

STUDENT IMPACT SCRUTINY REVIEW

Report of the Panel

July 2006

Canterbury City Council

Military Road

Canterbury

CT1 1YW

Tel: 01227 862000

Preface

Students have been around a very long time. In ancient Athens the people accused Socrates of corrupting the ideas of young people; so they executed him, and his students transformed western culture. A famous Latin student song, *Gaudeamus igitur*, from medieval Germany shows how some things have not changed a bit. It starts, 'So let us rejoice while we are young'.

It speaks of the brevity of life, and in praise of women. It adds: ' Long live the University, the professors, all its members – may they always be in bloom.' The community is cherished: 'Long live the State and its ruler, long live our City, and our patrons' charity, which supports us here.'

Finally: ' Down with sadness, down with haters, evil, and all enemies and mockers of students.'

Much has changed. Then, of course, students were exclusively young men training for the church and professions. Today a student is just as likely to be someone re-training in their middle years or a nonagenarian reading for a doctorate as a young man or woman of twenty.

It is thus impossible to label all 'students' as a block opposed to 'us' or 'them' or 'the residents' or 'the City'. However this Review has highlighted the changes that occur when thousands of people gather to study in a small area like Canterbury. We found overwhelming advantages: and some issues to address.

Our 47 recommendations are just that. They are for others to consider. We are convinced that the more of them that can be carried through, the greater the rewards will be to an already excellent partnership.

It has been a great pleasure to work with such fine colleagues. I cannot praise enough the hard work, good humour and patience of my fellow panel members and the dedicated officers. We had a mountainous amount of evidence to sift; we made numerous visits, consulted a national survey, received conference reports. We are immensely grateful to all our witnesses, their time and hospitality.

Special tribute must be paid to David Reed who pulled the Review together, a high intellectual task: and to Lyn McDaid and Charlotte Smith who took copious Minutes and processed the words.

Gaudeamus igitur – so let us rejoice. We commend our Review and hope it makes people much more happy than sad.

Michael Northey, Chairman

July 2006

LIST OF CONTENTS

| Chapters | Page Number |
|---|--------------------|
| 1. Introduction | 1 |
| 2. Scope of the review | 3 |
| 3. Canterbury and its higher education institutions | 8 |
| 4. Profile and economic impact | 13 |
| 5. Community, cultural and sporting facilities | 18 |
| 6. Student numbers, characteristics and potential growth | 21 |
| 7. Students' positive contribution to the local community | 29 |
| 8. Student accommodation | 33 |
| 9. Student households in residential areas | 42 |
| 10. Tackling negative issues in residential areas | 47 |
| 11. Student landlord issues | 54 |
| 12. Crime and Anti-social behaviour | 60 |
| 13. Better liaison and communication | 67 |
| 14. Recommendations | 70 |

Appendices

1. List of witnesses
2. Draft Student Accommodation Accreditation Scheme
3. Anti-Social Behaviour Protocol

CHAPTER 1

Introduction

- 1.1 The Student Impact Scrutiny Review was set up in early 2005 as part of the City Council's scrutiny programme overseen by the Overview and Scrutiny Committee. The review has been undertaken by a panel of five elected members supported by an officer team. The panel decided, in view of the large number of potential interest groups involved, that it would not be appropriate to co-opt any additional members onto the panel for this review.
- 1.2 In May 2005, as a result of the change in political control at the City Council, it was necessary for Councillor Rosemary Doyle, who had chaired the panel up to that date, to stand down and her place was taken by Councillor Gabrielle Davis. Councillor Michael Northey, who had been a member of the panel from the outset, took over as chairman from May 2005.
- 1.3 The members and officers involved in the review are as follows:

Scrutiny Review Members

Cllr Michael Northey (Chairman from May 2005)
Cllr Michael Berridge
Cllr Gabrielle Davis (from May 2005)
Cllr Ron Flaherty
Cllr Fred Whitemore
Cllr Rosemary Doyle (until May 2005)

Scrutiny Review Officers

David Reed, Director of Community & Environment Services (Lead Officer)
Wayne Gough, Scrutiny and Research Officer
Glynis Alexander, Public Relations Manager
Nick Churchill, Economic Development Projects Manager
Steve King, Private Sector Housing Manager
Paul Williams, Environment Protection Manager
Mark Richardson, Community Safety Manager
Lyn McDaid, Committee Administrator
Charlotte Smith, Trainee Committee Administrator

- 1.4 The panel met on a total of 16 occasions including two informal site visits to see the issues first hand on the Hales Place Estate and Parham Road Student Village.
- 1.5 At the outset of the review, detailed evidence was heard from a range of council officers to understand the wide range of issues pertinent to the review. Publicity in the local press and District Life magazine was used to announce that the review was under way and invited comments from interested members of the public. As a result a total of 38 comments were received which helped the Panel understand some of the problems which were perceived to arise from the number of students in the city.
- 1.6 Subsequently visits were made to the four main education institutions concerned to hear a number of presentations and to tour the various campuses. A very valuable session was also held with the Student Unions to hear their concerns. Separate

sessions were held later in the review process with a number of student landlords and letting agents.

- 1.7 A full list of the persons who gave evidence to the panel is set out in Appendix 1. The panel would like to place on record its thanks to all those who took the time and effort to write in or give evidence in person, and for the positive and constructive way in which they debated the issues with the Panel.
- 1.8 The relatively complex set of issues involved and the need for discussion and if possible consensus on the conclusions and recommendations of the Panel led to the decision that, prior to preparing their final report, a draft report was published for consultation and discussion by the various stakeholders and within the city generally.
- 1.9 The comments of both representative groups and individuals were therefore invited on a draft report during the consultation period which ended on 28 June 2006. All those who had previously expressed interest in the review were contacted and there was some press publicity. As a result a total of 31 responses were received from the institutions, student unions, landlords and agents, parish councils, residents associations and individuals.
- 1.10 These responses were carefully considered and were very helpful to the Panel – as a result this report and its recommendations were amended and refined. The Panel would like to thank all those who responded.
- 1.11 The final report will be considered formally by the City Council in due course but the four educational institutions and other parties within the city will also be invited to consider how they should respond to its recommendations.

CHAPTER 2

Scope of the Review

- 2.1 The terms of reference of the review were agreed by the City Council's Scrutiny Management and Review Sub Committee at its meeting on 3 March 2005. It was agreed that the "project concern" was how to maximise the long term and short term positive impacts of the district's higher education institutions and their student population, whilst minimising and managing the negative impacts which arise at the same time. It is an important task of the review to attempt to identify and understand the various issues involved and to set the negative impacts in the clear context of the many positive benefits and advantages of having the institutions and their students in the district.
- 2.2 The importance of this issue for Canterbury is illustrated in the following tables derived from the 2001 census. These show the proportion of student households in the council's area, firstly in comparison to the rest of Kent and secondly in relation to a number of other University cities. Canterbury is by far the most affected district in Kent and one of the most affected in the country. The table in fact understates the position - these statistics relate to administrative areas, some of which are tightly defined around a single urban area unlike Canterbury, which of course also includes Whitstable, Herne Bay and surrounding rural areas where there are few student households. They are also out of date – the 2005 figure for Canterbury district was 3.3% - see paragraph 9.4.

| Kent District | Total Households | % of Student Households |
|---------------------|------------------|-------------------------|
| Canterbury | 55584 | 2.04 |
| Medway | 99566 | 0.12 |
| Maidstone | 56454 | 0.11 |
| Dartford | 35240 | 0.09 |
| Ashford | 41450 | 0.08 |
| Thanet | 55228 | 0.04 |
| Sevenoaks | 44364 | 0.02 |
| Tunbridge Wells | 42695 | 0.02 |
| Dover | 44314 | 0.01 |
| Gravesham | 38266 | 0.01 |
| Swale | 49257 | 0.01 |
| Tonbridge & Malling | 42736 | 0.01 |
| Shepway | 41155 | 0.00 |

| City | Total Households | % of Student Households |
|-------------------|------------------|-------------------------|
| Oxford | 51732 | 3.47 |
| Nottingham | 116112 | 2.82 |
| Southampton | 91217 | 2.55 |
| Durham | 34847 | 2.11 |
| Manchester | 167451 | 2.06 |
| Canterbury | 55584 | 2.04 |
| Cambridge | 42658 | 1.87 |
| Sheffield | 217622 | 1.83 |
| Exeter | 46573 | 1.75 |

| | | |
|-----------------|--------|------|
| Bristol | 162090 | 1.68 |
| Lincoln | 36643 | 1.66 |
| Portsmouth | 78719 | 1.64 |
| Leicester | 111148 | 1.63 |
| Lancaster | 55839 | 1.51 |
| Coventry | 122353 | 1.48 |
| Preston | 52970 | 1.46 |
| Welwyn Hatfield | 39844 | 1.44 |
| York | 76920 | 1.40 |
| Bournemouth | 72212 | 1.39 |
| Bath | 71115 | 1.36 |
| Charnwood | 60472 | 1.30 |
| Norwich | 54584 | 1.29 |

2.3 These figures both explain and illustrate the widespread interest and concern in this issue in Canterbury.

2.4 It is widely perceived within Canterbury that the large student population leads to a number of negative impacts, but it is important to understand these in the context of the positive advantages that the educational institutions and their students bring to the city. The Scrutiny Review Panel has worked in parallel with a national study looking at the impact of student communities in a number of cities across the UK. This research work, carried out by Dr Darren Smith of the University of Brighton for the Universities UK organisation looked at Canterbury amongst six case studies. The final report of this study “Studentification: A Guide to Opportunities, Challenges and Practice” was published in January 2006 and copies are available on request. The report has been used by the Review Panel to inform its work and usefully summarises the positive effects of a large student population in the following table which sets out the range of issues very clearly under four headings – social, cultural, physical and economic issues. The report has also been submitted to the government and may have an effect on national policy.

| Table 1: Student populations – positive effects | | | |
|--|--|---|---|
| Social | Cultural | Physical | Economic |
| Student volunteering makes an important contribution to many aspects of social life. | Create a critical mass and demand for diverse range of cultural events. | Higher/rising property prices provide a level of incentive for upgrading properties which might otherwise remain empty, languish in a neglected state or be generally unfit for habitation. | High demand for student housing and the stimulus to private rented sector leads to rising house prices. |
| Student housing needs prevent serious depopulation in many inner-city areas. | Enhances reputation of city as vibrant, dynamic location and as an attractive destination for eg, night-clubbing, evening economy, or tourism. | Many older properties receive considerable investment by private landlords which extends their life. | Growth in buy-to-let market and private investment opportunities. |
| Increases the range of goods, services and attractions available to the city's population. | Creates an international/cosmopolitan feel/outlook. | | Students constitute a flexible part-time labour force undertaking seasonal employment. |

| | | | |
|---|--|---|---|
| <p>A critical mass of students can ensure transport links to the benefit of the whole community.</p> <p>Student communities can also support nurseries and multi faith centres.</p> | | <p>The existence of large numbers of young people help to make city centres attractive to social and retail spaces.</p> <p>Changes in type of retail and entertainment services available – eg, local shops becoming cafes, bookshops, live music venues.</p> | <p>Student presence can help stimulate urban regeneration.</p> <p>Goods purchased locally by students make a significant contribution to the local economy.</p> <p>Student presence ensures the viability of some retail businesses.</p> <p>Repairs, renovations and extensions to student properties benefits the construction and service sector of the economy.</p> <p>Availability of a graduate workforce.</p> |
|---|--|---|---|

2.5 On the other hand, there are a wide range of challenges which arise from a large student population which are set out in the following table from the Universities UK report. This table sets out the issues from a national perspective but provides a useful context for the review in Canterbury. This review report considers the negative impacts which are of most relevance within the city for discussion and debate.

| Table 2: Communities of students – challenges | | | |
|---|--|---|---|
| Social | Cultural | Physical | Economic |
| <p>Increase in low-level anti-social behaviour.</p> <p>Concentration of vulnerable young people with low awareness of security and highly attractive possessions leading to increased levels of crime. This can result in higher insurance premiums (ie, house, contents, vehicle).</p> | <p>Expansion of HMOs in traditional owner-occupied, family areas can lead to change in nature of communities.</p> <p>Gradually self-reinforcing unpopularity of area for families wishing to bring up children.</p> <p>Conversion of houses into student residences, often make difficult transformation back into family homes.</p> | <p>Reduction in quality of housing stock and neglect of external appearance to properties including gardens, due to lack of investment by absentee landlords.</p> <p>Turnover of properties and preponderance of property letting boards – recurring annually – detract from streetscape.</p> | <p>High demand for student housing and the stimulus to private rented sector leads to a rise in house prices, deterring access to housing ladder for other sections of community.</p> <p>Changes in type of retail and entertainment services available – eg, local shops becoming take-aways and cafes, and re-orientation of stock.</p> |

| | | | |
|---|---|--|--|
| <p>Decreased demand for some local services leading to closure – particularly educational services.</p> <p>Residents feel pressure to move to avoid becoming marginalised and isolated as permanent residents. This can lead to the demoralisation of established residents.</p> <p>Increased competition for private rented houses.</p> <p>Pressure for greater provision of establishments catering for night time entertainment and consequent detrimental impact on residential amenity.</p> <p>Seasonal availability of some retail and service provision – development of a ‘resort economy’.</p> | <p>Transient occupation engenders a lack of community integration and cohesion and less commitment to maintain the quality of local environment.</p> <p>Turnover and short stay are disincentive and barrier to self-policing and aversion to crime.</p> <p>Different perceptions of what is considered acceptable behaviour and communal obligations by different social groups.</p> <p>Lifestyle frictions – late night student culture disturbs children and working people.</p> | <p>Increased population density and increased pressures on services (policing, cleansing, highways, planning, public transport).</p> <p>Increased on-street parking pressures arising from shared households and seasonal traffic congestion (eg. at graduations, end of term).</p> <p>Increase of squalor (litter/refuse), as infrastructure is designed for lower density usage, low awareness of refuse collection arrangements and different conceptions of what is tolerable.</p> <p>Noise between dwellings at all times especially music and at night – parties and gatherings and late night street noise disturbance.</p> | <p>A rising concentration of students in particular streets acts as a strong inducement to owner-occupiers of non-student properties to take advantage of a lucrative sale to private student landlords.</p> <p>Fluctuating demand for private rented housing.</p> <p>Seasonal employment (in shops, pubs) and provision of retail and leisure services.</p> |
|---|---|--|--|

2.6 Other issues to be considered by the review include:

- Any issues arising from overseas students and their concerns (see paragraphs 6.20-6.22, 8.39, 12.24 and 12.25).
- How to retain graduates in the district, to help create the highly skilled workforce of the future (see paragraph 4.30).
- The response to the expansion of colleges in Thanet, Ashford and Medway (see paragraph 6.28).
- Any financial implications for the City Council (see paragraphs 9.21-9.25).

2.7 It is important to recognise and address the undoubted negative impacts which arise from the large number of students living and moving around the city. The intention of the review is to build on the strong high-level partnerships that exist between the Council and the educational institutions to address the impact that students have in the Canterbury district and to work with the institutions and other agencies to promote the positive benefits of the higher education presence in the city. It was agreed the scope of the review would not extend to the detailed consideration or amendment of the Council’s land use planning policies, for example existing development briefs or local plan policies, but it was envisaged

that land use planning issues could be flagged up by the review for consideration when these land use planning policies are next reviewed.

- 2.8 In summary, the aim of the review is to identify the impact that the educational institutions and their students have within the district in terms of community, economic and cultural issues. The positive impacts should be recognised and promoted, and at the same time the negative managed to minimise their effects. Outcomes would include the examination of the existing partnerships between the institutions, the Council and other agencies to ensure they are working effectively, and where they are not to suggest improvements or new partnership arrangements where appropriate. After analysis and consideration of the various issues involved a number of recommendations have been drawn up to address the issues identified in the review, both in the short and medium term. An action plan to implement these will subsequently be developed.

CHAPTER 3

Canterbury and its Higher Education Institutions

- 3.1 The City of Canterbury has a long and proud educational and cultural tradition as a result of its importance as an ecclesiastical and monastic centre from Saxon times onwards. The Kings School has its origin before the Reformation, and was joined in Canterbury by a number of other educational establishments in the latter part of the 19th Century, including a Missionary College, St Edmunds and Kent College and the Simon Langton Grammar Schools.
- 3.2 In Canterbury today higher education is just a part of a wider educational role, the city having a range of state school provision at both primary and secondary level, three private schools, and a number of foreign language colleges. This combination of education establishments leads to significant traffic and transportation issues which are very familiar to residents of the city. The school students involved however are part of the established community and are not considered to be “students” for the purposes of this review. Whilst there are some boarders at the three private schools they are accommodated in purpose built supervised houses. Students at the foreign language colleges in the city tend to be relatively short term lodgers in established family accommodation and so again have a limited impact on the city other than in terms of transport and the sheer number of people moving around..
- 3.3 The focus of the Scrutiny Review has therefore concentrated on students aged 18 years and above attending higher and further education courses in the city. The term student however needs to be carefully understood; it must be recognised that the nature of education has changed significantly in recent years with a greater emphasis on part-time and vocational education later in life, which supplements and complements the more traditional full-time education undertaken by 18-25 year olds.
- 3.4 The Review has not looked at the issues which arise from the large number of young adults, say 18 – 25 years old, who live or work in the city but who are not studying. For the purpose of this review it is important not to confuse students with young adults generally.
- 3.5 The establishment and rapid growth of higher education in the city is a relatively recent, post-war, phenomenon. In 1962 a teacher training college, which has subsequently developed into Canterbury Christ Church University, was established, rapidly followed in 1965 by the first intake of the University of Kent at Canterbury on the hill to the north of the city. These two institutions offer a wide range of educational opportunities in the city, together with the Canterbury campus of the University College for the Creative Arts and the local further education institution, Canterbury College, which is now also developing a higher education role. Whilst there are a number of institutions offering education up to age 18, and language schools as well, it is the combination of these four main institutions, and their rapid growth over the last few years, that has led to the City of Canterbury becoming a major player in higher education, leading to both great benefits and the concerns which have led to the establishment of this review.

- 3.6 The purpose of this chapter is to outline the nature and development of the four main higher and further education institutions within the city which form the focus of this review. Detailed statistics regarding the growth and makeup of student numbers at each institution are set out in a later chapter as these require careful discussion and understanding. The aim is to set out the overall context of the higher education offer within the city as a background to the chapters which follow.

Canterbury Christ Church University

- 3.7 The University was first established as Christ Church College, a Church of England teacher training college in 1962 with its first new buildings in North Holmes Road. Initially there were 450 students. In 1978 the first non-teacher training degrees were offered, validated by the University of Kent and in the late 1980's the College also became a centre for health education, offering programmes in nursing and related disciplines.
- 3.8 By the mid 1990's there were 7,500 students at the College, then offering a balance of courses between education, health and other subject areas and having a mix of full-time and part-time students. This mix of courses and mode of attendance remains approximately the same today albeit the overall size of the College's activities has nearly doubled.
- 3.9 In 1995 the College was awarded the power to grant degrees in its own name and was subsequently renamed Canterbury Christ Church University College. Full university title was achieved in 2005 when the current name was adopted.
- 3.10 Whilst the North Holmes Road campus remains the main centre of the University's activities in Canterbury, growth over the years has involved the development of a number of satellite facilities in and around the city centre, including since 2000 the lease of the Sidney Cooper Centre in St Peter's Street for an art school and the purchase of a large office block, formerly known as Clarkson House, on Rhodaus Town for teaching accommodation. Hall Place, an impressive 16th century building on the outskirts of the city at Harbledown has also been bought for renovation as an Enterprise Centre to develop links between the academic and business community.
- 3.11 The University is not solely based in Canterbury, however. In addition to the Salomons Centre near Tunbridge Wells, acquired in 1996, the University has developed a Broadstairs campus since 2000 to provide higher education opportunities for the community of Thanet, and a further campus opened at Chatham in 2004 as part of the Universities at Medway project. In addition 2,500 students follow accredited courses at partner institutions across the UK. The total student population of the institution must therefore be distinguished from that which studies at Canterbury.
- 3.12 Canterbury Christ Church University has developed into the largest centre of higher education in Kent in support of the public services – notably teacher training, nursing, social care and policing. Teaching and research work is undertaken within four faculties – arts and humanities, business and sciences, education, and health and social care. A wide range of undergraduate, post-graduate and other programmes are offered on both a full-time and part-time basis at the four campuses and by partner institutions to a total student population of approximately 14,000. Given the nature of the courses on offer, there is a particular emphasis on students already based in Canterbury and East Kent, either who take up education on a part-time basis alongside their employment or enter full-time education later in

life as a mature student. The student population at Canterbury Christ Church University has therefore a distinctive and more local character compared to that of the University of Kent.

University of Kent

- 3.13 The University of Kent was granted its Royal Charter in 1965 when the first 500 undergraduate students were admitted. It was founded as a collegiate university on a single campus and, while academic life is now strongly rooted in departments, the four colleges continue to provide a social and pastoral focus for students.
- 3.14 Since its foundation, the University of Kent has sought to offer an integrated intellectual and social environment, with an emphasis on flexibility and inter-disciplinarity in its teaching and research across all departments. Provision for students includes the Student Learning Advisory Service, and all teaching staff are encouraged to gain the Postgraduate Certificate in Higher Education. Within the local region, the university has partnerships with industry, including Pfizer, and is part of the Interreg consortium of universities on both sides of the English Channel.
- 3.15 In spring 2000 the University of Kent and Mid-Kent College went into partnership to form the University of Kent at Medway with the aim of creating new higher education opportunities in the Medway towns. In September 2005 the University of Kent at Medway moved to the newly developed Pembroke campus which it shares with the Universities of Greenwich, Canterbury Christ Church University, Mid-Kent College and the University College for the Creative Arts.
- 3.16 The University's Canterbury campus is located on 121 hectares of parkland, one mile north of the city centre. The campus has grown and developed over the years. The most recent developments are new Drama studios opened in autumn 2001, a new building for the School of Social Policy, Sociology and Social Research opened in autumn 2002 and a new extension to the Registry administration building in autumn 2003.
- 3.17 The Templeman Library, on the Canterbury campus, is probably the largest library between London and France. It contains over a million books, periodicals and other sources of information, plus special collections.
- 3.18 Kent Union is the students' union at the University of Kent, providing representation, commercial services and membership services to its students. The Union operates a variety of commercial services including a nightclub, bars, catering outlets and shops on the University's campus; the Union also operates a wide range of non-commercial services, including a radio station, newspaper, 50 sports clubs, advice centre, employment agency, volunteering placements and 100 cultural, religious and educational societies. The Union employs approximately 300 staff and has an annual turnover of £6.5 million. It is one of the biggest students' unions in the United Kingdom.

University College for the Creative Arts

- 3.19 There has been an art college in Canterbury since the 19th Century. The Canterbury School of Architecture has a history that dates back to 1932, but was officially founded in 1952. In 1987 the separate art colleges of Canterbury, Maidstone and Medway merged to create the Kent Institute of Art and Design (KIAD).

- 3.20 In August 2005 KIAD merged with the Surrey Institute of Art and Design to form the University College for the Creative Arts in Canterbury, Epsom, Farnham, Maidstone and Rochester. The Canterbury campus undertakes teaching in three subject areas, Fine Art, Architecture (including Interior Design) and Further Education. The college teaches around 1000 students on pre-degree, undergraduate and postgraduate courses.
- 3.21 The Canterbury campus underwent extensive rebuilding and refurbishment in 2003 and its Herbert Read Gallery and related display spaces constitute one of the region's leading exhibition venues for contemporary art of all types.

Canterbury College

- 3.22 Canterbury College is a general further education (FE) college which provides a wide variety of education and training for approximately 12,000 students each year. Around 640 different courses are provided for 16 year olds up to degree level. The mission of the college is to provide excellent education for all. 60% of the students attend the college on a part-time basis and 40% full-time, 7,126 and 4,827 students respectively in 2005/6. 37% of the students are under 18 years old, and 90% of these come from 20 non-selective feeder schools in the East Kent area.
- 3.23 The college operates in four departments:
- (i) Young Peoples College, mainly for under 18 year olds, offering vocational and A level options.
 - (ii) Adult and Community College, offering a wide range of courses for adults.
 - (iii) Higher Education College, specialising in vocational degree options.
 - (iv) Workforce Development College, offering a range of mainly part-time and short courses to support local businesses and individual workers.
- 3.24 Since 1993 the college population has grown by approximately 6% each year. Students are drawn from across East Kent, mostly from Canterbury, Whitstable, Herne Bay, Sandwich, Deal, Faversham, Sittingbourne and Sheppey. Approximately half of the students at the college come from Canterbury, Whitstable and Herne Bay. In addition to the main site at Canterbury, the college operates a satellite college at Sheppey. As part of its strategy for providing equality of opportunity and increasing diversity, the college has expanded its outreach work. Education and training are provided for some 2,500 students in 40 community venues across North and East Kent, some in economically disadvantaged area such as Northgate, Wincheap, Murston, Milton Regis, Hersden and Sheerness. Teaching and support services are provided by 750 staff employed on both a full and part-time basis.
- 3.25 The College is currently undergoing significant development at its Canterbury site. The £47 million redevelopment is one of the largest projects of its kind in any further education facility in the country. The work will be complete by December 2007 and the finished campus will include a unique, street-like layout which will have 'front of house' services open to the public including hairdressing, travel shops and restaurants complete with training facilities.
- 3.26 The college believes it is underfunded per student compared to similar FE colleges. This restricts the courses which can be offered to the local community and needs to be addressed.

Conclusion

- 3.27 The City of Canterbury hosts four separate higher and further educational institutions which provide a wide range of educational opportunities as described above. The four institutions complement each other in providing a very broad base of educational opportunity which is available to meet the educational needs of the Canterbury and East Kent population. The ready access provided to higher and further education is of critical importance to the economy and general well-being of the area, and means that the local population has access to diverse educational opportunities without the need to travel long distances or live away from home unless someone wishes to do so. With the increasing cost involved in gaining higher education qualifications this factor will be of increasing importance in the future. The very presence of these institutions in Canterbury is of great benefit to local people and should be recognised as such.

CHAPTER 4

Profile and Economic Impact

- 4.1 The significant presence of higher education within Canterbury district and the four institutions which are the focus of this review in particular are a key factor in raising the profile of the area as a place of learning and culture. This is a significant benefit for the area which should not be underestimated in importance albeit difficult to quantify in financial terms.
- 4.2 Given the large expansion in student numbers in recent years and the considerable expenditure of the institutions themselves, the local higher and further education sector also has an important economic impact on the Canterbury district. In 2003 4,425 people worked in higher education in Canterbury district (approx. 8% of all employees in the local economy) according to Government statistics (*Source: Annual Business Inquiry, Office for National Statistics, 2003*).
- 4.3 Canterbury Christ Church University has provided a salary breakdown for 649 of their direct employees who live in Canterbury district, including both full and part-time staff. This information is set out in the following table:

| <u>Salary Range</u> | <u>No. of Employees (FTE)</u> | <u>Proportion of total staff</u> |
|---------------------|-------------------------------|----------------------------------|
| £0 - £10,000 | 1 | 0.2% |
| £10,000 - £20,000 | 290 | 44.7% |
| £20,000 - £30,000 | 108 | 16.6% |
| £30,000 - £40,000 | 134 | 20.6% |
| £40,000 - £50,000 | 65 | 10.0% |
| £50,000 - £60,000 | 19 | 2.9% |
| £60,000 - £70,000 | 26 | 4.0% |
| £70,000 - £90,000 | 6 | 0.9% |

- 4.4 Using the mid-point of each salary range for the calculation gives an annual salary for Christ Church University employees of £27,560. An equivalent figure provided for 825 University of Kent employees living in Canterbury district is £26,161. These figures can be compared with the average annual salary overall for employees in Canterbury district which was £23,730 at the same time (Annual survey of hours and earnings, Office of National Statistics 2005). The education institutions do therefore boost the average income in the district.
- 4.5 The economic benefits of the sector were demonstrated and highlighted in two reports published by Canterbury City Council in 2000 and again later in 2003. Both research reports employed a 'Keynesian Local Multiplier' model, used to estimate the economic impact of Nottingham University in previous work, but adapted this model to provide individual estimates for the financial and economic impact of the four higher and further education institutions in Canterbury.
- 4.6 The 2003 Study updated the findings from the earlier paper specifically focusing upon the gross output, disposable income and employment effects of the University of Kent, Canterbury Christ Church University, the University College for the Creative Arts (formerly Kent Institute of Art and Design) and Canterbury College in 2001/2.

4.7 The key findings indicated a very substantial economic impact, as revealed in the following conclusions:

- In terms of gross output, an estimated £127 million was collectively contributed to the local economy by the four institutions and their students in 2001/2, around £27 million more than in 1998/9. The dominance of the University of Kent and Canterbury Christ Church University was clear with an impact of approximately £66 million (52% of total impact) and £44 million (35%) respectively in 2001/2. Uprating these figures to take account of the growth in the four institutions between 2001/2 (using growth in student numbers as a guide) would give an equivalent gross output figure of £166 m in 2004/5.
- With regards to local disposable income, the Report estimated that the four institutions had a gross impact of around £42 million per annum in 2001/2, approximately £7 million higher than in 1998/1999. This is an estimate of the gross disposable income made available to local residents who would have lived in the District even if the institutions were not there. In 2004/5 this figure would have grown to around £55 m per annum.
- With respect to employment, in addition to those people already directly employed by the four institutions, an estimated 3,400 local full-time equivalent jobs were dependent on the expenditure of the institutions, their staff and students in 2001/2, which was 700 jobs greater than in 1998/9. In 2004/5 this figure would have grown to about 4,400 jobs.
- Kent Union spends £1.05 million on staff salaries in addition to the above.

4.8 The local business sectors which directly benefit from institutional and student expenditure include transport, retail and entertainment together with the obvious advantage to local businesses in respect of students being available for part time employment in a local economy dominated by a strong service sector.

4.9 More indirectly this expenditure supports industries and procurement areas such as catering, cleaning and domestic, computing, furniture and textiles, scientific equipment, laboratory and workshop, professional and administrative, maintenance and stationery and office supplies.

4.10 The large number of students seeking accommodation in the private rented market supports a buoyant housing market in the city, and although this manifests itself in higher house prices it also leads to investment and upgrading of the housing stock and the economic spin-offs from this in the local economy.

4.11 Although the above analysis concentrates upon institutional and student expenditure, this does not include recent larger-scale capital expenditure by the institutions such as spend on construction activity. Most notably, £47 million of funding was secured from the National Learning and Skills Council for the Canterbury College redevelopment. This investment is one of the largest of its kind in any further education facility in the country. There has also been significant capital investment in recent years in construction projects by the two Universities, for example the Parkwood and Tyler Court student accommodation schemes and the work at Hall Place.

- 4.12 Although only a proportion of this spend is likely to reach the local economy, this remains an additional injection of investment that would not have taken place if the higher and further education institutions were not located in the District.
- 4.13 Further capital investment is planned, for example the South East of England Development Agency (SEEDA) is in the process of investing over £5 million into the Canterbury Business Innovation Centre to be developed at the University of Kent's Canterbury campus. Canterbury Christ Church University is planning to refurbish or redevelop St Augustine's House which will also be a major capital scheme.
- 4.14 The presence of higher education also drives other types of funding (e.g. from UK and European schemes which offer money and help to graduates/students developing knowledge-based activities). Schemes such as Great Ideas in Science and Technology (GRIST) encourage graduates to commercialise new innovative and creative ideas. The Shell Technology Enterprise Programme (STEP) offers students summer and term time project management experience. Other schemes and programmes fund or facilitate collaborations between industry and academia. UCCA's involvement in a number of funded cross-channel creative projects and its work with Arts Council England, English Heritage and many other regional public and community arts organisations attracts arts funding to the city, facilitating increasingly ambitious cultural events.
- 4.15 Furthermore, higher education institutions attract overseas students and visitors who bring income directly and support economic activity via the money they spend in the area, which is unlikely to have been spent otherwise. This factor also tends to broaden the demographic profile of visitors to the area, which is otherwise biased towards older people.
- 4.16 The expenditure generated from university accommodation based conference visitors and tourists (for example during vacation periods) were not included within the City Council's economic analysis in 2003 thereby resulting in a further overall economic benefit to the District. The Lambeth Conference of Anglican Bishops held in 1998 and planned for 2008 is perhaps the most high profile conference hosted by the University sector of the city.
- 4.17 Added to short term visitors and the local resident population, the comparatively high number of students contributes to making Canterbury City one of the leading retail centres in the region. The presence of the institutions, students and graduates with a healthy disposable income makes the area an attractive target market for many kinds of investors.
- 4.18 In a wider economic context, in addition to increased output, income and employment, the presence of education institutions in a local area also generates indirect economic effects including, for example, the upgrading of the local skills base, technology transfer and improving the attraction of the area to potential inward investors. Therefore their presence acts as a catalyst for more economic activity and investment but these indirect effects are more difficult to measure.
- 4.19 Canterbury's prestigious Enterprise Hub status is unlikely to have been achieved without the District's significant HE presence. The Hub is a technology business incubator that improves start-up and survival rates of technology and knowledge based companies having high-growth potential. It offers tailored business support services and flexible easy in/easy out office and laboratory accommodation. Many of these services are targeted at students/graduates but in reality they are more likely to be linked to post-graduate research. A number of entrepreneurs engaged

in science and technology based research and development have already joined the Hub with many others taking advantage of the available specialist business support services.

- 4.20 Canterbury Christ Church University has a particular role in relation to the local public sector labour market. As well as providing the sector with a pool of available placement and trainee candidates, graduates then occupy various permanent positions in local schools, hospitals, clinics and the police service.
- 4.21 The many graduates from all the institutions that complete their studies each year provide a wealth of talented individuals who are well positioned to be social and economic entrepreneurs. To aid this process, Graduate Placement Programmes operate at both universities to try and retain graduates locally. In simple economic terms, if an area can provide good quality jobs and affordable housing, it should be easier to retain graduates from local institutions than to try to attract new skilled labour to migrate to the area from elsewhere. There are also benefits in community relations terms if undergraduate students can see a permanent future in the area and remain settled in the area after graduation.
- 4.22 The universities have access to and attract the latest, most advanced technologies. Several projects including a wireless broadband technology initiative piloted at the University of Kent could soon be offered to local businesses, communities and services. These technologies would be less likely or readily available without University facilities and support.
- 4.23 It is clear that the investment and operational activities of the local educational institutions have considerable impacts on the Canterbury district economy, through their direct expenditure on local goods and services, the local spending patterns of their students and staff and the added value their presence generates.
- 4.24 In addition, there is a strong association between the concentration of well-educated individuals and economic growth. Their knowledge and experience tends to spill over to others and increase their productivity or improve means of production. Therefore the higher education sector is well placed to play an even greater role in safeguarding the future prosperity of the District.
- 4.25 In this respect, higher education and capitalising upon the presence of higher education to boost local economic performance and embrace new economic opportunities features prominently in the Canterbury District Local Plan, Canterbury District Economic Strategy and the District's Community Strategy. Each of these plans seeks to increase the number of quality 'knowledge-based' jobs available in the local economy.
- 4.26 In driving forward economic development for the area, the higher education sector also has an important role as a key player in strategic partnerships such as Canterbury 4 Business (C4B), the Canterbury District Local Strategic Partnership and the East Kent Partnership (EKP).
- 4.27 **Recommendation 1: The higher and further education institutions in Canterbury should continue to work together with the City Council to further raise the profile of the city.**
- 4.28 **Recommendation 2: The local economic benefits of the education institutions and their student populations should be maximised by the establishment of**

procurement policies which encourage as far as possible local small and medium sized businesses to supply them with goods and services.

- 4.29 Recommendation 3: The City Council and Canterbury 4 Business should work closely with the education institutions to monitor their continuing effects on the local economy and to promote and publicise these benefits more effectively.**
- 4.30 Recommendation 4: The City Council should promote the economic development of the district, particularly knowledge based businesses, to encourage graduate retention in the area.**

CHAPTER 5

Community, Cultural and Sporting Facilities

- 5.1 One of the distinctive benefits of hosting four major higher and further education institutions within the city is the range of community, cultural and sporting facilities which are provided by the institutions. These benefit not only the student community studying at the institutions but in many cases are also made available to the community as a whole.
- 5.2 The purpose of this chapter is to draw attention to the extensive range of facilities that are provided, and to give an indication of the level of general public access and use of these facilities. One of the issues that needs to be considered as part of the Scrutiny Review is how use by the general public of the various facilities can be developed and publicised. Clearly maximising the public use of these facilities, subject of course to the educational requirements of the institution concerned, must be a very valuable opportunity and by promoting public use in this way there can only be a wider recognition of the value of the institutions to the city.
- 5.3 The facilities offered by the four main institutions will be considered in turn.

Canterbury Christ Church University

- 5.4 The facilities which are available within the City of Canterbury as a result of the presence of Canterbury Christ Church University include the following:
- St Martin's Priory. Refurbished 16th century building available for conferences and private or corporate events.
 - Sidney Cooper Gallery, St Peters Street, opened in 2004 as a gallery space with a programme of exhibitions by national and international artists, staff and students. Open to the public daily. (It is recognised that the Gallery building previously provided facilities for public use).
 - Bookshop. Open to the public daily.
 - St Gregory's Centre for Music. Provides a range of concerts and other events open to the public, especially during the Festival.
 - Fitness Centre, St George's Place. Open to the public daily.
 - Self-catering accommodation for tourists and visitors in Lanfranc House and Parham Road village from July to September each year.
 - Library. Open to the public for reference purposes

5.5 University of Kent

The facilities which are available within the City of Canterbury as a result of the presence of the University of Kent include the following:

- Facilities for large and small scale residential and non-residential conferences, functions and events during vacation periods.
- Gulbenkian Theatre. Provides a full programme of plays, concerts and other events open to the public.
- Cinema 3. Shows a wide range of films open to the public.
- Convenience store and Bookshop. Open to the public daily
- Wide range of indoor and outdoor sports facilities, available to the public.
- Library. Open to the public for reference purposes.

University College for the Creative Arts

5.6 The facilities which are available within the City of Canterbury as a result of the presence of the University College for the Creative Arts include the following:

- Herbert Read Gallery, the city's largest contemporary art space, with a curated annual programme of exhibitions and events, featuring the work of leading and emerging artists and architects, graduating students and art and architecture research groups. Open to visitors daily.
- Art Materials Shop. Open to the college/gallery visitors daily.
- Café. Open to the college/gallery visitors daily
- Library. Canterbury's largest specialist visual art, architecture, design and creative arts resource, at present open to students and alumni only, but potentially a resource for interested members of the public.
- The Cragg Lecture Theatre, a large modern facility available for conferences, film and video screenings.

Canterbury College

5.7 The facilities which are available within the City of Canterbury as a result of the presence of the Canterbury College include the following:

- The Lanfranc Theatre, showing a wide range of work produced by the performing arts students at the College. Open to the public.
- Café and Beretun Restaurant. Open to the public daily.
- Floristry shop. Open to the public.
- Hairdressing services, beauty therapy and holistic therapy treatments available to the public.
- Library. Open to the public.

Canterbury Student Radio

- 5.8 A new initiative by the local Students' Unions, the radio station to be provided by students for students is also intended to serve local school students and young people generally – thus benefiting the local community.

Conclusion

- 5.9 It is apparent from the list of facilities and opportunities set out above, that the presence of the four educational institutions within the city offers a wide variety of facilities for the benefit of Canterbury and East Kent residents and businesses.
- 5.10 Please advise during the consultation period if there are any significant facilities or services available that are missing from this list.
- 5.11 **Recommendation 5: The use of these facilities should continue to be publicised and promoted for the benefit of the wider community whilst not prejudicing the interests of the students for whom they are provided in the first instance. Policies should be put in place to encourage additional access by the public and local businesses and such usage should be monitored. The institutions should consider using the city council's residents' card scheme to promote usage by local residents.**
- 5.12 **Recommendation 6: Each of the four HE/FE institutions should continue to hold a variety of events each year aimed at the general public, to familiarise the public with the facilities available at each institution and the educational opportunities on offer, and generally to foster goodwill amongst the local community.**

CHAPTER 6

Student Numbers, Characteristics and Potential Growth

- 6.1 When discussing the impact of students on Canterbury, it is important to understand the statistics in relation to student numbers, the characteristics of the student population, recent trends and the potential for future growth. This is quite a complex area and given the clear trend towards more varied patterns of higher education compared to 10-20 years ago, it is important not to be simplistic about the issue.
- 6.2 In the public mind and in the media, the term “student” raises the image of someone in the age range 18-22 years, who has left home to study on a full-time basis, after which they move away again for work. This image, which may have been true 20 years ago, is now much too simplistic. Canterbury College prefer to use the term ‘learner’ rather than student to avoid this misleading impression. Many “students” attending the educational institutions in the city will be part-time students in employment who are part of the settled community in the Canterbury and East Kent area. Similarly, many full-time students will already be based in the area, either opting for higher education in their home area after school (possibly staying in the parental home) or studying later in life as mature students after years of employment in the area. Students such as these form an increasing proportion of the total and account for much of the growth in student numbers. Plainly this part of the student population does not have the same impact as those who come to Canterbury to study and require accommodation in the Canterbury area.
- 6.3 It is therefore possible to overstate the number of students in the traditional sense in the Canterbury area, and thus to exaggerate the impact of these students. It is sometimes said that there are 30,000 students in Canterbury, giving the impression that the city with a total population of 45,000 is overwhelmed. A more accurate indication would be the 17,500 full-time students attending at UoK/CCCU/UCCA, but this figure fails to recognise the large number of people of all ages already located in Canterbury and East Kent who opt to study at these institutions. Local people studying at these institutions have little impact by virtue of their studies compared, say, to their paid employment in the area. The number of full-time students who have actually moved to the area to study is probably about 12,500.
- 6.4 Nevertheless it is clearly important to recognise and seek to address the real and apparent problems which arise from the number of students living and studying in the city.
- 6.5 To assess the true impact of student numbers on the Canterbury area the following factors need to be taken into account:
- a) Three of the institutions, the University of Kent, Canterbury Christ Church University and Canterbury College provide courses at campuses and other locations outside Canterbury, such as Broadstairs, Chatham, Tunbridge Wells and, in the case of Canterbury College, a number of learning shops around East Kent. It is thus important to distinguish between students taught by the institution and those taught at campuses in Canterbury, only the latter having any potential impact on the city. In the case of the University College for the

Creative Arts, there are five campuses across Kent and Surrey with only the Canterbury campus relevant to this study.

- b) The University of Kent and Canterbury Christ Church University also accredit courses which are provided by other institutions elsewhere in the UK. Again these have no impact on Canterbury. For example, Canterbury Christ Church University accredited 2,541 students in other institutions in 2003/4. The higher education courses at Canterbury College are currently accredited by the University of Kent, but these students study at the College and should not be double counted.
- c) Many students studying at the various institutions do so on a part-time basis, defined as students with a study pattern allowing a major employment commitment. Such students are likely to have been in the area before commencing their studies. Full-time courses require 20-25 hours attendance at the institution each week, which allows for part-time employment to assist with living expenses but precludes a major employment commitment.
- d) Even when the true number of full-time students is identified this is an overstatement of the number moving into the area due to the increasing trend towards studying from the parental home or those taking up study as mature students. Mature students, normally defined as those aged 25 or more will usually be based in the Canterbury and East Kent area already and thus part of the settled community.

6.6 It is the minority of the student population who move to the area to study that has associated with it the impacts which are considered by this review – both positive and negative. In order to clarify these potential impacts, this chapter contains a careful analysis of student numbers, their characteristics, recent growth and possible future trends.

Canterbury Christ Church University

6.7 In the case of Canterbury Christ Church University the overall number of students registered by the institution is approximately 14,000, but of these only 2,250 are full-time students who have moved to the Canterbury area to study. The remainder attend at other institutions, other campuses or were already based in the area prior to commencing their studies. The following table gives a full breakdown of student numbers relating to the academic year 2003/4.

Analysis of CCCU Student Numbers 2003/4

| | |
|--|--------|
| Total number of students registered by the Institution. | 13,948 |
| Less students attending courses accredited by CCCU but taught at other institutions (Canterbury College and elsewhere in the UK) | 2,541 |
| Students being taught by CCCU itself. | 11,407 |

| | |
|--|---------------|
| Students being taught by CCU itself | 11,407 |
| Less students attending courses at campuses outside Canterbury: | |
| Broadstairs | 800 |
| Tunbridge Wells | 561 |
| Medway | 0 |
| Students being taught at Canterbury locations | <u>10,046</u> |
| Less part-time students combining study with employment, already based in the area. | 3,635 |
| Full-time students being taught at Canterbury locations. | <u>6,411</u> |
| Less students living outside the district and commuting to CCCU to study. | 3,407 |
| Full-time students living in Canterbury district. | <u>3,004</u> |
| Less students already living in Canterbury district at the time of their application to study, so already based in the area. | 753 |
| Full-time students who have moved to the Canterbury area to study. | <u>2,251</u> |

6.8 It is this figure of 2,251 full-time students who have moved to the Canterbury area to study who need accommodation, either in university provided accommodation or in the private housing market.

6.9 In recent years the student population at Canterbury Christ Church University has grown substantially as shown in the following table.

Growth in CCCU Student Numbers 1998-2006

| | Registered by Institution | Being taught at Canterbury | Full-time at Canterbury * |
|--------|---------------------------------|----------------------------------|---------------------------------|
| 1998/9 | 10,998 | 9,906 | 5,029 |
| 1999/0 | 11,627 | 10,466 | 5,366 |
| 2000/1 | 12,461 | 10,990 | 5,784 |
| 2001/2 | 13,094 | 11,412 | 5,877 |
| 2002/3 | 13,727 | 11,072 | 6,199 |
| 2003/4 | 13,948 | 10,046 | 6,411 |
| 2004/5 | 14,630 | 11,256 | 6,609 |

* Includes commuters from outside the district and those living in the area prior to taking up their studies.

- 6.10 The relatively high proportion of older, mature students studying at Canterbury Christ Church University is shown in the following table.

CCCU Full-time students 2004/5: age on entry

| | | |
|-------------|-------|-------|
| Under 18 | 23 | 0.3% |
| 18 – 20 | 3,115 | 45.0% |
| 21 – 24 | 1,623 | 24.4% |
| 25 – 29 | 715 | 10.3% |
| 30 and over | 1,447 | 20.9% |
| Total | 6,924 | 100% |

University of Kent

- 6.11 In relation to the University of Kent the overall number of students registered by the institution is approximately 15,200, but of these only 10,200 are taught full-time at the Canterbury campus. The remainder attend at other institutions or other campuses. Even amongst the 10,200 a proportion were already based in the area prior to commencing their studies. The following table gives a full breakdown of student numbers relating to the academic year 2005/6.

Analysis of UoK Student Numbers 2005/6

| | |
|--|--------|
| Total number of students registered by the Institution | 15,165 |
| Less students attending courses accredited by UoK but taught at other institutions (Canterbury College, Mid, South & West Kent Colleges) | 1,329 |
| <hr/> | |
| Students being taught by UoK itself | 13,836 |
| Less students attending courses at locations outside Canterbury: | |
| Medway | 1,257 |
| Brussels School | 124 |
| London Centre | 0 |
| Tonbridge Centre | 135 |
| <hr/> | |
| Students on courses at Canterbury campus | 12,320 |
| Less part-time students combining study with employment, already based in the area: | |
| Undergraduate | 1,554 |
| Postgraduate taught courses | 450 |
| Postgraduate research courses | 128 |
| <hr/> | |
| Full-time students on courses at Canterbury campus | 10,188 |

| | |
|--|--------------|
| Full-time students on courses at Canterbury campus | 10,188 |
| Comprising: | |
| Undergraduates | 9,228 |
| Postgraduate taught courses | 581 |
| Postgraduate research courses | 379 |
| Less students on year abroad or placed in industry | 335 |
| Full-time students being taught at Canterbury Campus | <u>9,853</u> |

6.12 Some of these 9,853 students live outside the district and commute to the University of Kent to study; others are already living in the Canterbury district at the time of their application to study, so are already based in the area, and potentially remain in the parental home or, if mature students, in their own home. An analysis to establish the number of students in these categories is being undertaken but there is no doubt the number of full-time students who have moved to the Canterbury district to study will be less. It is these students who need accommodation, either in university provided accommodation or in the private housing market.

6.13 In recent years the student population at the University of Kent has grown substantially as shown in the following table.

Growth in UoK Student Numbers 1998-2006

| | Registered by Institution | Registered at Canterbury | Full-time at Canterbury | On year abroad/in industry | Full-time * being taught at Canterbury |
|--------|---------------------------|--------------------------|-------------------------|----------------------------|--|
| 1998/9 | 9,916 | 9,916 | 7,185 | 249 | 6,936 |
| 1999/0 | 10,042 | 10,042 | 7,303 | 234 | 7,069 |
| 2000/1 | 10,602 | 10,602 | 7,585 | 218 | 7,367 |
| 2001/2 | 12,241 | 10,100 | 7,547 | 233 | 7,314 |
| 2002/3 | 13,029 | 10,683 | 8,261 | 248 | 8,013 |
| 2003/4 | 13,803 | 11,423 | 8,957 | 269 | 8,688 |
| 2004/5 | 14,280 | 11,692 | 9,379 | 289 | 9,090 |
| 2005/6 | 15,165 | 12,320 | 10,188 | 335 | 9,853 |

* includes commuters from outside the district and those living in the area prior to taking up their studies.

6.14 The age distribution of the full-time student population studying at the University of Kent is shown in the following table. Compared with the figures for Canterbury Christ Church University in paragraph 6.10 there is a much greater proportion of younger students.

UoK Full-time students 2005/6: age on entry

| | | |
|-------------|--------|-------|
| Under 21 | 8,642 | 74.1% |
| 21 – 24 | 1,659 | 14.2% |
| 25 and over | 1,355 | 11.6% |
| Total | 11,667 | 100% |

University College for the Creative Arts

- 6.15 The number of students studying in the academic year 2005/6 at the UCCA Canterbury campus is as follows:

| | |
|-----------|------|
| Full-time | 960 |
| Part-time | 104 |
| Total | 1064 |

- 6.16 The total figure has increased over recent years as shown in the following table:

| | |
|--------|------|
| 2002/3 | 876 |
| 2003/4 | 878 |
| 2004/5 | 992 |
| 2005/6 | 1064 |

- 6.17 The strategic plans of the University College envisage modest growth in student numbers at the Canterbury campus by approximately 8% by 2008/9, an absolute increase of 84 students. The planning totals are as follows:

| | |
|-----------------|------|
| 2005/6 (actual) | 1064 |
| 2006/7 | 1065 |
| 2007/8 | 1125 |
| 2008/9 | 1148 |

Canterbury College

- 6.18 The total number of learners attending the college in 2005/6 is 11,954. Not all of these attend the main Canterbury campus. The age range is very wide as shown in the following table.

| <u>Age</u> | <u>Total Learners</u> | <u>Proportion</u> |
|------------|-----------------------|-------------------|
| Up to 18 | 4,449 | 37.2% |
| 19 – 25 | 2,200 | 18.4% |
| 26 – 40 | 2,448 | 20.5% |
| Over 40 | 2,857 | 23.9% |
| Total | 11,954 | 100% |

- 6.19 Only those 19 and over – 7,505 - are within the scope of this study and of these many are following part-time workforce development and adult/community courses. 829 are following higher education courses based at Canterbury.

Ethnicity of the Student Population

- 6.20 Figures have been provided by both Canterbury Christ Church University and the University of Kent regarding the ethnicity of their student populations. It should be noted these statistics relate to the total number of students attending each institution, not those attending at Canterbury. These figures are presented in both absolute and percentage terms, together with the ethnic breakdown of the district population as a whole derived from the 2001 census.

Student Population ethnicity

| Category | CCCU Total | CCCU Proportion | UoK Total | UoK Proportion | District Proportion |
|----------------------------|---------------|--------------------|--------------|-------------------|------------------------|
| White | 11,692 | 83.8% | 10,525 | 69.4% | 96.6% |
| Black | 397 | 2.8% | 700 | 4.6% | 0.5% |
| Asian | 310 | 2.2% | 1,412 | 9.3% | 1.0% |
| Chinese | 66 | 0.5% | 491 | 3.2% | 0.5% |
| Mixed | 88 | 0.6% | 445 | 2.9% | 1.0% |
| Other ethnic background | 173 | 1.2% | 172 | 1.1% | 0.5% |
| Not known | 1,222 | 8.7% | 1,420 | 9.4% | - |
| Total | 13,948 | 100% | 15,165 | 100% | 100% |

Note: CCCU 2004/5 figures; UoK 2005/6 figures

- 6.21 It is important to note that the student population is clearly much more ethnically diverse than the general district population, and it is also clear that the students at the University of Kent are more ethnically diverse than those at Canterbury Christ Church University. This no doubt reflects the nature of the courses on offer and the nature of the two institutions. The proportion of students at UCCA recruited from overseas is between seven and ten percent on average which also implies a more ethnically diverse population than the average locally. 5% of the students at Canterbury College are from minority ethnic groups, compared with 3.4% in the general population, indicating above average recruitment from these groups.
- 6.22 It is understood that the trend in student recruitment is likely to mean an increasing proportion of students being recruited from ethnic minority backgrounds and from overseas. This raises particular issues in respect of student accommodation (see paragraph 8.39) and potentially racial bias incidents (see paragraphs 12.24 and 12.25).

Potential Future Growth in the Student Population

- 6.23 This report contains the latest available statistics in terms of student numbers. It is obviously highly relevant to the Scrutiny Review to seek to understand the likely trend in student numbers at the various institutions in the next few years. Whilst the institutions produce a number of projections of possible future student numbers these are primarily for internal business planning purposes and are inevitably surrounded by a number of significant uncertainties. The introduction of increased tuition fees and a new student loan/bursary system starting in the 2006/7 academic year is a case in point. This can only increase the uncertainty which affects student recruitment which is influenced in any case by supply and demand considerations and wider social trends affecting the take up of higher education. The general trends in relation to full-time and part-time education and the propensity to study

locally while based in the parental home are also liable to change in the future. For the purposes of this Scrutiny Review a further important aspect is the relative growth of student numbers at each institution which relate to their Canterbury operation as opposed to other campuses in Kent or courses taught elsewhere.

- 6.24 As a result of these uncertainties the Scrutiny Review Panel has not been able to assemble robust statistics for future student growth albeit growth in the foreseeable future is unlikely to occur at the same rate as the last few years. The Panel recommends that the position is carefully monitored each year and potential future trends are identified as the current level of uncertainty surrounding higher education becomes clearer.
- 6.25 Notwithstanding these comments, it is clear that all the institutions concerned remain very competitive and effective in student recruitment. For example, the University of Kent achieved year on year growth in the number of student applications received for 2006/7 in the face of a slight downturn nationally. There is consequently very little likelihood of a drop in student numbers at Canterbury but continued rapid growth is also unlikely.
- 6.26 There is no doubt that much of the growth that does occur at the University of Kent and Canterbury Christ Church University will be concentrated at their campuses outside Canterbury, particularly in Medway where there is a large urban population currently relatively poorly served by higher education. This trend is to be welcomed both in its own right and because it will ease the pressure from additional student numbers which might otherwise arise in Canterbury.
- 6.27 **Recommendation 7: Future changes in the number and characteristics of the student population should be monitored annually and reported to the City Council and relevant bodies. A dialogue about potential growth in student numbers should inform the institutions' accommodation strategies and the City Council's private sector housing role in terms of student rented accommodation.**
- 6.28 **Recommendation 8: The City Council welcomes the growth in higher and further education being developed by the institutions at their campuses outside Canterbury, both to spread the opportunities of education more widely and to assist the regeneration of East and North Kent.**

CHAPTER 7

Students' Positive Contribution to the Local Community

- 7.1 The large student population living in the city, as described and analysed in Chapter 6, makes a significant positive contribution to the city which needs to be fully recognised alongside the more negative issues which are addressed later in the report. The purpose of this chapter is to set out some of these positive benefits which are of a general nature and not related to whether or not students live in purpose-built accommodation or in private rented housing.
- 7.2 Four aspects of this positive contribution are dealt with in this chapter, namely:
- i) Students' contribution to the workforce
 - ii) Students' contribution to community life
 - iii) Students as a generator of services and facilities
 - iv) Students' contribution to cultural life

Students' Contribution to the Workforce

- 7.3 Students' contribution to the workforce and thus the local economy is wide ranging just as the nature of the student community is wide ranging. Many of the students at Canterbury Christ Church University for example are full-time employees within the workforce, often in senior positions within local businesses and services such as schools and the NHS.
- 7.4 In relation to the younger undergraduate student population one of the benefits is the ready availability of a flexible and well qualified workforce able to take up part-time employment roles. There has been a clear trend in recent years for students on full-time courses taking up part-time employment during term time to help pay for their time at university, together of course with employment during vacations.
- 7.5 The University of Kent student survey in 2005 found that 30.9% of students within the sample who responded had a job. Of these, most worked between 6 and 15 hours per week, although a small proportion worked longer hours (presumably many of these being part-time students). The average number of hours worked per week was 12.8 hours.
- 7.6 Approximately one-third of those with a job earned up to £5 an hour, with approximately two-thirds earning between £5 and £10. Only a tiny proportion earned more than £10 per hour. The average hourly wage was £5.59. Multiplying the average number of hours worked by the average wage gives an average weekly income of £71.55.
- 7.7 Students obviously work in a wide range of occupations, but given the strong service sector in the city much employment must be in the retail and hospitality sectors. The ready source of flexible, part-time and well-qualified labour can only benefit the wide range of businesses within the city.
- 7.8 One disadvantage for local people may be that the student population reduces the number of available opportunities for permanently resident young people. It is understood that the number of students seeking work in the city does mean that

some need to find employment elsewhere in East Kent and even as far afield as Bluewater.

- 7.9 Many students engage in the local workforce as an integral part of their studies, for example as student teachers in local schools and by taking placements in the health service and other social sectors. In effect, they may well occupy labour 'gaps' which otherwise might be difficult to fill.
- 7.10 Students have many skills which could benefit the local community on a casual paid for basis. Consideration could be given to the setting up, perhaps by the Student Unions, of a 'Hire a Student Agency' which would match students with customers seeking specialist skills such as music tuition, I.T. and personal coaching or more general work such as baby sitting, garden tidying etc. Work would be paid for (at least at the national minimum wage) and proper safeguards would of course be required. Such a scheme would assist the integration of students into the local community and provide a financial benefit for participants.
- 7.11 **Recommendation 9: The Jobshops run for the students at each institution should continue to be promoted to and used by local businesses and voluntary groups to maximise the employment and volunteering opportunities available locally for students, including temping and casual work opportunities.**

Students' Contribution to Community Life

- 7.12 The students who are resident in the city contribute in many ways to general community life. The majority see themselves as residents and wish to be considered as such. They participate in the community in a number of ways.
- 7.13 They are fully involved in the sporting life of the area. The universities and colleges run a wide variety of sporting teams who participate not only in inter-university competitions but also locally in various sporting leagues. Many individual students participate by joining local clubs and their teams. The universities' facilities are used for many of these activities and host a variety of sporting competitions on both a local and regional basis.
- 7.14 Students in the city also take an active role in voluntary and charitable work. Kent Union employ two volunteer coordinators who match volunteer opportunities within the community with student volunteers. Recent figures include 550 student volunteers and 40 staff volunteers from the University of Kent investing 26,000 hours and £150,000 worth of volunteering time in the community over a year. Kent Union organise 'One World Week' every year to celebrate diversity and culture, and RAG (raise and give) charity fundraising for local charities.
- 7.15 Student volunteers work throughout the community in a wide variety of organisations - the Scrine Foundation, Canterbury Open Centre, Umbrella Centre, Local Primary and Secondary Schools, National Read Together Scheme, Montgomery School, Oxfam, British Heart Foundation, Mind and Cancer Research, Charity Shops, Local Rainbow, Brownie, Guide and Scout Units, British Red Cross, Blean Woods Nature Reserve, The Stour Project, Kent Wildlife Trust, and many local churches amongst others.
- 7.16 Volunteering at the University of Kent is accredited via the Kent Students Certificate for volunteering. The university authorities encourage volunteering, recognising the many benefits. Volunteering is not only beneficial to the

organisations assisted but to the students themselves and assists job prospects. Most volunteering is carried out by 18 to 23 year olds, older students generally having other work or family responsibilities.

- 7.17 Particularly in the case of Christ Church University students, there are many trainee nurses, teachers and so on who work in the community on course related placements. This may limit the amount of voluntary work they can do as they have less spare time available.
- 7.18 Many UCCA students undertake arts-based projects in the community which is a form of voluntary community engagement valuable both to the communities and to the students themselves.
- 7.19 It has been traditional amongst universities and colleges to try to keep Wednesday afternoons free from formal contact time in order to allow students to engage in voluntary and sporting activities. This is seen as very valuable but timetabling pressures are tending to threaten this half-day opportunity for students to engage with the local community.
- 7.20 **Recommendation 10: The university authorities are asked to continue to keep Wednesday afternoons free from formal teaching as far as possible in the case of full-time non professional programmes in order to allow the student community to engage most effectively in sporting and voluntary activity within the community.**
- 7.21 **Recommendation 11: Student voluntary activity should be targeted if possible towards the residential areas in the city where there is a significant student population in order to foster improved community relations in those areas. Volunteering opportunities are particularly sought in such areas.**
- 7.22 **Recommendation 12: An annual Student Award Scheme should be established to recognise (a) good neighbourliness and (b) exceptional voluntary work in the community. A co-ordinator and sponsorship for such an award scheme is invited to come forward.**

Students as a Generator of Services and Facilities

- 7.23 In addition to the other spin-off benefits, the resident student community have a significant role in terms of generating additional facilities and services in the city which would not otherwise be available.
- 7.24 For example, the city offers a far wider range of cafes, restaurants, take-aways, bars and clubs than would normally be present in a city of Canterbury's size, and this is clearly a result of the student population. The number and range of retail outlets in the city is also enhanced by the support of the student population, not only convenience outlets but the full range of retail facilities provided.
- 7.25 The large number of students living and studying in the city, many of whom do not have a car, and those who travel to their studies daily, do much to generate public transport services. Taxi services and bus services such as the frequent Unibus serve the student community and are also then available for use by local residents, benefiting everyone.

Students' Contribution to Cultural Life

- 7.26 The student population form an important market sector for the city's various cultural services. Quantifying the level of student engagement is difficult as attendance figures are not broken down to determine usage in this way. However, in terms of the City Council's own services, the following gives a snapshot of the benefits of the student population:
- Student stand-by tickets priced £5 are offered for Marlowe Theatre performances. Some programming particularly appeals to student audiences.
 - The museums and galleries work formally and informally with a number of student projects each year, for example history dissertation projects, archaeology courses, electronics and multi-media projects. Canterbury Christ Church University students visit the museums and galleries for teacher training familiarisation and Canterbury College students to develop marketing skills.
 - Anecdotal evidence from Active Life indicates that Kingsmead Leisure Centre is particularly popular amongst students. The pool in particular is well used complementing the dry facilities provided at the University of Kent Sports Centre and to a lesser extent Canterbury Christ Church University.
 - Students are traditionally frequent consumers of cultural products such as festivals and events. Some of these are provided directly by the Council (eg Whitstable Biennale), some are co-funded/partnered by the council (eg Canterbury Festival, Global Bandstand).
 - UCCA students initiate and contribute to numerous exhibitions and contemporary art and architecture projects in and around the city, and many alumni are employed within the city' creative sector.
- 7.27 Canterbury has a strong tradition of arts education. The council's local cultural strategy includes action seeking to improve partnership working with the educational institutions to enable the development of culture and learning opportunities for local residents as well as students. The city's creative economy however is weak and fragmented, with little support available to help graduates to develop careers or new businesses in Canterbury. A major constraint on creative enterprise in Canterbury is the lack of suitable affordable workspace in the city centre, and intervention is required to create a supply of suitable studio and rehearsal space, no frills accommodation for start ups and serviced workspace in a dedicated creative industries centre. Work to encourage entrepreneurship amongst arts students to support new businesses in Canterbury is also much needed. The City Council's Culture and Communications division is working to address these issues to maximise the benefits of the significant arts and cultural resources in the city, both the physical resources available and in terms of the creative student population which lives in the city. The newly formed University College for the Creative Arts is developing a Cultural Strategy in close consultation with the city's and region's cultural and civic institutions.

CHAPTER 8

Student Accommodation

- 8.1 At the outset of this chapter it is important to recognise that a significant proportion of full-time students and pretty well all part-time students are already part of the settled community based in the area before they commence their studies and do not therefore have any accommodation requirements. As the statistics in the previous chapter demonstrate, this amounts to a very large proportion of the total number of 'students' studying in the city at any one time.
- 8.2 The purpose of this chapter is to identify the accommodation which is available and used by full-time students who move to the Canterbury area to study. The higher education institutions provide accommodation for a proportion of their full-time student communities. The amount of accommodation provided and the allocation policy of each institution is set out below, and this is then compared with the number of full-time students who move to the Canterbury area to study at each institution and who therefore need accommodation.
- 8.3 An assessment of the overall number of private sector houses in the residential areas of the city occupied by students is also included, together with a table to bring together the overall picture for the city as a whole and a future projection given anticipated trends in the student population.

Canterbury Christ Church University

- 8.4 Canterbury Christ Church University provide the following accommodation for full-time students studying at the Canterbury campus:
- Campus based accommodation
 - 149 student rooms
 - Off campus accommodation owned directly by the University:
 - Lanfranc Hall of Residence, Northgate – 212 students
 - Vernon Place Hostel – 26 students
 - College owned houses – 85 students
 - Off campus accommodation managed by the University and leased accommodation from third parties
 - College Court Halls, College Road – 20 students
 - Holmes Court, College Road – 20 students
 - Oaten Hill Hostel – 20 students
 - Parham Road Student Village – 383 students
 - Pin Hill Halls of Residence – 156 students
 - Headlease Scheme – 35 students
- 8.5 The total accommodation provided in the 2005/6 academic year by the University therefore provides places for 1,106 students.
- 8.6 In relation to the total 2,251 full-time students moving to the area to study at the Canterbury Campus in 2003/4 this amounts to accommodation for 47.5% of the student population.

- 8.7 There are no plans at the present time to provide further accommodation. Phase 4 of Parham Road Student Village (106 students – included in the total above) was handed over in September 2005 and the University now wish to establish a clear pattern of demand for its accommodation before considering any further provision. The University is not therefore anticipating increasing its student accommodation in the next two years but will review the position after that date.
- 8.8 The allocation policy of the University is to guarantee all first year full time student arrivals under the age of 24 an accommodation place. No such guarantee is given to second or third year students, or mature first year students. Some priority is given to overseas students. Part-time students are not accommodated, being based in the area already.
- 8.9 Since 1998/9 the amount of accommodation provided by the University for its full-time students has grown as shown in the following table:

| | Accommodation Places |
|--------|---------------------------------|
| 1998/9 | 630 |
| 1999/0 | 647 |
| 2000/1 | 780 |
| 2001/2 | 758 |
| 2002/3 | 1,122 |
| 2003/4 | 1,069 |
| 2004/5 | 1,132 |
| 2005/6 | 1,106 |

- 8.10 The amount of university provided accommodation for CCCU students in relation to the number of full-time students is set out in the following table:-

Accommodation for CCCU full-time students in 2003/4:

| | | Proportion accommodated |
|---|-------|----------------------------|
| University provided accommodation | 1,069 | |
| Number of full-time students being taught at Canterbury locations | 6,411 | 16.7% |
| Number moving to the Canterbury area to study | 2,251 | 47.5% |

University of Kent

- 8.11 Based as it is in extensive grounds, the University of Kent has historically provided a large amount of on-campus accommodation for its full-time students studying at Canterbury. By the academic year 1998/9 there were approximately 3,200 residential accommodation places on campus. This figure remained roughly constant until 2004/5 when an additional 339 en-suite bedrooms were provided in Tyler Court phase 2. A further site in Parkwood was then developed with 520 en-suite bedrooms and these were made available in September 2005 in time for the 2005/6 academic year. The University has no accommodation off campus. 400 places are made available to postgraduate students, the remainder to undergraduates.

- 8.12 The University's stock of student accommodation in 2003/4 and 2005/6 was made up as follows:

| | 2003/4 | 2005/6 |
|---------------------|--------------|--------------|
| Darwin Houses | 138 | 138 |
| Darwin College | 369 | 348 |
| Rutherford College | 309 | 296 |
| Elliot College | 299 | 272 |
| Becket Court | 103 | 103 |
| Keynes College | 320 | 294 |
| Tyler Court | 189 | 528 |
| Parkwood 5 bedrooms | 790 | 790 |
| Parkwood 6 bedrooms | 618 | 618 |
| Parkwood Flats | 0 | 520 |
| Other | 85 | 74 |
| Total | 3,220 | 3,981 |

- 8.13 Since 1998/9 the amount of accommodation provided by the University for its full-time students has grown as shown in the following table:

| | Accommodation Places |
|--------|---------------------------------|
| 1998/9 | 3,244 |
| 1999/0 | 3,244 |
| 2000/1 | 3,196 |
| 2001/2 | 3,189 |
| 2002/3 | 3,185 |
| 2003/4 | 3,220 |
| 2004/5 | 3,524 |
| 2005/6 | 3,981 |

- 8.14 The following table demonstrates that during the period 2000/1 to 2003/4 the combination of an increasing number of full-time students together with a roughly constant amount of on-campus accommodation led to a reduction in the proportion living on campus from 44.9% to 37.1% and a corresponding increase in the number and proportion of students living off campus from 55.1% (3,928 students) to 62.9% (5,465 students).

UoK Full-time students in relation to campus accommodation

| | 2000/1 | 2001/2 | 2002/3 | 2003/4 |
|---------------------------------|---------------|---------------|---------------|---------------|
| (i) Full-time students * | 7,124 | 7,207 | 8,013 | 8,685 |
| (ii) Campus residential places | 3,196 | 3,189 | 3,185 | 3,220 |
| (iii) Students housed on campus | 44.9% | 44.3% | 39.8% | 37.1% |
| (iv) Off campus students | 3,928 | 4,018 | 4,828 | 5,465 |
| (v) Students housed off campus | 55.1% | 55.7% | 60.2% | 62.9% |

* Number of registered full-time students at the University of Kent Canterbury campus excluding those on year abroad/placed in industry.

- 8.15 The next table illustrates the impact of the recently built accommodation on the position. Between 2003/4 and 2005/6 the additional 859 campus residential places provided at Tyler Court and Parkwood increased the proportion of students housed on campus by 3.1%. However the increase in full-time students of 1210 means that the number of students living off campus still increased by 449. 40.2% of the student population is now accommodated on campus, somewhat lower than the proportion of 44.9% in 2000/1.

UoK Full-time students in relation to campus accommodation

| | 2003/4 | 2004/5 | 2005/6 |
|---------------------------------|--------|--------|--------|
| (i) Full-time students | 8,685 | 9,086 | 9,853 |
| (ii) Campus residential places | 3,220 | 3,524 | 3,981 |
| (iii) Students housed on campus | 37.1% | 38.8% | 40.4% |
| (iv) Off campus students | 5,465 | 5,562 | 5,872 |
| (v) Students housed off campus | 62.9% | 61.2% | 59.6% |

- 8.16 As well as the completion of the Parkwood development, the University are pursuing proposals to erect a further 450 bedrooms on campus for September 2007, making 4,431 in total by that date. If the number of full-time students remains at 9,853, 44.9% will be accommodated, the same percentage as in 2000/1, although the absolute number living in the city will have increased by nearly 1,500 since that date. The University will then wish to establish a clear pattern of demand for its accommodation before considering any further provision. It is not, however, anticipated that the number of full-time students at the Canterbury campus will increase significantly in the immediate future, so the position in relation to off campus student numbers should stabilise.
- 8.17 The allocation policy of the University is to guarantee all full-time foundation year and undergraduate students an accommodation place in their first year, together with new European Union short-term and diploma students and new post-graduate students. Interestingly on average 18% of the students in these categories do not take up the offer of accommodation – either because they are going to stay in their parental or own home or they make other arrangements.
- 8.18 This allocation policy (which has operated for a number of years) was reviewed in early 2004/5 in the light of the new student accommodation being provided and a decision was taken to house some 300 third year students from September 2005. These places are allocated by a ballot which was oversubscribed twofold for 2006/7 places indicating unmet demand which could justify further provision in future.

University College for the Creative Arts

- 8.19 The Canterbury campus of the University College for the Creative Arts provides the following accommodation for full-time students:
- Ian Dury House – 57 student places in a residential block on the campus site.
 - Riverdale House, off Sturry Road – 24 student places in 4 flats, each for 6 students
 - Parham Close - 21 student places in 3 houses adjacent to Riverdale House, each accommodating 7 students.

- House in St Augustine's Road – 5 student places.
- Managed houses - 120 places in a number of privately owned houses located in ordinary residential roads, which are leased to the college.

8.20 The total accommodation provided in the 2005/6 academic year by the University College provides places for 227 students.

8.21 Since 1999/2000 the amount of accommodation provided by the University College for its full-time students has grown as shown in the following table:

**Accommodation
Places**

| | |
|--------|-----|
| 1999/0 | 99 |
| 2000/1 | 99 |
| 2001/2 | 114 |
| 2002/3 | 139 |
| 2003/4 | 200 |
| 2004/5 | 188 |
| 2005/6 | 227 |

8.22 The University College is planning to increase its stock of student accommodation with the development (in partnership with Paul Roberts Associates) of Hotham Court within the Parham Road Student Village. This development is planned to open for the 2006/7 academic year providing 107 student places. The agreement to lease the managed houses will cease at the same time, so it is envisaged there will be 214 student accommodation places provided by the University College in 2006/7.

8.23 There are plans for a further 100 student places in a development adjacent to Hotham Court in time for 2007/8, and a further 80 student places in 2008/9. If these developments are pursued the University College will possibly close Ian Dury House on campus (to be released for academic accommodation) and Riverdale House. If all these proposals are implemented the University College will have 313 student accommodation places available for its full-time students in 2008/9.

8.24 Very like the two universities, the allocation policy is to accommodate only first year full-time students or those new to Canterbury, and this aim is achieved with the stock of places available.

8.25 The information available to the University College regarding the place of residence of its students is incomplete but an analysis of the place of residence during 2005/6 for the 850 students for which records were available reveal the following pattern:

| | <u>Students</u> | <u>Proportion</u> |
|--|-----------------|-------------------|
| Living in parental home outside the district | 254 | 29.9% |
| Living in parental home within the district | 102 | 12.0% |
| Living in University College accommodation | 175 | 20.5% |
| Living in private accommodation | 319 | 37.5% |
| Total | <u>850</u> | |

- 8.26 Assuming that these same proportions apply in relation to all the 1,064 students registered during 2005/6, the following would be the pattern of residence:

| | <u>Students</u> |
|--|-------------------------|
| Living in parental home outside the district | 318 |
| Living in parental home within the district | 128 |
| Living in University College accommodation | 219 (actual figure 227) |
| Living in private accommodation | 399 |
| Total | <u>1,064</u> |

- 8.27 It should be noted that the category “Living in Private Accommodation” could include mature students living in their own accommodation as well as groups of students living together in private rented accommodation. It is clear that the University College attracts a large proportion of its students from the local area who either remain in their parental home or are already living independently within the area. The impact of the University College on the student rented accommodation market in the city is therefore modest compared to the two Universities.

Canterbury College

- 8.28 The higher and further education courses provided by Canterbury College are designed for students already based in the Canterbury and East Kent area, who therefore commute to the College as necessary rather than moving to the city to study. The College consequently does not provide residential accommodation for its full-time students as there is no need to do so.

Student Accommodation within the private housing market

- 8.29 As explained above, the three higher education institutions in the city who attract full-time students to the area to study provide accommodation essentially for first year or postgraduate students new to the area, leaving students in their second and subsequent years to find their own accommodation within the private housing market. As demonstrated in Chapter 6, since the late 1990s there has been a significant increase in the number of students studying in Canterbury, and whilst a proportion of this increase has been the take-up of both part-time and full-time education by those already based in the area, there has also been a significant increase in the number of full-time students attracted to the Canterbury area to study.
- 8.30 The higher education institutions have provided additional accommodation since the late 1990s, but perhaps inevitably this was not provided in step with the increase in full-time student numbers. Additional provision in the recent past however has significantly improved the position. With this additional accommodation the proportion of the full-time student population who are accommodated in purpose-built provision is approximately the same percentage now as it was in the late 1990s. The overall increase in student numbers however means that in absolute terms the number of students being accommodated in the private housing market has increased significantly.
- 8.31 To accommodate the demand for student accommodation a strong student rented accommodation sector has grown up in the Canterbury area. In one sense this has been a success story, the market responding to meet demand and thus providing

the necessary accommodation which has enabled students to attend the higher education courses that they have wanted to and thereby enabling the higher education sector in the city to expand. There have also been some undesirable consequences however as discussed elsewhere in this report.

- 8.32 It is possible to accurately establish the growth in the student rented accommodation sector within the city by analysis of the Council's tax records, because students enrolled on full-time education courses are exempt under national legislation from paying council tax under Class N of the relevant exemption regulations. This exemption mirrors Class M under which full-time students living in university halls of residence are similarly exempt from paying council tax. The financial effects of the council tax exemption position are discussed in Chapter 9.
- 8.33 The clear trend since the late 1990s is that there has been a substantial increase in the number of houses within Canterbury district which are occupied wholly by full-time students. An analysis of council tax records in the spring each year (the most accurate time to measure the peak figure) gives the following information as to the number of full-time student households.

Student Households in Canterbury District

| Year | Date of Peak | Number of Student Households |
|-------------|---------------------|-------------------------------------|
| 1998/9 | May 1999 | 1,087 |
| 1999/2000 | May 2000 | 1,210 |
| 2000/1 | May 2001 | 1,334 |
| 2001/2 | April 2002 | 1,470 |
| 2002/3 | May 2003 | 1,659 |
| 2003/4 | May 2004 | 1,872 |
| 2004/5 | May 2005 | 2,030 |
| 2005/6 | May 2006 | 2,035 |

- 8.34 Clearly there has been a significant increase in the number of full-time student households within the community over recent years. The effects of this trend, however, are even more significant because full-time student households are concentrated in very specific areas. An analysis of where these households are located is set out in the next chapter.
- 8.35 Very significantly the figure for the latest academic year, 2005/6, shows only a minor increase in student households for the first time following a consistent and relatively rapid rise since 1998/9. This is clearly the result of the University of Kent and to a lesser extent UCCA bringing on-stream additional purpose built accommodation in 2005/6. Time will tell whether this is just a temporary pause in the upward trend or the beginning of a period of stability in the student rented market.
- 8.36 The above table does have to be interpreted with caution, however. An analysis of the number of full-time students in a sample of these households has been carried out which demonstrates a significant number (about 20%) of one and two person households. These small full-time student households may well relate to older students beginning to "settle down" or mature students already based in the area opting for full-time education. The majority of full-time student households are occupied by three to five students, with only a very small number having six.

Size of Full-time Student Households

| Number of full-time students in household | Number of households | Number of full-time students | Percentage of households |
|---|----------------------|------------------------------|--------------------------|
| 1 | 5 | 5 | 6% |
| 2 | 11 | 22 | 14% |
| 3 | 16 | 48 | 20% |
| 4 | 26 | 104 | 33% |
| 5 | 17 | 85 | 22% |
| 6 | 4 | 24 | 5% |
| Totals | 79 | 288 | 100% |

Sample size 79 households

Average number of students per household 3.65

- 8.37 Student household size tends to be significantly larger than the average, this figure of 3.65 compares with 2.03 for the city as a whole. This factor increases the potential impact of a high concentration of student households in any particular area – see chapter 9.

Summary of the Student Accommodation Position

- 8.38 Relating the number of full-time students studying at Canterbury locations with the accommodation position set out in this chapter reveals the following overall picture for 2004/5, the latest year full figures are available.

Full-Time Students and their Accommodation 2004/5

| | | | |
|--|-------|--------|-------|
| Full-time Students | | 16,683 | |
| UoK | 9,086 | | |
| CCCU | 6,609 | | |
| UCCA | 988 | | |
| University Accommodation | | 4,844 | 29.0% |
| UoK | 3,524 | | |
| CCCU | 1,132 | | |
| UCCA | 188 | | |
| All-Student Houses in residential areas (2,030 x 3.65) | | 7,410 | 44.4% |
| Students living with non-students, in parental homes, or commuting from outside the district | | 4,429 | 26.5% |

Students from Ethnic Minorities

- 8.39 It was noted in paragraphs 6.20 – 6.22 that the student population comes from a diverse range of ethnic minority backgrounds and an increasing number from overseas. The Universities' accommodation policies give preference to such students for obvious reasons and this is to be welcomed.

Conclusion

- 8.40 It is obviously the case that the more student accommodation that can be provided by the higher education institutions themselves the lower the number of students who will look to the private rented market for accommodation. Now that higher education is becoming increasingly competitive, it is in the institutions' own interest to ensure the provision of suitable accommodation as part of their "offer" to attract applicants for their courses. However, the constraints on the institutions also need to be recognised. Investment to secure additional student accommodation must be based on a sound business case and may need to compete against investment for academic purposes as a funding priority. In recent years Canterbury Christ Church University and latterly the University College for the Creative Arts have worked in partnership with a private sector provider to secure additional accommodation on a long term lease basis, but again the financial risk is being carried by the institution concerned and so there must be a strong business case to justify such proposals.
- 8.41 In addition, the preferences of the student community must be carefully taken into account. Whilst most first year undergraduate students seek an accommodation place, many (but by no means all) prefer for their second and subsequent years to take up privately rented accommodation with a friendship group as this is seen as a preferable, more independent lifestyle. In practice, none of the three higher education institutions provide accommodation for second and subsequent year students, with the exception of the University of Kent who now offer a small number of places to subsequent year students by ballot. This ballot is substantially oversubscribed indicating latent demand which could be satisfied by further provision.
- 8.42 **Recommendation 13: In order to reduce the pressure on the private housing market in Canterbury, the higher education institutions should explore the provision of further purpose built accommodation based on an assessment of the anticipated growth in full-time student numbers and the likely demand from second and subsequent year students. Such accommodation could be either on campus or elsewhere in the city. As a minimum the higher education institutions should aim to accommodate 50% of non-local full-time students who would otherwise be likely to seek rented accommodation in the city.**
- 8.43 **Recommendation 14: That land should be allocated and/or policies encouraging additional purpose built student accommodation should be included in the emerging City Council Local Development Framework.**
- 8.44 **Recommendation 15: It is important to keep the provision of purpose built student accommodation and the number of student rented properties in residential areas under review. The Student Impact Working Group (see chapter 13) should fulfil this role and prepare a report for the City Council and the Institutions on the subject annually.**

CHAPTER 9

Student Households in Residential Areas

- 9.1 The purpose of this chapter is to describe the distribution of all-student households who are living in non-university accommodation in the general housing market. Following this analysis the potential means for controlling this distribution is discussed and then the implications of this position. In the great majority of cases student households rent their accommodation from a variety of landlords and the student/landlord relationship is thus very important. Landlords have a key responsibility and role to play in managing student impact issues in residential areas and this issue is discussed in Chapter 11.
- 9.2 The perceived negative effects arising from a large concentration of student households in any particular residential area are discussed in chapter 10, together with recommendations as to how each issue can be best addressed. Anti-social behaviour issues, which do not solely relate to residential areas, are discussed in Chapter 12.

Distribution of Student Households

- 9.3 The distribution of student households within the residential parts of the district is very concentrated in specific areas. Proximity to the institutions concerned is a key factor – the preference amongst students is to be close to the institution's facilities and the student community activities which take place there. However, the distribution is also affected by the characteristics of the housing stock in different parts of the district, with student rented accommodation tending to be concentrated in the smaller, more affordable housing types.
- 9.4 An analysis of student households using the May 2005 council tax records has been undertaken to establish the distribution of student households within the community and therefore the areas which are particularly affected by the associated effects of a large student population. The following table shows the breakdown of student households across the district .

Student Households in May 2005 in Canterbury District

| Area | Total Properties | Student Houses | %Student Houses |
|-------------|------------------|----------------|-----------------|
| Canterbury | 22154 | 1885 | 8.5 |
| Whitstable | 14683 | 40 | 0.3 |
| Herne Bay | 16337 | 37 | 0.2 |
| Rural Areas | 7856 | 29 | 0.4 |
| Total | 61030 | 1991 | 3.3 |

- 9.5 It is immediately obvious that student households are concentrated almost exclusively within Canterbury city, the number of student households elsewhere being negligible. The following table provides a breakdown of student households in a number of zones which have been analysed within the city, together with the immediately adjacent villages. The zones are shown on map overleaf.

Student Households in May 2005 in Canterbury City

| Zone | Area | Total Properties | Student Houses | %Student Houses |
|------|------------------------------------|------------------|----------------|-----------------|
| A | Hales Place Estate | 1461 | 342 | 23.4 |
| B | North Holmes Rd | 1297 | 165 | 12.7 |
| C | Northgate/Sturry R. | 2242 | 279 | 12.4 |
| D | Whitehall Road/St Dunstons Terrace | 675 | 72 | 10.7 |
| E | Station Road West/Broad Oak Road | 1478 | 156 | 10.6 |
| F | City Centre | 1614 | 165 | 10.2 |
| G | Salisbury Road/ Giles Lane | 1562 | 155 | 9.9 |
| H | Wincheap | 2092 | 193 | 9.2 |
| I | Cherry Drive/ Westgate Court Av. | 1137 | 93 | 8.2 |
| J | Spring Lane Estate | 836 | 64 | 7.7 |
| K | London Rd Estate | 773 | 56 | 7.2 |
| L | South Canterbury | 2156 | 92 | 4.3 |
| M | Tyler Hill Village | 243 | 7 | 2.9 |
| N | Rough Common & Harbledown | 775 | 17 | 2.2 |
| O | Blean Village | 587 | 12 | 2.0 |
| P | Thanington Without | 932 | 6 | 0.6 |
| Q | Sturry Village | 2294 | 11 | 0.5 |
| | Total | 22154 | 1885 | 8.5 |

- 9.6 It is clear student households are concentrated in the north and east parts of the city but there are some student households throughout the city. It is noticeable how the number of student households is small in the surrounding areas of Sturry, Thanington Without, and even Rough Common/Harbledown, Blean and Tyler Hill which are relatively close to Kent University but nevertheless have few student households presumably because of the housing characteristics in those areas and the relative lack of services such as public transport.
- 9.7 This analysis by zone averages out the concentration of student households in particular streets, some of which have higher concentrations than others. There is a noticeable concentration of student households on the Hales Place Estate but other parts of the city are also significantly affected. It has already been noted in paragraph 8.36 that the average student household size is significantly larger than for non-student households, thus increasing their potential impact in residential areas.

Legislative Controls

- 9.8 The increase in and relatively concentrated distribution of student households in the city raises the question as to whether there are any regulatory controls which might be available to influence the position. The only potential control over the number and distribution of student households would be under the Town and Country Planning legislation. However, as explained below, this has only very limited application to the issue.
- 9.9 Essentially the occupation of residential property by students is left to market forces, as planning law does not distinguish between student and non-student occupied dwellings. When planning permission is granted for a residential unit, it can be occupied by a conventional family or up to 6 persons living together as a household. Consequently the city council, as local planning authority, cannot distinguish between different types of occupiers, provided they live together as a single household. This normally entails a significant element of shared facilities such as a kitchen, living room and bathroom and the sharing of household utility bills. In the case of most student households these requirements are met and in virtually all student households the number of persons involved is no more than six (see table in paragraph 8.35).
- 9.10 If there are no significant shared facilities and the accommodation is effectively made up of bed sits, with independent utility billing, cooking arrangements etc. then the unit is likely to be termed a house in multiple occupation (HMO) for planning purposes. This is a different planning use from a single dwelling unit and the change from one type to another would require planning permission.
- 9.11 Where it is known that a proposed residential building will be or is likely to be multi-occupied in this way, a planning condition can be imposed requiring the owners of the building to submit for approval a management plan dealing with the parking and maintenance problems which might arise.
- 9.12 Concern is sometimes expressed that a particular planning application for a private residential development will inevitably become student housing. As explained above, this is essentially a matter for market forces to determine and there is no ability to control occupancy by students or non-students one way or the other. Similarly, planning permission is not required to change the use of established family dwellings for occupation by households of up to 6 students, notwithstanding any environmental or other problems that might occur. Such dwellings also have their normal permitted development rights which allow alterations and extensions up to a limited size without planning permission being required, thus often providing an extra bedroom or allowing an integral garage to be converted to a further bedroom. The city council, as local planning authority, cannot prevent this from happening unless there is a condition removing these permitted development rights on the planning permission for the house when it was first granted. This for example could require garages to be retained for parking purposes unless planning consent is obtained. Such conditions are normally only found on relatively recent planning permissions but can certainly be imposed in appropriate cases.
- 9.13 **Recommendation 16: The city council as local planning authority should consider imposing appropriate conditions to remove permitted development rights in new housing developments (as explained in 9.12) when it is felt that the use of these rights might be likely to increase certain problems should the houses concerned be used for multiple occupation.**

- 9.14 Concerns have been expressed that the student village at Parham Road, off Sturry Road, has developed in an incremental way and did not include any affordable housing element. As stated above, there are no controls available to prevent the occupation of housing by students and this is essentially what happened. The mechanism to seek to coordinate what might otherwise be incremental development is to prepare a development brief for the area which is then taken into account during the determination of relevant planning applications. Unfortunately, in the case of the first application for redevelopment in Parham Road, a planning refusal on the basis that there was no development brief for the area, which might have included a requirement for affordable housing, was dismissed on appeal, thus setting the scene for the individual applications that have followed for development in Parham Road.
- 9.15 Whilst there are understandable concerns surrounding the concentration of development in Parham Road, on the other hand the accommodation which has been provided there for students has made a significant contribution to the amount of effectively purpose-built student accommodation in the city (see Chapter 8). This has correspondingly reduced the pressure for student households to be accommodated in rented housing elsewhere in the city. The housing in Parham Road is high quality, modern accommodation, popular with the students and has the benefit of an on-site staff presence from Canterbury Christ Church University. By concentrating student accommodation together in this way there are distinct benefits in terms of compatible life styles, although the concerns of nearby permanent residents and those living on walking routes to and from the student village are appreciated.
- 9.16 **Recommendation 17: The University authorities should consider what additional facilities and services might be made available to enhance the Parham Road area as an attractive and convenient place for students to live, and to work with the relevant public authorities to minimise any adverse impacts for the surrounding area.**
- 9.17 There has been much interest nationally in attempts to control the increase in student occupied dwellings by a planning policy approach such as the so far abortive initiative to introduce an “area of student housing restraint” in Leeds. However, this approach provides no control over the use of housing by up to six students living as a household which makes it an ineffective suggestion certainly in the context of Canterbury. Such a designation would potentially be able to control the construction of purpose-built student housing but such housing should be encouraged wherever appropriate in order to reduce the pressure on the rented housing market.
- 9.18 The recent Residents/Students Conference on student impact issues did not feel that in the Canterbury context there was any need at this stage to seek to look to additional regulatory controls over student households, which would in any event require national legislation. It was considered that the emphasis should be put instead on measures to improve community relations in areas with a high student population, together with practical measures to tackle particular issues. These practical measures are discussed in Chapter 10.
- 9.19 Legislative controls under housing legislation are discussed in chapter 11. Such controls can be used to regulate the quality and standard of student housing accommodation, as explained in that chapter, but do not assist in the regulation of the number of student households in any particular area.

- 9.20 It is recommended in Paragraph 8.41 that the city council should develop planning policies to encourage additional purpose-built student accommodation in order to reduce the number of student households seeking accommodation elsewhere in the city.

Students and Council Tax

- 9.21 Although an issue of national policy rather than local, one of the issues which has arisen during the review is the question as to whether students or their landlords should pay council tax. The City Council is reimbursed for the tax lost, but the issue still seems to be divisive. At present the tax is levied on the occupiers of buildings and full time students are exempt from the tax under national legislation. Although clearly a matter for central government, the city council may wish to influence the subject.
- 9.22 In terms of the financial effect of the student exemption on the city council, it is a common misconception that the council tax not collected on the properties occupied by full-time students falls directly on the city council and thus to the council tax payers in the district. This is simply not the case, as the central government revenue support grant system takes account of these exempt properties, in effect reimbursing the city council for the income foregone. Under the old revenue support grant system it was estimated that the reimbursement in 2002/3 was complete except for £19,600 due to the detailed mechanics of the calculation. From 2006/7 the revenue support grant system has been changed so that it is now impossible to clarify exactly if the reimbursement amounts to 100%, suffice it to say that the number of student exempt properties is reported to government annually and is taken into account in the calculation of grant.
- 9.23 Notwithstanding the fact that the financial implications for the city council are minimal, the argument can be made that nationally there is a loss of tax income and in any event it is inequitable for student properties to be exempt. This is however a complex issue. The exemption is a matter of national policy and is closely related to the overall financial arrangements surrounding higher education including tuition fees, student loans, bursaries and so on, all in the context of government policies which seek to encourage additional take-up of higher education. Alternatively it might be possible for landlords to be made liable for the tax; whether or not this cost would be absorbed or passed onto the students is not clear. Other factors also need to be taken into account, for example purpose built student halls of residence are not subject to council tax and the relationship with the council tax benefit system for those on low incomes for which students might become eligible. It is interesting to note that in Canterbury district, approximately 6,500 properties receive 100% council tax benefit which is over three times the number of properties exempt from council tax as a result of full-time student occupation. The income foregone by the city council in respect of council tax benefit is similarly reimbursed under the revenue support grant system.
- 9.24 In view of the complexity surrounding the issue and the fact it is a national policy matter the Panel recommends that the Local Government Association should set up a working party to consider the student council tax exemption.
- 9.25 **Recommendation 18: Whilst recognising that the city council is reimbursed the lost income, it is recommended that the Local Government Association should set up a national working party to consider the case for full-time students or student landlords to pay Council Tax.**

CHAPTER 10

Tackling Negative Issues in Residential Areas

10.1 The purpose of this chapter is to discuss the impacts arising from significant numbers of student households in general residential areas. Given the pattern of student households which is now well established in the city these are clearly difficult issues to resolve with no easy answers apparent. The chapter seeks to deal with the following matters:

- i) Refuse collection issues
- ii) Car parking issues
- iii) Perceived isolation
- iv) "Clash of Lifestyle" issues

10.2 Two other matters are raised as negative effects of a large number of student households, namely an increase in poorly maintained properties and increased crime and anti-social behaviour. These topics are complex and have chapters to themselves (chapters 11 and 12 respectively).

Refuse Collection Issues

10.3 Difficulties associated with refuse and recycling collections are frequently mentioned as an issue in areas with a large number of high student households. This particular council service is inevitably high profile and relatively challenging due to the fact there are 60,000 individual households across the district and the service relies on both public understanding and co-operation and the performance of SERCO, the council's contractor. This combination of factors can sometimes lead to problems even in the most stable of communities but the issues are undoubtedly more difficult to deal with where there is a high concentration of private rented property and a more mobile population comprising households of unrelated students living together.

10.4 There is little hard evidence in relation to these issues and great care must be taken not to generalise or attribute problems to the student community when they may not actually be responsible.

10.5 The problems attributable to some students (but equally to some non-students) are as follows:

- i) Refuse or recycling material put out on the wrong day, in the wrong container or excessive waste put out not contained within the bin provided.
- ii) Large household items and waste dumped at the start or end of term (which might equally be due to the action of landlords).
- iii) Cars in disrepair taking up valuable parking bays, although there is no evidence that students are any more likely to abandon cars than other sectors of the community.

- iv) Difficulty in providing information to students enabling them to comply with the council's collection arrangements, due to the relatively more mobile nature of the student community, potentially moving in and out each academic year as compared to the non-student community which is generally settled for a longer period.
 - v) The difficulties caused by students vacating the property during long vacations, thus not necessarily fitting in well with the council's alternate weekly collection arrangements. Such intermittent occupation can also cause difficulties in getting information to the student community.
 - vi) It is sometimes difficult to take enforcement action in areas with a high student population because the council is never quite sure who is responsible for putting waste out.
- 10.6 These are indeed difficulties which require vigilance and determination by city council and SERCO staff to tackle. However these problems are by no means solely confined to areas with large student populations.
- 10.7 Additional effort to ensure the provision of information and guidance in areas with a large student population is clearly critical to secure the understanding and co-operation of the student community with the council's collection arrangements. In order to ensure that this is the case, a number of improved processes have been put in place in recent months:
- The arrangements are outlined briefly in an annual leaflet (first produced in 2004) entitled "Welcome to Canterbury", which is distributed widely to students each year at freshers' and registration events, plus various Student Union and Institution outlets. The contents are also included on the websites of the City Council, the Institutions and Student Unions.
 - A more detailed explanation has been prepared for the various websites, also for distribution by the main letting agents in welcome packs prepared for their properties, for distribution at freshers'/registration events and by direct mail shot to known student properties.
 - City Council staff attend both freshers' and registration events each year to answer questions and distribute information leaflets.
 - The City Council has asked agents with student properties to insert additional requirements in their tenancy agreements that the tenants comply with the City Council's procedures for refuse/recycling collections. Nine agents have already agreed to include these additional requirements in their tenancy agreements and it is hoped many more will do so.
 - The issue is being addressed through the proposed Student Accommodation Accreditation Scheme.
- 10.8 There is general agreement that the council's alternate weekly collection arrangements are more challenging to implement in areas where there is a large student population. The combination of all adult households of larger than usual size combined with periodic periods of non-residence means that, even with complete cooperation, the potential for student households to exceed their landfill waste allowance or put out their waste at the wrong time is more likely. The claim

that the alternate weekly collection system would be unworkable in student areas was frequently made in the lead up to the introduction of the system in Canterbury during the autumn of 2005, and whilst this did not prove correct (many student households cooperated fully and were able to recycle successfully) there have nevertheless been difficulties in some areas. Continued efforts by both the council's staff and those of the contractor will be needed in any event in student areas but the Review Panel feel that the difficulties are such that further steps need to be taken to address the situation. The council is due to review the implementation of the alternate weekly collection system in summer 2006, and the following recommendations are put forward for consideration during the review.

- 10.9 The council's collection arrangements do involve flexibility because when there are large households (defined as six persons or more) who are making the effort to recycle or compost as much as possible of their waste, but nevertheless find they are unable to contain their landfill waste within the standard 240 litre bin each fortnight, a second landfill bin is made available. Whilst this flexibility applies equally to student households, the Review Panel believes that consideration needs to be given to the fact that student households are all adults, whereas many large households contain children who would not normally generate as much waste. The Review Panel therefore recommends that a second landfill bin should potentially be made available in the case of all adult households of four persons or more as well as large households of six persons or more. This additional flexibility would ease the operation of the alternate weekly collection system in areas with a large student population but would also apply equally to non-student households as any discrimination would be inappropriate.
- 10.10 **Recommendation 19: The offer of a second landfill bin should potentially be made available to households of four adult persons or more in addition to large households of six persons or more.**
- 10.11 With the additional flexibility recommended in the previous paragraph, the Review Panel believes that the council's alternate weekly collection system can be operated successfully in areas with a large student population during term time. It is most important that the student community play their full part in meeting the council's recycling and composting performance targets and there is no legitimate reason why they cannot do so. The institutions promote recycling amongst their students and these efforts are appreciated. Different considerations do apply at the end of each term, and this issue is considered separately below.
- 10.12 **Recommendation 20: Student households should operate within the council's normal alternate weekly refuse and recycling arrangements in the same way as non-student households during each term, and be responsible for putting out waste on the correct day. During vacation periods landlords will be held responsible for waste at their properties.**
- 10.13 **Recommendation 21: Continuous efforts to communicate the council's refuse and recycling collection arrangements are essential each academic year and the council's Environment and Street Scene section and the contractor should pay particular attention to this issue.**
- 10.14 In relation to student households, problems tend to arise at the end of each term and particularly at the end of the summer term when student households vacate their properties and excess, unsorted or bulky waste is sometimes put out without reference to the correct collection day.

- 10.15 The Review Panel has debated at length what special arrangements should be made to accommodate these end of term problems. Despite concerns that additional, exceptional collection arrangements in areas with a high student population could lead to the generation of more waste and the potential for abuse of the extra collections that are laid on, the Review Panel have concluded that additional and/or more flexible collections in such areas should be provided to tackle what is a serious issue. Efforts should also be made to publicise the additional collection arrangements which are available to all, namely the possibility of additional paid for collections using purple sacks, the use of the council's bulky waste collection service and the option of taking waste to the local civic amenity site.
- 10.16 **Recommendation 22: Additional and/or more flexible refuse collections should be made in areas with a large student population at the end of each term, and particularly the summer term, in recognition of the fact that students often then have additional waste and move out in advance of the normal collection day, and collections are not then required for several weeks. The Students Unions and HE/FE institutions should be invited to assist in tackling this issue.**
- 10.17 **Recommendation 23: The end of term waste issue should also be tackled by better publicity and promotion of the existing services that are available, for example paid for purple sack and bulky waste collections, improved liaison with student landlords and letting agents, and the rigorous use of enforcement powers.**

Car Parking Issues

- 10.18 As explained earlier in this report, many full and part-time students are based in the Canterbury area prior to commencing their studies and may continue to live either with their parents or, if mature students, in their existing accommodation. Such students may well own cars and the parking issues associated with these students at their home addresses are not related to the fact that they are commencing study.
- 10.19 The issue is raised however as a concern in relation to those students who move to the area to study, particularly those who are living in residential parts of the city rather than in university provided accommodation. There is also an issue in relation to car parking pressures adjacent to the University and College campuses where staff and students may try to park. This is a particular issue in relation to the University of Kent because the streets nearby are unrestricted – those adjacent to the other main campuses being restricted with resident's parking zones.
- 10.20 In the case of university provided accommodation, parking provision is restricted by the university authorities. At the University of Kent campus accommodation is not allocated any on-site parking provision except for the Parkwood development where provision is made. Residents elsewhere on the campus are unable to bring their cars to the city unless they use the paid for car parks on campus or park in nearby residential areas. However, there is probably more parking in nearby streets by staff or students commuting to the institutions to work or study than by resident students. Students living within 1 mile of the campus are not allowed a parking permit for the campus. In relation to Christ Church University, no student car parking is provided on campus, nor in relation to its accommodation either at the Parham Road student village or elsewhere.

- 10.21 The main concern in relation to students' cars is the level of additional parking in residential areas as a result of students living together in rented accommodation, with households of four, five or six students potentially each bringing a car to the city.
- 10.22 Students who rent accommodation in the city are of course legally entitled to bring and use their cars just as much as any other person who is not a student who lives in the city. It is not clear on what basis student car owners in residential areas could be treated any differently from non-student car owners. The issue is really the number of cars being parked in any particular residential area and whether this is excessive leading to inappropriate parking, obstruction and serious inconvenience to those seeking a space.
- 10.23 The recent University of Kent students survey revealed that of students living in private rented accommodation about a third brought a car to the city. This is perhaps lower than popular opinion might have thought. However there will of course be some student households where more students own a car than the average or where parking space is particularly limited and parking difficulties then arise. In any event students should be discouraged from bringing their cars to Canterbury because of the difficulties and attention should be drawn to the many public transport services which are available, including the Park and Ride services.
- 10.24 **Recommendation 24: The HE/FE institutions and the Student Unions should seek to discourage students bringing their private cars to the city in the recruitment and promotional information which is provided to prospective and existing students. Attention should be drawn to the difficulties associated with bringing a car to the city and the public transport services which are available.**
- 10.25 Fortunately a mechanism to control on-street car parking is available as the city council has already developed a residents' parking scheme covering the central part of the city as shown on the plan overleaf. Within the twelve parking zones shown, there are restrictions on on-street parking with residents parking permits issued to residents by the council's parking office. Within the twelve current zones, there are 2,119 on-street parking bays. In each zone a limit is placed on the number of permits issued and at present five of the twelve zones are oversubscribed (City Centre, St Georges, St Augustines, St Gregorys and St Dunstans) with a total waiting list of 107 people. These zones are in and around the city centre. The remaining seven zones are undersubscribed at present with the potential for more residents' parking permits to be issued before capacity is reached.
- 10.26 The city council is currently carrying out a review of parking problems across the city and a questionnaire was circulated to all households at the end of 2005 to establish if there were parking problems in areas currently with uncontrolled on-street parking. The results of this survey are imminent and an analysis of any problems will be undertaken. This process will provide a mechanism for extending residents' parking zones into further areas of the city if this is justified and receives public support.

- 10.27 **Recommendation 25: The current review of on-street parking issues in the city should be used to tackle issues in areas where there is a parking problem. The council's Executive should carefully consider the evidence gathered during the review process and if necessary extend residents' parking schemes into areas of the city close to University campus premises or with a large student population if additional controls are justified and have local support.**
- 10.28 The Canterbury Area Member Panel, at its meeting on 2 December 2004, agreed that in view of the number of on-street residents' parking bays being occupied by students in the city, the Student Impact Scrutiny Review be asked to consider that in order to reduce waiting lists, permits should only be granted to households that pay council tax.
- 10.29 The Review Panel has considered this suggestion carefully and taken legal advice which is clear that discrimination on the basis of status as a student or non-student would not be legally possible. In any event when any particular residents' parking zone is undersubscribed, there is no reason why students should not be allowed to purchase a permit. Where a particular zone is oversubscribed a limit of one permit per household is normally applied and the waiting list system means that the more mobile student households are less likely to receive a permit anyway. There are practical problems too, whilst there is a clear definition of student for council tax purposes, under the Data Protection Act it is not possible to use that information to pursue parking objectives. The suggestion that permits should only be granted to households who pay council tax would also affect those households who receive 100% council tax benefit.
- 10.30 **Recommendation 26: Students should be treated on the same basis as non-students when it comes to the issue of residents' parking permits. Where a particular zone has a waiting list, the number of permits issued per dwelling is used as a means of rationing, but such an approach should apply to students and non-students equally.**

Perceived Isolation

- 10.31 One of the more intangible but significant problems identified by local residents living in areas with a large student population is the perceived isolation of living in a community with a significant proportion of student households who are seen as "temporary" residents, being present for normally just one or two years. Some residents described such student households at the recent Residents/Students Conference as "not proper neighbours" which must be regarded as a great shame although undoubtedly is a real perception by some. Ironically, at the same conference, some students said they felt isolated too, not really knowing the other student households in their area nor the local residents who they had moved among.
- 10.32 This is a very challenging issue. Even in the most settled communities there can be difficulties of neighbourliness and perceptions of isolation. These issues however are undoubtedly more challenging when a significant number of the student population move each year and with the long vacations breaking up the continuity of residence.
- 10.33 One of the most positive outcomes of the Residents/Students Conference was the general agreement that grassroots action to tackle perceived isolation and good

neighbourliness in residential areas was a key priority. It is clear that the significant student population in Canterbury is here to stay and that the pattern of student rented accommodation across the city is unlikely to change significantly, whatever regulatory systems are put in place. The student housing accreditation scheme described in chapter 11 is intended to address many of the student/landlord issues that arise in residential areas, but this cannot tackle directly the need for improved community relations on the estates themselves. This can only be addressed by grassroots activity and discussion is invited as to how this could be achieved. The working group established after the Residents/Students Conference has identified this issue as a key challenge, and is planning a concerted effort at the start of the next academic year to run events and activities intended to break down student/non-student barriers in the main residential areas affected, this being the critical time when neighbour relations for that year are either established or not.

- 10.34 There needs to be wide discussion within the city as to how the perceived isolation of both student and non-student households in residential parts of the city can be tackled as this is clearly a significant issue.
- 10.35 **Recommendation 27: Residents' Associations in the city should ensure that one or more student representatives is involved in their organisation if there are a significant number in their area. Associations should consider how to welcome new student households into their area each academic year and how they can assist in breaking down student/non-student barriers.**

"Clash of Lifestyle" Issues

- 10.36 Part and parcel of addressing perceived isolation is the need to address the issues which arise from the potential clash of lifestyles of a student population amongst an older, more settled community. However, no one lifestyle can expect to take precedence in any particular residential area, and there is a need for good neighbourliness in all areas.
- 10.37 Continued efforts should be made to address these concerns by the publication and dissemination of "how to be a good neighbour" advice each year, aimed at both the student and non-student community. Occasionally more persistent issues will arise in relation to inter-neighbour relations and action to address this type of anti-social behaviour is therefore important. A new student related anti-social behaviour protocol has been drawn up to address persistent issues as described in chapter 12. There is no substitute, however, for good neighbourliness generally and local communities are encouraged to consider how they could positively address this matter.

CHAPTER 11

Student Landlord Issues

- 11.1 Concerns are frequently expressed that concentrations of housing in student occupation lead to an increase in poorly maintained properties in terms of external building maintenance and the appearance of poorly tended gardens. Whilst the student occupants may have a role in the latter issue (depending on the terms of the tenancy agreement) the former issue is solely a landlord responsibility. It must be recognised that neither poor house maintenance nor poorly maintained gardens are solely a problem in the private rented sector, some owner occupied houses being similarly affected. Nevertheless, it is generally the case that such problems are more common in private rented accommodation and the cumulative effect is a particular problem if there are a number of rented properties in any particular area. This does tend to be the case in relation to student occupied households.
- 11.2 It is important to make clear that maintenance issues are not the responsibility of the student population, rather that of the landlord community which ranges from good landlords who take their responsibilities to their tenants and neighbours seriously through to poor quality landlords who do not. It is very unfair to blame students for issues which are the landlords' responsibility.
- 11.3 In relation to gardening, it should be remembered that lawns and shrubs grow very vigorously during the spring and summer months, yet students are not usually in occupation during this period. Some landlords recognise this fact and make arrangements for gardening; others do not. There is clearly a strong case for educating landlords with a view to having gardening arrangements included as part of the "student package" when renting a house. Students do not generally consider that gardening is their responsibility and landlords should therefore make the necessary arrangements.
- 11.4 **Recommendation 28: Landlords should make arrangements for keeping garden areas in good order at their properties, with frequent maintenance during the growing season, and should not pass this responsibility onto their student tenants.**
- 11.5 The private rented housing sector is relatively complex in that it is primarily governed by market forces, with willing landlords opting to rent their property to willing tenants. The laws of supply and demand also apply, however, and the rapid rise in the Canterbury student rented market in recent years would tend to suggest demand outstripping supply, with a consequent potential effect on standards. The students who rent property are often relatively inexperienced as tenants but there are a number of sources of advice available and students are, like any other group, seeking the best quality accommodation in relation to the rents paid. The more discerning the student tenants are the better position they will be in to drive up standards in the rented housing sector. Generally the trend was for students to expect higher standards and the sector was for the most part responding to this.
- 11.6 **Recommendation 29: The Student Unions and Educational Institutions should continue to run information and awareness raising campaigns each autumn to advise students about to rent property as to the issues and potential pitfalls involved in becoming tenants.**

- 11.7 Student rented accommodation in Canterbury operates on an annual cycle, with student friendship groups seeking accommodation at the turn of the year with the tenancy itself commencing the following summer. Most tenancies are for a year, ending the following June or July, after which the tenancy is often passed to a successor student group, although in some cases a student group may remain in the same property for a second year. This is to be encouraged if at all possible, as additional continuity would assist in maintaining good community relations.
- 11.8 The detailed terms of a tenancy are set out in a legal agreement which establishes the rights and responsibilities of both parties. There may also be an agent involved, either just to introduce the tenant to the landlord or alternatively to also have a longer term management role acting as the landlord's agent in respect of the property throughout the tenancy. A number of letting agents have grown up in Canterbury to fulfil this function. An agent acts for the landlord, but has a duty of care to the tenant. In the case of about half of the student rented market, private landlords let and manage their own property, sometimes having a significant portfolio of properties to let which amounts in effect to a business operation.
- 11.9 However, private rented accommodation is not left purely to market forces, as successive governments have recognised the need to intervene in the market with regulatory controls which are operated by the City Council. The Housing Acts 1985 and 2004 set out the regulatory framework which operates, the aims of which are to regulate both the physical standards and contractual relations surrounding private rented accommodation with a view to protecting the rights and interests of landlords, tenants and the wider public.
- 11.10 The Housing Act 1985 contained provisions which applied specifically to the physical conditions of houses in multiple occupation (HMO). The definition of an HMO under the legislation was clearly of crucial importance, and much case law has surrounded the issue. The Housing Act 2004 has now cleared up the matter with a wide definition encompassing almost all kinds of accommodation that is occupied by people who are not members of the same family. This potentially brings under control the great majority of student rented accommodation in Canterbury, although as will be noted below, the controls that are actually available are more limited in nature.
- 11.11 It is important to recognise that the definition of a house in multiple occupation for Housing Act purposes is different from that under the planning legislation which has been described in chapter 9. The new definition in the Housing Act 2004 does not change the planning definition.

Influencing the Student Rented Property Market

- 11.12 The City Council as private sector housing authority has an educational and partnership working role in relation to student rented property as well as a regulatory role. The council has sought over the years to use all the opportunities available to it to influence the market. These include:
- Well-developed links with landlords and letting agents as a consequence of the housing department's day-to-day work. Landlords are accustomed to asking the City Council for advice.
 - The educational institutions work closely with the housing department and require every student house they advertise to be registered with the council.

- The City Council give information and advice through the well attended landlords forum which is run in partnership with the University of Kent and the Southern Private Landlords Association.
- The council publish information for landlords explaining what standards are expected in student rented accommodation.
- Landlords of student properties are generally fairly cooperative and respond positively. There are a number of big players in the Canterbury student housing market who are comparatively easy to engage but there are also a significant number of landlords with just one or two properties, often having been let out for many years. These landlords are harder to engage and often more resistant to change.
- The occasional prosecution of an uncooperative landlord or letting agent has a very positive effect on others and this approach is employed from time to time.

Exercising Control over Student Houses

- 11.13 Under the Housing Act 1985 the City Council ran a registration scheme which required landlords to notify the council of the details for all multi-occupied properties. This enabled the Council to make sure that adequate facilities and reasonable standards were maintained. Although adoption of the registration scheme was discretionary, once adopted it carried the force of law and it was compulsory for landlords to register.
- 11.14 The 1985 Act has now been superseded by the Housing Act 2004 which significantly changes the regulatory regime available to the City Council. The previous regime was primarily concerned with ensuring appropriate physical standards whereas the new approach focuses more on the approach to the management of property.
- 11.15 Under the Housing Act 2004 a mandatory licensing scheme will have to be introduced district-wide but this will only apply to the biggest houses, defined as those with three or more stories and five or more occupants. Due to the nature of the rented housing stock involved this will only apply to a very small number of student rented properties in the district.
- 11.16 There are discretionary powers to set up an additional licensing scheme to cover houses which are outside the mandatory licensing provisions but such a scheme would have to be approved by central government and it would be difficult to make a case for this without first trying other alternatives.
- 11.17 The only real alternative in Canterbury to tackle the student housing issue at this time is to pursue an accreditation scheme. Instead of being a regulatory scheme, accreditation seeks to harness market forces to raise standards by giving a market edge to better quality rented accommodation. In Canterbury's case any scheme would rely on partner organisations all being actively involved.

The Proposed Accreditation Scheme

- 11.18 The Review Panel commissioned a draft Canterbury accreditation scheme which has been drawn up by a working group of stakeholders including the Student Unions and HE/FE institutions. The draft scheme is included in this report as appendix 2. It is innovative in that it would be web-based and requires both students and landlords to engage with the scheme in order to gain the benefits. It would work as follows:
- (i) Landlords would use the scheme as a marketing tool to promote their houses and their services to students, with supporting photographs and a simple star-rating system. Property details would be entered on the system by the landlord via the internet, with a nominal fee charged per house. If any landlord wants to use a paper form instead, this could be done through the scheme administrator.
 - (ii) Students seeking a house would check the accreditation website for the house they are thinking of renting in order to find out what facilities it has got and to read feedback from current or previous tenants. Students could also get the feedback score via their mobile phone.
 - (iii) Universities as partners agree to only let or advertise houses that are on the accreditation scheme.
 - (iv) The Student Unions would advertise and promote the accreditation scheme website to all students, so that students make this their first port of call when seeking privately rented housing.
 - (v) The council is widely seen as an impartial or neutral organisation so the administrative centre for the accreditation scheme would be based at the council offices. Council staff will focus inspection and enforcement efforts on those houses where problems are reported.
 - (vi) Students taking up tenancies will be asked to give simple on-line feedback two or three times each year (eg was the house clean when you moved in? Were any repairs carried out before you moved in? Were you told about the refuse collection arrangements?). Any disputed feedback would be considered by the scheme operator.
 - (vii) Landlords have to join the scheme before being able to put their property details on the website. Joining the scheme entails both signing-up to the scheme and receiving education/training on the scheme's requirements. If a landlord subsequently fails to manage his houses properly he could be suspended from the scheme or, in exceptional cases, excluded from it, with his properties being immediately taken off the website.
- 11.19 It is expected that many of the owners of houses that currently feature on the council's registration scheme will join the new accreditation scheme at the outset, but the scheme will need a "critical mass" of participating landlords to make it successful. If this does not happen by the operation of market forces alone it may be necessary to set up an additional licensing scheme to supplement or even replace the accreditation scheme.
- 11.20 In view of the need to progress the accreditation scheme in time for the next student letting season, the Review Panel agreed to recommend the scheme in

advance of preparing this draft report. The City Council's Executive resolved to develop the scheme at its meeting on 27 April 2006 and a scheme administrator is currently being recruited. The higher education institutions have offered financial support towards setting up the scheme and the Student Unions are also strongly supportive, the standard of student accommodation being a priority issue for their members. The cost of setting up the scheme (primarily IT and staffing costs) is approximately £27,000 which will be shared by the City Council and the HE institutions, but the running costs are intended to be covered by a modest annual fee per property charged to landlords for posting their property details on the website.

11.21 The proposed accreditation scheme set out in appendix 2 offers the prospect of tackling many of the issues which cause concern in relation to student housing. As well as setting requirements for the landlord/tenant relationship, landlords will undertake to:

- provide clear telephone contact numbers
- use a model tenancy agreement
- include a clause requiring the tenant not to cause a nuisance or annoyance, with the landlord agreeing to use reasonable endeavours to achieve compliance
- cooperate fully with the public safety unit and police to resolve problems if required
- at pre-tenancy viewing stage undertake in writing to carry out any repairs or improvements that are necessary.
- maintain dwellings in a satisfactory state of repair
- remove surplus materials/debris after any building works
- arrange for regular lawn cutting/garden maintenance
- observe room size standards and prevent overcrowding
- provide appropriate security measures for the property
- include a clause requiring tenants to comply with the City Council's refuse/recycling collection arrangements
- provide the appropriate wheelie bins and collection sacks in accordance with the refuse/recycling collection arrangements
- provide tenants with written information about the refuse/recycling collection arrangements and to enforce tenancy provisions in relation to refuse disposal
- hold deposits in accordance with the new legislative requirements

11.22 Providing the proposed accreditation scheme has sufficient take up, it should provide a significant incentive towards the improvement of the student rented housing in the district and thus go a long way to mitigating many of the concerns which surround student rented accommodation. The scheme will need to be kept under review to ensure it is meeting its objectives. If at any stage the scheme does not appear to be working further consideration can be given to introducing an additional licensing scheme which would be of a mandatory nature. If the proposed accreditation scheme is not successful the City Council will have no hesitation in actively pursuing a licensing approach and would expect central government support if this approach proved to be necessary to tackle the issues involved.

- 11.23 **Recommendation 30: The Student Housing Accreditation Scheme should be developed and launched to be in place in time for the next “student letting season” in late 2006/early 2007. The higher education institutions should contribute financially towards the cost of setting up the scheme. In the event of the scheme failing to attract sufficient landlords or otherwise not achieving its objectives an additional licensing scheme should be considered.**
- 11.24 **Recommendation 31: Landlords and their agents should use their influence and powers under tenancy agreements in persistent or serious cases in support of the anti-social behaviour protocol.**
- 11.25 **Recommendation 32: Landlords should issue a welcome pack for their tenants containing useful information about local services, how to be a good neighbour and how to contact the landlord or agent to deal with property related issues.**
- 11.26 Not all student housing needs to be included in registration or licensing. In particular the halls of residence and the off-campus purpose built student accommodation that is directly managed by the universities is exempt from these schemes. In practice the universities make a point of ensuring that their own accommodation matches or exceeds the standards expected of the private sector and to this end the management of their housing must comply with a prescribed code of practice. However, the Universities might prefer to include their own properties voluntarily in order to give students better information about their accommodation and receive feedback.

CHAPTER 12

Crime and Anti-Social Behaviour

- 12.1 It is sometimes said that the large number of students in the city leads to an increase in anti-social behaviour and that there is more such behaviour than would otherwise be the case in a non-university city. This is a contentious claim and great care must be taken, in particular, not to blame the student community for the behaviour of non-students who are of the same age range. The term anti-social behaviour leaves scope for interpretation as to what is unacceptable behaviour and great care must be taken not to generalise. Students can be the victims of anti-social behaviour just as much as its cause and no one lifestyle choice can expect to have preference over another. These issues need careful handling and to this end an “Anti-Social Behaviour Protocol” has been drawn up.
- 12.2 It needs to be emphasised that the vast majority of students are well behaved but there are a small minority who, either knowingly or more often thoughtlessly, engage in behaviour which is considered as anti-social by others. It is in the interests of all that the few cases of serious or persistent anti-social behaviour are dealt with effectively, whether or not they relate to students or non-students. The purpose of this chapter is to recognise the reality of the issue, to put it into perspective and also to set out the procedures which are being put in place to effectively deal with it.
- 12.3 The statistics that there are clearly indicate that Canterbury enjoys low levels both of crime and anti-social behaviour, notwithstanding of course that even low levels are a matter of concern particularly to those directly affected and continued efforts need to be made to tackle the issue. The fear of crime, as indicated in a survey conducted by the Canterbury District Safer Community Partnership in 2004, is disproportionately higher than actual crime levels. Violence in open spaces and anti-social behaviour are the two most concerning for local residents. Within this context, the statistics of recorded anti-social behaviour and crime incidents show clearly that the student population contributes only a small amount towards these issues, rather less than the proportion of students within the city would suggest. Indeed, it would seem students are if anything more likely to be the victims of crime and anti-social behaviour than the perpetrators of it.
- 12.4 Anti-social behaviour can be seen in a number of different ways, and may range from verbal abuse to extreme levels of noise and harassment. Whatever the level of anti-social behaviour, its effects can be the same and in many cases the areas concerned will experience both crime and fear of crime.
- 12.5 The definition of anti-social behaviour can be taken from the Crime & Disorder Act 1998, which says that anti-social behaviour is acting “in a manner that caused or was likely to cause harassment, alarm or distress to one or more persons not of the same household as themselves and is not reasonable in all circumstances”. However, by describing the consequences of the behaviour rather than defining the behaviour itself, the definition lacks specifics and measurability. To allow the agencies concerned to tackle and then monitor anti-social behaviour effectively, a list of relevant behaviours has been drawn up which includes drug/substance misuse and dealing, street drinking, vehicle related nuisance, noise issues, rowdy/nuisance behaviour, intimidation/harassment, criminal damage/vandalism, litter and fly-tipping/posting.

- 12.6 In 2005 a total of 2,452 anti-social behaviour incidents were reported in the district to the public safety unit. Amongst this total, only 112 (4.6%) of the incidents related to student behaviour, which puts the student issue into clear perspective in relation to the other types of anti-social behaviour in the district.
- 12.7 During 2005 the following types of anti-social behaviour were reported as having been instigated by students. It is clear that the most significant issues are nuisance in the street followed by neighbour issues and environmental damage.

| <u>Type of Incident</u> | <u>No. of Incidents</u> |
|--------------------------------------|-------------------------|
| Bias Crime | 2 |
| Neighbour dispute | 29 |
| Environmental damage | 23 |
| Rowdy/nuisance in the street | 53 |
| Intimidation/threats | 5 |
| Other – drugs, begging etc. | 0 |
| Licensing – alcohol/premises related | 0 |
| Total | 112 |

- 12.8 Dealing with anti-social behaviour issues is a joint responsibility of the City Council, Kent Police and other agencies. Because many of these issues require careful liaison and a range of actions which are not the responsibility of just one agency, the City Council and Kent Police set up a joint public safety unit in November 2003 in order to establish a blended team to tackle anti-social behaviour and public safety incidents. This team has proved highly successful and acts as the lead coordinating agency in relation to anti-social behaviour incidents whether perpetrated by students or others. It is the public safety unit which will lead the investigation and resolution of anti-social behaviour incidents which are student-related.
- 12.9 A student behaviour protocol was first drawn up in Canterbury district in December 2000 (before the establishment of the public safety unit) to give frontline officers guidance how to tackle incidents as they were reported and to establish information sharing arrangements between the agencies concerned which included the City Council, Kent Police, the HE/FE institutions and other agencies. The 2000 protocol had extensive flow diagrams to show how an incident should be tackled from a warning through to a serious enforcement case with the powers available at each stage.
- 12.10 The 2000 protocol officially ended at the end of 2005. The Review Panel quickly recognised the need to draw up a new protocol and to update it in the light of the changes which have occurred since 2000, in particular the advent of the public safety unit and the introduction of a wider range of interventions available to tackle particular incidents. The Review Panel has overseen the revision of the protocol document and recommended it to the relevant agencies in November 2005; commitment to the protocol has subsequently been confirmed by the various agencies and it was adopted by the City Council's Executive at its meeting on 30 March 2006.
- 12.11 The new protocol looks at the relationship between key parties, in particular the public safety unit, the HE/FE institutions, landlords and statutory agencies and sets out how they should communicate, share information and find solutions to incidents

together. Students are in fact a very compliant group and tend to respond readily to requests from agencies on anti-social behaviour issues and as a result there have been no formal enforcement cases to date. The new protocol reflects this and sets out the wide range of interventions available which range from initial warning letter, warning visit, mediation, high visibility patrolling, through acceptable behaviour agreements and neighbourhood watch schemes through to formal enforcement powers which include anti-social behaviour orders (ASBOs), statutory nuisance action, dispersal area powers and the powers available to landlords which include eviction if necessary. The protocol commits the case team which will be established in serious or persistent cases to investigate the issues and look to find the most appropriate solution in each case. An incident will be closed when the case team have agreed by consensus that all the issues have been resolved satisfactorily.

- 12.12 The protocol includes a section on service standards. This includes guidelines on the courtesy and respect that those raising issues are entitled to receive, that principles of fairness and objectivity will be applied, officers will clearly explain the issues to complainants, will be accessible and responsive, with the provision of an official response to any enquiry promised within one full business day of contact being received.
- 12.13 The aim of the new protocol is to ensure that students within the Canterbury District experience a good quality of life, and are able to live in harmony with their neighbours and the wider community. There are seven further objectives. These are:
- to set guidance to all agencies committed to the protocol so that there is a clear procedure for tackling and coordinating student-related anti-social behaviour
 - to improve communication and information sharing between agencies
 - to improve all residents' quality of life in the Canterbury district, and demonstrate that the agencies take student-related anti-social behaviour seriously
 - to be fair and non-judgemental in dealing with student-related anti-social behaviour
 - to set up a clear procedure for residents and students to report anti-social behaviour
 - to ensure that this protocol is reviewed on a regular basis, looking in particular at its effectiveness and use by partner agencies involved
 - to consult with residents, students and relevant agencies on matters relating to this protocol to ensure the most appropriate action is taken.
- 12.14 A full copy of the student related anti-social behaviour protocol is attached as appendix 3 to this report.
- 12.15 **Recommendation 33: The Student-Related Anti-Social Behaviour Protocol should be adopted and launched by the city council, the higher and further education institutions, Kent Police and other relevant agencies. The monitoring and operation of the Protocol should be overseen by the Student Impact Working Group and the group should prepare a report for consideration by the relevant parties on the subject annually, recommending any amendments that might prove beneficial. Students should be reminded of the contents of the Protocol from time to time.**

- 12.16 Key to the success of the protocol is public awareness of the commitment of the various agencies to tackle incidents and a knowledge of the means of reporting incidents for investigation. At present the reporting arrangements are fragmented, with separate numbers for Kent Police (to report crimes or serious incidents that have already happened) and a separate number for the public safety unit to report anti-social behaviour incidents, the latter number being manned during office hours only although incidents can be reported out of hours for a response the next working day.
- 12.17 There is a clear public desire for a simpler, single, integrated reporting system for non-emergency incidents and there are government proposals to introduce such a service by 2008. In the meantime the Review Panel believe that the relevant agencies should be working together to introduce a single reporting number manned 24 hours a day and notes that the community safety scrutiny review has already made a recommendation along the same lines.
- 12.18 **Recommendation 34: A single, integrated, 24 hour a day mechanism for the public to report non-emergency but significant noise and anti-social behaviour incidents should be set up as a matter of urgency (as also recommended by the Community Safety Scrutiny Review). Sufficient resources should be made available to respond to the most serious incidents and to investigate them all. A log of all incidents should be kept, any patterns noted and appropriate action taken. An annual report on the issues raised should be produced.**
- 12.19 Clearly having sufficient officer resources on the ground to respond to, investigate and resolve anti-social behaviour incidents is critical to the success of the protocol and the wellbeing of communities in and around the city. A very welcome initiative in this regard has been the additional police community support officer post which was established in April 2005 supported financially by Canterbury Christ Church University to serve the area around the university campus where there were particular concerns about anti-social behaviour and community related issues. This post has been very successful in resolving many issues. The Review Panel believe that a similar post supported financially by the University of Kent would be extremely beneficial in serving the community around their campus, for example in the Hales Place/St Michaels Road area. Although there are proposals for additional police community support officers within Kent these will inevitably be deployed in accordance with county-wide needs and a dedicated resource to tackle issues in the vicinity of the two main university campuses in the city can best be achieved by the institutions concerned providing financial support. The University of Kent currently invests £10,000 in a scheme operated by Kent Union which provides security surveillance of residential areas at night by a mobile unit.
- 12.20 **Recommendation 35: The University of Kent should support financially the appointment of a Police Community Support Officer to serve the area around their campus, for example the Hales Place/St Michaels Road area, in the same way that Canterbury Christ Church University support financially an officer to serve the area around their campus.**

Noise Nuisance from Residential Properties

- 12.21 The City Council has statutory noise nuisance powers which are operated by the Environmental Protection section. The council's out-of-hours noise service operates from Friday nights until Monday morning and deals with car alarms, burglar alarms and noisy parties which are disturbing a neighbourhood. If the

control room receives 3 separate complaints about a party, then an officer is called out to investigate. An Abatement Notice is served if the noise nuisance emanating from a party is serious and is not turned down. Police assistance is sometimes necessary at these incidents. To give an indication of the scale of the issue, between April and December 2004 a total of 394 domestic noise complaints were received of which just 43, approximately 10%, related to noise from student houses.

12.22 Most student domestic noise complaints relate to students arriving home late and playing music. Noisy parties, which tend to be one-off incidents, have the potential to disturb more people. It is rarely necessary to take formal action against noise from student households. At present domestic noise incidents are only attended on site if three separate complaints are received; the Review Panel recommend that this policy should be reviewed in order to provide a more responsive service and to tackle student related noise incidents more effectively.

12.23 **Recommendation 36: The City Council should reconsider its policy of requiring three separate complaints in relation to domestic noise incidents before attending on site.**

Racially Motivated Incidents

12.24 It has already been noted in paragraphs 6.20-6.22 that the student community comes from a wider ethnic background than the district population as a whole. It is most important that the student community enjoys a high quality of life whilst living in the city and any incidents which may have been racially motivated need thorough investigation (reporting line 0800 138 1624).

12.25 **Recommendation 37: Students should be encouraged to report any incidents that they feel could have been racially motivated.**

Use of the Institution's own Disciplinary Powers

12.26 When students join a particular course of study, they sign up to the rules and regulations of the institution concerned which includes an internal disciplinary regime. This regime is intended to enforce academic matters and offences against university staff or property, but allows some action to be taken in respect of off-campus activity which may have been the subject of a complaint. The university authorities have the ability to advise and warn their students and they are asked to continue to do so in support of the anti-social behaviour protocol.

12.27 The limitations of these disciplinary powers, particularly for incidents that take place off-campus, need to be understood. The public assumption that the institutions can discipline their students 'in loco parentis' is a common misunderstanding. There are a range of options and powers available, as set out in the protocol, but these are applicable to both students and non students equally and are implemented by the public authorities, not the institutions.

12.28 **Recommendation 38: The Educational Institutions in the city should continue to use their ability to advise and warn their students and potentially use their disciplinary powers in persistent or serious cases in support of the anti-social behaviour protocol.**

Crime Statistics

- 12.29 In relation to recorded crime statistics, it is apparent that the student community are as often the victims of crime than the perpetrators of it. Kent Police have analysed the crime statistics for Canterbury district during the academic year 2004/5 and the results are shown in the following table:

Crimes with student as victim 2004/5

| Type of incident | No. of undetected incidents | No. of detected incidents | Total no. of incidents | Proportion of overall incidents |
|------------------------------|-----------------------------|---------------------------|------------------------|---------------------------------|
| Violence | 80 | 45 | 125 | 6.7% |
| Burglary-dwelling | 35 | 23 | 58 | 11.2% |
| Vehicle | 58 | 2 | 60 | 6.4% |
| Criminal damage | 85 | 9 | 94 | 3.4% |
| Theft other (eg pedal cycle) | 199 | 10 | 209 | 58.0% |
| Other crimes | 11 | 4 | 15 | 0.4% |
| Total | <u>468</u> | <u>93</u> | <u>561</u> | <u>5.4%</u> |

Notes:

Many of the 'theft others' were "theft of pedal cycle" and "theft by finding".

These crimes amounted to 5.4% of the total crime incidents for this period which numbered 10,404.

Of these crimes, 9 were racially motivated.

- 12.30 The following table sets out those detected crimes where the offender was a student. Clearly in the case of undetected crimes it is not possible to determine whether the perpetrator was a student or not.

Crimes with students as perpetrator 2004/5

| Type of incident | No. of detected incidents | Proportion of overall incidents |
|------------------------------|---------------------------|---------------------------------|
| Violence | 29 | 1.5% |
| Burglary-dwelling | 1 | 0.2% |
| Vehicle | 18 | 1.9% |
| Criminal damage | 2 | 0.1% |
| Theft other (eg pedal cycle) | 21 | 5.8% |
| Other crimes | 32 | 0.8% |
| Total | <u>103</u> | <u>1.0%</u> |

Notes:

"Other crimes" here that were prominent include drugs offences and "obtaining property by deception".

These crimes amounted to 1.0% of the total crime incidents for this period which numbered 10,404.

Of these crimes 3 were racially motivated.

- 12.31 For the purpose of these crime statistics, the figures relate to incidents where the person concerned has stated their occupation as “student”, excluding those under the age of 18 years.
- 12.32 Recommendation 39: The Public Safety Unit, HE/FE institutions and other relevant agencies should run an awareness campaign amongst the student community in relation to crime and anti-social behaviour issues at least once each academic year.**

CHAPTER 13

Better Liaison and Communication

- 13.1 All of the issues addressed in this scrutiny review will require ongoing commitment and action to address. The higher and further education institutions in the city are clearly here to stay, together with their associated student population. None of the issues are capable of being addressed by easy, complete solutions and consequently continuous efforts by all the stakeholders involved will be required.
- 13.2 The purpose of this chapter is to establish a framework for improved liaison and communication between the various stakeholders in order to keep the issues under review and to discuss and take action to address them.
- 13.3 There are, of course, already a number of mechanisms in place to ensure liaison between the various stakeholders but these need to be clarified and strengthened in order to ensure they are fit for purpose to tackle the various issues.
- 13.4 At the highest level there is a regular 6 monthly meeting between the Leader and Chief Executive of the city council and the Principals of the four higher and further education institutions in the city. This meeting debates strategic issues and ensures high level co-operation between the parties. It is recommended that this forum continues to meet regularly.
- 13.5 The education institutions are also represented on the Canterbury District Local Strategic Partnership, both on the Executive Board and its various sub groups. This partnership establishes and leads work on the overall community strategy for the district and the education institutions are clearly key stakeholders in this forum.
- 13.6 At political level, there needs to be regular liaison between the city council and the four institutions. The University of Kent has periodically invited all city councillors to a seminar discussion and this has been a very helpful forum for the University to set out its strategic concerns and for general discussion to take place. Views are invited as to whether this approach should continue, and be followed by the other institutions as appropriate, or whether some other liaison arrangements might be put in place. The City Council runs briefing sessions for its members which could be used to discuss particular topics.
- 13.7 At senior management level, periodic meetings take place between the senior management of the city council and both universities, less frequently with the University College for the Creative Arts and Canterbury College. It is recommended that these senior management meetings should take place on a regular basis with the two universities and as required with the other two institutions.
- 13.8 On a more operational level, a Student Impact Working Group has already been established, chaired by the city council's Director of Community & Environment Services, on which sits the Director of Student Services from each of the four institutions and other officers as required. This group meets termly to debate student impact issues and ensure proper liaison between the various departments of the institutions. The group has discussed in the past issues like refuse collection, anti-social behaviour, attendance at Freshers' events, better links

between websites, student housing issues and so on. It is one of the main forums for seeking to carry forward the issues raised by this scrutiny review and it is recommended that the working group continue to meet regularly.

- 13.9 Recently an annual students' forum meeting has been established attended by the local Member of Parliament, leading city councillors, officers from the city council and the four institutions, together with the presidents of the four student unions, and representatives from Kent Police. This forum enables a general debate on student issues within the city and provides an opportunity for the student unions to promote their work and engage in debate with the city authorities as to how student issues in the city should be carried forward.
- 13.10 **Recommendation 40: Proper communication and liaison should be established and maintained between the four institutions, the city council and other relevant agencies including residents associations with both informal contact and a regular structure of meetings to tackle the issues involved. A regular annual briefing session between each institution and all members of the council should be introduced.**
- 13.11 The Review has identified many issues which require high level liaison between the HE/FE institutions and the local community. The Universities UK report identified as best practice the appointment of a senior manager in each institution as a Community Relations Manager to act as a point of contact for all community related matters. This could be a full or part-time role as appropriate.
- 13.12 **Recommendation 41: The Educational Institutions in the city should each appoint or nominate a senior member of staff with sufficient financial resources and authority to act as Community Relations Manager to address community issues relating to the institution.**
- 13.13 Whilst there is much positive publicity about the educational institutions and sometimes the student population, from time to time there are negative and occasionally misleading stories which do nothing to enhance the reputation of the city. Improved liaison between the press and public relations officers of the various institutions would assist in countering this problem.
- 13.14 **Recommendation 42: Communications officers from the council and the four HE/FE institutions should meet and communicate with each other regularly, involving the Students Unions as appropriate, to ensure a comprehensive and joint approach is taken to promoting the positive impact of students, and to deal with any concerns.**
- 13.15 The regular dissemination of information both to the student community and to residents in the areas where there is a high student population is clearly essential and continued efforts need to be made by all the relevant agencies in this respect. Electronic information is increasingly the communication mode of choice, particularly amongst the student community, and this also enables information to be kept relevant and up-to-date. Improved website links between the relevant agencies are important.
- 13.16 **Recommendation 43: The City Council, educational institutions and student unions should regularly update their websites to provide relevant information to tackle the issues addressed in this review. The communications officers from the council and the educational institutions should work to improve links between their websites and those of the student unions.**

- 13.17 **Recommendation 44: The educational institutions and student unions are actively encouraged to contribute articles to the council's residents newsletter (District Life) which is circulated to all households in the district.**
- 13.18 **Recommendation 45: The local press is urged to publish an occasional column on 'Student Life' in the city, perhaps by inviting the Student Unions and HE/FE institutions to contribute material on a rota basis.**
- 13.19 **Recommendation 46: The City Council should continue to produce an annual information and advice leaflet for distribution through the institutions and other outlets to all first and second year students. This serves as a "good neighbour guide" as well as imparting useful information about council services and who to contact in relation to various issues.**
- 13.20 Recently a consortium of the local student unions has received a licence to set up a Canterbury Students Radio station locally. This is a very welcome initiative by the student bodies. The station should assist as a readily accessible and immediate source of information for the student community and could also assist in disseminating relevant information from the City Council and other public agencies.
- 13.21 **Recommendation 47: The City Council, the education institutions and other relevant public agencies should be encouraged to use the new CSR radio service as a means of increasing communication and disseminating information to the student community.**

CHAPTER 14

Recommendations

Throughout this report the Review Panel have identified a number of recommendations.

The recommendations in the report are set out in bold type and for convenience are also brought together in this chapter.

Chapter 4: Profile and Economic Impact

- 1. The higher and further education institutions in Canterbury should continue to work together with the City Council to further raise the profile of the city. (Paragraph 4.27)**
- 2. The local economic benefits of the education institutions and their student populations should be maximised by the establishment of procurement policies which encourage as far as possible local small and medium sized businesses to supply them with goods and services. (Paragraph 4.28)**
- 3. The City Council and Canterbury 4 Business should work closely with the education institutions to monitor their continuing effects on the local economy and to promote and publicise these benefits more effectively. (Paragraph 4.29)**
- 4. The City Council should promote the economic development of the district, particularly knowledge based businesses, to encourage graduate retention in the area. (Paragraph 4.30)**

Chapter 5: Community, Cultural and Sporting Facilities

- 5. The use of these facilities should continue to be publicised and promoted for the benefit of the wider community whilst not prejudicing the interests of the students for whom they are provided in the first instance. Policies should be put in place to encourage additional access by the public and local businesses and such usage should be monitored. The institutions should consider using the city council's residents' card scheme to promote usage by local residents. (Paragraph 5.11)**
- 6. Each of the four HE/FE institutions should continue to hold a variety of events each year aimed at the general public, to familiarise the public with the facilities available at each institution and the educational opportunities on offer, and generally to foster goodwill amongst the local community. (Paragraph 5.12)**

Chapter 6: Student Numbers, Characteristics and Potential Growth

- 7. Future changes in the number and characteristics of the student population should be monitored annually and reported to the City Council and relevant bodies. A dialogue about potential growth in student numbers should inform the institutions' accommodation strategies and the City Council's private sector housing role in terms of student rented accommodation. (Paragraph 6.27)**

8. **The City Council welcomes the growth in higher and further education being developed by the institutions at their campuses outside Canterbury, both to spread the opportunities of education more widely and to assist the regeneration of East and North Kent. (Paragraph 6.28)**

Chapter 7: Students' Positive Contribution to the Local Community

9. **The Jobshops run for the students at each institution should continue to be promoted to and used by local businesses and voluntary groups to maximise the employment and volunteering opportunities available locally for students, including temping and casual work opportunities. (Paragraph 7.11)**
10. **The university authorities are asked to continue to keep Wednesday afternoons free from formal teaching as far as possible in the case of full-time non professional programmes in order to allow the student community to engage most effectively in sporting and voluntary activity within the community. (Paragraph 7.20)**
11. **Student voluntary activity should be targeted if possible towards the residential areas in the city where there is a significant student population in order to foster improved community relations in those areas. Volunteering opportunities are particularly sought in such areas. (Paragraph 7.21)**
12. **An annual Student Award Scheme should be established to recognise (a) good neighbourliness and (b) exceptional voluntary work in the community. A co-ordinator and sponsorship for such an award scheme is invited to come forward. (Paragraph 7.22)**

Chapter 8: Student Accommodation

13. **In order to reduce the pressure on the private housing market in Canterbury, the higher education institutions should explore the provision of further purpose built accommodation based on an assessment of the anticipated growth in full-time student numbers and the likely demand from second and subsequent year students. Such accommodation could be either on campus or elsewhere in the city. As a minimum the higher education institutions should aim to accommodate 50% of non-local full-time students who would otherwise be likely to seek rented accommodation in the city. (Paragraph 8.42)**
14. **That land should be allocated and/or policies encouraging additional purpose built student accommodation should be included in the emerging City Council Local Development Framework. (Paragraph 8.43)**
15. **It is important to keep the provision of purpose built student accommodation and the number of student rented properties in residential areas under review. The Student Impact Working Group should fulfil this role and prepare a report for the City Council and the Institutions on the subject annually. (Paragraph 8.44)**

Chapter 9: Student Households in Residential Areas

16. **The city council as local planning authority should consider imposing appropriate conditions to remove permitted development rights in new housing developments when it is felt that the use of these rights might be likely to increase certain problems should the houses concerned be used for multiple occupation. (Paragraph 9.13)**
17. **The University authorities should consider what additional facilities and services might be made available to enhance the Parham Road area as an attractive and convenient place for students to live, and to work with the relevant public authorities to minimise any adverse impacts for the surrounding area. (Paragraph 9.16)**
18. **Whilst recognising that the city council is reimbursed the lost income, it is recommended that the Local Government Association should set up a national working party to consider the case for full-time students or student landlords to pay Council Tax. (Paragraph 9.25)**

Chapter 10: Tackling Negative Issues in Residential Areas

19. **The offer of a second landfill bin should potentially be made available to households of four adult persons or more in addition to large households of six persons or more. (Paragraph 10.10)**
20. **Student households should operate within the council's normal alternate weekly refuse and recycling arrangements in the same way as non-student households during each term, and be responsible for putting out waste on the correct day. During vacation periods landlords will be held responsible for waste at their properties. (Paragraph 10.12)**
21. **Continuous efforts to communicate the council's refuse and recycling collection arrangements are essential each academic year and the council's Environment and Street Scene section and the contractor should pay particular attention to this issue. (Paragraph 10.13)**
22. **Additional and/or more flexible refuse collections should be made in areas with a large student population at the end of each term, and particularly the summer term, in recognition of the fact that students often then have additional waste and move out in advance of the normal collection day, and collections are not then required for several weeks. The Students Unions and HE/FE institutions should be invited to assist in tackling this issue. (Paragraph 10.16)**
23. **The end of term waste issue should also be tackled by better publicity and promotion of the existing services that are available, for example paid for purple sack and bulky waste collections, improved liaison with student landlords and letting agents, and the rigorous use of enforcement powers. (Paragraph 10.17)**
24. **The HE/FE institutions and the Student Unions should seek to discourage students bringing their private cars to the city in the recruitment and promotional information which is provided to prospective and existing**

students. Attention should be drawn to the difficulties associated with bringing a car to the city and the public transport services which are available. (Paragraph 10.24)

25. The current review of on-street parking issues in the city should be used to tackle issues in areas where there is a parking problem. The council's Executive should carefully consider the evidence gathered during the review process and if necessary extend residents' parking schemes into areas of the city close to University campus premises or with a large student population if additional controls are justified and have local support. (Paragraph 10.27)
26. Students should be treated on the same basis as non-students when it comes to the issue of residents' parking permits. Where a particular zone has a waiting list, the number of permits issued per dwelling is used as a means of rationing, but such an approach would have to apply to students and non-students equally. (Paragraph 10.30)
27. Residents' Associations in the city should ensure that one or more student representatives is involved in their organisation if there are a significant number in their area. Associations should consider how to welcome new student households into their area each academic year and how they can assist in breaking down student/non-student barriers. (Paragraph 10.35)

Chapter 11: Student Landlord Issues

28. Landlords should make arrangements for keeping garden areas in good order at their properties, with frequent maintenance during the growing season, and should not pass this responsibility onto their student tenants. (Paragraph 11.4)
29. The Student Unions and Educational Institutions should continue to run information and awareness raising campaigns each autumn to advise students about to rent property as to the issues and potential pitfalls involved in becoming tenants. (Paragraph 11.6)
30. The Student Housing Accreditation Scheme should be developed and launched to be in place in time for the next "student letting season" in late 2006/early 2007. The higher education institutions should contribute financially towards the cost of setting up the scheme. In the event of the scheme failing to attract sufficient landlords or otherwise not achieving its objectives an additional licensing scheme should be considered. (Paragraph 11.23)
31. Landlords and their agents should use their influence and powers under tenancy agreements in persistent or serious cases in support of the anti-social behaviour protocol. (Paragraph 11.24)
32. Landlords should issue a welcome pack for their tenants containing useful information about local services, how to be a good neighbour and how to contact the landlord or agent to deal with property related issues. (Paragraph 11.25)

Chapter 12: Crime and Anti-Social Behaviour

33. **The Student-Related Anti-Social Behaviour Protocol should be adopted and launched by the city council, the higher and further education institutions, Kent Police and other relevant agencies. The monitoring and operation of the Protocol should be overseen by the Student Impact Working Group and the group should prepare a report for consideration by the relevant parties on the subject annually, recommending any amendments that might prove beneficial. Students should be reminded of the contents of the Protocol from time to time. (Paragraph 12.15)**
34. **A single, integrated, 24 hour a day mechanism for the public to report non-emergency but significant noise and anti-social behaviour incidents should be set up as a matter of urgency (as also recommended by the Community Safety Scrutiny Review). Sufficient resources should be made available to respond to the most serious incidents and to investigate them all. A log of all incidents should be kept, any patterns noted and appropriate action taken. An annual report on the issues raised should be produced. (Paragraph 12.18)**
35. **The University of Kent should support financially the appointment of a Police Community Support Officer to serve the area around their campus, for example the Hales Place/St Michaels Road area, in the same way that Canterbury Christ Church University support financially an officer to serve the area around their campus. (Paragraph 12.20)**
36. **The City Council should reconsider its policy of requiring three separate complaints in relation to domestic noise incidents before attending on site. (Paragraph 12.23)**
37. **Students should be encouraged to report any incidents that they feel could have been racially motivated. (Paragraph 12.25)**
38. **The Educational Institutions in the city should continue to use their ability to advise and warn their students and potentially use their disciplinary powers in persistent or serious cases in support of the anti-social behaviour protocol. (Paragraph 12.28)**
39. **The Public Safety Unit, HE/FE institutions and other relevant agencies, should run an awareness campaign amongst the student community in relation to crime and anti-social behaviour issues at least once each academic year. (Paragraph 12.32)**

Chapter 13: Better Liaison and Communication

40. **Proper communication and liaison should be established and maintained between the four institutions, the city council and other relevant agencies including residents associations with both informal contact and a regular structure of meetings to tackle the issues involved. A regular annual briefing session between each institution and all members of the council should be introduced. (Paragraph 13.10)**
41. **The Educational Institutions in the city should each appoint or nominate a senior member of staff with sufficient financial resources and authority to act**

as Community Relations Manager to address community issues relating to the institution. (Paragraph 13.12)

- 42. Communications officers from the council and the four HE/FE institutions should meet and communicate with each other regularly, involving the Students Unions as appropriate, to ensure a comprehensive and joint approach is taken to promoting the positive impact of students, and to deal with any concerns. (Paragraph 13.14)**
- 43. The City Council, educational institutions and student unions should regularly update their websites to provide relevant information to tackle the issues addressed in this review. The communications officers from the council and the educational institutions should work to improve links between their websites and those of the student unions. (Paragraph 13.16)**
- 44. The educational institutions and student unions are actively encouraged to contribute articles to the council's residents newsletter (District Life) which is circulated to all households in the district. (Paragraph 13.17)**
- 45. The local press is urged to publish an occasional column on 'Student Life' in the city, perhaps by inviting the Student Unions and HE/FE institutions to contribute material on a rota basis. (Paragraph 13.18)**
- 46. The City Council should continue to produce an annual information and advice leaflet for distribution through the institutions and other outlets to all first and second year students. This serves as a "good neighbour guide" as well as imparting useful information about council services and who to contact in relation to various issues. (Paragraph 13.19)**
- 47. The City Council, the education institutions and other relevant public agencies should be encouraged to use the new CSR radio service as a means of increasing communication and disseminating information to the student community. (Paragraph 13.21)**