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**EXECUTIVE SUMMARY**

Canterbury City Council’s emerging Local Plan requires a masterplan for the Canterbury campus; the University of Kent is therefore working collaboratively with the Council and others to develop a masterplan that articulates a long-term vision for the future of the campus and provides a framework for future development.

The University published a Concept Masterplan in July 2015 as a first step to help engage with stakeholders and local people over the future of the campus. This is part of a stepped approach to developing a more detailed masterplan that will provide a framework for the evolution of the campus over the coming decades.

The University is committed to undertaking an effective public consultation process in line with the principles of good practice and, as part of that process, the University will take into account comments received on the scheme at every stage. This statement provides an account of the first stage of public consultation undertaken, including who was involved, how they were involved and what comments were made. It also focuses on the Concept Masterplan and is the first of several that will record and track the progress of feedback and comments following consultation at various stages of the masterplan process.

The Concept Masterplan was the subject of an extensive consultation programme between April and September 2016. This included publication of the Concept Masterplan on the University’s website, an on-line feedback form, a press release, email notification, a leaflet drop, four exhibitions, six presentations and six meetings. We continued to accept feedback after the published consultation deadline until the end of 2016.

The Concept Masterplan and the University’s efforts to engage with people were generally welcomed. However, as should be expected at this stage of the process, a large number of comments were received on a wide range of issues. In total the University received 280 responses from individuals and organisations which contained 558 comments on different areas of the plan or University in general. This Statement sets out a record of all comments in full (in its appendices) and provides a detailed summary of the key messages under a number of categories (Section 6). It also draws out key messages about the consultation process.

The University and its consultants will carefully consider all comments during the next step of developing the proposals from concept into a more detailed masterplan.

The comments are expected to help inform the following:

- A review of the vision for the campus and the organising principles
- The scope and format of a more detailed masterplan, the issues to be addressed and the way in which ideas are presented and explained; and
- The need for and scope of studies and strategies into particular issues (eg, transport) to ensure that the masterplan is informed and supported by a proportionate evidence base.

During the coming stages of developing more detailed masterplan proposals, the University and its consultants will take heed of the comments made during the public consultation process when identifying and developing masterplan proposals for the campus, and be ready to explain how these comments have informed their thinking during the design process that follows.

The University is also keen to learn lessons for future engagement and consultation so that it can communicate more effectively with its neighbours, service providers, interested groups, organisations and decision makers. This Statement identifies a number of ways in which the University can do better next time and this will help shape its future consultation strategy.
1 INTRODUCTION

The University of Kent recently celebrated its 50th anniversary and, to mark this important landmark in its development, it is undertaking a re-appraisal of its estate.

The original 1965 Holford Masterplan took advantage of this unique hilltop location overlooking the historic City of Canterbury, by distributing the new college buildings along the ridgeline within a generous parkland setting. This allows the dramatic views, as well as the green landscape, to infiltrate right into the heart of the campus.

Students and teaching staff alike are drawn by the character of the existing campus. However, in recent years the University has been a victim of its own success; in the process of a rapid expansion during the last two decades, the coherence of the original concept has been diluted by a tendency to build beyond the original boundary of the heart of the campus.

The University of Kent currently enjoys a strong position in the academic marketplace, but also recognises that it must plan intelligently for future growth to maintain that edge. Enhancing the ‘sense of place’ will play a major part in attracting new students and staff to the campus, as well as differentiating the University of Kent from competing universities.

In 2015, the University commissioned Farrells to undertake a Concept Master Plan study to explore and articulate a vision for the next 50 years. Informed by the University’s Institutional Strategic Plan and Estate Strategy and existing and emerging planning policy, this study concluded that the absolute priority should be to intensify the heart of the campus with the objective of unlocking development and place-making capacity to enable the creation of the ‘Best Garden Campus in the UK’.

The Concept Masterplan describes a ‘Vision’ for the development of the campus as a proposition for debate with local stakeholders and all those concerned with the future of the University. The Concept Masterplan also sets out certain important organising principles to help inform the development of a more detailed masterplan, as a first step in response to the call for a masterplan by Canterbury City Council in its emerging Local Plan.

The Concept Masterplan advocates a wider diversity of landscaped spaces to broaden the opportunity for interaction within the University community. The places and spaces between the buildings will be the public ‘living rooms’ where all members of the University community can gather to exchange ideas, where formal events take place and informal encounters are made possible. In conclusion, the whole campus will be the most powerful expression of the academic, cultural and civic life of the University, an enduring expression of the University’s aspirations and achievements.

The objectives of the Concept Masterplan are as follows:

1. A plan for future growth and development for both academic and research buildings and student housing
2. Improved potential and value of the University land holdings
3. Make ‘Placemaking’ a top priority and a great place to be
4. Flexibility to accommodate an evolving mixed-use, knowledge-based economy
5. Reinforcement of the University’s reputation for excellence in all aspects of sustainability
6. A coherent and unique brand for the university, recognising its reputation as the UK’s European university
7. An environment for social interaction
8. A stimulating, safe and supportive environment – home to a vibrant academic community
9. Strengthen the symbiotic relationship with the City
10. Create a remarkable public realm

To help establish the context for considering comments set out in subsequent sections of this Statement, Table 1 below summarises the key physical changes that the Concept Masterplan proposes.
Table 1: Physical propositions from the Concept Masterplan

1 Propositions applying to whole campus:

- Create the ‘Best Garden Campus in the UK’ – a vision for the future of the estate, taking a long-term view to 2050
- A reappraisal of the Holford masterplan created in the 1960’s
- Create an efficient and clear mental map
- A coherent pattern of development to allow for future capacity needs and to enrich the campus
- A careful balance between built space and open space
- New buildings should be of great architectural quality
- Create a diversity of green landscapes of value and character
- Create a variety of characterful places and spaces and high quality external environments as gathering spaces, productive landscapes, spaces for public art, planting that changes throughout the academic year and seasons
- Reveal the historic narrative of the campus, linking together its past, present and future
- Strengthen and enhance the public links between the campus and the city
- Views to and from historic Canterbury should protected and new ones created
- Take advantage of the existing transport infrastructure
- Former Hothe Court farmhouse to be re-used, Giles Lane to be adopted, Beverly Farmhouse to be re-used and the Innovation Centre to be expanded

2 Propositions applying to the campus heart:

- Intensify and consolidate the Heart of the Campus to prevent future sprawl
- Development should be focused in strategic areas to create an accessible, inclusive and a highly efficient core
- ‘Places and spaces’ between buildings should be public living rooms for formal events and informal encounters
- ‘Tame’ the existing roads
- Create strong, well-defined pedestrian and cycle routes – a new grid of paths supporting unprecedented accessibility

CONTINUED OVERLEAF
Table 1: Physical propositions from the Concept Masterplan (cont)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Propositions applying to the campus heart:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>• Relocate parking to the periphery of the campus heart to create more room in the centre for building or spaces and places</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Develop a coherent pattern of streets, spaces and a variety of new spaces with a clear hierarchy defining vehicular and pedestrian routes, front doors and landmark features</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Better defined spaces between buildings to create an attractive and coherent ‘sense of place’</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Create a wide variety of spaces to broaden the opportunity for interaction between the University community</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Introduce a mix of new uses in the Heart of the Campus, including new academic and student residential buildings, to create activity and vibrancy throughout the public realm</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Create 2 new primary routes: A main east-west route along the ridgeline &amp; a main north-south route along the ‘Crab and Winkle Way’</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Create a Campus Walk or University ‘high street’ across the campus as a busy, lively pedestrian-dominant route</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• The Campus Walk should be lined with shops, cafes, cultural and leisure buildings, student services and a variety of other active frontages and building entrances</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Library Walk should be considered as a priority location for University ‘Centres of Excellence’ and which reinforce and support the library as a centre of learning and social interaction</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Develop two ‘Gateway Squares’ along the primary east-west route, to serve as new landmark arrival spaces</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- To help orientate within the campus</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- To form a backdrop for new landmark buildings</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- As a location for shops, cafes and other related uses and services</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• A new hard-landscaped square to the west of the campus will act as an occasional marketplace and gathering place for pop-up shops and cafes, and the place where seasons and festivals are celebrated</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• A new entrance space to the east might be a predominantly ‘soft’ landscape, a much greener and quieter space for outdoor eating and drinking</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Facilities located around the Gateway Squares or along the Campus Walk will have their front door facing these spaces</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• The open space to the south of the University library should become a space where large public events and gatherings take place, and where students and staff can continue to take advantage of the incredible views over historic Canterbury</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Extend the campus to the east of St Stephens Hill</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Develop strong links to the surrounding green open space</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### Table 1: Physical propositions from the Concept Masterplan (cont)

#### 3 Propositions applying to the parklands:

- Parklands should be preserved and enhanced as a complementary landscape asset around a more coherent and intensified campus core
- Parklands should be enhanced with new landscape components such as gazebos, mazes, observatories and an open air theatre
- It should have a significantly lower density of buildings than in the campus heart and a greater focus on open green landscape
- A location for the continued development of new academic buildings designed as landscape buildings or pavilions in the park that enhance the landscape rather than detract from it
- The design and setting should enhance the landscape character and personality of the parklands
- Development within the parklands should be considered, providing they are modest, pavilion-like features that enhance the landscape
- Hotel and conferencing facilities should be outside the heart of the campus, in order to take advantage of an association with the University whilst maintaining independence to cater for the non-University market
- There should be a new sustainable transport route connecting the city with the campus – perhaps utilising the ‘Crab & Winkle Way’
- Also, a new entrance should be opened on the north side of Canterbury West Station

#### 4 Propositions applying to the northern land holdings:

- The green open space is a considerable landscape asset, providing a green setting to the north of the University
- This landscape setting should be retained as a distinct northern edge to the heart of the main University campus
- It should be connected to the heart of the campus by a new cross-campus route or routes, that could be created to link to Giles Lane and the new Campus Walk
- An opportunity to create valuable high value business growth in this part of Canterbury
- A commercial hub or a research and innovation campus which is linked to the University as a satellite development
- An opportunity to create rural business clusters along Tyler Hill Road as a 'disaggregated' satellite development between Blean and Tyler Hill
- A more independent part of the campus for a linked commercial hub/research and innovation campus, but which would not join the two existing settlements
- A complex of start-up business & incubator spaces in the northern part of the campus, where access to the University research community is strong but where road access is not in conflict with the University
1 INTRODUCTION (CONT)

Table 1: Physical propositions from the Concept Masterplan (cont)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>4 Propositions applying to the northern land holdings: (cont)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>• Satellite development would be connected to the heart of the campus by means of a shuttle bus service and other sustainable means of transport such as pedestrian routes, cycleways etc.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Development of a cricket green and pavilion immediately to the west of Blean Church, surrounded by new business space, which could be a University facility shared with the residents of Blean Village</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Create another phase of housing between the new Cricket Green and Tyler Hill Road</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• A ‘Park and Ride’ scheme to connect the northern land holdings to the heart of the campus by means of a shuttle bus service</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• A benefit to local communities in terms of jobs and start up locations and improved transport links</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• The business clusters to have discreet parking in modest quantities</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Existing ‘Crab &amp; Winkle Way’ pedestrian/cycle route widened for vehicles</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The University consulted widely on the Concept Masterplan between April and September 2016. This Consultation Statement has therefore been prepared as a summary record of that Consultation Process, and includes the following:

• The role of the Concept Masterplan as the first stage in the process of preparing a more detailed masterplan
• Consultees and methods of consultation
• Comments received
• Key messages
• Lessons for future consultation
• Conclusions and Next Steps

This Consultation Statement is part of the University’s commitment to engage with a wide range of stakeholders, to listen carefully to what they say, to take account of comments in developing a more detailed masterplan and to provide feedback to people on how their comments are influencing the University’s thinking.
Canterbury City Council is at an advanced stage of preparing a new Local Plan and is currently awaiting a report from the Planning Inspector who examined the Canterbury District Local Plan Publication Draft (June 2014). Policy EMP7 (University of Kent) in the emerging Plan makes clear that Canterbury City Council expects a masterplan to be prepared for the whole of the identified Canterbury campus site, before any further significant development takes place.

The University strongly supports Policy EMP7 and the requirement for a masterplan. The Concept Masterplan proposes a set of ‘urban design principles’, as well as some physical propositions and organising principles. These are intended, in due course, to form the basis of a more detailed masterplan that will satisfy the requirements of Policy EMP7 and establish more detailed guidance on how the campus is to be developed in the future.

The University intends to prepare a more detailed masterplan in collaboration with Canterbury City Council, local residents and businesses and other stakeholders. The objective is to ensure that a more detailed masterplan is informed by local knowledge and opinion so that Council as the Local Planning Authority can afford significant weight to it when determining future planning applications and both the University and local people can have a greater degree of certainty of outcome.

The Concept Masterplan represents the first stage in an incremental approach to developing a more detailed masterplan, and the first step in this process will be to define a ‘Strategic Vision’ for the campus. This next step will, in part, be informed by the public consultation process already undertaken on the propositions and organising principles that the Concept Masterplan describes.

A summary of the future steps in the process and opportunities for further consultation and engagement are set out in Section 9 – ‘Conclusions and next steps: A Framework Masterplan’.
3 CONSULTATION PRINCIPLES

The University has reviewed Canterbury City Council’s Statement of Community Involvement (SCI) dated 2007 that sets out commitments on how the City Council will engage with stakeholders over the preparation of Local Development Documents. This has helped the University to identify a number of key principles that have informed the consultation events that were undertaken about the Concept Masterplan and that will inform future rounds of consultation and engagement. The key principles are as follows:

- Be clear and transparent about the process and programme;
- Seek to engage a wide range groups and individuals, including those that have commented on emerging Local Plan Policies EMP7 (University of Kent) and previously proposed Policy OS6 (Green Gaps);
- Employ a wide variety of methods to engage all concerned;
- Make greater efforts to engage with key relevant ‘hard to reach’ groups;
- Acknowledge receipt of comments and feedback; and
- Prepare a Consultation Statement at each stage to record comments and feedback received, and explain how they have influenced the masterplan proposals.
4 CONCEPT MASTERPLAN: CONSULTEES & METHODS OF CONSULTATION

Taking account of the key principles identified above, the University consulted widely on the Concept Masterplan between April and September 2016. Appendix 1 sets out a list of consultees that were actively engaged. Set out below is a detailed account of the consultation that was undertaken.

Publishing the Concept Masterplan
The Concept Masterplan was published on a set of web pages that were made available on the University’s website (www.kent.ac.uk/masterplan) from 25 May 2016. Throughout the consultation exercise, a PDF of the complete Concept Masterplan document was available to download, which included summary pages examining the Plan, the consultation process and dates for intended submission to Canterbury City Council. By the end of 21 September 2016 (the published consultation deadline), the pages had received over 13,863 views from 3,678 visitors.

A printed copy of the Concept Masterplan was made available in the University’s Templeman Library from 22 June 2016. The Plan was also made available to the public in Canterbury’s Beaney House of Art and Knowledge from 3 August 2016. In addition, a number of printed copies were posted out to those who requested one and given out at events. Many of these were used by parish councils and local residents to help share the plan with neighbours who were less comfortable with online access or did not have it.

Initial Promotion
An email was sent to all University employees on 19 May 2016, introducing the Plan and advertising a presentation and exhibition for staff. At the same time, an online article with similar information was published on our University staff news web pages (www.kent.ac.uk/campusonline) and highlighted in our weekly email staff news round-up (Kent Staff Online) w/c 23 May 2016.

For external audiences, an initial press release was issued to local media (including the Kentish Gazette, Kent on Sunday, Canterbury Times, Medway Messenger and Kentish Express) on 26 May 2016. Resulting media coverage included a two-page feature in the Kentish Gazette (circulation 11,993) on 2 June 2016.

At the same time, a story was also published on our online News Centre (www.kent.ac.uk/news/kentlife/9990/university-concept-master-plan-under-public-consultation) and highlighted on our University website home page (www.kent.ac.uk) throughout the consultation exercise.

In addition, the June 2016 edition of the alumni e-newsletter featured the Concept Masterplan and was sent to former students at 60,637 addresses worldwide.

Presentation and exhibition materials
A series of information panels (16 in total) were produced, outlining the beginnings of the University campus at Canterbury 50 years ago and development since then, recommended design principles looking forward, and illustrations of how the concepts might translate into a new overall campus layout. The panels were used at both formal and informal presentations, meetings and exhibitions (see below).

Printed materials made available at the presentations, meetings and exhibitions, included A5 four-page leaflets, summarising content in the display boards, with a feedback form on the back page. In addition, a four-page Kent in Brief leaflet highlighted key facts and figures about the University.

NB: Copies of the presentation and exhibition materials mentioned in this section are available in Appendix 3.

Formal presentations
A number of formal presentations were made to key stakeholders from 25 May to 7 September 2016.

The presentations included an introduction/Q&A session with the Lead Master Planner (John Letherland) and/or senior University staff (including Deputy Vice-Chancellor Denise Everitt and Director of Estates Peter Czarnomski). Exhibition display boards and full copies of the Concept Masterplan document were on view at all of the presentations.

Table 2 below provides full details of the invited groups, date, location and numbers attending the presentations.
4 CONCEPT MASTERPLAN: CONSULTEES & METHODS OF CONSULTATION (CONT)

Table 2: Details of presentations

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Invitees</th>
<th>Date</th>
<th>Location</th>
<th>No of attendees</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>All Canterbury City Councillors and selected Officers</td>
<td>25 May 2016</td>
<td>Kent Business School, Canterbury campus</td>
<td>16</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Residents’ Association committee members (south of the campus)</td>
<td>26 May 2016</td>
<td>Colyer-Fergusson Building, Canterbury campus</td>
<td>14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• St Michaels’s            • Whitstable Road</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• St Stephen’s            • Harkness Drive</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>All University of Kent current staff (3,500)</td>
<td>26 May 5 July 2016</td>
<td>Gulbenkian Theatre, Canterbury campus</td>
<td>120</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Grimond Building, Canterbury campus</td>
<td>50</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>University of Kent former Staff Association</td>
<td>6 July 2016</td>
<td>Grimond Lecture Theatre</td>
<td>15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Local Conservation and Heritage groups</td>
<td>6 July 2016</td>
<td>Kent Business School</td>
<td>19</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Canterbury Archaeological Trust</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Canterbury Heritage and Design Forum</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Canterbury Society</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Crab and Wrinkle Line Trust</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Local Business Community</td>
<td>28 July 2016</td>
<td>The Abode Hotel, Canterbury</td>
<td>21</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Business Improvement District members</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Kent Invicta Chamber of Commerce (Canterbury chapter)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Representatives of Institute of Directors</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Representatives of Federation of Small Businesses</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Parish Council members (north of campus)</td>
<td>7 September 2016</td>
<td>Kent Business School</td>
<td>15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Blean Forest</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Hackington</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Harbledown and Rough Common</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Exhibitions

University of Kent staff, members of the Local Business Community and the general public were also given a number of opportunities to visit an exhibition summarising key features in the Concept Masterplan. The details of these exhibitions are set out in Table 3 below:

To publicise the public exhibitions in advance, a press release detailing dates, times and venues was issued to our main regional media outlets on 26 July 2016. Two half-page full colour advertisements were also placed with the Kentish Gazette (circulation 11,993) on 21 July 2016 and Kent on Sunday (circulation 155,101) on 30 July 2016. An email was circulated to all members of the ‘My Canterbury’ mailing list (over 7,000 recipients), which was seen by 4,920 of the subscribers.

In addition, leaflets outlining the consultation process and exhibition details, were printed and arranged to be delivered by a third-party leafleting company in advance to properties in the postcodes CT2 7, CT2 8 and CT2 9 – approximately 9,500 homes and businesses covering north Canterbury, Blean and Tyler Hill. Feedback received near the end of the consultation period has indicated that unfortunately not all intended recipients did receive a leaflet – see section 8 ‘Lessons for Future Engagement and Consultation’.

Whilst we were too late in the process to repeat the leafleting and exhibitions, we did supply additional materials to the Tyler’s Klin in Tyler Hill at the request of members of the Parish Council and continued to accept feedback after the published deadline until the end of 2016.

Table 3: Details of exhibition

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Audience</th>
<th>Date</th>
<th>Location</th>
<th>No of attendees</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>University of Kent current staff</td>
<td>26/27 May 2016</td>
<td>Colyer-Fergusson Building</td>
<td>50</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(6 July with Former Staff Association)</td>
<td>5-6 July 2016</td>
<td>Grimond Foyer</td>
<td>60</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Local business community</td>
<td>28 July 2016</td>
<td>The Abode Hotel, Canterbury (with presentation)</td>
<td>21</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>General public</td>
<td>2-3 August, 12/19 August 2016</td>
<td>The Abode Hotel, Canterbury Blean Village Hall</td>
<td>79 105</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
4 CONCEPT MASTERPLAN: CONSULTEES & METHODS OF CONSULTATION (CONT)

Additional meetings
A number of standalone or follow-up briefing meetings also took place with a number of groups, as detailed in Table 4 below.

Table 4: Details of additional meetings

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Group</th>
<th>University representative(s)</th>
<th>Date</th>
<th>Nos attending</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Canterbury City Council Leader and Officers’</td>
<td>Peter Czarnomski</td>
<td>Various dates</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Blean, Hackington and Harbledown Parish Councils</td>
<td>Peter Czarnomski/Miles Banbery</td>
<td>17 June 2016</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Canterbury BID (Business Improvement District) Board</td>
<td>Peter Czarnomski/Miles Banbery</td>
<td>6 July 2016</td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kent Council Cabinet</td>
<td>Denise Everitt/Peter Czarnomski</td>
<td>18 July 2016</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Local landowners and immediate neighbours</td>
<td>Peter Czarnomski</td>
<td>Various dates</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kent Ambassadors</td>
<td>Denise Everitt</td>
<td>13 July 2016</td>
<td>50</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
The University received a total of 280 responses from individuals and organisations.

Figure 1 below summarises the range of consultees who responded. This shows that the majority of respondents to the first round of consultation were individuals, although it is fair to assume that the responses from the various organisations consulted will also reflect the collective views of a significant number of people.

Figure 1: Number of responses received by category of consultee

Analysis of the methods of consultation reveals that of the 280 responses, 215 were received online via email or the University website and 65 were received as written or printed comments delivered by hand or by post.
5 CONCEPT MASTERPLAN: FEEDBACK SUMMARY – NUMBER AND RANGE OF RESPONSES (CONT)

A postcode analysis of the feedback was also undertaken. Out of the 280 responses, 179 contained the postal addresses of the respondents. Of those, the overwhelming majority (137) came from the Canterbury postcodes of CT2 7, CT2 8 and CT2 9 shown below in Figure 2 below:

Figure 2: Postcode analysis of consultation responses

The 280 responses we received contained a total of 558 comments. Figure 3 below organises these comments into eight key categories or themes and identifies the number of comments that are made in relation to each category.

Figure 3: Summary of consultation feedback by Masterplan category
6 CONCEPT MASTERPLAN: SUMMARY OF COMMENTS BY CATEGORY

Appendix 5a sets out in detail a complete list of all the comments that were received by groups and Appendix 5b sets out all the comments received from individuals.

Below is a combined summary of all comments (both group comments and comments from individuals) made in relation to each of the categories that are identified in Figure 3 above.

The 280 responses we received contained a total of 558 comments. The comments received fall broadly into three independent categories:

A Comments (offering support as well as expressing concerns) made directly in response to the urban design principles and the physical propositions made in the Concept Masterplan. (377 comments)
B General comments and suggestions in addition to the Concept Masterplan. (81 comments)
C Clarifications and corrections to any comments and misunderstandings in relation to the Concept Masterplan. (100 comments)

The number of comments in each category is indicated alongside each of the comments. However, it should be noted that the numbers do not represent a like-for-like comparison. For example, some represent group comments whilst others are comments made by individuals. No value should therefore be attributed to the total number of comments on any issue. They have been included to help the reader get a sense of reoccurring comments, as well as the strength of feeling expressed in relation to the various issues raised.

A Comments of overall support and concerns (377 comments)

The following comments were made both in support of, and as expressions of direct concern to, the propositions made in the Concept Masterplan proposals. A total of 377 comments have been recorded overall in this particular category.

The comments have been assembled in this table under a number of ‘geographic’ categories that relate directly to the propositions for the various parts of the campus made in the Concept Masterplan.

The comments have been organised so that opposing views are expressed clearly on the same issues, such that a balance can be struck between the various comments made. As will be noted, many of the comments of support are in direct opposition to other comments of concern. A careful analysis of these varying views will need to be made in the next stage of work to achieve a balanced masterplan approach.

The University and its consultants will carefully consider all of these comments during the next step of developing the proposals from concept into a more detailed masterplan.

The number of comments in each category is indicated alongside each of the comments. Comments from groups have been recorded as one comment, as have comments from individuals. In consequence, the numbers do not represent the actual number of people having agreed or commented on any particular issue, but have been included to help the reader get a sense of those issues which recurred in the feedback, as well as the strength of feeling expressed.
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### Table 5: Overall support and concerns

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Comments in support</th>
<th>Comments received</th>
<th>Comments of concern</th>
<th>Comments received</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Overall proposals across the whole campus (81 comments received in total)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1 Creating a more aesthetically pleasing Garden Campus is a wonderful idea – it will have a large impact on recruitment and student experience</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>1 The University should not increase student numbers – Canterbury cannot cope</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2 Having a professional masterplan being commissioned by an internationally well-regarded firm of architects is a good thing</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2 The Plan is based on questionable assumptions – socially, financially and intellectually weak The Concept plans are weak and lack detail Diagrams and maps in the master plan should have better labelling of buildings and roads</td>
<td>8 3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3 This plan and vision, if executed correctly, would ensure Kent can compete with talent on a global scale</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3 The University does not need to plan for expansion due to the impact of Brexit</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4 These plans could possibly create more employment opportunities. This is vital to the community</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>4 The University does not need to plan for expansion due to the rise of online learning</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5 The University needs to build more accommodation to take the strain off the town centre</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>5 When is it going to end – the constant building and developing of the UKC site</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6 The University could raise its profile as a green university by developing the Campus Heart whilst leaving the wilder aspects of the campus wild</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>6 The Plan makes few concessions to the interests of those likely to be affected by the physical expansion</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7 Large areas of grassland support the semi-rural feel and should be kept</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>7 There is no mention of wildlife within the Masterplan – it should be considered</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8 Having the master plan online in full was very helpful to residents</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>8 The door-to-door leaflets were too vague with a map that was too small and insufficiently detailed</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
## Comments in support

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Comments received</th>
<th>Comments of concern received</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>9</td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I would like to offer my support for the proposals at Kent University</td>
<td>I 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!</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### The Campus Heart (52 comments received in total)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Comments received</th>
<th>Comments of concern received</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>10</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The plans for the Campus Heart are good</td>
<td>The Campus Heart should not be intensified – the campus will lose its parkland feel The Campus Heart should be considered for conferencing needs rather than 'The Parklands'</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Improving the main entrances to the campus would be helpful for new visitors</td>
<td>Linking Darwin Square to a new eastern campus entrance seems impossible given the narrow/steep/busy nature of St Stephen's Hill</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>St Stephen's Hill would be a perfect spot for expansion, particularly for the views down to the Cathedral and the easy access for bus links</td>
<td>The hotel should be built on the fields to the east of St Stephen's Hill</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The campus does need more named open spaces, roads and places</td>
<td>More cycle paths and pedestrian routes would be a great improvement</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Other comments

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Comments received</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The grand High Street would be a great addition to the campus</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Comments received</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Increased cycle paths would be a great addition to the concept</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Comments received</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Creating better maps on campus would be helpful for new visitors</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Comments received</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The new pedestrian priority should be introduced immediately, with additional zebra crossings and clearer indications of shared areas (eg School of Arts)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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Table 5: Overall support and concerns (cont)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Comments in support</th>
<th>Comments received</th>
<th>Comments of concern</th>
<th>Comments received</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>18 Moving car parks to the Campus Heart outskirts is a good</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>19 The plans for The Parklands and The Northern Land Holdings are very troubling.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>idea. More car parks should be built near Turing College</td>
<td></td>
<td>Chaucer Fields should not be built on; it is a great asset to the University, it would worsen</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>relationships with local residents, the geography amplifies noise, any permanent hospitality centre</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>would produce unreasonable noise pollution and there are medieval hedgerows bordering the bridle</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>way. There should be a reference to a/the Green Gap</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The Parklands (101 comments received in total)</td>
<td></td>
<td>20 In support of the sustainable new route – great opportunity to build links with local community/</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>tourism to sell our University</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>19 Enhancing the Parklands to make them more attractive for</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>20 The proposed shuttle service at the base of the cycle path would have a negative impact on the</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>leisure time is an excellent idea (eg mazes, play areas,</td>
<td></td>
<td>local area because people would start driving and leaving their cars at the base of that route.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>open air theatres, wildflowers)</td>
<td></td>
<td>The Crab and Winkle track bed route to the south should not be changed; this would increase student</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>noise, it is not wide enough for a shared, pedestrian and cyclist route, it runs behind back gardens</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>on Salisbury Road/Leycroft Close. A better and more regular bus route would be preferable.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>The implications of changing the Crab and Winkle track bed on wildlife have not been adequately</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>considered</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>21 Creating a route from the University down to the Canterbury</td>
<td>14</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>West Station would be an improvement and would help locals,</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>staff and students</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
2 Creating a main route from the University to the Station would prevent the anti-social behaviour that regularly happens around the Station West Road area

22 Comments received

22 Connecting the city centre with the campus with walkways will cause more security implications – will there be cameras and patrols?

2 Comments received

23 I 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

23 The pedestrian and cycle route from the campus to West Station will be a waste of money if the property in Roper Road is going to be developed for housing

1 Comments received

The Northern Land Holdings (143 comments received in total)

24 The innovation and research centres in the north are welcome as is their proposed farmstead character

24 The University needs to demonstrate the need for business/research use of this area before destroying agricultural land

3 Comments received

25 Glad that the University has opened dialogue with local residents and others

25 The University must genuinely engage with local residents and has not done so thus far

8 Comments received

26 Pushing car parks out of the centre of the campus and having a Park & Ride or shuttle bus service would a great idea

26 Building car parks and University buildings outside of the campus will create huge pressures on the local roads surrounding the University and is not environmentally friendly

6 Comments received

Tyler Hill Road is not suitable for an increase in traffic.
There is to be a Herne village bypass, in conjunction with Strode Park development, which will increase traffic through Tyler Hill and potentially Tyler Hill Road.
The junctions at Fleets Lane and Link Road which are already hazardous enough, will be further compromised by increased traffic on Tyler Hill Road.
The recent effects of the Chestfield bus which has been rerouted along Tyler Hill Road, has caused traffic problems and reduced the safety of families and older people walking to the church from the shop. This gives a glimpse of the carnage a park and ride will cause.

41 Comments received

11 Comments received
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### Table 5: Overall support and concerns (cont)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Comments in support</th>
<th>Comments received</th>
<th>Comments of concern</th>
<th>Comments received</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>27 Should not sell off land for housing in Blean – it should be preserving the area’s environmental and historic integrity</td>
<td></td>
<td>27 Should not sell off land for housing in Blean – it should be preserving the area’s environmental and historic integrity</td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>28 Blean is in a Conservation Area and the land surround the village is reserved for agricultural use</td>
<td></td>
<td>28 Blean is in a Conservation Area and the land surround the village is reserved for agricultural use</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>29 The University’s developments around Blean and Tyler Hill will lead to a reduction in property prices</td>
<td></td>
<td>29 The University’s developments around Blean and Tyler Hill will lead to a reduction in property prices</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>30 These proposed developments would create an undesirable conurbation linking the two villages</td>
<td></td>
<td>30 These proposed developments would create an undesirable conurbation linking the two villages</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>31 Tyler Hill and Blean are already suffering increased traffic due to developments in Whitstable and Herne Bay</td>
<td></td>
<td>31 Tyler Hill and Blean are already suffering increased traffic due to developments in Whitstable and Herne Bay</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>32 Blean does not want or need a cricket pitch</td>
<td></td>
<td>32 Blean does not want or need a cricket pitch</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>33 The impact of the proposed reservoir at Tyler Hill needs considering</td>
<td></td>
<td>33 The impact of the proposed reservoir at Tyler Hill needs considering</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>34 The University should not sell off land for housing in Blean – it should be preserving the area’s environmental and historic integrity</td>
<td></td>
<td>34 The University should not sell off land for housing in Blean – it should be preserving the area’s environmental and historic integrity</td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>35 Much of the land near Blean suffers from well known drainage, flooding and sewage issues making it unsuitable for cost-effective development</td>
<td></td>
<td>35 Much of the land near Blean suffers from well known drainage, flooding and sewage issues making it unsuitable for cost-effective development</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
B General comments and suggestions in addition to the Concept Masterplan (81 comments)

The following comments have been included in the table below as they offer further propositions and suggestions in addition to those made in the Concept Masterplan. A total of 81 comments were received in this particular category.

Some of the comments raise issues and questions which will need further consideration before a response is made. The University and its consultants will carefully consider all of these comments during the next step of developing the proposals from concept into a more detailed masterplan.

Table 6: General comments & suggestions in addition to the Concept Masterplan Proposals

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>General comments &amp; suggestions in addition to the Concept Masterplan Proposals</th>
<th>Comments received</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Parkwood student village (though not changed in this plan) should be intensified as it is already developed</td>
<td>12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>New buildings should reflect the surrounding county – materials should be chosen more sympathetically</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The older buildings need to be refurbished to create an attractive campus. This is affecting recruitment and student experience</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A swimming pool on campus would complement the Kent Sport facilities further and increase income to the University</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The accommodation on campus needs to be accompanied by sufficient car parking spaces to relieve the use of residential streets for all day parking by members of university staff and students</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>More parking is needed for staff</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Buildings should not be too tall – no bigger than the Templeman Library</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Make sure to give consideration to parking for the public visiting the campus</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Again, the number of comments in each category is indicated alongside each of the comments. Comments from groups have been recorded as one comment, as have comments from individuals. In consequence, the numbers do not represent the actual number of people having agreed or commented on any particular issue, but have been included to help the reader get a sense of those issues which recurred in the feedback, as well as the strength of feeling expressed.
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### Table 6: General comments & suggestions in addition to the Concept Masterplan Proposals (cont)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>General comments &amp; suggestions in addition to the Concept Masterplan Proposals</th>
<th>Comments received</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>The University should consider underground parking</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The land below Eliot and Rutherford needs to be cultivated/improved</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Giles Lane through traffic needs to be stopped</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Some of the example images in the master plan from other places appeared irrelevant or unhelpful in thinking about Canterbury</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Build the Hotel/Conference centre at the Beverley Farmhouse site</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The University should be working with the Council to enable students to live in student accommodation rather than family homes</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>New buildings within the Campus Heart should be part of colleges and not just named buildings</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>If intensifying the built environment, consideration needs to be taken for the current tree population</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Trees currently obstructing Eliot dining halls view – those trees should be felled</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Please keep Jennison Pond</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>More social space for staff is needed</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>If you increase buildings and body mass, you need to increase the width of the corridors and stair wells in each building</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>New names for roads, buildings etc should reflect gender equality</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>General comments &amp; suggestions in addition to the Concept Masterplan Proposals</td>
<td>Comments received</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>-------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>If the Parklands might contain more interesting gardens, the University should look to the Royal Entomological Society for advice on planting bee friendly areas</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The area between Beverley Farmhouse and the City and Cathedral has special historical significance which should be mentioned and respected</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Would there be a pedestrian bridge over Forty Acres Rd? How would the railway-line be crossed?</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Student accommodation in the north for PhD or mature students would be appreciated</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Subsidised housing for staff in the north would help recruit staff as Canterbury house prices continue to rise</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Developing the fields nearer to Park Wood rather than the Tyler Hill Road would seem an easier win for planning permission</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A Boris bike scheme should be brought in for people who travel in from train stations and bus stations or for campus use</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The insistence on more and more parking seems to ignore the fact that other transport solutions are possible and in fact more sustainable ie, 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</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Masterplan p40 – the train shown is not a Javelin</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The plan should have included examples of how the campus may change over time – 10 year stages</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Having mapped walking routes for hikers and locals would be desired</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gender specific housing needs to be created – many females with Islamic background find it hard to attend University due to their family’s beliefs</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I would like to offer my support for the proposals at Kent University. The Stour valley should not be called the Pilgrims Way – no reference exists to the Roman approach to Canterbury along the Stour to Fordwich and the movement of materials into Canterbury from this important area</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>We urgently need a student union open to all during the day of week and evenings as is the case at most (all?) universities</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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C Clarifications and corrections (100 comments)
The following comments have been included in this table where they appear to have been in response to misunderstandings or mis-readings of the propositions made in the Concept Masterplan. A total of 100 comments were received in this particular category.

Inclusion in this table is not intended to diminish the significance of these comments in any way, as the number of comments is quite significant in some cases. However, they do appear to be based upon suppositions or presumptions which were not intended to be conveyed by the Concept Masterplan, and as such each comment has been provided with a response or clarification.

As with the tables above, the number of comments in each category is indicated alongside each of the comments. Comments from groups have been recorded as one comment, as have comments from individuals. In consequence, the numbers do not represent the actual number of people having agreed or commented on any particular issue, but have been included to help the reader get a sense of those issues which recurred in the feedback, as well as the strength of feeling expressed.

Table 7: Clarifications & corrections

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Clarifications &amp; corrections from consultation</th>
<th>Comments received</th>
<th>University of Kent comments</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. The Crab &amp; Winkle Way should not be changed; it is valued and enjoyed in everyday use in its current form, it is a popular path for runners and walkers. Do not allow cars to use it. It will take away this peaceful and safe option from parents and children who choose to walk/cycle to school</td>
<td>34</td>
<td>1. Agreed, this is Sustrans Route 1, and as such it is a very valuable local and national route and should remain a resource for walkers, school children and cyclists. It was not the intention of the Concept Masterplan that cars should use this route. The Concept Masterplan Report should have been clearer. It was suggested that the route might be widened slightly to accommodate a sustainable transit system (e.g., a shuttle bus) to connect the campus with the satellite research hubs proposed in the Northern Land Holdings. However, it would be our preference to use the former 'Crab &amp; Winkle' Rail Line for this purpose if at all possible.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. The Northern Land is a major asset to the townpeople and University in its present form due to lack of green space elsewhere</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>2. We consider the green open space that constitutes the Northern Land Holdings of the University to be a considerable landscape asset in providing a green setting to the north of the Campus Heart, made clear in the Concept Masterplan Report on page 105. We believe that this landscape setting should be retained in large part as a distinct northern edge to the University campus.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. The University should not be removing all cars from the Campus Heart and putting them in Blean</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>3. It was definitely not the intention of the Concept Masterplan to suggest the relocation all the cars from the Campus Heart into Blean. As part of enhancing the campus heart, the idea we intended to convey was a proposal to relocate existing car parks from the centre to the outer edges of the Campus Heart, and NOT to the outer edges of the University land ownership (Concept Masterplan Report page 57).</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### Clarifications & corrections from consultation

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Comments received</th>
<th>University of Kent comments</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>With hindsight, the text at the bottom of Page 97 of the Concept Masterplan Report was misleading. As can be seen from The Parklands drawing on Page 92 of the Report, the proposition was for discreet small-scale car parking areas directly associated with proposed ‘disaggregated’ satellite developments. We did provide clarification on parking and the Concept Masterplan at the presentation to the parish councils of Blean, Hackington and Hartledown which is included as Appendix 4.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>The University should not be putting satellite business developments in Blean</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9</td>
<td>4 There is no intention to build satellite business developments in Blean village. The proposal in the Concept Masterplan was for a small number of ‘disaggregated’ satellite development between the villages of Blean and Tyler Hill and independent of the two existing settlements (Concept Masterplan Report page 105). However, the Concept Masterplan proposals also include a Cricket Green and Pavilion immediately to the south and west of Blean Church, as a University facility shared with the residents of Blean Village. To fund this facility, some new business space and/or housing was proposed surrounding the new Cricket Green and south of Tyler Hill Road</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>Locating car parks further afield will add an extra time to peoples commutes – the plans are impracticable</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>Any parking provided in the Northern Land Holdings would be associated with the discreet research hubs/small business clusters proposed in that part of the campus. Our plan proposes discreet parking areas integrated with these clusters, and transport connections to the heart of the campus by means of a shuttle bus service and other ‘green’ transport links (Concept Masterplan Report page 104).</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>The ‘Northern Lands’ are a dynamic and rich biodiverse area for wildlife including sky larks. The University’s existing agricultural land is supporting Britain’s food security and should not be removed. The University should concentrate on one or two specific areas and leave as much land for farming for as long as possible</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>6 The Concept Masterplan Report clearly makes the point that the green open space in the Northern Land Holdings is a considerable landscape asset in providing a green setting to the north of the University. It is true that the Concept Masterplan Report does not actually specify ‘agricultural use’, but that use would certainly be within our definition of a ‘green setting’. Building University facilities in the Northern Land Holdings is not considered to be a viable or desirable part of the growth of the University in the short to medium term (Concept Masterplan Report page 102).</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>Parking should not be pushed into residential areas</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>Agreed. The Concept Masterplan proposals certainly do not advocate providing University car parking within private residential areas (see points 3 and 5 above).</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### 6 CONCEPT MASTERPLAN: SUMMARY OF COMMENTS BY CATEGORY (CONT)

#### Table 7: Clarifications & corrections (cont)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Clarifications &amp; corrections from consultation</th>
<th>Comments received</th>
<th>University of Kent comments</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>8</strong> The University should not be building car parks near the ancient church of St Cosmus and St Damian, Blean</td>
<td>2</td>
<td><strong>8</strong> Agreed. It was not intended in the Concept Masterplan proposals to build car parks near to this church (see points 3 and 5 above). A diagram showing park and ride car parks on the Blean Road was labelled inaccurately in the Concept Masterplan Report – there are no plans to do this. We did provide clarification on parking and the concept master plan at the presentation to the parish councils of Blean, Hackington and Harbledown which is included as Appendix 4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>9</strong> Position the park and ride along the A2 instead of the Northlands where it is already congested</td>
<td>1</td>
<td><strong>9</strong> The Concept Masterplan Report proposes discreet parking areas in the Northern Land Holdings, and transport connections to the heart of the campus by means of a shuttle bus service and other ‘green’ transport links (Concept Masterplan Report page 104).</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>10</strong> A ‘conceptual’ plan cannot get to planning approval stage by Spring 2017 and include enough consultation with neighbouring residents</td>
<td>1</td>
<td><strong>10</strong> Agreed. It is not the University’s intention to seek a planning approval for the Concept Masterplan proposals within this timescale. During the coming stages of developing more detailed masterplan proposals, the University and its consultants will take heed of the comments made during the public consultation process when identifying and developing masterplan proposals for the campus.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>11</strong> Masterplan p44 – main footpath from Eliot College into town should be to the west of the college</td>
<td>1</td>
<td><strong>11</strong> This comment is quite correct. The diagram indicated on page 44 of the Concept Masterplan Report indicates proposed routes, and not existing routes, as intended. Apologies for this error.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>12</strong> The Jarman plaza is in an unattractive part of campus and should not be made bigger</td>
<td>1</td>
<td><strong>12</strong> Agreed. The Jarman plaza is at present a large and unattractive space at the junction of University Road and Giles Lane, which does nothing to celebrate this major point of arrival to the Campus for most visitors, students and staff. This first new square proposed in the Concept Masterplan is intended to establish a new ‘front door’ to the heart of the campus, which is appropriate to the importance of this location. We believe this space should be lively and surrounded by buildings with active uses at ground level. It should be large enough to host a year-round programme of events, with annual festivals celebrated here and the space landscaped to reflect the changing seasons and key points in the University calendar (Concept Masterplan Report page 118).</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Clarifications &amp; corrections from consultation</td>
<td>Comments received</td>
<td>University of Kent comments</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>-------------------</td>
<td>-----------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13 Contradictions on page 74 and page 69 in regards to the location of the hotel on the southern slopes.</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>13 Noted, but we do not believe there is a contradiction. Our assumption is that there may be a need or justification for more than one type of hotel serving different markets in different parts of the campus. Further in-depth analysis, including market testing and consultation with the public will be undertaken in future stages of the masterplan process to determine whether this is a valid assumption or not.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14 The campus area on page 87 is not to scale.</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>14 Apologies – all drawings should have been provided with a scale bar to avoid any such confusion.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15 Turing College and the road leading to it is not on the Campus Heart map.</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>15 Apologies, the visuals are in conflict on this point, but given the scale of development at Turing College we believe that it should be included as part of the Campus Heart.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16 In depth analysis is needed surrounding this comment: ‘Parklands will also provide locations for buildings.’</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>16 Noted. The concept for Parklands does assume the possibility of further buildings, and the report goes on to clarify: “Such buildings will be designed as ‘landscape buildings’ or ‘pavilions in the landscape’ which could include appropriately-designed functional commercial or academic buildings, as well as landscape components such as gazebos, mazes, observatories, open-air theatres and so on”. Further in-depth analysis will be undertaken at the next stage of the masterplan process.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17 The route from Canterbury West Station to University of Kent ignores the existence of established homes.</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>17 Noted. The drawings are intended to convey a concept rather a firm, fixed proposal. Once again, further in-depth analysis will be undertaken to explore how the most direct route might be established given the distribution of existing homes and other buildings, at the next stage of the masterplan process.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
7 TAKING ACCOUNT OF COMMENTS

The University and its consultants will carefully consider all comments in developing the Concept Masterplan into a more detailed masterplan. The comments are expected to help inform the following:

- A review of the Vision for the campus and the organising principles
- The scope and format of a more detailed masterplan, including the issues to be addressed and the way in which ideas are presented and explained; and
- The need for, and scope of, studies and strategies into particular issues (e.g., transport) to ensure that a more detailed masterplan is informed and supported by a proportionate evidence base.

The University and its consultants will keep track of the key comments when identifying and developing spatial options and explain how these comments have informed their thinking during the planned 2nd stage consultation.
8 LESSONS FOR FUTURE ENGAGEMENT AND CONSULTATION

In addition to the detailed comments made in relation to the Concept Masterplan (set out in Appendices 5a and 5b and summarised above), a number of general points were made in conversation with stakeholders at both presentations and exhibitions, though were not necessarily reflected in the feedback.

The University is keen to learn lessons about how best to engage with its neighbours and other stakeholders. Table 8 below sets out the key general comments that University of Kent staff took from conversations they had with stakeholders and sets out a response to them.

Table 8: General comments and responses

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>General comment</th>
<th>University response</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| Respondents were unclear what the University business plan was and how this related to the Concept Masterplan.  
  • There was a general sense of not knowing what a leading university in 2016 did or how it was funded.  
  • This led to a feeling of surprise and often displeasure that the University had plans to further develop innovation/enterprise and commercial activity which many perceived as non-core activities or not appropriate for a university though are essential to the business and region and have been for a number of years. | Need to provide further information about the University as a Higher Education Institution and its broader strategic objectives. |
| Many respondents were not aware that the Concept Masterplan was always intended to be followed by more detailed environmental and transport studies.  
  • Consequently, they were left with the impression that the University had neither understanding of those issues nor any desire to consider or appreciate those issues.  
  • Where the Concept Masterplan briefly mentions options, such as car parking on the Tyler Hill Road, the lack of technical evidence meant that these raised more questions than answers. | Need for proportionate evidence to inform and support a more detailed masterplan and for this to be made available to local people. |
| There was a difference in how respondents were consulted on the Concept Masterplan:  
  • In general, organisations and agencies were either met with informally or invited to presentations. Having more knowledge of planning processes, they reacted positively to the long-term and conceptual nature of the Plan and welcomed the opportunity to be involved at such an early stage. They also appreciated the ability to address questions directly to the author of the Plan or a senior member of the University staff.  
  • The majority of individual respondents had been offered the chance to read the Plan in full online, or would have attended an exhibition or seen a leaflet. Whilst many also appreciated its conceptual nature, it appeared that without the opportunity to attend a presentation and ask questions, misunderstandings and suspicions remained that the printed materials did not help allay.  
  • Also, those without experience in planning matters found it was easy to mistake the Plan for a planning application. A number of people appear to have mistaken the need to plan for consolidation and expansion as an expression of definite intent. | Need to be clearer about the status and role of a more detailed masterplan and what its function will be in the overall planning process. |
8 LESSONS FOR FUTURE ENGAGEMENT AND CONSULTATION (CONT)

Table 8: General comments and responses (cont)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>General comment</th>
<th>University response</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| In general, the Concept Masterplan was better received by neighbouring residents to the south of the campus than those to the north:  
  • The University has previously sought planning permission for a building on part of the Parklands to the south and so there had already been considerable interest from neighbouring residents over a number of years.  
  • The St Stephen’s Ward to the south contains a large number of student residences and the main thoroughfares between the University and City. This has led to a greater awareness of the University’s impact and greater levels of communication between residents and the University.  
  • Residents’ associations from the south of the campus took an active role in the consultation process helping to inform more residents of the initial ideas and explain the conceptual nature of the Plan.  
  • In the north of the campus, there is less history of student accommodation, parking or pedestrian thoroughfare.  
  • The University has not mentioned the possibility of building on its northern borders before and few residents were aware of the extent of the University’s land ownership or the potential to build there.  
  • There are fewer residents’ association in the north and the University has built fewer relationships with residents  
  • The Concept Masterplan suggests a greater number of developments in the Northern Lands than in the Parklands to the south.                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                 | Need to make particular effort to engage with residents and businesses to the north to strengthen relationships and build trust.                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                 |
| A number of comments were made on the drawings, photographs and terminology used in consultation material and in the Concept Masterplan document itself:  
  • Though the diagrams and illustrations were appreciated by many and attracted a lot of attention, some key maps and plans contained a lack of accuracy and clear labelling that the public needed to understand what we were meaning.  
  • Some of the photographs and drawings appeared to suggest types or scales of development that were not intended.  
  • A number of labels and phrases carried negative or unhelpful connotations – terms such as ‘Park and Ride’ and ‘Innovation Park’ suggested to members of the public much bigger than intended and environmentally damaging.  
  • There was some confusion as to when references were to the ‘Crab and Winkle Way’ path and when they were meant to be to the original track bed of the Crab and Winkle railway line.                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                 | Need to work harder at making sure that facts and ideas are clearly communicated.                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                 |
| Some of the photographs and drawings used in the Concept Masterplan Report were considered to be inappropriate or unclear. More appropriate images were used in the presentations to the public.                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                      |                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                       |
| There were a number of comments welcoming the availability of online information, but as the consultation progressed University staff became more aware of a greater demand for offline materials and ways of feeding back than was anticipated.                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                          | Need to better resource the consultation process and make consultation material available in a wider variety of formats to suit all consultees.                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                 |
| The University commissioned a mass leafleting exercise to cover all properties in CT2 7, CT2 8 and CT2 9. Late on in the process, the University received comments from some residents living in Tyler Hill and along the Tyler Hill Road that they had not received these even though feedback from other residents confirmed delivery.                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                 | Need to more carefully commission and monitor the delivery of leaflets.                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                 |
In addition to the above, the University and its consultants have also identified the need to be clearer going forward about:

- What change can be effected by the University working alone and what change needs to be carried out in partnership with other stakeholders (eg, Canterbury City Council, Kent County Council, Network Rail); and
- Phasing and what is likely to happen in the ‘short’, ‘medium’ and ‘long-term’

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>General comment</th>
<th>University response</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| There were a number of adverse feelings and perceptions about the University’s impact on Canterbury City and the District that overlapped with the City’s HE/FE Impact Review.  
  - Many of the positives were not well understood – eg, volunteering, Jobshop and economic/social/cultural provision.  
  - Some of the beliefs (such as the University’s negative impact on city traffic and student parking in residential areas) have subsequently been investigated by the Review.                                                                 | Need to use the findings of the review to support future communications and more fully understand the concerns of the residents.                                                                                                               |
| Whilst many residents did use the campus for culture or leisure activities, others were unclear how welcome they were on campus and how publicly accessible the University is:  
  - What services the University provides that the public might benefit from  
  - Where on campus you are allowed to go  
  - Where the public footpaths are  
  - What there is to see and visit  
  - What cafes/facilities there are                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                 | Need to be clearer about what the campus has to offer members of the public and make that information more easily available.                                                                                                               |
| Local stakeholders were interested in how the University manages its land and sometimes had questions – but were unclear who they were meant to ask and what response should they expect? For example:  
  - Current and proposed capital projects  
  - Building refurbishments  
  - Land management/gardening enquiries                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                 | Need to make clearer who local people should contact.                                                                                                                                                                                      |
9 CONCLUSIONS AND NEXT STEPS: A FRAMEWORK MASTERPLAN

Conclusions
The University is committed to undertaking effective consultation in line with the good practice consultation principles it has adopted. The preparation of this statement, which sets out who was involved, how they were involved, what they said and how the University is going to take account of comments, is part of this commitment.

The Concept Masterplan was the subject of an extensive consultation programme between April and September 2016, as set out in Section 5. This included publication on the University’s website, on-line feedback form, a press release, email notification, a leaflet drop, four exhibitions, six presentations and six meetings.

The Plan and the University’s efforts to engage with people were generally well received. However, as should be expected at this stage of the process, a large number of comments were received on a wide range of issues. In total the University received 279 responses from individuals and organisations which contained 524 comments on different areas of the plan or University in general. A full list of comments is set out in Appendices 5a and 5b and the key comments, by theme, are summarised in Section 7.

The University and its consultants will carefully consider all comments during the next step of developing the Concept Masterplan into a more detailed Framework Masterplan. The comments are expected to help inform the following:

- A review of the vision for the campus and establishing a shared Strategic Vision;
- The scope and format of a Framework Masterplan (issues to be addressed and the way in which ideas are presented and explained); and
- The need for and scope of studies and strategies in to particular issues (eg, transport) to ensure that a Framework Masterplan is informed and supported by a proportionate evidence base.

The University and its consultants will keep track of the key comments when identifying and developing spatial options and be ready to explain how these comments have informed their thinking during the planned 2nd stage consultation.

Section 8 identifies a number of lessons for future engagement and consultation and the University will draw on these when preparing its consultation strategy for the 2nd stage of consultation.

The next steps: A Framework Masterplan
The University’s objectives for a more detailed Framework Masterplan are for it to:

1. Provide a planning and decision-making tool for the University by giving spatial expression to its Estate Strategy (2015-2025) in the short-term, a strategy up to the end of the District Local Plan period (2031) in the medium term and a long-term vision for the campus over the next 50 years;
2. Provide Canterbury City Council as the Local Planning Authority with a framework for considering and determining planning and related applications within the campus;
3. Establish a flexible spatial ‘framework’ rather than a precise ‘blueprint’ for development;
4. Enable a broad mix of uses and their disposition within the heart of the campus and throughout the wider campus area;
5. Maintain and strengthen the campus character of the University by establishing a clear place-making strategy;
6. Ensure that future development respects, and where possible enhances, the setting of the site in the wider countryside, Canterbury Cathedral World Heritage Site and nearby conservation areas;
7. Establish a Landscape and Biodiversity Strategy that ensures that the landscape character and nature conservation interests of the whole site are safeguarded and wherever possible enhanced.
8. Establish an effective Movement and Transport Strategy that enables updates to the University Travel Plan and detailed Transport Impact Assessment as and when planning applications are made;
9. Establish whether the campus area is sufficient to deliver its long-term vision – making recommendations for any additions that are considered necessary; and
10. Provide a checklist of activities for all concerned in working through the masterplan process and to provide a staged structure and a summary of outputs at each stage.

The University will work collaboratively with CCC on preparing a Framework Masterplan for the Canterbury campus.

The process of preparing a Plan will be incremental, with Step 1 focusing on developing a common Strategic Vision and with subsequent steps (set out below) subject to review as the process unfolds:
Step 1: Strategic vision
- Define the ‘Building Blocks’ for a Draft Strategic Vision
- Review Concept Masterplan in the context of this Statement
- Agree the Client Brief in the light of the above
- Undertake a Draft Strategic Vision Study
- Prepare a strategy to guide next stage of public consultation (Round 2)
- Undertake public consultation on Draft Strategic Vision (Round 2)
- Review the feedback from Round 2 of public consultation
- Adjust, finalise and publish a Strategic Vision Report, and
- Agree the next steps before progressing to Step 2

Step 2: Option studies
- Identify and agree options to be studied from within the existing Concept Masterplan
- Produce options expressed through a series of ‘Mini-Masterplans’ of character areas
- Test the options in workshops with various stakeholders
- Prepare presentation and exhibition material
- Undertake a 3rd round of public consultation to determine option preferences
- Publish a Strategic Options Report, and
- Agree the next steps before progressing to Step 3

Step 3: Option review
- Assemble the various options in an overall ‘Plan of Plans’ and review
- Test options against the agreed Client Brief & Public Consultation Feedback
- Identify & agree optimum/preferred option
- Test the Preferred Option through desktop studies, stakeholder workshops & design review
- Publish a Preferred Option Report, and
- Agree the next steps before progressing to Step 4

Step 4: Framework Masterplan
- Agree the overall layout of the Framework Masterplan
- Agree the overall form & massing of the Framework Masterplan
- Agree the strategic phasing & delivery of the Framework Masterplan
- Undertake a 4th round of Public Consultation
- Masterplan team to prepare Framework Masterplan Report for submission to CCC & (where relevant KCC)
- Publish a Framework Masterplan Report, and
- Agree the next steps before progressing to Step 5

Step 5: Publication
- Submit the Framework Masterplan to CCC for approval
- Undertake a further round of presentations and advocacy to CCC
- CCC internal consultation & feedback
- Agree any amendments with CCC & incorporate into Framework Masterplan
- Final agreement & adoption by CCC
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St Michael’s Road Area Residents’ Association
St Stephen's Residents’ Association
University of Kent Alumni
University of Kent Former Staff Association
University of Kent Staff
University of Kent Students
Whitstable Road Residents’ Association
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Information leaflet and feedback form

UNIVERSITY OF KENT
MASTER PLAN CONSULTATION

The University is developing a blueprint for the next 50 years to support and enhance its status as one of the UK’s best universities and to be globally recognised for its work.

We have been working for the benefit of the local community, and we acknowledge the social, economic and cultural connections with the city of Canterbury.

We are currently seeking feedback on our concept master plan for the Canterbury campus, produced in partnership with leading architects for the University.

This is the first of three stages leading to the final concept master plan being presented to Canterbury City Council in 2017.

The concept master plan shows how a new university campus, designed to include new teaching and research facilities, a sports facility and the redevelopment of the West Hill Department of Social Sciences and Arts building to provide central accommodation for students.

This text is a part of the concept master plan, as well as some key principles.

THE PROCESS

Creating a master plan is a three-stage process. The first of three stages leading to the final concept master plan being presented to Canterbury City Council.

We are now seeking further feedback on our plan before we move on to the next stage.

We have also provided a feedback form that you can complete and return to us.

We would like to encourage the submission of feedback, and we are looking forward to hearing your views.

You can also submit feedback via email to: masterplan@kent.ac.uk.

All comments will be reviewed by the Masterplan Team and the Executive Committee of the University, and we will be holding an open meeting to discuss our final proposals in the near future.

Produced by University Communications
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Information leaflet and feedback form
Appendix 2 – Public information

Leaflet produced for delivery to all households in CT2 7, CT2 8 and CT2 9

DEVELOPING OUR CAMPUS MASTER PLAN/FEEDBACK FORM

Name ________________________________
Address _______________________________
Email ________________________________

Are you a ☐ Resident ☐ Councillor ☐ Member of the business community
☐ University of Kent student ☐ University of Kent staff
☐ Alumni ☐ Other

Are you happy for us to contact you again in relation to our proposals? ☐ Yes ☐ No

(Please note that we are committed to protecting your privacy and will not release your personal details to anyone outside of the University of Kent)

Comments

Please continue overleaf
1 WELCOME

Welcome to this exhibition of our concept master plan for the Canterbury campus, produced in partnership with leading architects Farrells.

The concept plan contains ideas on how best to develop our campus to meet the needs of the University community and the city and region that we are so proud to be part of.

This is the first of three stages leading to the finished master plan being presented to Canterbury City Council in 2017.

We need your comments and feedback on our ideas. These comments will be used to help us develop this concept into the finished master plan.

2 THE PROCESS

Creating a master plan is a three-stage process.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Spring 2016</th>
<th>Phase one</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>We are presenting our concept master plan for discussion and feedback.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>This provides information about the background and context to our plans, sets out the University’s vision and objectives, and tests some initial conceptual ideas.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Autumn 2016</th>
<th>Phase two</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>We will be presenting our preferred option based on further technical and design work and your initial feedback.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rather than concepts and ideas, this will be in the form of a more concrete set of proposals for you to respond to.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Spring 2017</th>
<th>Phase three</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>We will be submitting our final proposals to Canterbury City Council.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Each of the proposals will then still need to go through the regular planning process for approval.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
OVERVIEW

We have taken the opportunity of our 50th anniversary in 2015 to build on principles outlined in the University's original development plan from 1963.

We want to develop a blueprint for the next 50 years to support our ambitions to remain one of the UK's best universities and to be globally recognised for our work.

We must ensure we deliver long-term benefits to our local communities, and improve our intellectual, physical, economic and cultural connections with the city of Canterbury.

OUR PLACE IN CANTERBURY

Canterbury is the cultural and intellectual capital of Kent. We are proud to be part of the city and want to have the best possible impact on our local communities.

We make a £740m economic impact on the region and directly employ 3,300 full time equivalent skilled and semi-skilled staff. Our sports, theatre, music, gallery and cinema facilities are open to the public.

We want to make a greater contribution to the growth of the knowledge-based economy and build on our work with city partners to support Canterbury's evolution and growth.
Information Boards

5 WHY WE NEED A MASTER PLAN

Universities operate in a highly competitive market. We face stiff competition from within the UK and increasingly from international universities.

Our campus must be of the highest quality to attract and retain students. We need to deliver an exceptional student experience.

We must have first-class research facilities to be one of the best universities in the world.

We need an outstanding workplace environment to attract high-quality staff.

6 UNIVERSITY LAND HOLDINGS

University of Kent / Master plan consultation Spring 2016
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7 OUR VISION

Our vision is to create the **best garden campus in the UK**, a world-class site which reflects our status as a top 20 UK university and as a global research institution.

The campus already has a reputation as being a green and open space. We would like to **make it even better** with orchards, parklands, meadows and gardens.

We want to **safeguard and enhance** the views of historic Canterbury.

We have drawn inspiration from the **great Kent estates** such as Sissinghurst and Great Maytham Hall.

8 OUR DESIGN PRINCIPLES

Our ideas are based on **carefully considered design principles** which we believe will enable us to deliver our vision for the campus.

- **Make more effective and intensive use** of the heart of the campus
- Create **places of quality** and variety in the spaces between buildings
- Create an environment that is **easier to find your way around**
- Define a **hierarchy** of streets, spaces and places
- Create a **diversity of green landscapes** of value and character
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9 OUR DESIGN PRINCIPLES (CONT)

• Prioritise the needs of the pedestrian across all public spaces
• Strengthen physical and intellectual links between the University and the city
• Safeguard existing views of historic Canterbury
• Reveal the historical narrative of the campus linking together its past, present and future
• Deliver the best garden campus in the UK

10 A STRATEGY FOR THE WHOLE CAMPUS

A strategy for the development of the whole campus will make for better long-term planning and development. It will help shape plans for future growth and investment.

With the support and engagement of our local communities, we would like to create a masterplan that builds on our existing identity, heritage and culture and sense of place.

We have divided our proposals into three distinct areas: the campus heart, the parklands (or outer campus), and the northern land holdings.
11 THE CAMPUS HEART

The heart of the campus and home of the original university would provide the initial focus for development.

A clearly defined area spanning from Darwin College in the east to the Sports Centre in the west; from Woolf College in the north and Rutherford and Eliot Colleges in the south.

A more efficient use of existing space means we could develop more academic and residential accommodation in this area.

12 THE CAMPUS HEART (CONT)

A new layout of squares, gardens and other public places at the heart of the campus supporting the creation of the best garden campus in the UK.

Fewer cars at the heart of the campus, with improved pedestrian and cycle routes – cars out, feet in!

Two landmark squares to act as ‘gateways’ to the campus, linked east to west by the ‘Campus Walk’, a pedestrian high street lined with shops, cafés, cultural and leisure buildings.
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13 THE PARKLANDS

We want to preserve and enhance the parklands that surround the campus heart, protecting the historic buildings that have long been part of the landscape.

Where academic or commercial development is required in this area, building design will be sympathetic to the surroundings and complemented by landscape components such as pavilions, mazes, gazebos, open-air theatres and observatories, drawing on the finest examples of parkland.

We would like to improve the physical link between the campus and city, easing peak-time congestion on the surrounding roads.

14 OUR NORTHERN LAND HOLDINGS

Our estate extends north, up to and beyond Tyler Hill Road.

We suggest that some of this land could be used as a satellite development, supporting the growth of the local economy with minimal environmental impact.

Improved digital connectivity would support the growth of a knowledge economy and business innovation cluster creating start-up opportunities and jobs.

We could provide car parking for staff, students and visitors, relieving the pressure on space in the heart of the campus.
Please tell us what you think

We would like you to consider the concepts outlined here and let us know what you think. We hope you will help us shape our plans over the coming months.

You can fill out a feedback form available at this exhibition and posting it in one of the boxes available here.

You can also give feedback online at www.kent.ac.uk/masterplan

All comments will be carefully considered by the project team and be fed into the next stage of developing the plan. At that point, we will be asking for further feedback on a clear set of proposals for a masterplan.
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Kentish Gazette and Kent on Sunday adverts

OUR VISION FOR THE CANTERBURY CAMPUS OVER THE NEXT 50 YEARS

TELL US WHAT YOU THINK!

The University’s concept master plan, developed with leading architects Farrells, builds on principles outlined in our original development plan from 1963.

We need your comments and feedback to help us develop the concept into the finished master plan.

Find out more:
- Abode Hotel, 30-33 High Street, Canterbury CT1 2RX
  Tuesday 2 August, 11.00-19.00 and Wednesday 3 August, 09.00-17.00
- Blean Village Hall, 2 School Lane, Blean, Canterbury CT2 9JA
  Friday 12 August, 12.00-20.00 and Friday 19 August, 09.00-18.00

You can also read the plan in full and tell us what you think online:
www.kent.ac.uk/masterplan/

Or contact us by email: masterplan@kent.ac.uk
phone: 01227 824009.
Media coverage following University press release
Kentish Gazette
2 June 2016
APPENDIX 3 – CLARIFICATION TO PARISH COUNCILS

Dear Parish Council Member,

Many thanks to all of you for your assistance in the first consultation phase of the University of Kent master plan, especially to those who have been able to come and talk to us at one of our presentations or exhibition events.

At our presentation to some of you last week, it transpired there is a degree of confusion about our plans for car parking on land adjacent to Tyler Hill Road.

The concept master plan talks about wanting to move car parking away from the centre of the campus heart as well as looking for new and better used pedestrian and cycle-routes.

In providing only one indication of where car parks may go and in labelling them ‘park and ride’ we are aware that our presentation materials may have inadvertently suggested that the Tyler Hill Road will be our principle location of staff and student car parking on a large scale.

The University has no intention of siting any commercial or large-scale car parks on those sites.

As part of the next stage of development of a more detailed master plan, we will be undertaking detailed transportation and environmental studies to help us identify the best solutions. The transportation study will include all aspects of vehicular and pedestrian movements to, from and within the campus including cycles, car sharing and public transport.

An important part of this study will be to review any future requirements for additional car parking and where those car parks may be located.

That will present a number of potential options each of which will only be progressed subject to the usual planning consent process through Canterbury City Council.

We would also like to reiterate that the concept master plan that we presented to you last week sets out a hypothesis for how the campus might develop and grow in the future, and as such it is a collection of ideas for discussion and review. We should emphasise that it is not yet intended to represent a fixed and final set of master plan proposals.

The concept master plan proposals, although not designed in any detail at this stage, are intended to indicate an approach which would enable growth and evolution in a sensitive and considered way, and how the application of some of the design principles could play out over a 30-50 year time frame.

Once the detailed master plan study has been undertaken, it will be discussed with you and other stakeholders again before it is lodged with the City Council for formal adoption or approval. Over time it will of course be subject to periodic review to take into account changes to the University population as well as local and other factors.

Many thanks again for your continued help with our consultation.

Peter Czarnomski, Director of Estates, University of Kent
John Letherland, Urbanist and Masterplanner, John Letherland Ltd

Master plan consultation
Corporate Communications, University of Kent, Room 155, The Registry, Canterbury, Kent, CT2 7NZ, UK
Tel: +44 1227 824343
www.kent.ac.uk/masterplan
In the consultation responses, a number of comments were made on the drawings, photographs and terminology used in consultation material and in the Concept Masterplan document itself.

Though the diagrams and illustrations were appreciated by many and attracted a lot of attention, some key maps and plans contained a lack of accuracy and clear labelling that the public needed to understand what we were meaning. In addition, some of the photographs and drawings appeared to suggest types or scales of development that were not intended.

Revised illustrations and images were used in the presentations to the public, and it was felt appropriate to record the revised illustrations as part of this document.

The following pages therefore contain the revised illustrations by way of clarification.

**Contents**

1A  Illustration on page 95 of the Concept Masterplan Report

1B  Revised Illustration used in Public Consultation Presentations

2A  Illustration on page 101 of the Concept Masterplan Report
    (NB: similar illustrations were used on pages 65, 73 & 93)

2B  Revised Illustration used in Presentations

3A  Illustration on page 109 of the Concept Masterplan Report

3B  Revised Illustration used in Presentations
APPENDIX 4 – REVISED ILLUSTRATIONS (CONT)

1A: Illustration on page 95 of the Concept Masterplan Report

2. THE PARKLANDS
1B: Revised illustration used in Public Consultation Presentations

- An architectural precedent more appropriate to the Parklands setting (bottom left)
- How a more generous and direct ‘avenue’ through the Parklands could provide the setting for fun-runs and other events (middle right)
- The type of sustainable vehicle that might connect the University to the City along the disused Crab & Winkle rail line (bottom right)
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2A: Illustration on page 101 of the Concept Masterplan Report
(NB: similar illustrations were used on pages 65, 73 & 93)

3. THE NORTHERN LAND HOLDINGS

The Northern Land Holdings

The Campus Heart

The Parklands
2B: Revised illustration used in Public Consultation Presentations

This new illustration used in Public Consultation events, was intended to emphasise that the ‘Innovation Park’ concept is for a disaggregated arrangement of rural business clusters arranged like farmsteads along Tyler Hill Road, rather than a single, large Science Park.
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3A: Illustration on page 109 & 105 of the Concept Masterplan Report

In the Concept Masterplan Report, the following precedent images were used to describe the character of the Northern Land Holdings, and how the Innovation Park might appear:

---

3. THE NORTHERN LAND HOLDINGS

---
In the concept master plan, we have carefully considered the most appropriate place to create development in the northern land holdings at some future stage.

Once again, the geography of the land has played some part in our thinking; travelling north from the heart of the campus, the land falls away from the ridge line along which Giles Lane travels, into a small valley fed by the Sarre Penne stream, which flows from west to east through the existing fields. North of the stream, the land climbs again up to the next ridge-line. Like Giles Lane to the south, this higher ground provided a dry route along which another east-west connector was established historically between farming communities.

Tyler Hill Road connects the villages of Blean in the west and Tyler Hill in the east, and follows a winding route between the farm fields. Access to the northern land holdings is currently made along the combined public footpath and cycle route which connects Canterbury with Whitstable, and which forms part of the Sustrans National Cycle Route 1.

The green open space that constitutes the northern land holdings of the University is a considerable landscape asset in providing a green setting to the north of the University. We believe that this landscape setting should be retained as a distinct northern edge to the heart of the university campus.

However, like Giles Lane to the south, the ridge-line occupied by Tyler Hill Road does provide an opportunity to create a ‘disaggregated’ satellite development between Blean and Tyler Hill, which would exploit this more independent part of the campus for a linked commercial hub/research and innovation campus, but which would not join the two existing settlements. This location would not only take advantage of the transport connectivity provided by existing public roads, it could also be connected to the heart of the campus by a new cross-campus route or routes.
APPENDIX 4 – REVISED ILLUSTRATIONS (CONT)

3B: Revised illustration used in Public Consultation Presentations

The new illustrations in the pages below were used in Public Consultation events, and were intended to clarify the intended character of the Northern Land Holdings, and to reinforce the point that the concept for the rural business clusters would be of a small scale that would sit comfortably into the landscape.
3B: Revised illustration used in Public Consultation Presentations (continued)
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3B: Revised illustration used in Public Consultation Presentations (continued)
APPENDIX 5 – LIST OF ALL COMMENTS
APPENDIX 5A – COMMENTS FROM GROUPS

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

Blean Parish Council

Initial Response from Blean Parish Council September 2016

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

Hackington Parish Council

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

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

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

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

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

The Council supports the concept of maximising the potential for both educational and commercial interests of the University within the existing campus footprint as described in the ‘Campus Heart’;
• The Council appreciates the development of the ‘Parklands’ concept in order to protect and enhance the wider open spaces to the south of the existing Campus provided that any environmental, landscape and conservation aspects are fully assessed and any negative impacts adequately managed. The Council is conscious that the present document seeks to include development, in some form, on lands to the east of Giles Lane and St Stephens. At this stage, this is only briefly commented upon and appears to be an ‘Extended Campus Heart’ (as indicated on Page 93 of the Plan). Very clearly, the Parish Council would seek to limit any extension on to the existing greenfield landscape until such time as the existing Campus is fully developed in line with the Campus Heart concept.

• In relation to the ‘Northern Landholdings’, the potential end uses for this area are less clear and Farrell has indicated some creative thinking around satellite hubs, transport links, research and potentially commercial activities. Some of these could develop into smaller satellite developments linked to the wider University research opportunities – including, as an example, links to the rural economy. However, any such development would require detailed assessments covering potential highway impacts, environmental and biodiversity aspects and any further technical assessments that would be required to support a future planning application. We expect therefore that any potential development within the Northern Landholdings would be the subject of detailed scoping exercise, determined by Canterbury City Council as the Planning Authority.

• The Council has concerns as to the inclusion of a number of aspects relating to both pedestrian and vehicular movements between the Campus and any suggested ‘satellite’ sites within the Norther Land Holdings and whilst we support the potential development of rural economy research and development ‘hubs’, there is simply too little detail within the Concept Plan to provide any level of consultation response.

• The Council has accepted that the inclusion of a ‘Park and Ride’ facility near Blean was, as is stated in your letter to us, wrongly presented and was actually meant to suggest some form of linked transport system between these outlying areas and the Campus itself and not a ‘Park and Ride’ facility like others around the city.

• The Plan currently recognises that extension of University interests in to the Northern area “is not considered viable or a desirable part of the growth of the University in the short to medium term” (Page 102) and we therefore see no reason to support the inclusion of this element within any strategic Planning document at this stage.

Summary

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

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

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

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

St Stephens Residents Association

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

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

We believe that it is important to maintain a ‘green gap’ policy so that the ‘Parklands’ act as a ‘landscape demarcation from the City’ (p94). In that respect, we would not want to see further inappropriate development of the southern slopes. It is noted that any new buildings will be designed as ‘pavilions in the landscape’ (p94) and wondered if the proposed conference centre that has been mentioned on previous occasions as a long-term plan for
the University could be based around the Beverley Farmhouse as part of its preservation and enhancement as a historic site. This would enable the green setting of the southern slopes or ‘parkland’ to be preserved.

We are pleased that ‘the proposed rethink of the campus heart will... offer the opportunity to develop more (residential) accommodation through a more efficient use of space’ as we would prefer more purpose built accommodation to be available on campus in order to reduce the high concentration of private housing in our neighbourhood used as student accommodation, (ie, Hales Place). The accommodation on campus needs to be accompanied by sufficient car parking spaces to relieve the use of residential streets for all day parking by members of university staff and students. (Residents of Manwood Avenue have mentioned that they are bothered by this.) We would welcome a new station entrance in Roper Road ‘to the north side of Canterbury (West) station’ to help relieve traffic at the St Dunstan’s level crossing and ‘avoid the bottleneck of the existing pedestrian tunnel under the...railway line’.

**St Michael’s Road Area Residents’ Association**

Response to the University of Kent Concept Masterplan August 2016

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

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

A concerning feature of the University’s vision of the parkland is its persistent intention to build a ‘conferencing hotel’ and ‘pavilions’ on that section of the Southern Slopes referred to as Chaucer Fields. Although largely scaled down from previous proposals, which received huge numbers of objections at the planning application stage, we contend that development on this section of the parkland is inappropriate. Reference is made in the Masterplan to the work of Capability Brown at Stowe. However, the designs of Brown were intended to enhance and develop vistas. His genius lay in how he was able to vary the vistas across a limited landscape. Currently, Chaucer Fields serves as a delightful enhancement to the existing grassland, bluebell woods and trickling streams that grace the Southern Slopes. Occupying possibly the most historic part of the campus, the remains of orchards and the unusual double hedges (markers of the ancient boundary between St Stephen’s and St Dunstan’s parishes) are merely the most obvious traces of the previous character of the land. We suggest that this, together with the ancient farmhouse now part of the University buildings should be better recognised and enhanced. Needless to add that the diversity in landscape produces diversity of habitat which, in turn, encourages greater diversity of species, a feature which may be more apparent to those of us who live in the vicinity than those who commute in to work here. The suggestion of wildflower meadows elsewhere in the Masterplan is one that would sit easily in this area and enhance views already recognised as iconic across a diverse pastoral landscape towards the cathedral. Again, the contrast with the views across the green, tree-rimmed landscape of the Southern Slopes below Eliot College would be true to Brown’s intent. It would be overlooking this latter part of the slopes that any ‘pavilion’ type structure would be appropriate in the style of Capability Brown- and maybe this should be borne in mind when the time comes to replace the existing college buildings which, we are informed, are reaching the end of their serviceable lifetimes.

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

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

We are concerned about the proposal to open up the route of the disused railway line to the south of the University towards the City. A vehicle route along the route of the Crab and Winkle line appears to us to be impractical, necessitating as it would the demolition of several houses and gardens in Beaconsfield Road and the reconstruction of the missing railway embankment across Beaconsfield Road, not to mention severe disruption and loss of privacy...
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to residents whose homes and gardens back on to this historic route. Further, this would open an additional corridor of disturbance through a residential area. In any case, increased vehicle access from this direction would put enormous pressure on a narrow access route at the point of Beaconsfield/Forty Acres Road.

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

Images supplied by St Michael's Road Area Residents' Association
Appendix 5a – Comments from groups

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

There has been rapid expansion over the last decade and this has spread beyond its tighter original boundaries. This has resulted in a low density and dispersed campus environment which does not provide shelter from the elements.
The continuous outwards growth and sprawl of the campus area has led to a decreasing green periphery leaving empty pockets of space in the centre of the campus. Therefore, there is opportunity to accommodate growth without further sprawl.

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

**Student numbers**

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

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

**The development proposals**

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

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

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

**Key points:**

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

**Signage**

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

**Car parking**

The campus is dominated by cars

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

Car parking is puncturing the campus heart

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

**Views**

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

**Proposal ideas**

The overall site is divided into three district character areas:

i. **The Campus Heart** – sympathetic growth and place making, to develop more academic and residential accommodation through more efficient use of space (a gradual replacement of buildings as they reach the end of their useful life)

ii. **Parklands** – (the outer campus) – develop as a landscape resource.

iii. **The Northern Land Holdings** – ideas for the development of a ‘satellite campus’ that will provide a template for further development and enable growth for the next 50 years

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

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

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

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

**Campus Heart**

- The proposal pushes car parks to the periphery of the campus heart or even completely outside of it.
- Two Gateway Squares will be developed along the primary East-West route – the first new square will be at the junction of University Road and Giles Lane at the...
heart of the campus. The second square will be located at the east end of the Campus Walk at its junction to St Stephen's Hill – this will form a new Eastern pedestrian entrance to the Campus.

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

**Chaucer Fields and Parklands**

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

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

**Northern Land Holdings**

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

In developing the Northern Land holdings, in order to retain a physical separation from the campus hear and Parklands, a new link between Tyler Hill Road and the Campus Heart will be created. Three different ways to create a convenient link could be:
- To upgrade the Crab and Winkle Way and widen it from a pedestrian and cycle route to take vehicles
- The dis-used rail line which runs to the west of St Stephen's Hill could be acquired and upgraded for re-use
- A completely new and direct street could be created through the existing fields.

**Further consultation**

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

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

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

**Q&A and comments from the floor**

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

Dear Sir/Madam,

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

Canterbury has a slightly higher cycle commuting rate than the average for the county of Kent, 2.7% vs 1.7% [1 – Canterbury District Transport Strategy 2014-31 – page 9]. This may well be partly attributable to the contribution made by the University in allowing sustainable routes to pass through its property as well as providing cycling facilities on site such as secure cycle parking and segregated cycle paths. However, the level of cycle commuting is much lower in Canterbury than it is in some other cities such as Oxford with 17.6% and Cambridge with 29.9% [2]. On the continent Groningen in the Netherlands has between 31 and 55%, and Freiburg in Germany has between 13 and 28%. Although improvements have already been made, there is clearly a lot of potential for further improvement.

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

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

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

Current campus road infrastructure

We agree with the assessment that the plan makes about the current road infrastructure within the University campus and how it is used. We agree that the current campus is “Dominated by roads, vehicles and by car parking”. It is a prime example of somewhere that was built in an era when they thought that the private motor car would become the solution for nearly all travel requirements. We agree with the plans aim to ‘Tame’ the existing roads.
The following paragraph from the report is a very accurate appraisal:

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

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

Current active travel infrastructure

From the north NCR1 enters University near Tyler Hill road and exits from the Campus at Whitstable Road, the plan does not mention this westerly route that NCR1 takes in to Canterbury (page 45). The plan does mention the Crab and Winkle link that branches from the main NCR1 route at Park Wood Road. It is routed along Park Wood Road, then it travels along alternate sides of Giles Lane, down the side of University Road where it follows the service road to Eliot College, here it becomes a segregated pedestrian/cycle path down the hill to Lyndhurst Close. It then Follows Salisbury Road and St Michael’s Road down to Beaconsfield Road where it crosses and doglegs back to the side of the Crab and Winkle Embankment. It then passes over Beverly Meadow. Joins the St. Stephens Path way (Cyclists should dismount here) which emerges near to Station Road West. There is also a piece of segregated pedestrian/cycle path that goes from the edge of the Park Wood accommodation to the Gym.

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

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

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

Current routing of NCR1

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

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

Routing of the Crab and Winkle Link across campus

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

Tyler Hill Road – Northern Hub proposals

The plans indicate that this road may become access for the satellite developments, for access to a park and ride, and even access to the existing campus. This road is very narrow and twisty, there is no foot path. At each end, it is
flanked by properties so it appears there is very little scope for widening or adding a footpath. This road is already a rat-run as it is the first opportunity to transfer between the East to West of Canterbury when approaching or leaving via the North. Will it be expected to take extra traffic? Could an alternate route be found? Further, allowing traffic in from the north may make this trip easier for people commuting by car in to the University. Or even using it as access to Canterbury beyond if that was possible.

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

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

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

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

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

If the current NCR1 route was converted to a road then even if it had segregated cycle/walking paths it would still lose a big part of its current inherent safety. If parents were able to use this new road it would attract a lot of school run cars. Using the original crab and winkle route would add 2km to the journey from Blean to the School and/or Nursery. The car would have a clear advantage in terms of convenience. Currently where this section runs between the Blean Church and private house it is too narrow for a road. So, it looks like the road would have to deviate here. Perhaps if this road was deemed necessary then the option suggested in the plan of building it away from the current NCR1 and Blean Church, and also the original route of the Crab and Winkle railway line, could be taken.

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

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

Reinstate the Original Crab and Winkle Route and Preserve the existing
As mentioned the current NCR1 route has a number of things going for it. However, adding the original railway line route for walking and cycling could be of great benefit.
• Tyler Hill Village would get a traffic free link into Canterbury, currently there is no safe route for cyclists of all ages and abilities.

• There are plans for a Crab and Winkled Style route to Herne Bay; this Tyler hill route would make it more direct. The local plan shows one potential Herne Bay route coming in from the East of Canterbury Hill; however there is another route that would bring cyclists into Clowes Wood from Herne Bay [1 – Canterbury District Transport Strategy 2014-31 – A291 To Clowes Wood p147].

• Some university staff and student would have a more direct and safer route into work.

• Some non-University commuters would have a more direct route.

• The two routes would provide university staff and students an amazing recreational resource. Many walk or jog or cycle into Clowes Wood for recreational purposes. This would help in the aims of creating “THE BEST GARDEN CAMPUS IN THE UK” and “REINFORCEMENT OF THE UNIVERSITY’S REPUTATION FOR EXCELLENCE IN ALL ASPECTS OF SUSTAINABILITY”.

• By providing routes that are popular not only with the university staff and students but also non-university users the University is helping to mitigate some of the motor traffic and other disturbances that the University generates. This benefits both the University and the local community.

**Herne Bay to Canterbury Cycle Route**

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

• The University could help to drive the implementation of the path forward, the Crab and Winkled to Whitstable is very popular, particularly with university staff and students, the roads between Herne Bay and Whitstable are not attractive for cyclists so a Herne Bay route should be just as popular. Herne Bay’s population is approximately 30% larger than Whitstable’s.

• This path and/or development could be joined by a traffic free route into Hales Places, Hales Place houses quite a few students. (Subject to further land availability)

**Parking**

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

• There is already a car park at the end of Park Wood Road, it is incredibly popular as it provides a convenient drop off point for Blean Primary School and the Oaks Day Nursery. It is already at the edge but access to it requires driving through the middle of the campus, how will this be addressed buy the plans?

• Is there an overall plan to reduce or maintain the number of parking spaces despite growth in people accessing the site? Growth in parking spaces is likely to induce demand, Canterbury is already very congested at times. These plans should seek to maintain or reduce overall parking, not increase it.

• How will disabled drivers be catered for? Will they have parking that is close to the centre? On Page 86 there doesn't appear to be disabled parking anywhere near the Gulbenkian Theatre, Cinema, and Colyer Ferguson Concert Hall all of which hold events that are open to the general public including disabled drivers. Currently, the number of disabled driver spaces for events is most inadequate and inconsiderate parking is rife. How till this feature of central campus be dealt with?

• On Page 80, some of the parking appears to be moved to the parkland between the Campus and the City. Would this compromise the parkland?

• Exactly where will the car parks on the edges go?

**Park and ride**

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

The plan shows how the new ‘Gateway Squares’ will be created. These look to be a great improvement on the existing road infrastructure and may address our concerns above. However, careful consideration should be given to how these squares are implemented. Will they use the principles of Shared Space of Filtered Permeability? Shared space has become a popular tool but it does not always work out and it is attracting some controversy and opposition. Guide Dogs for the Blind have some useful resources on shared space [4]. Shared spaces can fail to eliminate rat running and produce environments that are still vehicle dominated like Exhibition Road in London, this has resulted in the improvements for non-motorised traffic being much smaller than was initially anticipated. Clearly, the St. Stephens Hill Gateway Square would have to allow through traffic, but the University Road/Giles Lane gateway might not have to.

Active travel within the campus
It is very welcome that the plan talks about creating strong, defined pedestrian and cycle routes. The plan also stated that the pedestrian will be king, this is also very welcome. However, it does not give many details about how cycling will be catered for. The plan goes into some detail about walking and driving. Cycling sits in the middle and offers some of the benefits of both. This is why it is currently booming in popularity in cities where good facilities are provided. This not only helps with local pollution, health and sustainability but it is an incredibly efficient way of moving large numbers of people across cities very quickly, it is often the quickest form of transport in a busy city.

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

Potential for cycle hire / cycle shop on campus
There is already a cycle hire facility by the Park Wood residences. Canterbury also has a few other cycle hire facilities:
• Kent Cycle Hire – https://kentcyclehire.com/ (Limited hours of operation)
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- biketart – www.biketart.com/bike-hire-i47
- Brompton Dock at Canterbury West Station – www.bromptonbikehire.com/
- Dr Bike and Bike Hire at UoK – www.facebook.com/DrBikeatUoK/ (Occasional or Limited hours of operation)

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

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

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

As the plan progresses we would welcome more detail in the following areas:
- Explore with other developers, Canterbury City Council, and Kent Country Council how a co-ordinated plan to drive modal shift toward active and public transport within the Greater Canterbury area in order to efficiently transport more people in the available space without major disruptive road building scheme.
- More mention of cycling within the campus and how it will allow uninterrupted door-to-door cycle commuting.
- Mention of both routes taken by NCN1.
- How the Crab and Winkle Link will be preserved and enhanced.
- Best practice use of segregated cycle/pedestrian routes where appropriate.
- Mention of cycle parking locations, current or planned.
- Bringing cycle retail, repair, hiring facilities into the centre.
- Exactly how Gateway Squares sill work, will they used shared space or filtered permeability.
- Traffic generation projections for the northern hub.
- Re-consideration about the need to connect the northern hub by a new road that takes motor vehicles.
- Detail on the positioning of park and ride car park(s).
- If park and ride will be available to the general public to access the campus and Canterbury beyond.
- Adequate provision for disabled drivers in car parks next to key buildings.
- Evidence that any new roads will not create new rat-runs.
- Projection of generated traffic for more populated campus, and how this fits in with potential traffic generated by other developments around Canterbury.
- Detail on car park capacity and how this will or won’t cause more private motor vehicle use by induced demand.

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

Yours sincerely,

SIGNATURE

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

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

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

I would very much like to continue that dialogue as you develop your thinking and consult on your plans for the university in the future. In particular, trustees and I would like to discuss how you intend to use the existing Crab and Winkle Way as a connection to your proposed northern developments, how you might also bring in the currently overgrown route of the original line to the north as a potential footpath and cycle route to improve access and sustainability, how you might capitalise on the nearly 200-year history in the tunnel (the world’s first ever passenger railway tunnel) beneath your buildings, including its northern and southern portals, and how the Crab and Winkle Line Trust and our members across the district and beyond can work effectively with you to develop a detailed scheme that we can publicly support.

I very much look forward to hearing from you.

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

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

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

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

We would like to express our disappointment at this stage that this masterplan is based only upon an urban design/architectural approach. There is no reference made to the need for an assessment of the biodiversity value of the area covered by the masterplan. There is also no reference to the need to evaluate this or indeed to embrace and enhance the biodiversity value on site. This would be expected in any planning process or submission to the Local Planning Authority and any omission would contravene the National Planning Policy Framework.

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

We look forward to contributing further at the earliest opportunity.

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

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

In the circumstances, it would in our view be wrong for you to proceed with the next stage of the Plan on the basis of such a flawed attempt to engage the public. We therefore request that you start the consultation again in a proper manner, and ask that you kindly confirm this will be done.
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We should also mention that we are reliably informed that Serco has been removing notices drawing attention to the plan erected locally mostly on private property, presumably following dialogue between you and the City Council. We have seen the notice which seems to us to be inoffensive, and which merely alerts people to the Plan, which is what you were supposed to have done. Can you please instruct Serco/the City Council not to remove such notices from private land in the future?

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

-----

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) farm land 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’s 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, but you might 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.

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.

-----

-----

-----

-----
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 of the proposed Campus Heart is not particularly large and some of the images used to emphasise how open space can be created on page 87 are out of scale to reality and somewhat misleading.

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 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 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 that the 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 hutch’ properties for the overflow from poor and middle Londoners who now cannot afford to live at home or near their place of work. Enough is enough – stop ruining our and this country’s historic and beautiful heritage NOW!

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 eg 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 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.

2) The grounds are extensive and great for walking. It would be beneficial to have mapped/signposted walking routes for those wishing to take regular exercise over the lunch period. A map could be produced, highlighting the various routes, indicating the distance and approximate time to complete the walk. Perhaps 45 and 30 minute walks could be routed. This would be a great incentive for all, maybe used by the wider community/public? It could take in some of the new plans of making it ‘a garden of England’ and take walkers through those newly developed areas and countryside.

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 space, 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 everywhere 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.

some more detailed thoughts:

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 wood road. Giles lane is far too narrow and positively dangerous as a junction for vehicles, cyclists and pedestrians and not fit for purpose.

-----

The first principle stated is ‘Make more effective and intensive use of the heart of the campus’

The idea that the buildings are too spread out and that what we need is a densely built up central area seems to me 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 some key buildings put to the world, for example Jarmain, 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.
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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 3 miles (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 there. 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 with dense, unattractive campuses. The focus should be on building over surface car parks rather than green areas.

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!!). 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 Tylers 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 à 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 my 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 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?

-----

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. Shameful.

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!

-----

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 siting 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 that hill sticking out like a sore thum b 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.
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“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 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 you going on the trek from north of KBS (parking) to what is being the labelled the heart of campus -- and it is home to some semi-friendly water birds. It may be man-made (I don’t know) but it doesn’t look contrived. It also is a neutral space which we need to gather thoughts and de-stress occasionally. It is a calming space near the increasingly urban business school/Jennison/ Stacey campus.

Parking -- if it takes longer than 7-8 minutes to walk to location people will engage in gamesmanship over spaces. Zone the parking so people can park near their home base -- be that staff in offices or students at lectures / seminars/ academic Schools. Remember paperwork / scripts are heavy if going any distance and horrible in the wet or at night because it slows you down.

-----

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. Pls 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 Jennision. 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.
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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 in 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.

I note with concern that page 3 of the plan states that “Developments within the Parklands’ could be considered” and that page 7 still shows a “conferencing hotel”. This seems at odds with the following statements from the plan:

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.
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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 Stonew 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 the 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
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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 obstruct 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 judicially 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 Michael’s 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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corners on the parkland. Firstly that the idea of restoring
the crab and winkle 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
and 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).

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 inifills, 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 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.

This land was a designated green space and buffer zone in
the original conceptual development of Kent University and
in addition is now also recognised by the Canterbury
Council in their latest 5 year local development plan.

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 mailshot 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.

-----

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 SMRARA and, on his own behalf, by ***** *****.

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 halts 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.

-----

9 Personal information redacted to protect an individual's identity.
The part of the plan that interests me is the Northern Land Holdings because I enjoy walking in the area near Blean Hill. 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 ***(redacted)***

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 comfortably 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 mass of car parks, you can always make 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
assume that access to this Cricket Pitch would be via the current Crab and Winkle route as plans seem to be re-routing 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 ***** [redacted], 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?!)

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 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 homogenous – 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 bio-diversity.

Within 50 yrs many more UK and international students may choose to use a distance internet access to learning/teaching model 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 nebulas 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 presumabily 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.

A further major consideration is that the development of the route, which would have to involve widening the present path, would almost inevitably involve some loss of mature trees. Quite apart from making the rear view from all these houses less attractive, this would also have an impact on wildlife.

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
take away this enjoyment and close the campus in in a
claustrophobic manner.

-----

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 there
are clearly no plans to turn it into a decent research library.

-----

It is vital that UoK does not take away green spaces that
have been enjoyed by all for decades. It is a campus
university, not an urban university. The green campus
spaces and nearby green spaces are central to its appeal
and helps recruitment and enrolment. Expansion needs to
be sustainably, morally, and ecologically sound. Bigger is
not always better or appropriate.

-----

I am amazed you have included any buildings on the
Chaucer Fields. We as residents have campaigned long
and hard to protect those fields. It’s cost us greatly, 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.

Continue as you are and the relationship you wish to gain
with the people of Canterbury will never happen.

You have by far so much more PR work to before this will be
accepted by all.

-----

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
production
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emissions 2005-2020 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 core mission of academic productivity (research, teaching, 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 outcome 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 Keynes 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
I am a resident of Tyler Hill. My property is on the ***** ***** just before it become Tyler Hill Road.

I have accessed on line 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 Land Holdings”

“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 Land Holdings. 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

The potential value of these land areas to the University must surely be considerably greater than their value to the current owner. I suggest that it would be worth entering into negotiations for the purchase of this land. As an alternative to cash purchase, an exchange of land involving areas owned by the University further to the north, between Brotherhood Wood and Hothe Court Farm, would surely be to the advantage of both parties. In my opinion, the University could afford to offer a generous deal to the other landowner here.

It would be so much better to develop these areas within such close walking distance of the campus heartland, than to develop currently owned areas much further out to the north, or on the western area of the Southern Slopes, as proposed in the draft master Plan.

-----

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.

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 Blean and Tyler Hill.

-----

The map of the University’s landholdings (page 13) shows what seems to me to be a striking feature, which I have never seen referred to in any planning documentation. There are two areas of land immediately to the north of Giles Lane Car Park, and the Estates Buildings, which are not in University ownership. A third such area is to the north of the sports pavilions. These areas could be of immense strategic potential to the expansion of the University, as they are close enough to the central part of campus (“heartlands”) to be within a few minutes’ walking distance. They could be used for teaching space or for new residential accommodation.

The potential value of these land areas to the University must surely be considerably greater than their value to the

“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 p96, 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

APPENDIX 5B – COMMENTS FROM INDIVIDUALS (CONT)
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
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.

Sorry I meant to add I particularly like 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 which is most needed and can be achieved by extending the existing rail footbridge into adjacent vacant land along Roper Road.

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'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 404 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 am 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.

Hoew 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.

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.

I also found the fact that I was not made aware of any of these plans or receive a flyer which the University said they distributed pretty underhanded.

-----

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 Whitsable 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
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 with 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 Beane 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? Whilst 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...
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 car parks 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 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 Whitstable 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 situting 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 â 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 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. 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 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.
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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
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 decisions about subject mix and subsequent investment 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 line 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.

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. 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 otherw ise, 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 would urge UK C to listen to its neighbours and rethink the approach to its northern land holdings; UKC has a vital role in maintaining the environmental and historic integrity of this part of Kent and should not be facilitating intensive residential development.

-----

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.

-----

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 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 otherw ise, 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 would urge UK C to listen to its neighbours and rethink the approach to its northern land holdings; UKC has a vital role in maintaining the environmental and historic integrity of this part of Kent and should not be facilitating intensive residential development.

-----

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 long.

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 by brother, sister and friends.

I do not think the University should build a hotel in the southern slopes / fields. There is lots of land still where a hotel could be built near the Innovation Centre. This would leave the fields for everyone to use, including the students we see there. I also see a lot of wildlife in the fields, including bats that I think use the trees. I think this area should be kept and not destroyed by building and bright lights also.

-----

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
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
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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 Radfai 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

VERY OPEN + INFORMATIVE SESSION; WHILE UKC OFFERS AND IMPORTANT HEARTBEAT TO THE CITY IT COULD BE DOING MORE IN ESTABLISHING AN ENERGY CENTRE FOR BOTH ITSELF AND THE SURROUNDING COMMUNITY AS PART OF ITS FUTURE DEVELOPMENT.

Consideration should be given to ‘sweating the asset’ through some radical thoughts of a 4 term year, better occupancy levels, thus giving some consolidation to the existing estate rather than just random building on spare vacant areas of land.

The presentation by the architect was rather haphazard, no mention to the concept of his masterplan seemed to start from the point of an academic plan, which must lead the vision of years ahead, hence the function suitability of some aspirations of their relevant juxtaposition to each other seem to be overlooked. Their concept seems to major on the urban landscape and less on the opportunity for a business hub, with a HEI as its centre, perhaps some more thoughts on innovation centres, acting as incubators for students, such that teaching/learning and the work environment can be a better flow, one from the other. This idea could build upon better links to London + Europe and encourage better business links and promote Canterbury as a city that not only has a cathedral, history and good shopping, with little else, currently, to offer as regards jobs etc.

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.

139 Appendix 5b – Comments from individuals
APPENDIX 5B – COMMENTS FROM INDIVIDUALS (CONT)

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 smack 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.

---
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 ACCOMODATION AS SOON AS POSSIBLE. WHERE WE LIVE HALES 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 cafes?

-----

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!
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:
**Canterbury East CA482 / PA009**

I can confirm that Network Rail does not want the Canterbury East (CA482 / PA009) 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 sites potential and enable the site to accommodate more units.

**Herne Bay CA491 / PA012**

I can confirm that Network Rail does not want the Herne Bay (CA491 / PA012) 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.
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Conclusion

Network Rail requests that its Canterbury East (CA482 / PA009) and Herne Bay (CA491 / PA012) 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 / PA009) 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 Stipp
Town Planner
Five images supplied by respondent.
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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 silicone 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 ploy 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 Land holdings’ 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 SERVICING 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.

**BUSINESS CLUSTER. PARK AND RIDE**
Blean church site, the northern edge proposed for housing as part of the ‘EARLY WIN’. The site is within the designated Conservation Area and has no existing access to Tyler Hill road.

**CRICKET PITCH**
The site for the cricket pitch is sloping, poorly drained and crossed by a public footpath. The proposed ‘small-scale’ business buildings are each approximately 10 x 50 metres – much larger than any existing building in Blean or Tyler Hill.

**NEW BUILDINGS (Approximate length 50 Metres)**

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.

Image supplied by respondent
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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.
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 delete 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 your 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 and 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

19 Personal information redacted to protect an individual’s identity.
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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.

-----