

Minutes of the Neighbourhood Forum
Held on Tuesday, 17th October 2017 in Meeting Room 6

Present:	Membership: Cllr Andrew Simcock – AS (Chair) Cllr Chris Paul – CP Joanne Fitzpatrick – JF (The Christie) Jason Dawson - JD (The Christie) Cllr David Ellison – DE	Residents: Jim Machin – JM Peter Walch – PW Colleen Scott – CS Roger Smith – RS Stuart Bracewell – SB
In attendance:	David Sinclair – DS (The Christie) Maggie Doyle – MD (The Christie) Will Blair – WB (The Christie) Rosie Gill – RG (The Christie) Bernard Flanagan – BF (The Christie) Colin Dowell – CD (Interserve) Adrian Burt – AB (The Christie) Peter Rowe – PR (Turley) Gavin Evans – GE (Neighbourhood Lead)	

AS took the opportunity to send Marjorie McSweeney and her husband the thoughts and best wishes on behalf of himself and members of the Neighbourhood Forum.

17/17	Standard business	
a	Chairs welcome and introductions	
	The Chair welcomed members to the meeting. He introduced Gavin Evans who was standing in for Rob Dillon at this meeting.	
b	Apologies for absence	
	Apologies were received from Gavin White, Cllr John Leech, Cllr Garry Bridges, Madeleine Rose, Cllr Chris Wills, Doug Edwards, Marjorie McSweeney, Cllr James Wilson, Rob Dillon, Cllr Rebecca Moore, Cllr Kelly Simcock.	
c	Minutes of last meeting held on 4th July 2017	
	<p>The minutes of the previous meeting were agreed as a comprehensive and accurate record. Thank you to Karen Baxter for producing the minutes in this format and it was agreed that a timescale of two weeks for presentation onto the website was perfectly reasonable.</p> <p>SB wished to highlight an item from the previous set of minutes which was item 13/17 c) Terms of Reference. He stated that the neighbourhood forum was a delegate council with a small number of people who take the time and commitment to attend meetings regularly and to reflect the views of local residents. However, concern had been raised by a resident who does not attend the CNF stating that the CNF is not representative and that places outside the CPZ are over-represented. SB argued that he feels that this is in fact the opposite. SB stated that he feels this statement is unfair. AS replied by saying that obviously that is a point of view but AS is interested in the residents comments because he does have a point of view and does live next to the proposed site and it is only fair that he is represented. AS asked CS for her view as she had expressed a view about terms of reference in the past. CS stated she does not feel it is undemocratic for</p>	

	residents to be able to send matters into the committee if they so wish.	
d	Matters arising	
	<p>AS reported that an email had been received from a resident concerning the fire on The Christie site and the potential effects of smoke. This had been circulated to all members prior to the meeting and will be covered later in the meeting by DS.</p> <p>One action from the previous meeting was highlighted and had now been completed by RG. This concerned the Park and Ride Scheme and rewarding staff who use this facility with a car park permit. RG stated that the trust will be reviewing the car park eligibility processes in December 2017. There have not been any changes to the park and ride usage since the last meeting and therefore the trust is still looking at ways of promoting the scheme and there are a number of things being considered.</p>	
18/17	Update on meeting of Cotton Hill residents: (LORA - Loss of Residential Amenity)	
	<p>AS and his fellow councillor Rebecca Moore from Withington Ward, had attended a LORA meeting to have a discussion about the planning application.</p> <p>Key concerns raised were about the size of the car park, about the trust's commitment to extend the controlled parking zone and the need of such a large car park when there are obviously empty spaces.</p> <p>CS also attended that meeting. She added that there were comments raised about environmental treatments such as air pollution and particularly the exterior of the car park. AS explained that when the car park application actually goes live everything will be clear and therefore may be discussed in a meaningful way. AS also stated that if any other local group of residents wished him to attend a meeting from any roads he is very happy to do so. He felt strongly that a lot of time had been invested into this project and therefore there is a lot to discuss.</p> <p>RS wished to highlight that there were also some residents from Kinnaird Road present at that meeting as they are actually on the parameter of the site. It was felt that some of them may experience traffic in an immediate way so they have got a case to be heard also.</p> <p>CS raised that there were a couple of unresolved matters at that meeting which from what AS had said will be resolved. One was that residents mentioned the difference between the descriptions of the car park zone on two separate leaflets that the trust has issued. One leaflet described that the trust will pay for an extension of the managed car parking zone and the other stated that the trust will pay for a review of parking zone. Therefore it was not clear and CS thought that AS stated he would seek clarity on that matter. The other one point raised was that AS had said that he was expecting substantial environmental improvements including investment in environmental treatments to the buildings. This was very different from the discussion at the drop-in workshops. Residents were told that it was too expensive and that the wood facings were the environmental treatments that will be used.</p> <p>AS stated that hopefully both these issues will be clarified in the next presentation by PR.</p> <p>JF apologised for any confusion and stated that the trust is committed to financing the extension of the car parking zone in terms of level of investment it will be as a minimum to the same value invested in the existing CPZ.</p> <p>CS asked if this will be a condition in the planning application. JF stated that it is expected to be part of it but is unable to confirm that at the present time.</p> <p>JF reiterated the trust will invest as minimum as much as was invested in the existing CPZ.</p> <p>AS stated clearly that The Christie is committed to providing at least £190,000 as a minimum. It is also worth reminding people that when it comes to the consultation that it is not an issue for the Christie but that is for MCC in consultation with residents, councillors as happened last time. AS asked CS to relay this message back to Mr Plater in particular as he is very concerned about this issue.</p> <p>CP wished to raise two questions. Firstly, has there been any movement on reviewing the efficacy of the existing scheme? JF reported that The Christie cannot commit to invest in that matter. The investment the trust has is to extend the current CPZ, as there are insufficient funds available to review it. CP expressed that it will be difficult to get a</p>	

	<p>new effective scheme if there are no results from the current one. JF stated that this would leak into the money that is available to extend the scheme and therefore she suggests that is not an option. The second question CP wished to raise is that is the exact direction of the extent to the people that will be consulted with. Has the trust got any idea about that?</p> <p>PR stated that it is very difficult as areas can only be suggested based on feedback obtained and it will come down to MCC to agree that.</p> <p>CP stated there must be a concern that there will not be enough money to do an effective job but if lessons were to be learned from the existing scheme then better use of money would be available. AS stated that when it comes to the size of the area this is something that local councillors will be working on with MCC. It is also worth setting a caveat here that when making that commitment it is providing the planning application is successful. JF confirmed this is the case.</p> <p>CS wished to make it clear that the statement AS had made that she had supported the development of the car park at that meeting was untrue. She confirmed that she is not in a position to support the development of the car park because there has never been a proper analysis of the needs of parking in the area and there has never been what she considered a robust justification of why it is going to be built. To be clear, CS is concerned that her presence in this meeting suggests to people that she supports the development of the car park but she wished to be absolutely clear that this is not the case. AS stated that he does not think her presence alone indicates that but thanked CS for the clarification on this matter.</p>	
19/17	<p>Update on the car parking planning application</p>	
	<p>PR thanked those present for attending this meeting. He gave a very short update on where things are now, progress and the consultation findings, the planning application and next steps going forward.</p> <p>He reported that since the last neighbourhood forum in July, the consultation had closed. There was then a follow up meeting with Maggie's and their staff who were very supportive of where this was coming from and gave some useful feedback. There was then a staff consultation held for their views and role in the car park. This was followed by a period of review and responding to all of that information during August and September. The planning application was then finalised, looking at the environmental work together and meeting with MCC. This then led to the production of a final planning application in the technical term.</p> <p>PR explained some of the facts regarding the consultation process as he wanted to give some of the details. He stated that at the last meeting it was all very interim. He confirmed that in total there had been 171 responses to the consultation, 80 of these came via hard feedback forms from the Red Lion meetings held over 2 nights, 80 online feedback forms via email and website and there were 11 independent emails received. As far as where people live, 80% were outside the CPZ, 17% within the CPZ and 3% were unknown because they did not have postcodes stated on them.</p> <p>PR showed a number of slides that described how questions were answered. Overall, there were some themes mentioned. Green travel was a key issue that came out in the consultation and in response to that it has been made very clear that this is not a replacement for green travel. This is first and foremost the trust's aim and the car park is a component alongside that. In addition, a commitment has been made to provide further on site cycle storage. This is something that will come through the planning application and may potentially be subject to a planning condition. PR stated that the building has also been set at greater depth into the ground. The upper floors have also been looked at and it has been possible to tier that to a greater degree. He also explained that the third storey has now been inset.</p> <p>In terms of road safety, there were some concerns from local residents particularly around Heyscroft Road and Cotton Lane about the crossing there and in particular its width. Therefore in response to that it has been investigated as to how that junction can be reconfigured to make it narrower and safer and again this will be delivered as a condition in the planning application. Trees were also a key issue. It was clear that</p>	

protecting the trees that are TPO'd and in particular the highest quality ones are paramount. There will be some tree removal but overall there will be a net gain of 24 trees across the whole site.

The planning application has now been submitted and is a similar layout to the one seen at the consultation. Overall, there will be 818 car parking spaces which is a net increase of 404. 565 will be in the building itself and 253 will be a surface level car park. PR highlighted that 12 spaces will be electric car parking ones but the building will have all the ducts necessary so that it can be expanded when necessary and is therefore future proofed. Again, there will be longer standing improvements to cycle provision which will provide 26 cycle stands at the car park and there is an opportunity to provide more elsewhere on the site.

There will also be a new controlled crossing at the junction on Wilmslow Road and Cotton Lane which will include a new pedestrian crossing and there will be improvements to the geometry of the junction. PR then showed some computer generated images which illustrated the final images showing the landscape enhancement on the boundaries and views from different areas within the site which articulates the application being made.

To summarise, the planning application is now complete with appendices including a planning statement and the key drivers. It also provides environmental impacts and a technical summary of the surveys which have taken place. It is a very long document but that is what the legislation requires.

There are some suggested heads of terms about what the trust will sign up to for a section 106 legal agreement and what these might look like. They are only suggested therefore MCC needs to review these to see if they are acceptable. It also includes a commitment to provide temporary car parking to off-set any car parking requirement during construction. That is an ongoing process and agreement needs to be made with where those locations may be.

In terms of next steps, the planning application has been submitted and it generally takes the MCC a few weeks to review, ratify that process and then prepare all the consultation letters. These will then be circulated to the local residents. It will not be to the same level that The Christie did previously as it is a statutory process. The Council will only write generally to those residents who share a boundary as stipulated by The Planning Act. There will then be a three week period of consultation (21 days), in that period a resident can respond and following that, it goes into a period of negotiation where any issues raised need to be addressed and will be working towards a time when MCC will be happy to take it to a planning committee.

RS asked about the proposed modifications to Wilmslow Road/Cotton Lane and also Cotton Lane/Heyscroft Road. He also stated that on the former, there is a very well used drop-off zone at the Wilmslow Road entrance to the hospital which it seems is eliminated. He wondered if that is correct. JD confirmed that is the case and stated that the trust are looking to develop the Outpatients department to another location within the hospital and that a new drop-off zone on Oak Road has already been created which is much safer.

CP stated that the diagrams show the crossing staying where it is rather than bringing it into a 3-legged control crossing. JD confirmed that there will be 3 sets of traffic lights with a crossing at each set of lights. On the west side, there is a cycle bypass for the whole junction but on the east side it will be the same as the highway. Some discussion took place about cycle lanes which will be worked through with planning. The idea is to tie in with the existing cycle lanes but make them safer.

AS raised a question about the height of the structure and in particular was it any higher than those houses on Rathan Road. PR confirmed that it was no higher. One of the drawings in the planning pack is a section which shows exactly that.

CS stated that the structure is very close to Cotton Hill at one point and wondered what is the height in relation to those houses. PR confirmed that the roof is staged down to the height of the houses on Cotton Hill. CS asked how close the structure is to Cotton Hill. PR responded, within the parameters set out in Strategic Planning Framework which is 21 metres. PR also wished to reiterate that the environmental feedback showed that there was no adverse effect of daylight not getting into those properties on Cotton Hill or Rathan Road or indeed any light intrusion for instance, headlights from the car park or

	<p>the roof. Detailed work has been completed and what mitigation needs to be put in place to stop that.</p> <p>CP stated that the vegetation on the drawings looks very mature. Secondly, given the green swathe next to the MCRC and Maggie's Centre, he felt there may be an opportunity to provide a nature walk or some kind of access to the general public around the site. JF reported that the security aspects would have to be considered in further detail as it would most definitely have to be secure.</p> <p>CS stated it would be nice to know what species of tree is going to be used and at what level of maturity. PR explained that in the planning application pack there is a landscape drawing and on that it sets out what trees are going to be planted and what size.</p> <p>AS mentioned that one of his constituents is very concerned about the trees. They live on Rathan Road and maybe it might be an idea to have a discussion with them about what trees they would prefer to see there. This was agreed.</p> <p>AS asked a final question to CS as she was at the meeting with LORA. This was about the scale of the building and its height being a lot greater and asked if she felt reassured to a certain extent. CS replied that it more or less what she expected from the drop in session and that she does not think people will be surprised.</p> <p>CS left the meeting.</p> <p>JF stated that an email message will be sent to all members of the neighbourhood forum when the application goes live.</p> <p>Action: Email to be sent to members when application is live.</p> <p>AS thanked PR for his time and clear presentation.</p>	KB
20/17	Update on site developments	
	<p>JD gave an update on site developments. He mentioned that the proton beam therapy building is still on programme and is due to treat its first patient in August 2018. The crane has now been removed and therefore congestion on Oak Road is much improved.</p> <p>JD also confirmed that in the next couple of months there will be a lot less plant on site.</p> <p>There is some temporary office accommodation on the PBT building site. The trust will be extending the planning permission for this temporary accommodation whilst the Paterson Building's future is determined.</p> <p>The new main entrance is now operational with Marks and Spencer and WH Smith both open. These shops are available to the general public. The space itself looks very impressive and is a much better experience for both patients and staff.</p> <p>The final thing to mention is the Outpatient developments. The trust is currently working through a business case in this area. From a neighbourhood point of view there will be no impact as it is inside the proton building on the ground floor.</p>	
21/17	Update on the Paterson fire	
	<p>A letter had been previously circulated to the CNF from a resident.</p> <p>DS is currently working with Greater Manchester Fire and Rescue Service and supporting them as they continue their investigation. The full investigation has not yet been completed.</p> <p>DS stated that the vast majority of the content of the smoke was carbon which is why it was black and dense. There was a lot of carbon burned. There were no laboratories involved. There were no stored chemicals or solvents or anything of that nature.</p> <p>SB asked would it be true to say that the carbon was the timber frame. DS confirmed that it was the material of the building. GM Fire and Rescue at a very early stage of the fire and then throughout, undertook an assessment to protect their own fire fighters and the view was that whilst they needed breathing apparatus when they were inside the building (and that was due to lack of oxygen rather than the inhalation of smoke) those that were away from actually fighting the fire could remove their breathing apparatus.</p> <p>The Greater Manchester fire investigation is now complete and they are in the process of drafting the report. No date has been set for when this will be available.</p> <p>The trust, Manchester University and CRUK insurers and various others are undertaking their own investigations. Clearly the damage is huge, the claim is therefore going to be</p>	

	significant and they want to be assured.	
22/17	Any other business	
	None was raised.	
	Date of next meeting: Tuesday, 9 th January 2018 at 5.30 p.m. in trust administration, meeting room 6.	