

**Neighbourhood Forum**  
**Tuesday, 21<sup>st</sup> September 2021**  
**DRAFT Minutes**

<b>Members</b>	<b>Representing</b>	<b>Present / Apologies</b>
Cllr. Andrew Simcock (Chair)	Didsbury East Councillor	Present
Stuart Keen	The Christie	Present
Sally Parkinson	The Christie	Present
Doug Edwards	Resident	Apologies
Dave Roscoe	MCC	Present
Gavin Evans	MCC	Present
Marjorie McSweeney	Resident	Present
Stuart Bracewell	Resident	Present
Roger Smith	Withington Civic Society	Present
Cllr. Gavin White	Old Moat Councillor	Apologies
Rosie Gill	The Christie	Present
Will Blair	The Christie	Apologies
Cllr. Chris Wills	Withington Councillor	Present
Madeleine Rose	Resident	Present
Cllr. John Leech	Didsbury West Councillor	Present
Jim Machin	Resident	Present
Cllr Debbie Hilal	Didsbury West Councillor	Present
Cllr. James Wilson	Didsbury East Councillor	Apologies
Mhorag Goff	Resident	Apologies
Cllr. Becky Chambers	Withington Councillor	Apologies
Bernard Flanagan	The Christie	Present
Darren Bugg	The Christie	Present
Cllr. Greg Stanton	Didsbury West Councillor	Apologies
Bill Ibram	Resident	Present
Peter Walch	Resident	Present
Andy McDougall	Resident	Present
Cllr Linda Foley	Didsbury East Councillor	Apologies
Amanda Salmon	Neighbourhood Manager	Apologies
Richard Wilks	Resident	Present
Cllr. Suzannah Reeves	Old Moat Councillor	Present
Cllr. Garry Bridges	Old Moat Councillor	Present
John Sanderson	MCC	Present
Rachel Barker	Local Dialogue	Present
Cathal Kavanagh	Local Dialogue	Present

		Action
<b>15/21</b>	<b>Standard Business</b>	
<b>a</b>	<p><b>Chair's Welcome and Introductions</b>  The Chair welcomed members to the meeting.  He informed the group that Joanne Fitzpatrick had now taken early retirement from The Christie and he took this opportunity to wish Joanne all the very best for the future. Members agreed and wished to send a thank you to Joanne for all her efforts and hard work with the Neighbourhood Forum.  It was noted that Sally Parkinson (SP) is the Christie Interim Director of Finance and will now be attending this meeting. All extended a warm welcome to Sally.</p>	
<b>b</b>	<p><b>Apologies for absence</b>  Noted above.  AS extended a warm welcome to Cathal Kavanagh from Local Dialogue who was joining the meeting with regards to the Neighbourhood News item.</p>	
<b>c</b>	<p><b>Minutes of the last meeting held on Tuesday 22<sup>nd</sup> June 2021</b>  AS noted that Mhorag Goff had sent her apologies for this meeting but had earlier sent an email with her comments to all members of the neighbourhood forum. This email was regarding the format of these meetings as she felt that the forum isn't fit for purpose and does not discuss important matters. In particular, she felt that there are issues concerning her privacy with the build of the tiered car park which are not being addressed. AS wondered what other members of the forum felt about this matter and asked for any comments.  SB stated that he personally did not support MG's comments. He felt that the meetings had good interface between the Trust and neighbours and was an effective forum for communication.  MM noted that the email went out to all members of the Neighbourhood Forum and was not blind copied. She also stated that she felt that MG always had her fair say in meetings and was able to comment freely.  BI asked if a sentence could be added to the minutes of the last meeting as he had mentioned that any plans for development that The Christie had were discussed at this meeting in the planning stage. He felt that any proposals should be presented to the neighbourhood so that engagement can be communicated directly. He also stated that it is the responsibility of the CNF members to let other neighbours know of any proposals. He felt strongly that consultation must take place when in the ideas stage as at the moment it seems to be in the formative stage not when decisions have already been made. He would like a comment added to the minutes of the previous meeting noting that 'proposals should be presented to members of the neighbourhood forum when in the formative stage'. AS stated that he felt that this had always been the case but is happy for this sentence to be added to the previous minutes.  Subject to making these two changes, the minutes of the previous meeting were agreed.</p>	<b>KB</b>
<b>d</b>	<p><b>Matters arising</b>  All matters arising are covered on the agenda for this meeting.</p>	
<b>1621</b>	<p><b>CPZ Extension Update</b>  AS introduced John Sanderson (JS) who has replaced Clare Kenyon in attending this forum for the time being. John is an engineer in the MCC Highways Design Team.  JS gave an update regarding the CPZ extension. He stated that the scheme is currently undergoing legal consultation following the statutory requirements. This involves notices on lamp posts, documents in the Town Hall and adverts in the Manchester Evening News. He said that the council must follow strict legal guidelines on how schemes are advertised. The advertising started on 5<sup>th</sup> September and notices went up on 10<sup>th</sup> September. The advertising period is 3.5 weeks with a final date for comments of Monday, 11<sup>th</sup> October 2021. He stated that if anybody does want to make comments or objections the way to do this is via email or write to the city solicitor. All this information is on the notices.</p>	

JS stated that there have been some objections received, which in turn does start the objections process for consideration and if required a response to that objection. As far as practical, the scheme will be aligned to the full opening of the tiered car park in Spring 2022.

RS thanked JS for this update and asked a question regarding the double yellow lines. He said it was not clear from the plans how far around each corner the double yellow lines go. JS will look into this matter further and send a separate communication regarding this matter,

JS

AS noted that there has been extensive consultation on this scheme and particularly in some areas it is very well supported.

JL noted that there were a lot of positive comments made in the informal consultation phase and wondered if these would be taken forward to formal consultation? JS stated that the previous consultation is not a legal consultation but he will speak to his legal team to take advice on this point. He will circulate this information in the next few days so that everybody is clear on the status of previous positive comments.

JS

BI asked if there is a website where the final proposals may be viewed. JS stated that the requirements are very strict and must followed to the letter and you can request the documents by emailing: [rpz\\_christie@manchester.gov.uk](mailto:rpz_christie@manchester.gov.uk)

AS wished the team well with the legal consultation and this will be an agenda item again at the next meeting in January 2022.

JS left the meeting.

**Note circulated by JS after the meeting:**

*As the highway authority we have a legal duty to consider all objections received in response to a statutory advertisement. A report is prepared discussing the objection and the response from Officers, with the recommendation to either overrule the objection or in some cases accept them. This may or may not lead to amendments to the design. Any decision is reached with full reference to all previous stages of the scheme design – so in this case, we will consider the objection based on the feedback/comments and conversations/design decisions made as a result of the previous consultations. Clearly the entire purpose of the previous design stages is to place us in a position of confidence that the scheme is one which has support and to reinforce any decisions going forward.*

*The objection report makes reference to the original Delegated Approval report, in which all these previous consultations and the reasons behind any design decisions are presented. The report is presented to the Head of Network Management, the Strategic Director for Neighbourhoods and the Executive Member for Environment – the same people who approved the design as advertised.*

*So, essentially, those reading the objection report will have full knowledge of the work involved to get to where we are now.*

*However, we would need to be cautious referring to data from those previous consultations. These have been based on initial designs, and covered a wider scheme area. All previous consultations have involved engaging with a specific set of people – for example we posted letters inviting residents to view and comment on the initial design in Feb 2020. This statutory consultation however is a public process, and comments can be made by any member of the public, as they are proposed to be placed on public roads. Therefore, for example, a comment referring to a percentage of respondents in favour of the scheme would not be comparable. However, if an objector referred to a specific street/area we would be able to refer back.*

*The procedure described must be followed in order for the council to demonstrate that we are following due process and will ultimately enable the scheme to be delivered successfully.*

	<p><i>I'd also like to clarify the comments regarding the 10m of No Waiting at any Time (NWAAT). Highway Code Rule 243 advises (among others): <b>DO NOT stop or park opposite or within 10 metres (32 feet) of a junction, except in an authorised parking space</b></i></p> <p><i>The phrase 'Do not' is advisory (as opposed to a legal requirement, in which case the phrase 'Must/Must not' is used). Therefore, this gives us flexibility to place waiting restrictions that suit the local street layout rather than simply placing 10m minimum at every junction. For example, if a 10m stretch would finish in the centre of a dropped kerb providing access to a private driveway, it would be reduced in length.</i></p> <p><i>In some cases, on smaller/narrower streets, we have proposed lengths of 5m (or they may already exist in that length). An existing length of 5m of NWAAT is placed on Holmwood Road in the Ballbrook Avenue area – clearly this is a minor junction on a low speed street and the risk arising from parked vehicles is lesser than at junctions with, for example, Palatine Road.</i></p> <p><i>The specific lengths of NWAAT proposed are all described in the Traffic Regulation Order. Please note that this only provides detail of proposed NWAAT, so the example on Holmwood Road would not be included as it is already in place.</i></p>	
<p><b>17/21</b></p>	<p><b>Tree Planting update</b></p>	
	<p>SK reported on the tree planting update which was to consider planting and street furniture from the hospital site to the traffic lights in Withington village. SK stated that he had recently met with RS and they had walked from the hospital to the traffic lights in the village, and then returned via Palatine Road. The general view is that more can be done to encourage hospital visitors and staff to use the facilities in Withington village. Some examples could be additional finger signs to the village and additional street furniture and benches to improve the area. All of this would be subject to approval by the Highways Authority. In terms of the planting of trees along Palatine Road, there is little opportunity or need and on Wilmslow Road the opportunities are limited because of the width of the pavement but it was noted that there are areas that could possibly work such as outside the Red Lion pub.</p> <p>RS agreed with SK's comments and added that one or two planters along the foot path might also be a good idea. RS said that he was appalled at the state of the footpath in some of the areas but that was not The Christie's responsibility.</p>	
<p><b>18/21</b></p>	<p><b>The Christie Estates Strategy</b></p>	
	<p>SK shared a short presentation giving an update on The Christie Estates Strategy. He highlighted the current operating environment as it is a different time now and therefore affects plans in the future. He said that the current Estates Strategy is approximately 200 pages long and covers the period until 2024. This strategy is available on The Christie website.</p> <p>SK stated that a number of the projects included in the strategy have now been undertaken and are complete. SK highlighted briefly each project that had been completed. He said that the Health and Wellbeing Centre was scheduled to move but this now may not happen and the area remains prioritised as an existing inpatient ward.</p> <p>SP briefly updated the forum on the new financial regime in Greater Manchester which limits spending on the whole of the region. She stated that freedom to spend capital is now much more restricted.</p> <p>SK stated that a working group has been set up with clinical engagement to look at opportunities and priorities given operational demands.</p> <p>MM asked about the Golden Lion car park as it is her understanding that if approved, this will be an evacuation point for the HS2 line. MM understands that this is safeguarded at the moment but there may be a Compulsory Purchase Order made on that car park. MM stated this will be an issue as the cars will need to be parked somewhere else.</p>	

	<p>Further debate followed but SK said it was his understanding that it is a site HS2 are looking at and this would have to be addressed if this situation does arise. AS asked whether there were any development plans for the Bridge Club site. SK reported that at the present time there are no immediate projects planned for the site. He said that it is predominately a car park and The Christie does lend the basement area to GM Fire and Rescue for practice drills.</p> <p>BI noted that this is the current strategy but wondered will it change. There will be an increase in capacity when the Paterson opens which will impact on car parking, and that car parking on the Golden Lion site will not be possible following HS2.</p> <p>BI raised that he had also written to SK as a number of residents had complained about lack of mobile signals and TV signals and there is general concern that is this brought about by the building work of The Paterson. He said that mobile phone reception had reduced by about 50% with many dropped calls being experienced. SK stated this matter will be covered in the Capital update below.</p>	
<p><b>19/21</b></p>	<p><b>The Christie Capital Development update</b></p>	
	<p>SK gave a short presentation regards the Capital Development update.</p> <p><i>Paterson:</i></p> <p>SK shared some slides to document the progress made with the Paterson build. Work is continuing on the 9th floor structure, the stair and lift shafts, external glazing and cladding. Overall, at the present time work is on track to complete in December 2022 and is on budget. On the matter of TV reception, SK is aware that there had been some residents experiencing problems with obtaining satisfactory TV signal. He asked that if anybody is affected by this, please contact the Christie construction line email address, which is in the Neighbourhood Newsletter, and these will be passed on to the contractor. At the end of the project or sooner if required, there is an obligation under the planning permission to do a survey of the area. This includes both mobile and TV reception. A resident would need to inform The Christie of their service provider and this will be taken up with them directly.</p> <p>SK stated there is continuing discussion with the contractor about parking and in particular construction workers not parking in the streets and causing a nuisance to neighbours.</p> <p><i>Christie at Macclesfield:</i></p> <p>SK shared a number of slides and a short video which gave an idea of the size of the site at Macclesfield. This project also remains on budget and on time. SK reminded members that this is The Christie's 3<sup>rd</sup> satellite site with 16 chemo chairs and 2 Linacs. This will be fully operational in December 2021. He stated that some areas are now completely finished and the snagging process is taking place at the present time.</p> <p><i>Tiered Car Park:</i></p> <p>SK stated that work is scheduled to finish in March 2022 although it is likely that Section 278 works will be completed in Q2 2022. This involves improvements in the junction of Wilmslow Road and Cotton Lane. Works are well advanced on the car park and the cladding is about to commence. SK stated that some trees have now been removed and the replacement trees will be larger than currently required by the consent. SK was aware that some comments had been received from neighbours about solvent smells. He said that these come from the paints and that all the correct instructions for these solvents are being adhered.</p> <p><i>Combined Heat &amp; Power system:</i></p> <p>SK reminded members that this work involved replacement of the energy centre, removal of the old oil tanks, upgrading lights to LED lights which automatically dim if close to a window to save energy and a variety of other energy saving works.</p> <p>AM thanked SK for his presentation. He stated that his concern regarding trees and the tiered car park concerns the area of the boundary wall of Cotton Hill. He referred to the letter from the trust dated 3<sup>rd</sup> September which talked about improvements and he wondered who these improvements were for. In his opinion</p>	

	<p>the trees that have been taken down were good specimens. SK stated consent was received to remove the trees and that the new trees to be planted in February 2022 were designed to form a screening with branches that will form a barrier between the houses and the car park.</p> <p>SK stated he had noted AM's comments and will reply to his email in detail separately from this meeting.</p> <p>Discussion followed concerning damage to AM's property which he feels had been caused by the work undertaken with the car park. He stated he had asked a surveyor for his opinion and the surveyor had agreed with him. AM had contacted the project manager concerning this issue but had received no reply.</p> <p>SK confirmed that this email had been forwarded to him and he will make sure that a reply is sent to AM. He said he had also received feedback from other areas regarding dampness in the area and this is also being reviewed. He noted that a Condition Survey had been offered to neighbours before work started and some residents did take this offer up.</p> <p>JM asked for confirmation regarding the work at the junction of Cotton Lane and Wilmslow Road and was this Section 278. SK confirmed it was and that although work will not be finished until Q2 in 2022, it does not delay the opening of the car park. He noted however that the car park cannot be used to any greater extent than before the work commenced. This is embodied in a planning condition.</p> <p>RS noted that the work at the junction of Wilmslow Road/Cotton Lane Junction had had no local consultation and it was a very important junction and that many people may have comments to make.</p> <p>SK stated that the trust is following Section 278 with TfGM and Highways and that all technical matters are agreed with them. He said that he believed it was a Highways Department issue.</p>	
<b>20/21</b>	<b>Any Other Business</b>	
	None was raised.	
	<p><b>Date of next meeting:</b> The date and time of the next meeting will be Tuesday, 11<sup>th</sup> January 2022 at 5.30 p.m. In person or could be online.</p>	