

Reproduced with the kind permission of the KM Group

■ WE RECENTLY attended a meeting which the Vice-Chancellor kindly arranged for us and were told that the blocks are required purely as accommodation for first year students on campus, rather than leaving them to find accommodation in the city. We have been commenting for some time now that both city universities should be providing more campus accommodation, so we are pleased, in principle, about these proposals. Even with these proposed blocks, however, we were told there would still be a shortfall for first-year student accommodation on campus.

However, we are unhappy about the siting, both of the blocks and the hotel, on green land (which the university maintains beautifully) which forms part of the setting for the city. We believe that the blocks could be placed in between other buildings on the campus, and that the hotel would also be better sited on the developed parts of the university.

We also have concerns about more cars being brought into the city and although on-campus parking for students has been stopped, it does not prevent students arriving with cars which they then park in residential areas around the university to the detriment of local residents. We have suggested to the Vice-Chancellor that a condition of entry should be that students are not to bring in cars.

Canterbury is just too small a city with serious air pollution problems to cope with the considerable traffic that its two universities generate and we would like the car-free areas of other university towns adopted. We would also like to see more use by university staff of the excellent bus service within the city, which would free up some of the land used for car parking. We appreciate that staff who travel from outlying areas might still have to use their cars but those who live within the city should not need to and would set an excellent example to the students.

Barrie Gore, Chairman Canterbury District, Protect Kent (CPRE Kent), Ashford Road, Charing

Use UKC plans to make a decision on proposal

LOSS springs to mind when considering the UKC proposal for the cathedral-facing slopes (University Plan Revised But The Fight Continues, Gazette, March 31).

There is certainly the loss of amenity but also the loss of geographic reference, in that everyone thinks of the campus and town as being distinct and the proposal joins the two.

There is also a loss in heritage and personal orientation where for many the sight of Canterbury and the cathedral over the slopes are iconic.

David Morley, head architect of the Chaucer Field proposal, maintained at a recent talk at UKC's School of Architecture that the buildings will sit naturally in the flow of the slopes.

In the context of the notion of a sense of flow, it is important to emphasise the physical enormity of the proposal.

Block structures, with bendy-bus variations, are to be dispersed over an area of seven football pitches.

Walking around the perimeter there will be no point at which the buildings do not cumulatively present you with a solid wall.

ends of its horseshoe configuration are five stories high. The architect justified the design with tree screening (the extent of tree and hedgerow removal for this project is, in fact, considerable) and an assurance that the physical reality would be better than CAD enhancement images and drawings.

City and district residents should try with what plans are to hand to picture the proposal and consider its design.

Oliver Fry, Harkness Drive, Canterbury