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Policy EMP7 (University of Kent) in the Canterbury District Local Plan requires a masterplan for the Canterbury campus. The University of Kent is therefore working collaboratively with Canterbury City Council and others to develop a Framework Masterplan that articulates a long-term vision for the future of the campus and provides a framework for future development.

Drawing on the Concept Masterplan of July 2015 and responses to it, the Framework Masterplan is being developed in a series of steps. Step 1 was to develop and consult on a Strategic Spatial Vision. Step 2 (this current step) involved preparing and consulting on proposals for specific areas of the campus, for movement and transport and for short and medium-term development within four different character areas. Step 3 will see the publication of a Framework Masterplan Document.

In accordance with its adopted masterplan consultation principles, the University carried out extensive consultation on the emerging Framework Masterplan, including a presentation to stakeholder representatives, four public exhibitions and a hotel/conference centre stakeholder meeting. This Statement sets out the details of the consultation, the comments received and the University’s response to them.

All written comments received are set out in full in Appendices 16 and 17. There is also a note of the hotel/conference facility stakeholder meeting (Appendix 6). The body of the Statement includes analysis of the number of responses to the consultation, including who they were from and where respondents lived/worked. It also summarises and responds to the comments received – organised under seven themes: Chaucer Fields, General, Place-making, Planning & Environment, Landscape & Biodiversity, Movement & Transport and Consultation.

A summary of the key consultation statistics is as follows:

- Representatives from 20 organisations attended a stakeholder presentation event held on 13 September 2018
- 365 people attended four public exhibitions in October 2018
- A total of 237 written responses were received (228 from individuals and nine from groups), with 117 comments being made online or by email and 120 by handwritten feedback forms
- The majority (51%) of individual respondents were residents, although University employees and students were well represented (together comprising 42% of responders)
- The majority (85%) of individual responses came from postcodes CT2 7, CT2 8 and CT2 9.

Discounting those people who did not provide a view on specific questions and those who ticked the middle ‘neutral’ column, the analysis of completed feedback forms found the following levels of satisfaction:

- Overall vision for the evolution of the campus – dissatisfied 55%, satisfied 45%
- The focus on place-making/sustainability and the proposals to consolidate the Campus Heart – dissatisfied 52%, satisfied 48%
- The scope of the Framework Masterplan and the character areas – dissatisfied 57%, satisfied 43%
- The projects identified as proposed short-term and medium-term developments – dissatisfied 61%, satisfied 39%.

Of those who completed the relevant sections of the feedback forms:

- 39% of respondents thought the Framework Masterplan would contribute positively to the future planning of Canterbury District and 41% thought that it would not
- 27% of respondents thought that Canterbury City Council should endorse the Framework Masterplan as the guide against which future proposed projects on campus will be assessed and 57% thought that it should not.
The proposal for a conference hotel to the south of University Road within the University Rise Character Area dominated responses. Of the 228 individuals who responded, 142 (62%) objected to this proposal. Of these 142, a total of 88 (62%) raised this as their only objection. All nine local groups that commented on the Framework Masterplan objected to the proposal. Responses on this issue also stood out in terms of their length, the level of detail and the emotion conveyed. A student organised a local petition with (as of 28-12-18) 3,382 signatories objecting to the proposal.

Since the consultation events, the University is revising the emerging Framework Masterplan by relocating Development Proposal A (conference hotel) from land to the south of University Road (on Chaucer Fields) to land to the north of University Road (to the south of Turing College). The land to the south of University Road is predominantly to be maintained and enhanced as open space. This is being done taking account of recent advice and recommendations from external consultants on a range of factors, including market conditions in the Canterbury area. The newly proposed location gives maximum flexibility both in the size of the footprint of the building and also with regard to the size of conferences that can be held as this location provides easy access to the facilities available in Turing College.

A broad range of other concerns were raised in relation to general University-related issues; place-making; planning and environment; landscape and biodiversity; movement and transport; and the consultation. Comments are set out in Section 4 of this Statement, together with a University response to them. Section 5 identifies a number of lessons for future consultation.

This feedback, together with on-going studies, will inform the preparation of a draft Framework Masterplan Document. The University intends to provide stakeholders with an opportunity to comment on this document before finalising and publishing it.
1 INTRODUCTION

From Concept Masterplan to Framework Masterplan

In 2015, the University of Kent published a Concept Masterplan containing ideas on how best to develop the campus over the next 30 to 50 years. A public consultation on that concept took place from July to September 2016 and involved residents, parish councils, amenity groups, university staff and Canterbury City Council. The University learned a lot during the consultation and published the results in a Concept Masterplan Consultation Statement in April 2017.

Taking on board the feedback received during the consultation process, the University is currently developing a Framework Masterplan. It details the framework within which the University will make decisions about the future evolution of its campus in the short-term (2018 to 2021) and medium-term (2021 to 2031). It covers the period defined in the Canterbury District Local Plan. The Framework Masterplan document will not be a planning application but a vision for the evolution of the campus. It will provide a framework against which future planning applications will be assessed. When and if aspects of the plan are funded, they will go through the usual planning process and members of the public will be involved in the usual way.

The Framework Masterplan is being prepared in a number of steps, as set out below. We are currently at Step 2.

Step 1 – Strategic Vision. The first step was to prepare an overall Strategic Spatial Vision detailing the type of place the Canterbury Campus should be and how it should be delivered. A Strategic Spatial Vision Discussion Document was created to enable a range of stakeholders to discuss and shape an overall spatial vision and the strategies for delivering it. This drew on a number of ‘building blocks’, including consultation feedback on the Concept Masterplan (as set out in the Concept Masterplan Consultation Statement). The Discussion Document was widely consulted on, including at a Strategic Spatial Vision Workshop held at the Canterbury Campus on 19 July 2017. A Workshop Report providing a short factual summary and account of the discussions that took place at the event was published on the University’s website in August 2017. This was followed by publication of a note of a Staff Focus Group in September 2017 and then a Consultation Statement in November 2017, which set out details of all discussion and comments received, along with the University’s responses to them.

Step 2 – Framework Masterplan. This step involved preparing proposals for specific areas of the campus. The proposals draw on the strategic vision and strategies, which were amended to take account of feedback received during Step 1 (as set out in the November 2017 Consultation Statement) and discussions with Canterbury City Council, Kent County Council and other technical stakeholders. The Framework Masterplan consultation material set out proposals for movement and transport and short and medium-term developments within four character areas: University Rise, Whitstable Road, Campus Heart and the Sarre Penn Valley.

Step 3 – Publication of a revised Framework Masterplan. The next step involves reviewing feedback, revising the proposals to take account of the comments received and the results of on-going studies, and then preparing a Framework Masterplan document for publication. It will become a key tool for decision-making by the University in shaping future developments on the campus and a key material consideration against which future planning applications will be determined. The University intends to provide stakeholders with an opportunity to comment on this document before finalising and publishing it.

The purpose and structure of this document

The University is committed to preparing a consultation statement for each stage in the development of its Framework Masterplan. The statement provides an opportunity to record comments and feedback received, explain how they have influenced the Masterplan proposals and to identify lessons for future consultation. It sets out who was consulted, how they were consulted, what they said and how the University is going to take account of comments.

- Section 1 (this section) sets out the background to the preparation of a Framework Masterplan and the purpose and structure of this document
- Section 2 sets out the consultation principles adopted by the University and outlines the consultation and stakeholder engagement undertaken
- Section 3 details the number of comments received, how those individuals who responded are categorised, where responders live/work, and their answers to the specific questions included in the Feedback Form
- Section 4 summarises the key comments, ordered by issue, and includes the University’s responses to them
- Section 5 identifies lessons for future consultation/engagement
- Section 6 sets out conclusions and next steps.
2 CONSULTEES & METHODS OF CONSULTATION

Consultation principles
Canterbury City Council’s (CCC’s) Statement of Community Involvement (SCI), dated 2007, sets out commitments on how CCC engages with stakeholders over the preparation of Local Development Documents and identifies the Council’s Consultation Principles. It helped the University to identify a number of key principles that informed the consultation events that took place during Step 1 and Step 2 of the Masterplan process and that will shape 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 of 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
- Prepare a Consultation Statement at each stage to record comments and feedback received, and to explain how they have influenced the Masterplan proposals.

Consultation
Taking account of the above principles, the University developed a consultation strategy to effectively engage with the local and regional stakeholders listed in Appendix 1, together with local residents and businesses.

Presentation to stakeholder representatives
A presentation for Masterplan stakeholder groups took place on Thursday 13 September 2018 on the Canterbury Campus in advance of the public consultation events. Over 140 representatives of 40 external stakeholder groups were invited, including county, district and parish councillors, amenity groups, residents’ associations, transport and environmental advisory bodies and Kent Union, the University’s students’ union (See Appendix 1). The invitation1, sent on 9 August 2018, also gave those invited advance notice of the public consultation event details, which are listed below.

The event was held in the Sibson Building on the Canterbury campus and included a presentation2 from architect and master planner, John Letherland, and opportunities to ask questions. Attendees were reminded of the public consultation locations and dates and also viewed an exhibition featuring a number of the posters that were to be used at the public events3. This display included notes on the Masterplan’s context, vision and principles and a feature on short and medium-term plans for the campus but lacked the character study posters which were added later, in time for the public consultation.

Feedback forms4 were available throughout the event for attendees to fill in and either return on the day or by post after the event.

Of the 40 organisations invited, 20 were represented at the event.5 John Letherland’s presentation was subsequently emailed to all those who attended, and it was made available on the Masterplan webpages6.

A number of event attendees also took part in a quarterly meeting with the University’s Vice-Chancellor, Professor Karen Cox, arranged for representatives of local residents’ associations and parish councils7 (see Appendix 1). The Masterplan was on the agenda for the meeting, giving those in attendance a chance to ask further questions arising from the Masterplan presentation. Members of the University’s Estates team and master planner John Letherland attended to assist with responding to questions.

1 Stakeholder presentation event invitation email, see Appendix 2
3 Stakeholder presentation exhibition posters – see Appendix 3
4 Stakeholder presentation event feedback form, see Appendix 4
5 Stakeholder presentation event attendees, see Appendix 1
6 Masterplan web pages www.kent.ac.uk/masterplan. The presentation was published in advance of the first consultation session but a technical hitch led to it being unavailable over the weekend of the first event in Westgate Hall. It was again available from Monday 8 October.
7 Residents’ associations and parish councils meeting with the VC invitees, see Appendix 1
Hotel/conference centre stakeholder meeting

A question from the floor at the stakeholder presentation event raised the proposed location of the hotel/conference centre as a concern and prompted the suggestion of a meeting with local residents’ groups to discuss the University’s continued choice of Chaucer Fields as the preferred location. The meeting was arranged for 7 November 2018 with invites sent to a list of relevant residents’ associations and interest groups8 (see Appendix 1) on 7 October 2018.

Public exhibitions

Local residents, members of the public, University of Kent staff and students were given a number of opportunities to visit an exhibition outlining progress towards producing the Framework Masterplan.

The exhibition took the form of 21 x A0 posters9 mounted on presentation boards and covering the Masterplan’s context, vision and principles, general summaries and maps of the key character areas of the campus, and a feature on short and medium-term plans.

The exhibition was staffed throughout by members of the University’s Masterplan project team including the master planner and architect, planning consultant and colleagues from the University’s Estates and Corporate Communications departments.

Feedback forms10 were available to fill in on the day and visitors were also encouraged to email or write to the Masterplan consultation team. The details of these exhibitions are set out below:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Date/time</th>
<th>Location</th>
<th>Number of attendees</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>10.00-16.00 Saturday 6 October</td>
<td>Westgate Hall, Canterbury</td>
<td>117</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14.00-20.00 Thursday 11 October</td>
<td>Tyler Hill Memorial Hall</td>
<td>49</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14.00-20.00 Friday 12 October</td>
<td>Blean Village Hall</td>
<td>69</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10.00-16.00 Thursday 18 October</td>
<td>Darwin Conference Suite, University of Kent</td>
<td>130</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The exhibition posters were available online from Monday 8 October for the duration of the public consultation. A number of members of the public, some of whom were also representatives of local groups, requested that the posters be emailed to them or printed and sent by post so they could share the information with those who were unable to attend.

A handout on the hotel/conference facility11, copies of the latest Community Newsletter12, the University’s Annual Review/Financial Statements 201713 and a leaflet on the University’s regional impact14 were also available at the events.

---

8 Hotel/conference facility stakeholder meeting invitees, see Appendix 1
10 Framework Masterplan Step 2 Feedback form – see Appendix 5
11 Hotel/conference facility handout – see Appendix 6
12 Community Newsletter issue 5 August 2018, available online at: www.kent.ac.uk/community/canterbury/files/community-newsletter-aug-2018.pdf
13 University of Kent Annual Review/Financial Statements 2017, available online at: www.kent.ac.uk/finance/about/accounts/accounts20162017.pdf
14 Regional impact postcards – ‘Community impact’ and ‘Economic impact’ – see Appendix 7
2 CONSULTEES & METHODS OF CONSULTATION (CONT)

Publicising the exhibitions
The University’s quarterly Community Newsletter for August 2018 included an article outlining the consultation process and gave details of the exhibitions. The newsletter was printed and delivered by Royal Mail during the week beginning 27 August 2018 to all properties in the postcodes CT1 2, CT2 7, CT2 8 and CT2 9, reaching 12,210 homes and businesses covering the city centre, north Canterbury, Blean and Tyler Hill.

In the same week, beginning 27 August 2018, a link to an electronic version of the newsletter was emailed to the University’s Community Newsletter external stakeholder list including county, city and parish councillors, council officers, amenity groups, residents’ associations, businesses and business groups.

In addition, leaflets outlining the consultation process and exhibition details, were printed and delivered by Royal Mail during the week beginning 24 September 2018 to all properties in the postcodes CT1 2, CT2 7, CT2 8 and CT2 9, reaching 12,210 homes and businesses covering the city centre, north Canterbury, Blean and Tyler Hill.

A Masterplan public consultation story was added to both Campus Online, for staff, and the Student Guide sections of the University website on Tuesday 25 September 2018, receiving 440 views. The notice was also emailed to all staff (circulation 3,500) on Monday 1 October 2018.

The University’s online News Centre carried a story on the Masterplan and the consultation events from Tuesday 2 October 2018, receiving 210 views.

A full-page colour advertisement was placed with the Kentish Gazette (circulation 12,000), published in the Thursday 4 October 2018 edition and online listings.

Feedback deadline
A deadline of Friday 26 October 2018 was set purely to enable inclusion in this consultation statement. This date was published in the week beginning Monday 8 October 2018. In the event, it proved possible to include feedback received up to 7 November 2018.

Masterplan webpages
From the date of the August Community Newsletter, which initially announced the consultation, to the end of October 2018, approximately 1,060 users visited the University’s Masterplan webpages and requested nearly 4,000-page views.

One-to-one meetings and correspondence
The University has had one-to-one discussions with the following since the November 2017 Consultation Statement was published:

- Canterbury City Council (CCC) and its advisors – regular discussions and meetings on the emerging Masterplan
- Kent County Council (as Highway Authority) and CCC to discuss movement and transport issues
- Historic England

---

15 ‘New Masterplan consultation events’ in Community Newsletter issue 5, excerpt available in Appendix 8
16 Community Newsletter regional stakeholder list, see Appendix 9
17 Public consultation leaflet for Royal Mail delivery, see Appendix 10
18 Public consultation on Campus Masterplan, notice for staff and students, see Appendix 11 and online for staff at www.kent.ac.uk/campusonline/?View=15045 and for students at www.kent.ac.uk/student/news/?id=19045&source=blog
19 University News Centre online story, see Appendix 12 and online at: www.kent.ac.uk/news/kentlife/19197/public-consultation-on-campus-masterplan
20 Artwork for advert placed in Kentish Gazette print and online, see Appendix 13
3 FEEDBACK SUMMARY – NUMBER AND RANGE OF RESPONSES

**Who commented?**
The University received a total of 237 written responses (228 from individuals and nine from groups). There is also an online petition with 3,382 signatures.

Analysis reveals that of the 237 responses, 117 were received online via the University website or by email and 120 by handwritten feedback forms.

Figure 1 below summarises the range of consultees who responded, based on those who provided this information. Where individuals self-identified as falling in to more than one category, all of the categories that the person selected have been counted.

21 Where an individual filled in a feedback form and submitted one or more additional written comments, this has been counted as one response.
A postcode analysis of the feedback was also undertaken. Of the 228 individual responses, 107 contained the postal address of the respondent. Of those, the majority (85%) came from the Canterbury postcodes of CT2 7, CT2 8, CT2 9 shown below in Figure 2. Another 12 responders came from other Canterbury postcodes and two came from other postcodes.

Response to specific questions on Feedback Form

The feedback forms (Appendices 4 and 9) used to facilitate responses at the four public exhibitions posed six specific questions. Four of the questions asked those responding to score the specific aspects of the Framework Masterplan on a scale of one to five (where one is highly dissatisfied and five is extremely satisfied). The results are summarised below, with associated comments set out in full in Appendix 19.

The tables below provide a summary of who completed the form and their answers to the six specific questions. The following should be noted: (1) Some people identified as representing more than one of the categories outlined below. In such cases, all of the categories that the person ticked have been counted. Given this, the total number of forms completed is less than the total number of people in the various categories; (2) Not everyone who filled in a form answered all the questions or added a comment under every question; and (3) Not everyone that attended the event filled in a form.
Discounting those who did not provide a view on this question, 41% of people did not think that CCC should endorse the Framework Masterplan (with 39% thinking that they should).

### Table 1: Who commented?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Who commented</th>
<th>Number</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Resident (R)</td>
<td>71</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Councillor (C)</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Member of the business community (B)</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>University of Kent student (S)</td>
<td>21</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>University of Kent employee (E)</td>
<td>37</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>University of Kent alumnus (A)</td>
<td>12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other (please specify)</td>
<td>Church warden, user of facilities, Associate, UCA student, cyclist, University Medical employee, councillor</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>None specified</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total number of forms completed</td>
<td>120</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Table 2: Answers to Question 1

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Question 1. Do you think that the Framework Masterplan will contribute positively to the future planning of the Canterbury District</th>
<th>Response</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>41</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No</td>
<td>43</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Don’t know</td>
<td>20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>None of above</td>
<td>16</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>120</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Table 3: Answers to Questions 2, 3, 4 and 5

On a scale of one to five (where one is highly dissatisfied and five is extremely satisfied) how would you score the following aspects of the Framework Masterplan presented today?

#### Question 2

Overall vision for the evolution of the campus.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Highly dissatisfied to extremely satisfied</th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>None</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20</td>
<td>28</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>28</td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

#### Question 3

The focus on place-making and sustainability and the proposals to consolidate the Campus Heart presented in the Strategic Spatial Objectives.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Highly dissatisfied to extremely satisfied</th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>None</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16</td>
<td>33</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12</td>
<td>16</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16</td>
<td>25</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>25</td>
<td>18</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

#### Question 4

The scope of the Framework Masterplan and the character areas that may see development under the current Canterbury District Local Plan (to 2031).

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Highly dissatisfied to extremely satisfied</th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>None</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>25</td>
<td>38</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15</td>
<td>26</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

#### Question 5

The projects identified as proposed short-term and medium-term developments.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Highly dissatisfied to extremely satisfied</th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>None</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>24</td>
<td>42</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20</td>
<td>22</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>22</td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Discounting those who did not provide a view on these questions and those who ticked the middle ‘neutral’ column, the above demonstrates the following levels of satisfaction:

- Overall vision for the evolution of the campus – dissatisfied 55%, satisfied 45%
- The focus on place-making/sustainability and the proposals to consolidate the Campus Heart – dissatisfied 52%, satisfied 48%
- The scope of the Framework Masterplan and the character areas – dissatisfied 57%, satisfied 43%
- The projects identified as proposed short-term and medium-term developments – dissatisfied 61%, satisfied 39%.

Table 6: Answers to question 6

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Answer</th>
<th>Count</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>29</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No</td>
<td>60</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Don’t know</td>
<td>17</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>None of above</td>
<td>14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>120</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Discounting those who did not provide a view on this question, 57% of people did not think that CCC should endorse the Framework Masterplan (with 27% thinking that they should).
Responses

The full comments made by groups, organisations and individuals are set out in appendices as follows:

• Appendix 18 is a complete list of all the comments that were received from groups and organisations
• Appendix 19 is a complete list of all the comments that were received from individuals
• Appendix 20 details an online petition objecting to the proposed conference hotel on Chaucer Fields and includes all of the posted ‘reasons for signing’ the petition.

Summary of key comments

One issue dominated responses to the emerging Masterplan. This was short and medium-term Development Proposal A for a conference hotel to the south of University Road within the University Rise Character Area.

• Of the 228 individuals who responded, 142 (62%) objected to this proposal
• 88 of the 142 people who objected (62%) raised this as their only objection
• All nine local groups that commented on the Framework Masterplan objected to the proposal
• Responses on this issue also stood out in terms of their length, level of detail and the emotion conveyed.

In addition to the consultation organised by the University, a student organised a local petition with (as of 28-12-18) 3,382 signatories objecting to Development Proposal A (conference hotel). For completeness, the wording of the petition and comments posted in support of the petition are included as Appendix 20. However, this needs to be treated with some caution as the petition webpage refers people to the ‘Save Chaucer Fields’ website (rather than the University’s website). The ‘Save Chaucer Fields’ website identifies a much larger area of the Southern Slopes than that to which Development Proposal 1 relates and it is not clear whether those who signed the petition have seen the University’s proposal or the Masterplan in the round.

A broad range of other issues were raised and below is a summary of key comments, together with the University’s responses to them. These are organised around the following themes (corresponding, in part, with the four emerging spatial strategies):

A Chaucer Fields;
B General;
C Place-making;
D Planning & Environment;
E Landscape & Biodiversity;
F Movement & Transport
G Consultation.

Some respondents repeated or made very similar comments in answer to each of the questions on the feedback form. Others repeated or made very similar comments in the feedback form and in separate emails. Where this occurs, the comment in respect of a key issue has only been counted once.

A Chaucer Fields

Most comments objecting to the proposed conference hotel refered to its location, rather than the use in principle, and there is at least one comment supporting the need for world class conferencing facilities in Canterbury. However, the majority of comments by individuals and all of those from local groups opposed a conference hotel being developed on part of Chaucer Fields. Their reasons are set out in full in Appendices 19 and 20 and are briefly summarised in Table 7 below.
### 4 SUMMARY OF KEY COMMENTS BY ISSUE (CONT)

Table 7: Summary of comments on Proposal A – Chaucer Fields

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>No</th>
<th>Comment</th>
<th>Response</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| CF1 | It is fundamentally incompatible with the core principles of the Masterplan.  
• The Canterbury campus will be defined by a strong high-quality landscape...  
• The Campus and nearby University owned land will be developed in ways that protect its special natural and semi-natural environment...  
• To consolidate the Campus Heart rather than locating further development on the periphery  
• The vision for creating an enhanced environment, including conserving and enriching the pastoral landscape of University Rise and restoring historic planting of the University Rise area, improving and extending woodland habitats and conserving and restoring the open grass slopes overlooking the city | The proposed conference hotel needs to be seen as an integral part of a wider Framework Masterplan which delivers the Strategic Spatial Vision for the campus. However, it is recognised that the alternative locations discussed at the Hotel Stakeholder Workshop on 7 November 2018 could be equally aligned with these emerging principles. |
| CF2 | It is incompatible with Canterbury City Council’s Local Plan, in particular:  
• The designation of the southern slopes as part of an Area of High Landscape Value  
• Guidelines in the Canterbury Landscape Character and Biodiversity Appraisal. The relevant guidelines for the Stour Valley Slopes (including encouraging the restoration of the historic parkland planting, strengthening and recreating the traditional field pattern, conserving and restoring open grass slopes overlooking the City, strengthening the structure of the field pattern on the slopes beneath the University). | Chaucer Fields is within a designated Area of High Landscape Value, but so too are the alternative locations for a conference hotel discussed at the Hotel Stakeholder Workshop on 7 November 2018. However, it is recognised that the alternative locations discussed at the Hotel Stakeholder Workshop on 7 November 2018 could be equally aligned with these Guidelines. |
| CF3 | It would result in the loss of valuable open space and would:  
• Place buildings in a ‘green gap’ (formal if not formal)  
• Result in the loss of habitat/wildlife  
• Result in the loss of walking, socialising space (contrary to encouraging healthy lifestyles)  
• Damage a historically significant space  
• Be environmentally unsustainable. | A large number of local residents objected to development on green open space that helps to separate University buildings from the residential neighbourhoods to the south. Some individuals mistakenly thought that the Canterbury District Local Plan had designated the Southern Slopes as a formal ‘Green Gap’ (where there is a presumption against new development). In fact, following the Examination in Public and Inspector’s findings, an earlier proposal by Canterbury City Council for a ‘Green Gap’ was not included within the adopted Local Plan. |
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>No</th>
<th>Comment</th>
<th>Response</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>CF4</td>
<td>It is contrary to the conclusion of the Village Green public inquiry that the fields of the southern slopes are a much-valued asset for the local community.</td>
<td>It is acknowledged that the Inspector at the Public Inquiry concluded that there was evidence of lawful use of Chaucer Fields for sports and leisure pastimes. However, it should be noted that this is at the discretion of the University and that the application to register land as a new Village Green was not successful.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CF5</td>
<td>It would lead to additional car parking and traffic to the area.</td>
<td>A conference hotel is being proposed as an integral part of a wider Framework Masterplan and the Movement and Transport Strategy that underpins it. The strategy is based on encouraging sustainable modes of transport, managing overall traffic growth and rationalising car parking. Within this context, additional traffic and parking associated with a conference hotel has been accounted for and would be mitigated by proposed measures.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CF6</td>
<td>Business case  • Weaknesses with the economic and ‘business case’ aspects of the previous proposal (2011/12 planning application)  • Lack of publicly available information on these issues  • Recent decline in student numbers brings in to question overall expansion of the campus at this time.</td>
<td>The context within which the University is proposing a conference hotel includes the following:  • the University sector is facing challenging times  • the University needs to be financially sustainable in order to continue to focus on its core education function during a period of reduced funding  • the University is having to adapt to changing demand from students and changes in demographics, including a move towards more vocational and in-work courses  • the University needs to respond to changes in the learning and professional sectors, including cross-over between the two  • the proposed conference hotel would provide additional, and diversified income, for the University  • there is both a need and market for a conference hotel in the region (with the area having a dearth of tourist accommodation and conferencing facilities)  • The University already has a track record of providing tourist accommodation and conferencing facilities, but generally only within a short window during the summer holidays  • the proposed conference hotel would contribute positively to the local knowledge and visitor economy which are key tenets of Canterbury City Council’s strategy.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
4 SUMMARY OF KEY COMMENTS BY ISSUE (CONT)

Table 7: Summary of comments on Proposal A – Chaucer Fields (cont)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>No</th>
<th>Comment</th>
<th>Response</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>CF7</td>
<td>It would set a precedent for further development on the Southern Slopes. Objection on the grounds that a conferencing hotel would make way for further development.</td>
<td>Planning decisions are not based on legal precedent. Individual proposals are decided on their merits. Planning law requires applications to be determined in accordance with the development plan (in this case the Canterbury District Local Plan), unless material considerations indicate otherwise.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CF8</td>
<td>If a conference hotel is needed, there are better alternative locations. A number of alternative locations have been suggested. The most common are the north side of University Road (next to Beverley Farm or north of the existing Innovation Centre) or in the Campus Heart.</td>
<td>Noted. This was the basis of discussion at the Conference Hotel Stakeholder Workshop on 7 November 2018.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
| CF9 | It would completely ignore the feedback from the following groups in previous consultations and make a nonsense of the consultation process.  
- Local resident’s community groups  
- University students  
- University staff. | The decision to propose Chaucer Fields as the preferred location for a conference hotel took account of previous consultation responses. |
| CF10 | It would do irrevocable damage to relations between the university and the local community. | Noted. |

Overall response

The University will revise the emerging Framework Masterplan by relocating Development Proposal A (conference hotel) from land to the south of University Road (on Chaucer Fields) to land to the north of University Road (to the south of Turing College). The land to the south of University Road will be predominantly maintained and enhanced as open space.

The decision follows recent advice and recommendations from external consultants that feed into the development of the University’s Framework Masterplan and its underlying principles and vision, including information about market conditions in the Canterbury area. The proposed location – north of University Road and south of Turing College – would give maximum flexibility both in the size of the footprint of the building and also with regard to the size of conferences that can be held, as this location provides easy access to the facilities available in Turing College. The conference hotel would be designed to address a changing higher education landscape offering both facilities and opportunities for the generation of income to help support the University’s teaching and research activities.

The proposed revised site for a conference hotel is allocated in the Canterbury District Local Plan for business purposes (B1 only). However, the University considers that the public benefits associated with a conference hotel (including additional jobs and increased opportunities for local and regional businesses), together with the identification of other parts of the campus as being suitable for business purposes provides a compelling case for making an exception to or amending this allocation. The University looks forward to receiving support for this case from those groups and individuals who identified land to the north of University Road as being an acceptable alternative to Chaucer Fields.
### B General

Table 8 below summarises the key general comments made in response to consultation.

**Table 8: Key general comments**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>No</th>
<th>General comments</th>
<th>Comments received</th>
<th>Response</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>GC1</td>
<td>Question the need for growth, given that student numbers are going down and uncertainty in Higher Education.</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>Canterbury District Local Plan Policy EMP7 calls for the University to prepare a masterplan. The University needs to plan for different scenarios for an uncertain future and the Framework Masterplan is not posited on growth. Aside from the identified short and medium-term development proposals, the Framework Masterplan is not a detailed ‘development plan’, but a flexible ‘development framework’ that allows for consolidation and different levels of growth to occur. Some of these development proposals seek to improve the quality of provision for the existing number of staff and students, which have seen significant recent increases. Those projects associated with business, innovation and conferencing are not directly dependent on staff or student numbers.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>GC2</td>
<td>Inappropriate for the University to diversify into sectors outside of its remit as a non-profit education institution – it should focus on teaching, learning and research.</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>The University is encouraged by central Government to become increasingly self-funding. As a result, the University intends to diversify the elements of its business that make a positive contribution to the student experience and needs of the region (including cultural/sports activities and conferencing). Where a profit is made from such activities, this will make a positive financial contribution towards the University's core business of teaching and research.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>GC3</td>
<td>Local authorities bought land in the 1960s to establish the University on the basis that open space would be maintained for the common good and the establishment of a ‘Green Gap.’</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>The Masterplan proposes a large amount of open space and land for the common good. Furthermore, with the decision to locate a proposed conference hotel on land to the north of University Road, the southern slopes are to be predominantly maintained and enhanced as open space.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
## SUMMARY OF KEY COMMENTS BY ISSUE (CONT)

### Table 8: Key general comments (cont)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>No</th>
<th>General comments</th>
<th>Comments received</th>
<th>Response</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>GC4</td>
<td>The University’s business model is flawed. Open space/environment is key to attracting students (particularly overseas students). Open space and natural beauty may be hard to quantitively value, but such assets should not be overlooked.</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>The University agrees that an attractive campus is key to attracting students. The Framework Masterplan proposes a large amount of open space and biodiversity enhancements. Any future growth is generally directed to the Campus Heart, with some exceptions in other character areas where necessary.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>GC5</td>
<td>The student/resident balance in the city exceeds sensible levels and more development would bring little benefit.</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>The University sees no immediate increase in student numbers. The Framework Masterplan is not posited on the basis of additional student numbers in the future, but instead plans for this possibility. The University works with Canterbury City Council and other partners on issues concerning Canterbury’s student population.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>GC6</td>
<td>The University claims to be in deficit, is on a hiring/pay freeze but can afford such developments.</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>See response to GC1 above. The identified short and medium-term projects are in the best interests of University staff, students and the wider regional economy.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### Place-making

Table 9 below summarises the key comments made in relation to place-making/master planning.

**Table 9: Key place-making comments**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>No</th>
<th>Place-making comments</th>
<th>Comments received</th>
<th>Response</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>PM1</td>
<td>Support the intensification of the campus heart/brown field sites (denser, courtyard/squares, legibility), rather than greenfield land (containment)</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>Noted.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PM2</td>
<td>General support on placemaking – positive proposals to better utilise and expand current buildings rather than ad hoc development and improve legibility.</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>Noted.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PM3</td>
<td>Support the proposed re-location of Blean School (if done carefully) and addressing traffic problems.</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>Noted. The University believes that the proposal for a new Blean School would bring benefits to both the school and to the University. However, this idea needs to be discussed with the school and Kent County Council before any decision is made.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PM4</td>
<td>Improvement on previous Masterplan – better balance, removal of previous proposal for development along the Tyler Hill Road ridge.</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>Noted.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PM5</td>
<td>Support creation of a safe route from Blean Church to Blean village (although fragmented ownership may make this difficult to implement).</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>Noted. This route would also enable safe pedestrian/cycling between Blean, Blean Church and Blean School, and would require the co-operation of other local landowners.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PM6</td>
<td>Support giving the central campus more definition and character</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>Noted.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PM7</td>
<td>Support proposals to create University Square as a proper entrance.</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>Noted. Not only would University Square add to a sense of arrival for visitors and provide them with a central point of orientation, it would also provide a space for outdoor events for the University community (eg: Markets, celebration of festivals, carol concerts etc).</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### SUMMARY OF KEY COMMENTS BY ISSUE (CONT)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>No</th>
<th>Place-making comments</th>
<th>Comments received</th>
<th>Response</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>PM8</td>
<td>Support the creation of wetlands along the Sarre Penn.</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>Noted. The Masterplan seeks to broaden the opportunities for greater biodiversity across the campus wherever possible.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PM9</td>
<td>Needs to recognise the ‘iconic’ view over Canterbury from University Road.</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>Many of those commenting on this point did so in relation to the proposal to locate the conference hotel on Chaucer Fields. The proposed location of the conference hotel has now been amended so hopefully these concerns have been lessened as a result. Where concerns are more broadly about the development principles, the comment below is applicable.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PM10</td>
<td>There should be no development outside of the original campus boundary.</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>The Framework Masterplan proposals are limited to the existing campus boundary (in the adopted Canterbury District Local Plan), which is identified in red on the drawings.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PM11</td>
<td>Objection to proposal for buildings by the Sarre Penn – vague, no rationale for ‘retreats’ or business space, possible damage to public footpath that runs alongside the stream.</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>Noted, but the University wants the provision of a small amount of space for quiet academic activities located slightly apart from the Campus Heart to include a centre for quiet study, a writer’s retreat, remote teaching, meeting and/or seminar spaces, spaces for nature and/or agricultural studies, hides for wildlife observation, etc. The Masterplan proposals also include for the restoration of the footpath alongside the Sarre Penn, and its upgrading to include a cycle path, plus a number of new footpaths and cycle routes, so that the University community as well as visitors from Blean and Tyler Hill might enjoy greater access to this part of the campus.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PM12</td>
<td>Objection to development of land near Hothe Court Farm and land to west (‘Story Rocks’ field) – out of keeping, increase in traffic on Tyler Hill Road, business hubs should be accessible off main roads, no need to use agricultural land.</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>Noted. However, the small amount of proposed space would accommodate quiet academic activities such as a centre for quiet study, a writer’s retreat, remote teaching, meeting and/or seminar spaces, spaces for nature and/or agricultural studies, hides for wildlife observation, etc. Access to these facilities would be entirely from within the campus and would not put any more traffic on Tyler Hill Road.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Table 9: Key place-making comments (cont)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>No</th>
<th>Place-making comments</th>
<th>Comments received</th>
<th>Response</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>PM13</td>
<td>Concern that proposal for Blean School has too many houses, could lead to a reduction in outside space for the school or to extra traffic/noise/pollution.</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>The proposal to rebuild Blean School resulted from comments made during consultation on the Strategic Spatial Vision in 2017. Part of the thinking behind the proposal in the Masterplan is that the school would be relocated further away from the traffic, noise, congestion and air pollution of the existing Whitstable Road. The proposed new housing development is a suggestion in case funds need to be raised to pay for a new school facility. Space is shown within the housing development for parents to drop off and pick up their children, a facility that is woefully inadequate at present. It was thought that the proposed new school location overlooking the University campus would provide plenty of open space and a very green outlook, as well as the opportunity to use the University sports facilities. However, the proposals for a new Blean School need to be discussed with the school and Kent County Council before any decision is made.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PM14</td>
<td>Need separation from neighbouring area (disturbance from students).</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>Many people who attended the consultation events also expressed the view that the University needs to maintain a physical separation with its host city, Canterbury. The Masterplan proposes to consolidate future growth in the heart of the campus, along the existing ridgeline overlooking Canterbury. The large areas of green space on the slopes to the north and south of the campus will continue to provide physical separation between the University, north Canterbury and the villages of Blean and Tyler Hill.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
## 4 SUMMARY OF KEY COMMENTS BY ISSUE (CONT)

### Table 9: Key place-making comments (cont)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>No</th>
<th>Place-making comments</th>
<th>Comments received</th>
<th>Response</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>PM15</td>
<td>Overall impression is of sprawl and ‘creeping development’.</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>Noted. Since the inception of the University in 1965, the approach to providing accommodation has increasingly been very pragmatic and tactical, and buildings have tended to be built on the most easily available sites within the campus, resulting in the ‘sprawl’ that the correspondent describes. The campus has arrived at a ‘tipping-point’ in its evolution, where the investment in new buildings, spaces and facilities is eroding the charm and legibility of the campus as a whole. This, in turn, is beginning to erode the quality of faculty and student experience of learning and living on campus. It is hard to reverse this process, but it can be arrested and corrected. One of the most important of all the principles behind this Framework Masterplan is to stop the sprawl and to change to a Masterplan-guided approach to accommodate future change. The Masterplan therefore proposes to consolidate future growth in the heart of the campus, along the existing ridgeline overlooking Canterbury. The large areas of green space on the slopes to the north and south of the campus will continue to provide physical separation between the University, north Canterbury and the villages of Blean and Tyler Hill. New buildings in the Framework Masterplan are therefore located quite deliberately to create a more coherent built environment, in gap sites and on existing car parks within the heart of the campus to avoid continued ‘sprawl’ at the edges. The exception to this rule is within the Sarre Penn Valley, where a small amount of space is proposed to accommodate quiet academic activities such as a centre for quiet study.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>M16</td>
<td>Green space in the Campus Heart is its main attraction and should not be built on.</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>It is not the University’s intention to build on existing green spaces. The Masterplan seeks to utilise space in the Campus Heart currently used for car parking, or space occupied by temporary buildings, for more productive uses.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PM17</td>
<td>Relative dearth of high-quality centrally located teaching space – should encourage redevelopment of sub-optimal buildings.</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>The Framework Masterplan identifies a number of areas within the centre of the campus where new academic buildings might be located in the future. These new buildings would occupy space within the central campus currently used for car parking, or space occupied by temporary buildings.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### Table 9: Key place-making comments (cont)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>No</th>
<th>Place-making comments</th>
<th>Comments received</th>
<th>Response</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>PM18</td>
<td>Incomprehensible extension of footpaths alongside existing public footpaths across privately owned land into undeveloped and sustainable agricultural land.</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>The Masterplan proposals include for the restoration of the existing footpaths within the campus, as well as the introduction of new footpaths and cycle routes in order to make the campus much more accessible for the University community as well as visitors. This proposal is part of a desire to make the campus generally more accessible in order to encourage people to exercise more and to promote health and well-being. This network of footpaths and cycle routes is principally focussed upon University-owned land, but it could be extended further by agreement with, and the co-operation of, adjoining landowners. The University apologises if any of the Masterplan proposals are confusing or incomprehensible, and it would be pleased to provide further clarification of detailed Masterplan proposals in specific areas if required.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PM19</td>
<td>Need to safeguard built heritage and views.</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>Agree – the Landscape Setting &amp; Visual Impact Appraisal Study of the Masterplan has been undertaken to consider the proposals in relation to the relevant protected views noted in the Canterbury Conservation Area Appraisal. A 3D computer model has been used to study how the Framework Masterplan proposals would appear in these views. Where any aspect of the Masterplan proposals has appeared to be in conflict with the landscape setting, they have been adjusted to respect the views and the built heritage.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PM20</td>
<td>Object to vague proposals for development in fields up to Tyler Hill Road. The only University use of this land should be teaching and research into conservation, agriculture and archaeology.</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>Noted. The Masterplan includes the provision of a modest amount of space for quiet academic activities located slightly apart from the Campus Heart to include a centre for quiet study, a writer’s retreat, remote teaching, meeting and/or seminar spaces, spaces for nature and/or agricultural studies, hides for wildlife observation, etc. Archaeological study might also be included in this list. The Masterplan also proposes a linked network of existing and new footpaths and cycle routes in this area, so that the University community, as well as visitors from Blean and Tyler Hill, might enjoy greater access to this quieter, more agricultural, part of the campus.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### 4 SUMMARY OF KEY COMMENTS BY ISSUE (CONT)

#### Table 9: Key place-making comments (cont)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>No</th>
<th>Place-making comments</th>
<th>Comments received</th>
<th>Response</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>PM21</td>
<td>Object to development in the Alcroft Grange/Little Hall Farm area, including public footpath across private land. This is outside the designated campus.</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>The Masterplan does not include the provision of any University accommodation in the area of Alcroft Grange/Little Hall Farm. The Masterplan drawings include the existing network of footpaths and cycle routes in this area, in order to indicate wider linkages in the landscape surrounding the University. Apologies for any confusion if non-public footpaths or other routes have been represented erroneously on the drawings – they will be checked to eradicate any such errors.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PM22</td>
<td>Object to St. Stephen’s Square – but if this were to happen, the University should provide a buffer zone beyond which it agrees not to develop and/or offer locals the opportunity to buy land.</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>The proposal for a new St. Stephen’s Square has been included in the Masterplan as a new ‘front door’ to the campus for cyclists and pedestrians – the only other entrance in this location being a busy (and dangerous) vehicular junction at Giles Lane. The purpose of the square set on the ridgeline will be to accommodate bus stops on both sides of St. Stephen’s Hill, where they can pull off the road in safety in order to drop off and pick up their passengers. Similarly, this square will enable car passengers to be picked up and dropped off on both sides of St. Stephen’s Hill. The square will provide a new safe pedestrian and cycle entrance into the area of Darwin College. Cycles could be locked-up in safety in the square, so that bus and car passengers could (if they wish) transfer to cycles to travel around the campus. Existing hedgerows would be moved and replanted to surround the square on both sides of St. Stephen’s Hill. An entrance could also be created into the field east of St. Stephen’s Hill. The University does not consider that a square, offering the advantages listed above, would require a ‘buffer zone’ to separate it from agricultural land currently in the ownership of the University.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### Table 9: Key place-making comments (cont)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>No</th>
<th>Place-making comments</th>
<th>Comments received</th>
<th>Response</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>PM23</td>
<td>Unclear rationale for introducing a square (‘Beverley Court’) along University Road – St. Stephen’s Road will always be a secondary entrance.</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>Apologies if this is unclear. Beverley Court is proposed to represent the site of a former small field near to the former entrance to Beverley Farm. This field was revealed in a study of the former agricultural use of the University estate, and remnants of the former field boundary are still visible today on the north side of University Road. The introduction of this space was intended to create a forecourt at the entrance to the proposed conference hotel (if it were to be located here), and to punctuate the journey along University Avenue, where Canterbury Cathedral and the historic city are best viewed. A viewing platform is included in the Masterplan proposals at this point to enable these views to be enjoyed. Studies demonstrate that more vehicles enter the campus from St. Stephen’s Road on a daily basis than from University Road. A new St. Stephen’s Square is therefore proposed in order to provide a new safe pedestrian and cycle entrance to this part of the campus.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PM24</td>
<td>Blean Church should not be surrounded by playing fields/bridges etc., nor its car park used by UoK.</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>Agreed. Previous Masterplan proposals for a cricket green adjacent to Blean Church – to be shared between the University and Blean village – have been removed due to public objections raised at previous consultations. There are now no sports facilities proposed near to Blean Church in the Framework Masterplan. There are also no Masterplan proposals for any bridges near to the church, nor any proposals to share the use of the church car park.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PM25</td>
<td>Need to meet the needs of disabled people.</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>Agreed. The Masterplan proposals will make movement in and around the campus significantly more accessible to all. By their nature, the Framework Masterplan proposals deal with accessibility at a very broad level. Detailed proposals for delivery of specific parts of the Masterplan will be designed to ensure that the campus fully meets the needs of people with disabilities.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
4 SUMMARY OF KEY COMMENTS BY ISSUE (CONT)

D Planning and environment

Table 10 below summarises the key comments made in relation to planning and environment issues.

Table 10: Key planning & environment comments

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>No</th>
<th>Planning &amp; environment comments</th>
<th>Comments received</th>
<th>Response</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>PE1</td>
<td>The University already has a poor reputation for environmental sustainability – proposals would further damage this.</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>A number of respondents refer to the People and Planet University League, which classifies the University as a 'Third Class' University (101 out of a total of 154) based on 13 sustainability criteria. <a href="https://peopleandplanet.org/university-league">https://peopleandplanet.org/university-league</a> The University of Kent, along with a number of other large and high-profile institutions, has not been an active participant in the People and Planet University green league for a number of years, which is reflected in its poor score. As a whole the University has taken a number of positive steps forward in environmental sustainability in recent years, including becoming one of the first UK Universities to achieve the updated 2015 version of the ISO14001 Standard for Environmental Management. In March 2018 the Vice-Chancellor signed the UN Sustainable Development Goals Education Accord, committing the University to embed sustainability in everything it does. This commitment is reflected in the Masterplan, which puts sustainability at its heart, and is underpinned by ambitious environmental targets including reducing carbon emissions by 33% by 2025 and year-on-year reductions in waste generated on its sites.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PE2</td>
<td>Support provision of additional student housing – fewer HMOs in surrounding area and releasing housing in the city for non-students.</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>Noted. See response to PE3 below.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PE3</td>
<td>Additional student housing not needed given reduction in numbers of students and empty student bedrooms.</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>Student demand/numbers will fluctuate over time. The University is preparing a long-term Framework Masterplan which needs to allow for and plan for increases in student accommodation on campus if student numbers increase in the future. The emerging Planning and Environment Principles will address this issue further.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
## Table 10: Key Planning & Environment comments (cont)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>No</th>
<th>Planning &amp; environment comments</th>
<th>Comments received</th>
<th>Response</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>PE4</td>
<td>Lack of clarity on energy and low carbon strategies, the role of the University’s Carbon Strategy and commitment to include carbon management considerations in Masterplan.</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>The Strategic Spatial Vision calls for development to be an exemplar of environmental sustainability by (amongst other things) reducing energy use and carbon emissions. The emerging Planning and Environment Principles will set out how this is to be achieved.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PE5</td>
<td>The University should take the opportunity to demonstrate good practice on environmental sustainability and transition to carbon-free society.</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>See response to PE4 above.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PE6</td>
<td>Objection to the Masterplan having any role in the determination of planning applications. The University should keep an open mind and not make decisions solely on the basis of the Masterplan.</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>Canterbury District Local Plan Policy EMP7 calls for the preparation of a masterplan. Paragraph 8.30 which supports Policy DBE3 (Principles of Design) reads as follows: “Where design statements, masterplans, development briefs or design codes/guides have been prepared, or adopted, these will form the background design guidance for assessing development proposals and will be a material consideration when determining planning applications.”</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PE7</td>
<td>Support provision of a swimming pool (Short and Medium-term Proposal I).</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>Noted – Although also objection on sustainability/water usage grounds.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PE8</td>
<td>Should investigate archaeology of University-owned land around Blean and extend mapping of archaeological interest across the whole campus.</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>There is scope for additional mapping by students. Planning applications for projects will be supported by archaeological assessments where necessary.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PE9</td>
<td>Involvement of CCC Planning to provide oversight of proposals has clearly been beneficial.</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>Noted.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
4 SUMMARY OF KEY COMMENTS BY ISSUE (CONT)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>No</th>
<th>Planning &amp; environment comments</th>
<th>Comments received</th>
<th>Response</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>PE10</td>
<td>Buildings will prevent soakaway and will cause flooding in Salisbury Road.</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>Noted. The emerging Planning and Environment Principles include incorporating Sustainable Urban Drainage Systems (SUDS) to help manage run-off rates and reduce the risk of pollution reaching sensitive controlled waters on campus.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PE11</td>
<td>Air quality issues are not being addressed.</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>The Movement and Transport Strategy is based on encouraging sustainable modes of transport, managing overall traffic growth, rationalising car parking (to reduce drivers having to search for spaces) and providing electric vehicle charging points. This, and the energy and sustainability commitments in the emerging Planning and Environment Principles, addresses air quality issues.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

E Landscape and biodiversity

Table 11 below summarises the key comments made in relation to landscape and biodiversity issues.

Table 11: Key Landscape & biodiversity comments

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>No</th>
<th>Landscape &amp; biodiversity comments</th>
<th>Comments received</th>
<th>Response</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>LB1</td>
<td>Welcome focus on sustainability and ecology, retaining the character of natural and semi-natural spaces and recognition of the Kent Community Oasis garden but, the proposed conference hotel is inconsistent with these.</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>Noted. See Table 7 and overall response to Chaucer Fields proposal above.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LB2</td>
<td>Support for landscape character areas and creation of distinctive identities.</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>Noted. Implementation of the Framework Masterplan should help create distinctiveness.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LB3</td>
<td>Support proposal to preserve ancient woodland.</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>Noted.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### Table 11: Key Landscape & biodiversity comments (cont)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>No</th>
<th>Landscape &amp; biodiversity comments</th>
<th>Comments received</th>
<th>Response</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>LB4</td>
<td>Importance of retaining undeveloped areas for leisure, walking, ecology, identity of the campus etc.</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>Noted. Sensitive building styles and materials will be key to their integration into the landscape.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LB5</td>
<td>Concern at homogeneous green spaces with little sense of place. There should be a commitment to tree planting to strengthen landscape character of the Blean Woods – including planting as many trees as those that are felled.</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>Such a commitment will be included within the Landscape and Biodiversity Principles in the Framework Masterplan document. This would be best implemented as part of a comprehensive strategy for optimal effect on conserving and enhancing landscape character.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LB6</td>
<td>Commitments to biodiversity should be strengthened – undervaluing green land and wildlife as assets.</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>The Landscape and Biodiversity Principles in the emerging Framework Masterplan document do this.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LB7</td>
<td>Objection to loss of open space for the surrounding villages.</td>
<td></td>
<td>All of the proposed development is within the designated Campus boundary (although the University allows discretionary access) and would be predominantly within the existing building footprint.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
4  SUMMARY OF KEY COMMENTS BY ISSUE (CONT)

F  Movement and transport

Table 12 below summarises the key comments made in relation to movement and transport.

Table 12: Key movement & transport comments

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>No</th>
<th>Movement &amp; transport comments</th>
<th>Comments received</th>
<th>Response</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>MT1</td>
<td>Support intensification of Giles Lane car park.</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>Noted.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MT2</td>
<td>Support for continued bus access to Campus Heart and for greater publicity.</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>Noted.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MT3</td>
<td>Support more footpaths and cycle routes in to city centre.</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>Noted.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MT4</td>
<td>Support for opening up the Crab &amp; Winkle Line as a pedestrian/cycle route.</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>Noted.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MT5</td>
<td>Support for use of transport/travel plans to bring about a modal shift in favour of sustainable modes/‘car-free’.</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>Noted.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MT6</td>
<td>Support for public transport, including a new bus route from Tyler Hill through the campus and opening up northern entrance to Canterbury West Station.</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>Noted.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MT7</td>
<td>Objection to opening up the Crab &amp; Winkle Line as a pedestrian/cycle route – adverse impact on wildlife, exit on to a busy/dangerous road, part (at least) privately-owned. The Crab &amp; Winkle Way (NCR1) was established on the basis that the Crab &amp; Winkle Line would not be used for this purpose.</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>Noted. Opportunities are being explored as part of the Masterplan to improve north-south connectivity to the campus more broadly. The Crab and Winkle Line is one of these. Further work would be required in due course to understand how these routes could be delivered (if applicable), and establish the impacts and how they would be minimised.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Table 12: Key movement & transport comments (cont)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>No</th>
<th>Movement &amp; transport comments</th>
<th>Comments received</th>
<th>Response</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>MT8</td>
<td>Objection to using old railway embankment as a pedestrian/cycle/shuttle route – no access from Beverley Road, steep steps only from south, would transfer night time noise from front of houses to the back of houses, lighting at night, impact on property values, loss of mature trees, shuttle bus version relies on northern entrance to Canterbury West Station (Southeastern not interested in doing this).</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>Noted.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MT9</td>
<td>Better solution to improving access from campus to the city would be to improve signage and layout for cycle route through St. Michael's Road, linking Eliot footpath with cycle route on other side of Beverley Road and create better crossing point on Beverley Road.</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>Noted.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MT10</td>
<td>Traffic issues not given enough attention – concern at additional traffic on Tyler Hill Road, Whitstable Road, Hackington Road, Calais Hill.</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>The University continuously works with Kent County Council and Canterbury City Council to manage the traffic impacts of its growth. This is continuing as part of the Masterplan. Impacts associated with specific proposals are still subject to the standard transport impact assessment process.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MT11</td>
<td>Objection to the relocation of car parking from the central campus to other areas – imposes on neighbours, longer to walk, difficult for disabled people, would need electric buses/buggies, spoils attractive entrance at University Road.</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>The car parking strategy focuses on removing traffic from the heart of the campus by relocating large parking areas to the edges of the campus, encouraging those who are not Blue Badge-holders to make the last part of the journey on foot. Blue Badge-holder parking would remain located close to the building entrances. A central car park would be provided for visitors only and peripheral car parks would be designed in a way sensitive to the surrounding landscape.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MT12</td>
<td>Lack of overall transport strategy</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>The transport strategy is formed by the constituent elements of the Masterplan presented.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### 4 SUMMARY OF KEY COMMENTS BY ISSUE (CONT)

Table 12: Key movement & transport comments (cont)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>No</th>
<th>Movement &amp; transport comments</th>
<th>Comments received</th>
<th>Response</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>MT13</td>
<td>Objection to lack of detail about cycle routes. Routes need to be properly maintained.</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>Noted. The purpose of the Masterplan is to establish and agree transport and movement principles. Further, more detailed, work and consultation would be undertaken by the University on specific routes as and when they are brought forward.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MT14</td>
<td>Concern at students parking cars in neighbouring residential streets – controlled parking may be needed.</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>Noted. The University discourages irresponsible parking by its staff and students and has a disciplinary procedure for repeat offenders. However, if residents become concerned about any parking issue (University related or otherwise), the University recommends contacting Canterbury City Council to advise further on how residents may apply for the implementation of parking controls, e.g. permits etc.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MT15</td>
<td>Objection to proposed road link to Whitstable Road – compromise Crab &amp; Winkle Way (NCR1).</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>Noted. The Masterplan does not incorporate a connection to Whitstable Road that would directly encroach upon the existing NCR 1.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MT16</td>
<td>Objection to re-routing Crab &amp; Winkle Way (NCR1).</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>Noted.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MT17</td>
<td>Suggestions for cycle paths/facilities, including:</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>Noted.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Create route to north of Elliot Path</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Covert path from the Venue and Lighthouse to Darwin to a shared foot/cycle path</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Create east/west route south of Elliot and Rutherford (helping to avoid Giles Lane)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Alternative east-west route would be north of the Library and south of Cornwallis and north of Grimond Building</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Connect Woolf College to Sports Centre and Park Wood</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Connect Park Wood to Keira Lane (NCR1) from Holme Court Farm to Whitstable Road at Kent College</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• St. Stephen's Hill – dangerous at present</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• St. Dunstan's Street and Forty Acres</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Signposting/publicising the cycle hub off Park Wood.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### Table 12: Key movement & transport comments (cont)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>No</th>
<th>Movement &amp; transport comments</th>
<th>Comments received</th>
<th>Response</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>MT18</td>
<td>Objection to inclusion of Well Court Farm road in routes out of Tyler Hill (continuation of Fleets Lane), which is a private road from Rough Cottage and not open to the public.</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>Noted. This route was incorrectly indicated as an existing footpath on the plans presented. This route north of Tyler Hill has been removed from the proposals.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MT19</td>
<td>Objection to expansion of campus east of Hackington Hill and temporary car park – creep of campus across a dangerous road.</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>Further work has since been undertaken in relation to the car parking strategy for the Masterplan. The car park east of Hackington Road was initially identified as a location for temporary car parking to allow for overspill during the consolidation of the parking on the main campus. Further car park capacity analysis indicates this temporary car park is no longer required and it has therefore been removed from the current Masterplan proposals.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MT20</td>
<td>Objection to multi-storey car parks.</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>Noted. In developing the car park strategy, priority was given to surface-level car parking. Multi-storey car parks are proposed at locations within the campus that are less sensitive visually to enable consolidation.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MT21</td>
<td>The 1965 Masterplan included vehicular access off Hackington Road south of Darwin College – remove bottle neck at Giles Lane junction, provide safe pedestrian crossing.</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>Noted. Providing an additional vehicular access was not considered essential to the Masterplan strategy at this point in time.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MT22</td>
<td>Concern that National Express coach trips through Rough Common are increasing – adverse impact on village.</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>Noted, although National Express coach operations are not controlled by the University.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MT23</td>
<td>Support for a link-road and large (1,000) space park and ride facility in the north (no facility for north Canterbury).</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>Noted. No link-road or park and ride facility is incorporated within the current Masterplan.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### 4 SUMMARY OF KEY COMMENTS BY ISSUE (CONT)

#### G Consultation

Table 13 below summarises the key comments made in relation to consultation and presentation material.

**Table 13: Key comments on consultation**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>No</th>
<th>Comments on consultation</th>
<th>Comments received</th>
<th>Response</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>Appreciation of efforts /availability of staff at the drop-in sessions. Generally clearly presented.</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>Noted.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>Plans not clear (definition of campus, ‘red’/’blue’ land, no north points, road names should be included, need distinction between roads and footpaths, colour coding for ‘short’ and ‘medium-term’ projects, need more indication of likely visual impact and transport links).</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>Noted. The University will re-examine the drawings as part of preparing a Framework Masterplan document, with a view to making its proposals clearer and as jargon-free as possible.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>Consultation process is generally inadequate.</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>Section 2 sets out in detail the extensive consultation that was undertaken, but the University acknowledges that there is always scope to do more.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>Language is vague, excessive use of jargon, questions on feedback forms difficult to understand and reply to.</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>See response to C2 above.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>The University should publish consultation results in their entirety and have an independent party assess feedback to ensure that there is no cherry-picking.</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>This Statement includes consultation results in their entirety, as was the case in the earlier Consultation Statements.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>There should have been greater opportunities to voice concerns directly to the University – outside of the official presentations.</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>The University is always open to receiving comments on proposals by any means during designated consultation periods (and beyond).</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>Proposed development projects are unclear.</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>See response to C2 above.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
5 LESSONS FOR FUTURE ENGAGEMENT AND CONSULTATION

The organisation and delivery of the consultation drew on lessons learnt in relation to consultation on the Concept Masterplan and the Strategic Spatial Vision (Step 1). Following reflection on how the consultation went, including comments received, the following general observations and lessons for future events have been identified:

• A number of individuals who responded were apparently new to issues and unaware of previous rounds of consultation
• Respondents from the area to the north of the campus who were aware of previous consultations were generally relieved to see less development proposed and appreciated clarity on the future of existing farmland – although many were surprised to discover that the designated campus area in the adopted Canterbury District Local Plan extends up to Tyler Hill Road
• Responses from individuals to the south of the campus were dominated by one issue (the proposal to locate a conference hotel in Chaucer Fields). It has proved difficult to get balanced feedback on the Framework Masterplan as a whole when responses were dominated by the Chaucer Fields issue
• The exhibition was only able to show some of the work involved in preparing a Framework Masterplan. It has become evident that this did not match the expectations of some of the consultees who responded and it is proposed to give all stakeholders an opportunity to comment on a draft Framework Masterplan document before it is published
• The University will re-examine drawings and text when preparing a Framework Masterplan document, with a view to making its proposals clearer and as jargon-free as possible.

The University will take account of these lessons when organising future consultation and engagement events.
6 CONCLUSIONS AND NEXT STEPS

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 consulted, how they were consulted, what they said and how the University is going to take account of comments, is part of this commitment.

Development Proposal A for a conference hotel to the south of University Road within the University Rise Character Area dominated responses to the emerging Masterplan. Of the 228 individuals who responded, 142 (62%) objected to this proposal and of these, a total of 88 (62%) raised this as their only issue. In addition, all nine local groups that commented on the Framework Masterplan objected to the proposal and a student organised a local petition with (as of 28-12-18) 3,382 signatories objecting to the proposal.

Most (but not all) comments regarding the proposed conference hotel objected to its location, rather than the use in principle. In response to the level and depth of concern about its proposed location, the University held a specific stakeholder meeting on 7 November 2018 to discuss the proposal.

The University will revise the emerging Framework Masterplan by relocating Development Proposal A (conference hotel) from land to the south of University Road (on Chaucer Fields) to land to the north of University Road (to the south of Turing College). The land to the south of University Road is to be predominately maintained and enhanced as open space.

The decision follows recent advice and recommendations from consultants on a range of factors as part of the development of the University’s Framework Masterplan and its underlying principles and vision, including market conditions in the Canterbury area. The new proposed location – north of University Road and south of Turing College – would give maximum flexibility both in the size of the footprint of the building and also with regard to the size of conference that can be held, as this location provides easy access to the facilities available in Turing College. The conference hotel would be designed to address a changing Higher Education landscape offering both facilities and opportunities for the generation of income to help support the University’s teaching and research activities.

A broad range of other issues were raised. The University has sought to identify and respond to the key issues. Some of these are general and relate to the role of the University or to the Framework Masterplan consultation itself. Others have been grouped and considered around the themes of the four emerging spatial strategies that underpin the Framework Masterplan, namely, Place-Making, Planning & Environment, Landscape & Biodiversity and Movement & Transport.

Section 5 identifies a number of lessons for future engagement and consultation and the University will draw on these when undertaking consultation in the future. The University will take account of all other comments raised when developing a Framework Masterplan document, discussed below.

The next steps in preparing a Framework Masterplan
The next and final step in preparing a Framework Masterplan (Step 3) involves revising the draft Masterplan to take account of feedback set out in this Statement and on-going studies, then preparing a Framework Masterplan document for publication. It will become a key tool for decision-making by the University in shaping future developments on the campus and a key material consideration against which future planning applications will be determined. The University intends to provide stakeholders with an opportunity to comment on this document before finalising and publishing it.
## Appendix 1 – Framework Masterplan Stakeholder List

| The Archbishop’s School, Canterbury       | Dover District Council Environment Agency                     | Oaten Hill & South Canterbury Association*                  |
| Ashford Borough Council                   | Federation of Small Businesses                                 | Save Chaucer Fields                                         |
| Barton Residents’ Association*            | Folkestone & Hythe District Council                           | South East LEP                                             |
| Blean, Hackington and Tyler Hill Society  | Hackington Parish Council*                                     | Southern Water                                              |
| Blean Parish Council*                     | Harbledown and Rough Common Parish Council*                    | SPOKES East Kent Cycle Campaign                             |
| Blean Parochial Church Council            | Headcorn Drive Area Residents’ Association*                   | Spring Lane Residents’ Association*                        |
| Blean Primary School                      | Highways England                                              | St Dunstan’s Residents’ Association*                        |
| Blean Residents Community Group           | Historic England                                              | St Edmund’s School, Canterbury                             |
| Campaign for the Protection of Rural England – Canterbury Branch | Institute of Directors                                      | St Michael’s Road Area & Harkness Drive Residents’ Association* |
| Canterbury 4 Business                     | Inquire                                                       | St Mildred’s Area Community Society*                       |
| Canterbury Archaeological Trust           | International Council on Monuments and Sites                 | St Peter’s Residents’ Association*                         |
| Canterbury Cathedral                      | Kent Ambassadors                                             | St Stephen’s Residents’ Association*                        |
| Canterbury Christ Church University       | Kent and Medway Economic Partnership                          | Swale Borough Council                                       |
| Canterbury City Council members (St. Stephen’s Ward) | Kent Bee-keepers’ Association                               | The Oaks Day Nursery                                        |
| Canterbury Connected Business Improvement District (BID) | Kent College, Canterbury                                    | Thanet District Council                                     |
| Canterbury Heritage and Design Forum      | Kent County Council members (Canterbury City North, Canterbury City South, Canterbury North, Canterbury South) | Tyler Hill Memorial Hall Trustees                            |
| Canterbury Innovation Centre              | Kent Cultural Transformation Board                            | University Challenged                                       |
| Canterbury Society*                       | Kent Invicta Chamber of Commerce                              | University of Kent Alumni                                   |
| Canterbury World Heritage Site Committee  | Kent Union                                                    | University of Kent Former Staff Association                 |
| Chaucer College                           | Kent Wildlife Trust                                           | University of Kent Staff                                    |
| Chaucer Fields Picnic Society             | Kingsbrook Park Residents’ Association*                      | University of Kent Students                                 |
| Crab and Winkle Line Trust                | KM Group                                                      | University Medical Centre                                   |
| Crown Gardens Residents’ Association*     | Market Way Residents’ Association*                           | Whitstable Road Residents’ Association*                    |
| Curzon Cinema                             | Marlowe Theatre                                               | Wincheap Society*                                           |
| Diocese of Canterbury                     | Natural England                                               |                                                            |

**Bold text** = Those organisations invited to the Stakeholder Presentation Event (13 September 2018)

* = Those organisations invited to the quarterly meeting of representatives of local residents’ associations and parish councils with the Vice Chancellor (13 September 2018)

**Italic text** = Those organisations invited to the Hotel/Conference Facility Stakeholder Meeting (7 November 2018)
APPENDIX 2: STAKEHOLDER PRESENTATION EVENT INVITE

Dear xxxxxxxxxxx,

The final stage of consultation on our Campus Masterplan project will get underway this autumn. During this process we will share details of how we might use land in different areas of our campus in the short and longer-term.

We're inviting you to attend a preview event we are hosting for our key stakeholders from 11.30 to 13.00 on Thursday 13 September 2018 at the Sibson Building on our campus. Please register at [weblink] by Friday 24 August 2018 in order to attend.

The Masterplan document that we will present to you takes into account all of the feedback you provided during the initial public consultation on the Concept Masterplan in 2016 and during the workshops with community groups, technical stakeholders and other key groups in July 2017. A full report of all of the feedback received is available at www.kent.ac.uk/masterplan.

We learned a lot from this process and we hope that you can join us on 13 September to help shape the final stage of consultation on our Masterplan. The architects and planning consultants that we've been working with and members of our Estates team will be present at the event.

The Framework Masterplan outlines possible developments for the period covered by Canterbury City Council’s Local Plan (up to 2031).

If you are unable to attend the preview, please note that a series of public consultation events will take place in October at the following locations:

- Saturday 6 October 10.00-16.00 Westgate Hall
- Thursday 11 October 14.00-20.00 Tyler Hill Memorial Hall
- Friday 12 October 14.00-20.00 Blean Village Hall
- Thursday 18 October 10.00-16.00 Darwin Conference Suite, University of Kent campus

If you have any questions please contact Corporate Communications on 01227 824009 or email masterplan@kent.ac.uk.
APPENDIX 3: STAKEHOLDER PRESENTATION EXHIBITION POSTERS

1 WELCOME

Welcome to this exhibition of the emerging Framework Masterplan proposals for the Canterbury campus.

The Framework Masterplan is intended to provide a framework for the future evolution of the campus to best meet the needs of the University, and of the wider city and region. It details the framework within which we will make decisions on the future development of our estate in the short-term (2018 to 2021) and medium-term (2021 to 2031), covering the period defined within the Canterbury District Local Plan.

This is the penultimate stage in the creation of a Framework Masterplan to be presented to Canterbury City Council for their endorsement.

The Masterplan document is not a planning application, but a vision for the evolution of the campus. It provides a direction for the evolution of the campus and the framework against which future planning applications will be assessed. When and if aspects of the plan are funded they will go through the usual planning process and members of the public will be involved in the usual way.

We invite you to take this final opportunity to share your feedback to help us refine the Masterplan that we present to the Council.

2 THE PROCESS TO DATE

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Step One – Strategic Spatial Vision</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>April 2017</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>June-July 2017</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>November 2017</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Step Two – Draft Framework Masterplan</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>January-March 2018</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>April-ongoing</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>September-November 2018</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Next steps:
- Review feedback for publication
- Consultation statement published
- Preparation of final Masterplan document, incorporating learning from the consultation, for submission to Canterbury City Council

CONTINUED OVERLEAF
3 OUR PLACE IN CANTERBURY

We are a university that changes lives. Our education and research, and the talents of our staff and students support social, economic, cultural, intellectual, and public life in ways that make us a leading contributor to the success of our city.

We contribute more than £485m to the economy in Canterbury, through direct expenditure on goods and services and spending by our students. We are the largest employer in the city and one in ten jobs here is dependent on our activities. Our research directly impacts our communities and we aim to grow our research and innovation activities for the benefit of our region.

We are working with local health authorities and Canterbury Christ Church University to deliver significant health, well-being and social care benefits to the community through the creation of Kent and Medway Medical School. We partner with regional economic and development organisations to support economic growth and we will continue to engage with them to ensure our activities best meet the needs of employers and the local economy.

Our involvement in Canterbury’s cultural and arts offering is extensive and we continue to engage local young people with a range of creative activities. We are seeking new ways to open up our campus as a resource for our local communities, to encourage more use of the Gulbenkian cultural centre, our library services, our extensive conference and leisure facilities, and our growing sports facilities.

4 WHY DO WE NEED A MASTERPLAN?

We identified the need for a Masterplan in 2015 to help shape the future of our Canterbury campus and ensure it realises mutual benefits for the University and the community. The Framework Masterplan builds on the principles established in the University’s original development plan, created by Lord William Holford in 1965.

The Masterplan is also identified in Policy EMP7 of the Canterbury District Local Plan. It provides a flexible framework for development, rather than a precise blueprint, to assist with local planning.

The Masterplan recognises the need to provide a strategic direction for the development of the campus that places an equal focus on the provision of outstanding buildings and quality spaces that strengthen its character and respect the rich landscape and ecology of the surrounding environment.

It establishes a series of principles that will guide the future development of the campus to respect its setting within the wider countryside and heritage area, integrate effectively with the local transport strategy and ensure that we offer a more welcoming environment for visitors.

The Masterplan delivers several allied strategies for the management of specific aspects of the proposed campus developments. These include a Landscape and Biodiversity Strategy, a Movement and Transport Strategy, a Planning and Environment Strategy, and a Place-making Strategy.
5 OUR VISION

The Canterbury campus will be defined by a strong high quality landscape that helps to create an outstanding place to teach, learn, work, undertake research, live and enjoy. It will form an integral part of Canterbury District by providing educational, cultural, recreational, sporting and employment opportunities for people in the District and the wider Kent region and will use the University's national reputation to help improve economic prosperity.

Roads on the campus will be transformed into attractive streets that prioritise walking and cycling. Public paths, paths and bridleways will be enhanced to provide a welcoming and legible network of routes. The campus and nearby University-owned land will be developed in ways that protect its special natural and semi natural environment, the setting of Canterbury's World Heritage Site and local heritage assets.

6 OUR VISION (CONT)

Future development will respect the quality of life and day to day activities of people living and working in the surrounding villages and residential neighbourhoods and avoid any significant impacts on the wider surrounding area in terms of traffic, car parking, air quality or demand for recreation. The campus and development on nearby University-owned land will be outward-facing and seek to improve the lives of local people as well as being an exemplar for environmental sustainability by reducing energy use and carbon emissions, adopting high standards for water usage and waste and recycling and creating an environment that promotes healthy living and physical and mental wellbeing.

The University's ownership will enable the long-term stewardship of the campus and ensure that it is managed and maintained in ways that sustain the outstanding place that is created.
7 OUR STRATEGIC SPATIAL OBJECTIVES

A series of Strategic Spatial Objectives have guided our Masterplan proposals, providing a framework within which good place-making through development will take place. The objectives are to:

• Enhance the appeal of the campus as a place to be and inspire a greater sense of arrival, making it easier to find your way around
• Consolidate the Campus Heart and make the best use of existing buildings
• Create a flexible plan to accommodate growth of academic and research facilities, student housing, new shared amenities and infrastructure
• Create a diverse and sustainable environment by establishing a walkable campus where traffic is tamed and connections with the surrounding environment are strengthened
• Develop an environment that encourages social interaction

8 WHAT AREA DOES THE MASTERPLAN COVER?

The Masterplan proposals are generally limited to the campus as defined in the Canterbury District Local Plan, identified by the red boundary below.

The Masterplan identifies a series of distinct landscape character areas:

1 – University Rise
2 – Whitstable Road
3 – Campus Heart
4 – St Stephens Hill
5 – Little Hall Farm
6 – Sarre Penn
7 – Blean
8 – Tyler Hill

The current proposals include developments in University Rise, Whitstable Road, Campus Heart and the Sarre Penn Valley.

The St Stephens Hill, Little Hall Farm, Blean and Tyler Hill areas are not in the scope of this document, but this may change when the Canterbury District Local Plan is reviewed in 2031.

Proposals beyond the campus boundary will be dealt with through the planning process and we are committed to working with Canterbury City Council and local people on any developments that involve nearby land that we own.
Appendix 3: Stakeholder presentation exhibition posters

9 SHORT AND MEDIUM-TERM DEVELOPMENTS

The University is currently in a period of consolidation characterised by limited growth in academic facilities and student accommodation, refurbishment or improvement of current buildings, and re-organisation and rationalisation of car parking on campus.

Priorities for the short-term (2018-2021) include:

- 12,000sqm of new academic and administrative floor space including a new Economics Building (complete April 2019), a Life Sciences Building (complete May 2021), a new Kent and Medway Medical School building (complete September 2020), a new student social and study facility (complete August 2018), a Science Student Hub building (complete May 2019) plus an additional floor to the Jennison workshop
- Upgrade and extension to the tennis court enclosures (planning permission granted)
- Creation of a community garden (underway)
- Consolidation and improvement of car parking, creation of new and improved cycle and pedestrian routes
- Landscaping, planting of woodland, conservation of existing sites

Priorities for the medium-term (2022-2031) include:

- Development of new student services and Kent Union buildings near Keynes College
- New teaching and academic buildings
- New innovation facilities and business space
- Additional leisure and sports facilities, including a swimming pool
- Additional 2,000 student bed spaces
- Possible development of a conference centre and hotel (subject to funding)
- Possible re-provision of Blean Primary School to include improved car parking and up to 30 additional homes
- Possible new road, cycle and pedestrian link between Whitstable Road and Park Wood Road
- New bus-only link between Whitstable Road and Park Wood Road
- Improvements to footpaths and cycle routes

CONTRIBUTED OVERLEAF
11 PLEASE TELL US WHAT YOU THINK

We would like you to consider the proposals within the Framework Masterplan and let us know what you think. Your feedback will help us to finalise the plan that we submit to Canterbury City Council.

You can fill in a feedback form available at this exhibition and post it in one of the blue feedback boxes near the entrance.

Today’s event will be followed by a full public consultation in October. Full details of the dates and locations for these events are as follows:

Saturday 6 October 2018 10.00-16.00, Westgate Hall
Thursday 11 October 2018 14.00-20.00, Tyler Hill Memorial Hall
Friday 12 October 2018 14.00-20.00, Blean Village Hall
Thursday 18 October 2018 10.00-16.00, Darwin Conference Suite, University of Kent campus
APPENDIX 4: STAKEHOLDER PRESENTATION FEEDBACK FORM

FRAMWORK MASTERPLAN FEEDBACK FORM

Name:
Address:
Phone:
Email:

Due to limited space, please use a black or blue pen to complete this form. We may not be able to read other colors. Thank you.

1. Overall understanding and ability to follow the presentation?
   ( ) 1 ( ) 2 ( ) 3 ( ) 4 ( ) 5

   Please add any comments or ideas in the space below:

   ________________________________________________________________
   ________________________________________________________________
   ________________________________________________________________
   ________________________________________________________________
   ________________________________________________________________

2. The presentation of the framework, masterplan, and other information presented during the presentation was:
   ( ) 1 ( ) 2 ( ) 3 ( ) 4 ( ) 5

   Please add any comments or ideas in the space below:

   ________________________________________________________________
   ________________________________________________________________
   ________________________________________________________________
   ________________________________________________________________
   ________________________________________________________________

3. The focus on the elements and audiability of the information provided during the presentation was:
   ( ) 1 ( ) 2 ( ) 3 ( ) 4 ( ) 5

   Please add any comments or ideas in the space below:

   ________________________________________________________________
   ________________________________________________________________
   ________________________________________________________________
   ________________________________________________________________
   ________________________________________________________________

FRAMWORK MASTERPLAN FEEDBACK FORM

What additional information do you wish to see presented during your public consultation sessions to enhance your understanding?

   ________________________________________________________________
   ________________________________________________________________
   ________________________________________________________________
   ________________________________________________________________

   Additional feedback/comments:

   ________________________________________________________________
   ________________________________________________________________
   ________________________________________________________________
   ________________________________________________________________

FRAMWORK MASTERPLAN FEEDBACK FORM

Please leave any written comments you have regarding the information that we have presented here.

   ________________________________________________________________
   ________________________________________________________________
   ________________________________________________________________
   ________________________________________________________________

   Additional feedback/comments:

   ________________________________________________________________
   ________________________________________________________________
   ________________________________________________________________
   ________________________________________________________________

Thank you for your feedback on our stakeholder presentation.

CONTINUED OVERLEAF
APPENDIX 5: FRAMEWORK MASTERPLAN STEP 2
FEEDBACK FORM

FRAMEWORK MASTERPLAN
FEEDBACK FORM

Name: 
Address: 
Email address: 

Are you a: 
☐ Resident 
☐ Councillor 
☐ Member of the business community 
☐ University of Kent student 
☐ University of Kent employee 
☐ University of Kent alumnus 
☐ Other (please specify) 

On a scale of one to five (where one is highly dissatisfied and five is extremely satisfied) how would you score the following aspects of the Framework Masterplan presented today?

1. Do you think that the Framework Masterplan will contribute positively to the future planning of the Canterbury district?
   ○ Yes 
   ○ No 
   ○ Don't know

2. Overall vision for the evolution of the campus
   ○ 1 
   ○ 2 
   ○ 3 
   ○ 4 
   ○ 5
   Please add any comments you have on this aspect

3. The focus on place-making and sustainability and the proposals to consolidate the Campus Heart presented in the Strategic Spatial Objectives
   ○ 1 
   ○ 2 
   ○ 3 
   ○ 4 
   ○ 5
   Please add any comments you have on this aspect

4. The scope of the Framework Masterplan and the character areas that may see development under the current Canterbury District Local Plan (by 2017)
   ○ 1 
   ○ 2 
   ○ 3 
   ○ 4 
   ○ 5
   Please add any comments you have on this aspect

5. The projects identified as proposed short-term and medium-term developments
   ○ 1 
   ○ 2 
   ○ 3 
   ○ 4 
   ○ 5
   Please add any comments you have on this aspect

6. Do you think that Canterbury City Council should endorse the Framework Masterplan as the guide against which future proposed projects on campus will be assessed?
   ○ Yes 
   ○ No 
   ○ Don't know
   Please share any further comments that you have regarding the information that we have presented today.

Please place your completed form in one of the boxes provided or return it to Masterplan consultation, Corporate Communications, University of Kent, CT2 7NZ.

You can also give feedback online at: www.kent.ac.uk/masterplan
APPENDIX 6: HOTEL/CONFERENCE FACILITY HANDOUT

HOTEL AND CONFERENCE CENTRE

Our suggestion for a 150-bed hotel and conference centre in the University Rise character area is a medium-term proposal. This means it is a development that we might consider at some point during 2021-2031.

The proposals presented in 2011 were for a 150-bed hotel and conference centre, with seven blocks of adjoining student accommodation.

We now propose a much smaller development to the north of the Southern Slopes and adjoining University Road.

This new proposal takes into consideration feedback from the 2011 public consultation and feedback from residents, the business community and other interested parties during consultation events held in 2016 and 2017. We have also received advice from experts from the hotel and conference sectors.

We know this proposal is a concern for some residents and so we are arranging a meeting in November with representatives of residents who live in the St Michael’s Road and St Stephen’s areas to discuss it with them.

Any proposal outlined in our Framework Masterplan, including the hotel and conference centre, will be subject to the normal planning process where further feedback will be invited from the public.
APPENDIX 7: IMPACT POSTCARDS

UNIVERSITY OF KENT/
OUR ECONOMIC IMPACT
www.kent.ac.uk/impact

**Economic contribution**
£907m a year contributed to the south-east region, supporting 9,448 jobs

**Generating local jobs**
Largest employer in Canterbury, supporting one in 10 jobs in the city

**Growing the visitor economy**
The largest conference venue in the south-east, hosting 132,000 visitors a year

**Off-campus spending**
£300m to the regional economy, supporting 3,000 jobs

**Supporting start-ups**
More than 130 new businesses launched at our enterprise hub since 2013

**Benefitting business**
Through professional development training for more than 250 local business leaders

---

UNIVERSITY OF KENT/
OUR IMPACT IN OUR COMMUNITIES
www.kent.ac.uk/impact

**Student volunteering**
Our volunteers help more than 130 local organisations with more than 90,000 hours contributed

**Reaching out through research**
Engaging the public with our research through projects, festivals and events

**Working with our communities**
Building better relationships via our student community champions and street marshals schemes

**Keeping you informed**
12,500 residents and businesses receiving our community newsletter in Canterbury

**Meeting future healthcare needs**
Kent and Medway Medical School will recruit aspiring doctors to train and work in our region

**Arts and culture hub**
Welcoming more than 97,000 people to more than 1,000 arts and culture events on campus
New Masterplan consultation events

The final stage of consultation on our Campus Masterplan project takes place in October, when we share how we might use land in different areas of our campus in the short and longer-term.

The Options Study takes into account the feedback you provided during the initial public consultation in 2016 and workshops in July 2017. Representatives of local residents' associations, parish councils, and amenity groups attended those events. A full report of the workshop discussions and the feedback provided were included in the November 2017 Consultation Statement.

We learned a lot from this process and we invite you to attend further consultation events as follows:

- **Saturday 6 October 2018**
  10.00-16.00 at Westgate Hall

- **Thursday 11 October 2018**
  14.00-20.00 at Tyler Hill Memorial Hall

- **Friday 12 October 2018**
  14.00-20.00 at Blean Village Hall

- **Thursday 18 October 2018**
  10.00-16.00 at Darwin Conference Suite, University of Kent campus

We’ll present our plans for the period covered by the city council’s local plan (to 2031). Copies of the Masterplan and feedback forms will be available for two weeks from 6 October 2018 at: The Beaney, Canterbury City Council offices, Tylers Klin, Blean Village Hall, St Dunstan’s Hall, and the Registry building or Templeman Library on our campus.

Our response to your feedback will be published in November, before we present our Framework Masterplan to Canterbury City Council at the end of the year.

More information is available at www.kent.ac.uk/community/masterplan or by contacting 01227 824009.
APPENDIX 9: COMMUNITY NEWSLETTER
REGIONAL STAKEHOLDER LIST

The quarterly Community Newsletter, as well as being delivered by Royal Mail to all homes and businesses in the postcodes CT1 2, CT2 7, CT2 8 and CT2 9, is also emailed to the following organisations, the MP for Canterbury, elected members of Kent County Council for Canterbury North, Canterbury City North, Canterbury City South and Canterbury South, and each of the elected members of Canterbury City Council.

- Archbishop’s School, Canterbury
- Barton Residents’ Association
- Blean Parish Council
- Blean Parochial Church Council
- Blean Residents Community Group
- Blean School
- Blean, Hackington and Tyler Hill Society
- Canterbury 4 Business
- Canterbury Archaeological Trust
- Canterbury Cathedral
- Canterbury Christ Church University
- Canterbury City Council
- Canterbury Connected Business Improvement District (BID)
- Canterbury Innovation Centre
- Canterbury Society
- Chaucer College
- Crown Gardens Residents Association
- Curzon Cinema
- Diocese of Canterbury
- Hackington Parish Council
- Harbledown and Rough Common Parish Council
- Headcorn Drive Area Residents Association
- Inquire
- Kent Invicta Chamber of Commerce
- Kent Union
- Kingsbrook Park Residents Association
- KMGroup
- Market Way Residents’ Association
- Marlowe Theatre
- Oaten Hill and South Canterbury Association
- Spring Lane Residents Association
- St Dunstan’s Residents’ Association
- St Edmund’s School, Canterbury
- St Michael’s Road Area & Harkness Drive Residents Association
- St Mildred’s Area Community Society
- St Peter’s Residents’ Association
- St Stephen’s Road Residents Association
- The Oaks Day Nursery
- Tyler Hill Memorial Hall Trustees
- University Medical Centre
- Whitstable Road Residents Association
- Wincheap Society
The Masterplan contains our proposals for developing the campus to best meet the needs of the University, and of the wider city and region.

Public consultation events are taking place as follows:
- Saturday 6 October 2018 10.00-16.00, Westgate Hall
- Thursday 11 October 2018 14.00-20.00, Tyler Hill Memorial Hall
- Friday 12 October 2018 14.00-20.00, Blean Village Hall
- Thursday 18 October 2018 10.00-16.00, Darwin Conference Suite, University of Kent campus

Find out more at www.kent.ac.uk/masterplan

APPENDIX 10: PUBLIC CONSULTATION LEAFLET DISTRIBUTED BY ROYAL MAIL

THE PROCESS

We are now in the final stage of consultation on the Framework Masterplan.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Initiation of Masterplan</th>
<th>May 2016</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Publication of Concept Masterplan, outlining a long-term vision for the campus</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>July-September 2016</td>
<td>Public consultation on Concept Masterplan involving residents, parish councils, amenity groups, university staff, Canterbury City Council</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>April 2017</td>
<td>Consultation Statement published</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Step One – Strategic Spatial Vision</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>April 2017</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>June-July 2017</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>November 2017</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Step Two – Draft Framework Masterplan</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>January-March 2018</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>April-ongoing</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>September-November 2018</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The Framework Masterplan document is not a planning application, but a vision for the future evolution of the campus. When and if aspects of the plan are funded it will go through the usual planning process and members of the public will be involved in the usual way.

We invite you to take this opportunity to share your feedback to help us refine the Masterplan that we will present to the Council.

All comments will be carefully considered by the project team as we finalise the document.
Public consultation on Campus Masterplan
25 September 2018

A public consultation on our Campus Masterplan takes place in October. We’ll share our vision for the future evolution of the campus to best meet the needs of the University and of the wider city and region.

The Framework Masterplan proposals detail the framework within which we will make decisions on the future development of our estate in the short-term (2018 to 2021) and medium-term (2021 to 2031), covering the period defined within Canterbury City Council’s District Local Plan.

This latest version of the Masterplan takes into account the feedback that staff, students, local amenity groups and residents provided during the initial stages of consultation in 2016 and 2017.

We learned a lot from that feedback and we now invite you to share your views on the Framework Masterplan by attending our consultation events. They take place as follows:

Saturday 6 October 2018, 10.00-16.00 at Westgate Hall, Canterbury
Thursday 11 October 2018, 14.00-20.00 at Tyler Hill Memorial Hall
Friday 12 October 2018, 14.00-20.00 at Blean Village Hall
Thursday 18 October 2018, 10.00-16.00 Darwin Conference Suite, Canterbury campus

Our response to the views you express during this stage of the consultation will be published in a Consultation Statement later this year. This will feed into the final stages of development of the Framework Masterplan document, which will be presented to Canterbury City Council at the end of the year.

More information about the Masterplan and copies of previous consultation statements are available on our Masterplan web pages – www.kent.ac.uk/masterplan
Public consultation on Campus Masterplan  
By Michelle Ulyatt  
2 October 2018  

A public consultation on our Campus Masterplan takes place in October. We’ll share our vision for the future evolution of the campus to best meet the needs of the University and of the wider city and region.

The Framework Masterplan proposals detail the framework within which we will make decisions on the future development of our estate in the short-term (2018 to 2021) and medium-term (2021 to 2031), covering the period defined within Canterbury City Council’s District Local Plan.

This latest version of the Masterplan takes into account the feedback that staff, students, local amenity groups and residents provided during the initial stages of consultation in 2016 and 2017.

We learned a lot from that feedback and we now invite you to share your views on the Framework Masterplan by attending our consultation events. They take place as follows:

Saturday 6 October 2018, 10.00-16.00 at Westgate Hall, Canterbury

Thursday 11 October 2018, 14.00-20.00 at Tyler Hill Memorial Hall

Friday 12 October 2018, 14.00-20.00 at Blean Village Hall

Thursday 18 October 2018, 10.00-16.00 Darwin Conference Suite, Canterbury campus

Our response to the views you express during this stage of the consultation will be published later this year, before we present the final version of the Framework Masterplan to Canterbury City Council.

More information about the Masterplan and copies of previous consultation statements are available on our Masterplan web pages – www.kent.ac.uk/masterplan.
APPENDIX 13: ADVERT ARTWORK PLACED IN KENTISH GAZETTE AND KENT ONLINE

UNIVERSITY OF KENT MASTERPLAN CONSULTATION

The University is developing a Framework Masterplan for the Canterbury campus. It is intended to provide a framework within which we will make decisions on the future evolution of the campus in the short-term (2018 to 2021) and medium-term (2022 to 2031), covering the period defined in the Canterbury District Local Plan.

We are currently seeking feedback on the Masterplan during a consultation process that is an important stage in the creation of a finished document to be presented to Canterbury City Council.

The Masterplan contains our proposals for developing the campus to best meet the needs of the University, and of the wider city and region.

Public consultation events are taking place as follows:
Saturday 6 October 2018 10.00-16.00, Westgate Hall
Thursday 11 October 2018 14.00-20.00, Tyler Hill Memorial Hall
Friday 12 October 2018 14.00-20.00, Blean Village Hall
Thursday 18 October 2018 10.00-16.00, Darwin Conference Suite, University of Kent campus.

Find out more at www.kent.ac.uk/masterplan
In doing so, it can upgrade existing facilities to reduce their impacts and to make them future-proofed for the more extreme weather we can expect.

As the Chair of the Environmental Audit Committee, Mary Creagh MP, said:

“The Government has committed to create sustainable cities and healthy communities as part of the Sustainable Development Goals. Ministers must act to protect people from the risks of heatwaves. There is a worrying lack of co-ordination across government, and the Government’s admission that all new properties are prone to overheating is astonishing.”

Obviously, these comments apply to the UKC too, so this should be the focus, not an unnecessary and continually increasing footprint. Sources given.

Q1. Do you think that the Framework Masterplan will contribute positively to the future planning of the Canterbury district? No

On a scale of one to five (where one is highly dissatisfied and five is extremely satisfied) how would you score the following aspects of the Framework Masterplan presented today?

I was unable to attend any of the presentations/exhibitions so response based on your documentation. Also, there was insufficient public consultation and it is no answer to say that there will be further consultation opportunities after planning applications have been lodged.

It would be unreasonable of you to issue a further Consultation Statement next month, because many or all of those attending your exhibitions or missing that information in your website would be unaware of your very short timescale.

The Concept masterplan included the Northern Land Holdings with very detailed suggestions for future development within the next 50 years, but for this consultation I could find no information about how the University now feels about the period 2031–2065, so this renders your consultation on this area meaningless. Please withdraw these aspects of your proposals.

Q2. Overall vision for the evolution of the campus. Score: 2. Please add any comments you have on this aspect.

The Vision as given in Step 2, Public Consultation Content, says: “The Masterplan recognises the need to provide a strategic direction for the development of the campus that places an equal focus on the provision of excellent buildings and quality spaces that strengthen its character and respect the rich landscape and ecology of the surrounding environment.

Roads on the campus will be transformed into attractive streets that prioritise walking and cycling and buses and public paths and bridleways will be enhanced to provide a welcoming and legible network of routes. The campus and nearby University-owned land will be developed in ways that protect its special natural and semi-natural environment, the setting of Canterbury World Heritage Site and local heritage assets.

Future development will respect the quality of life and day to day activities of people living and working in the surrounding villages and residential neighbourhoods and avoid any significant impacts on the wider surrounding area in terms of traffic, car parking, air quality or demand for recreation. The campus and development on nearby...
University-owned land will be outward-facing and seek to improve the lives of local people.

However, the proposals do not conform to these worthy aspirations, especially in terms of changes proposed around the perimeter of the main campus and most significantly all the appalling proposals north of main campus. See below for more details.

Q3. The focus on place-making and sustainability and the proposals to consolidate the Campus Heart presented in the Strategic Spatial Objectives. Score: 1. Please add any comments you have on this aspect.

Inadequate time to study these aspects in detail.

Q4. The scope of the Framework Masterplan and the character areas that may see development under the current Canterbury District Local Plan (to 2031). Please add any comments you have on this aspect.

This question has no obvious answer without a lot of study, and question is meaningless. What are you actually asking??

Is it just the scope of the Masterplan or is it just those parts that may see development under the Local Plan 2031…or are you asking if the scope fits in with Local Plan 2031…?

Q5. The projects identified as proposed short-term and medium-term developments. Score 1. Please add any comments you have on this aspect.

See Introduction for general comments and below for comments on the individual unsuitable proposals which conflict with the Vision as given in Step 2, Public Consultation Content, listed above in Q2.

Q6. Do you think that Canterbury City Council should endorse the Framework Masterplan as the guide against which future proposed projects on campus will be assessed?

It would need major changes before it could be accepted as complying with the District Plan.

In addition, Plan Policy EMP 7 needs to be followed much more closely, and you also need to make it clear that you are here for educational reasons, and not commercial ones – as described in your Royal Charter of 1965. The Charter states that “The University’s fundamental objectives are to advance education and disseminate knowledge by teaching, scholarship and research for the public benefit.”

In other words, there is no role for commercial or business purposes, so your Masterplan goes far and away beyond your educational purpose. Regrettably, the continuing numbers of commercial operations on the Campus have an adverse impact on businesses elsewhere in the city, which would otherwise benefit from more student spend and, incidentally save students money through better competition and lower prices. Your proposed hotel is a major example of a business which will take away business from accommodation providers elsewhere.

I understand that there are four areas outside the scope of the masterplan at present, but indicate a possible change when the Local Plan is reviewed in 2031. As the current LP is due to be reviewed every five years can you please let everyone know what changes you will seek in those reviews.

I should like to know how involved you are with the proposed, and strongly opposed, Multi Storey Car Park in Station Road West, to which I objected, for reasons of it not being future-proofed, and that the car park and new roads will increase air pollution, endanger public health and tempt people to use private vehicles and polluting diesel buses when sometimes their destination is just a few minutes’ walk away. Surely students and young people should use their legs and cycles instead. At present there is dangerous use of cars, with students parking in various places, such as along Whitstable Road and St. Thomas’s Hill. I was told some time ago that students would have to agree not to bring cars to Canterbury, but clearly you are not enforcing this. If presented in the right way, and becoming a condition of acceptance, students would, in the main, give up their cars. In addition, the provision of so much car parking for staff is unnecessary and is setting a bad example to students. Many of your staff could travel by bus/train/walking/cycling – some do, but nowhere near enough.

Please share any further comments that you have regarding the information that we have presented.

The fundamental problem is that UKC is proposing developments outside the main campus which will negatively affect the Vision’s ideals.

It is even more surprising that these proposals are in the revised Masterplan despite strong objections in the first Step consultation, and this gives me little confidence that you will listen to objections and makes changes but I hope you will prove me wrong.

In particular the following proposals/aspects are unacceptable.

1 New innovation facilities and business space
   It is unclear if this means the “Possible new small-scale business clusters” proposed in Sarre Penn valley. Either...
way there is no obvious evidence of any real need for these, and the Sarre Penn valley area is particularly unsuitable, both because it would despoil natural areas contrary to the Vision, but would also increase traffic in very quiet areas. Business spaces would be more appropriate to areas needing employment such as Hersden and Thanet, not Canterbury, which has huge inward migration every day.

2 Possible development of a conference centre and hotel—this is also described as: 150-bed hotel and conference centre to provide additional visitor accommodation “Helping to grow Canterbury’s visitor economy by offering 20% more capacity for overnight stays with a new hotel and conference centre.” The Framework Masterplan says it: “aims to ensure that the character of the campus and its surrounding landscape, and the nature conservation interests of the site are safeguarded and enhanced”, and “Conserving and restoring the open grass slopes overlooking the city and augmenting them with orchards.”

Clearly this development conflicts with improving the campus character and landscape and destroys woodland and does nothing for the open grass slopes. I note that a proposal has been developed for a similar facility at the western end of Giles Lane near St Edmunds, which could be a less intrusive site and could benefit St Edmunds too. However, the UKC does not need the facilities and the proposed increased student accommodation could be used for the peak holiday times for visitors.

3 Possible re-provision of Blean Primary School, to include improved car parking and up to 30 additional homes. This proposal is unacceptable because it would expand the existing site significantly and so destroys some existing green areas, and there should be no increase in parking. The proposed housing and parking would also increase traffic onto the main road from the site at a poor location, which would intrude on the traffic flow on the main road.

4 Possible new road, cycle and pedestrian link between Whitstable Road and Park Wood Road I object to this because it would need to be very carefully designed to integrate with the existing main road and roundabout, and especially the need to allow pedestrian and cycling traffic to travel without being in conflict with motorised traffic.

It would also increase traffic intrusion into the UKC site.

5. P15: Proposed car parks around campus perimeter: A Hothe C ourt B Nursery/Blean School C Sports Centre D Park Wood Road E Giles Lane F St. Stephen’s Hill. G Tyler Court H Campus Central J Turing K Hotel Car Park L University Avenue

With some also described as possible new small-scale business clusters. These are simply unacceptable as it transfers transport impacts around the edge of the UKC land, so is no better than existing situation.

6. P19: Possible new safe route from Old Salt Road and Blean Church to Blean Village Centre and a series of linked green spaces, and Possible linking to the Crab and Winkle Link cycle-way. It is unclear how the safe route from Old Salt Road to Blean village centre would be achieved, and this would only be acceptable if it were for non-motorised traffic. Likewise, the new Circular Cycleway is unclear.

Potential Park and Ride Sites combined with NCN1. It has been increasingly recognised that Park and Ride actually increase traffic and emissions, contrary to national and local policies.

In particular, the map showing this proposal indicates traffic coming along the Whitstable Road and the road through Tyler Hill. Both of these roads carry similar traffic at peak times, and the Tyler Hill Road is totally unsuitable for more traffic because of the frequent vehicle-road accidents.

All the historic evidence from Canterbury and elsewhere shows that Park & Ride does not reduce the overall vehicle miles travelled, and the research by Dr Stuart Meek (Stuart Meek, Redefining car-bus interchange to reduce traffic, Loughborough University, June 2010 see: http://homepages.lboro.ac.uk/~cvme/pm/Stuart_Meek _thesis_final_version.pdf) confirms that the total vehicle miles travelled are increased, not reduced. Furthermore, the evidence shows that since well before the recession, people in the UK have been making fewer car journeys and using buses and trains more. Total traffic started to fall in the mid-2000s and the National Travel Survey shows this welcome trend is continuing. So please cancel this expensive, damaging and unnecessary proposal.

8 Possible Shuttle Bus Route.

This is totally unnecessary, and dramatically increases intrusion into the countryside, destroying the tranquillity of the Sarre Penn Valley. Any shuttle buses must use existing roads, and thereby reduce motorised traffic.

9 Proposed Footpaths.

I support the new proposed Principal Walking Routes although the use of the old Crab and Winkle railway line will need to be done with great care, and Old Salt Road must not be made into a high-speed cycling route. Provided that the intrusive developments in the Sarre Penn Valley do not take place, then the number of people along the Crab and Winkle route should be acceptable and would provide benefit for those in Tyler Hill.
Market Way Area Residents’ Association

- The University’s exhibition on its draft Masterplan states clearly that ‘the campus and nearby University-owned land will be developed in ways that protect its natural and semi-natural environment, the setting of Canterbury’s World Heritage Site and local heritage assets’. It also states that ‘future development will respect the quality of life and day to day activities of people working in the surrounding villages and residential neighbourhoods’ and that it will create an ‘environment that promotes healthy living and physical and mental well-being’.
- These are excellent aspirations, but our members are extremely concerned that they do not fit with your plan to build a 150-room hotel and conference facility on the Southern Slopes of the University. The integrity of the Southern Slopes is very important to Canterbury residents and our members since this area provides a critical setting for the university in the Canterbury landscape with outstanding views of Canterbury as a city and it makes an important contribution to the quality of life of many of the residents living in the residential areas south of the University. Canterbury residents have for many years fought long and hard to preserve such valuable green, open spaces.
- In line with your aspirations, we therefore urge you not to damage this valuable green fringe by the construction of a hotel and conference facility on it. Instead, we would like to request that you take an enlightened approach and move the hotel and conference facility closer to the heart of the University, such as between the Innovation Centre and Turing Road.
- We also consider that it would be only fitting for the University to then provide certainty to the residents of Canterbury that these important southern slopes will receive permanent protection.

UKC Student Assembly Against Austerity

- We really appreciate your aims to provide quality buildings and spaces that respect the rich landscape and ecology of the surrounding environment as well as promoting the physical and mental well-being of students and staff alike and the maintenance of the Green Gap between the University and the city.
- However, we do not see how these aims are served by the resurrection of the plan to build a 150-room conferencing hotel on the southern slopes going by the name of Chaucer Fields and especially not by the associated facilities and car parks. We understand the aims and motivations behind this decision, however, these do not comply with the expressed wishes of the UCU, local residents, staff, students, alumni, and the city council etc. Who all opposed this the last time it was proposed (we urge you remember the student vote of 2012).
- We ask that management re-prioritize its spending and funnel it towards teaching (and how about sorting the rat problem at Darwin?) we do not need a conferencing hotel while students are taught by people on precarious contracts. We also ask how this looks in terms of the University’s poor sustainability ranking by people and planet. The building of this conferencing hotel would have a detrimental impact on the surrounding environment and destroy an ancient field system forever.
- If management wants to ‘create a better environment for staff, students and visitors to live, work and play’, how about allowing students and faculty to foster freely on campus? This would foster community and engagement and why not find a way to keep conferences on the main campus and scrap the proposed conferencing hotel?

Oaten Hill & South Canterbury Residents’ Association

While we welcome the University’s commitment to engaging with the local community there are aspects of the plan which we would like to question. The University states a commitment to shared green space and acknowledges the importance of conserving the green environment. The University also states a commitment to encouraging building on the central campus. The University also states a commitment to engaging with the local community and acknowledges the fact that it is embedded within the local community. It is therefore important to listen to and take account of the views of local people.

We are therefore dismayed at the proposal, yet again, to build on the lower slopes. While we recognise that the previous plan has been amended, it is still of concern to OHSCA members that the University proposes to build a conference centre and additional car park in an area which contains many trees and forms part of the important “Green Gap” between the city and the main campus. The proposal to build a conference centre is accepted by the Senior Deputy Vice-Chancellor as having no academic import but a way to attract money for the University.

OHSCA therefore objects to this aspect of the Masterplan in the strongest possible terms and hopes that the University will listen to the views of its members.

CPRE KENT – Canterbury District Committee

The feedback form is inappropriate for what we wish to say, and we also consider that 26 October is too soon for people to comment on such a detailed exhibition. This is insufficient public consultation in our view, and it is no answer to say that there will be further consultation opportunities after planning applications have been lodged. We ask you to
publicise a later feedback end-date, and we consider this should be at least Friday 16 November. As a guideline, the City Council gives a minimum period of six weeks for people to respond to public consultations. Meanwhile we shall do the best we can within the limited time available, using your display poster nos. for ease of reference.

**Poster 1** Thank you for arranging these exhibitions in different areas, and I suppose the only criticism is that the persons responsible for preparing the Framework draft were not necessarily present for discussion, whereas the Concept Masterplan did provide speaking opportunities for many people who had been involved, and also a useful question and answer session.

The Concept Masterplan included the Northern Land Holdings with very detailed suggestions for future development within the next 50 years. However, no mention was made of these proposals at your recent exhibition, although many of them might, we feel, be relevant to the period of the Framework Masterplan 2018-2031. There are of course the Concept responses on the Northern Holdings, but we are left in the dark about how the University now feels about the period 2031-2065.

We do not see how you can publish a further Consultation Statement next month, simply because many or all of those attending your exhibition were unaware of your very short timescale.

**3 You are a University by Royal Charter of 1965 – a great privilege. The Charter states that “The University’s fundamental objectives are to advance education and disseminate knowledge by teaching, scholarship and research for the public benefit.” There is no provision for commercial involvement, and we consider that your Masterplan goes far and away beyond your core educational purpose. Indeed, the continuing numbers of commercial operations on the campus in fact have an adverse impact on businesses in the city, which would otherwise benefit from more student spend and, incidentally save students money through better competition and lower prices. To use a blatant example, your proposed hotel will take away business from accommodation providers elsewhere.**

**4 You mention Policy EMP 7 in the Council’s Local Plan (LPO), and the wording of this illustrates the points we raise in 3. above. We certainly need a Masterplan from you, but it needs to follow EMP 7 much more closely and make it clear that you are here for educational reasons, and not commercial ones.**

**5 This contains a number of good objectives, but we do not consider that using some of your very attractive open spaces for expansion of development would be an improvement. We see no harm in very limited development, purely for educational purposes, over the plan period to see whether or not UK student numbers reduce or remain the same. It would be adverse for Canterbury as a whole if you were to build on open space on the basis that UK student numbers are going to increase. Further, there is a contradiction in terms between your desire to develop and the objectives of avoiding increases in traffic, air quality, car parking or demand for recreation both in and around the Campus.**

**6 Thank you for the map which enables people to see things in context.**

**7 Thank you too for consulting us, though we are unhappy about the inefficient notifications in the early stages, and the short timescale we are now under. These factors do, in our view, render the consultations of less value.**

**8 Your summary of comments seems reasonably accurate from the notes we ourselves took, but there was a strong assurance from one of your speakers at the Concept Masterplan meeting, that the option of not developing outside the present campus was very definitely a prospect. Also, we do not recall much strength of feeling from those attending for provision of commercial offerings. If the University were to provide additional cultural and commercial offerings, this would diminish businesses within and around the city, and would also increase traffic in roads where there is already too much. We should be interested in knowing which particular developments recently completed equate, in your view, to sustainable development.**

Furthermore, the proposed hotel on Chaucer Fields contradicts at least four of the summarised points.

**9 It would help everyone to comment more meaningfully if you told us what you intend for the Northern Land Holdings.** The Concept Masterplan suggested converting Giles Lane from a public highway to a private one, and having a Welcome Centre in a place different from your present Reception building, e.g. perhaps in University Road. You also suggested a “shopping street” of some kind, but in our view, this is outside your Charter remit.

Creating a flexible plan should be subject to continuous monitoring of UK student numbers, so that existing
resources are in full use, before possible expansion takes place.

10 We are worried that proposals beyond the Campus boundary will be dealt with through the planning process, as such process is difficult for most people to understand, they are not given a proper right of audience before the Council Planning Committee, and the time constraints are too limited. We believe that there should be public consultation before any planning applications are formulated so that the University has a clearer idea of people’s wishes. In our experience, people have less complaints where they are brought into the picture before firm decisions are made. The City Council has been particularly bad at giving early notice, and very often its public consultations are just window dressing for what they have already decided to do.

11 You mention four areas outside the scope of the Masterplan at present, but indicate a possible change when the LP is reviewed in 2031. What possible changes do you envisage? Also, are you aware that the current LP is due to be reviewed every five years, and if so, please let us know what changes you will seek in those reviews.

12 In the current climate of increasing apprenticeship and other private training opportunities for young people, we object to the first of your five short-term objectives. In our view UK student numbers will continue to reduce because of the enormous debts that university students carry when they leave, their preference to earn whilst being trained, and the inadequacy of some of the courses on offer in relation to future job requirements/availabilities. Many of those, probably unnecessary, courses could transfer to evening classes at colleges, as used to be the case where people were interested in subjects outside their likely job opportunities.

As to medium-term priorities, we object to those numbered 1-6 and 9. They all depend on student increases, which, if the University cuts down on some of what people might regard as “luxury” courses, will not happen. Also, we should like some information about the University’s intention to attract foreign students, and the terms that might be offered, i.e. length of course, length of stays on campus, etc. This request is made in the light of information about the differing rental levels in recently completed student blocks. Some of these levels are not designed for the average UK student, but are for more luxurious accommodation which is clearly designed to attract a different kind of user.

13 The best method of enhancement is not to build on the open land you have, and to engage on tree and hedge planting where needed to provide connectivity between wildlife habitats. Development in or adjacent to such spaces brings noise, air and light pollution. The best remedy for public health and well-being is to leave your open spaces as natural as possible. We are concerned that the current completely natural route of the Sarre Penn might be unnecessarily “prettified” to the detriment of the environment. Would you please identify by description and map location the historic and heritage assets which you have in mind, and state your intentions for them?

14 We should like to know how involved you are with the proposed, and strongly opposed, Multi Storey Car Park in Station Road West. Environmentalists are concerned that the car park, new roads, and even more buses, will increase air pollution, endanger public health and tempt people to use private vehicles and polluting diesel buses when sometimes their destination is just a few minutes’ walk away. Surely students and young people should use their legs and cycles instead. In this respect we would mention the unsatisfactory use of cars at present, resulting in students parking dangerously in various places, particularly along Whitstable Road and St. Thomas’s Hill. We were told some time ago that students would have to agree not to bring cars to Canterbury, but clearly you are not enforcing this. If presented in the right way, and becoming a condition of acceptance, students would, in the main, give up their cars. Also, we consider your provision of so much car parking for staff to be unnecessary and it is setting a bad example to students. Many of your staff could travel by bus/train/walking/cycling – we know of a few who do, but nowhere near enough.

15 We object to the first three proposals, as they would have an adverse effect upon the environment and be contrary to objectives stated in the LP, particularly for the designated landscape. As to the fourth proposal, we believe that the trees etc. already in place suffice, and congratulate the University on its care of woodland and vegetation.

16 More detail needed, especially about the junction between Giles Lane and Parkwood Road. We should not want to see road widening, and consider the humps and speed limit there at present do a good job in reducing speeds. Nor do we think you need a new public space. How public would it be anyway, bearing in mind the recent dispute on Chaucer Fields? The other objectives would...
depend on increases in student numbers, which we think might be unlikely. You should consolidate and improve what you already have, and consider tailoring your courses to the job needs of the individual and the requirements of potential employers.

18 A firm “no” to the Multi Storey car park – would attract more cars and bring noise, light and air pollution. No also to student spaces – please wait and see about student numbers before expanding any further.

19 Retreats could be provided in the Franciscan Study building, but we do not understand why the University did not buy this attractive modern development on its large plot. The only reason for re-location of Blean School would be for the provision of a new road, and we should like details please. Business clusters are outside your remit, in our view.

20 We consider many of the “benefits” would in fact have an adverse effect upon businesses in and around the city, and with our main shopping streets suffering closures (Nasons etc) we do not want to see the University in competition with Canterbury commerce. We believe your aims amount to a “hedge” against possible reductions in UK students, so that you can replace lost fees by commercial income. This is well outside education provision.

21 The feedback form is quite inadequate for people to comment meaningfully, and we wonder whether you could arrange with the City Council, when making each planning application, to extend the time for comments to six weeks and to allow a higher number of people to speak to the Planning Committee, and for more than three minutes to be allowed for each speaker.

St Michael’s Road Area and Harkness Drive Residents’ Association

5. The projects identified as proposed short-term and medium-term developments.

This is a submission to the consultation on the University of Kent’s Framework Masterplan from St Michael’s Road Area Residents’ Association. We represent residents in the area from Harness Drive through to Leycroft Close and Beaconsfield Road, including Salisbury Road, St Michael’s Road, and all the streets and closes leading off them. We have encouraged our members to respond to the consultation individually. They will have their own views, and in this submission, we focus on the issues on which we know that we can speak collectively for local residents — in particular, the proposals for the southern slopes, between the built area of the campus and our own area.

PROPOSED MEDIUM-TERM DEVELOPMENT: HOTEL AND CONFERENCE CENTRE. We welcome the Masterplan’s core principle of preserving and enhancing the green landscape setting of the university. This principle, however, is completely incompatible with the proposal to locate a conference centre and hotel on the southern slopes, to which we strongly object.

History: ‘Chaucer Fields’ and the Village Green application

As is well known, this issue has a long history. When the ‘Chaucer Fields’ planning application was submitted by the university in 2011, for a 150-bed conference centre and hotel and student accommodation on the southern slopes, it met with concerted opposition not just from the immediate local community but from many hundreds of residents, as well as from university staff and students, on the grounds that it would destroy the much-valued green setting of the university. In response to an active and prolonged campaign, the proposal for student accommodation was withdrawn, and the accommodation was located on the other side of the University Road, as what is now Turing College. The proposal for the conference centre and hotel has now returned and is as unacceptable now as it was in 2011.

The previous campaign was followed by an application from four local residents’ associations for the fields of the southern slopes to be designated a village green. Although the application failed on one of the three conditions (that use of the fields should be ‘nec precario’), the public enquiry established clearly that the unspoilt fields are a much-valued asset for the local community, extensively used by local inhabitants for ‘lawful sports and pastimes’.

The value which the fields have for local people is not confined to the practical use which they make of them. The southern slopes form a green landscape which is, from below, an attractive setting for the university and, from above, an attractive setting for the whole of the city. Each of the fields is an integral part of this landscape. It is an irreplaceable area of green open space, one of the most important in the district, and it forms a much-needed green gap between the University and the residential area.

We believe that the University consistently underestimates the value of its green setting to its own recruitment and retention. From our extensive interactions with staff and students it is remarkable how many cite the green campus and particularly the first impression given by the green gateway from St Thomas’ Hill as a major factor in their decision to work or study at the University of Kent.
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Responses to previous consultations
The value attached to the fields by local people has been reflected in the responses to the consultations on the earlier stages of the Masterplan, for example in this small sample from the comments referring to Chaucer Fields:

… “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…” p.2

“a better location for a conference centre would be north of University Road 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.” p.6

“I believe that 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.” p.10

“When I first visited the University on an open day… 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 of the university that I formed that day and had a significant part to play in my decision to choose Kent.” p.11

“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…could be.” p.11

All comments are taken from Comments from Individuals Appendix 05b, an 82-page collation of comments submitted to the first phase of the consultation on the Masterplan. This contains many more comments in similar vein.

These responses are summarised, with commendable honesty, in the Framework Masterplan Exhibition. On panel 8, the list under the heading WHAT YOU TOLD US includes:

- Intensify the campus heart to conserve the surrounding landscape
- Maintain a ‘Green Gap’ between the University and the city
- Enrich the landscape and biodiversity of the campus
- Locating the proposed conference hotel on this green landscape, in this green gap, would fly in the face of everything that has been said by local people, as well as by university staff, students and alumni. It would be a direct affront to the local community. It would render the whole consultation process completely pointless.

An Area of High Landscape Value
The importance of this landscape is reflected in its designation as an Area of High Landscape Value, recognised in Canterbury City Council’s Local Plan in paragraphs 9.25, 10.12-13, and Policy LB2. Paragraph 10.13 says of all the AHLVs that “the Council’s objective is to preserve and enhance these distinctive landscapes... AHLVs are of special importance because of their landscape, archaeological and nature conservation interest, their local amenity value and their importance to the setting of historic, ecological or wider landscape features.” It also states that their protection should follow the guidelines in the Canterbury Landscape Character and Biodiversity Appraisal. The relevant guidelines for the Stour Valley Slopes include:

- Encourage the restoration of the historic parkland planting.
- Strengthen and recreate the traditional field pattern.
- Conserve and restore open grass slopes overlooking the City.
- Strengthen the structure of the field pattern on the slopes beneath the University resisting the further introduction of scattered ornamental planting.
- Resist the introduction of dominant features on the visually sensitive ridgeline.

These guidelines have recently been restated in the March 2018 Evidence Report for the council’s Green Infrastructure Strategy, pages 106 and 117.

The environmental vision in the Framework Masterplan
The character of the landscape is clearly recognised in the Masterplan itself – both in the previous stages and in the presentation of the current Framework Masterplan. Panel 5 of the exhibition sets out OUR VISION:

The Canterbury campus will be defined by a strong high-quality landscape...

The Campus and nearby University owned land will be developed in ways that protect its special natural and semi-natural environment...

Accordingly, one of the main strategic spatial objectives is to consolidate the Campus Heart rather than locating further development on the periphery.
The vision for creating an enhanced environment, on panel 13, includes:

Conserving and enriching the pastoral landscape of University Rise...

And on panel 14, the specific proposals for enhancing the environment include:

Restoring historic planting of the University Rise area

Improving and extending woodland habitats...

Conserving and restoring the open grass slopes overlooking the city.

This is an admirable vision, and one which we strongly support. The proposed location for the conference hotel is fundamentally incompatible with it.

The location – and an alternative

The case for the conference hotel has been made not on the grounds that it is needed for the teaching and research and the academic life of the University. It is being proposed as a purely commercial enterprise, an additional income stream for the University in a difficult financial climate. We recognise the funding problems, and it is not for us to say whether a conference hotel would or would not be a viable source of additional funding. Our objection is to the proposed site for the development – the most sensitive location which could possibly have been chosen.

No doubt it will be said that the proposed location would merely remove one part of one field on the southern slopes, and that the remainder of the slopes would still exist as a green gap and a landscape setting. This would be disingenuous. Building on that site would remove an established and attractive wooded area, and would irreversibly alter the character of the whole field. It would limit the access which is so much appreciated by local people. It would also set a precedent which would then be very difficult to resist. The southern slopes below University Road form an integral whole. They have been treated as such in the previous stages of the Masterplan. To accept the principle of building on one of the fields would be to abandon their status as a special character area. If building a hotel there is held to be consistent with its location in an Area of High Landscape Value, then it is almost inevitable that the same claim will before long be made for the other fields.

As we understand it, the criteria for the preferred location of the conference hotel are:

Convenient access from the city, easy to reach by car and by bus

The cachet of a university location without the inconvenience of close proximity to student areas

An attractive view across the valley to the city and the cathedral.

It is a moot point whether the deeply felt concerns and interests of local people should be sacrificed to the desire of hotel guests for a nice view. Be that as it may, we have repeatedly pointed out that all three criteria could be equally well met by an alternative location on the other side of University Road, up the hill from Beverley Farmhouse. That area has been identified as being for business and innovation. It would therefore be an entirely appropriate location for a conference hotel which is essentially a business enterprise. Proximity to the Innovation Centre would be an asset. And Beverley Farmhouse itself, a listed building already used for guest accommodation, would be a highly attractive additional feature, provided the new building were sensitively designed to complement it.

It is worth bearing in mind that the southern slopes including the western field, if left undeveloped, would themselves be an additional asset for a conference hotel located just across the road. An unspoilt field with a tranquil woodland area in which visitors could walk and relax would be an added attraction for the hotel, and would be marketable as such. But of course, that asset would not be available if it were sacrificed to make room for the hotel.

We think that the University is missing an exciting opportunity to enhance the semi-natural area, for instance with sensitive planting of wild flowers and native herbs and the provision of some wooden seating. This could then be promoted to staff and students as an area of peace and tranquillity, complementary to the community garden to the north of the campus. It could also be an area of community interface between the academic community, the public, and the business community located on the north side of University Road.

Summary

We therefore object to the proposed location for a conference hotel on the grounds that:

1. It is fundamentally incompatible with the core principles of the Masterplan.

2. It is incompatible with Canterbury City Council’s Local Plan, in particular with the designation of the southern slopes as part of an Area of High Landscape Value.

3. It is contrary to the conclusion of the Village Green public enquiry that the fields of the southern slopes are a much-valued asset for the local community.
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4. It would completely ignore the feedback from the previous consultations and make a nonsense of the consultation process.

5. It would do irrevocable damage to relations between the University and the local community.

We strongly urge that this component of the Masterplan should be withdrawn. If a conference centre is considered essential to the University’s planning, it should be in a different location, such as the one we have suggested.

There are two other matters on which we wish to express the shared views of our members.

PROPOSED NEW CAR PARK

We do not support the proposal for a new ‘University Avenue’ car park at the approach to the University from St. Thomas’ Hill, near Chaucer College. The beginning of University Road at present provides an attractive entrance to the University’s estate, and this would be lost if a car park were created there. As with the southern slopes, once the green starts turning to grey, the University will lose one of its greatest assets. One concreted campus looks very much like another.

POSSIBLE NEW WALKING/CYCLE ROUTE TO CANTERBURY WEST STATION

Our members are also highly sceptical of the suggestion for a new walking/cycle route from the University to Canterbury West station using the old Crab and Winkle Line embankment. Concerns have been expressed that this would add another route which might be a source of night-time disturbance, but in any case, the idea is highly impractical. There is no direct access to the embankment from Beaconsfield Road, and any supposed access to it from either side would encounter a formidable steep gradient and other considerable obstacles. The apparent suggestion that it might even provide a shuttle bus route is even more bizarre, and is best forgotten.

St Michael’s Road Area & Harkness Road Area Residents’ Association

I am writing on behalf of the committee of the St. Michael’s Road Area and Harkness Area Residents’ Associations in connection with the latest phase of the University Masterplan consultation.

Firstly, I should put on record that our Association has appreciated the improvement in the relationship between local residents and the University that has been fostered in recent years. This has been the product of a great deal of effort by residents, Council and University staff working together. We have appreciated the opportunity to be represented at meetings and to be consulted on the University Masterplan.

Local residents participated in the first round of the Masterplan consultations in reasonable confidence that they would be listened to and their input acted upon.

It therefore came as a shock to discover that the most objectionable element in the first round of consultation has been retained into the second and firmed up as an intended medium-term development. This is the proposal to build an hotel on the area of the southern slopes, a successor to the 2011 ‘Chaucer Fields’ application. This flies in the face of a history of intense and sustained objection by residents and others from 2011, extended into the first round of consultation on the Masterplan. It also runs counter to the University’s own ambitions to “…protect its special natural and semi natural environment, the setting of Canterbury’s World Heritage Site and local heritage assets.”

It is hard to justify how grubbing out a 50-year-old acer plantation to replace it with a 150-bed hotel can possibly fulfil this aim. This is particularly the case when the University has land to the north of University Road which could comfortably accommodate such a development within an area already marked for business development and already hosting buildings with which such an hotel would have close synergy.

A development on this field, even at the northern extremity of the site, would irreversibly impact on the rest of the semi-natural environment of this part of the southern slopes. It is not difficult to imagine how the flora and fauna would respond to the huge increase in human activity nearby, including vehicle movements and the concomitant pollution of noise, light and air quality. And, were a development to be allowed in this place, others would almost inevitably follow on the other fields once the precedent had been set.

Local residents, university staff and students have long valued the fields for both their natural environment and their heritage links to Beverley Farmhouse by virtue of the unusual double hedgerows which also mark the boundary between the parishes of St. Stephen’s and St. Dunstan’s. In very recent times this has been the site of beating-the-bounds ceremonies by both churches. It is hard to understand why the University itself does not place especial value on this outstanding part of its campus and make particular efforts towards its conservation. This is especially the case now, when many communities are actively nurturing such semi-natural spaces in recognition of their benefit to health and, in particular, mental health.
I began this letter by expressing our appreciation that relationships between local residents and the University had been improving in recent years and by articulating the impression that local residents were increasingly feeling that they were being listened to and their concerns acted upon by the University. This latest draft of the University Masterplan is in danger of destroying all the good work which has gone into improving relations in recent years.

**St Stephen’s Road Area and Harkness Drive Residents’ Association**

St Stephens Residents Association welcomes the vision described in the emerging Framework Masterplan proposals for the University of Kent. As neighbouring residents, we look forward to the campus and nearby University-owned land being ‘developed in ways that protect its special natural and semi-natural environment…… and local heritage assets.’ We are pleased that roads on the campus will be transformed to ‘prioritise walking and cycling and buses’ and that future development will be planned to ‘avoid any significant impacts on the wider surrounding area in terms of traffic, car parking or air quality’. We have already mentioned in the ‘Concept Masterplan Consultation Statement’, April 2017, that we believe that it is important to maintain a ‘green gap’ policy so that what is currently described as the ‘University Rise Landscape area’ is kept as a green area between the University and the city. We were therefore pleased to see that the University believes that ‘conserving and enriching the pastoral landscape of University Rise’ is viewed as a priority. A small way in which the nature conservation interests of the site could be enhanced would be through restoration of the nature trail and production of a new edition of the excellent guide that used to be available to assist with recognition and interpretation of natural features and wildlife around the site.

However, despite an identified priority to safeguard the ‘character of the campus and its surrounding landscape’ the Masterplan proposals include a plan to build a 150-bed hotel and conference centre in the middle of the sensitive ‘University Rise Landscape area’ which serves as an important green gap. This proposal totally fails to support the University’s key objective of enhancement to its environment by ‘Improving and extending woodland habitats’ and ‘conserving and restoring the open grass slopes overlooking the city’. The wooded slopes are a historic and traditional feature of the countryside surrounding Canterbury’s World Heritage site. The Masterplan mentions the importance of ‘Reinforcing and framing…views to historic Canterbury’ from the campus but fails to recognize the importance to local residents of views of the open green slopes as a backdrop to life in the city. A large hotel and conference centre built on the crown of these grassy slopes would remove an area of woodland and create an unwelcome intrusion on the traditional pastoral landscape in order to ‘grow Canterbury’s visitor economy’ as a commercial objective. St. Stephen’s Residents Association believes, as mentioned in the April 2017 consultation document, that the proposed hotel and farm house (point 3 on the University Rise landscape Character Area diagram) where the building’s historical significance as the original farm house on the University site could be used as a feature to attract visitors and enable a new use to be given to a structure that has considerable green heritage value although at present not well known and hidden behind a clump of trees. Moving the proposed site for a hotel and conference centre to the North of University Road would enable the unique quality and character of the parkland area to the south of the road to remain untouched and promote the Masterplan’s aim of ‘bringing University-owned buildings…of historical or heritage value back to life by giving them appropriate new uses.

Proposals in the Masterplan to adapt Giles lane in order to increase safety and reduce vehicle speeds are welcome and residents in St Stephens would also like to see the University work with Canterbury City Council to establish park and ride provision to the North of the City as part of its proposed Movement Strategy. This could help to reduce through-traffic on St. Stephen’s Hill where there are currently safety issues with large numbers of students crossing a road where a combination of poor visibility and fast-moving traffic creates a high level of risk. Reduction in traffic on this road could also improve air quality for both the University and local residents. Two proposed new car parks are mentioned for St Stephens’ Hill as part of the Masterplan’s Movement and Transport proposals which should help to relieve the use of residential streets in the district for all day parking by University staff and students. However, one of these car parks (St. Stephen’s car park) appears to be located alongside the road leading to Alcroft Grange on land which is currently used as grazing pasture. It would be extremely intrusive and inappropriate to build a multi-storey car-park on this site, as mentioned by John Letherland in his presentation to representatives from Residents Associations, since this location is seen on the horizon when viewed from the city and similar to the University Rise creates a familiar backdrop of pastoral landscape that is valued by local residents. If a surface level car park was constructed on this site it would be important to provide pedestrian crossing facilities to provide safe access to the University.

Members of St. Stephen’s Residents Association would welcome the encouragement of modal shift through the provision of integrated cycle hubs in car parking facilities and ‘improvements to existing pedestrian and cycle routes across campus and opening up new routes. However the proposed development of ‘Wade Court’ on the slopes to the south of the University library and the beginning of a new
route into the city at that point, following the old ‘Crab and Winkle’ route appears to be an inappropriate intrusion into an attractive stretch of grassy slope that would mar an untouched area of pastoral landscape and woodland when an adequate footpath and cycle path into the city already exists quite close by. However, as mentioned in the April 2017 consultation, St. Stephen’s residents would welcome a new entrance to Canterbury West station from the north side on Roper Road to relieve the poor access route through the tunnel on St Stephens footpath that currently provides the most direct route from the University.

The Abbot’s Mill Project
• We wish to object to the proposal set out in the University’s Masterplan to develop a 150-room conferencing hotel and associated facilities on the Southern Slopes of the University. The proposal to develop south of University Road entirely undermines the intelligibility, coherence, and basic credibility of the Masterplan and directly contradicts the Masterplan’s own, widely welcomed, core aim of concentrating development at the centre of the campus.
• It is also ignores the huge amount of expressed opposition from local residents, University staff, students and alumni, local government, and local civil society and voluntary sector groups ranging over a seven-year period (and continuing throughout the recent consultation events), starting when proposals to develop on the Southern slopes/Chaucer Fields were first expressed by the University.
• This widespread public opposition is grounded in the fact that this landscape currently functions as shared unspoilt green space, a “green lung” or “Green Gap” with high heritage value. It is treasured for its spectacular views of the city and cathedral, its historic mosaic pattern and ancient field structure; its natural and seminatural beauty; its provision of a haven for wildlife and wild plants, and its constant use as a tranquil place for relaxation, recreation and leisure, play and wide range of pastimes.
• To develop here would destroy this precious legacy and deeply damage the University authorities’ relationship with its own staff and students, as well as with local residents. It would also set a dangerous precedent for further “development” on other parts of the southern slopes.

What should be done? We believe that the University should...
• Adopt a ‘one-planet living’ approach to all planning and decision-making; respecting and protecting the limits of the planet’s environment, resources and biodiversity. The University should be taking a long-term view (as opposed to short to medium-term profit-maximisation) by carefully weighing up the potential benefits, or otherwise, to future generations and considering these as paramount to all decision-making, especially decisions to build on green spaces.
  www.bioregional.com/oneplanetliving
• Only “develop” further where there is a clear community/civic need for such development and not for the primary benefit of corporate interests in the private/for-profit sector
• Only “develop” using genuine low impact building methods and green technologies, to map a truly green infrastructure and wider environmental sustainability, ensuring that we leave a safe and peaceful planet for future generations. As such, commit to the BREEAM Communities International Technical Standard: www.breeam.com/discover/technical-standards/communities
  http://www.breeam.com/discover/technicalstandards/communities

Sustainability (environmental, social and economic) means treating the Earth as if we intend to stay. It is about living within our environmental limits now and meeting the needs of existing and future generations. By living sustainably, we are clearly saying that we want to leave the best possible inheritance to our children and grandchildren. That does not mean unrelenting and perpetual economic growth, development of green spaces and the destruction of our natural environment. It does mean ensuring a planet that is safe and peaceful and conducive to a healthy life for all.

Stay true to its Masterplan principle of concentrating any development at the centre of campus; involve University staff, students and alumni, local residents and local community groups in a meaningful way to ensure the co-design and co-production of any development, the result of which would also be to foster excellent community relations and ensure genuine community ‘buy-in’
• Recognise and honour the strength of public opinion in maintaining the integrity of the Green Gap and formally protecting the land south of University Road, as well as other key green spaces on campus, as unspoilt shared green space in perpetuity.
This appendix sets out the feedback received from individuals by feedback form, post and email. It has been anonymised by the removal of names and address information and any additional personal information within the feedback that may unintentionally lead to the identification of an individual. The comments are verbatim, although some introductory text and closing text have been removed (e.g., “thank you for consulting ...”, “I heard about this consultation by ...” and “I hope you take these comments in to account ...”).

Appendix 6a – Comments from Feedback Forms

This part of the appendix sets out the hand-written comments provided by way of the feedback form. In total, 120 completed or partially completed forms were received. All but one of these forms were filled out at one of the four consultation events held at Westgate Hall, Tyler Hill Memorial Hall, Blean Village Hall and Darwin Conference Suite.

Comments

The tables below set out comments received in response to the six specific questions on the feedback form. These have been organised under each of the four consultation events and ‘others’ to help people identify their comments. When handwriting proved difficult to read, where possible the University sought clarification from the person who submitted the form. Where this was not practicable, the unreadable text is replaced by XXX.

Westgate Hall Comments Question 2: Overall vision for the evolution of the campus

• The map information should be clearer. In particular the colour coding of boundaries; the colour coding of building proposals; the meaning of short, medium and long-term.
• The overall presentation is unclear.
• The dissemination to the local stakeholders is inadequate.

From the point of view of the University, this would, no doubt, be great. However, nearby residents will not be so satisfied if they are affected.

Infill to main campus is understandable. All the buildings proposed to the north and south of the existing campus are unwelcome. The proposed conference hotel centre should be refused. It would breach the Green Gap endorsed by Canterbury Council and local residents. No, no, no!

You talk about prioritising walking and cycling but this needs to also include cycle lanes into the city centre. St. Dunstan’s Street and Forty Acres Road need cycle lanes. You say you respect people that live in the local area but I see little respect for me!! Please get rid of the cars!

More indication of visual impact and transport links – stronger emphasis.

I would like to object to the proposed hotel and conference centre. This is contrary to the spirit of the local plan. It is not in keeping with the idea of a green heritage which the University says it supports. The chosen site involves cutting down the only trees bordering University Road on the south side. If such a development is needed it could be better sited on the north side of University Road nearer the University – where the ground is treeless and flat and has a pavement. It would be on the same side as the bus turnaround and have access to existing car parks.

I agree with the need for a Masterplan and with the principles of developing the core. However, I strongly object to the location of the conference centre on the southern slopes aka Chaucer Fields. There has been and will be considerable opposition to this development. It is a valued local green space and should remain so.
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### Westgate Hall Comments Question 2: Overall vision for the evolution of the campus

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Comment</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>All of this was discussed three years ago, in relation to the threat to Chaucer Fields. Why is this being raised again?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Happy that there is an attempt to consolidate the development of the campus. Unhappy at some of the ideas for development at the periphery.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The hotel conference centre is on land which should be kept as green field.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>All development must be based in existing central campus. Expansion will despoil the unique character of the site and seriously damage the University’s reputation and relations with the local community.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A grandiose scheme which would overwhelm the town and its environs.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The campus is special because of its beautiful location surrounded by Chaucer Fields and the woods and fields. The new developments would ruin this and negatively affect the wellbeing and quality of life of students and residents. The business case for this initiative should also be made explicit.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>There is plenty of university land at Tyler Hill on the right as you go to Chestfield. This land would not affect the land village green status that didn’t go through on the proposed campus. Because it is near the University it would be an ideal alternative for building on.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I am encouraged there is a plan, but previous experience of previous plans makes me seriously doubt that I can trust this – i.e. it will not be held to in the future.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I like the idea that UKC take the future of development and the issue of sprawling seriously.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>But the vision is governed by the future demand for University expansion which may be questioned when first degree undergraduate entry to British universities is declining as cost of degree is questioned and the government emphasis on apprenticeships and sandwich courses. Kent’s undergraduate in-take is down this year and may well continue for some years.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I think the ideas and the ideals are positive. However, I am totally opposed to the building of a conference centre on the university slopes. This area should be protected as important free space. There are many trees which would be felled for car parks encouraging greater pollution and destroying wildlife.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>This may be positive but depends on future student numbers and the ways in which students access degree work on campus, e.g. will they be residential or will the majority come only to specific courses and not for interaction with other students and staff?</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### Westgate Hall Comments Question 2: Overall vision for the evolution of the campus

Great to have a coherent vision where placement of future development is well considered.

Development should take place only within the central campus not on the surrounding open green spaces. The plans were not clear about the extent of what is now termed “the campus” which now extends far beyond what local residents think of as “the campus”. There is no key on the maps/plan to explain what the red and blue lines refer to! We asked someone to explain and were astounded to hear the above. The overall vision says “creeping development”.

I am pleased that the university is developing a masterplan and that this will need to be approved by the local council – hopefully leading to development which not only meets the needs of the University but also those of the local residents and city life.

The proposed hotel with its attendant car park/s will not add anything to local residents’ amenities. It will destroy the integrity to the green space below the University Road.

The green space is key to the holistic atmosphere of the uni. Urban sprawl encroaching on neighbourhoods causes undue traffic and ecological damage.

It seems to relate to planning of Kent University rather than planning of Canterbury district. We love to use Chaucer Fields and we enjoy the quiet green area and nature. I can’t see benefit to Canterbury City. I only see plans to benefit the university. I am concerned about increased noise and traffic in my home area of St Michael’s Road.

My only interest is protecting Chaucer Fields as was always intended when the University was set up in 1965. Allowing the hotel and conference centre to be built on that land will I believe be the beginning of erosion of this green lung. There must be other creations that would satisfy the criteria for the location of this building. May be not as “perfect” but still possible within the large area of land owned by the University.

### Westgate Hall Comments Question 3: The focus on place-making and sustainability and the proposals to consolidate the Campus Heart presented in the Strategic Spatial Objectives.

It sounds as if there will be a containment of development, but:

- The Chaucer Fields development is not well-thought out and contained
- The extension of the campus boundary into farmland enables a considerable expansion of the development areas. This contradicts the principle of campus containment – a sophistry.

An improvement on the 2011 scheme, but this is just the tip of the iceberg.

CONTINUED OVERLEAF
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Westgate Hall Comments Question 3: The focus on place-making and sustainability and the proposals to consolidate the Campus Heart presented in the Strategic Spatial Objectives.

This is two questions. Some of the proposed changes to the Campus Heart may not advance a sustainability agenda. The proposals for satellite buildings on all or any greenfield sites are against sustainability and should not proceed.

Not sure about energy?

This is extremely unclear.

The proposed conference centre is not consolidation into the Campus Heart. Inconsistency here.

Rubbish: PR hypocrisy to hide the threat to our local environment. Smooth talking, discernible lies.

The objectives are good. But certain developments (especially the conferencing hotel) go against the whole idea of consolidation. In my opinion, the University has not made a convincing case (business or environmental) for this proposal. Let us see the business case.

- The University certainly needs a central core or focal point. At present the buildings are not connected. I welcome plans to link buildings together.
- Also, the emphasis on public transport is very important. The bus services are good and needs more publicity. I am pleased that the cycle/walking route to Whitstable is not going to be disturbed or altered.

Developments such as the conference hotel completely contradict sustainability. Inconsistency will not do the University any favours. Ecological sustainability is welcome – shallow greenism is not.

A plethora of car parks, a hotel conference centre – how could this be described as contributing to sustainability? How would this enhance or safeguard the natural environment? If we have heavy rainfall the buildings will prevent a soakaway and the rain will go right through the pathway to Beaconsfield Road as it has in the past and it will cause flooding in these houses opposite Salisbury Road.

Speaking to the architect I felt his description of things made sense and will improve this area.

Again, I have few issues with development in the heart of UKC but I am totally opposed to the possibility of more development on the south slope- Chaucer Fields and feel this has already been addressed.
### Westgate Hall Comments Question 3: The focus on place-making and sustainability and the proposals to consolidate the Campus Heart presented in the Strategic Spatial Objectives.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Comment</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>I support the need for the building of a badly needed medical school and improving certain areas of Kent University excellence such as Law (Wigoder Building), computing, economics but it may be folly to create new departments or buildings for academic where response is unknown. It must be remembered that many of the 130 or so British Universities will be thinking of expansion leading perhaps to academic white elephants.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I would be concerned if too much space is taken for car parking and encroached on residential areas. The University should be encouraging a car-free environment. Already students bring cars into residential areas which causes residents problems. The idea of consolidating the Campus Heart is positive.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Good to focus on cohesive areas for future planning.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Very pleased with this focus but would like more information on some of the areas e.g. delivering for biodiversity as I have some concerns about a few of the schemes not being connected to existing biodiversity features.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The plans and maps were unclear. I strongly object to any development on green open spaces surrounding the central campus and I particularly object to the proposed “Conferencing Hotel” on the site of Chaucer Fields, a site which is essential to the appeal of the area and is enjoyed by students, staff and residents. The developments are not sustainable- the conference hotel would destroy large areas of beautiful natural land enjoyed by students, staff and residents. The vague buildings dotted about in what is only now referred to as “the campus” i.e. green fields extending north are more creeping development. If those were built there might then be roads and further development.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Looking at the plans and speaking to the architect this seems to represent a positive development, better utilizing and expanding current buildings and in areas rather than ad hoc development. Also making campus easier to navigate.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Net result more disturbance – the increased footfall of students and hotel/conference guests through local resident areas.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I find these questions difficult to understand and reply to.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### Westgate Hall Comments

**Question 4: The scope of the Framework Masterplan and the character areas that may see development under the current Canterbury District Local Plan (to 2031).**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Comment</th>
<th>Response/Concern</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Not at all clear. The impression is of creeping development planned for green fields.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>These are very ambitious plans, but do they take into account likely student numbers in the future?</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The newer red territory in the campus should never be developed, especially to the south and north. Not at all clear. The impression is of creeping development planned for green fields.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>These are very ambitious plans, but do they take into account likely student numbers in the future?</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The newer red territory in the campus should never be developed, especially to the south and north.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I disagree – you are altering the natural environment by developing the conference centre at its proposed location.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Why, at a time of falling rolls and the drop in 'league tables’ positions, is the University not focussing on its prime directive of teaching, learning and research?</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I feel that the Framework Masterplan is somewhat XXX. The Council's District Local Plan is not sustainable and the serious air quality problem is not being tackled.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I contributed to the previous consultation. As far as I am concerned any development on the Southern Slopes is unacceptable because it will inevitably lead eventually to future development and will isolate the appearance of the current views.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Perhaps the University could consider the natural beauty of the area as a more valuable asset than the Framework Masterplan appears to recognise. The reputation of the University might also be worth taking in to consideration. Do you really want to risk the public image of an underdemocratic corporate machine swallowing beloved green space in pursuit of questionable developments?</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• University Rise – one word, disastrous. Ignores community views completely.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Sarre Valley – why provide business clusters and ‘retreats’?</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Campus Heart – a multi-storey car park at Giles Lane, attracting more cars. How is this sustainable?</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>It is overriding the wishes of the majority of local residents and raises concerns about sustainability and the environment.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>What does this mean? Does “scope” mean the area of land covered by the Masterplan? If so then it seems to include all major areas.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### Westgate Hall Comments Question 4: The scope of the Framework Masterplan and the character areas that may see development under the current Canterbury District Local Plan (to 2031).

You clearly display all your land and especially that to the North of the original campus towards Blean. I would be loath to see this developed and certainly question the need as university demand is at present. Naturally I am pleased that recent development in Park Wood has been sensitive to the natural surroundings.

As before, I think the total plan has good points but the building of a conference centre on the University Road is in my view a total blight.

The plans are not clear. We are told that the “Masterplan” is to prevent further sprawling of the campus. There is no justification for opening up new greenfield sites for development – this is a) creeping development and b) further sprawling. More creeping development – deeply unwelcome. This would destroy the character of the area. Canterbury is a heritage site and its character – the views included – must be preserved.

I am going to give this a score of one as I assume “scope” includes the 150-bed hotel which I am totally opposed to. Generally other developments in the Masterplan, expansion of existing buildings etc, new footpaths/cycle paths etc seem to make sense.

I find these questions difficult to understand and reply to.

### Westgate Hall Comments Question 5: The projects identified as proposed short-term and medium-term developments.

There may be embedded in some of these ideas’ valuable principles. But there are so many grey areas of uncertainty that it is difficult to be optimistic. The principle of containment is valuable, but it is contradicted by the very plans themselves. The Estates staff were very helpful, but it felt like they were making a silk purse out of a sow’s ear.

Obviously, nothing stands still, but should these proposals be seen in the light of the current economic/political situation (e.g. Brexit)?

Infill of Campus Heart is understandable. Everything else in the proposals should not proceed.

See overleaf – the hotel conference centre as proposed does not enhance the environment and encroaches on the green buffer that was endorsed in the local plan.

**CONTINUED OVERLEAF**
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### Westgate Hall Comments Question 5: The projects identified as proposed short-term and medium-term developments.

Several of the ‘core developments’ will no doubt benefit UKC. However, the conference centre location is out of step with what is being planned elsewhere.

I assume the University retains its ‘charitable status’, yet consistently insists it is primarily a ‘business’. This is contradictory, and threatens such charitable status.

The 150-room conferencing hotel is an absurd proposal. The locals have overwhelmingly rejected this plan, as have many members of staff and student bodies. The proposed and rather vague buildings – of indeterminate purpose – are clearly a way of sneaking through future development. We reject the proposed development.

I don’t understand how a university that claims to be in deficit to the extent that it cannot afford to pay its employees properly and is on a hiring freeze can afford such developments. It’s very upsetting and frustrating.

Whilst I am concerned about developments in Blean my major concern is with the 150-bed hotel on Chaucer Fields. It could easily be put somewhere else less controversial and give equal access to Canterbury/Trains etc and not be an eyesore from the city and locality and encroach on the green space.

I cannot support the idea of hotel/conference centre on the site proposed in University Road. It was the subject of a planning proposal in c.2010 and was bitterly opposed by residents in neighbourhood and further afield. It is an area of high landscape value and was designated as part of the green wedge between “town and gown.” The hotel can be built elsewhere on university land such as vicinity of Park Wood. It must now be questioned whether the University of Kent needs a conference centre and accommodation, since there is plenty of room in the colleges outside full term time. Any application to build on this land will meet with fierce opposition leading to months or years delay.

Conference centre is medium term development. Strongly oppose this.

The hotel and conference centre should not be built on University Rd adjacent to Chaucer College. Once this green site is built on it will be difficult for residents in the area to argue against future buildings. The same applies to a proposed car park partially up University Rd. What about the view over Canterbury which is iconic?

The plans are not clear. I strongly object to the plan to develop on open green spaces such as Chaucer Fields and anywhere outside of the central campus. There is no need for a “Conferencing Hotel” and no justifications have been provided for building this or for building such a thing on green fields. The conference centre will destroy the character and value of beautiful natural green spaces. This land was originally bought very cheaply and it has been enjoyed as a public amenity for decades.

My main concern is the proposed development of the 150-bed hotel – particularly the location of the Chaucer Fields. I am also concerned about the impact on local residents at Blean as the development proposed with new “houses” and repositioning the school. Again, development of the campus, new footpaths, cycle paths seem to make sense.
Westgate Hall Comments

Westgate Hall Comments Question 5: The projects identified as proposed short-term and medium-term developments.

I am still unclear what these are.

Southern slopes – original plan of hotel and student accommodation was cancelled. We were told there were no proposals for development below University Road. When the student blocks were proposed we were told no land was available at the top of the hill; since then we have seen huge development on Giles Lane. Now the hotel concept is resurrected for the southern slopes. There is still land above University Road. Why should we believe this proposal when we have been misled (lied to) previously?

Westgate Hall – Please share any further comments that you have regarding the information that we have presented.

I am very concerned that building on the Southern Slopes will be detrimental to the view and available amenity. Car parking will be a problem and the scale of the building and necessary service facilities will create a larger footprint than suggested in the Masterplan. The slopes should continue to be a green gap between the town and the University.

- I endorse the principles of biodiversity (e.g. the Crab and Winkle Way is an important site for biodiversity, including rare species).
- I endorse the importance of the need to plan for future uncertainty. But the inadequacy of dissemination to all stakeholders and the potential loopholes creeping development should be resisted.

Perhaps another Masterplan by residents would give some balance.

The colonisation of the areas surrounding the existing campus are not wanted or justified. Creeping development is not warranted. All local residents are opposed.

Good work, confidence.

- The conference centre should be the issue that causes CCC to reject the masterplan. UKC should bring forward a plan that places any conference centre north of University Road.
- This questionnaire is not helpful in enabling the public to express their views on the Masterplan. Will the views expressed here (without names) be published?

I believe that CCC should keep an open mind as regards future developments and not solely base their decisions on the current Masterplan
- Also, I am concerned about the building of a path on the old Crab and Winkle lines as this goes through a residential area and would mean some compulsory purchase of land and a considerable amount of building work to make this happen. A simpler improvement of the existing pathway with adequate signage would be more appropriate and keep the existing communities that benefit and interact with the students.

CONTINUED OVERLEAF
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Westgate Hall – Please share any further comments that you have regarding the information that we have presented.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Comment</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Time and again local people are ignored, their environment undermined rather than supported by such soulless, hegemonic greed. Why, for example, the hotel? Why here? Why now?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• I believe there is a conflict by developing the proposed hotel and conference centre on the north of the southern slopes adjoining the University Road as it is recognised in the local Canterbury Council forward plan and also by the University review as a green space buffer zone area, and should not be built on.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• I have been a resident in the local area (Verwood Close) for over 30 years and reducing green space area would be a travesty for the local community.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>For the reasons already stated in (3) and the fact that the University is overriding strongly and consistently expressed views of local residents, creating a great deal of unnecessary friction with its neighbours.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I am still concerned about the hotel and conference centre. The size has been reduced but will these facilities be big enough for large conferences? Underground parking is expensive but possible. Will the University encourage delegates to travel by public transport instead of bringing their cars?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The attempts to address the traffic problems associated with Blean School seem very useful and would be a considerable contribution to the general locality.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CCC should endorse the Framework Masterplan – subject to hotel conference centre being relocated.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A+ for effort in the PR departments, and for the rather audacious claim that “many locals are supportive.” Unfortunately, we are rather wiser than that in Canterbury. Your proposed developments will cost you more time and money than they are worth because we will do everything in our legal rights to stop them.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The proposals would undermine the balance between the interests of Kent University and the city of Canterbury.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The plans are incoherent.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I believe there is a conflict by developing the proposed plans. This area is used by families, dog walkers and students and therefore would be detrimental to build on.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Given our previous experience of University plans how can we be expected to believe what is presented to us? The use of euphemisms such as “pavilion” and the presentation of the sheet labelled &quot;HOTEL AND CONFERENCE CENTRE&quot; seems to me dishonest. This latter is clearly an attempt to make us feel lucky to have a hotel rather than the 2011 &quot;village and hotel!&quot; which local residents vehemently opposed.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

CONTINUED OVERLEAF
Westgate Hall – Please share any further comments that you have regarding the information that we have presented.

This question cannot be answered since the Framework Masterplan is subject to external or natural circumstances. Projects should be limited to proven or argued case. We have to face a stark fact regarding university education today. There are over 130 universities and university institutions. Many are now suffering from lack of applicants and filling places by “scraping the barrel” of academic ability. Perhaps many will close in the next 30 years. Kent should only expand in its proven areas of academic excellence. In science it is no use competing with Imperial College or Oxbridge. Unfortunately, Kent unlike Warwick and York, has not made it into the Russell Group so it will have to find or fight for its own strengths. It advertises itself as Europe’s University but then this is dependent on what happens after Brexit and how far Kent and other universities continue to attract students at undergraduate or graduate level. Perhaps there ought to be a rationalising of departments between Kent and Christchurch. Can both institutions for instance support individual faculties of history.

What is the financial/geographical/infrastructural justification for the placement of the hotel and conference centre?

The plans are too confusing. Be Clear. Don’t have a Masterplan, simply state that you are not going to continually expand and you are going to honour the “sustainability” by conserving natural habitats and open spaces which are vital for the well-being of people and other life forms – wildlife, plants, eco systems. It is the open spaces surrounding the university campus which help attract students. This is not a consultation since most local people think it concerns the central campus. We now discover (only by asking) that the campus extends far further than anyone knew or in most cases knows. There must be numerous other places apart from Chaucer Fields where a conference hotel could be sited. It will ruin the landscape and the views for local people, staff and students. Rather than trying to “make money” why not reduce the spending on all the construction that is and has been going on, in and around the University.

I have said no because I dearly hope that the local council will not accept the plan if it includes the development of the 150-bed hotel. Local residents have clearly registered their concerns about any development on the Chaucer Fields area, particularly during the Village Green Enquiry. I am saddened to think our views do not seem to have been taken into account in the development of this plan. I had been hopeful after the enquiry and with a new chancellor in post – there would be more recognition of the thoughts and feelings of the local community.

Consultations with the public seem to result in the University continuing their planned expansion – without taking any notice of the residents’ dissatisfaction and unhappiness. Any building below University Road will end up with infill of other buildings.

I am concerned about the development of a transport link between the University and Canterbury City Centre/Canterbury West as I do not wish to have any route created behind my garden. At present my garden backs onto other gardens and I feel secure. I do not wish to have a road behind as well as in front of my property.

Currently the campus has little identity or sense of place. It is sprawling and hard to navigate. The plans look like a good proposal to consolidate the site and will release housing in central Canterbury for non-students.

Excellent plans which benefit local people as well.
APPENDIX 15: FEEDBACK FROM INDIVIDUALS IN FULL (CONT)

Tyler Hill Memorial Hall Comments Question 2: Overall vision for the evolution of the campus.

I’m relieved that plans either side of Tyler Hill Road seem to have been dropped. Am concerned re the hotel south of University Road.

A lot of repetition and rhetoric but as a resident I am pleased to be “consulted.”

I like the concept of concentrating much of the new developments in the heart of the campus.

Although the presentation of information was not always clear (white lettering on a pale blue/green background) the content was well presented. I particularly liked the several passes made over the landscape to show notions boundaries both of landscape (physical geography) and habitations.

Like cycle paths along TH Road. Like opportunity to rebuild Blean Primary School. Like plan to develop Crab and Winkle Way. Like prospect of a new swimming pool at UKC. Thanks for shelving plan to develop the Northern Lands.

The university is in the beating heart of Canterbury and needs vision to create new facilities for the community to share.

Wanting to build more student accommodation and a hotel when UKC had 200 empty student bedrooms start 2018/19 academic year. Car parks by University gate will mean student/staff parking adjoining roads if no spaces, as Uni cannot control external roads.

The phased approach centering on main developments close to the main campus together with proposed amenities in the surrounding areas (e.g. network of footpaths in Blean and Tyler Hill, arboretum) is appropriate.

Tyler Hill Memorial Hall Comments Question 3: The focus on place-making and sustainability and the proposals to consolidate the Campus Heart presented in the Strategic Spatial Objectives.

Sounds promising.

All looks fine to me but probably won’t be here to see it.
Appendix 15: Feedback from individuals in full

Tyler Hill Memorial Hall Comments Question 3: The focus on place-making and sustainability and the proposals to consolidate the Campus Heart presented in the Strategic Spatial Objectives.

I agree with the emphasis on sustainability and the attempts to remove traffic from the heart of the campus. However, it is important to remember the needs of all XXXX and/or disabled people when planning car park arrangements. There are many people who cannot walk very far but whose problems are not severe enough to be eligible for a Blue Badge. If car parks are going to be on the edge of campus you may need to consider electric shuttle buses (or similar) to meet their needs.

I thought that the design proposals had been developed cogently and coherently.

I would like to see a link road from Whitstable Road and a large 1000 space park and ride facility in the North constructed as there is no facility from the North of Canterbury. This should be landscaped and the terminal sustainably constructed with natural materials.

Will not have the money to do these plans and will only do those that make money, not the proposed nice-to-haves for “community”. Masterplan is a back-door attempt to get council to agree principles within Local Plan to make easier to get planning.

Yes, consolidation of the Campus Heart should be a priority. Yes, the development of resource(?) that contribute to place-making is important. It would be good to know what access to central university resources the surrounding communities could benefit from.

Tyler Hill Memorial Hall Comments Question 4: The scope of the Framework Masterplan and the character areas that may see development under the current Canterbury District Local Plan (to 2031).

The plan mentions more footpaths but Uni not always complying with requirements.

Proposals are credible. The rest is down to planning and finance. The inclusion of a city planner in the oversight of the proposals has clearly been beneficial.

As long as the green buffer and woodland is maintained between university and city.

It is not clear what the relationship is between the XXX of the proposals for when development will take place and its tentative statements about what some of those will be. The devil is in the detail e.g. I think the idea of car parks is appropriate but I don’t think multi storey car parks should be introduced (One is suggested for Giles Lane). I think the University should also present a complete transport strategy; at the moment these appear to be a number of individual initiatives but not an overall plan.
APPENDIX 15: FEEDBACK FROM INDIVIDUALS IN FULL (CONT)

Tyler Hill Memorial Hall Comments Question 5: The projects identified as proposed short-term and medium-term developments.

I am not satisfied with the proposal to build the hotel/conference centre on the proposed site. “The Green Gap” between the city and the campus should be preserved. The destruction of the wood on the proposed site seems to be at odds with the sustainability emphasis of the Masterplan.

I understand the medical school is situated at Christchurch University, for which enabling works has commenced and due to open in 2020.

I welcome some creative thinking about the future of Blean School but think the development proposal has too many houses on the old school site and that the school should not suffer from a reduction in outside space which it appears that it would under current proposals.

Tyler Hill Memorial Hall Question 6: Please share any further comments that you have regarding the information that we have presented.

No because of the proposed encroachment on the Green Gap.

I am a Crab and Winkle line trustee and would like to see the old track bed of the line from the north portal of the tunnel to Tyler Hill road converted into a shared use footpath and cycle way. The land to the north forming the old track bed could be compulsorily purchased back from Clowes Wood under the Highways Act 1980. The trust’s aim is to reopen the tunnel. Major structural repairs would be required. The excavation and disposal of 690 linear metres of pulverised fuel ash and brick and clay rubble would be a major task. Re-lining parts with segments would be required from Rutherford College to Woolf College would be necessary. The Uni Heritage Lottery could fund it as the tunnel is a grade 2 * listed building.

Blean Village Hall Comments Question 2: Overall vision for the evolution of the campus.

Too vague about transport, parking, cycling.

Doesn’t look as if enough attention has been paid to traffic issues on/through the campus or in the surrounding area. This goes for both vehicles (motorised) and cycles.

Like the expansion of common sense re organisation on campus but need to meet needs of the disabled. Like green credentials and awareness of need for students and local residents for green spaces. Like plans for new footpaths and cycle paths linking Crab and Winkle Way.

CONTINUED OVERLEAF
### Blean Village Hall Comments Question 2: Overall vision for the evolution of the campus.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Feedback</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Delighted that no development will go north.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Concern about the hotel and conference centre in relation to Chaucer Fields rumours.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Impossible to say at this stage. The overall vision (with the emphasis on preserving and enhancing the green landscape of the campus) is in principle very good, but it is not consistently applied. It is directly contradicted by the proposal for a conference hotel in the &quot;Green Gap&quot;.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Totally XXX.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I think you will do whatever you want to do.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Blean Village Hall Comments Question 3: The focus on place-making and sustainability and the proposals to consolidate the Campus Heart presented in the Strategic Spatial Objectives.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Feedback</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Not convinced by sustainability aims. No prior success in this area so how will UKC suddenly become sustainable? Need to demonstrate true commitment to this.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Please make sure that you plant at least as many trees as those which may have to be felled.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Again, in principle good, as long as it is consistently applied. Building a hotel in the Parklands would not be consolidating the Campus Heart.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>XXX.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Blean Village Hall Comments Question 4: The scope of the Framework Masterplan and the character areas that may see development under the current Canterbury District Local Plan (to 2031).

1) The spelling of Saint Cosmus and Saint Damian needs adjusting. 2) Recent archaeological discoveries suggest the areas around the Roman villa require further investigation. There is evidence of considerable building activity to the south of church cottage. Please refer to work done by Fred Birbeck who has just collected a classics and archaeology degree. I have Fred’s contact details. 3) Blean Church is currently proposing to extend the church room adjacent to the church. This might be of interest to the University – if you are interested please contact me by the end of October as we shall be submitting a planning application shortly afterwards. More details of the proposal to link the University to Blean village through cycle/footpaths are needed. I could not work out what your plans were for this.

More sensible development of pre-existing sites is excellent.Diminishes impact on local environment. NB Very important roads, especially inner University Road takes capacity of extra traffic as Radfall Road, Hackington Road and Tyler Hill road esp. too narrow and dangerous.

Development of Blean School to alleviate road blocking is a good thing. Was horrified to hear that parents use the uni as a short cut to the school. What a nerve! The uni is for young people not children.

Again, the problem is inconsistency. The Parklands (lower part of University Rise, on the southern slopes) is not a character area which should be developed.

It will wreck our character.

Blean Village Hall Comments Question 5: The projects identified as proposed short-term and medium-term developments.

I think the link between the Salt Road/Church and Blean village is a positive development but it will be extremely difficult to find a safe route given land ownership between the University-owned land and the village centre.

Concerned that these only add to current transport problems. No sustainable solutions shown.

Concerns remain about increase in traffic due to extra facilities proposed. The hotel will increase traffic generally to and from the campus and through the town. Also, it seems to me that more remote “quiet areas” e.g. on Tyler Hill Road will also generate more traffic on that road and this is highly undesirable.
### Blean Village Hall Comments Question 5: The projects identified as proposed short-term and medium-term developments.

But traffic management needs to be managed carefully and no excess onto Hackington Road or Calais Hill.

Conference centre placement remains a concern.

Some good, some seriously bad.

---

### Blean Village Hall Comments Question 6: Please share any further comments that you have regarding the information that we have presented.

I am concerned about the idea of an arboretum (S on your map) since it is believed there may be a need for further archaeological work there – possibly a fish trap to service the Roman villa.

But this has to be a shared vision and XXX needs to be done to address the water transport issues in Canterbury in which the University continues.

Not sustainable enough. Too many car parking spaces. No evidence of sustainable transport plan.

Cycle routes through the campus need to be well thought out. Current cycle ways run through roads which have overhanging trees dropping large sharp spines – which puncture tyres – both my wife and I have experienced countless punctures. Also cycle ways need to be delineated with a small fence as students do not respect the fact these routes are designated not for walkers but for cyclists.

But with clauses re traffic impact assessment.

Information presented seems lazy – general overview of improvements rather than explicitly stating proposals – concerns on traffic on Whitstable Road/rough common area, particularly with multi storey car park – increased traffic to area. – will bigger university mean more need for 2nd/3rd year student houses in our area (sad face drawn).

No to any development on Chaucer Fields at all. Everyone loves this view. It has high value to everyone’s quality of life here. 2) we have 90% trust in the University making decisions with good intentions/ we have a high level of trust by and large. 3) Don’t need to slow decisions down by putting everything through city process. General comment – catering on campus is still very poor and unhealthy. Vegans are very poorly catered for.
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Blean Village Hall Comments Question 6: Please share any further comments that you have regarding the information that we have presented.

If the proposal for a conference centre in that location were removed, I would still have doubts about some details but would be happy for CCC to endorse it. The objection is not to the ideas of a conference centre but to the proposed location.

Anyone who has to live near (?) next door to students (?) The noise of music and shouting .......... XXX.

1) Proposed Hotel – I prefer this isn’t built – should this proceed my concern it could start a preceadence to build over the entire southern slopes. This is vital GREEN SPACE for my neighbour and I.

2) Crab and Winkle Way – I would like serious consideration to be given to opening the Grade 2* listed Tyler Hill Tunnel, then extending the half mile northern section of track to the Tyler Hill Road.

Blean Parish Church should not be surrounded by playing fields/buildings etc. Nor should its car park be overrun by UKC parking.

Darwin Conference Suite Comments Question 2: Overall vision for the evolution of the campus.

I can’t see why the placement of the conference hotel needs to destroy green space and feel this is being forced through based on economic logic rather than through good judgement and consultation.

It is important to retain undeveloped areas of the campus for leisure/walking.

The University should really focus on providing better working conditions for the teachers, instead of building an unnecessary hotel that will contribute to a lack of sustainability. It is a highly misplaced investment of money, resources and energy. I expressively wish you would reconsider your priorities given the fact that climate change is happening and economic self-interest destroys our environment. If your egoism surpasses this consideration, please be aware that in the long run you are literally committing suicide because you constantly reduce XXXX.

Why build a hotel? It is not clear how the University plans to implement all these “environmentally” sustainable ideas while it focuses so much on the economic ones.

I do not think the developments in the SP valley should be pursued as they would be highly damaging environmentally. I do not think the conference hotel project should be pursued especially in the current proposed location due to the damage to the environment and …the local community. Is this project advantageous to the university financially? A site between the innovation centre and Turing would be much better.

CONTINUED OVERLEAF
### Darwin Conference Suite Comments Question 2: Overall vision for the evolution of the campus.

The idea of intensifying the centre is imprecise. The green space in the central area is its main attraction and should not be built on when the campus is large and spacious. No conference centre should be built on the Lower slopes. Since 1975 when I joined the uni, these have been understood as sacrosanct. The uni land holdings have doubled in size since then. There is even less argument for building on the Chaucer Fields.

Need to make more of the existing green spaces – not build on them. There is a great deal to be said about this. Let’s build the country’s first Uni with eco focus!

The destruction of the Chaucer Fields area, so important to the local community – no matter what spin you put on it – spoils the rest of the plan, some of which is excellent. Replacing a community area with car parks. Can’t the University of Kent be on board with environmental impact i.e. where are the solar panels ……

At the last consultation I was pleased that notice had been taken on public feedback. This time I’m concerned that the plans still include a hotel or conference centre on what is currently a wooded area. I have no comments to make about other elements of the plans.

The proposed plans destroy green space highly valuable both environmentally and for student experience. I also think they reflect a poor set of priorities on the part of the University. We are constantly being told that the University cannot afford XX. The budget allocated the department by the university cannot stretch to, for e.g. XXX to be properly financially remunerated for their work.

No hotel needed. Save our environment.

SAVE CHAUCER FIELDS.

The campus is big enough. No hotel needed. Environment is much more needed to be saved as being destroyed by human ideas.

I would like to see the money I pay for my education to be invested in our education. Our staff members deserve better wages. We deserve better facilities (e.g. Darwin is falling apart, better accommodation). Also, you’re building on lands that should be protected, not destroyed. You already have bad rep by being a 3rd class ranking on being a “green” campus.

Adding buildings to an already overcrowded location instead of repairing and improving current buildings. This destroys rather than enhances the campus.

Student support services are woefully inadequate. Teaching staff are facing increased precarity. More building work is not required.

I remain concerned that the plan ignores the input of so much of the community and its members.
### Darwin Conference Suite Comments Question 2: Overall vision for the evolution of the campus.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Comment</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Found the visuals not very easy to understand but staff helpful in explaining ethos.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I fail to understand how the University is quite happy to invade the countryside with even more buildings and concrete. The University has a massive footprint and needs to keep to local and close proximity solutions, not stretch across farm land, ruining Blean and Tyler Hill.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Good balance compared to previous plan.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>This is much improved compared to the original plan. There seems to have been a welcome reduction in the scale of ambition, while still providing substantial scope for development of the campus.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The Masterplan suggests limited development concentrated in the existing footprint – positive.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Student accommodation, Sarre Penn, New sports centre all good. Proposed conference centre would destroy beautiful environment and resource.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Talking to staff helped explain the plans for traffic and cycle/pedestrian paths – not so clear on posters.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Could be a bit more emphasis on public transport access and getting rid of more car parks (even more).</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I agree whole heartedly with the way the landscape character areas have been defined and the possibilities this creates to develop areas with distinct identity reflective of their landscape.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The maps should have road names on them. There should be a key to distinguish main roads from footpaths. In the present plan both are yellow! A hotel on the southern slopes would ruin the delightful uninterrupted sweep down to Canterbury.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The university needs a vision, a guide for the evolution of the campus – to make the most of the green environment – enhance teaching spaces and improve the appeal of the University to potential students.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Concern over ensuring that the University remains rural and not merge too closely towards residents. Students create disturbances which residents would find damaging if the University encroached too far south or west.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Darwin Conference Suite Comments Question 2: Overall vision for the evolution of the campus.

Plans to relocate Blean School and add extra housing does not benefit the local village community – it would create noise, pollution and increase traffic during building works and increase traffic problems once the work has been completed. Further works building on green land currently used for agriculture.

I think that the principles underpinning the Masterplan are very good and that it contains a number of positive ideas but that the proposed location for the conference and hotel is inappropriate and contradicts the stated principles.

Good because the campus needs to be improved for the needs of the students, however the Masterplan's priorities are not always on the "right" side.

I think this is an awful idea as the money is being spent on increasing profits for themselves rather than spending the money wisely for students and pay for lecturers.

I can see that a vast amount of thought has gone into the future of the campus. Big list of organisations consulted.

There could be more emphasis on transport infrastructure, especially for students, staff and residents.

It is important to retain undeveloped areas of the campus for leisure/walking.

Good to see how the campus could progress over the short/medium-term.

I welcome the plan for growth and development.

The university site would benefit from a central feel and narrative.

I believe the University should follow its ethos of concentrating progress in the core of the campus and the people who maintain it. Building a conference hotel and car parking lot on an unspoilt green space appreciated by many goes against this, it in fact contributes to a growing trend of students and employees’ interests being disregarded in favour of marketization of Higher Education.

Building on historical land and (more importantly) ecologically necessary grounds is against the environmentalist’s ethos of the University that was a large part of why I enrolled here.

Whilst it is vital that services are provided for prospective and existing students (such as medical school) the destruction of green spaces in favour of a totally unnecessary building (conference centre and hotel) makes a mockery of the University’s “Enhancing our Environment” agenda.
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**Darwin Conference Suite Comments Question 2: Overall vision for the evolution of the campus.**

- Protect our green space. Fund students and staff before your own pockets.
- Save our green space. Pay our staff.
- SAVE CHAUCER FIELDS. Staff deserve fair wages – we need more open spaces preserved – not more hotels.
- The Masterplan won’t make the campus evolve, but rather devolve. I don’t want the campus to look like a mall.

**Darwin Conference Suite Comments Question 4: The scope of the Framework Masterplan and the character areas that may see development under the current Canterbury District Local Plan (to 2031).**

- As long as they are actually sustainable: environmentally, socially and then economically.
- 16 University Rise – move hotel development to somewhere less damaging (board 16).
- 17 Whitstable Road – swimming pool development again environmentally damaging due to water used, we have two large pools in Canterbury.
- 18 The Holford Walk through campus seems to be a poor use of scarce university funds.
- 19 10, 11, 12 – pointless and highly environmentally damaging use of Greenfield land.

- Conference hotel on Lower slopes should be removed.
- Proposed hotel is in a highly visible and green space of the University – why not behind the Innovation Centre?
- The University has a poor sustainability ranking.
- SAVE CHAUCER FIELDS.

- No area should be taken away from the various animal species on the campus ground.

CONTINUED OVERLEAF
**Appendix 15: Feedback from individuals in full**

---

**Darwin Conference Suite Comments Question 4: The scope of the Framework Masterplan and the character areas that may see development under the current Canterbury District Local Plan (to 2031).**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Feedback</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Chaucer Fields is a rare space for wildlife and natural beauty in an already overdeveloped city. A space used for relaxation and rewilding should not be destroyed by buildings.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Not really sure what this question means – a couple of contentious issues noted in plans – Blean School, conference centre.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Far too much being proposed. Will this really entice more students to Kent? I doubt it. No more buildings beyond the University’s central campus.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Does the city need a hotel this far out? Does the hotel cater for up to 150 vehicles to park? It does not respect the Green Gap between the city and campus. (14 states “Conserving and restoring the grass slopes overlooking the city”!!).</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Parking long term for the future is a critical element not only for UKC but the CCC and the local community.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>It is pleasing to see the reduction in ambition for the peripheral areas of campus, particularly the Sarre Penn area, Blean and Tyler Hill.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Not sure what this means.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Please fight for northern access to Canterbury West station.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Some developments proposed are not in the interests of local residents and the university community such as the idea/concept of a new hotel/conference centre (no real need for destroying the woods in that area).</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I would be concerned to see development around the so called Sarre Penn area. The walk along the river from the salt route is one of the prettiest and richest in wildlife.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Progress means that sometimes green space has to be built on, as long as we are making the best use of brown space first.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Make better use of current space before building on farmland and fields.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>It seems sensible to focus on the core areas around the heart of the university first but would make equal sense (from a community relations and landscaping perspective) to adopt a principle to keep the southern slopes intact as a green buffer.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

CONTINUED OVERLEAF
Darwin Conference Suite Comments Question 4: The scope of the Framework Masterplan and the character areas that may see development under the current Canterbury District Local Plan (to 2031).

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Comment</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>The Canterbury District Local Plan needs to be reconsidered anyway to incorporate people’s values and priorities. It needs to pay more attention to the area’s needs of maintaining high quality green space for all, plus many other areas.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>It is difficult sometimes to visualise what newly shaped areas will actually be like looking through the plan.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The Masterplan will add character to several areas of the campus.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I walk every day with my dog by or on so called “Chaucer Fields.” They are empty except for the occasional dog walker and pedestrian. No picnics, no kite flying, no children ever, so not important on the imaginary users and I am glad that the plan might now go ahead. Also, I am tired of non-residents protesting!</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Developments harm local wildlife and unspoil green areas that make the campus more beautiful. Particularly I have an issue with the proposal for “small scale business clusters” which are unnecessary and a hypocritical proposal from a university claiming to be environmentally conscious.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The scope of the plan is vast and includes wanton environmental destruction.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The University sells itself as a “green” university with regards to the local environment. Destruction of green spaces to develop hotels that all UK institutions do not require to provide their services flies in the face of this commitment.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Changes focused on the existing built up area of the campus are useful but extensions are mainly beyond that area, raising concerns about drastic changes to a relatively stable environment.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Unnecessary.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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Darwin Conference Suite Comments Question 5: The projects identified as proposed short-term and medium-term developments.

Why build a conference hotel on the campus? Sure, the money could be used in projects that will help students and staff practically and not theoretically. Green spaces are valuable and their destruction should have a clear XXX whose effects are certain and are for the students and the environment.

Redevelopment of existing Parkwood accommodation to provide newer higher density accommodation would be a good idea. Planting of woodlands usually environmentally damaging unless done on poor grade land. The recent planting north of the Sarre Penn appears to have degraded the site environmentally and been very poorly maintained – a waste of money. Conference centre/hotel – if viable the location should be moved to one less environmentally damaging.

The community garden sounds nice. I am unsure why its existence is being tied to the development of a hotel. How future university spending is allocated and how this may intersect with the actual problems the university faces – around staff pay satisfaction etc. is unaddressed.

The best thing of this uni is the nature surrounding it – do not destroy it.

SAVE CHAUCER FIELDS.

Create a better environment for staff and students by improving sustainability.

The further developments of undeveloped land encroach upon the natural beauty of places such as Sarre Penn. The only acceptable development is perhaps the reworking of Parkwood.

Short term seems more realistic. Medium term and beyond ridiculous. Leave Blean School alone. Parking is a problem but this will not be alleviated by the proposed relocation. Why would we want more houses in that space on a main road at the top of a hill where visibility is restricted, Crazy idea!

Need further clarification on the "innovation" buildings on the Sarre Penn and Tyler Hill Road. The new road junction would be a positive move to reduce the use of Giles Lane.

If these are achieved, I think they will significantly improve the campus. I would like to see improvements to cycle and foot paths prioritised. I do wonder about the reposition of Blean School. The illustrations depict a big reduction of playing field space for the school. Provision of more outside space and a less ambitious housing development would be better.

The XXX and impact of the conference hotel is a XXX.

Relocation of Blean School destructive. Object to conference hotel in woodland.
Darwin Conference Suite Comments Question 5: The projects identified as proposed short-term and medium-term developments.

Short term more emphasis needed on sustainable development, the environment and transport that is not dependent on CO2. Make a case to the council to come up with a solution to Giles Lane and how to reduce traffic (and use of car) on campus.

Any medium-term plan along Tyler Hill Road must take account of a road that is essentially a country road with 2 s-bends and farm traffic passing along it. It would not be able to accommodate any large-scale development.

These are all excellent additions to improve facilities for current students, attract new students and provide an additional (needed) income for the University.

Short term projects seem more focused and beneficial to the medium-term projects.

Most of the proposed short and medium-term developments are focussed on the heart of the campus and seems sensible. The obvious exception is the proposed location for the hotel/conference centre.

Would like to see the campus entrance would stay the same and not to be tree lined obstructing the views of Canterbury.

When available/possible “artists impressions” of the developments would be good.

Interesting to see how new buildings that we come to know will change.

The city/university desperately needs a professional world class conference environment to attract and maintain revenue. Our current facilities are a bit threadbare and don’t feel modern. Medium term developments, “business space”, conference hotel, new buildings are irrelevant and do not contribute positively to the campus while there are pre-existing issues in Kent buildings such as accommodation issues for students. Moreover, pre-existing issues such as wages and conditions for cleaners, lecturers and precarious staff.

Medium term developments will see irreversible harm done to the green spaces surrounding campus.

One good short-term development that the University could take instead is to pay and contract its staff fairly.

No need for a hotel when there’s plenty of accommodation and the campus is so close to the city centre. The car park would be a monstrosity. What about investing in people?
## Darwin Conference Suite Comments Question 6: Please share any further comments that you have regarding the information that we have presented.

- I don't understand how you can provide a list of people/organisations you have consulted with when so much response to the hotel plans has been negative.

- Masterplan is not complete and lacks actual implementation plans. Some of the proposed projects seem to overlap others or even go against them, e.g. being environmental and then destroy nature to put concrete in its place.

- The exhibition is extremely difficult to understand and different boards seem to contradict each other for example 12 doesn’t show the development in the Sarre Penn Valley, shown on board 19.

- Would like to see proposals for green energy: Methane capture from sewage, green waste digester, solar and possibly wind.

- It should ask for changes, removal of conferencing centre/hotel from lower slopes, discourage “long buildings”, retain existing unbuilt green centre of the campus – a unique asset, (intensification may be necessary in city centres with high land costs. It is unnecessary at Kent!).

- My only concern is regarding the hotel and conference centre. It would be built on an area of wooded land. I understand that the purpose is income generation rather than to enhance academic work. Is this needed or the only way income can be generated?

- Very jargon heavy. Full of weasel words and concepts, fails the NOT test (i.e. Not providing excellent education), stating the bleeding obvious. Full of commercial developers’ “walks”, “squares”, “gardens”. And why the hotel, is this just a commercial development? What benefit for the University? Also, this form, had great difficulty understanding and following.

- Why is there money for buildings that destroy our wildlife but not money for fair wages for your staff.

- Only the bankers and management want this – not the students nor the nature.

- SAVE CHAUCER FIELDS.

- Animals and plants have no voice – we are able to give them one. The money used for the build of the hotel should be given to the underpaid university staff. Good teaching is the core function of a university. If Kent wants to continue to be a good university it should reconsider its priorities. Canterbury City Council should not endorse this. The project disregards the feedback from the community when it was first brought up. This construction affects many of the residents living in the area, as well as the aspiration of the City Council to protect the green areas in Canterbury.
Darwin Conference Suite Comments Question 6: Please share any further comments that you have regarding the information that we have presented.

The ambitious ideas put forward will hopefully enhance the campus. This development will help ensure a high status in university league tables BUT All development impacts on the community which is Canterbury. The parking problem is widespread and causing some people to leave the city, thus destroying the sense of community. Please consider accommodating all cars on campus in all initiatives.

I am concerned about the ongoing commercialisation of the University – as represented by this hotel /conference centre plan.

Not enough detail on site plans – mention of areas but no real information on what plans for areas are. Can’t really see benefit to local environment although suggestions on improved road links e.g. Park wood to Whitstable road.

Definitely not. The University needs to keep its boundaries into a confined area and not spread any further. Enough is enough!

Much better public communication this time. Well done!

I’m not sure with the characterisation of 4 The wetlands. The wetlands are specific ecological features and the area identified (currently Jennison pond) is not suitable for a wetland and therefore should not be characterised as such. Jennison pond is at best suited to be an amenity pond (please see sustainability team’s work on this), calling it “the wetlands” is green-washing.

Where is the policy for height of buildings? How does this link with the travel plan?

Very useful to talk to people not just look at plans.

There is potential and some of the concepts proposed are considerate and sensitive towards the environment. This should be the aim of the University. Putting the environment at the heart of what they/we do and not unnecessary development of buildings in areas other than in the heart of the campus.

The plan has been well presented and the public has been given ample opportunity to express its views. However, a lack of road names on the maps and the general complexity of the scheme plus the plausible explanations of the developers mean that the general public has grounds for wondering whether it is all as good as it sounds.

The university should rethink the location of the conference centre/hotel. Save natural habitats and use another area which isn’t so naturally beautiful. Workers need parking. Bicycle inappropriate for school run/distance. Bus likewise and unaffordable. How can the University plan such changes in a time of falling student numbers? Strategic review of poor pay? The plans feel as if they have been made unclear for a reason.
Appendix 15: Feedback from individuals in full

Darwin Conference Suite Comments Question 6: Please share any further comments that you have regarding the information that we have presented.

I strongly believe that car parking should be restricted to Giles Lane, providing a multi storey with green living walls. Provision could be included for a drop off and pick up point for open days etc., with coach parking at the edge of campus. Smaller parking areas near colleges and buildings would help departments who have visitors and events, where equipment needs to be delivered. It would also make for a more pedestrianised campus.

Not as it currently stands. The southern slopes beneath the University are an area of high landscape value and should be kept intact. Alternative locations for a conference/hotel facility should be thoroughly considered. Possible locations would be 1 between Turing Road and the Innovation Centre and 2 between Turing Road and Keynes College.

Yes, if we accept the Masterplan is acceptable by the wider community.

Absolutely. The University is key to the city – future development and plans have to be supported by CCC. Good that staff have an opportunity to see all this.

Perhaps more information on the boundaries displayed and what significance they have (how much they relate to the local plan).

Overall a really good presentation and easily understandable boards.

I think the University should concentrate on accessibility to pre-existing buildings, improve conditions of pre-existing accommodation, pay employees a fairer wage and provide better conditions, improve quality of education for students. Kent has dropped out of the top 50 in the university guide, surely this should indicate that Kent should be focusing on these aspects of the University to improve its results and promote people over profit? I object most strongly to the proposed conference centre hotel on Chaucer Fields, which is also opposed by fellow students, residents, alumni, teaching staff, the council and architects. It is an unspoilt green space that future generations also deserve to enjoy.

I believe the language used for explaining the details of the Masterplan is deliberately vague, so as to shroud the reality that this expansion is disregarding for the environment.

The plan fails to address any of the endemic issues on campus. The council’s role is to assist, support and provide services for its residents. This plan openly ignores issues of pay and contract precocity in its staff. The many previous hollow promises made with this led me to believe that increased profits from this plan will never find their way to fixing these issues.

Fair pay and pensions before destroying green space. FREE EDUCATION.

The council believe our green spaces should be preserved. We do not want an educational – industrial complex. We want fair wages, nature and conservation.

The campus is the biggest green area in Canterbury and it should remain so.

CONTINUED OVERLEAF
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Other Comments Question 2: Overall vision for the evolution of the campus.

Impossible to say until we know whether the overall vision has to include the proposed conferencing hotel.

It is an excellent vision which has been spoiled by a couple of aspects. The first is the continued desire to site the conferencing hotel on Chaucer fields and the second is the siting of the new car park at the very entrance of the University at the bottom of a big slope on University Road. The impact upon local residents is enormous and we all know it will lead to further building on Chaucer Fields and the whole of the University Rise as you now call it.

Other Comments Question 3: The focus on place-making and sustainability and the proposals to consolidate the Campus Heart presented in the Strategic Spatial Objectives.

Impossible to say until we know whether the focus on place making and sustainability and the proposals to consolidate the Campus Heart are regarded as consistent with building a conferencing hotel on the southern slopes.

If you wish to keep the campus green, then why the continued desire to remove the green entrance and setting of the University with a desire to build on Chaucer Fields?

Other comments Question 3: The scope of the Framework Masterplan and the character areas that may see development under the current Canterbury District Local Plan (to 2031)

See previous comments about Chaucer Fields.
**Other Comments**

**Question 4: The clarity of information about the proposed short-term and medium-term developments.**

- Totally unclear why the proposal for a conference hotel on the southern slopes has resurfaced and how it is supposed to be compatible with the underlying principles of the Masterplan.
- Further information about alternatives to the currently proposed location for a conferencing hotel.
- The promised special meeting with local residents to discuss the proposal for a conferencing hotel.

- The vast majority of proposals are excellent. The one that isn't is the hotel on the top of Chaucer Fields. This remains and will continue to remain an open sore with local residents and is totally unnecessary as just across the road surrounding the Beverley Farmhouse is a perfect piece of land for the hotel which would enhance the farmhouse if it were incorporated into it.

---

**What additional information could we provide to clarify our proposals during the public consultation events taking place in October?**

- More information on why you have chosen Chaucer Fields on which to build a hotel and why alternatives were not considered and how this fits your green campus agenda. Also, why the car park on University Road is so essential as this again does not demonstrate green proposals in terms of setting. Finally, can you be very specific about how you would landscape Chaucer Fields and with what type of trees? Orchards are not a long-term option as these are easily scrubbed out and do not constitute a parkland setting as was originally proposed. We need large trees like Oak.
Appendix 6b – Comments on website/by email

The table below sets out comments posted on the University’s website or sent in by email. It does not include requests for clarification/further information.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Comments</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>• I would like to express my strongest objection to the proposed Masterplan for the development of Chaucer Fields.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• As a resident, I object to this unnecessary development. I have had the privilege of studying for two postgraduate degrees at Kent University, an institution that has made a significant contribution to my academic life.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• I appreciate that the University has to improve with the times. However, the proposed development is not the right way to achieve this. The University seems to think that the views of the local community is not worthy of serious consideration. The continuing support of the local community is essential to the future success of the University.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• The Chaucer Fields should be preserved for future generations if the University’s claim to sustainability is to be believed. These fields have been enjoyed by generations of families in the area, and the destruction of these wonderful fields would be disastrous for the whole community.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• I hope that the University reconsiders its proposed development as it is wholly inappropriate.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• The University should concentrate on the education and &quot;well-being&quot; of its students. Having been granted the site by and flourished partly due to the goodwill of Canterbury as a city, building business hubs and hotels just serves to bite the hand that fed/feeds it. Revenue that would be going into the city is taken away and stays up on the hill. This desire is backed up by students themselves; who voted clearly for universities to spend less money on buildings, sports and social facilities and more on teaching hours and learning facilities. Source:<a href="https://www.hepi.ac.uk/wp-content/uploads/2016/06/Student-Academic-Experience-Survey-2016.pdf">https://www.hepi.ac.uk/wp-content/uploads/2016/06/Student-Academic-Experience-Survey-2016.pdf</a></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• The Masterplan as a framework to future planning decisions. I strongly disagree that the Masterplan should in any way have influence over future planning decisions made by the council. Planning applications should be assessed singularly by the council at the time of proposal. Any weight given to a prior &quot;framework&quot; is planning through the back door – especially considering the consultation issues that have been apparent in this process.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Vehicles and pollution. Canterbury is suffering from often illegal levels of pollution. The University is responsible for a large percentage of this. Instead of pushing vehicles outside of the Campus Heart – the University must implement robust transport services to ensure the number of vehicles brought into the city by students and staff is reduced – not simply displaced. Perhaps start with an electric vehicle rental programme.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• The student-resident balance in Canterbury has far exceeded sensible levels. The arguments in favour are simply the financial income to the city. These incomes appear to go to a very small cross segment of society with little trickle down, and are being reduced each time a non-educational facility is built by the University or indeed a privately-owned accommodation block anywhere in the area.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• This is part of the land was bought by local authorities in the 1960s when the University of Kent was established and understood for decades by both parties to be worth preserving as open space for the local common good: as part of a ‘Green Gap’, for the benefit of all between the University and city. But now this area is the place that the University of Kent authorities propose to destroy, to situate a 150-room conferencing hotel and facilities for commercial gain, sprawling south of University road, and setting an appalling precedent for the rest of the southern slopes.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• As a resident who likes walking and enjoying these precious areas, I totally object to these proposals.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Comments

• I welcome the fact that this version of the proposed plan has taken into account representations about the preservation of existing woodland and green space on Giles Lane.

• However, I am particularly concerned by aspects of the proposed Masterplan that appear, by removing traffic and car parks from the central campus, to compromise visitors’ first impressions of the campus and to impose unwanted traffic upon the University’s neighbours. The plans for sites either side of University Road are especially objectionable because these sites were landscaped and planted with trees, at least partly with funds subscribed by university staff and alumni, some 30 years ago, and are now relatively mature and attractive.

• Whilst I understand the concern to remove vehicle traffic from much of the central campus, the proposals to site new car parks on both sides of the University Road close to Whitstable Road and St Edmund’s School, and around Hothe Court, threaten to give a much less welcoming entrance to the University and to greatly devalue what are at present relatively attractive areas at the margin of the campus. Since it is the appearance of the landscaped areas of the campus (as well as the remaining woodland) that attract most favourable comments by visitors, I think this is a serious mistake. But I also doubt whether it is practical insofar as these proposed carpark sites are a relatively long walk from the central campus. Enlarging the capacity of the existing Giles Lane carpark by adding one or more levels would seem a much better idea, especially as the fall of the land makes it relatively easy to screen it from view.

• I understand the access problems, but the proposed solutions do not seem well considered. The proposal to build a road linking Whitstable Road to Parkwood Road near Hothe Court runs into the very considerable objection that it would compromise a key section of National Cycle Route 1; given the battle to get it, I would expect the cycling lobby to vigorously defend it against any such intrusion. A link via the present Blean School site might excite less opposition.

• It is crucial that the central campus remains readily accessible by bus and to that end it is important that the existing bus stops be retained in / near their present locations. There is a disappointing lack of detail about enhanced provision of cycling access and routes across the campus, which are currently severely inadequate.

• I do not understand the rationale for the introduction of a square (‘Beverley Court’) midway along University Road; it seems to be a purposeless interruption of some of the best views from the campus – from the existing Keynes bus stop across the Southern slopes to the city and beyond.

• Nor do I understand the point of enhancing the entrance on St Stephens Road, as this is bound to remain a secondary entrance because of the narrowness and hilliness of the approach roads. Most of the existing buildings on the campus are neither attractive nor especially fit for purpose. In particular, there is a relative dearth of centrally located, high quality teaching space. I would hope that a Masterplan might address this problem by anticipating the redevelopment of existing sub-optimal buildings.

• My overall impression of the plan is that it is an exercise in putting lipstick on a pig. The central campus already feels very overcrowded in term time, so much so that it appears that the University has outgrown its site to the extent that further development in the interests of expansion threatens to damage those things that are best about the campus – the green spaces and the views (certainly not the buildings!). I think it would be better to develop some of the University-owned land further from the campus than to embark upon a further intensification of the central campus and developments that threaten the present green spaces immediately surrounding it.

I am a resident of the Canterbury area and wish for the green space to be totally preserved. I am referring to the land between the University of Kent and the residential area in northern Canterbury. It is part of the land bought by local authorities in the 1960s in establishing the University of Kent and understood for decades by both parties to be worth preserving as open space for the local common good as part of a ‘green gap’ for the benefit of all between the University and the city. It now contains mature woodland (maple, oak and yew) which I wish to be preserved. I completely object to the proposals by the University of Kent to destroy this ‘green lung’ by building a 150-room conferencing hotel and other buildings.

I live close to the southern slopes of the ever-expanding University and I am very worried about any building on the Green Gap, such as the proposed hotel.
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Comments

• I urge you to rethink your plans for Chaucer Fields. Why do you have to build on this green-field site backing onto already long-suffering residents in what is gradually becoming an extension to UKC as local families (such as myself) are gradually pushed out of Canterbury?

• You have so many hectares of land on which to build so why antagonise the few locals who can still actually live in Canterbury by building immediately adjacent to them on what is beautiful and unspoilt land- a green area of apple trees, and wood. It's an area where local children can enjoy and play and explore outdoors away from screens. I have spent many happy days as a child and parent playing with friends here, spotting insects and birds. I've even seen snakes here!

• A hotel here will seriously impact Salisbury Road and nearby residential roads even more than now with increased traffic as whether you think so or not, they will drive up here looking for a short cut through to a hotel. Staff will park in these now already congested roads adding to the many students who already park badly up in this area. What once was a lovely residential area is being overrun by the knock-on effect of UKC.

• There is so much space closer to the main campus with a bus service or in Parkwood.

• Please be considerate to your long-suffering neighbours and rethink your planning...

• As a local Resident and a Member of the St Michael's Road Area Residents' Association (SMRARA), I write just to add my personal support to the submission that that Organisation has made about the University of Kent's Master Plan.

• I might also add, from my personal point of view, how depressing I find it that, after all the lobbying and arguments that were advanced six or seven years ago – when the idea of a hotel in this position first arose – and after local residents' apparently convincing the University of the merits of their case against this plan, the previous agreement that this proposed development shall not take place has apparently been overridden in the current Masterplan.

• This is very disheartening and it is indeed wearisome that we have to make similar arguments all over again when we thought that this matter had been settled in the previous round of public consultations.

• I fully support the request from SMRARA that, even at this late stage, (a) this decision be reviewed by the University again and – given that the public is ostensibly being consulted once again – that, this time, some genuine cognisance is taken of our expressed views, and (b) serious consideration be given to SMRARA’s suggestion of an alternative, less environmentally antagonistic, place for the Hotel to be built – if indeed it is eventually deemed necessary for a building of this sort to go ahead.

• It should be emphasised that the fields and views under discussion here are, in their present form, hundreds of years old – we are talking about the first views of the city and the Cathedral that Chaucerian pilgrims would have seen. The University may well own the land in a legalistic way but, in my view, UkC is merely a temporary trustee of this plot. Previous generations – over, maybe, a thousand years – have preserved it, with the result that we can enjoy it today. Once it is built on this little piece of our national heritage will be lost for ever. And all for a hotel, of all things – not even a vehicle that will be (directly) contributing to the University's academic excellence!

• I earnestly plea for the University's decision-makers to think again.
Comments

• Our comments on the proposed future development for a Conference Centre and nearby parking.
• The Canterbury City Council recently designated the southern slopes as an important area that should remain as a green gap between the university and the city. It was given the status of an “Area of High Landscape Value” in the Local Plan. The proposed plans, as envisaged in the Masterplan, would appear to be at odds with this statement. It has always been an area much enjoyed by the community and students, and it is important to retain this area for the well-being of all.
• As we understand it the Conference centre is envisaged to be a commercial enterprise. As such, if it is considered to be an extension of the Innovation Centre then it should be built alongside on the land that is currently a green space. If it is envisaged that parents would also be able to book the accommodation then it could be sited anywhere on the campus such as the land opposite where the buses drop-off and pickup up students. It could be incorporated with a transport hub linking buses, taxis, a cycle loan scheme etc with the train stations and the city. Possibly a bus service that ran with much smaller buses right into the city, more regularly, so requiring fewer people to use their cars whilst on site.
• The proposed site would involve the destruction of more woodland and this seem s somewhat at odds with the impression that the university gives of great importance given to the beauty of the green campus. The proposed plan to convert the green entrance to the campus with car parks would again seem to be at odds with this view. It would try again to destroy a beautiful green area.
• Similarly, we are unhappy with plans to use the embankment of the Crab and Winkle Way for a cycle route and any development of the same route beyond Parkwood. These are both areas of beauty for the whole community and therefore are not an area solely for the University to annexe and develop at will.
• I can only reiterate the comments of the SMRARA submission wholeheartedly.
• I strongly disagree with your proposed plan to reroute the current walking/cycle path to the Crab and Winkle Way. This quiet enclave of the Crab and Winkle Way is a little oasis of calm enjoyed by residents and visitors, with abundant wildlife including various species of owl. I can only imagine the decimation that would be bought about by directing hordes of students via this route night and day, never mind possible coaches! This proposal offers very little benefit and an awful lot of downsides. I strongly recommend that this proposal is re-evaluated.
• I also object to the re-emergence of the idea to build on the southern slopes. This location is another prized green space much valued by the community as was made clear in 2011. Please reconsider building on the southern slopes at the Canterbury University. We need to preserve this valuable piece of land for future generations.
• Good that the Northern Holdings are not being developed in the near future.
• Plans to give the central Campus more definition and character sound very positive.
• More footpaths and cycle paths into the city are a good idea.
• Initially I thought that it would be a good idea to open up the old railway track as a foot path but it has become a wildlife haven in an environment which is rapidly vanishing under concrete, so perhaps it should not be cleared.
• I’m worried that the ‘temporary’ car park at the Giles Lane/Alcroft Grange junction will cause traffic tailbacks along into Tyler Hill and increased traffic.
• The buildings by the stream seem to be very vague at the moment. This has a public footpath running along the stream and is at present a lovely peaceful area for walking and wildlife. Buildings equate to vehicular access, building works, concrete, loss of habitat. Also, any additional building on Tyler Hill Road will increase traffic on a road which is already carrying too much traffic for a narrow road.
• You want a ‘green’ campus but appear to want surrounding villages to lose their green space and tranquillity.
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Comments

• Not all users of the Campus are young fit students. A lot of users from the wider community are older people who would struggle to walk to venues too far from car park. You must also have older staff as well.
• If you have any influence over buses, please could we have a bus that runs from Tyler Hill through the Campus so that the many people from the village who work/study or use University facilities do not have to rely on using their cars.

• My wife and I strongly object to the suggestion on pages 28 and 29 of the recent Framework Masterplan presentation 20180913-1 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 a shuttle bus route.
• 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 presumably 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.

• As well as houses in Salisbury Road, properties in Leycroft Close, Lyndhurst Close and St Michael’s Road would also be adversely affected. There could well be 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 Elliot 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.

• I note that the shuttle bus version of the scheme relies on access to the station from the northern, Roper Road, side. There is no such access, and in recent years the Southeastern rail company has resisted suggestions to create car parking and access from that side.

• When we attended the consultation at the Westgate Hall on 6 October 2018, we noted that there was no reference to a proposed shuttle bus, and indeed a member of the University’s Estates team assured us that there was no plan to develop a shuttle bus route. We therefore find it somewhat alarming to see that this plan does after all exist in the Framework Masterplan presentation 20180913-1.

• I agree thoroughly and passionately with the submission of the St Michaels Area Residents Association on the Masterplan, objecting to the University’s intrusion onto the southern slopes. Beyond this, I also strongly object to:

The failure of its multiple authors from the start to examine two fundamental premises on which the whole Masterplan is apparently built, namely that of if any kind of growth is desirable and that a university 50 years hence amidst robotised virtual environments, will be essentially the same in nature as one today. So, this expensive plan lacks intellectual rigour and integrity, quite extraordinary in that it emanates from a university.

• The refusal of the University to reply in parallel to the very strong criticism of the Plan by a range of authors in Canterbury’s main newspaper over 2-3 years. This again, despite the formal consultation process, reneges on the proclaimed role of a university, and of this one, to engage with its local community as it should.

• The sense of impotence created by the lack of individual response to cogent arguments made.
**Comments**

- I agree thoroughly and passionately with the submission of the St Michael's Area Residents Association on the Masterplan, objecting to the University’s intrusion onto the southern slopes. Beyond this, I also strongly object to:
- The failure of its multiple authors from the start to examine two fundamental premises on which the whole Masterplan is apparently built, namely that of if any kind of growth is desirable and that a university in 50 years hence amidst roboticised virtual environments, will be essentially the same in nature as one today. So, this expensive plan lacks intellectual rigour and integrity, quite extraordinary in that it emanates from a university.
- The refusal of the University to reply in parallel to the very strong criticism of the Plan by a range of authors in Canterbury’s main newspaper over 2-3 years. This again, despite the formal consultation process, reneges on the proclaimed role of a university, and of this one, to engage with its local community as it should.
- The sense of impotence created by the lack of individual response to cogent arguments made.
- I fully endorse the recent submission by SMRA but would like to also add some concerns of my own.
- I do not believe that the University’s business plan addresses the recent decline student recruitment and am aware that there are serious management issues across the University. Is it realistic for the University to be embarking on any plan involving expansion? I would hope that the council would look closely at the university's business activities and governance before the issues raised by SMARA are taken into account. Objecting to the plan is one thing; but I would like first to object to the idea that the university of Kent is competent in its ability to propose and guarantee delivery of such a plan.

- General support for the proposals and welcome the efforts that the university has made to consult the local community and local charities. I just have two points to make for you to consider.
- First, the University should make every effort to preserve the route of the historic Crab and Winkle railway line, including the northern entrance to the tunnel. It is historical assets like this which, though not of any immediate benefit perhaps, could be absolutely invaluable to future generations of students and historians. The railway was the very first regular passenger railway in the world. One day, it could be a site of world historic interest, and it would be a desperate shame if it were damaged, whether the tunnel entrance, the tunnel itself or the potential to exploit its route.
- Second, please do not build anything or damage the beautiful grassland to the south of the University which looks down over the town of Canterbury itself. It is also the most amazing asset to the University, to local residents and to the city more generally. That strip of green does wonders for the University and all who visit it. It must really be kept clear of buildings at all costs, especially when there is so much land tucked away to the north that you could build on.
- I’m saddened to see that after a very hard battle that many had worked to save the Chaucer Fields the land is still earmarked for development. Do remember many, many residents, students, university staff and more have all continually voiced their views strongly not to build on the Fields.
- To defend their views, it has cost the University dearly. The Village Green application was always intended to protect the southern slopes and surely that should have been enough for you all to understand the feelings of so many. Our Council also has added this area is now designated as an area of High Landscape Value and this can only reflect the importance of the land to so many.
- Having already had one public consolation where a Pavilion style hotel and conference centre had been planned on Chaucer Field the only reaction from express views was to move it back some thirty meters. The University has plenty of space to build, so why here? Surely, it is only it would offer views across Canterbury? Has anybody given consideration on how the build may look at Beverly Farm, a possible consideration that I’m sure many would support?
- The University continually say and we have to include Denise Everitt’s letter to the press that you listen to the views of others, sadly, it’s very clear you may listen, however at this stage many people’s views are just not being heard.
- Like so many, all we ask is for the southern slopes to be left alone.

**Appendix 15: Feedback from individuals in full**
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- Overall, I do support the Masterplan in principle.
- However: – I have serious concerns about the proposed hotel at Chaucer Fields. My children played there and I walk my dog daily on the southern slopes. We have lived in our present home for 40 years and our whole being has changed with the huge numbers of my neighbours who have now moved and homes turned into HMO’s. I am aware of everything done by our residents’ association to help with this problem but the hotel, if built will create a precedent and more building will spread across the slopes. The Southern slopes are a natural barrier between the UKC and residents on the southern side. I STRONGLY OBJECT TO THE PROPOSED HOTEL AT CHAUCER FIELDS.
- I welcome initiatives which remove traffic from the roads on to foot/cycle paths. For that reason, I ask that serious consideration be given to taking this opportunity to re-open The Grade 2* listed Tyler Hill Tunnel and to extend the obvious route from the northern portal along the beautiful half mile section of the old track bed to join up with Tyler Hill Road. In relation to the tunnel itself, I am aware a desktop study was carried out several years ago by civil engineers which concluded it is quite possible to reopen the tunnel. This can be discussed in more detail through The Crab and Winkle Line Trust.
- Having attended the recent public consultation and had the opportunity to speak to members of the university staff about the masterplan, our main concern remains the siting of the conference hotel. We have no objection to the University opening a hotel – if that is what universities must do nowadays to make ends meet. However, the choice of this position, south of University Road, is highly contentious and risks permanently alienating UKC’s neighbours. As the views of local residents have been made abundantly plain at every opportunity, it is baffling to us as to why this plan has been resurrected.
- We also feel that the university authorities have under-estimated the value of this green gap to the recruitment of students, both British and from overseas.
- Furthermore, as residents of Leycroft Close, our garden backs on to the old railway line. If any serious plans are ever put forward for reopening the pathway to any form of vehicular traffic, you can be sure that there would be very stiff opposition indeed from everybody in the vicinity.
- I wish to focus entirely on the conferencing hotel aspect. Like many others in the local residential and university communities, I have been shocked and appalled to see the resurrection of the proposal to situate this facility south of University Road, on Chaucer Fields in the context of the Masterplan. Not only do these plans directly contradict the stated goals of the Masterplan itself, undermining its credibility and integrity overall (drawing attention from some otherwise sensible content within it). They are also self-evidently out of line with the expressed commitment to protect this place as an integral part of the ‘green gap’, ‘green belt’ or ‘green lung’ articulated on numerous occasions over the past seven years by the following groups:
  - University staff (expressed through support for a UCU motion to protect the fields in 2012, and reaffirmed in the staff expert focus group conducted at stage 1 of the Masterplan process in 2017)
  - University students (expressed through the all student vote in 2012, and reaffirmed in the expert spatial workshop conducted at stage 1 of the Masterplan process in 2017)
  - Experts from local government (affirmed in the expert spatial workshop conducted at stage 1 of the Masterplan process in 2017)
  - Experts from local civil society and voluntary groups (through representations made throughout the period from 2011 onwards, and most recently affirmed in the expert spatial workshop conducted at stage 1 of the Masterplan process in 2017)
  - Local residents’ groups, in close proximity to the proposed development site
  - Other local residents’ groups, from across the wider district
  - Individual people, who are neither current staff not students, nor members of residents’ associations, but a key part of the broader public from across the wider district and beyond, including alumni, former staff members, and other members of the community at large without direct University connections.
  - Canterbury City Council, which sought to heighten the protections already in place for this place as part of the District Plan finalisation process with its ‘green gap’ proposal.
The commitments and values here are extremely well known and well documented, and reflect the irreplaceable status of the unspoilt Chaucer Fields resulting from a combination of this place’s exceptional value as a shared aesthetic, cultural, environmental, heritage and social (contributing to well-being and cohesion) resource, as recognised by the aforementioned “stakeholders”. Indeed, one of the most troubling aspects of the re-emergence of this proposal at the current time is that the University authorities can no longer claim that the evidence in support of these stakeholder perspectives in not utterly overwhelming. We now have literally hundreds of statements, representations, and testimonials to this effect, from lay people and experts alike, as a result of the reviews conducted over the past seven years. In the case of lay knowledge and experience, this includes (but is not limited to) the evidence tested through Kent County Council’s quasi-judicial village green application process, which affirmed that a meaningful ‘community’ can be identified with this place, and verified the extent to which the unspoilt green land here has been used for decades for beneficial recreational, amenity, and leisure pursuits.

In the body of the letter below I wish to emphasise three overarching sets of considerations: (a) heritage and cultural factors (b) the economic/business dimension; and (c) policy related matters. (a) and (c) jointly reinforce one another and suggest that building a commercial Conferencing hotel and related facilities on Chaucer Fields would be profoundly mistaken, and a violation of policy priorities at the level of both local government, and the University itself. As to (b), since no information or evidence has been made available in support of hotel development – and there was silence on this matter at stage 1 of the Masterplan process – all we can do is lament the damage done to the University’s reputation by the opaque way it has proceeded, as set out below.

(a) Heritage and Culture. This land has remarkable resonance and value from this perspective not only at the District level, but at the County level too. This follows from:

- the ways in which the gentle but varied topography has shaped the organic emergence of a beautiful ‘semi-natural’ balance between nature and man;
- the wide range of wildlife which makes Chaucer Fields its home, or uses it as a staging post as the seasons and weather change;
- the existence of tantalising myths about the site in the local community (for example, are some of the features of the site even anticipated in the Doomsday book?);
- the strong existing sense of identity growing out of the demonstrable appreciation of this land by local people of all types;
- the remarkable imprint of layers of history – from the obvious mediaeval field structure, and the connection with the Kentish yeoman farming tradition (following from the site’s connections with Beverley Farm), to ways in which the use of some of the land for orchards and market gardening purposes in the twentieth century are also in evidence;
- The accessibility of this site to people from all directions, and the extent to which it provides an arena or ‘public realm’ which these people share.

This combination of factors traces out a distinctly Kentish legacy, and underscore this site’s significance to the people of Kent, not just people who currently live close to it in Canterbury and the District. [2] It is clear from all this evidence and argument here that the development of a hotel and conference centre cannot be undertaken here without destroying this remarkably rich semi-natural legacy.

(b) Economic and ‘business case’ considerations There were serious weaknesses with the economic and ‘business case’ aspects of the hotel/conferencing facility aspect of the 2011/12 planning application, and many of the assumptions and claims being made at the time were not considered robust at the time. In relation to the current Masterplan, unfortunately, no substantive information has been made available at all. Despite repeated requests from members of the local and university communities, the Masterplan Team have failed to present any documentation, analysis or reports outlining the case, in systematic terms and under current economic conditions, for proceeding with a conferencing hotel on campus. Worse still, the Masterplan Team also failed to evidence the assertions made repeatedly during the consultation events that such a facility (i) must be essentially commercial in character, and not integrated with the core educational and research functions of the University; and (ii) can only be situated on Chaucer Fields, rather than on any of the other available potential sites on campus (there are many). Instead, when questions were asked, they were deflect with anecdotal ad hoc claims, and vague evocations that the undisclosed models/materials have found favour with ‘experts’ from the hotel and conferencing sector; and the ‘business community’. This level of opacity and evasiveness makes a mockery of the University authorities’ often repeated claims to be committed to such basic values as open communication and dialogue with its stakeholders; accountability; and responsiveness to the local and university communities.
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(c) The Policy arguments against the proposal for the conferencing hotel are at several levels

- Planning Policy as per Canterbury City Council’s District Plan: The proposal demonstrably violates both general policy principles (relating to landscape policy, open space and amenity policies; as well as the heritage and economic considerations already considered above) of the District Plan; and the detailed applications of policy specific to this site as they have evolved in recent years. One key example from the later category are the guidelines requiring not only the resistance of site fragmentation and respect for traditional field structure patterns, but their active strengthening. Another example is the extent to which retention of the open woods and fields in this particular place is crucial, due to this specific locality’s relative deprivation of amenity land and open space.[3] When account is taken of both these general principles, and the particularities as they relate to Chaucer Fields as integral to the unspoilt Southern Slopes, it becomes impossible to see how any claim could be made that the hotel proposal respects Canterbury City Council’s landscape, open spaces and amenity policies.

- Masterplan Priorities The whole purpose of the Masterplan process is to stabilise and offer a coherent sense of direction to what had previously been a chaotic and piecemeal approach to campus planning and development as pursued by the University authorities to date. It is intended to complement and support the legally pivotal District Plan.

The first observation about the Framework Masterplan, therefore, is that the inclusion of the conferencing hotel proposal on the Chaucer Fields site within it would have the opposite effect to that envisaged when the Masterplan became a requirement of local policy. This is because, as set out above, the proposal violates the District Plan’s priorities in relation to landscape, amenity and open space policy. Hence, retaining this as a possibility within the Framework Masterplan would embed an anomalous and contradictory element within the Plans, create costly uncertainty for the years to 2031, and make it difficult or impossible for the plans to function together in a stable and coherent way.

A second consideration is that the proposal directly contradicts what is probably the single most important aspect of the Masterplan (which has been widely welcomed by both local and university communities, and by expert opinion): the imperative that development should be concentrated on the central campus/at the Campus Heart. Because Chaucer Fields and the proximate Southern Slopes are far from central campus, allowing the positioning of a hotel, and associated facilities here, directly undermines this core commitment, and further weakens the Masterplan.

A third consideration relates to many of the more specific supporting commitments and values emerging from the Stage one process. If the hotel proposals were to be retained, then these supporting values will have been undermined, and the credibility of the entire Masterplan approach, once again, weakened. The relevant aspects here overlap with many of the preceding points, but some can still usefully be identified here: the importance of responsible and responsive stewardship of the relevant land because of its landscape value; respect for how local people wish to protect and enhance their quality of life on a day to day basis (linking to amenity and open space); and respect for shared green heritage. These important values will be seen to be fulfilled if and only if the Chaucer Fields conferencing hotel proposals are removed from the Masterplan; otherwise, they will not only ring hollow, but will have been actively undermined by the inclusion of this anomaly.

University strategic policies. As a non-profit higher educational institution, the University is a complex organisation, constantly evolving to balance a range of challenging educational, research oriented, social, cultural, environmental and economic considerations. In this context, it is worth clarifying what we know currently about how this balance can and should be struck, from the perspective of the University’s own governance institutions. Two aspects are especially pertinent:

- First, we should not lose sight of the fact that the original decisions by the University Council to allow a hotel proposal to move forward, in 2011 and 2012, were not framed as offering executive planners a free rein to pursue unrestrained commercial activity. Rather, the decision was conditional on the hotel operating in such a way as to secure functional integration with the University’s core functions of education and research, and it was envisaged this would have particular advantages under conditions of economic uncertainty. It is unclear, therefore, how the implied model of “unencumbered income generation”, not directly related to University mission, as evoked at consultation events, is compatible with the foundational University Council decision.
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• Second, there is rightly an increased emphasis in emerging strategic University policy on what is being called “civic mission”. Some of this is oriented towards the regional, national and international levels, but the University authorities are now also claiming that, in order to protect reputation in a fast changing environment, they need to be more responsive to the local host community. There are even explicit references to “opening up our campuses and resources”, “building a sense of community and engagement” and “promoting access”. These sentiments, values and priorities resonate well with the ways in which the unspoilt shared green space at Chaucer Fields have traditionally functioned. To destroy this legacy and pursue the anomalous hotel option on this site, once again, would do great damage to the intended direction of policy direction.

• I am writing this email in order to express my concern and disapproval of the plan in question.

• The University’s principal values should be educational and not commercial/financial.

• The University already has a huge campus which has occupied almost 500 acres of parkland.

• It does not need to consume more environment, and it certainly does not need an intrusive hotel which will seriously affect animal life and local residents.

• Let me also remind you that Kent University has already a poor reputation in terms of environmental issues. For example the ‘People & Planet University League’ recently classified Kent as a ‘third class University’ (placed 101 in the UK, https://peopleandplanet.org/university-league), therefore such a ‘Masterplan’ may well put Kent into target, counter-act possible benefits from this ‘investment’ and inflict serious damage on the University’s reputation and attractability.

Please add my name to the long list of local residents who are protesting against your proposal to build on the beautiful green buffer between UKC and the city.

I am firmly opposed to the development of a hotel on Chaucer Fields. The proposed plan is shrouded in opacity and seems to go counter to the stated values of the University. I am particularly concerned by the three following points:

• the lack of transparency and communication, with a website on which information keeps being added and modified without justification

• the intent that such a hotel would be run for profit rather than integrated in the mission of education and development of the University, and more generally, the idea that this would NOT be for the benefit of local communities

• the destruction of a valuable local wildlife area that provides both a strong support for student and staff well-being and mental health, as well as a repository for species conservation.

Please add my name to the long list of local residents who are protesting against your proposal to build on the beautiful green buffer between UKC and the city.

As an alumnus and a local St Stephen’s resident I am extremely concerned at the potential loss of yet more open green space, vital for the health and well-being of locals, students and future generations. The Chaucer Fields are a real asset to UKC and once lost will not be regained.

The University’s exhibition on its draft Masterplan states clearly that ‘the campus and nearby University-owned land will be developed in ways that protect its natural and semi-natural environment, the setting of Canterbury’s World Heritage Site and local heritage assets’. It also states that ‘future development will respect the quality of life and day to day activities of people working in the surrounding villages and residential neighbourhoods’ and that it will create an ‘environment that promotes healthy living and physical and mental well-being’.

These are excellent aspirations, but sit very uneasily with the proposal to build a 150-room hotel and conference facility on the Southern Slopes of the University. The integrity of the Southern Slopes is very important as the slopes currently:
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1) Form a key part of the University's landscape setting, providing outstanding views of Canterbury's World Heritage Site;
2) Make an important contribution to the quality of life of many of the residents living in the residential neighbourhoods south of the University;
3) Promote healthy living and physical and mental wellbeing for many residents, students and university staff alike.

In line with your aspirations, I would, therefore, urge you not to fragment this valuable green-belt by the construction of a hotel and conference facility on it. Instead, I would urge you to take the bold move to place a perpetual covenant on the Southern Slopes and designate them as an inviolable green space for the benefit of people, biodiversity and the landscape setting of the university.

To this end, I suggest that an alternative site for the hotel and conference facility should be found which is closer to the heart of the University and in a location, which integrates well with other developments. One such site would be the area of land between the Innovation Centre and Turing Road. I urge you to give it serious consideration.

I wish to express my very strong objection to any building on the Chaucer Field below the University. I do not use the area at the moment, but when I worked in the area it was a favourite place to walk at lunchtime, and the openness of the field made the cycle ride to and from work particularly cheering. The pleasure I had should be extended to the next generation. What cold hearts came up with the idea of destroying it?

- Having lived here for the past 40-odd years, I've been increasingly alarmed at the continuing development and sprawl of the UKC in a sensitive and beautiful environmental area. Many years ago, there was a healthy population of Dormice and yellow neck mice in the woodlands but because of loss of habitat these rare creatures are on the decline.
- It depressed me to see that your Masterplan seems to be to further develop the area and sprawl out like a cancer. I don't see that you can care about the environment and its inhabitants when all you want to do is destroy it by more building which will need more infrastructure and an increase in traffic which will inevitably cause more pollution on the roads.
- You may want to build a hotel on the Chaucer Fields but the residents and the inhabitants that live there clearly don't.
- We have already lost so much to development in the area and it is having an impact on people's health. Please refrain from adding to it, please do not develop on Chaucer Fields and please reconsider any other development that may impact on the valuable and delicate habitat to our rare and local species.

- I attended your recent events to publicise this and very much appreciated that you had several members of staff on hand for discussion.
- Sadly, it was apparent that there was no rational analysis of why the proposed hotel had been sited on Chaucer Fields, rather than any other position on campus. Your staff said two sites looked at were north of the Innovation Centre and North East of Beverley Farmhouse. The first of these was not where a hotel operator wanted to be and the second you said, would spoil the iconic view towards the cathedral.
- I mentioned a site in the south east corner of your site which would mask the rather unsightly student accommodation but that was said to be difficult to access. I have subsequently been there and access could be achieved fairly easily and it would have a great view.
- Another site surely, would be your estate offices largely housed in low quality buildings and able to be moved to any site, such as behind the Innovation Centre. This site would have a good street presence and be very visible.
- Your staff told me that the main locational driver was to be where the hotel operator wanted to be, within the campus but away from the main part. That of course contradicts the Terry Farrell principles except of course that they were compromised already by including a hotel as a "pavilion" (sic) in the park with a horrendous visualisation of how it might look. It was however small but resulted in a huge amount of third-party community comment which you very honestly reproduced in a public document. It was a very unfair process, as what you now suggest is far larger. Of course, it affects the view mentioned above by its very presence and also the adjacent car parking with its attendant lighting. You will be aware that the levels on the site present a challenge as vehicle access will have to be at a standard angle which will torture the landscape. You offered no verifiable views or even sketches to show the impact.
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• You seem to forget that the view up the slope is very important. Currently the woodland at the top hides the Innovation Centre very effectively ensuring that the vista is completely rural. I note that you intend to remove that woodland almost completely saying that they are not acceptable species. It is strange how trees that an owner wants to remove are always said to be sick or inadequate. Even if they are not the best species, within the landscape they give a traditional deciduous image which complements the whole scene. So, the bulk of the hotel will be made even larger by the new visibility of the Innovation Centre.

• The City Council wanted to have the space between the suburbs of the city and the University as a Green Gap but even though that was not put into policy one can readily understand their concept. The area's designation as High Landscape Value should be enough to protect it. The built confines of the city tightly contain the built-up area to the south of your campus and would normally preclude development outside them.

• There can be exceptions to these policies if there is an overriding social benefit or need in the city. Your displays did not indicate that in any way. You want to build an hotel, as currently visitors have to stay in the city so the implication is that city hotels will lose out to any hotel you propose.

• You further state that you need the extra income that an hotel would provide. Financial gain for an applicant is not a valid reason to grant a Planning Consent, otherwise every owner of an undeveloped parcel of land would achieve a consent.

• In your view the amount of hotel accommodation in the city is inadequate but you provide no analysis of this. If you could prove it, that would not give any weight to any particular site but should be subject to a site, rationally selected, which may not even be on your campus. You state that such an hotel would be for the city as a whole as well as the University. So, to choose a site that clearly would cause so much visual harm, just because a hotel operator wants it and you would appreciate the income has no rational basis. It would certainly not be a reason to set aside City Council policies, especially when there are other locations on your site which could accommodate an hotel without visual harm. When seeking a Planning Consent an applicant cannot always achieve exactly what he or she wants.

• Overall your persistence with siting an hotel here is very disappointing and shows that you have not factored in community relations. We had really thought that in the last few years that your philosophy had changed but we seem to be mistaken.

• If you continue with this idea as an application to the City Council, it will show, once again that all the consultation is just a waste of every party's time. It will cause an immense amount of damage to the University's role as an important neighbour who we are proud to have in our city.

I'd like to voice my concerns about the Masterplan. This is part of the land bought by local authorities in the 1960s in establishing the University of Kent and understood for decades by both parties to be worth preserving as open space for the local common good: as part of a 'Green Gap', 'green belt' or 'green lung' for the benefit of all between the University and city. But this mature woodland (maple, oak, yew) is now the specific place that the University of Kent authorities propose to destroy, to situate a 150-room conferencing hotel and facilities for commercial gain, sprawling south of University Road, and setting an appalling precedent for the rest of the Southern Slopes.

The Masterplan shows buildings on Tyler Hill Rd that will inevitably increase traffic on this narrow country lane. I suggest that buildings should not be placed beyond the Sarre Penn so that they are in easy walking or cycling distance of the main campus. This would also maintain the rural aspect of the surrounding community.

I am a third-year student at the University. It has come to my attention that there is a development project in Chaucer Fields. This deeply saddens me and I would highly protest the plans in development. Chaucer Fields is an area I walk through almost daily and brings so much to the university campus. Moreover, the green spaces on campus are one of the biggest selling points of the University. It is great to have undeveloped areas on campus. Please leave Chaucer Fields alone.
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- As a long standing nearby resident, I am writing to object to the proposed ‘Masterplan’ developments at UKC, and in particular the hotel and associated carparks.
- This has long since been disputed and resolved, so why is the matter being proposed once again?
- The clear if unwritten agreement on the building of the University was to protect a ‘green belt’ between the University and residential accommodation. All the evidence submitted previously still stands, not least the use of Chaucer Fields by local residents and the key environmental issues.
- Why is the university so insistent on building here, when there is copious room for such developments across the campus which would not so infringe on the local environment and community?
- Given the charitable status of the University and the requirement to engage and support the local community, why is UKC risking its reputation in such an unnecessary manner?
- Why is the University as a place of learning engaging in the hospitality industry any way?
- We all have an obligation to protect the environment, and this imposition appears to place corporate greed above consideration for your community neighbours. Please think again.

I wish it to be known that I object in the strongest terms to any development on the Chaucer Fields site.

- I am a second-year student studying Wildlife Conservation at the University of Kent and I am strongly opposed to the Framework Masterplan.
- I have attached images of some of the most significant responses, which include the perspectives of an international student, a parent of a past student, and a disabled student – all who believe strongly in the importance of this greenspace for well-being and wildlife within the area. N.B. ALL ‘REASONS FOR SIGNING PETITION’ HAVE BEEN INCLUDED IN APPENDIX 20.
- I cannot express to you enough how much this development has played on my mind, not only for my experience of Kent but for future generations. I initially was shocked at the amount of interest the petition received in such a short time, then I came to realise that this affects not only the University of Kent students, but the local community who benefit from this green space.
- In a time where urbanisation is increasing in frequency, and habitats all over the UK are being lost, it would be a massive disappointment to see such an important habitat go, homes to such species: Woodpeckers, Jays, Owls, Bats, Newts & Dormice.
- Other central concerns (taken from the Save Chaucer Fields website) = Loss of an ‘Area of High Landscape Value’, loss of public open space enjoyed by locals, students and the University’s own staff. This was land that originally the City Council and the University agreed would be protected from development. The adjoining residential area of St. Stephen’s has one of the lowest amounts of open green space in Canterbury. This open green space area has been an attractive feature of the University, separating the main campus core from the city’s built up area. Noise, disturbance and student car parking will become issues of friction between students and local families. Many students would like to see some of the £60m capital outlay being spent on improved study facilities. Extra traffic will be generated with higher levels of toxic gasses. Congestion at St. Thomas’ Hill-University Road T junction on a steep hill will increase accident risk. There will be increased traffic through Rough Common disturbing villagers.
- Alternative methods: 1) It can be done with smaller developments nearer to existing student accommodation. 2) Planning policy states that brownfield sites should be considered first for large schemes such as this. There is such land elsewhere on campus, as well as the Wincheap in Canterbury and possibly further afield the Discovery Park on the ex-Pfizer site at Sandwich.

I am very concerned that the plans for the hotel will destroy precious woodland and will inevitably lead to further development of the area in the future, thus completely decimating the natural habitat. If a hotel has to be built then surely an area that would cause less damage could be identified.

- I am emailing in response to the UKC Masterplan Consultation in the capacity of both a land-owning neighbour of the University and the Warden of a volunteer-run conservation site with boundaries running adjacent to UKC-owned land.
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• Thank you in advance for carrying forward the comments and concerns stated in this email to the relevant decision-makers in the Masterplan vision. I have framed my comments on your identified Opportunities and Constraints.

• With regards to the roads and traffic concerns, it is evident that motor vehicles tend to dominate the campus layout, carrying fast-moving traffic and are intimidating to pedestrians and cyclists. This is primarily due to the identified road design issue which encourages high speeds and non-University motorists to use them to bypass the city centre. This is most noticeable in school holidays and half-term breaks when the roads are dramatically calmer in terms of traffic density and speed. It is understandable that the University has highlighted the numerous car parks and the bottle-necks which occur on a daily basis. However, the proposals do not seem to tackle the main causes of these issues but offer temporary, sticking-plaster responses which do not seem to be born out of desire to reduce traffic but to spread the problem out. The most noticeable idea of this is the concept of extending the campus across Hackington Road onto green field site as a ‘temporary car park’. This would mark an unnecessary expansion of the campus across an already dangerous artillery road into undeveloped land which is not part of the officially designated Campus Boundary. It seems a reckless attempt to begin the campus creep into areas which are not appropriate or necessary for development. The 1965 University plan shows an entrance further down Hackington Road to connect campus traffic to the road and car parks below Darwin College. This would be a much better solution alongside a re-development (multi-storey?) of the existing car parks in that immediate area if a development along this main road is deemed necessary. It may remove the bottle-neck from the mini-roundabout at the top of the hill, and may also alleviate the dangerous pedestrian crossing if a proper entrance to the UKC campus was made in this area.

• One of the constraints includes the statement that the campus is low-density, with buildings that are widely dispersed and do not provide shelter to the spaces between them. This is hard to dispute, so why do the plans look toward reaching out across green-belt, undeveloped land rather than redeveloping the numerous impractical buildings and brown-field sites within the existing Campus Heart?

• Further concerns have been identified such as the University under-achieving in terms of landscape character and personality, and having plentiful green spaces but rather homogenous and lacking in variety. This is undoubtedly evident in the amount of short-cut lawns which are lacking in biodiversity and value. A commitment to wildlife-rich, educationally valuable areas would be much more rewarding to both staff, students and visitors. It may also help with other concerns such as the campus being very exposed to the weather in its hill-top location, and ongoing criticism regarding the continual removal of trees and valuable habitat in an area which was an important part of the Blean woodland complex.

• The last identified concern in the Masterplan Consultation is a clear understatement. Tensions exist between the University and its neighbours where development pressure, traffic and other nuisances provide a focus for potential dispute.

• The continuous scatter-gun, detail-lacking approach which seems to be a recognisable characteristic of the University’s ‘concepts’ and developmental ideas has not proven to be successful in the past, so it is curious as to why this hasn’t altered. A recent example of this is the ill-thought out, unnecessary and incomprehensible inclusion of an extension of footpaths alongside the existing public footpaths across privately-owned land into undeveloped and agriculturally sustainable land, which seems to serve only as an afterthought with the intention of further extending the campus reach into new areas. This idea has been put forward even though a recognised constraint is ‘paths that connect the campus are long, lack animation and do not feel safe’.

• A revolutionary and forward-thinking approach to development needs to be adopted if UKC is to be considered to be progressive. At present it appears that the decision-makers are pushing an aged agenda of sprawl and consumption of ever-reaching, undeveloped green-belt land, while using unconvincing green-wash soundbites.

• On a positive note, there has been considerable improvement in the attitude of the University and especially, the Campus Security in dealing with the concerns of the residents along Alcroft Grange Lane, which we continue to be grateful for and hope that our symbiotic relationship may continue in this area.
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• Do you never learn – or listen to what local residents are telling you? The fact that once again a proposed hotel and conference centre on the southern slopes of the University, in the area commonly known as Chaucer Fields, appears in the Masterplan, only goes to prove you only pay lip-service to ‘consultation’ and are happy to cock a snook at public opinion.
• I would have thought by now, following successive representations by local residents, a public enquiry and council opposition, all at a huge cost, the University would have dropped these cock-eyed plans for such a development. To say you have listened when there has been – and still is – so much opposition shows a cynical disregard for local views.
• Before you start trashing valuable green, unspoilt, countryside, you will be better served looking at the considerable area of brown-field land on the campus to site such a development. If, once the local residents and others who used to consider the University of Kent to be an asset to the City of Canterbury, see an element of responsibility and truth in the development plans, you may, just may, start to win back support.
• Unless and until I see some positive moves on the part of UKC to cherish and protect its unique green spaces I, for one, will remain deeply sceptical.
• I am deeply upset upon hearing about the conversion of the Chaucer Fields into a hotel. It is absurd to even consider getting rid of one of the unique characteristics that makes the University of Kent itself. I am sure that those willing to construct the hotel have walked down Chaucer Fields at least a couple times themselves! The fields for the students and faculty provide immense mental health benefits as well as an incredible view to observe.
• Nevertheless, the biodiversity that is present within the fields are very important. I myself have surveyed birds for a module in those fields, producing important data presenting the great biodiversity within the University of Kent.
• It is a disgrace that you are even considering ruining the fields we all use daily. I truly hope you reconsider your actions before impacting the environment, faculty and student health as well as the identity of the University.
• I write to object in the strongest possible terms to the development of the 'Chaucer Fields' area of campus, as proposed in the Masterplan.
• A previous, very similar, plan to develop the area was tabled several years ago, and withdrawn following massive opposition from University staff and students, and Canterbury residents. To be putting forward the proposal again shows nothing but contempt for other stakeholders, in particular staff and students of the University, and massively undermines the University's reputation as a worthwhile place to work or study.
• In addition, the building of a hotel perfectly illustrates that the University is more interested in generating profits than meeting the needs of its student body. Developing such a reputation can only be harmful for the University.
• Finally, the public consultation process has been worse than woeful – large numbers of staff and students in my school were completely unaware of the proposal or the consultation process until it had been completed, clearly demonstrating that the process was unfit for purpose.

• I am writing to strongly object to the university plans to build car parks in Tyler Hill area where I live and to the development of the conference centre in Chaucer Fields. This proposed development will forever alter the beautiful countryside where we live, part of which is the area of outstanding natural beauty (Tyler Hill).
• Professor Karen Cox announced to her staff that University of Kent should be a civic university serving the needs of Canterbury community and working in partnership with it. Given the strong opposition to the Chaucer Fields development from the local residents as well as those living in Tyler Hill, I believe these plans should be shelved.

The Masterplan is an improvement on the first one, but I am most concerned about "wish list" development at Hothe Court Farm and between this property and church cottage. It would be totally "out of keeping" with the overall landscape and, most concerning, would increase traffic on Tyler Hill Road. This road is already very busy with speeding cars, runners, cyclists and horse riders and car crashes are not uncommon at the bend just up from Hothe Court Farm. Surely any "business hubs" should be accessible off the main roads running through the campus or off the A299? Why put "business hubs" on agricultural land?

CONTINUED OVERLEAF
Comments

I can’t understand why the University feels the need to develop a conferencing hotel on campus when it has the excellent facilities at Woolf College which are very popular with conference delegates, as well as a huge amount of accommodation on campus. Most conferences occur outside university term time when a lot of the student accommodation is empty. Investing money in renovating our existing accommodation (and giving students a small financial incentive to leave rooms suitably vacated during university holidays) would solve the accommodation issue in a much more sustainable way, and would enhance the student experience at University of Kent, to everyone’s benefit.

It would be a huge shame to develop the southern slopes of the University (including the proposed new access road); these are enjoyed by so many local groups (and the University would be unwise and short-sighted to lose local support) and this area is a key asset of the University in attracting students and staff to move to University of Kent.

I was unable to go to any of the four events held as only one was on campus and I work full-time and have childcare responsibilities in Herne Bay after work each day. However, I read with interest the Masterplan document on the University website. I was astonished to find the resurrection of plans to build a conference complex on the Southern Slopes, particularly in the face of very clear opposition from staff, students and local residents. Protection of this green lung and community leisure space is vital to preserve the fundamental essence of what makes our campus special. The Masterplan indicates a general direction of overdevelopment which should be scaled-back, before habitats and greenspace is irrevocably destroyed. Given the growing evidence of the importance of green space to well-being, I object in the strongest possible terms to these proposals.

I continue to be concerned about the development of the southern slopes. When I was involved in departmental UCAS days one of the great attractions to potential students and their parents was the separation of the University from the city, the views over the city and the woodland and field aspects of the campus. Further development that moves the University “down the hill” encroaches on this aspect and detracts from this identity.

Placing a commercial venture there makes even less sense as the students will not benefit from the proposed buildings at all. As a Canterbury resident I hear a lot of complaints from other residents and visitors about the encroachment of Canterbury Christ Church University and its impact on the history, culture and Cathedral City status. It would be a positive move for the University of Kent to avoid this.

I might have missed this detail, but is there a possibility to have another cycle path from the St Stephen’s hill. I never use this but I see many people do which creates serious hazards given the landscape both to the cyclists and to the drivers. It would be nice if there were options on this side of the campus. I do not know the exact statistics (which perhaps can be checked with Kent Police), but I have an impression from colleagues that the number of accidents there is also not trivial.

I have been looking at these plans for information on the business model that underpins the hotel proposal. I understand from colleagues that this information has not been released. To my mind, this compromises the scope of the consultation and makes it difficult to respond in a meaningful way. However, for the record, I would like to state that I recall the last time a campus hotel was proposed, the business model was based on what were widely regarded as overly optimistic occupancy rates. Please share information about proposed occupancy in order to demonstrate the viability of this project (in commercial terms) and allow people to comment.
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I have no doubt that you have received a large number of emails criticising the way in which these plans have been handled, the lack of coherent information provided, and the ostensible lack of interest in the opinions of those who live locally and who have a vested interest in preserving the site. I agree with all of these points. I also wish to add that one of the main "selling points" of the University is its campus: destroying its green spaces has the potential to have a detrimental effect on undergraduate recruitment (the "greenness" of the campus was the main reason I opted to do my undergraduate degree at Kent, many years ago). Building on the site will also have a negative impact on the local wildlife and will inevitably damage relationships with local residents. All of this for a conference centre that, frankly, does not appear necessary.

I very much hope that our views are taken into account and that these plans will not go ahead. Our beautiful campus deserves better.

I'd like to register my objection to the conferencing hotel as adumbrated on the Masterplan.

- It creates sprawl on the campus.
- It eats into invaluable green-belt between the campus and town.
- It will cause a loss of goodwill of city residents towards the University.
- It is objected to by many members of the University.
- It is premised on an unsustainable model of transport, with car parks.
- There appears to be no scrutinisable business model for its success.

I would like to formally add my voice to the many others expressing concern regarding the plans to build on Chaucer Fields. I strongly urge the University to reconsider, as one of the best features of UKC campus is the abundant green space, in particular Chaucer Fields. Whilst I understand the need to grow, I think there are better ways to develop the campus – the new business school for example is a lovely building however is not particularly efficient with the space.

I have strong objections to the Masterplan. I recognise that the University is responding to a current decline in student numbers and a wish to diversify income. An alternative response would be: instead of spoiling or destroying vital assets of green spaces and habitats, the University could improve the quality of what is already provided and engage with issues of sustainability.

To respond to the format of the questions posed in the Masterplan Feedback Form:

1. The Masterplan will not contribute positively to the future planning of Canterbury district.
2. The overall vision is misguided and includes a hotel and the development of green land. In the references and proposals for ‘place-making’: I see this term as a euphemism for ‘development’.
3. None of the proposed developments are ‘sustainable’. They will simply increase local traffic, pollution, and open up the entire area for ‘creeping development’.
4. In the ‘character areas’ it is not clear what is proposed from the confusing maps and plans, but what can be discerned appears to ignore ecological and cultural considerations about the development of green spaces.
5. I object to development both on the Southern fields and on the Northern fields. For more, see below.

It ignores the strong local opposition for developments such as proposal 6. I do not think that Canterbury City Council should endorse the Framework Masterplan as the guide against which future proposed projects on campus will be assessed. The Masterplan is a blueprint for ‘creeping development’. It will not stop the ‘sprawl’ of the campus which is the claim of its proponents. It opens up the area to further sprawl, further pollution, and the possibility of future infill of sites further away from the central campus. This is sprawl on a grand scale. Yet the central campus is where the University claims to have a policy of concentrating development.
IN TERMS OF THE PROPOSED HOTEL, the University appear to base their case for this from the views of "experts" from the hotel and conference sector and similar bodies. These views were not made transparent in the consultations. The information I have is that, when questioned on why hotel experts and the business community had the competence to guide a complex decision with many economic, social and environmental dimensions, no answer was forthcoming. In my understanding, the University does not exist legally, constitutionally or ethically for financial gain or to pursue growth per se, but instead is meant to be geared essentially towards achieving collectively agreed, non-profit socio-educational objectives.

I strongly object to developing any part of the existing green, natural open spaces of what we term 'Chaucer Fields' in order to build this hotel and its associated developments of car parks etc. The hotel, if it must be built, should be built on a brownfield site and not the site of Chaucer Fields. The site appears to be admired, by hotel experts advising the University, for its beauty, landscape and panoramic views, all of which would be blighted and lost for students, University staff and residents if the hotel development went ahead on the proposed site.

FURTHER ISSUES RELATING TO THE MASTERPLAN, TRANSPARENCY AND THE CONSULTATION PRESENTATION

1) Lack of transparency in how the feedback from consultations will be analysed and used

We understand that there is a short time frame before the 'Masterplan' goes to Canterbury City Council, and there is no clear information about any independent body who would receive and analyse the feedback and how the feedback would be used. Without such an independent body in place to do this, the University will be able to pick and choose from the range of feedback, or select it only from certain areas, in order to ignore or misrepresent feedback from the consultation process.

2) Lack of clarity in the presentation

There are numerous 'oversights' in the presentation which make the exact proposals unclear and the consultation invalid. These include:
- No elevations or 'mock-ups' of proposed developments, especially the proposed hotel, and no comparative photos or images of the existing areas to be developed. A visitor to one of the consultations would have little idea of the impact of these developments. All that was shown was a series of 'aerial' maps or plans (not photographic), which did not distinguish clearly between existing development and proposed.

- No keys on the maps and plans to show what the red and blue lines refer to.
We had to ask staff to discover that the red lines refer to the newly extended boundary of what is termed 'the campus', which stretches over a vast area of farmland to the north.

- No indication of what is a proposed building and what is an existing one.
There are no clear images alongside proposals to show the existing land and development. It is impossible to clearly compare the present state of things with the proposals. I assumed that some vague and extremely large buildings dotted about the fields north of what I assumed was 'the campus' were existing farm buildings, as there are some here and there.

On asking about this, I was informed that these are proposed buildings, with no specific purpose, which would require access, which might also be a road with 'light traffic'. The same was true of the plan for the hotel. It was not clear which were new building works and which were existing ones. When we asked about some vaguely hatched images near the image of the proposed hotel, we were told that these were new car parks servicing the hotel.

We would not have known in any case if they were existing building works or proposed developments. The same was true for some infill relating to Parkwood. It was not clear what buildings already existed and which did not.
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3) The wider implications of developments such as those suggested on the Masterplan
Natural habitats and green land are ‘assets’ in themselves, and for themselves. They are vital for the sustainability of our human civilization and for the plant and animal forms which also
themselves sustain our civilization. I’m certain that all those involved in producing the Masterplan recognise that diverse cultures and habitats should be preserved and not gradually destroyed, bit
by bit, through development, and that green spaces with their associated trees, plants and wildlife, are the green ‘lungs’ of more developed areas such as the UK; they have also been found to be vital for the well-being, physical and mental, of residents. Development chips away at the vital spaces of green fields and wooded areas, parks and gardens. It will not enhance the University’s
reputation for this process of creeping development to be brought to its own green assets, and it may limit the appeal of the University in terms of student and staff recruitment. A proper
approach to sustainability would be to preserve those green spaces, and to enhance their biodiversity in order to develop and study this for a sustainable future. The University could lead the way
in the increasingly important research fields of conservation and ecology towards a genuinely sustainable civilization. This kind of research attracts funding from relevant institutions.

A further point on funds is that there has been ongoing construction around the University for many years, with the building of new bars and other facilities which require staffing. There would be a
means of building up funds by avoiding new construction.

I am contacting you in regards to the planned developments on Chaucer Fields. I, along with many students, find the planned development for Chaucer Fields rather distressing. One of the main
reasons that I chose to study at Kent was due to the lovely campus that it had to offer, and the main feature of this is the green spaces around campus. Sadly, these green spaces have become
increasingly smaller over my four years at Kent with the on-going development. I understand that development is necessary to continue to help Kent University grow, but I think to expand on
existing green spaces that the University has would be a grave mistake for a number of reasons:

1. As previously mentioned, the University’s green spaces are what makes Kent’s campus stand out from other university’s and is a genuine reason some students choose Kent as their first
choice. Due to Kent’s recent drastic slip down the university league tables, I do not think that the University can afford to take any other actions that may further reduce student numbers.

2. The University’s low ranking at 101 in the People & Planet’s University League also shows that the University is not very environmentally friendly, and one of the few things that the league
mentions the University is working on is biodiversity. However, for obvious reasons, developing on a large green space with a variety of different habitats (woodland and open grassland) would
cause a large loss to local biodiversity. Therefore, this planned development would further increase the University’s environmental footprint, and jeopardize its own sustainability strategy.

3. The university likes to promote its mental health and well-being services and I think that green spaces really compliment this, with lots of evidence suggesting that nature spaces in urban
environments have long-term mental health benefits (e.g. https://www.bbc.co.uk/news/science-environment-25682368). Walking through Chaucer Fields on the way to/from university is a great way
to clear your head before the day or to de-stress at the end, or even just a great way to get some lovely fresh air and to hear the birds sing as a break between studies/work. Not to mention
development would spoil the iconic view from Keynes down across Canterbury and its cathedral spires.

I hope you will seriously reconsider the future plans for the University to keep expansion on current green/nature spaces at an absolute minimum and save Chaucer Fields from a grim fate.
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In 1970 Joni Mitchell sang: They paved paradise, put up a parking lot,
With a pink hotel, a boutique and a swinging hot-spot,
Don’t it always seem to go, that you don’t know what you’ve got till it’s gone?
They pave paradise put up a parking lot.

Food for thought… you don’t get your green areas back once you lose them.

I looked over the Masterplan and discussed various aspects with the architect.

It seems to me that UKC is generating an unnecessary amount of adverse publicity by building next to Chaucer College. Why not just say that the slopes will be preserved and build elsewhere on the Campus and everyone gets what they want. Is this the time and place to have a fight? There also could be some interesting arguments about prescription which might arise.

On another matter I applaud the intention to transform the campus from the modernist approach of individual buildings on a ground plane to a much denser courtyard/square and street layout. This is not only a good use of the resource of the land but also will generate a better campus environment for all.

Whist I agree with the majority of the plan and believe having a foundation for future campus developments is a good idea, I believe this Framework Masterplan does not take into account the views of local people, and students and staff at the University.

After previous consultations it is apparent that people do not want the beautiful land surrounding the university’s central campus to be spoilt. This area should be enhanced as parkland for everyone to enjoy – creating better pathways and natural public spaces, improving biodiversity and natural habitats, and even creating a sculpture trail. The trees should not be cut down to make way for a hotel and conference centre!!

Please do not produce a plan that ruins this parkland environment that is an asset to the University and city. By doing so you will create a divide with local people who object to this, to students and staff that object to this, and to affect the variety of species that depend on this space.

There are so many other spaces that could be built upon that have less visual and environmental impacts. I have set out simple ideas in the attached document – e.g. the land south of Turing College, surrounding Beverley Farm, or behind the Innovation Centre. A hotel and conference centre would have positive impacts on the University’s income and city’s tourism – but building it on Chaucer Fields will not and is unacceptable.
I would just like to express my concerns regarding the possibility of an Innovation Centre and buildings between Hothe Court and Church Cottage.

My mother lives in Church Cottage and whilst the close proximity to her property bothers both her, who I am writing this on behalf of, as well as myself, I understand that nothing can be done about this as the land has already been earmarked for development under the local plan.

We both found it very disappointing that more green-belt land will be lost to development. Both of our main concerns lay with the extra traffic any kind of development will bring to Tyler Hill Road. The road is extremely busy anyway and the 'S'-bend near Hothe Court Farm is a notorious black spot for accidents.

The road already struggles to cope with not only the cars that use it for access to their homes in both Blean and Tyler Hill but also walkers, horses and cyclists. Using the road, as it is, is already pretty hazardous and there are some areas of the road that struggle to cope with two cars passing each other. I seriously don’t see how this country road could accommodate any more cars, cyclists or pedestrians without there being dire consequences.

I’m sure many others who live in the area, use the road or the cycle path will feel the same way.

I feel that the business model underlying your plan overlooks a major factor. Surely, one of UKC’s most valuable assets is the open, green space surrounding it, which creates a pastoral, almost Elysian feel to what could otherwise be a very dull, functional campus. Compared to, say Southampton, Plymouth or any number of other urban campuses, practically UKC feels like an Earthly paradise! This is particularly prized by foreign students seeking an idyllic English university experience, although I, as a British student here in the late 80s also valued the *setting* of the campus enormously, and some of my fondest memories of my time here (BSc and PhD in maths, ’88-'94) are tied up with the surrounding environment: tranquil wanderings down the slopes and into town, exploring the network of footpaths on the Blean and Tyler Hill sides of the campus, etc.

I understand that the University is locked into a marketplace economy, competing with others for student intake. But the idea that building ever more structures and facilities to attract students is a blinkered view – if you continue along this path, UKC will lose its fundamental attractiveness.

Because natural beauty and open spaces are hard to quantitatively value, they tend to get overlooked. But this doesn’t mean they don’t have real, economic value. The overall happiness and well-being of the student body are affected, as is the morale of the staff (which then feeds into student satisfaction).

I’d suggest that if you want the University of Kent to flourish and have a secure economic future, you stop and take a step back from this headlong rush into infrastructural expansion. I really appreciate your aims to provide quality buildings and spaces that respect the rich landscape and ecology of the surrounding environment as well as promoting the physical and mental well-being of students and staff alike and the maintenance of the green gap between the University and the city.

However, I do not see how these aims are served by the resurrection of the plan to build a 150-room conferencing hotel on the southern slopes going by the name of Chaucer Fields and especially not by the associated facilities and car parks. We understand the aims and motivations behind this decision, however, these do not comply with the expressed wishes of the UCU, local residents, staff, students, alumni, and the city council etc. Who all opposed this the last time it was proposed (I/we beg you remember the student vote of 2012).
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I/we ask that the university reprioritize its spending and funnel it towards teaching (Insert other issues you might care about), we do not need a conferencing hotel while students are taught by people on precarious contracts. I/we also ask how this looks in terms of the University’s poor sustainability ranking by people and planet. The building of this conferencing hotel would have a detrimental impact on the surrounding environment and destroy an ancient field system forever. (You may want to add something personal about how you have benefited from the southern slopes and the surrounding greenspace).

If the University wants to ‘create a better environment for staff, students and visitors to live, work and play’, how about allowing students and faculty to poster freely on campus this would foster community and why not find a way to keep conferences on the main campus and scrap the proposed conferencing hotel.

I’m writing to express concern over the plans to demolish Chaucer Fields in order to place a conference hotel for the University to use.

As someone who lived in Keynes accommodation last year, I experienced the value of these fields every day. One of the things that is so unique and important about the University of Kent is its green spaces, and to demolish these fields would not only diminish the University’s aesthetic value, but would also diminish an environment that is helpful to many people’s mental health.

I write to express my concern that the University is hoping to build a 150-bed conference-hotel south of the main campus.

I appreciate that you have taken account of local concern in that the proposed site is further away from residential roads than that suggested a few years ago. As a resident of one of those roads, I am grateful that it is no longer intended to house students there.

However, the choice of site conflicts with the need to conserve the surrounding landscape and maintain a green gap between the University and the city, acknowledged under ‘What you told us’ in the current consultation document. I passed the site of the proposed conference centre and car parking area the other day and was disturbed to realise how many trees would have to be felled if they were to be built. Green belts are only preserved if there is no further encroachment on them. I trust that as a result of this further consultation you will think again.

• I recently had a chance to view your updated Masterplan for the University. I am reasonably in favour of most of your plans. However, my major concern whilst viewing the plans was the proposal to open up the Crab and Winkle Way as a footpath and cycle path. I walk alongside the old railway line most days and am amazed by the variety of birds and animals I see and hear living along the line. These include common species such as squirrels, rabbits and foxes but also much rarer creatures such as bats, snakes, barn owls, stoats, weasels, buzzards, cuckoos and nightingales. And this is just from walking past. This is the most amazing nature corridor and I do not believe that it would stay the same if you put a path straight through the middle of it. There is already an existing permissive footpath down the side of the line so it would seem that you are duplicating what is already there. With the pressure put on wildlife around Canterbury with the massive amount of development happening, I would ask that you conserve this area and perhaps even develop it further as a natural habitat for amazing birds and animals.
• My other concern with you developing the old railway line is that it comes out on a pretty nasty road and having walked and cycled along it myself I can say that I would not want to encourage others to do so.
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I attended the consultation event this evening and was asked to complete a Feedback Form. The form did not lend itself to detailed comment and I felt that an e-mail from me would be more appropriate. I am away for the next two weeks or so, so felt it necessary to write the e-mail tonight.

The consultation does not seem to have progressed much further than that presented the last time, as far as the Northern Holdings are concerned. I have the following points to make:

I understand that in the Master Plan/Canterbury District Plan certain areas of agricultural land are now included in what is termed “The Campus”. I was under the impression that the campus covered only the built-up areas of the present site. By extending “The Campus” Northwards onto agricultural land does this mean the “new” areas can be developed more easily?

There is nothing in the plan to state what the University plans to do with its agricultural holdings. When and in what fashion will you respond to Colin Caverhill’s questions? At present the University is only giving five-year tenancies to its farming tenants. I do not feel that any tenant farmer can plan for the future and expend funds on capital improvement of the land on such short tenancies and that a minimum of 10 years should apply. The University has continued to fail to tell me what plans it has for its agricultural holdings after 5 years. The present tenant shared by the University with me for livestock farming is probably the best and most efficient livestock farmer in East Kent and I cannot believe that the University does not concur with this. He has spent large sums making huge improvements to this area. The University has a large holding of agricultural land, both suitable for livestock and arable. Why does it not have an agricultural faculty to monitor the farming of this land by two very good tenants?

The plan does not give an indication of the future for the buildings of Hothe Court Farm, which are fundamental for the farming of livestock on our land and also through which I have access rights to my land.

The plan indicates an interest in an area to the west of my land, again near which I have access rights, in a fenced-off area by what has been referred to as “Stony Rocks” field. I wonder if a pollution exercise has been conducted on this area which has been used as a “dumping ground” for many years.

There was an indication of some sort of “track”, allegedly not for motor vehicles, which would join the University with the “Stony Rocks” dumping site. Electric vehicles were mentioned. I am aware that land owned by St. John’s Hospital is in the process of being bought by the University and I would like to be made aware of the progress of this sale as it affects our mutual tenant. I gather that the “electric track” may pass. It is hoped that this would not increase the number of people who walk through the adjoining wood, which is probably the most delightful bluebell wood in East Kent and should be preserved from over use.

I have previously strongly opposed the opening up of the Crab and Winkle line from the top of the tunnel to the Blean/Tyler Hill road. It has been left alone since the 1950s, when the line was closed, and is now the most amazing wildlife corridor. Nightingales have returned year after year to the old railway line and such other birds as wood cocks have been seen, in addition to the normal bird and wild animal population. Because of pressure from the University staff and students I arranged for some time a permissive footpath along the side of my land from the top of the tunnel to the footpath running from Tyler Hill to Blean church. To take a footpath further along the railway line to emerge on a bend on the Tyler Hill road would be extremely dangerous. This road is narrow and is not suitable for a large number of pedestrians or cyclists.

I hope that this is of help and that detailed clarification can be made regarding the points I have raised.

CONTINUED OVERLEAF
• The focus on sustainability and ecology was welcome, as well as the commitment to retaining the character of the natural and semi-natural spaces on campus. The formal recognition of the Kent Community Oasis Garden, in which I have some involvement myself, is a very positive step. However, it is difficult to take the commitment to ecology and sustainability entirely at face value when the University appears to be so enamoured with the idea of developing the much-loved southern slopes that have become known as Chaucer Fields, or retaining the option of creeping development by suggesting vague proposals for buildings of indeterminate purpose in the fields within the extended campus boundary. A proposed arboretum is fine on its own terms, but when proposed at the same time as the destruction of well-established woods opposite the Canterbury Innovation Centre, it seems somewhat callous and distasteful. I am reminded somewhat of the television comedy character Ali G’s self-consciously absurd argument in favour of a multiplex cinema development: “why don’t we just build it and put the trees somewhere else?”. The consultation events are also welcome in theory. However, the fact that locals, staff, students, and alumni are becoming increasingly exasperated by the University’s insistence on expansion into the southern slopes despite massive opposition does not inspire confidence in the willingness of the University to actually listen to them. When I raised this objection at the consultation, I received the rather vague response that “some locals have been very supportive”. If that is the case, then perhaps the University would be happy to publish all of the feedback in its entirety, and to hire an independent party to assess the results of the feedback to ensure that the University is not cherry-picking to distort the results in favour of their proposals? If not, the University will continue to risk tarnishing its reputation.

It is also rather interesting to note that ‘experts from the hotel and conferencing sectors’ have allegedly been consulted for feedback. Perhaps the University would like to specify which ‘experts’ have been consulted, and give a little bit more information about what these ‘experts’ actually advised? Why should advisors from ‘the business community’ have equal weighting to ‘residents’ and ‘other interested parties’? Why have the University not formally acknowledged that some of their own internal experts, in relevant fields such as social policy and conservation, have opposed the plans for development? Are their views not seen as important, in the way that those of ‘the business community’ and ‘experts from the hotel and conferencing sectors’ are evidently seen? As the University is ostensibly a non-profit educational organisation, this emphasis appears rather questionable.

### GENERAL OVERVIEW

- The focus on sustainability and ecology was welcome, as well as the commitment to retaining the character of the natural and semi-natural spaces on campus. The formal recognition of the Kent Community Oasis Garden, in which I have some involvement myself, is a very positive step. However, it is difficult to take the commitment to ecology and sustainability entirely at face value when the University appears to be so enamoured with the idea of developing the much-loved southern slopes that have become known as Chaucer Fields, or retaining the option of creeping development by suggesting vague proposals for buildings of indeterminate purpose in the fields within the extended campus boundary. A proposed arboretum is fine on its own terms, but when proposed at the same time as the destruction of well-established woods opposite the Canterbury Innovation Centre, it seems somewhat callous and distasteful. I am reminded somewhat of the television comedy character Ali G’s self-consciously absurd argument in favour of a multiplex cinema development: “why don’t we just build it and put the trees somewhere else?”.

- The consultation events are also welcome in theory. However, the fact that locals, staff, students, and alumni are becoming increasingly exasperated by the University’s insistence on expansion into the southern slopes despite massive opposition does not inspire confidence in the willingness of the University to actually listen to them. When I raised this objection at the consultation, I received the rather vague response that “some locals have been very supportive”. If that is the case, then perhaps the University would be happy to publish all of the feedback in its entirety, and to hire an independent party to assess the results of the feedback to ensure that the University is not cherry-picking to distort the results in favour of their proposals? If not, the University will continue to risk tarnishing its reputation.

- It is also rather interesting to note that ‘experts from the hotel and conferencing sectors’ have allegedly been consulted for feedback. Perhaps the University would like to specify which ‘experts’ have been consulted, and give a little bit more information about what these ‘experts’ actually advised? Why should advisors from ‘the business community’ have equal weighting to ‘residents’ and ‘other interested parties’? Why have the University not formally acknowledged that some of their own internal experts, in relevant fields such as social policy and conservation, have opposed the plans for development? Are their views not seen as important, in the way that those of ‘the business community’ and ‘experts from the hotel and conferencing sectors’ are evidently seen? As the University is ostensibly a non-profit educational organisation, this emphasis appears rather questionable.

### HOTEL AND CONFERENCE CENTRE

- In recent years, student numbers have been falling, and the University has had to lower its entry requirements in some cases. The University must be very careful not to lower student numbers even further by damaging its own assets. By building a 150-room hotel and conference centre on the bus route into campus, by showing a series of aesthetically displeasing non-academic buildings, prospective and current students will be greeted with something that looks more like a business park than the green and pleasant campus that I saw back in 2008. A Chinese student I was speaking to in 2008 told me he liked the campus so much because of ‘the nature’, something he was not used to in the city he came from. What would he have said, if he had seen what the University are proposing now? Would he have been so keen to go to Kent University, or to take his studies elsewhere? I notice the website uses the picturesque view from the labyrinth, over the trees and down towards the cathedral in order to showcase the beauty of the campus. It is somewhat ironic that the University is proposing to start undermining those very factors that are benefiting its public image.

- One may respond, ‘the University is losing money. We need to diversify in order to maintain our growth.’ The University was not set up to be a business; it does not receive public money in order to engage with the hotel and conference centre industry. It is an educational institution. If the University is losing profits from falling student numbers, then a more sophisticated approach to budgeting is required. Money must be put into keeping the University at the top of the game in teaching and research. The green assets of the campus should be used for research into conservation and agriculture, both increasingly important for human survival in the coming century. Money should be spent building the morale of staff and students through intelligent investment and sensible planning for the future. Building this centre against the wishes of staff and students alike will risk undermining the morale of the University as a whole, and this will inevitably bring financial consequences. The hard-working staff employed for the rather thankless task of hosting these consultation events seemed uncertain about the Masterplan’s proposals. If the tiny body of staff employed for the consultation seem hesitant to throw their full weight behind the Masterplan, how will it be for the staff of the University as a whole? Discord and fragmentation will be the result of this development proposal, not profit. One may respond by pointing to the Canterbury Innovation Centre as an example of a successful non-academic
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development on campus property, but how successful has it really been? I have been informed that it has been something of a financial disappointment. How will the University recover if this proposed 'hotel and conference centre' is also a failure? With staff whose morale and motivation has been undermined, students living on a concrete business park for the first year away from home, local residents feeling betrayed and angry? The picture painted is not good.
• Furthermore, the World Health Organization has recently expressed alarm at the number of conference delegates being denied visas by the Home Office ('WHO voices alarm as academics denied visas to visit UK conference', The Guardian, 9 October 2018). Is it really wise for the University to try to capitalise on the international conference market when the UK sector is about to undergo a crisis due to Home Office visa restrictions?

PLANS FOR MORE STUDENT HOUSING
• As one of the consultation staff admitted, student numbers have been falling. Despite this, the University has suggested building more student houses in Park Wood, in case student numbers increase again. If the University needs money, it should start by saving money. Building houses that will probably sit empty for the next 10 to 20+ years is not a very prudent approach to budgeting.

PLANS TO ESTABLISH A 'FOOTPRINT' IN THE FIELDS CLOSE TO GILES LANE AND TOWARDS BLEAN VILLAGE
• A series of vague proposals were outlined, including buildings of uncertain purpose in the fields towards Blean that 'could be writers' retreats, we're not sure' and a 'temporary car park' in the field by Giles Lane (how 'temporary' can a car park be? Are you going to pull the tarmac up afterwards?). These were not clearly flagged up in the presentation, and it fell to local residents to ask what the buildings on the map actually were. This is creeping development, and an abuse of the extended campus boundary. If the University must use these fields, then use them for non-destructive academic purposes, such as teaching and research into conservation, agriculture, archaeology.

THE CONSULTATIONS
• There was a palpable feeling of antagonism, anger, and hostility towards the proposals from the visitors to the consultation events. The only event where people seemed to be having a good time was the Darwin event on campus, where students had been allowed in to protest, hold banners, and pin up their own signs to the boards. The staff did their best to defend the Masterplan, which cannot have been an easy task considering nobody seemed to like it all that much. I wonder if the University will record any of this in their response to the Masterplan events? Will the feedback be published in full? Furthermore, how will the advice from 'experts in the hotel and conferencing sectors' square up to advice from all the other quarters?

CONCLUSION:
• I am not really sure why the University is so keen to push through non-academic developments such as the hotel and conference centre, and creeping developments such as the car parks and ambiguous buildings in the fields within the extended campus boundary. The necessity for the University to remain financially viable is unquestionable, but it is exceedingly inappropriate of the University to diversify into sectors outside of its remit as a non-profit educational institution. A sensible approach to budgeting seems to be required here, and I don't think there's much evidence of that in these proposed developments. Furthermore, the community of Canterbury is unusually organised, and there is a history of successful democratic campaigning here (e.g., Save Kingsmead Fields). The University would be well advised to take heed of this, and save themselves the potentially considerable financial costs of trying to force through unwanted developments.
We live on the estate immediately bordering the University lands – the ‘Southern Slopes’, including Chaucer Fields (which we now understand has been given a new name?). Consequently, we are pleased to walk in the area and can see the trees from our house and benefit from the birds and animals that live there. Unfortunately, however, we also hear noisy students as they make their way up the hill late at night – and, indeed, live in nearby houses on our estate, not to mention the cars that are now being parked all along our residential streets.

We attended the recent event detailing the ‘Masterplan’ which was held recently at the Westgate Hall. We were there for about an hour or so. The one thing that stood out for us was the proposed hotel. This is something that we feel should not be built where it is shown – there are plenty of other sites that could be used (including behind the Innovation Centre across the road). Apart from the worry that it would be ugly to look at, as so many of the ‘new’ University buildings are, in our opinion, the greater danger would be ‘creeping development’ below and beside it.

Amongst some of the things that were said to us was ‘The University is a business and it needs to make money in order to continue to provide the education that is its primary purpose’. This was to justify the hotel, that they acknowledged had been the one topic by far that had been exercising every visitor that morning. Somebody used the ‘Canute’ analogy to us which I think meant that it was inevitable that the hotel and other developments would be built, and that people could not stop ‘progress’! They claimed that access to the station and city meant that the hotel could only be built where the plan showed it – nobody acknowledged that the view of the Cathedral was probably the real reason. It was claimed that there could not be creeping development below the hotel as the plan did not show it. As we say below, we were not persuaded by assurances that we had from a member of staff.

We asked why the hotel had previously been labelled as a ‘pavilion’ – why had they not called it what it was? Also, why had they used the word ‘village’ to describe the previously proposed student accommodation in 2011? It looked on the plan nothing like any village we have ever seen, and if Turing College is anything to go by it certainly wouldn’t have been. We were not given any adequate answer, and said that we felt these were euphemisms that had possibly been deliberately used to mislead people. Under these circumstances why should the University expect local people to trust any of the claims made about the plan. There were piles of sheets labelled ‘HOTEL AND CONFERENCE CENTRE’. This shows two map extracts showing, firstly the large-scale 2011 ‘village’ proposal, and secondly the ‘current proposal’. The only reason we can think for this sheet is a crude attempt to ‘sweeten the pill’, by showing how much more acceptable the new hotel would be!

We were able to give written comment, which we did – although it was in the form of 5-point responses to questions – some of which were obviously leading questions and some of which we could not really understand what they were asking – e.g. About the ‘scope’ of the project! After each response you could make a brief comment.

In summary, for us, the whole thing was overshadowed by the hotel which we feel the University was trying hard to underplay. This was unfortunate because we did not really give sufficient attention to all the other aspects of the plan. The Architect, for example, gave us an interesting description of his plans for the ‘Campus Heart’. Some of the other developments in Blean and towards Tyler Hill also look interesting.

The Southern Slopes are a wonderful semi-parkland area and are an asset to the University. They are visible from the city and are enjoyed and valued by staff and students and local residents. They should be left as they are and not subjected to piecemeal development that will ultimately destroy them for future generations.
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I am delighted to see that the proposed developments along the Tyler Hill Road appear to have been shelved and I would like to be sure that this is not just sitting in the wings waiting to re-emerge.

I note that you have a proposed footpath/cycle track along the track of the Crab and Winkle Line where it is part of the northern land of the university and you have continued it north onto the track bed that I own.

I would like to make it clear that I will vigorously oppose any change in the status of the track bed in my ownership.

We agreed to the construction of the cycle track (NR1) that goes through Amery Court on the understanding that no effort would be made to open up the aforementioned track bed, next to Well Court. It would seem that this agreement has been forgotten.

I also note that you have included the Well Court farm road in your routes out of Tyler Hill (this is a continuation of Fleets Lane). This road is a private road from Rough Cottage north and is not open to the public.

As a local resident I find the plan to be vague, contradictory, and damaging for the future of the local area. I object to the plan on grounds of sustainability and in particular the detrimental effect on an area – the Southern Slopes (Chaucer Fields) which I and my family know and love. As an institution that has signed up to the UN's Sustainable Development Goals, I find it very strange that – in a month when the IPCC's findings have so starkly put into context the effect of climate change on future generations – the University is putting forward a plan that will destroy the green, biodiverse spaces south of the University for the sake of a little-needed conference centre.

The Estates Department's Carbon strategy post-2020 commits to 'including carbon management considerations in the development of the University's campus masterplan', and I am eager to know how the 'University Rise' conference centre and Beverley Court will take these considerations into account, given that they will require the loss of significant natural habitat.

I see the orchards and community gardens as only a tokenistic gesture that will fail to offset the decimation of a part of my local environment that I value extremely highly.

In 2012 I performed and recorded a song, Concrete Lung, which describes my feelings towards Chaucer Fields, and although the 'student block' (with the Keynes development) has moved on, I stand by this expression and will repeat my sentiments now. The area around the proposed conference centre must not be lost, firstly because the environmental sustainability reasons mentioned above are real and immediate for those living in the surrounding area. The parkland provides an area of green space that is sadly lacking for residents near to the city centre, and as such provides opportunities for all for exercise and fresh air – including those such as me with young families. At a wider level, it provides a 'green-lung' to the city both for us and for the students, and increasingly, studies have shown the importance of air quality to our health and mental well-being.

If the conference centre and Beverley Court are built on the proposed area, Canterbury will lose – for ever – an area of beauty that not only brings added quality of life to the residents such as myself, but makes the University stand out as a campus that embraces its local environment and exists in harmony with its residents' needs and wishes.

I would like to see my local University – as a huge consumer of energy – making bold investments in renewable energy on land that is not of such importance to the local community. I strongly urge you to reconsider the University Rise element of the Masterplan with these concerns in mind.
Unbelievable... but true. I just read that the Chaucer Fields won’t remain the same. What is the Masterplan to build a conference hotel over this area of natural beauty for? For the purpose of the University: the students? I don’t think so.

The Chaucer Fields are a valuable place for students and even locals. For me personally, that place has been the first ‘wow-effect’ on the whole campus (and also for my parents when they came to the Open Days with me).

This unique viewpoint on Canterbury never stops to conjure a smile on my face and there couldn’t be any better way to wait for the bus while enjoying some nature. This close by woodland is what helps a lot of students to find relaxation outside of the campus and all the stress of University life. By building on this area, something, maybe even the sparkle of the University ground, would get lost.

I vehemently disagree with the building of a conference hotel on Chaucer Fields, to do so would be to destroy an invaluable natural resource which benefits the local wildlife and students alike. The increase in revenue does not justify destroying such an important place.

It has been proven that university students achieve better grades and have better mental health when surrounded by green spaces, so I would urge the University to reconsider destroying this field.

• I worked at Kent from 1982 sometimes part-time, sometimes full-time until a couple of years ago, and was for some years part of the Transport Committee. I cycled to work and cycling is one of the main focusses of what I want to add.
• I couldn’t see on the maps any proposed cycle paths except the two (one new) going north-south across campus. Since the campus is essentially spread out east-west what it really needs is more off-road east-west links for cyclists. Giles Lane is not wide enough for cars in some places let alone cycles as well. It ought to be possible to access the campus from all sides and travel to any part of it without travelling along a road with motor vehicles. Some suggestions:
• Coming up the Elliot Path and cycle route, at the point where one reaches grass (by the amphitheatre) there is a clear desire line across the grass towards Rutherford College and Tyler Court (and Darwin and the Registry). Could this be made into a surfaced walking and cycling route for access (in all weathers) to the east of the Campus?
• Would it be possible to make one of the wide paved paths (currently labelled No Cycling) say from The Venue and Lighthouse to Darwin, a shared use path? Ideally it would be a path without obstacles such as steps or flowerbeds, so that people could cycle from Keynes to Darwin with just crossing of the University Road at the point where it is constrained so the traffic is very slow.
• In addition, a path across campus below (south of) Elliot and Rutherford colleges would avoid Giles Lane and motor traffic.
• I wonder about access to the small clusters of buildings around the Sarre Penn. Any footpath going to them should be shared use (pedestrians and cyclists) for visitors and staff who work there.
• Access for cycles along the old railway line requires a shared use path from Giles Lane level down the hill. What about connecting Woolf to the Sports Centre and Park Wood with a cycle and pedestrian path on the north side of Giles Lane?
• For Park Wood residents the cycle path needs to be connected to Keirs Lane (NCR1 from Hothe Court Farmhouse to the Whitstable Road at Kent College). No cyclist wants to make a large detour around Park Wood estate to reach Rough Common or the Crab and Winkle route to Whitstable.
• In the years I worked at Kent my biggest worry was about riding along and across Giles Lane with cars fighting for space. When I worked in the Mathematics Department in Cornwallis there were bike racks outside the building, but you couldn’t cycle to them and the journey to Darwin Road (as there was no short-cut for cycles) was an extra hazard. The surface of Giles Lane left a
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Lot to be desired, and still does in places. I have had punctures through hitting potholes to avoid being squashed by a vehicle. Another possible east-west route across campus could be considered north of the Library, south of Cornwallis (where Dr Bike used to be held) and north of the Grimond Building avoiding Giles Lane.

- Cycle storage facilities have improved markedly, and it is good that most are secure and covered, but there are places where it is not clear where visitors without ‘cards’ to enter the shelters could park. I was delighted after years of asking for cycle parking at the business school (and being told it was too low tech and expensive!) to see the new shelter by the Sibson Building. That is accessible to all.

- I would like to add that the Cycle Hub just off Park Wood Road is absolutely brilliant. It should be more publicised and signposted. It provides a wonderful service to staff, students and the general public. I came upon it almost by accident (I had cycled past the previous workshops on my way from Rough Common to the Business School for years) and was really surprised to see how accessible and useful the new place is for everyone.

- In answer to your question about how the City Council should respond to the plan, I think both parties should grasp the idea of transport plans and encouraging sustainable transport, as the University has been setting an example for many years. The City Council wants a ‘modal shift’ in transport to more walking and cycling, but needs to be persuaded that this will only happen with the provision of infrastructure – safe routes avoiding conflict with motor traffic, parking arrangements in sensible locations, and changing facilities for some riders. Could the University collaborate more with Canterbury City Council to show how this can be achieved?

- I am delighted to be told that there are no plans to turn present cycle routes into shuttle bus routes. Even having buses alongside cyclists would destroy the peaceful sense of freedom on the Crab and Winkle Way from Park Wood to Blean Church and would be a deterrent to new cyclists.

- In the opinion of residents (particularly of Rough Common) the University students are not short of buses to take them to Canterbury, or Whitstable. We resisted the very frequent National Express journeys through our village and managed many years ago to have them reduced; they are creeping up again to our dismay! When I asked my seminar groups what they thought of National Express coming to the University they said they couldn’t see why it needed to do this as it was so easy to reach the bus station. I guess things have changed in the past 15 years but the number of coaches through Rough Common is a matter of concern as it cuts the village in half along the road (which is a C road!)

- There is also concern about students in particular who park for the whole term in residential areas near the University, and staff and students who park daily in nearby roads, making life difficult for residents. I suspect the only solution is to designate areas for permit parking by residents only, and maybe that will come.

- Christchurch is guilty of this, and I think UKC is not, but the building of vast areas of student residences in town, and then selling some of the earlier ones off to the City Council to be converted (at considerable expense) into council housing is madness.

- I would like to see more campus accommodation and fewer HMOs (particularly in Rough Common, as we don’t collect the village precept from HMOs and they don’t care for the gardens and decoration and nor do the landlords who should do this).

CONTINUED OVERLEAF
residents, staff, students, alumni, and the city council etc. Who all opposed this the last time it was proposed (I beg you remember the student vote of 2012). We are the University, listen to our needs and follow our priorities!

I ask that management re-prioritize its spending and funnel it towards teaching (and how about sorting the rat problem at Darwin?) we do not need a conferencing hotel while students are taught by people on precarious contracts. I also ask how this looks in terms of the University’s poor sustainability ranking by people and planet. The building of this conferencing hotel would have a detrimental impact on the surrounding environment and destroy an ancient field system forever. I personally walk through the fields every time I go to uni and the benefit to my physical and mental well-being cannot be stressed enough. The amount of academic breakthroughs alone I have had in those tranquil surroundings cannot be quantified, XXXXXXX surrounded by nature allows you to process information and reflect on it to gain profound insights. To see it compromised in any way would be a substantial loss.

If management wants to ‘create a better environment for staff, students and visitors to live, work and play’, how about allowing students and faculty to poster freely on campus? This would foster community and engagement and why not find a way to keep conferences on the main campus and scrap the proposed conferencing hotel.

I really appreciate your aims to provide quality buildings and spaces that respect the rich landscape and ecology of the surrounding environment as well as promoting the physical and mental well-being of students and staff alike and the maintenance of the green gap between the University and the city.

However, I do not see how these aims are served by the resurrection of the plan to build a 150-room conferencing hotel on the southern slopes going by the name of Chaucer Fields and especially not by the associated facilities and car parks. I understand the aims and motivations behind this decision, however, these do not comply with the expressed wishes of the UCU, local residents, staff, students, alumni, and the city council etc. Who all opposed this the last time it was proposed (I beg you remember the student vote of 2012).

I ask that the University re-prioritize its spending and funnel it towards teaching. We do not need a conferencing hotel while students are taught by people on precarious contracts. I also ask how this looks in terms of the University’s poor sustainability ranking by people and planet. The building of this conferencing hotel would have a detrimental impact on the surrounding environment and destroy an ancient field system forever. For me personally, as I walk through it every day on the way to the University, this part of the greenspace provides me with a mental calmness and desire to appreciate the nature, and it would be really detrimental to my well-being to have it destroyed.

Also, if the university wants to ‘create a better environment for staff, students and visitors to live, work and play’, how about allowing students and faculty to poster freely on campus? This would foster community and why not find a way to keep conferences on the main campus and scrap the proposed conferencing hotel?

Why has the University ignored the disgust of local residents and students and once again proposed this aggressive plan to ruthlessly concrete over unspoilt green space? I am referring to the proposed hotel and conference centre on Chaucer Fields on the University’s southern slopes. The plans demand the destruction of many trees on the hill and the defilement of this beautiful natural view with a huge ugly Orwellian-style structure. Why does the University even need a hotel? There are thousands of rooms on the existing campus that can be rented out, whilst this would take business away from existing local hotels in Canterbury. After the triumph of local residents against the corporate aggression of the University when this proposal was initially defeated years ago, it disgusts me that the University has clearly learned nothing from the experience and are selfishly attempting this scheme once again. I believe this will cause further resentment for the locals towards the University and its students, whilst the University will metaphorically shoot itself in the foot by destroying yet another part of the surrounding greenery that played a significant role in
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attracting myself and other students to study in this beautiful location. As if our recent catastrophic plunge in the university ranking tables wasn't bad enough, this scheme further makes me ashamed and embarrassed to call myself a Kent Alumni. Why not spend the University's funds in improving our academic abilities and reputation (e.g. hiring more esteemed professors and staff) instead of shamelessly trying to milk the hotel market? I sincerely hope that popular opinion defeats the greed of the University once again.

• I have played an active role within my school community and DICE, having led the UKC Conservation Society committee, and I know that many within the university community strongly oppose this development.
• Chaucer Fields is one of the few natural areas on the UKC campus and in Canterbury. Previously, I have personally carried out biodiversity surveys of this area of the campus, which is diverse in species, particularly birds. This development also has the potential to disturb the protected species onsite at the University.
• The greenery of the University's campus was a big pull factor for myself and most students I know for choosing the University of Kent, particularly for myself coming from a rural background and my love of the outdoors. This "greenness" factor was always on my list of considerations when looking at different universities, knowing the important effect it would have on my wellbeing, and ultimately, happiness. If this development was taking place at the consideration phase, I can honestly say I would have had to review my choices.
• The proposed development would cause the loss of an area with great social, wellbeing and biodiversity value, that is used by many student and student groups – one of the most social green spaces on campus.
• The importance of these green spaces to the well-being of all campus users and biodiversity found at Kent is fantastically great. As centres of progress, universities need to set an example – modelling that these social and environmental factors should be treated as high priorities, and not simply swept to one side for the benefit of economics.
• I hope you will consider my, and many others, opposition and review this proposal. This proposal has and will ultimately result in hostility and divisiveness, and other more agreeable solutions need to be considered. For instance, the further development of other already developed parts of campus to provide these same amenities e.g. adding another level of parking to Giles Lane car park with hotel on top.

I voice my concern over the plans to build a hotel on Chaucer Fields.

I feel this would be a terrible mistake. I don't usually take the time to protest such actions. But that's how much I was deeply saddened by this news. Chaucer Fields, and the view of Canterbury it provides, were a major factor for me to choose Kent University over others. The moment I walked up to the University and saw this area I knew Kent University was the place I wanted to go. All the people I've taken to see where I study have complimented this aspect of the University. And even my sister, who attended Edinburgh University, said how envious she was of how pleasant our campus was compared to hers. I know I'm just one voice. But I'm certain others feel the same way and have contacted you about it. And I'm sure many others feel this way, but simply don't know about the plan.

I am a postgraduate student at the University of Kent, and it has come to my attention that there are plans to build a new apartment complex, hotel and parking lot. I believe the plans to build on the southern slopes, in the woodland at the top of what is known as 'Chaucer Fields', plus the additional conversion of field/wooded areas into car parks beneath the Innovation Centre and above Chaucer College (beneath St. Edmunds), radically contradict the stated sustainability goals of "The University Masterplan". There should be no development on the Southern Slopes – to do so would be inconsistent with the notions of consolidation and intensification of the Campus Heart: it would also be seen as provocative and misguided by local residents as well as staff, students, local public authorities and relevant charities and societies, who evidently value the environmental/heritage character of the landscape and the wide range of activities it permits in its unspoilt form. It would be deeply counter-productive to ongoing efforts to foster stronger ties between the University and these constituencies to continue to threaten it with development.
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The name says it all. There is no accountability that whoever you are, you will listen or even take responsibility for listening. Mysterious and unaccountable. The Masterplan is given as if in the best interest of everyone, and those who do not agree will be thought of as not understanding or knowing better?

Prove me wrong.

I come from a generation of Kent undergraduates, postgraduates and staff (having been all three) who have woven relations into Chaucer Fields that generate value far deeper than you evidentilly know. You may have not known better before, but know now that you will be trampling on this community. This cannot sit easily with you. Prove me wrong.

I suggest the Masters clean up their own relations before trampling on others.

- I object from the potential building on Chaucer Fields for a conference room at the University of Kent.
- It’s so important to have green space on campus and I have, many tim es, walked through the fields, sat and relaxed on them and bird watched of a morning.
- I don’t think it is needed to continue to destroy green spaces and wildlife. I will protest this if I have to.

Thanks for giving me the opportunity to express my objection to building on the southern slopes.

According to what I've read on the blog and the emails, it seems contradictory to maintaining the ecology of the area. I won't elaborate further because I'm sure there are folks who've articulated it far better than I can.

The Uni ought to reserve its green spaces. I can understand its drive to sustain its own ends, economies must flow etc, but what happens really if we don’t stand for environmental stewardship in a radical way? I think it’s a lost opportunity. Perhaps that’s black and white, and I know what’s ecologically sound isn’t necessarily economically sound and that’s a consequence of our age. But I recommending reading the story of Wilding by Isabella Tree (published last year) on how there IS in fact a middle ground...

I am not able to come to Darwin today, so would like to register my views about the Masterplan by e-mail. Having read details of your plans on your website, I would simply like to express my deepest possible opposition to any actual or potential plans to build on the southern slopes or to increase car parking provision there (for example, in the field/wooded area below the Innovation Centre). I would also like to add that if these plans go ahead, I shall do everything I can to actively resist them at grassroots, university, and local council levels.

I would strongly object to the development of the conference centre on the southern slopes on green field as it would harm the environment and take away irreplaceable green space. There is a lot of undeveloped land to the east of Canterbury which could be used for your conference centre no doubt more profitably than as retail space, and given rise of amazon etc they will be out of business in near future. The same applies to the car show rooms which will be out of business as electric cars are mandated, so please hold out for brownfield land of which there will soon be plenty, which is plenty close enough to the campus.
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- They could drop this idea and put a layer on top of Giles Lane overspill parking. Now this is all pink permit there is a short fall of nearly 500 student blue zone spaces.
- Eventually all students wishing to drive into campus will be directed to park and ride. One more reason why Kent Uni will slip further down the rungs of the university ratings ladder.
- Start thinking of the people that pay all the money to be here before putting in a hotel etc. look to use what is already here and can be refurbished. Our countryside is being sold off at an alarming rate as it is. Build on the old wooden estates and maintenance area opposite Jennison, Ingram Road instead.

I am president of the UKC Conservation Society, an academic society with Kent Union that is associated with the wildlife conservation course within DICE (Durrell Institute of Conservation and Ecology) and SAC (School of Anthropology and Conservation). I would like to comment on a couple of features of the most recent version of the Framework Masterplan.

- Firstly, I would like to say how great it is that the community garden is featured on the Masterplan. The Conservation Society have been involved with the Gardening & Foraging Society who ran the garden for the previous two academic years, and I was also present at the opening ceremony of the community garden several weeks ago. The evolution of this space over that time, in particular over the last few weeks and months, has been amazing, and I look forward to seeing it continue to grow as a shining example of sustainability and community involvement.

- However, the planned development of a conferencing hotel on the University's southern slope, on Chaucer Fields and the surrounding woodland, concerns me greatly. One of the main reasons I came to study at the University of Kent is the incredible green spaces and wildlife present on the campus, and this particular area is a big part of that. As it consists of woodland, open grassland and hedgerows, it adds great diversity to the University's green spaces and supports much wildlife. It is also used by DICE students on their DI303 'surveying and monitoring for biodiversity' module as a location where bird surveys are conducted, as it's mix of habitats promotes and supports a wide range of bird species. This area also includes a hedged enclosure planted by DICE students in 2008. I feel that the development of this area would greatly tarnish the image of and reputation for sustainability that the University is trying (and in some ways, definitely succeeding!) to promote.

- I, along with very many colleagues and students, are somewhat taken aback by the inclusion of a development on Chaucer Fields as part of 'Our Vision' in the Masterplan. Who the 'Our' refers to — is clearly not an inclusive section of the University and, I believe, is essentially presenting a minority view.

- Notwithstanding the strong arguments against the Chaucer Fields location in terms of environmental impacts (damaging the Canterbury green belt, biodiversity loss, pollution and congestion), loss of amenity to the University and local community, and the hostility and divisiveness it will precipitate, there is a much more agreeable solution.

- The ugliest part of the University's built environment is most probably the Giles Lane visitor car park. So why not simply add another layer of car-parking and build the hotel on top.............? An obvious answer that will keep (almost) everyone happy........

Planned hotel on green fields.

We are grateful that the University has given an opportunity to comment on this plan. It's generally agreed in the circles in which we move that the place of the various universities in the city needs urgent reconsideration, on more matters than this particular project, and the University of Kent is in danger not only — as Richard Norman points out — of forfeiting sympathy, but, together with the other universities, of permanently damaging the city. Anyone walking on the city wall, for instance, cannot fail to notice the intrusive Christchurch building and to feel that the historical charms of the City are being casually discarded. Every time new student housing is announced — and nothing done to meet the need for affordable housing, let alone to tackle the city's serious homelessness problem — the universities forfeit further good-will.
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| No-one will have failed to notice two developments in the tertiary sector. First the increasing cost of a degree and the corresponding diminution of pressure on places. There is a general sense that the city is being despoiled for a market without a sure future. Secondly – to our regret – it is evident that the University of Kent is falling downwards in the pecking order of British universities. Surely this is a time when the authorities should be devoting their energies towards improving the University’s academic profile, rather than wasting resources alienating the local community for no academic purpose whatsoever.

The University has been deafeningly silent on another issue which is liable to do it great damage – Brexit. To combat the threat both to research money and to the flow of European students which Brexit involves needs greater energy and collaborative action together with the population of a city which voted Remain, and they should not be frittered away on something which alienates the local population and contributes nothing to the community.

I’m writing in relation to the Masterplan, much of which I agree with, such as the aim to ‘Reinforce the University’s reputation for excellence in all aspects of sustainability’ and ‘Create a more coherent landscape strategy with better woodland and species management’, both of which I think are excellent ambitions.

However, I am very disappointed and worried to see that the University plans to build on the southern slopes, in the woodland at the top of what is popularly known as ‘Chaucer Fields’, plus also convert the field/wooded areas into car parks beneath the Innovation Centre and above Chaucer College (beneath St. Edmunds). I would like to register my absolute objection to these plans and sincerely hope the University does not go through with them. Indeed, they entirely contradict the many excellent aims the university has, such as those I have quoted above.

As a member of the University of Kent community, I would like to express my concerns regarding plans to build new facilities on the Chaucer Fields. The reason for this is that the proposed location is an area of environmental, historical and social importance. Although the Masterplan has some wonderful ambitions, I noted that one of these ambitions is to enhance the setting of the University within its natural environment, and the development and construction of such a large complex on the Southern Slopes, in the woodland, would significantly spoil this ‘natural environment’. As such, the development of the complex on this area of land seems to contradict the abovementioned ambition. Additionally, I was pleased to take note that the Masterplan endorsed the UN Sustainable development goals and in light of this, I would urge a reconsideration of the location in which these facilities are to be built and choose instead a location in which such development has fewer environmental and social impacts.

I am writing to voice my concerns regarding continued plans to build a complex of residential, visitor and parking facilities on the University’s southern slopes. As you are well aware such plans have met with considerable opposition, not only from within your employees but among the residents that use and share that space. I am sure that you are also aware of the historical, cultural and ecological importance of the site. While I appreciate the need for the University to expand its facilities, I believe that this should be done in a site, and in a manner, that minimises the negative social and environmental impacts.

Although I am pleased that the University Strategy endorses the UN Sustainable Development Goals and many aspects of the Masterplan are clearly in line with these goals, I am writing to voice my concerns regarding the plans to develop on the University’s southern slopes, which, if realised, would clearly be out of line with these goals. You surely are already aware that these plans, owing to the historical, cultural and ecological importance of the planned site of development, have been met with considerable opposition from both a wide swathe of University employees and the Canterbury community at large. While I appreciate the need for the University to expand its facilities, it should do so in a way that will meet the sustainability goals we as an institution have endorsed, and avoid both the negative ecological repercussions and the unnecessary community dissatisfaction that the current plan will cause.
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I am writing to voice my concerns regarding continued plans to build a complex of residential, visitor and parking facilities on the University's southern slopes. I am sure that you are aware of the historical, cultural and ecological importance of the site. It is because this area is so important to the University and Canterbury community that these places have been met with opposition by staff, students and our neighbours.

While I appreciate the need for the University to expand its facilities, I believe that this should be done in a manner and location that minimises the negative social and environmental impact. Canterbury is a place entirely dependent on the preservation of its heritage, and so to diminish it in such a way seems short-sighted and inconsiderate to the larger community in which the University exists.

I am writing to voice my concerns regarding continued plans to build a complex of residential, visitor and parking facilities on the University's southern slopes. As you are well aware such plans have met with considerable opposition, not only from within your employees but among the residents that use and share that space. I am sure that you are also aware of the historical, cultural and ecological importance of the site.

While I appreciate the need for the University to expand its facilities I, like many others, believe that this should be done in a site, and in a manner, that minimises the negative social and environmental impacts.

I am pleased with many of the laudable aspects of the University Masterplan but I oppose the building and exploitation of Chaucer Fields. The plans to build on Chaucer Fields have been opposed by University of Kent staff and the larger residential community yet this opposition is blatantly disregarded in the University Masterplan. The University should consider building where there is the least negative environmental and social impact. Chaucer Fields matters to SAC staff and students – indeed, the destruction of woodlands fields includes a hedge enclosure planted by SAC DICE students.

Excellent vision in parts:
- Reinforce the University’s reputation for excellence in all aspects of sustainability
- Enhance the setting of the University within its natural environment
- Enrich the diverse landscape and the richness of the ecology which are amongst the University’s main assets
- Create a more coherent landscape strategy with better woodland and species management
- Respect for historic legacy and the built heritage from all eras
- Greater cohesion between the University, the City and Canterbury’s residents
- However, this is totally contradicted by the resurrection of the outrageous plans to build on southern slopes. These plans do not tick a single point in that list and make a mockery of what should be something to be proud of.

I am writing to voice my concerns regarding continued plans to build a complex of residential, visitor and parking facilities on the University's southern slopes. As you are well aware such plans have met with considerable opposition, not only from within your employees but among the residents that use and share that space. I am sure that you are also aware of the historical, cultural and ecological importance of the site.

While I appreciate the need for the University to expand its facilities I, like many others, believe that this should be done in a site, and in a manner, that minimises the negative social and environmental impacts.
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Such efforts blatantly contradict, moreover, the laudable commitment the University has made to endorsing the UN Sustainability Development Goals by integrating these within the University Strategy. It is clear to those of us who work on issues related to sustainability and well-being that the University needs to do a lot more to lessen its negative impact on the environment and demonstrate how institutions of higher learning can set the example by becoming part of the solution, and not the problem.

I am disheartened that the institution in which I base my efforts to help our students make a positive contribution to the world and address the monumental challenges facing them and their children would project itself through such actions as such a poor role model. The University of Kent has the potential and indeed the intellectual and moral responsibility to demonstrate good practice and the active transition to a carbon-free and sustainable society, based on careful and considerate forethought, consultation and planning.

• ‘There should be no development on the southern slopes – to do so would be inconsistent with the notions of consolidation and intensification of the Campus Heart; it would also be seen as provocative and misguided by local residents as well as staff, students, local public authorities and relevant charities and societies, who evidently value the environmental/heritage character of the landscape and the wide range of activities it permits in its unspoilt form. It would be deeply counter-productive to ongoing efforts to foster stronger ties between the University and these constituencies to continue to threaten it with development.’

• I hope that the University can see a way forward to promote environment and well-being on campus not through further construction of buildings, but through further care and enhancement of our green spaces. I would also like to see further consideration and facilitation being devoted to sustainability and green initiatives, including but not limited to encouraging environmentally-friendly commuting (walking and cycling).

I am strongly opposed to the proposed development on Chaucer Fields. Others have already provided plenty of very persuasive reasons but I would note that if we want a hotel/conference facility it would make more sense for it to be at the back of the campus, or indeed within the city where we could much more easily attract regular and higher paying delegates and could also more easily guarantee that the accommodation was in use even when conferences are not scheduled e.g. by academic visitors and tourists. It is quite surprising that this proposal has been resurrected given the concerted opposition it evokes. It is important that the University does not behave in a way that disregards such strongly and widely held views because that sends a signal that it regards its members with a degree of contempt. Not a very good approach.

The dubiety and questionable quality of both our existing and any proposed future student accommodation also suggests that we might want to consider converting some of our existing accommodation or its locations rather than eating up more valuable green space (e.g. in the event that student numbers decline, as seems likely).

I am concerned regarding the Master plan of the University especially in light of the plans to build a hotel/conference facility in Chaucer Fields. That area is of great importance historically but also to provide an amazing view of the city for all to share. To build something to block such a view for commercial/profit generating purpose does not seem to reflect what University of Kent is about.

Also, I think we need to be very careful about the general environmental impact the new Masterplan will have, especially in this day and age. I would suggest a careful reconsideration in this regard.
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- I had intended to write a plea to protect Chaucer Fields, because walking through the fields from my home to my University office is the lynchpin of my work-life balance. Losing my commute through green space to a concrete parking lot is something that I am very fearful of.
- However, even greater is my fear of anything that may threaten the financial stability of the University of Kent, which I have had the privilege of working at for nearly 14 years. A recent article in the Guardian has made me realise just how risky it is to build a conference centre at all.
- Whatever ultimately happens with Brexit, everything indicates that the hostile environment toward immigrants will be extended to all foreigners who do not meet certain salary requirements, and that the majority of academics around the world will not meet these requirements. In this climate we need to be extremely cautious about investing in a conference centre that aims to attract international meetings, because immigration policies already make it prohibitively difficult for international organisations to hold conferences in the UK.
- It would be extremely embarrassing to the University if it destroyed valuable green space to build a failed conference centre. It would no doubt become a national scandal.
- When was the market research for the conference centre conducted? If it was before the Brexit referendum, then please can you let me know when it will be updated?
- Also, please can you let me know when the business case was written and where I can find a copy of it, so I can see whether it takes the hostile environment into account?

Although the responses are vague, the only conclusion that I can draw is that there is no market research or business case for a conference hotel. If I was unclear in my original email, I would like to see any market research/business case, even if it is only from 2012 when the proposal to build a conference hotel was originally presented and strongly opposed by the local (and university) community.

The response I received from the Masterplan team suggests that the conference hotel is one of many blue sky’s ideas, which may or may not be taken forward in the future. However, at the recent V-C open forum Karen was asked about the plan to build a conference hotel in Chaucer Fields. I believe she referred to the hotel as a ‘fait accompli’ and mentioned receiving expert advice that this hotel needs to be built on the southern slopes.

I am confused about why senior management would bring in experts to determine the best location to build a conference hotel, when it has not even done the market research to determine whether a conference hotel is a wise investment for the University in the first place. Surely, this is placing the cart before the horse.

Likewise, I don’t understand why you are having a meeting with local residents, before it has even been determined whether a conference hotel is a financially viable idea or not. I can only imagine it creating a lot of upset, for potentially no reason.

Last year one of my colleagues designed a new MA pathway. It required no new modules or resources (other than a web page) and would have been an exciting new collaboration between SAC and the Business School. But we could not put it on because the EMS research said ‘no.’ It troubles me that such a controversial, risky and potentially destructive idea would be included in the Masterplan, which is being made public and presented to the local Council, when there is no market research or business case to justify it.

- With reference to your proposal, whilst I wish the Kent University to remain a successful university forever, I do not believe that building a hotel, conference hall and car parks will attract the surge of tourists claimed with the Masterplan.
- It is a fact that student numbers are in decline for all UK Universities and it is also a fact that all HE organisations are looking to expand the commercialization of their assets and services in order to overcome the deficit created by the decline of student numbers.
- I do not support the building of a hotel, conference hall and car parks in any of the fields, woods and farmland, on the ground that the construction of any buildings is not going to be beneficial.
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to the students, whose experience and wellness are and should always be at the heart of any HE organisation.

• Canterbury already has a considerable number of hotels and car parks and the University already has Woollf building as a conference hall. I don't know which type of tourists the University is aiming to attract, but it will be those tourists who seek affordable or expensive hotels alike for the reason that they are in the heart of the city – not three miles away and owned and managed by a university.

• In my opinion this plan does not have the "students' first" in mind. Kent University should focus on the investment and commercialisation of its own research, copyright, intellectual property and on technologies instead. Reap what you sow; the hard work of yesterday and todays students, for the benefit of students of tomorrow.

• The University should look at demolishing some of its existing buildings. It should be more innovative and inventive with the rebuild of new ones in the exact same locations. Darwin, for example, could be the new Darwin Hotel, with an underground car park, with the retention of its current surrounding green and trees.

• Has the University asked its own students to design and revamp its campus maybe? How do students feel about their University ground and the proposal to destroy its green fields, the nature, the environment?

• I see no economic advantage for Canterbury to progress with the plan. The University should employ architects and managers with an environmentally friendly aptitude at the heart of their design.

• As for another park and ride in Canterbury, why not building one on the field behind Kingsmead Leisure centre? Or use the site where Serco used to be to make a super car park and underground too? (does the council really have the funding to build the complex that nobody really needs as there are sufficient cinemas, leisure centres and supermarkets in town, without the need to congest the city further with more traffic caused by a new complex?).

I am 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 latest version of the Masterplan. 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. Much work on both sides has gone into repairing this relationship over the past few years. 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 an Area of High Landscape Value, obstruction of views over World Heritage Site; etc) are still fully valid today. The University's own Strategic Spatial Vision Consultation Statement (November 2017) states: "The importance of Chaucer Fields as a backdrop to the city and World Heritage Site is acknowledged.” (p31). It is so disappointing to see continued proposals to develop this site.

The University’s site evaluation document of 2011 attempted to justify development of Chaucer Fields by ruling out other potential sites as unsuitable. However, several 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 Masterplan as a highly suitable development site. Clearly the 2011 site evaluation has been completely superseded. The University’s extensive landholdings contain many other potential sites for a “conferencing hotel”, which are much more suitable than Chaucer Fields.

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. I urge the University to abandon plans to develop this area for commercial gain, and accept in its long-term Masterplan that the southern slopes should form part of a permanent “Green Gap” between the University...
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and nearby residential areas, as is already in place on the boundaries with Blean and Tyler Hill.

I am very surprised to see a continued proposal to develop a new “Southern Entrance” to campus, based on a walking / cycling route along the old Crab and Winkle railway embankment, and possibly even involving a bus service. It seems to be conflated with the possible creation of a new entrance to Canterbury West station on its north side; but this is a completely separate issue.

The earlier round of consultation saw a number of adverse comments about the idea of developing the southern railway embankment, but the University seems to have ignored these.

Land ownership – the University does not own this land. Notably, a key stretch just to the south of the old tunnel is part of the grounds of the Archbishop’s School, which is sensitive about public access close to its children’s classrooms and playing fields. The portal to the old railway tunnel is in a resident’s private garden.

Conservation – this part of the old railway embankment is a conservation area; partly because of its railway heritage, and partly because the vegetation with many mature trees represents an important wildlife corridor promoting biodiversity. To clear a route for a shuttle bus would cause great environmental damage and would never be given planning approval.

Topography – the gradient required for the new route at the southern portal of the old railway tunnel is almost vertical! It is far too steep even for a walking route, much less to operate a shuttle bus.

Impact on local residents – a route running at the rear of residents’ houses, on an embankment overlooking their back gardens and on a level with upper-floor bedroom windows, would create severe privacy problems for residents. Any lighting installed on the embankment would be intrusive. Existing problems with night-time street noise would simply be transferred from the front of residents’ houses to the rear.

Security for users – the current walking / cycling route (St Michael’s Road – Salisbury Road – Lyndhurst Close), is well-lit with clear visibility. A new route at the rear of residential gardens would be more secluded, and much less secure.

The whole concept of developing the old railway embankment as a major southern access route to campus seems completely implausible. It would not even be any shorter than the present route. I am astonished to see it being taken seriously at this stage of the planning process.

I am concerned at the suggestion for development of the “bomb crater” on the Southern Slopes as an open-air theatre. This was originally a completely theoretical student project in Architecture, but it now appears in the Masterplan. The site lacks any infrastructure (electrical supply for lighting; plumbing for toilets; etc) and is often flooded in wet weather.

More importantly for local residents, no consideration appears to have been given to how audiences would access the theatre site. It is some distance from car parks on the main part of campus (more so if these are moved away from the campus heartlands, as proposed). It seems probable that people would instead try to park in the nearby residential streets (Lyndhurst Close, Salisbury Road), and walk the short distance up the Eliot Footpath. Some means would need to be found to prevent this, without inconveniencing local residents.
I sadly missed your recent public meeting in Tyler Hill Village Hall, but my neighbour has briefed me as to what you are proposing in planning future Campus Development in the Alcroft Grange area. Little Hall Farm is surrounded by 14 acres of land that the University does not own, and I was intrigued by your proposed public footpath, seemingly routed through its land. This of course would be something I would not agree to, and wonder what the purpose of such a pathway would be anyway. Your students and other walkers litter the lane and your fields enough already, without encouraging further footfall. Apart from that, I agree wholeheartedly with all the points that my neighbour has already made to you regarding an overspill car park/student accommodation – which appears to be outside your designated Masterplan area anyway. I hope you will give due consideration to the points made in this letter.

I attended the consultation event at Blean Village Hall and provided some comments on the feedback form there, but I found the form very unsuited to making the comments I wish to make, and am therefore sending this additional email.

1. I strongly object to the proposed location for a conference hotel, for the following reasons:
   - It is fundamentally incompatible with the core principles of the Masterplan.
   - It is incompatible with Canterbury City Council’s Local Plan, in particular with the designation of the southern slopes as part of an Area of High Landscape Value.
   - It is contrary to the conclusion of the Village Green public enquiry that the fields of the southern slopes are a much-valued asset for the local community.
   - It would completely ignore the feedback from the previous consultations and make a nonsense of the consultation process.
   - It would do irrevocable damage to relations between the University and the local community.

   If a conference hotel is needed, I suggest that it should be located on the other side of University Road, in the vicinity of Beverley Farmhouse. This would satisfy all the same criteria, would have additional advantages, and would avoid the objections.

2. I welcome the statement of ‘What You Have Told Us’, in particular the messages from the previous consultations to intensify the campus heart to conserve the surrounding landscape. Maintain a ‘Green Gap’ between the University and the city. Enrich the landscape and biodiversity of the campus. I hope that all these messages will be heeded and followed.

3. I strongly support the principles for enhancing the environment, in particular
   - Conserving and enriching the pastoral landscape of University Rise...
   - Restoring historic planting of the University Rise area
   - Improving and extending woodland habitats
   - Conserving and restoring the open grass slopes overlooking the city and augmenting them with orchards
   - I note that these principles are incompatible with building a hotel on one of the fields on the slopes and removing the wooded area there.

4. I welcome in principle the objective of promoting community engagement, and I note that this could be particularly relevant to the ideas for restoring and enhancing the fields on the southern slopes, but I note also that such engagement by local people would not be forthcoming if the proposal to locate the conference hotel on those fields is retained.

5. I support the idea of recreating the traditional orchards on the fields of the southern slopes. This would be a good replacement for the diseased horse chestnut trees in the south-east field. I would also welcome ways of enhancing the landscape of the field immediately below University Road, where either a wildflower meadow or a wildflower strip bordering the road would be a great asset.
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6. I support the focus on place-making for the Campus Heart to create a better sense of arrival and make it easier to find one’s way around.

7. I strongly support the creation of the Kent Community Oasis Garden. I attended the opening event, I believe that it is an excellent initiative, and I hope that it will be properly resourced by the University.

8. I support in principle the creation of new and improved cycle and pedestrian routes. However, it has to be recognised that the idea of using the old railway embankment parallel to St. Michael's Road for this purpose is a non-starter. There is no access to it from Beverley Road and the only access at the southern end is via very steep steps from St. Michael's Road. It has been suggested that promoting it as a new route might take some of the night-time noise away from St. Michael's Road. However, rather than doing so, it would simply transfer the disturbance from the front bedrooms to the back bedrooms of the houses in the road. The embankment is a wooded track pleasant to walk in but totally unsuited to be a main thoroughfare. Much better would be to improve the signage and layout, including ground markings, for the cycle route through St. Michael’s Road linking the Eliot footpath with the cycle route on the other side of Beverley Road, and to create a better crossing point for cyclists and pedestrians at that point on Beverley Road.

9. I support bringing back into use the old Crab and Winkle railway route north of the campus as a cycle and pedestrian route to Tyler Hill Road. I doubt whether it would do much to improve access to the campus, as it would not be a convenient route for many people, but it would be a valuable asset for cyclists and walkers in the community.

10. I support the creation of a swimming pool as a medium-term development. This has been an aspiration ever since the University was founded. It would be very welcome if this aim could finally be realised.

11. I support in principle the creation of an additional 2,000 student bed spaces on campus, provided a suitable location is identified in the central part of the campus. I support the idea that this could best be done by making better use of the Park Wood village area.

12. I believe that the re-location of Blean Primary School could be an improvement if it were thoughtfully done and with the full co-operation of the school and local people.

13. I support the proposal to create a University Square as a proper entrance to the campus, with a Welcome/Reception area, Information Point, etc, creating a sense of arrival and orientation.

14. I support in principle the idea of a Wetlands area around the Sarre Penn, but this needs to be sensitively done. The Sarre Penn and the approach to it through Brotherhood Wood comprise the closest rural area to the campus, and its rural character should be strictly preserved and not disturbed. The references to ‘Sarre Penn Court’ and ‘Sarre Penn Way’ sound ominous. There should be no development in those locations. Any enhancements should be confined to projects such as the creation of a small boardwalk across the muddy area by the stream at the bottom of Brotherhood Wood, to facilitate access.

15. A new safe route from the Old Salt Road and Blean Church to Blean village would be good.
16. I oppose the creation of a new car park at the beginning of University Road. Reducing car traffic in the Campus Heart sounds nice but this is not a good way to do it. It would completely spoil the attractive entrance to the University Road. A car park there would be a long way from the centre of the campus, and a significant number of people would not be able to struggle up the long hill. Some other way of transporting them from the car park to the campus centre would be needed, thereby largely defeating the object of the exercise! A better proposal is to create more space on the Giles Lane car park by making it multi-storey, perhaps with one additional level of parking and, above that, a level of office space. Long-term, the only answer to the problem of cars and the parking problem is to reduce car usage – difficult though that is. Bear in mind that at present many staff and students use the streets below the University (Salisbury Road, St. Michael’s Road) as a car park.

17. Don’t build on the southern slopes!

Fred Birkbeck (who previously had a career in finance) graduated with a first in classical and archaeological studies this summer, having won the dissertation prize for his geophysical survey of university land in Blean. His results are impressive, and have implications for land use, in relation to current planning guidance.

As you are no doubt well aware, all development work on the Canterbury Campus is almost certain to be made subject to planning conditions requiring an archaeological assessment, or even works which can delay and add massive cost to individual projects. This is what we saw with Turing College. It is unsurprising given the proximity of Bigbury Hillfort and the iron age oppidum and Roman city of Durovernum.

I would strongly suggest we arrange a brief meeting to present Fred’s work, as this provides a non-destructive assessment of what is and what is not present on different parts of land that the University owns. It is cheap as it uses existing equipment in our department that is under-utilised.

For 20 years now, archaeology has not involved dodging between bulldozers but rather has been an integral part of the planning system under the ‘polluter pays’ principle.

A few years ago, we had a campus survey, led by archaeology, which sought to assist this by mapping what archaeology was present on our land. I would suggest that Fred is well-placed to renew such an initiative, and to provide information to inform planning choices (i.e. where one can build with no impact) as much as to enrich the stories that can be told about the campus, to its visitors and its inhabitants.

To be frank such a development is long over-due, and the absence of an archaeological assessment from the existing campus plans does expose them to unnecessary risk and cost.

Although in favour of many aspects of the University Masterplan, especially the centralisation of buildings on campus, we cannot understand why the University has again performed a u-turn with regard to a conference centre and hotel on Chaucer Fields, despite knowing the huge amount of opposition this previously generated. We thought that the University had finally realised how strongly this was opposed by almost all local residents in north Canterbury, most counsellors on both Canterbury City Council and Kent County Council and even most staff and students at the University.

The Masterplan states: “Possible development of a conference centre and hotel (subject to funding)”. As the University is in a difficult financial position at the moment leading to belt-tightening due to factors such as increased pension contributions, it doesn’t seem to make sense to exacerbate this by spending a great deal of money on a new conference centre.
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The proposed conference centre and especially the hotel is anyway purely a money-making exercise: it has little academic value, and is a prime example of how the University is increasingly a business whose main purpose is to make money rather than an educational institution. No wonder it is dropping sharply in the university league tables. There are already many hotels in Canterbury and no requirement for more. Many of the conferences, such as the Lambeth Conference, take place in the vacations anyway, when there is ample high-quality accommodation on campus to accommodate them.

The plans for the conference centre directly contradict the following points made in the plan on page 8: Intensify the Campus Heart to conserve the surrounding landscape – Page 8 How is building well away from the centre intensifying the Campus Heart?

Maintain a ‘Green Gap’ between the University and the city – Page 8
The conference centre and hotel would reduce the Green Gap, and may be the thin edge of the wedge. There would be a strong temptation for the University to continue with further building next to the conference centre in future.

Enrich the landscape and biodiversity of the campus – Page 8
How will chopping down a coppice of beautiful 100+ year old trees, containing great biodiversity where the centre is proposed to be built do this?

Improve connections between the University, the city and its residents – Page 8
The conference centre would destroy relations with the local community. All the hard work Wayne Campbell has been doing in building relations with the local community would be destroyed and, just as occurred three years ago, there will again be posters in many house windows in North Canterbury, and banners in gardens protesting against the university’s heavy-handed approach, again ignoring the views of local residents.

We thought that the University had finally realised how strongly this was opposed by almost all local residents in north Canterbury, most counsellors for both Canterbury City Council and Kent County Council (e.g. Graham Gibben) and even most students and members of staff at the University.

Reinforce the University’s reputation for excellence in sustainable development – Page 8 How would the conference centre do this?
Damages the main selling point of the University to students. A recent survey found that the main reason students choose university is not league tables, but the campus visit.

The prime reason students come to Kent is the beautiful rural campus: I’ve talked to many students about this over the years. It is not because they want to come to a concrete jungle like many other campuses. Concreting over the lovely coppice right next to University Road, literally the first thing students see when they visit the University and replacing it with another anonymous glass and concrete building would be shooting themselves in the foot.

Alternative locations
If the University is set on building a conference centre on campus, why not build it next to Hothe Court where it would not be contentious and attract no opposition, or as mentioned in the plan, near Blean School, where the University recently purchased land, instead of the proposed 30 houses. Or some of the oldest low-density student houses in Park Wood could be replaced by the CC, perhaps in conjunction to building in the grounds of Hothe Court.
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As a close neighbour of the university land I enjoy the amenity offered by the southern slopes. I walk on the slopes several times a week and in their frequent visits my grandchildren use the slopes to play, cycle and scooter on and climb the trees. So, I fully supported not just for myself but also for all others users of the area the Save Chaucer Fields Campaign that fought hard to save this area for the future. I was very pleased when the University dropped its confrontational approach to dealing with residents, promising instead to discuss any plans with residents, these plans at the time envisaged at the most a small number of ‘Pavilion’ like properties on the southern slopes.

Suddenly the proposal for a 150-bed Conference Hotel on the slopes is back on the Masterplan. Basically, I support the University, it is a major employer and a major contributor to the viability of the city of Canterbury and the standard of architecture of recent buildings, like the Business School and the library extension, are top class.

But the University should not go back on its word, what is being proposed is not a ‘pavilion’. If it is necessary, I am sure ‘Save Chaucer Fields’ will reform to fight this, with my full support.

I don't think it is an argument in favour of the hotel that it takes up only a corner of the slopes, in my opinion once it is agreed it will open the flood gates to further developments on this small but beautiful area.

I believe the land area of the University is about a square-mile, plenty of space to find a less sensitive plot for the conference hotel.

The University has identified a campus boundary, shown as a red line on its maps, but seems intent on development outside of this boundary when there is a vast area of equally undeveloped, equally agricultural land within it. Why? This relatively small development could easily be built within the boundary without any impact or disruption to residents. What is the significance of the plot at the top of St. Stephen's Hill? How would the University hope to facilitate safe access and egress to either the accommodation plan or car park given that this is already a very busy intersection?

What is the purpose of establishing new footpaths when a perfectly adequate network already exists on that land? What is the University trying to connect? Why do they believe bringing the footpaths closer to residents’ properties are acceptable? There are enough difficulties with students on the lane as it is, without creating more in the fields behind my boundary.

I should say that I am not against the University – in fact, I am an ex-student and qualified at the Business School. I recognise that the University strives, in many ways, to be a good neighbour. We benefit from regular campus security patrols and appreciated the re-fencing of fields to deter bikers from riding recklessly on the fields. However, I do not think I am alone in worrying about the university’s intentions for the land they own in our neighbourhood. It rather feels that we are watching a game of Monopoly unfold around us, in which the University snaps up, often without any fanfare, any and every piece of land it can acquire either side of the lane. When a staff member realised where my neighbour lived, she immediately asked her if she wanted to sell! This may or may not have been an attempt at humour but if nothing else it demonstrates a lack of understanding about the anxiety caused by the university’s acquisitions to local residents.

I am fortunate to live in a beautiful, quiet part of Canterbury, surrounded by stunning Kent countryside, just minutes from the city centre. My concerns may well sound like nimbysim to the University, but I would counter with my original argument – why aim to develop outside of your boundary and impact the quality of lives your neighbours (and ex-students/teaching staff) experience when you have perfectly adequate resources within the boundary? To do so seems unnecessary, crass and thoughtless to me.

If the University is determined, irrespective of need and local concerns, to pursue development of “St. Stephen's Square”, then can it not at least offer residents affected along the lane the reassurance of a buffer zone beyond which it agrees not to pursue developments or, more helpfully, the opportunity for residents to buy the fields beyond the development to prevent any such possibility? A line in the sand seems reasonable and might allow the University to be more open and relaxed about its intentions.
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Whilst I appreciate that it is a very intensive and arduous process that the University has to go through in order to develop its ‘plan’, one would have thought that the opportunity for adjacent residents to voice their concerns directly with the University (outside of the official presentations), would have exhibited a more genuine concern for those people that will be directly (and adversely) affected by the proposals. Some of us do not get the opportunity to attend the ‘official’ functions so easily. One should have thought that a rapidly-expanding campus is not as promising as you may suggest (I would refer to the ‘upset’ caused by the last election result, where itinerant voters set the course for the political landscape locally – as their preference was for a party with a more sympathetic view to the apparent plight of students – and upon graduating they depart Canterbury forever.) If academic excellence is your goal, and not existence as a commercial enterprise, then quality and not quantity would be your aim, surely?

I had the option to study at a great many universities, but what sold me on Kent was a drone video I saw that showed off all the green spaces on and around campus. That’s also what led me to live in Parkwood, as I really liked the wooded path between Parkwood and the main campus.

I can undoubtedly say that I would have chosen another school for my study abroad had there been less green spaces on campus. I implore you to protect and preserve Chaucer Fields and the surrounding green spaces. Once you’ve built, you can’t bring it back to nature.

I am a resident of St. Stephen’s and a former University employee. I oppose the current development proposals for the southern slopes of the University. The broad Masterplan has ideas about concentrating building and making the campus more coherent for those living, working and visiting there.

However, the destruction of the unbuilt historic parkland to the south of the University affects the edges of the campus, and does so in a way that is detrimental to the area as a whole. It will diminish Canterbury’s character as an historic city set in countryside and make it a less pleasant place as residents, workers and visitors experience increased traffic, noise and light pollution and lose access to precious open green space.

Kent defines itself as a European and international institution. That’s an attractive and potentially inspiring way to go. Replacing fields and trees with a hotel and car parks while we see global temperatures rise, habitats vanish, species become extinct, thanks to untrammelled ‘growth’ and ‘development’ on a large scale, seems an unthinking policy for a university to undertake. Are business and hotel development really core priorities for an educational institution? I don’t think they should be.

The University should give proper, serious attention to alternative proposals and rethink the Masterplan along lines that respect the views of the wider local residential community and the arguments against developing the southern slopes. Something can emerge that would be better for everyone.

I am emailing to register my protest at the Campus Masterplan. It is little more than another, barely disguised attempt to build on Chaucer Fields. This utterly disingenuous exercise in green space vandalism will cost a fortune whilst, at the same time, dozens of part-time teachers are in the process of losing their jobs and full-time staff are having their research days cut in half. What the University requires is more seminar rooms and up-to-date teaching facilities, not another corporate monstrosity.

Many of the aims of the Masterplan are laudable e.g. Bringing development back to the heart of the campus. However, the one feature of the Masterplan which is going to cause the most concern among the local residents is the proposed conference centre, planned for the southern slopes adjacent to the Chaucer College. This parkland open space of the southern slopes is much valued by the local community and by students who rate it as one of the reasons for choosing UKC.
Comments

The planned conference centre is the fourth development UKC have proposed for this section, aka Chaucer Fields, of the southern slopes in the last eight years. The first two developments were withdrawn by UKC following local objection, including a 2,000-signature petition. Local people spent time and money trying to have the southern slopes designated a village green to protect it for posterity. While this failed, it did demonstrate the strength of local feeling against development on the southern slopes. Following this enquiry relations and lines of communication between UKC and local residents improved. The first Masterplan version did place a ‘pavilions’ development on the southern slopes. This raised suspicions about UKC’s intentions, but the time-scale was distant and the nature of a ‘pavilion’ ill-defined. Now with the second version of the Masterplan on the table the suspicions appear to have been well-founded. The conference centre proposal is very disappointing to local residents who feel let down. After establishing better relations this proposal is going to bring UKC and local residents back into conflict.

Local residents have made it clear that development south of University Road is not acceptable to them. This is our red line. The campus map shows plenty of open spaces elsewhere for a similar size development nearby and further away. The area to the east of the Innovation Centre for instance would have the same infrastructure benefits. The Masterplan’s guiding principle of bringing development back to the centre of the campus is flouted by this proposed location.

I was pleased to meet several of the UKC staff at this exhibition and consultation session and have frank discussions with them. I found the feedback form frankly ‘useless’ as a means of the public expressing their views on the Masterplan. At least there was space after each question for a free response. This is one of the main reasons why I am emailing my views to you.

At the same time, I hope that the completed feedback forms, barring personal details, will be published on line. UKC would be displaying transparency rather than allowing a summary to invite criticism.

I note that the most recent version of the Masterplan still envisages building on Chaucer Fields. As you are no doubt aware this was strongly opposed by local residents when first mooted. Objections were made on a number of grounds but I personally drew attention to the damage this would do to the University’s relations with the community in which it is situated. This objection seems to me to be of considerable weight and I hope that you will give it serious consideration when you come again to examine the project.

I am writing to register my horror and frustration at discovering that this proposal for a 150-room ‘conferencing hotel’ on Chaucer Fields/the southern slopes is back on the agenda for the 2020s. Evidently you feel absolutely free to disregard all the feedback you have received from the university community (UCU, staff more generally, KU, and students more generally), as well as local residents and civil society groups, over the course of no less than seven years. Evidently you feel free to pay no attention whatsoever to Canterbury City Council’s aspiration to protect this vital and very beautiful green space in the city. And evidently you feel entirely free to disregard even your own principles, according to which this development should be concentrated in the core part of the campus.

As a fellow member of staff, I am writing to express my grave concern at the University’s plans to press ahead with the redevelopment of Chaucer Fields as part of stage 2 of its Masterplan process for the 2020s. I am aware that you may be receiving a high volume of emails at this time, and so thank you in advance for considering this one also.

I absolutely commend the decision to move the proposed conference centre and hotel closer to Chaucer College and in so doing keep with the proper plan that redevelopment should be focussed on the campus rather than absorbing – and, yes, ruining – valuable green space. However, the issue remains that valuable green space entrusted to the university at its inception 50
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years ago – an event we have been busy celebrating – was not gifted in order to be exploited, as will be the case if these plans continue.

It is not necessary for me to post links to the studies which demonstrate that natural surroundings, green space, and fresh air are beneficial for mental health. If our university truly cares about students with mental health problems – a very high number of my own have anxiety-related ILPs – then it makes little sense to press ahead with a decision to concrete over yet more of this beneficial space.

I am so touched and proud of this University at recruitment days, and meeting new students (for example, at first-year induction last week) when they praise how beautiful the campus is and the surrounding area, and how it fitted with their vision of an English campus university. (My American students, in particular, gleam with pride at showing their new home off). I am hard-pressed to imagine other universities as lucky as ours, such as Nottingham with its spectacular wooded and hilly campus, concreting over it! It is sad to think that I, and my students, will no longer share in that pride.

Please, protect what we have inherited. The reputation of the University will be damaged by these proposals. Preserving, rather than concreting over, our green space will keep our campus beautiful, will retain the necessary levels of luxuriance to attract students and care adequately for those already here, and will show that this university cares about what its community thinks. My understanding is that there has been widespread opposition to the plans to erect yet another ugly building to interrupt a glorious skyline. How much better it would be to invest the money into turning that beautiful space into something that our students can use more regularly, and for teaching purposes too. Outdoor tutorials, anxiety workshops with student support, outdoor exercise classes…the list goes on.

I have noted that plans for a 150-room “conferencing hotel” have now been added as part of Stage Two of the campus masterplan, due for development after 2020. This addition seems to disregard the feedback from the University community (UCU, staff in general, Kent Union, and students more generally), as well as local residents and civil society groups that have been received over the last seven years. This addition also seems to directly contradict the emerging campus Masterplan principles, which insist that development should be concentrated in the core part of the campus.

Given that feedback and the Masterplan’s principles are both being ignored, please could you indicate how feedback and consultation will be used within the planning process, and what the priorities are during the consultation process?

I was concerned to learn that the discredited plan to build over Chaucer Fields and the lower slopes of the University has been reinstated in the new plan. As you will be aware this project has been subject to extensive opposition locally in the community and among members of the University. To adopt it would be a foolish and destructive move that would damage the university and its setting forever: a tragedy in the long term. I urge you to pull back from this mistake.

Good idea to move car parking to the edges. However, this means that some visitors and residents (unlike your average 18-year-old) will need easy transport to the place of their choice on campus. As I said, it’s one of the largest campus sites in Britain and there will be a need – if you shift the car parks – for electric buses/buggies et al to get folk to buildings, especially from the western entrance close to Whitstable Road and the city of Canterbury ex pub. It’s just not walkable for anyone with mild to severe disabilities, and I’m sure you wouldn’t want that.
Separate point: I completely understand the need for a conference centre with somewhat posher and modern accommodation for delegates that that contained in the Colleges themselves. However, where you plan to locate it will attract the maximum opposition as it interrupts and damages the views towards Canterbury, which is one of the joys of the site. I would move it to Park Wood Road or somewhere close to the main Colleges with a separate car access point for those visitors. Easy to do and will avoid an unnecessary fight.

Separate point: Some of the older 1960s-early 1970s buildings, especially the administrative buildings, aren’t terribly distinguished as they were built at a time of restricted capex and therefore have little design input. I think you should review their future as they are on the main axis of development.

The Masterplan presentation was good and interesting. The concentration of new developments within the existing core is welcome and that underground parking will be provided.

The proposal to use the old railway line from Tyler Hill Road to the University as a walking/cycling route is excellent. However, this must be in place before any other development takes place. Leading on re-opening of the tunnel under the University would improve access to the proposed transport hub at Canterbury West. The tunnel entrance is almost in the centre of the campus and would provide a gentle slope up and down University Hill. This would encourage more walking and cycling. The proposal for a new entrance via Blean School with housing raises concerns with conflicts of traffic with national cycle route one. The housing is welcome as is new student accommodation on campus. The ideal site for a conference centre would be where the estates offices are!
An online student petition has been organised. This states that

"Chaucer Fields are a pride point of the University of Kent. An open area of grassland, woodland and hedgerows just across from Keynes bus stop and down the hill, providing beautiful views of the city and home to a wide range of wildlife. The University of Kent are planning to pave over these areas for a 150-bed hotel and conference centre as part of its "Framework Masterplan".

"As students at the University of Kent, we are strongly opposed to this plan as it's a loss of an aesthetic view and an important social space for the students and local community alike. As a Wildlife Conservation student, it is a worry for all the unprotected wildlife that will be displaced."

"There are only a few days left until discussions are closed so please sign as soon as you can, to make a difference! For more information about the development plans and an extensive list of reasons why to oppose this, visit: http://www.savechaucerfields.com/mapimpact.html"

#SaveItDon'tPaveIt

3,382 signatures (as of 28-12-18 – 10.15)

Reasons for signing petition

- There is enough development in the area. We NEED some green to live.
- This is a beautiful view of Canterbury and should not be lost.
- Green spaces in cities and towns are more important than hotels!
- This wonderful, unspoilt green space provides essential habitat for wildlife and invaluable amenity for people. As research increasingly shows the importance for health and well-being of regular time spent in nature, it would be nothing short of tragic for this space to be lost to the city of Canterbury.
- This petition is a great contribution to the ongoing and varied collective efforts of the residential and university communities to fight this monstrosity!
- Canterbury is developing far too fast and without proper planning for the future.
- Nature is essential for our mental well-being. Does Kent want productive students?
- How about, for once, greedy businessmen, whose priority in life is to make more money than they actually need, leave the Chaucer Fields as they are, a beautiful natural site that serves the well-being of all, except themselves.
- The current level of woodland and open space on the campus is really conducive to staff and student well-being. Let’s not allow the commodification of education to further undermine well-being.
- Once it's gone its gone. this image from Chaucer Fields is the classic image in the movie a Canterbury tale and will be a great loss to Canterbury and its students and the view of the trees and the nature that it holds. This area has also been used for nature talks as well. We have all the hotels we need and this will just prove again capitalism needs to overkill quite literally.
- These woods and walks are a benefit to all; it’s a travesty to destroy them at a time when it’s becoming clear that walking in nature is good for mental health and students’ stress levels are rising. The wildlife that lives there needs a home too!
- It goes against everything this University should be standing for.
- I love Chaucer Fields.
- When I was struggling, I spent many hours sat on the grass overlooking the view of the cathedral and city scape. It gave me such great strengths of hope and peace. Don't deprive other struggling people!!!!
- The University of Kent is situated on a gorgeous hilltop overlooking the city of Canterbury. Much of the campus appeal would be lost with development on this field, and the view would definitely disappear. I could never forget looking out of the library at some early hour and watching the cathedral appear at sunrise.
- There is already plenty of accommodation spare for conference speakers and such. The green spaces are a rare delight for many universities these days and something we’d like to protect as well as many of the habitats of the creatures who live in sites where this would be built!
• We need every green space we can get, the fact that someone would even consider paving over green spaces in our current state of climate change is disgusting.
• Chaucer Fields are too beautiful to be paved over by a hotel! A hotel is commonplace and can be stuck anywhere, but Chaucer Fields are a huge part of the University of Kent's beauty.
• I want Chaucer Fields to stay green!
• Countryside needs to be protected in urban areas and wildlife will have nowhere to go if we don't stop and think a little more often.
• Let us achieve 5000 Voices Soonest. Environmental Carnage!
• Once again, we witness a UK university behaving like a greedy, rapacious corporate with no regard for green space. Gavin Eshler, Karen Cox and the rest of the senior management team I expect better from you.
• The iconic view and green space to relax will be lost for the rise of more cooperate buildings for which the University focus on making more money at the expense of its students’ education.
• It's a beautiful setting ... leave well alone
• We need our trees!
• A hotel on campus...no thanks!
• UKC cannot be allowed to do this. That area is stunningly beautiful and should not be ruined by building on it.
• I’m passionate about wildlife and sick to death of seeing Kent concreted over. Give wildlife a chance!
• This is an awful idea which demonstrates more than ever that those in control of the University do not understand what the students value about it so much. Don't sell off Kent's distinctive, unique qualities – rather invest the money in education itself.
• My daughter is at Canterbury and she loves the wildlife side of the campus. They can’t do this. It would ruin the campus and also the views from Canterbury itself!
• I was a student at the uni and spent many happy moments walking through the field. It is a place to be at peace. This helps students with stress and their general well-being.
• I love that space – especially during the summer. It's nice to hang out with friends etc.
• I've enjoyed such beautiful and scenic walks to town, please #saveitdon'tpaveit!!
• The reason people come to this campus is because it is green and beautiful.
• Green space is becoming even more important in cities for young people to use.
• Sometimes staring out into nature is good for the soul. Helps to clear the mind and enables you to think straight. The simple things. God knows we all need to de-stress at some point
• As a graduate student I fondly remember the scenic beauty of Kent. The University would not feel the same if this plan were to go forward and would be a detriment to future students
• Green spaces are very important. Build over this one to provide a hotel and conference centre? What a waste that would be. And all for money? Shame on the people behind the scheme and supporters of it.
• Further development of this site would be vextatious to the spirit.
• There is just too much development in this Country on green land, what’s happening to our so called Green and Pleasant Land?
• Not another hotel – Think of the wild life.
• Let's keep this historic place scenic and peaceful.
• Concerned about the lack of natural habitat on campus.
• It's a lovely area and should remain as it is.
• More natural beauty being destroyed for profit.
• I would like people in charge of making these big decisions to spend more time finding suitable alternative locations.
• I trust Sophie's judgement and think that preserving green areas is essential.
• Too many of our green spaces are being paved over!! I hope this area stays beautiful and a home for all sorts of wildlife.
• I am UKC alumni and one thing I loved about the University when I was there was the gorgeous setting and countryside! Don't destroy it.
• Too much concrete everywhere.
• Open spaces in towns are vital for the physical and mental health of the residents.
• The view is stunning, anything that damaged it would be damaging the heritage of Canterbury.
• It’s such a beautiful part of the University and actually one of the reasons I decided to apply. It gives the University a peaceful place to explore wildlife and enjoy the changing seasons as well as encourage a care for the environment in the ethos of the University. It would be a disgrace to destroy this wonderful part of our university.
• It would destroy so many natural habitats that we do desperately need to conserve.
• The University's campus is a necessary green space for students and wildlife, and paving it over would send a message that the University cares about neither. Do not do this on student land for the benefit of a few!
• I want to save it for wildlife.
• It's the most beautiful part of campus! No clue how you'd think of something like that.
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- I believe that there is no need or necessity to continue building outwards and consuming more beautiful but unoccupied land – build upwards and start building coastal areas and out into the sea!!!!!!
- Saving the southern slopes are for all to enjoy and never ever be covered in concrete. The University should stay with education and not venture into the hotel trade, but do they listen?
- I strongly oppose this development for all the reasons stated.
- I and other international students mainly came to UKC because of how it's surrounded by nature.
- Take even the slightest part of it away and less students will come- and less students also means less money and reputation, right? Please think wisely.
- I went to Uni at Kent – beautiful grounds!!
- This area of space was one of the highlights of my uni experience and having the green space made Kent special in comparison to other universities. Why would you want to chop it all out, make wildlife homeless, destroy the fresh air that essentially allows us to think better, for the sake of profit?
- That's an amazing view and it would be such a shame to lose it.
- The views over this space are truly breathtaking. To lose that view point of such a historical city with its surrounding countryside would be a huge loss. The green spaces and beauty are what makes Kent campus and Canterbury city so attractive to residents and students alike. There are other sites that are less attractive and less invasive that could be better suited for this development.
- No need for the development and will result in ecological and environmental damage.
- Literally makes no sense. Why would you put a hotel there? It’s a good 20-minute walk from town and right by a nightclub. Stop.
- I’m signing this because I want to save the Chaucer Fields and it's a historic place.
- Save our green space!
- Keep public spaces public.
- We are slowly destroying habitat for wildlife around the world. There is only the smallest whisper of wildness left in the UK and that tiny whisper is on the brink of going silent.
- Green space matters!
- There’re too many people around as is.
- As a disabled student, I cannot stress how important it is to be able to have the privilege of access to space in nature when things get tough. The forest area is special because it makes UKC reflect the nature of Kent. If we wanted to look at concrete slabs chances are none of us would choose to study here. The forest is a place for learning, socialising, and healing. If the uni wants to take our money, the least they can do is leave us a safe green space to enjoy.
- This is literally the most beautiful and calmest part of campus, it would be heart-breaking to lose it.
- We don’t need a 150-bed hotel on campus. Really, no university needs one. Visitors have been doing just fine staying at hotels in town over the years.
- Stop building over green spaces.
- It will be a shame to build yet another commercial building...keep the ambiance!
- PROTECT OUR GREEN SPACES. WE DO NOT NEED A HOTEL. HALT THIS LATE-STAGE CAPITALISM NONSENSE.
- There’s no value to destroying the habitats of wildlife, much in need of conservation, for another generic hotel.
- Sitting at a bus stop was never so bearable until coming to Kent. That view was a beautiful sight to see after a long stressful day at uni. I’d hate to see future students being deprived of that.
• This amazing space and its stunning view is one of the delights of University of Kent.
• Environmentally the open space has to be preferable to a concrete hotel and conference centre. The benefits of the social space, aesthetic view and emotional well-being created for students by this space are immeasurable.
• It’s part of our university and should be kept that way!
• This university is my home and, in a city, as historically rich as this one, there needs to be some greenery to go with it.
• We have a beautiful campus; to use up the green spaces in order to build a conference centre (we have many conference rooms across campus) seems a pointless exercise which will only ruin the area’s aesthetic and wildlife.
• I’m signing because this view is one of the University’s key assets and its worth more to the community empty than with another hotel in its place.
• Once concrete goes down, that piece of land will never see light again, so permanent loss of habitat.
• I’ve had many tremendous chunders down this beautiful path.
• Among the beautiful grass/wood land with views of the cathedral and the spectacular wildlife like the rabbits, you can barely take notice the snakebites from the infamous ‘Venue’ gushing out your nose.
• Let’s preserve Chaucer Fields so future generations too can experience this feeling and leave Canterbury in awe.
• The iconic view is a part of the University of Kent, and green-field parts of campus, and Canterbury, should be protected, especially when it is to build something that is not directly for students.
• The views of the city and the green spaces (and the acres of woodland) surrounding the University is one of the big selling points for UKC. Get rid of that and the university risks losing out to greener universities.
• I know the campus and the loss of this wonderful natural amenity will have a detrimental effect on students there.
• Against over-development of area.
• Protecting the view is more important than the University building yet another building.
• This beautiful view is incredible and it’s awful that it will be blocked. It’s an asset to the University and is what will attract many students.
• It's a beautiful view that makes the university special.
• Why tf would you put a hotel there lmao
• The view is lovely and we need to protect our wildlife!!!
• What is wrong with people?! We need MORE trees, more natural green spaces, more beauty spots – less ugly grey plots!!! We need to help and support one another in moving towards protecting wildlife and our beautiful green landscape. Go build your grey, concrete building elsewhere! Make use of a disused one – Recycle! Up-cycle! Set an example. You’re a teaching faculty – teach!
• I love wildlife. I would be upset if there was less wildlife. I love grass. And daffodils.
• Destroying wildlife is wrong!
• Enough green spaces have already been developed on campus.
• This area of public open space is enjoyed by locals, students and the University’s staff. The loss of such an area of grass and trees will impact the habitats of the wildlife that thrives here which includes some protected species of bats, dormice and newts. Increased traffic and congestion in the local area and huge concerns as to how a large increase in waste water and run off from a built up area will be disposed of with a threat to people living at the bottom of the site. The fact that effluent waste would have to be pumped up a steep hill doesn’t dampen concerns for the likelihood of pollution affecting those residents. Surely some of the £60m capital outlay here would be better spent on improved study facilities and if this type of development is required and there are strong arguments that it isn’t on this scale, then brownfield sites should be considered first for large schemes such as this. There is such land elsewhere on campus, squeezing it into this part of the campus isn’t necessary OR valid considering all the implications involved.
• Wildlife and countryside needs to be protected.
• I’m signing this petition to prevent inappropriate development on a key area of open space. We the people of Canterbury appear to be at the mercy of the major business that universities have become and their need to succour their growth, expansion and wages of senior chancellor’s. This development should not take place and the University should spend a few more hours teaching its students who pay over the odds for some degree courses.
• This is an unspoiled beautiful place, it separates UKC from its neighbours and must never be built on. I walk on the southern slopes every day with my dog and my children grew up, and played there!
• Too much destruction of natural areas worldwide.
• Because we need green spaces not more concrete.
• Happy memories.
• This is the most beautiful view in Canterbury and everyone should be allowed to enjoy it. Building houses here will ruin this iconic view of Canterbury forever.
• All grasslands are special, but these in particular have an importance to the uni population. Don’t be idiots!
• I went to this uni based on the beauty of its surroundings. Being able to look across and see the cathedral was wonderful and the unspoilt land stretching out and down towards the town is beautiful. Don't take this away from everyone. Let it remain as a stunning uni campus.
• I’m signing because I live nearby and have done for 35 years. The University promised the council that it would leave this space open for a public breathing space between the University and the town. I deplore utterly the filling in of countryside for the sake of ugly and underused prestige developments of this nature.
• My family live and study and shop in Canterbury all the time. It’s a world heritage site. If we can't find a way to preserve Canterbury, including the spaces to walk and enjoy the outdoors around the city then we’ve failed future generations badly. Build something elsewhere, near the A2 on land that doesn't provide a public amenity please!!
• As an ex-student of Kent, I’m appalled at the idea of developing Chaucer Fields, for environmental, historical and social reasons.
• I live in Kent and am a former UKC student.
• I attended Kent Uni between 2007 – 2010. A hotel development on this site would be a sad and terrible mistake.