand for the University, recognising its reputation as the UK’s European University”, the plan needs to be able to make clearer what “being the UK’s European University” means and involves. Does it just mean the European links discussed on p. 24, or does it go beyond that?

p. 19, point 10. “Create a remarkable public realm”. This is very unclear. The term “remarkable” is also very subjective – it doesn’t inspire much confidence as used here!

Goal 7, p. 21: Facilitating an environment for social interaction: it is vital that non-commercialised spaces are made available for this, as well as commercialised spaces such as cafes. In relation to this, the suggestions on p. 37 about the creation of more sheltered outdoor spaces, and a “linked network of civic spaces”, are excellent.

p. 56 description of diverse green spaces sounds very good; ditto the details on p. 77.

-----

I find these proposals flawed on a number of levels but what I find most offensive is the dressing up of insidious and intrusive goals with obscuring patter – “Masterplan”, “Parklands” etc. The university should be honest and declare it couldn’t care less about open spaces. The sole intention of development is about the generation of income. These proposals will be implemented no matter how valid the arguments against are. We are not dealing with an educational establishment with belief in the betterment of locality but a business whose only interest is money and the acquiring of it.

-----

The proposals for building in the area around Blean are very concerning: this is a rural area that is lived in and enjoyed by residents and students and whose character would be radically altered by these plans. There is plenty of space on campus without sprawling towards Canterbury itself or Whitstable on the other side. Many students are attracted by the beauty of the campus; many staff stay because of it; many residents put up with the nuisance of student neighbours because the university has so far been reasonably respectful of its setting. These plans will have a negative impact on all of this.

A much more urgent priority is to get students out of low density family homes in the city where they have a hugely detrimental impact on neighbourhoods, residents, house prices, and where they use resources without paying council tax. As with other cities with disproportionate student numbers, such as Oxford, we should be working with the city council to enable students to live in student housing not in family homes.

-----

I am disgusted by how this process has gone so far and also by the proposals. I only heard about this plan recently and despite phone calls to ***** ***** 15 at Kent Uni to request a copy nothing has been forthcoming. The land is agricultural land, when Kent Uni bought it the Trustees of Eastbridge Hospital Trust- the vendor breached their duties as Trustees (re Hastings Bass principle)The land should never have been sold to Kent Uni. Further and regardless the person who left the land had covenants attached that it was to be used for “agricultural purposes” in perpetuity.

I am gobsmacked to see that park and ride is proposed around our home which is in a beautiful and tranquil spot.

15 Personal information redacted to protect an individual’s identity.
Also there is a big horseriding community around here and for you to think park and ride is acceptable and/or appropriate is an utter disgrace. Further now that the UK is out of the EU surely the activities of your university will contract. We adjoin a large fruit farm where the whole family has worked and works so darn hard and I fail to see how they would welcome park and ride or houses. Also to suggest a cricket pitch near the church is disgraceful. If you are reopening the original rail line near Tyler Hill surely any parking is better there. leave our countryside alone.

-----

So far it is an utter disgrace, not only the proposed plan but your total lack of communication with and total disregard for local people.

We have received no notification at all despite being local and potentially significantly affected by your outrageous plans to bulldoze some beautiful Kent countryside. I heard that there were meetings recently but too late to attend .

The university purchased this land from Eastbridge several years ago, the latter probably breaching their duties and responsibilities as trustees , in selling it to Kent Uni in the first place (I refer to the covenants etc. etc.- refer to Furley Page who acted for the vendors ). I believe the fact that you now propose to bulldoze agricultural land is an unintended consequence of the sale to you... We live on Tyler Hill Road, **** *****. We use the byway CB27 and you suggest building park and rides! This is outrageous, Furthermore now we are out of Europe I would have thought the Uni would be contracting its student numbers. In any event why do you think it acceptable to corner so far south and away form your campus to construct these things?

---

You also propose a cricket pitch and houses beside the ancient church and graveyard! Have no no respect for anyone at all?

We adjoin a local fruit farm, the family have worked so so hard over the years and invested such a lot in terms of money and blood sweat and tears, they already have “holidaymakers” staying on your campus down from London year after year in the summer months trespassing in the orchards stealing- yes stealing cherries – in huge quantities-filling children’s prams with them – I dread to think what will happen with so much more foot traffic re people with no respect for the countryside or the way of life in the countryside.

Finally I have rang your estates office three times to ask for a hard copy- I spoke most recently with **** ***** who promised to get a copy posted but as is so typical here, nothing has materialised.---

I managed the Social Hubs project in 2009, which developed a valuable methodology for exploring the desires and needs of different sectors of the University community in regards to spaces in which people congregate. The findings of this study should be of interest to the developers of the Master Plan (and I would, of course be willing to take this research further in support of the Plan). I also have an interest in developing the non-built environment, having helped established the campus kitchen garden, worked on the nature trail, and have been developing a woodland craft site in Brotherhood Woods and working with the School of Architecture with a view to designing and constructing round-wood framed buildings for various purposes. We have considerable coppice resources that are in need of cropping – and it would make considerable sense for a host of both environmental and learning and teaching reasons, for the use of these resources to be integrated into the Plan.---

PLEASE DITCH THIS IDEA AND KEEP THE GREEN SPACE FOR THE BENEFIT OF CANTERBURY RESIDENTS.---

My comments are in relation to the plans for the Northern Land Holdings.

- I am concerned about the development on land that is currently being used for farming.

- I also do not feel as though Tyler Hill Road is suitable for buses and therefore would not be ideal for a Park and Ride system to the main campus.

- Development along Tyler Hill road, despite initially only as a satellite business will encourage development along the stretch of the road and around Blean.

- Development may lead to a reduction of house value in and around Blean and Tyler Hill---

The proposed expansion is far from acceptable. Are these additional facilities actually required for students? or are they a business plan to maintain future income from the hiring out of facilities? I, along with a large number of Blean villagers, will be objecting to any proposals to build on A grade agricultural land.

---
Whilst welcoming much of the plan certain aspects seem ill thought out.

Building within otherwise open spaces seems contrary to the philosophy of the master plan. Particularly worrying is the re-emergence of the idea to build an hotel on the southern slopes, Chaucer Fields. The first attempt to do that gave rise to much opposition and damaged the University’s image in the city.

We had all thought that the University wanted now to work with the community.

The ideas to improve the foot/cycle route from the University to the city is undeliverable as it uses land not within the University’s ownership. It could have the effect of blighting certain homes.

I suggested a few years ago, making better use of the Parkwood site by infilling with additional student housing. It appears that the current plan does not include increasing the number of units on this already developed land.

You have appointed a skilled architect but the results are somewhat lacking.

I am not in favour of the proposals relating to your northern land holdings in the vicinity of Blean village.

I welcome the proposals in the CMP to preserve the landscape values of the campus, and to establish design principles to guide the design qualities of new / replacement buildings. Thus the plan promises to preserve the strongest positive appeal of the estate (its green landscapes and views over the city) and to mitigate the
weakest (the poor design quality and functionality of most existing buildings). In particular, I applaud the statement (p.59): “Whilst advocating the enhancement of the University’s relationship with the City, special care should be taken to preserve the character of the University as satellite of the City, and to nurture the views of historic Canterbury, which are one of the most delightful features of the Campus.” That said, the specific proposals too often show little appreciation of the qualities of the existing campus and would impose a “rationalisation” that is in many respects subversive of those qualities.

The CMP recognises that “The University is well known as a very verdant campus with plenty of open space, located within a semi-rural landscape setting. Parklands surround the campus, with incredible views over historic Canterbury.” These, surely, are invaluable assets that should be preserved.

The “spaces to be considered for development” include almost all the remaining woodland remnants in and around the central campus. Yet it is these that most enhance the central campus and give relief from the unattractive buildings that neighbour / surround them. The woodland fringe to the north of Giles Lane and along Parkwood Road, and the copse between Jarman and Keynes are a few examples – “rationalising” these spaces, or building on them, would greatly diminish the visual appeal of those parts of the campus, and the sense of well-being that they presently impart. Likewise, further development in the green space to the south of the Library (between Eliot and Rutherford) would compromise one of the iconic views of the cathedral from the campus.

I find it very odd that existing green spaces are considered “too homogenous”, yet the plan is to give the university greater “identity” by “rationalising” it. In fact, there is a considerable variety of green spaces on the campus, and it is mostly the relatively recently planted ones that could be said to be “too homogenous”. Preserving diversity is important, but it could be enhanced by better landscaping of some of the recently planted areas rather than wholesale redevelopment.

The correlation between “quality of place” and “university performance” as presented in the draft is almost certainly spurious. The main driver of “performance” (measured here by rank order in a league table) is academic performance in teaching and research, and in student recruitment; Kent’s lower ranking than its peer group mainly reflects early stages in academic development. Moreover, giving the lie to the claimed correlation, the university has been rising in the rankings without any notable improvement in “quality of place”. The idea that the hideously over-developed urban space of Lancaster gives it greater “quality of place” than Kent now is, to me, laughable. Kent has, as the CMP’s remarks about its greenness and landscape setting make clear, unique advantages that make such comparisons meaningless.

I really do not understand the enthusiasm in the CMP for Jarman Square (existing or enlarged) and a new “Darwin Square”. The existing hard-landscaped space around Jarman is, to me, one of the least attractive places on the campus, and I struggle to see it as either very useful or even potentially attractive, especially in Kent’s term-time weather. Squares were, historically, parade grounds and, unless someone is envisaging an improbable revival of revolutionary student activity, such spaces really do not deserve a place on a modern university campus. Better by far to develop new, smaller, more intimate spaces to which students and staff might develop attachment and which they might actually use. I really do not see the need for “formal, ceremonial spaces”.

The idea that the Darwin Square will be associated with a “new eastern pedestrian entrance to the campus” is mystifying, particularly because the narrowness and steepness of, and heavy traffic on, St Stephen’s Hill make this a very unsuitable point for a new principal entrance.

I am also sceptical of the value of a central street fronted by shops and cafes. Universities are not shopping centres and do not seem likely to become so, and cafes and restaurants (notably poor at Kent) are better located in quieter and more “defensible” nooks in various places on the campus.

The ambition “to build a reputation – The Best Garden Campus in the U.K.” “is familiar” it was tried some 25 years ago and was responsible for much of the poor / mediocre landscaping and planting from which the campus now suffers. It would be much better to preserve and enhance the woodlands, to make Kent the UK’s best woodland campus. Now, that could be truly magnificent.

The thing I find most disturbing in the CMP is the proposals for the “Parklands”. The landscape value of the historic buildings is admitted, but the significance of their historic status and their relationship to the historic relationship between the site and the city and Cathedral is not. The area between Beverley Farmhouse and the city is especially sensitive in this respect, sited as it is as the northern end of what remains of the ancient trackway from the Cathedral to Blean Woods.

For this reason, I am opposed to any suggestion that “the Parklands will also provide a location for the continued development of new buildings and other facilities as and when appropriate.” Such development simply cannot be compatible with the preservation of the key landscape and cultural values of the site. I would be very sceptical that Such buildings will be designed as “landscape buildings”
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or “pavilions in the landscape” ; that might work in formal gardens, but on a hilly, partly wooded site such as thus where views over the city are of such value, it would be much better, surely, to preserve these sites and to lightly manage to improve their existing landscape value. The area formerly referred to as “the Southern slopes” also has clear value as a green buffer between the city and the university, and is highly prized as a local green space in a part of the city that is otherwise relatively deprived in that respect. The preservation and enhancement of such unimproved green space should be a high priority for the university and the city.

One disappointing aspect of the CMP is its lack of clear proposal for cross-campus cycle routes. Even within the core campus, it is difficult to get from one end to the other in the time between lectures and seminars, and for those of us who are dependent on bicycles, this is an obvious area for urgent improvement.

I have refrained from commenting on the CMP’s proposals for the “Northern lands”, partly because I know this presently undeveloped area less well, but also because the proposals appear to be so contrary to a variety of planning guidelines – e.g., those against ribbon development (as development along the Tyler Hill Link Road would be); those protecting existing footpaths and cycleways (of which the Crab and Winkle Way is a nationally important example); those protecting the landscape setting of historic buildings (such as the church of St Cosmus and St Damien in the Blean). I would be surprised if planners would permit any such development on or accessed via the Tyler Hill Link Road. Developments on the existing fields closer to and accessible from Parkwood Road would seem much more likely to gain planning permission.

I applaud the plans for the Campus Heart. The need for development of this central area is well articulated: a central thoroughfare, a more identifiable entrance, replacing or refurbishment of existing buildings. All, to me, seems fine.

The plans for The Parklands and The Northern Land Holdings are based upon some misdirected apprehensions, and are very concerning.

The university is “blessed with an abundance of green spaces” (37). “The University is well known as a very verdant campus with plenty of open space, located within a semi-rural landscape setting” (39). It is heartening to see that recognised. However, “the green spaces within the campus are rather homogenous and repetitious, and this lack of variety means that the university under-achieves in terms of its campus character and personality” (37). This is troublesome. Surely the value of green spaces is that they are, precisely, green spaces. There is mention of vulnerability to inclement weather. Well trees are a perfect cover for bad weather. It would seem ludicrous to remove the woodland.

“Access to green space is available but their use is not encouraged” (37). There are excellent paths through all the woodland. If people like to walk in the woodland then they need no encouragement. That these wooded spaces “lack animation or passive surveillance” and “are not perceived as safe” (37) is again precisely because they are woodland. That is their charm. One cannot set up security cameras in dense wood.

Here we move to the very troublesome bit: “Parklands surround the campus, with incredible views over historic Canterbury. These have an as yet unfulfilled potential to become great assets for the University and the surrounding communities” (39). The woodland and field system are already great assets. Adaptation of their central feature as woodland and field system is not improvement. It is adaptation. It is development. A woodland is not improved by cutting back trees. A field is not improved by building in it. They cease to be what they are and become something different.

“Currently many of the existing areas of green landscape are ‘organic’ in nature, and are ill-defined and under-used whilst lacking variety. Much of this landscape is protected as woodland from development or adaptation” (56). It is revealing that the fields and woods are seen as unfulfilled potential. This is a dangerous ideological position akin to seeing untapped oil reserves in the arctic as unfulfilled potential or shale gas as crying out for fracking. Have any of the architects or the university planners sat quietly alone in the woods in the Northern Land Holdings? If so they may well perceive a very dynamic environment that beautifully reflects seasonal changes and demonstrates great biodiversity.

I also refute the notion that competitor universities have an edge over Kent because of exploitation of their natural land. If anything, I think that Kent can raise its profile as a green university by developing the Campus Heart whilst leaving the wilder aspects of the campus wild.

If the university is keen, as stated, to preserve good relations with the city and the community, then the plans to build on the treasured so-called “Chaucer Fields” betray a very different ambition. It suggests effectively trampling on many years of local opposition to the planned development in the valuable southern slopes.

My conclusion is that the plans for the Campus Heart are good. I find the tone of the narrative with regard The Parklands and The Northern Land Holdings very troubling, and indicative of a ruthless and ill-sighted desire for financial return over environmental and ecological concerns.
Firstly, I very much welcome that the University has commissioned a masterplan, so that there is a clear framework for future development and improvements to the university estate. This is an excellent initiative.

My comments fall into two categories, related to: A, the masterplan strategy; and B, the “concept masterplan” itself.

A Masterplan strategy

I very much like the focus on pedestrian and cycle priority – “making the pedestrian king of the public realm” – and the relegation of the car to lower status. In the spirit of this new strategy, the new pedestrian priority should be introduced immediately, with additional zebra crossings across Giles Lane and a very clear pedestrian priority on the “table” next to the School of Arts.

The idea of hierarchy of spaces is a good one, founded on sound urban design principles expounded by Christopher Alexander and other urban theorists.

The “Garden Campus” idea has a lot of strength to it. However, maybe “Parkland Campus” is a more realistic name.

B Concept masterplan

I welcome the form of the new “rural” developments for innovation and research centres in the “northern hub” and the character of the business clusters as farmsteads.

The densification in the centre to a certain extent is good, and the introduction of taller buildings – making more efficient use of the land with greater plot ratio.

However, I consider that the densification has gone too far, such that the campus will lose its parkland character. I think that the whole proposal looks too much like a business park rather than a university campus.

The existing infrastructure and buildings seem to have been ignored to a great extent in the development of new routes. For example the Templeman Library and Marlowe buildings are shown cut in half! The topography of the site – with significant slopes and changes in level, again seems to have been ignored in the new proposals.

New buildings and new and strengthened paths must be inflected to respond to the existing topography and building morphology – this is what helps to give a good masterplan its unique and special character in a specific location. For example, strengthened routes, such as the “Campus Walk” do not need to be straight and level. The north south route again should be inflected to go round the library and Gulbenkian and connect up to the old crab and Winkle bed, rather than introduce another new parallel path in the centre of the campus.

Overall I welcome the new masterplan ideas and the opportunity to comment on them as they are developed.

I am appalled to see that your masterplan includes the provision of several car parks along the length of Tyler Hill Road to replace and increase the current provisions within the campus.

That road has no pedestrian footway for much of its length and current traffic volumes already present a considerable hazard to users on foot.

The increase in traffic on Tyler Hill Road that would be a corollary of your proposal would significantly exacerbate the situation.

Dear sir/madam,

I’d like to register my strong objections to the building of park and ride and business parks in Blean. Tyler Hill Road is not an appropriate access road for such a development – the road is already narrow and winding: further traffic on the road would be unsafe and negatively impact the village. I am also sceptical of the ‘employment opportunities’ offered by the proposed business hubs. Finally the proposed cricket ground is not desired by the village, so access to such a facility is unlikely to benefit the community.

Finally the Crab and Winkle path is a beautiful rural area and many Blean families and members of staff at the University of Kent use that path to get to the school and to work every day. It is beautiful and the local community are incredibly thankful to the University who so far have been excellent custodians of the land- preserving an area of natural beauty for not just the local community to enjoy: cyclists, dog walkers and ramblers travel from all over Kent to walk and cycle this route. The area of the path on which the University of Kent plan to build on provides one of the most beautiful views of idyllic Kent countryside. We appreciate the University of Kent preserving this land to date and really hope you will continue to do so if for no other reason than to keep the good will of the local community and those across Kent who use and enjoy the Crab and Winkle.

Best wishes

The complete obliteration of Blean Village by mass speculative housing is unacceptable as is the replacement of the heritage Crab & Winkle path by a 3-lane motorway, as is the cramped development next to Blean Church. What about the proposed reservoir at Tyler Hill?
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What has Windsor and Stowe School got to do with Canterbury? The University should be a place of learning not a speculative property developer in hotels, speculative housing and factory development. It would appear that all this development of the ‘Northern Lands’ is going to make someone a lot of money. Who is behind it all? The University should confine itself to the Campus.

-----

I have lived in Cadnam Close for 23 years, and a further 10 years prior to this in Ringwood Close. The area has changed from a family centric area to a student centric one. The fabric of the area is deteriorating. It can be noisy at night as students seem to think alcohol excess is part of their course and the area has become an extension to the university car parks. The footprint of the university has increased over recent years and the plans seem to see this increase as growing exponentially. I am horrified that we who are local have no real say over our way of life, and that the university has an all consuming might. Now its influence is going to win in terms of environment and infrastructure.

-----

Having read the document in full, I can only conclude that the proposal to dispose of the university “northern land holdings” to residential property developers, for an “early win” would be catastrophic to the village of Blean in terms of environment and infrastructure. The irony of a masterplan that presents UKC as “the UK’s best garden campus”, whilst removing all undesirable cars and satellite business units to the village of Blean, and selling off land holdings utilised for farming for wholesale residential development is astonishing. Whilst I understand that this document is merely conceptual, the timetable for moving to planning approval in the spring of 2017 suggests otherwise, and does not allow sufficient time to consult properly with the neighbouring village residents, who may not have been alerted to the large scale development proposals buried within the document as most of this consultation period has been during the long summer holiday break.

-----

I am adamantly opposed to building up the green space for several reasons.

1) The green space is inherently valuable as green space, and is a major asset to the townspeople as well as to the university community.

2) Historically the area has not been built upon for good reasons: it does not present adequate solidity for stable foundations, so buildings will not last.

3) In enterprises like this, typically, the university is in danger of accepting the bulk of the financial risk, while its commercial partners get most of the profit.

4) There is no sound reason post Brexit to expect continuing expansion of Kent university will be sustainable.

-----

I have looked at some of the plans. I have just recently left Blean primary school, and have cycled, walked and driven through the campus, as well as playing in the fields with my brother, sister and friends.

-----

As a Tyler Hill resident and having had no information from the University, I was surprised to hear from a neighbour that the University’s plans include the idea of a green campus, with no traffic. It seems that in order to achieve this plan you intend to totally destroy the green area of Tyler Hill by providing a car park for 6,500 vehicles on the Tyler Hill Road. If true, this is completely unacceptable to residents because the road is totally incapable of carrying that amount of traffic. We also heard that the Salt Road would be used for a bus to ferry students from the car park to the University. Surely this a designated cycle route and cannot be used for vehicles.

We are extremely disappointed not to have received any information about the plans and have had to rely on word of mouth, which, as you can imagine, isn’t always the most reliable method.

-----

As a Tyler Hill resident and having had no information from the University, I was surprised to hear from a neighbour that the University’s plans include the idea of a green campus, with no traffic.

As a regular visitor to the Blean area and particularly to the Crab and Winkle Way, I object to the planned park and ride and business centre to be located in this area, Canterbury
has few green approach routes and this one should not be spoiled by this project merely to provide parking.


---

It is to be welcomed, that the University of Kent, rather than choosing confrontation with local residents, is seeking engagement. Much is to be applauded in the University’s master plan regarding the concentration of new buildings within the existing development footprint.

It is, however, preposterous to include in this development no strategy, the creation of a hotel/conference facility in the area known as Chaucer Fields. There is much to be applauded in the creation of an open air theatre in the ‘old bomb crater’, but this mustn’t be accepted as ‘soft-soaping’ to advance plans for the hotel/conference centre. When I spoke to the chief architect, he was unaware of the existence of the medieval hedgerows bordering the bridle way – a key element in the initial protests against the development of this area.

There is also a question as to why his proposed complex can’t be built on the land to the east of Stephen’s Hill? Far better views of the city – and well away from undergraduates.

There is still much to be done on the part of the university. If they want the support of local residents – they need to try harder.


---

Please find below my thoughts on the proposals for the master plan.

Campus Heart. I understand the principles of the campus heart, and making the most of the land in central campus and broadly agree with these to make the best use of space and improving the area. I am concerned however at the lack of detail on the routes, and the university must seek to ensure there is no negative impact on the surrounding areas from cars, and late night noise travel by students late at night on foot. The university must ensure good subsidies and bus service.

Parklands

I still do not feel the university is putting the hotel / conference centre in the right place. This would be better placed looking at page 90 of the consultation document in the area to the right of Beverley Farm Innovation Centre. This keeps the hotel / centre in a good location to make use of the other university facilities and buildings. It would also give views from the hotel down to Canterbury. Placing it or any other building in the fields is wrong, for the numerous reasons listed already under savechaucerfields work, and ensures this essential semi-natural green space is kept for students, wildlife and the community. The high use of the fields by local people was clearly evidenced by the Inspector in the village green Inquiry.

The ‘Pavilion concept’ is not in keeping with the area and the assertion that it would ‘enhance the parklands’ is ill-conceived and feels insincere and a false aspiration. Locally residents would also be greatly offended at attempts to try and direct additional traffic whether pedestrian or vehicular through the parklands and onto the residential areas. Some measured landscaping of around 20% could take place but to provide areas for the students and local community, such as wild flower gardens, orchards, seating and outdoor exercise equipment.

The principles behind some of the ideas around the Northern Land Holdings appear good, with the aims of creating employment and park and ride area to help traffic congestion. However the road network does not support this. The roads are narrow, rural and with little obvious room for any widening. I can understand the University wish to sweat their assets and gain profit from the land they have bought over recent years. However it is difficult to see how this can be done without significant investment in the roads as there are already issues on the hills around Blean and Tyler hill at peak flows including by the primary schools and safety must be considered. It may be that if the land is not suitable the University and council consider how the university can divert some of its profits through s106 or similar from the other movements to fund park and ride in an area along the A2 rather than diverting more traffic through the roads at Rough Common, London Road or Blean. The road to the sports fields and centre could be widened and innovation hubs built here. The sports provision could be provided near St Stephens’s Hill.

The proposal to build more housing in Blean could be welcomed with section 106 money to road, and primary school improvements (new assembly / sports hall). The University impact has pushed up house prices for local residents because of students. Although the University is building more student accommodation on main campus this a high end which means students will continue to want to rent cheaper HMOs in the city. The university should seek to make any housing affordable, by setting at least 40% aside as shared ownership (not homebuy where the price remains high which private developers do).


---

I am very much in favour of a professional masterplan being commissioned by an internationally well-regarded firm of architects. I enjoy the larger scale vision they put forward, and the improvements they are proposing for student accommodation and parking, but I nevertheless
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have significant reservations about their current design for the central campus area. The University of Kent has a campus typology, typified by pavilions in a green landscape. This allows for meandering paths and routes between buildings, through a ‘natural’ landscape, with wide reaching panoramic views across the city. The argument put forward in the masterplan is that Kent has outgrown this typology and we now need to convert the campus into an ‘urban’ typology typified by high densities and enclosed forecourts. The design proposed is based on the best progressive thinking for urban / civic environments, but I don’t believe this is to be the most appropriate solution for our ‘campus’ based setting. The ‘campus’ typology operates with a very different social scenario than an urban setting, typified by different functions, timings, and circulation demands than a standard civic centre. Many of the best-practice principles that have generated the kind of urban settlement model proposed here, are simply not relevant here, and we should be celebrating this difference and the freedom it enables for creating a place that has a distinctive, collegiate character that works in greater harmony with the remarkable setting and landscape that the University of Kent occupies.

Have you considered the impact of these proposals on the wider community? The ever growing expansion of the universities is severely impacting local residents. The pressure on our roads and in particular our housing is immense. People are having to move out of the city because all the local housing is being sold to students. It is grossly unfair. Canterbury cannot cope with more students. I am also concerned that this proposal is building on green space within the city which is much needed and much used by local residents.

The function of a University is scholarship not real estate development. As a professional planner and erstwhile planning inspector, I would say that the Farrell “Concept Masterplan” has all the hallmarks of a desk-study: clearly whoever wrote it has never walked the site. A grid-iron layout with a naff rows of flowering cherries is totally alien to the character and appearance of a spacious campus perched above a medieval city. UKC is not a metropolitan university, although it has already lost much of its charm with the development of every square inch in the central area by buildings of indifferent quality, minus mature trees and landscaping to soften the impact.

The links to the city centre via the old railway line are laughable. Would the trees on the embankment be cleared so that users could stare down into the bedrooms, living space and gardens of private houses? Would there be a pedestrian bridge over Forty Acres Rd? How would the railway-line be crossed?

With regard to the so-called Northern Land Holdings, the Master Plan ignores the fact that the Tyler Hill Rd itself is a Kentish country lane of limited width, which cannot cope with buses or additional traffic, as recent road-works have demonstrated. The main road through Tyler Hill is narrow, overloaded, and steeply undulating. This route would be totally unsuited to P&R and traffic from business units.

As for As for UKC’s aspirations to host a replica of the Cambridge Science Park, forget it. Every LPA and educational establishment in the UK had had similar ambitions for the last couple of decades. UKC’s existing Innovation Centre contains few if any hi tech companies. It is essential that UKC demonstrates that it has both the DEMAND from reputable scientists with appropriate funding BEFORE destroying agricultural land which supports Britain’s Food Security. UKC must be seen to be a responsible steward of its assets.

I am disappointed that the university are proposing further Student access routes including a possible new transport route. – It would appear preferable to improve the already established routes and transport links rather than carve up additional countryside and green space as suggested through their proposed renovation of the crab and winkle way. – The crab and winkle way (a conservation area) is a quiet and beautiful environment for the local flora and fauna, residents and students alike. The devastation that would be inflicted on this disused railway by such a development including increased footfall pedestrian, cycle and possibly traffic too including noise, destruction, light pollution, etc is incomprehensible.

St Stephens and associated areas already suffer due to the volume of students in the area and the late night footfall as they to and fro between uni and the city centre often making lots of noise late at night. – I do not see how the new proposal would in anyway benefit the local residents. It would merely inflict additional noise and disturbance across a broader area of the St Stephens district to the detriment of local residents and the unique environment of the crab and winkle way.

I like the idea of the campus walk. I think this should be done immediately to improve walking from central campus to Keynes and Turing college. This is round it particularly unsafe at night and it would be better to have improved paths in this area that are well lit. I also believe there should be more landscaped areas around campus with seating. I think the campus should improve its visual look so it’s more
pleasing to the eye; especially in the older parts of campus. Lastly the view over Canterbury is the selling point and nothing should spoil this view.

-----

OK, I see it is too late to comment but I'll try anyway. I am pretty horrified by the idea of turning a large part of Blean into a Park & Ride, or creating another business centre there. The traffic and the change of use in the community – a quiet rural Kent village – sounds like a horror for those of us who live in Blean and appreciate it. It looks like the university expanding and changing use of valuable agricultural land, and destroying a village and its character in the process. Please look after Blean as well and see the plan from the point of view of the village and not just in terms of expansion.

-----

totally oppose these proposals for the following reasons:

• Completely changing the rural character of Blean and Tyler Hill.

• There is currently NO business along Tyler Hill Road.

• Tyler Hill Road is a very narrow lane, totally unsuitable for increased numbers of vehicles as demonstrated recently when Radfay Hill was closed and Tyler Hill Road was used as a diversion, including for buses.

• There would be environmental, noise and light pollution both during construction and on completion.

• A rural/agricultural area would be blighted by swathes of concrete.

• These would lead to further problems with drainage in an area already suffering from flood/drainage issues.

• The Crab and Winkle pathway is brilliant for both walkers and cyclists – why does it need to be made “sustainable” and what does this even mean?

• The pedestrian route (footpath) is also enjoyed by walkers – they would lose this if it becomes a road connecting the Park and Rides with the university. This would undoubtedly become a busy road.

-----

Going to use all opportunities to block construction of your RURAL BUSINESS CLUSTER next to my house.

I would prefer to find solution before I handle this problem to my lawyer *****18 ltd*. feel free to contact me if you open to discussion in next 2 weeks.

-----

I like the plan and support the vision but would like to make the following observations!

1) I think that the student population base might change over the next 30 years so there might be more ‘local’ students who live at home but need to travel in – likely by car because of poor access to transport in the rural areas. I feel this could have a major impact on transport/car parking requirements.

2) The Chaucer Path could be a major footpath to the city and would benefit from improvement

3) Innovation Centre/hotel/business hubs would benefit from good buses

4) Access to open air theatre could impact me hugely as Elliot footpath access is used

5) – over BUT most important -> PTO

Idea of major route up existing Crab & Winkle railway will decimate my house! It might work if it’s on lower level on existing bridleway instead. Embankment runs 6-10 feet above my fences along the entire length of my garden and side of my house.

If you put a road or a tram along there, I will need a fence about 20ft high to protect my garden from debris, fumes, noise etc along the entire length of my garden.

The trees currently are a flight line for birds and a hunting ground for bats and I would be sorry to see this go if the trees are not preserved/replaced

-----

1) Thanks for sharing a conceptual plan.

2) Issues of concern to villagers are that drainage for housing in the village does not cope with the current sewage load. Extreme care needs to be taken to ensure the whole village sewage & rainwater drainage systems are not compromised.

3) The road network in Blean is inadequate both for vehicles and pedestrians. Any development must ensure that the road + pavement facilities are improved to cope with the additional traffic volume.

4) Blean is a village, not an extension of Canterbury. Please plan accordingly.

5) The railway line is identified as being a ‘sustainable new route’ We are not clear how the existing Crab & Winkle route going past Blean Church is proposed to be used.

6) The proposal to park off Tyler Hill Road causes concern because of the additional traffic volume along a narrow
road. Far better access to the A290 from Tyler Hill will be needed too.

7) Given the development of broadband and the potential to work away from a centre raises the question of how much additional building is really required.

8) It is essential that the ancient church of St Cosmas & St Damian, together with its graveyard, as well as the unexplored remains of the Roman villa adjacent to it are maintained and not surrounded by excessive building.

9) We are aware that informal discussion have been had with the Parish Council and the Parochial Church Council and hope that these will be continued

-----

Blean is a village, has been one for hundreds of years and should always remain one.

Your proposals are monstrous. The charm of this village is that it is surrounded by woods and fields and is still (just) separated from Canterbury so it can still keep its identity.

Your plans will totally ruin this and by concreting over green spaces, introducing buses and traffic onto highly unsuitable rural roads the village will be ruined for ever. And for what? Business areas to help the University to make money for even more buildings for even more businesses.

Universities should be a place for learning and you should have been made to plan your campus within your original confines and no more. Now, having ruined your campus you want to encroach and ruin our village.

Please drop this dreadful plan and think again. I may be old, and I certainly won’t be here in 50 years but I am absolutely sure that this is a very bad idea and future generations will be very thankful if this does not go ahead.

-----

Much of this seems delightfully vague

Pleased you have no plans for the development of the Northern Holdings in the short/medium term.

If there is no money surely the implementing of Phase 3 is optimistic.

Very good PR.

-----

I think you need to keep the heart of the campus clear of any new buildings, to preserve views from existing buildings and therefore keeps existing green spaces.

Otherwise views will consist of the structure and windows of the next door building!

-----

All looks good to me.

It’s evident that earlier feedback on plans have been taken into account.

-----

First fleeting impressions only :-
Impressive ambitions proposals – generally applauded; some reservations re: fate of old railway route.
Too early to make further comment

-----

Overall everything seems to be OK
Particularly like focus on getting rid of cars.
Hope conference centre looks nothing like picture on board 13.
like use of “bomb crater” as amphitheatre.

-----

I’m very pleased at the thought of the university using its existing land in the “heart of campus” more efficiently.

I’m grateful that that university has realised the enormous value (not only economic) of the parklands and is keen to keep them to an extent. I’d like to comment on the proposed conference and hotel facility planned for the parklands. I feel this would be detrimental to the area and would not be an ideal location for a conference facility. We have some wonderful facilities in the heart of the campus already (I chaired for a national conference held in Woolf College in December 2015 and so many delegates commented on what a wonderful lecture theatre and college it was). Being in the heart of campus allows us to show delegates some of our wonderful facilities (such as equipment and facilities in departments, but also our pleasant campus life with the Gulbenkian café etc). The only difficulty with hosting conferences here at University of Kent is the lack of accommodation on campus, but with the majority of conferences held outside term time, it would be wonderful to be able to make use of the (mostly vacant) student accommodation. If students were offered a small reduction in college fees to mostly vacate rooms during key conference periods, I’m confident we could offer ideal accommodation to delegates without the need to develop the hotel in the parklands. Indeed, the University of Warwick has been extremely successful as a conference venue and delegates are extremely happy with its student accommodation.
I am extremely concerned at the proposed new link between campus and the city, potentially along the existing Crab + Winkle Way, but also, as the maps imply, through our gardens! Please please don't take away our gardens – many of us work hard at the university so please respect our dwellings and don't take these small havens from us! The existing walking route is great- it is well-lit (and as you note on p.43, it would not be wise to develop another secluded route which would be less safe) and works well as a whole! I worked until 12:30am this morning on campus and felt safe walking home along the well-lit Eliot footpath and then residential streets, whilst walking along a secluded path at the back of people's (former) gardens would feel much more risky. I'd be very keen to learn more details of the plans regarding this proposed link.

VERY CONCERNED ABOUT THE RURAL BUSINESS CLUSTERS STRUNG ALONG TYLER HILL RD WHICH IS COMPLETELY UNSUITABLE FOR INCREASED TRAFFIC. IT SEEMS THAT KENT UNI IS MORE INTERESTED IN BEING A PROPERTY DEVELOPER THAN AN EDUCATION ESTABLISHMENT. THE NORTHERN LAND HOLDINGS WERE PURCHASED AT AGRICULTURAL PRICES AND SHOULD BE USED FOR THAT PURPOSE

Have the car parks on the edge of campus.

I am concerned about lack of car parking. Fine for those coming up from city, but for those of us coming from north, this will be increasingly difficult, particularly for those with care commitments.

The fantasy of public transport is all well and good, but until realistic/timely/affordable options are in place, most of us will continue to rely on our cars.

1) Inference diagrams speculating on the Uni as a character in the development/evolution of Canterbury But UKC has sister Universities – ‘The Club of 1965’ ‘The Plate Glass Universities’ – Kent/E.Anglia/Surrey etc they share a vision + strategy in their creation + location (outside) conurbations. What could we learn from the lessons/mistakes of our ‘Sisters’ 50 years after creation. Would be useful to see a comparative analysis of the ‘Club of ’65 Uni’s and not a more blinkered introspective proposition? For UKC campus alone.

2) Procurement is key. Would like a cross-map of UKC funded v PFI-type land-lease projects onto the patchwork plan. So we can speculate on architectural quality of the high density campus.

There is a huge disparity between new buildings library + Business School + law school verses Woolf College. Earlier Rutherford + Eliot verses Darwin (new houses) + housing blocks to SW of Rutherford.

Some exciting plans. especially around gardens and innovation centres.

Bicycle hire from parking to building (like London Boris bikes).

• When mixing the different uses of space – important not to impact on teaching ie not have a large social area of sports space next to teaching, as noise is disruptive.

• Parking – will be an issue for staff & also may impact on people coming here for PhD/PG study who don't live on campus.

• Don't want to lose the ‘campus’ feel of Kent.
The presentation was excellent: we shall double the capacity without rising above 4 floors, add 2000 bedrooms, avoid leakage outside the red boundary and abolish car parks as we – in time – seek a transport strategy.

It would be useful to provide an overlay map showing the existing campus and the proposed campus. This would help to orientate.

It is concerning that the Marlowe building and library are cut through when they are part of the original campus. Otherwise an interesting proposal.

Very impressive masterplan – nice to be consulted & informed.

My comment – please consider cyclists & include lock-up bike parks close to any peripheral car parks so people can cycle from the outskirts into the heart of campus.

1) I don’t think the university should undertake changes to semi-natural green area simply to create ‘corrective’ links such as the North South Avenue. In particularly there will be substantial costs to creating + maintaining these and the money could be better spent on care areas such as more teaching space.

2) An open air theatre is not required given that we already have three theatres on campus + the position would be open to vandalism + misuse.

3) The university should look at redeveloping old low density student housing with 4 story blocks which could improve raise numbers of room available.

4) The business clusters use far too much green space one higher density cluster would be much better environmentally.

1) DISGUISE, IMPROVE EXISTING POOR & UNSIGHTLY BUILDINGS Ref : KINGS CROSS STATION

2) USE TUNNEL ACCESS FROM OUTLYING CAR PARKS WITH AUTOMATED TRANSPORT

3) CONSIDER WHOLE AREAS AS SCULPTURE PARK

4) MAKE USE OF MURAL PAINTINGS

I agree with a lot of aspects shown in the presentation, all of which will develop the university for the better.

Great idea to have two welcome points – makes this easier for my job when meeting external clients who are unfamiliar with the campus.

Only thing – it’s a shame there is no funding (and too much opposition!) regarding the conference centre/hotel!

Cultural + leisure buildings Should have a swimming pool. It could be a huge economic success.

‘less cars, more feet’ is not appealing if you are a member of staff who already finds travelling to campus and finding parking stressful.

This particularly impacts on those with caring responsibilities (primarily women) who have to do school/nursery drop offs or care for other relatives and cannot get to campus earlier. If they have to factor in travel time for park and ride also (say 20 mins each way) This can potentially add another 3.5 hours on to a working week.

Would the working hours be logged as ‘time arrived on campus’ or ‘time arrives at desk’?

If the latter this would affect everyone but would most impact on hourly-paid (and therefore lower-paid staff).

We must be aware of indirect discrimination of lower-paid workers, carers and women.

I presume that senior managers would still have allocated spaces on central campus.

Swimming pool related to the gym is not in place?

It is good to see that a plan is being considered instead of seemingly random development around the campus but it must be undertaken with a realistic view of what is likely to happen in terms of the university’s development.

Will there be a focus on (and market for) the conference trade, study bedrooms, research teaching, arts or sciences? Deciding what the strategy is for the university is key to deciding what the estate will look like even at this macro level. Please let the public know this before we are asked to comment.

As a member of staff, it would be nice to see some investment and proper thought to transport. This plan seems to show disregard for staff-parking in a distant park.
and ride and making the Crab & Winkle cycle route open to traffic is not progress not respectful to staff.

I’d also say that infilling the open spaces in the centre of campus would detract from what makes the campus so pleasant and attractive. Please do not chop down any more mature trees whatever grade they may be. Their young replacements do not compensate for their loss, at least not during the working lifetime of current staff + students.

As mentioned, please let us know more about the overall university plan before progressing this otherwise it rather smacks of a PR exercise in the wake of Chaucer fields.

-----

1) What are the developments for the teaching facilities e.g. School of medicine.

2) Windsor Walkway is brilliant as is the opportunity for taking traffic from St Dunstans by having an electronic bus up the hill

3) Moving traffic away – excellent.

4) As a student, living in Eliot in my first year the campus was very confusing so improved signage

5) Use of the “green” space could be vastly improved.

-----

I largely agree with all the plans particularly about creating a central high street and moving car parks out. I’m not overly bothered about the rural business hubs – I can’t see how that would benefit the university apart from rental income.

I would like defined cycle routes and a ‘Center Parcs’ feed to the campus with a busy + vibrant hub in the centre. Cafe’s moved onto ‘streets’ without outdoor seating – not internal like Origins would be great to improve atmosphere. At the moment the Gulbenkian feels like the only place with any kind of vibrancy.

-----

As a near neighbour, owning land next to yours I would have liked more direct notice of your plans – only finding out by chance.

When is development planned to start on the Alcroft Grange side of the road? and how do you plan to gain access to you land – given that the only access currently is a private road whose upkeep is paid for by all the Alcroft Grange residents – a road that you also have a share in.

Your plans will obviously make St Stephens Hill more busy – The Alcroft grange residents have asked me to make contact with the vice Chancellor whom I know – so that their concerns may be addressed

PS. We are all concerned that our conservation area is being encroached upon inappropriately.

-----

There was a very interesting & enlightening discussion on Radio Kent at the weekend where the current thinking is the demise of full time residential higher education will be replaced by more part time + distance learning. Food for thought?

The current ‘Innovation’ centre is let to a local estate agent & physiotherapist etc. Where is the ‘innovation’?

-----

Some very interesting & positive ideas. I live in St Stephens so would be pleased if student accommodation is built on or by the campus. Thus releasing houses for local youngsters. As there are so many students in Canterbury it would be excellent if there was a cap on numbers.

I like the idea of building on campus & leaving lots of green land all around. Please lower student cars – ask them to bring bikes & lobby CCC for cycle paths.

-----

1) The intention to define spaces with specific character is welcome.  

2) Also welcome improved links with city, although some of the areas where work is needed (e.g. south end of Crab _ Winkle Way) is outside university land.

3) Good idea to move car parks away from campus heart, but hope parking will still be available for disabled (e.g. for Gulbenkian area)

-----

Very pleased that the views of historic Canterbury are to be “nurtured”, hope that means Chaucer Fields as well.

Love the idea of a green campus.

-----
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CONCERNED ABOUT ANY PROPOSED – EVEN 10 YEARS HENCE – OF DEVELOPMENT ON CHAUCER FIELD & SE FACING SLOPES.

- CONFERENCE HOTEL AS PAVILION IN THE PARK STILL MAJOR CONCERN. VERY RELIEVED THAT TURING COLLEGE STUDENT ACCOMODATION ENDED UP AWAY FROM CHAUCER FIELD.

- OTHER CONCERN IS ANY BUILDING EXTENSION OF INNOVATION CENTRE LIKE THE IDEA OF OPEN AIR THEATRE AT BOTTOM OF BLUEBELL WOODS ? IN CRATER.

LIKE THE PROPOSAL FOR PARK & RIDE PARKING ON EDGE OF BLEAN WOODS & NEW CRICKET GREEN TO BE ‘SHARED’ WITH BLEAN COUNTY SCHOOL. GOOD ALSO THAT CRAB & WINKLE WAY IS TO BE ACCEPTED & IMPROVED WHERE IT CROSSES UNIVERSITY LAND PHYSICAL LINKS WITH CITY STRENGTHENED – FOOTPATHS – NOT SHOWN FOR IMPROVEMENT FOOTPATH BOTTOM CHAUCER FIELDS TO WHITSTABLE ROAD

-----

First, I should like to thank and congratulate everyone involved in this plan and its presentation to us. I particularly liked :

1) The focus on spaces between buildings and the linkages between buildings

2) The aim of creating two ‘front doors’ where visitors can arrive and get information

3) The attempt to engage with the local community and to take on board news – we hope to continue the debate

Suggestions for the Master Plan include

1) Protect the skyline. Canterbury’s World Heritage site gains so much of its beauty from views of the Cathedral set in its bowl of tree-topped hills. It is important that the worded skyline is not disrupted by intrusive building on the campus at UKC

2) Develop the road from the campus to Parkwood. This can be a scary walk, especially on dark winter evenings. Building along the road could improve this part of the campus. This might be a good site for the planned conference centre/hotel?

3) Argue for an entrance to the Canterbury West station from the north ie roper Road. this would help those travelling to and from the University and ease congestion in St. Dunstan’s street

-----

1) FULLY SUPPORT THESE PROPOSALS

2) LOVE THE IDEA OF THE GARDEN UNIVERSITY

3) THE CENTRAL HUB IS PRESENTLY MESSY AND WOULD BENEFIT FROM THE NE DESIGN IDEAS

4) WOULD RECOMMEND DETAILED CONSIDERATION GIVEN TO DISABLED ACCESS.

-----

It is still a grave concern to me that the documentation shows “Views of Historic Canterbury protected & enhanced” & yet the Southern slopes still form part of a development plan with a Conferencing Hotel which doesn’t enhance any view for residents. The University is an important part of an historic Cathedral city – it is not Canterbury in itself. Developing the campus must be sensitive to this & not encroach on residential areas or areas regarded as places to relax and walk.

The leaflet ‘Kent in Brief’ lists the University as having “the largest conference venue in the south east” already. Is it necessary to build a new conference hotel on the Southern slopes in the light of this – if it is essential then the land above the hedgeline (opposite the bus stop road) would seem to be equally available.

-----

I LIVE WITH MY WIFE AT THE BOTTOM OF THE LOWER SLOPES.

1) MY WIFE AND I HAVE DISAGREED WITH THE BUILDING ON THE LOWER SLOPES SINCE YOUR PROPOSALS BEGAN.

2) YOUR LATEST PROPOSAL IS OVER THE PARISH BOUNDARY!

3) BY BUILDING BELOW THE TREE LINE YOU ARE PREVENTING THE NATURAL GREEN GAP THAT NOW EXISTS. PS. THIS BUILDING COULD EASILY BE BUILT ABOVE THE TREE LINE BELOW THE BUS STOP. THIS WOULD OFFER THE SAME VIEW BUT THE BUILDING WOULD BE HIDDEN FROM THE HOUSING BELOW AND GIVE A MORE NATURAL ‘GREEN’ BOUNDARY BELOW THE UNIVERSITY AND ABOVE THE CITY.

-----

I’m in overall support of your proposals with the following exceptions –

1) The hotel on the Chaucer Field site – could this not be more eco-friendly & built into the hill?
2) PARKING – for disabled students/visitors who do not use wheelchairs – there needs to be more accessible parking near the colleges, theatre, concert hall, etc for those who cannot walk very far.

Also, will the Gulbenkian/Collyer Fergusson be serviced by Park & Ride in the evenings?

3) Restricted access along the Giles Lane would make life difficult for residents of this road.

-----


-----

Concerns about how much UKC will grow. Can the City sustain more growth?

A good working campus is good, but UKC should not turn away from promoting the Cathedral. It’s a world famous building.

Losing Canterbury from the title of the university was a mistake.

Good news that plans to build on the green slope has been dropped.

Interesting plans for the creation of a new identity for UKC.

-----

PLEASE BUILD MORE STUDENT ACCOMMODATION AS SOON AS POSSIBLE. WHERE WE LIVE HALE PLACES IS INUNDATED WITH STUDENTS.

TRYING TO MAKE A COMPLAINT IS ALSO DIFFICULT.

YOU GET PASSED FROM THE CITY COUNCIL TO THE UNIVERSITY TO THE LANDLORDS. THERE NEED TO BE ONE POINT OF CONTACT AND COMPLAINTS AND SUGGESTIONS NEED TO BE TAKEN SERIOUSLY.

LIKE THE IDEA OF A GARDEN CITY UNIVERSITY. PLEASE KEEP ALL THE FOOT PATHS OPEN.

I HAVE WALKED THROUGH THE AREA AND BEEN ASKED WHERE THE CRAB & WINKLE LINE GOES, IT’S BADLY SIGN POSTED AND THE APPEARS TO BE A SIGN FOR EVERYTHING & EVERYONE

DOES NO ONE KNOW WHERE ANYTHING IS THERE?

PLEASE JUST GET ON WITH IT!

-----

Wholly supportive of the principles and proposals outlined.

It would have helped to have a key to the diagram on panel 8.

I hope that there will still be access to the heart of the campus for people with disabilities and their vehicles. Campus walk is a terrific idea, I hope to be able to use it on a regular basis when in place.

How will links with Europe be affected by the exit of the UK from the EU?

The number of different nationalities of the student body needs to be emphasised.

Please ensure adequate provision is made for people with disabilities across the whole range.

-----

Crab + Winkle Way – tram far preferable to cars if it’s absolutely necessary. The best would be to leave it as a cycle + pedestrian route.

The placards are not very informative, with rather vague wording and maps with few or no place/road names, making it difficult to identify what is where, and also what is existing and what just planned/envisaged; and the pictures add little.

The 136-page volume available is much more instructive, though difficult to absorb on a short visit.

Perhaps a map of existing buildings etc could have one or more transparent overlays (over time or with alternatives) to give a better idea of how development would take place.

Improving the green spaces – “quality and variety” – is a good idea. Tress, plants, wildlife. Page 77 ideas ✅

Get away from cars as far as possible. Tram/funicular, electric railway from city centre? White bikes scheme on campus? Even electric ‘golf caddies’ (?) to transport goods (and people).

Better participation/use of university facilities by residents. Gulbenkian a big attraction, though restaurant closes too early. We seldom hear of events in the Colyer-Fergusson. Have we missed any plans for/remarks about facilities for students, like shops and cafés?

-----

Just briefly – very much welcome the principle of the master plan and the main ideas in it.

Welcome the garden campus, sustainability and pedestrian-friendly elements. Note the interesting first plan by William Holford including botanical gardens, “swimming baths” and stadium!
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Glad that the southern slopes are proposed to be kept free of buildings (aside from the hotel/conference centre, which I strongly hope will be abandoned).

Hope the good design and consultation work will be kept up!

-----

• Particularly like and welcome the possibility for a cherry blossom avenue and for additional planting throughout the site

• The potential for a wider, better lit, and more inviting pathway up to the university would be greatly welcomed

• With increased site density additional consideration must be given to ensuring that there are no dark areas/corners which could permit crime of any nature to occur

Overall I very much welcome the draft plan and wish it to succeed in the coming months and years.

-----

Unlike most Canterbury residents I would be very concerned about an increase in student numbers as we feel there are already too many, resulting in an unbalanced community.

I saw no reference to this in the exhibition and fear it is implicit for funding reasons.

-----

Dear Sirs,

Having attended your recent exhibition at Blean Village Hall, I was flabbergasted to learn what future plans the University has in developing its Campus.

How the University could even entertain these “future expansion ideas”, which would affect the lives & leisure times of local residents in Blean and Tyler Hill, is beyond belief.

Surely, maintaining our precious countryside is top priority with the University’s relationship with residents, in & outside CANTERBURY.

All the ‘Agricultural land’ and ‘Countryside’ which the University purchased should subsequently have only 3 GOALS in mind:-

i) To maintain all the local and precious countryside for ‘generations’ to enjoy

ii) Continue the ‘farming’ of the agricultural fields by either sub-contracting or indeed developing an ‘Agricultural College’.

iii) By keeping the ‘status quo’ of the local countryside. Thus producing good relations with the local public.

At present it would appear that the University wishes to “run roughshod” over the locals, by Projects of “PARK + RIDES” – AND ‘RURAL BUSINESS CLUSTERS CREATED ALONG TYLER HILL ROAD’

i.e. Business Parks with subsequent traffic, spilling onto the narrow, dangerous country road of Tyler Hill + The buildings in the guise of ‘FARM STEADS’.

- PLEASE KEEP THE ‘RURAL WORD’ AND FOREGET THE REST.

It would, therefore, be much appreciated if the University respect the local community and re-think it’s ‘future plans’.

-----

A very glossy publication, excessively worded and repetitive with computer generated diagrams, cartoon imagery and poorly edited.

Why should the University of Kent Canterbury require more students per ratio that other ‘city’ universities when it has Medway and Tonbridge and the other European sites?

Why should the UK even need to compare with the three other Canterbury universities?

What I strongly object to most and disturbingly, is the proposal to build upon ‘The Northern Land Holdings’, with what seems total disregard for the villages of Tyler Hill and Blean. These two villages are not suburbs of Canterbury or hubs of the university, but have their own individual identities of which residents are very proud.

On many pages of the publication it remarks upon the beauty of the countryside:

“Some of the best countryside in the UK” page 25.

Yet page 3 states “Rather than spreading buildings across the land holdings, development should be focused in strategic areas to create accessible, inclusive and highly efficient cores”;

And “The absolute priority should be to intensify the ‘Campus Heart’.

Or on page 31 “The continuous outward growth and sprawl of the area of the campus has led to a decreasing green periphery leaving empty pockets of space”.

How can these statements justify the proposal of 3 Park and Ride sites and 6 Business Centres on Tyler Hill Road?

Currently Tyler Hill Road struggles to cope with the daily traffic, as was evident recently when Radfall Hill was closed, but more importantly, the loss of good agricultural
land the possible further ‘ribbon development’ and intrusion into the countryside which both villages have strongly defended in the past would be devastating to them.

I trust that UKC and Farrells revise their proposal to take account of the above points.

-----

Dear Sir,

Having looked at your plans for the further development of the University of Kent in this area, I have a number of concerns with regard to the effect on the villages of Blean and Tyler Hill.

1) My major concern is the likelihood of increased traffic problems particularly along Tyler Hill Road. This is essentially a country lane. It is not designed to take lots of traffic which could include buses should your plan for a possible Park & Ride come into effect. Increased traffic here would have an impact on the Whitstable Road and St Stephen's Hill, both major routes into Canterbury which already get congested at certain times of the day.

2) Pedestrians also use Tyler Hill Road to get to a number of footpaths in the area. It can be difficult at times with the traffic at the moment. How will it be if the volume of traffic increases further?

3) The villages are in the countryside – that’s why we live here. While I appreciate that your plans, as they stand, will not take too much of that away what about the future? It would seem inevitable that given time more expansion will arise, taking more of the countryside away and the wildlife with it.

While I value the presence of the university in the area – it provides theatre/arts/concerts/cinema/lectures for the public – I feel some of these plans will rob the area of its character.

-----

To whom it may concern:

I would like to offer my support for the proposals at Kent University, would like the reference to Stour valley being called the Pilgrims Way questioned, no reference exists to the Roman approach to Canterbury along the Kentish Stour to Fordwich and the movement of materials into Canterbury from this important area.

-----

I am broadly in favour of the proposal put forward for the Masterplan and have a few ideas for feedback.

I agree in principle with the objectives of ‘pedestrian as king’ on central campus and I note that there are some plans to run a shuttle bus from the outlying carparks to central campus but I believe that there is much more that could be considered at this stage for a radical re-think of transport links for staff and students.

I do not feel that the current services provided by Stagecoach are in any way adequate to meet the needs of our campus; they are expensive, infrequent and overcrowded. I think we would be better to take complete responsibility of our own transport network; if we were able to provide a viable alternative I think more people would be prepared to leave their cars at home altogether. In addition to the service between Medway and Canterbury, and the shuttle from car parks to campus, why not also consider a direct shuttle from Canterbury West Station and the campus to dovetail with the High Speed rail service? We could also have a City Centre Direct service for quicker access to Canterbury. It would also be interesting to survey the geographical spread of staff to see whether it would be worth running buses morning and evening between campus and some satellite towns such as Whitstable, Herne Bay or Faversham.

If we controlled our own transport services we could tailor their frequency in and out of term and have timings to fit the University’s working day.

On another point, when speaking of central campus I was concerned to note that there was mention of cyclists. The modern cyclist has become increasingly aggressive and inconsiderate of other road users and I do not think it is likely to improve in the next 30-50 years. I would, therefore, recommend that cyclists are in no way allowed to mingle with pedestrians on central campus but have their own designated routes being required to dismount when using pedestrian areas. If people are constantly having to check that they are not about to step into the path of a fast moving bicycle this vastly detracts from the pleasure and freedom of a pedestrian environment.

I agree that the current homogenous planting schemes are a waste of our landscape – much of our current planting puts me in mind of a municipal roundabout. Focus appears to be maintenance rather than the creative. I would welcome a complete re-think about realising our landscape’s full potential.

Many of our buildings are reaching the end of their natural lifespan; we have various ugly buildings which could be replaced. It would be nice to see a move away from ‘brutalist’ architecture. A 1960s campus should be able to accommodate some very futuristic and abstract building...
styles rather than the ‘prison blocks’ we currently seem to favour.

Overall think the masterplan is great – keep it up!

-----

Thank you for your informative presentation on Thursday 26 May. There are some really interesting ideas in the Master Plan and there are a few areas I wanted to feedback on. Please see comments below:

The University’s identity?

The University of Kent brands itself as the UK’s European University (mentioned in the design brief because we have good rail links to Europe/London…) 

The University of Kent is a collegiate University (not referred to at all in the design brief)

It seems to me that focussing on Kent as the UK’s best ‘garden’ university is a departure from both of these identities. I have thought about the argument that many of the top flight universities have lovely, green campuses but my view is that their success and appeal is largely to do with academic excellence rather than their green spaces. However, this campus Master Plan does create the perfect opportunity to really concentrate on enhancing Kent’s collegiate identity, in particular. It seems as though we’re missing a trick by concentrating on the garden campus aspect.

Enhancing collegiate identity and college life could be achieved by:

• Moving academic teaching spaces out of colleges, as suggested, and into the additional buildings would free up some space. Consolidating space rather than sprawling outwards is a good idea.
• The freed up spaces could then be allocated for student study spaces / student social spaces. Spaces that are desperately needed (more so that improved garden areas, ...students aren't here during the summer, the best time to enjoy the outdoors). NB: issues of accessibility would need to be addressed.

• Accommodation blocks and refurbished college rooms could be painted in college colours. College signage in accommodation blocks could be improved.

• The creation of two colleges in Park Wood; Park Wood North and Park Wood South

• Zoning the campus by College affiliation (see rough map attached). For example Keynes College could be affiliated with staff in Student Services, School of Arts and Digital Arts. Park Wood (N/S) could be affiliated with Sports and the Business School.....

• Creating a zoned campus would address the feeling of fragmentation and could help navigation.

Having a zoned area, strengthened by college / school affiliation would enhance collegiate identity.

Welcome points

The West Campus Gateway square and the East Campus Gateway square

This is a good idea but needs to be further developed perhaps into ‘Welcome Hubs’, to help visitors find their way around. The University lacks a clearly signposted central reception area. When I first came to Kent for an interview, I was surprised that I could just drive onto the campus, park up and then wander around and that there was no central welcome point where I could ask for directions (I was glad that I had printed off a campus map in advance).

The University lacks safe road crossings specifically in Keynes. I find it surprising that there is not a zebra crossing from Keynes to Jarman (at least). Vehicles drive too fast here and, at this time of the year, the view of the road looking right from Keynes is obscured by tree foliage. Creating these Gateway squares will mitigate the dangers of crossing the road here.

Parking

Park and ride for students but not for staff. To be honest I think that a park and ride system would be inconvenient for staff specifically those staff members who have to travel frequently off site to meetings etc. what would be the additional cost of running this service? A large bus shelter would need to be built for bad weather too.

-----

• We should not build on Chaucer Fields. It is a hugely used asset + denuding it will have a seriously detrimental impact on the lives of students, staff + residents + on the reputation locally + nationally of the university.

• We urgently need a Student Union open to all during the days of the week and evenings as is the case at most (all?) universities. This would help ease pressure on the library

-----

Dear Sirs

University of Kent Concept Master Plan: Crab and Winkle Way and Canterbury West Station

I have seen that the University’s Concept Master Plan report includes, on page 99, a proposal to realign the Crab and Winkle Way as a shared pedestrian and cycle route between the University and the City. The report goes on to explain that this would provide “a new link to the north side of Canterbury [West] Station, as well as a new station entrance here”, to “avoid the bottleneck of the existing pedestrian tunnel under the existing rail line”.

I consider this concept to be a splendid and much-needed solution to the problem of providing sustainable access to the University from the principle railway station in Canterbury, recognising the huge amount of long-distance travel (to London and beyond) generated by the University’s students, staff and conference and academic guests.

This concept would also fulfil very neatly Canterbury City Council’s and KCC’s aspirations, in their joint Draft District Transport Strategy 2014, as follows:

• “Action D6: Canterbury West Station

Opportunities to improve access and increase parking will be considered as part of any development proposal in line with the approved Development Brief. This will include parking, passenger drop-off and taxi facilities off Roper Road.”

• “Action D7: Access to Canterbury West Station from Roper Road

We will work with Network Rail to identify options for a new access to Canterbury West Station from Roper Road, and will review the Development brief as necessary.”

However, I am writing to draw to the University’s urgent attention the fact that this concept is, almost immediately after its birth, under threat of being snuffed out for ever.

This is because there is only one possible site for the new station entrance on the northern side of the railway tracks, off Roper Road, namely the “Kent Cars of Canterbury” site adjacent to the rear of the station.
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The University is doubtless aware of Canterbury City Council’s draft Local Plan, which sets out the development that is planned to take place over the next 15 years. At present, no new building is proposed in Roper Road in the Local Plan.

However, years after the official deadline for putting forward development sites, Network Rail recently wrote to the Government Inspector who is examining the Local Plan for the development of 8 – 15 houses or flats.

You will find attached a copy of Network Rail’s letter and plan, which have been passed to the Local Plan Inspector, and the deadline for receipt of any objections is Friday, 1st July 2016 at noon.

Please write, giving your reasons, to:
Mr. M. Moore, Inspector
c/o Local Plan Programme Officer
Canterbury City Council
Military Road
Canterbury, CT1 1YW

or by email: programme.officer@canterbury.gov.uk

Network Rail’s plans will then be discussed with the Inspector at a public hearing on Tuesday 19th July, commencing at 2pm at the Franciscan International Study Centre, Giles Lane, Canterbury, CT2 7NA.

In order to speak at this hearing, the University will need to specifically request this in its letter, otherwise it will only be able to observe.

Further details about the hearing are available at:
Appendix 5b – Comments from individuals

Canterbury East CA482 / PA0/09

I can confirm that Network Rail does not want the Canterbury East (CA482 / PA0/09) site to be removed from Canterbury Council’s Local Plan Site Allocations. Network Rail requests that the site continues to be allocated for residential development.

In addition Network Rail would like the council to consider an alteration to the existing site allocation boundary. Please see below and attached a map detailing the proposed site boundary;

The proposed boundary includes the East Station Snooker Club buildings and other land under Network Rail’s ownership.

The proposed site is approximately 7,853 sqm – 0.76 hectares in size.

This increase in the size of the site would help to maximise the site’s potential and enable the site to accommodate more units.

Herne Bay CA491 / PA0/12

I can confirm that Network Rail does not want the Herne Bay (CA491 / PA0/12) site to be removed from Canterbury Council’s Local Plan Site Allocations. Network Rail requests that the site continues to be allocated for residential development.

Roper Road (Canterbury West)

Network Rail would like to put forward its Roper Road (Canterbury West) site for consideration in relation to Canterbury Council’s Local Plan Site Allocations.

Please see below and attached a map detailing the proposed site boundary.

The majority of the site is currently occupied by car dealership Kent Cars of Canterbury Ltd operating within the Sui Generis use class.

The proposed site is approximately 1,632 sqm ~ 0.16 hectares in size. It is considered that the site could accommodate between 8-15 units.

The site is situated in a highly accessible location in close proximity to Canterbury West Railway Station.

Please see below photographs / images of the site;
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Conclusion

Network Rail requests that its Canterbury East (CA482 / PA/003) and Herne Bay (CA491 / PA/012) sites are not removed from the council’s Local Plan Site Allocation and that they continue to be allocated for residential development.

Furthermore, Network Rail would be grateful if the council could consider the proposed boundary alterations in relation to the Canterbury East (CA482 / PA/003) and the proposed allocation of Network Rail’s Roper Road (Canterbury West) site.

The allocation of these sites for residential development would help contribute to Canterbury Council’s housing targets and accord with the current government push to maximise the delivery of new homes.

If you require any further information or have any queries please do not hesitate to contact me on 020 7904 7247.

Yours sincerely

Elliot Stimpson
Town Planner
Five images supplied by respondent.

MASTER PLAN. NORTHERN LAND HOLDINGS. THE CASE AGAINST

This document has been produced by us as a family in response to the Master Plan proposed by the University of Kent.

We would like to query the assumption that the University’s expansion should be at the expense of Blean’s rural landscape. Is the creation of a series of large ‘business clusters’ or a vastly expanded University even necessary in a future of instant worldwide communication? Blean is an unlikely silicon valley and Discovery Park in Sandwich seems to fill most of the requirements of a high tech hub for associated research in Kent.

While planning for the next fifty years these proposals are unduly blinkered by an attempt to solve the University’s immediate transport and space problems. Unable to develop south towards Canterbury has Blean been considered a soft target for this eventual enormous expansion of car parks, roads, business parks and house building.

We have restricted our response to the area that concerns us most directly. We leave it to others to discuss the sustainability, viability, necessity and impact of this vast scale of development in Blean and Tyler Hill.

We entirely understand the motivation behind the creation of such an imaginative and far reaching document we would however refute the suggestions that have been made at it’s unveiling that it is only a series of ideas, ‘for the future’.

Unfortunately we cannot disregard the impact such a document has already had on Blean, and on the house and land that we still consider ‘home’. The first phase - the University’s ‘EARLY WIN’ - involves intensive development around the church and the village, incorporating car parks, new roads, large business areas, probably extensive housing and all serviced via the narrow and winding ‘Tyler Hill Road. The implication in the Master Plan document is that this will also be an ‘EASY WIN’.

The following pages are an attempt to understand the impact of these proposals and to put our case for a rebuttal of the Master Plan. The illustrations attempt to strip away the disguise from the large body of words and pretty images in the Master Plan. Our contention is that the Master Plan may be using the developers classic play of proposing a ‘worst scenario’ in order to confuse and divide the residents of Blean. Possibly in the hope that a reduced and more reasoned application will be met with a resigned sense of achievement.

If the first phase of the Master Plan the ‘EARLY WIN’ is at the core of the growth of the University then it would be much more honest and productive to make that clear. Disguising an ambition to build housing, car parks and roads in a cloud of pretty images, parkland settings and beguiling words is not a sophisticated or positive way forward.

We know the land surrounding ‘The Northern Landholdings’ extremely well - we grew up in Blean and still own considerable land in the village. It is very unfortunate that large buildings, many as large as 50 metres long, new access roads and potential housing have all been designated in areas that are extremely close to neighbouring landholdings. These areas of land and gardens would enable direct access to otherwise ‘landlocked’ University owned land. We do very much hope this isn’t yet another developers trick to intimidate, and is in fact only artists licence, and an unfortunate coincidence.
As a family we grew up in Blean in the Mill House, and we own Mill Field, Grovers Field and Grovers Mill. We manage an additional field (brown on the map). The three fields are used by the David Graham Centre for sheep grazing and educational farm work.

The land we own shares two long boundaries with the University’s proposed Master Plan. Extraordinarily large buildings in the suggested Blean Church site are within metres of Mill House and Grovers Mill. The majority of the buildings indicated throughout the development are around 50 metres in length. The University’s ambitions to become a parkland university are laudable, though unfortunate for Blean, as it appears that the village and it’s rural environment are to be sacrificed for this grand master plan.

We have been asked on various occasions to provide land for low cost housing on Mill Field. With the Rural Housing Development Officer and Canterbury planners support we had positive interest and enthusiasm from Local Housing Associations and self build organisations in an attempt to facilitate a low density development.

These all came to an inconclusive end amid considerable local objections from Blean residents. We didn’t progress further than these discussions.

The Master Plan proposes a fundamental change in the character and environment of Blean. We fully understand that it is a draft and imaginative discussion document and suggests a possible 50 year future. However the University seems to have totally failed to recognise the enormous and now permanent blight that these proposals have had on Blean.

It seems remarkable that Blean residents were not involved earlier in a more open and free ranging discussion. The charming drawing at the core of the proposal document does little to disguise the damage incurred, Blean is now blighted. The document has to be taken at face value, a parkland and car free future for the University is to be at the expense of massive and ill considered development in Blean. Presumptions have been made about access, ownership, ‘sustainability’, rights of way, conservation areas and the more general impact upon the historic, rural village landscape.

We would suggest that the shock of the scale of these proposals coupled with the rather self satisfied assumption that it is all to Blean’s advantage is a very short sighted and potentially insulting approach.
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MASTER PLAN. NORTHERN LAND HOLDINGS. BLEAN & TYLER HILL

BUSINESS CLUSTER. PARK AND RIDE
Blean Village site, proposed for housing and park and ride as part of the ‘EARLY WIN’. There is no existing access to Tyler Hill road.

NEW ROAD ACCESS
Access road for new park and ride and the proposed housing development. Using entrance via existing cycle path.

BUSINESS CLUSTER. PARK AND RIDE
Sites designated as future business clusters and park and ride with new linking access roads to the University. Funded in part by development of the ‘EARLY WIN’.

REROUTED NATIONAL CYCLE PATH
The cycle path re-routed via the old railway line. The University land holdings do not include crucial parts of this proposed new route.

NEW ROADS SERVING BUSINESS CLUSTERS & PARK AND RIDE
No area has been specifically designated for ‘Park and Ride’. The parking within the business clusters is minimal. New roads have been proposed for access to the business clusters and the shuttle service for the park and ride.

NEW BUILDINGS (Approximate length 50 Metres)

NEW ROADS

IMAGE SUPPLIED BY RESPONDENT
The business cluster, cricket pitch, or potentially housing, proposed for the Blean Church site are within Blean Conservation Area. The two business clusters, or housing, proposed for the Blean Village site are in close proximity to the Conservation Area. The new access roads skirt the Conservation Area and narrow, winding Tyler Hill road becomes a major feeder road for the new developments.

The Northern Land Holdings to the west of Blean, the Blean Village and the Blean Church site have very limited access to Tyler Hill road. Proposed developments at these two sites, and that at Tyler Hill Halt are on the boundary of University land. Buildings and roads are proposed that are in very close, almost threatening proximity to existing dwellings.

The blue areas on the map are not part of the University land holdings. They block direct access from Tyler Hill road to the two sites designated as part of the ‘EARLY WIN’ phase. They are also in close proximity or bounded by the most intrusive proposed developments.

It is the contention that the existing cycle path is not ‘sustainable’ and needs to be moved - to make way for new access roads and links for the park and rides. The alternative route suggested is not within the University’s land holdings.
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**MASTER PLAN. NORTHERN LAND HOLDINGS. EARLY WIN**

It becomes apparent in a close reading of the Master Plan that development in Blean is considered necessary for the further growth of the University. Among the rhetoric of parkland and country house estates there is a rather elegant solution to the University’s major problem - expansion and traffic.

The proposed growth on the University site will be predominately within the present parking areas. Creating an as yet undefined amount of parking at Blean and connecting it by a series of new roads clears the way for on site expansion.

The creation of business clusters, and cricket pitches, is also, and forgive our cynicism, possibly disguising a lucrative ambition. There are proposals within the Master Plan document for housing on the land next to the church and the village as part of a first phase ‘EARLY WIN’.

This early win for the University means in essence Blean becomes a dumping ground for Park and Ride, two, possibly three new roads, vastly increased traffic and a very large number of proposed large buildings in six business clusters or extensive areas of housing.

If as is suggested the Northern Land Holdings developments become an early phase of the Master Plan then Blean becomes an EARLY WIN for the University, but a disaster for the village.

---

**Text and pages from Kent University Master Plan. www.kent.ac.uk/masterplan**

THE FIRST PHASE OF THE NORTHERN HUB. MASTER PLAN PAGE 122

Farrells Vision for the Northern Hub assumes that this land could contribute both to the evolution of the University as well as assist in the growth of wider Canterbury. A second opportunity for early implementation of the Vision exists within the University’s land ownership in the Northern Hub, where it might be possible to create another first step toward the implementation of the concept for this part University.

THE NORTHERN HUB: BLEAN VILLAGE. MASTER PLAN PAGE 122

The parcel of University land in the north west part of the campus adjacent to Blean Village could become a first phase of the Northern Hub. Because of the proximity of this parcel of land to Blean Village, the use of this land may be more appropriate for the provision of housing than University facilities. This would be a good fit with the City’s need to provide more housing and the aspiration to grow the village.

This land could provide the opportunity for a high quality residential development that would take advantage of the desirability of Blean Village as a place to live and the higher land values that this area generates. A development in this area might become a combination of high-end, high-value houses, family homes and affordable housing.

Development of this land adjacent to Blean Village could generate income to fund a second phase of the Northern Hub adjacent to Blean Church.

THE NORTHERN HUB: BLEAN CREEK. MASTER PLAN PAGE 122

In this area, our concept masterplan assumes the development of a Cricket Green and Pavilion immediately to the west of Blean Church, which could be a University facility shared with the residents of Blean Village. If this idea is acceptable to the City and to the Village, we might also be able to create another phase of housing between the new Cricket Green and Tyler Hill Road. The introduction of further housing into this part of the masterplan might also provide funding for a pilot scheme for the first of the proposed University ‘innovation clusters’ to the south of the cricket green.

PARK AND RIDE. MASTER PLAN PAGE 97

Such links could form part of a new ‘Park and Ride’ scheme, utilising land in the ownership of the University on both sides of Tyler Hill Road for open car parks. Such a scheme would not only release space for development or for new squares and gardens, but it would also enable a more eco-friendly pedestrian dominant environment in the Heart of the Campus.
Dear Sirs/Madams,

UNIVERSITY OF KENT MASTER PLAN

I was grateful for the briefing I and the ***** ***** ***** 19 Hospital received from Peter Czarnomski, your Estates Director, on 8 July, being the owners of the neighbouring land to the North of the University. My comments are as follows:

HISTORY

You should understand that the Oakwell Estate, since about 1836, largely owned the land on either side of the Canterbury to Whitstable railway line from the Blean/Tyler Hill road to 40 Acres Road at St Stephens. The land from the University campus’s Northern boundary to St Stephens was largely compulsorily purchased for the University and the Archbishop’s School in the 1960s. About 70 acres remain from the original estate, which are now tenanted by two of the University’s tenant farmers. Until recently the fields between the University campus’s Northern boundary and the Sarre Penn stream was accessed by the Oakwell tenant farmer from the realigned Giles Lane at the top of the railway tunnels’ Northern Portal. To prevent university and farm traffic mingling on Giles Lane a right of access was agreed between Oakwell Estate and the University from the Hothe Court Farm buildings on the Blean/Tyler Hill road to these fields, and also across the old railway line at the top of the tunnel’s Northern portal and at the crossing to the rear of Oakwell in the Blean House. The University does not own the fields between the Sarre Penn stream and the campus’s Northern boundary, as shown on the attached plan, although an agreement exists to offer the fields, West of the old railway line, to the University first if they were ever sold. There is no prospect of this happening in the near future and you should deleted from your plans any building, roads or paths which are shown on these fields on your draft plans. The Hothe Court farm buildings on the Tyler Hill/Blean road are fundamental to the proper farming of much of the University’s, St John’s Hospital’s and Oakwell Estate farmland, as we share tenant farmers The old railway line has been largely undisturbed since about 1953 when the line was closed.

PROPOSALS FOR THE CAMPUS

How you reorganise the buildings and roads on your campus has little impact on your Northern neighbours, except that:

a) We would wish all buildings be planned to be no higher than tree top height and bearing in mind that most of the trees are deciduous and give no visual protection in winter. We would like the present protruding chimney of the Boiler House and the ventilation unit on the top of the Ingram building to be removed.

b) We have considerable concern about your traffic planning and car parks on the “periphery” of the reorganised campus. The proposals do not show where any future car parks might be. Presumably you do not envisage forcing all those working at the University to use some sort of park and ride system to get to the campus from car parks even further away. If so where would the car parks be?

THE NORTHERN HOLDINGS

We have considerable concerns about you plans for your Northern Holdings:

a) As stated previously the Hothe Court farm buildings are essential for the proper farming of the University farmland and the land jointly tenanted with the Oakwell Estate and St John’s Hospital. A right of way for Oakwell farm traffic exists through these buildings.

b) The Blean/Tyler Hill road is at present used at a “rat run”, is heavily used for a small road, had two very dangerous bends and we cannot envisage any additional road traffic on it, generated by your Northern holdings.

c) I understand that access from the Campus to and from the Northern Holdings might be achieved using the old railway line, the Salt Road, running past Blean Church, and possibly a new road between the two of them.

1) The old railway line has remained largely undisturbed since about 1953, when the line was dismantled. It is now the most amazing wild life corridor. A Permissive Footpath follows the line of part of the railway to allow walkers to follow the route more easily. Access to it from the Northern portal will be very difficult for anything other than pedestrians and cyclists. The Northern section of the line between the University and the Blean/Tyler Hill road runs through a cutting which is often flooded in winter. The access for pedestrians or cyclists from the end of the line onto the Blean/Tyler Hill road will be extremely dangerous as it is on a bend lined by hedges. Farm machinery will be crossing the track at the Northern portal and the Oakwell House crossing. Two public footpaths also cross the old...
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railway line, in the area of the culvert by the Sarre Penn stream and between the Oakwell House crossing and the Blean/Tyler Hill road.

2 The Salt Road is a SUSTRANS cycle track, a bridleway and is necessary for the proper farming of University’s farmland.

3 A new road running from the University to its Northern Holdings may be the only sensible solution, but may make the farming of the University farmland questionable.

d May people have wondered what the University's motives were to acquire large areas of farmland. Rather than building satellite sites on the farmland, the use of which are not yet declared, why not make better the use of the farmland, possibly incorporating the Oakwell Estate and St John's Hospital land into an “Agricultural Faculty”?

e The reorganisation of the University and its traffic may cause the development of a case for a Northern Canterbury bypass. We would wish to be the first to be consulted about this.