

Paterson Redevelopment Proposal
Public Meeting at St. Cuthbert's School, Withington
25 April 2019

Attendees: Local residents invited by leafleting.

Well over 200 people attended the meeting. 199 people signed attendance register but many didn't. This included 3 current and 3 prospective councillors.

There were **people from 65 streets** at the meeting.

Don Berry introduced the meeting, welcomed everyone, and thanked St. Cuthbert's for use of their school. This was a meeting for residents to express their views on The Christie Strategic Planning Framework Addendum which sets out proposals for the redevelopment of the Manchester Cancer Research Centre (Paterson) building. He made clear the meeting was arranged by local residents and that while local councillors might be present, it was an opportunity for them to listen, and this was not going to be a political hustings meeting. Don introduced himself as a long-term resident of the area, and former headteacher at St. Paul's Primary School in Withington.

He asked for a show of hands for those who had come wanting to speak, and on that basis, allocated a notional two-minutes per speaker. He asked for respectful consideration be given to all views. Don then asked two residents who had been pre-invited to speak to open the meeting.

Ann (local resident):

Most, if not all residents in this room, will at some time during their lives experience the devastation caused by cancer. Therefore, it cannot be denied, that The Christie carries out a great deal of wonderful work, treating cancer patients, at their sites in Oldham, Salford, Withington, and, in the near future, Macclesfield.

As a resident of Withington, I have always been proud to say, I am a neighbour of The Christie. And I loved the fact that The Christie is world renowned in its field.

However, my belief system has been shattered by these proposals, which extend way beyond rebuilding the Paterson building. They contradict, The Christie's ethos, the expectation I had of rights under the current planning framework, and the human rights act.

These proposals appear not to be so much about expanding The Christie, but about The University of Manchester and Cancer Research UK exploiting The Christie reputation, enabling these organisations to ride rough-shod over Withington and Didsbury residents, who have always been good neighbours to The Christie.

This redevelopment is to provide a workplace for up to a 1000 employees of The University of Manchester and Cancer Research UK.

This means up to a 1000 cars, travelling through our roads, and to be accommodated within our neighbourhood, every day. The consequences of this will have a detrimental impact, not only on residential amenities, but more importantly, on people's health and well-being.

The consequences of these cars and the congestion will diminish:

- the quality of the air we breathe,
- the safety of our roads,
- lengthen our travel times,
- and impact on the amenities outside of our homes.

As public bodies, the City Council and The University of Manchester are legally obliged to consider residents' entitlement to the right to the enjoyment of their home, and residential amenities, under the human rights act. Therefore, our fundamental human rights will be eroded if these proposals are given the green light.

The current Strategic Planning Framework states, that in considering proposals for the expansion and redevelopment of The Christie, the Council must have regard to the need to minimise any impact on the quality of the environment, character of the area, residential amenity, and traffic movements.

Therefore, how can this detrimental impact on the environment, in terms of residents' health and their amenities, be blatantly ignored by Manchester City Council in this way?

Cancer Research UK advocates that air pollution increases the risk of lung cancer, and increases the risk of respiratory and heart disease. Therefore, how can they be driving these proposals through, when it clearly has cancerous consequences?

The City Council needs to understand that within less than a quarter of a mile there are three primary schools accommodating 800 children, with one being within less than 100 metres away from this redevelopment. These children will be being placed at risk every single day. Not only in terms of road safety, but their long- term health.

This rebuilding of the Paterson building, under these proposals, will highlight the sheer hypocrisy of these organisations. When they say that this is going to save lives, there will clearly be a substantial risk to our own lives, and especially those of our children.

If one 16 year old child can get Michael Gove to promise to address climate change, then surely all of us in this room can act on behalf the 800 children whose lives are at risk, and make Manchester City Council act on our concerns.

I would therefore urge you to resist these proposals for the redevelopment, as they are clearly not fit for purpose.

Don introduced George, an architect who designed the Siemens Building.

George:

Everyone respects the work that The Christie does.

Over the last ten years or so, the scale of some of their building projects have been at odds with the residential area we live in. Buildings like the Maggie's Centre and the white building [MCRC] on Wilmslow Road respected the scale and nature of our area. The two multi-storey car park proposals were not as welcome.

The Strategic Planning Framework agreed with the City Council in 2014 limited the height of new buildings in and around the main hospital to a maximum of **4.5 storeys**.

The recently completed Proton Beam Therapy building on Oak Road at 70 feet tall/21.5 metres is an example of this height of building.

To be clear on how tall the proposed building is, it has eleven floors—a basement, 8 floors of offices and laboratories, and 2 floors of plant rooms that service the laboratory floors. The laboratory floors are particularly high to accommodate service equipment, which is what contributes to the overall height of the building, which is circa 150 feet/45 metres high. **This is equivalent to the height of a 15 storey tower block.**

If the City Council accepts the amendment to the Strategic Planning Framework, it will open the door to buildings over twice the currently permitted height on The Christie site.

In the case of the current proposal for the replacement of the Paterson Building, it is not only the fact that it is three times the existing building's height, it has a huge floor area. The current fire damaged building has a floor area of about 90,000 square feet. Its proposed replacement is 270,000 square feet. **That's over a quarter of a million square feet! Three times as much space, and people, and their cars.**

Following the fire at the Patterson in April 2017, I think most people anticipated a new four or five storey building would be built on the site. I don't think anyone anticipated the size of building we are now faced with.

At the various consultation events staged by The University and The Christie, the number of people who will use the building has varied from the first consultation in January to just the **300** who moved out after the fire. This figure became **760** at the March open day. At a meeting between the Withington Civic Society and the Project Team [Turley, BDP, and The Christie] in late March a figure of **956** people appeared in the presentation.

If the new MSCP (multi-storey car park) off Cotton Lane/Kinnaird Road eventually gets its full approval, after the expanded controlled parking zone is agreed and funded, the additional 404 cars it will produce, plus the 450-500 the Paterson replacement could generate, will have a drastic effect on the quality of life in our area. Air pollution, traffic congestion, light pollution, and loss of the residential amenity will be the result of such a huge building.

The University and The Christie need to think seriously about their whole strategy for our area. Should the **High Speed train link** be built, the already overcrowded patient car park on Wilmslow Road will be closed.....will that then generate yet another planning application for another multi-storey car park on Kinnaird Road, and create yet more pollution around the school off Cotton Lane and beyond?

In the current edition of The Christie Neighbourhood News, it is said that **three Park and Ride sites** are to be utilized when the multi-storey car park construction eventually goes ahead. **Why doesn't The University and The Christie pursue this as a permanent approach to the issue of cars and pollution?**

I would propose that the City Council not make any changes to the Strategic Planning Framework on the site until The University and The Christie once and for all address and respect the fact that they are in the middle of a residential neighbourhood that is highly valued by the people who live here and that any developments that they are contemplating should have that fact at the forefront of their thinking...

**The respect we have for The Christie and its work needs to be reciprocated.
THIS PROPOSAL NEEDS TO BE RADICALLY CHANGED OR TAKEN TO A SITE THAT IS NOT IN THE MIDDLE OF A VIBRANT NEIGHBOURHOOD.**

Don then opened the floor for speakers.

*(Speakers are identified by **Res.1**, and so on, and/or **road**. Where possible, comments are verbatim.)*

Res.1: Not many people are in favour of it [proposed new building]. Where does the power lie? (George replied that it is MCC's Planning Committee; we need to respond by 16th May.)

Res.2: Will the MCC Planning Committee take into account what local politicians say?

Res.3: I read the response to the SPF Addendum consultation. Every response was vague, e.g. "how many people will there be on the new site?". These are not "clear and honest" replies from Turley's and The Christie.

Res.4: There are falsehoods in the WHEN [Withington Healthy Environment Network] leaflet [*]. This is not going to be 15 storeys high. (He was interrupted by multiple individuals who objected saying the leaflet said "the equivalent of 15 storey residential building". Res.4 disputed that's how it was presented.) There will be 55 extra jobs and not 1000 extra cars. Get facts and don't be sensational.

[*NB: the leaflet/flyer about the public meeting was not a WHEN leaflet. It was produced by a group of local residents and not affiliated with any specific group or political group.]

Res.5: Since the fire at the Paterson, work has moved to Alderley Park. A lot of the labs in the new building are for research, and there is no great need for this to be done on site. Why has it got to be in the middle of a residential area? Move out to where there is easy parking. It [the proposal] doesn't make any sense.

Res.6 Westholme Road: (member Disabled Access Group). Two points:

All residents here know that it is impossible to park. When ambulances come to drop me off or pick me up they have to park in the road. Carers and Support Workers can't get to me because they cannot park. Lots of people have additional needs and require these services. There is the need to protect parking for people with needs and which should be conditional in any development.

I don't think that we can trust [MCC's] Planning or the developer, because, despite regulations, some new developments are not accessible for the disabled. It is critically important that The Christie recognize the needs of people with disabilities.

Res.7 Old Moat Lane: (identified himself as someone who works at the Alderley Park site). Responding to Res.5, you "cannot beat person-to-person interaction". You can collect live

samples (tissue) from an operating theatre, to, within a limited time of 20 minutes, get them into a Laboratory.....from clinical setting to research. This enables the patient, the doctor who is treating them, and the researcher to all be on the same site. At present that can't happen, and all the staff are really feeling the distance. "The confluence of people is very valuable". It's simply a historical accident that a community hospital started using radium and became a world-renowned centre for cancer care.

Res.8 Ferndene Road: I agree with people being in one location. The current [controlled] parking works for me. However if you go down Ferndene, Mardale, and roads around there you'll see everyone already has their TV aerial on an extension pole because of the height of The Christie. The proposed height of the new building is bound to have an impact. Also, wonder about the effect of light pollution and the rights of light.

Res.9 Barry Court: My flat lost its light because of the Proton Beam Therapy building. It's dark in the day, and then we get flooded with light when we're sitting down at the table in the evening. We have the unfortunate problem of being next to the Young Oncology Unit. The Council came to do a site visit after it was built and agreed "it was inappropriate for the site". [It has] "blighted our lives".

The noise from the building work on the Proton Beam building started at 7.30am, even though stated it shouldn't start until 8.30am. When they wrap it in plastic, the noise still comes through and we would get 80-90 decibels in the mornings. Letters of objection made no difference. The Christie promised that on future buildings they would start at 8.30am weekdays and only from 9.30am at weekends, but this does not seem to be the case in the most recent literature. The increased traffic has meant we've lost two cats.

We really tried to make a difference to previous plans and failed. We hope this [public meeting] will make a difference.

Res.10 Circular Road: We can't get an answer about when Oak Road will be resurfaced. We've been told that utility cables need to go down Oak Road for the new build, which is why they are delaying. Also, the temporary measures during the resurfacing of the pavements are hopeless. All the barriers had fallen over the other day and we had to pick them up. Our street is used as "a smoking bay".

Res.11: The reality is the building is over-sized and you can't plant it in an urban area. They've taken something and grown it out of all proportion. "Something is wrong in the mix....can't they do it in 5 floors?" But where are the teeth to stop this happening? Planners and local MPs need to heed the traffic and other concerns.

Res.12 Pytha Fold Road: "They don't care. They're meant to be a green hospital." I live near the multi-storey car park, and when I went to a meeting and complained that the pollution could give me cancer, I was told that I was lucky I wouldn't have far to go.

Res.13: No-one builds high rise research buildings. This is "a half-baked development and badly designed" building. Across the world, in Seattle and Cambridge [and noted other cities] others build low. If it's primarily for research, then no-one builds high rise. Five storeys and no more!! (lots of applause)

Also, they re-routed HS2 for the Proton Beam building; will HS2 not affect the new building because it is re-routed? I went to the public meeting about the Paterson redevelopment and learned very little. There is not clear information from The Christie.

Res.14: Manchester has fallen in love with massive developments. Manchester [City Council] has allowed lots of very big buildings, e.g. a very high car park in the Northern Quarter, and also the very big buildings at Manchester University, that are not even full. These are too big. This is not Abu Dhabi or New York.

People have two powers. As consumers we can choose to buy ethical products, and as voters we can choose on 2 May. Who represents our problems?

Res.15, in building behind Alpino Cars/Oak Road co-op: I have suffered 20 years with [The Christie] new builds.

I've been a nurse for 40 years, and I know that many tumour samples have to be checked and double checked so you can't get results that quickly.

According to Manchester Grammar School study in the 80's, Wilmslow Road is the most polluted in the area. Already there are many deliveries to Oak Road starting at 5.30am, and delivery drivers leave their engines running, which disturbs residents and adds to pollution.

This [new research facility] could go onto the Withington Community Hospital site – there is lots of space there and the car park is often nearly empty. [The proposed] "building should not go ahead."

Res.16 Burton Road: (identified himself as a researcher working at Alderley Park). There are 300 staff off site who were working in overcrowded accommodation in the Paterson. Another 300, who already work on site, will move into the new building. We expect another 50 staff at the opening. [i.e. a total 650 staff in new MCRC/Patterson building at opening]

As researchers, we've been extensively consulted and [have] fed into this design. There will be a new type of research. This would be a world-leading cancer research facility which is why offices, laboratories, and patients need to be next to each other.

It's important to engage with the public and patients. This building will be fantastic for cancer research. Every part of the building is important. The impact on schools and children is positive. (There was heckling at this point. Don intervened and asked him to continue saying that we do want to hear all points of view.) All are excited about it. There is reason and thought throughout.

Res.17 Rathen Road: We are being deprived of a full picture of what will happen on the site over the next 10 years.

Res.18 Rathen Road: [in response to Res.16] I have two young children with asthma.

No-one disagrees with the amazing and great work The Christie does. If we look at the next 10-20 years, it is time for them to have an amazing, purpose-built facility, just not here: it has outgrown the space and deserves more. We need you; we need researchers like you. The Christie is needed. A bigger site is needed.

Res.19: You can't build it at the Withington hospital site because there will be a second Community Hospital. The Christie should be moved.

Professor of Medical Oncology at the Christie: I want to know, what was The Christie and The University of Manchester long-term strategy before the fire, so that we can talk about alternatives and options going forward.

Res.20: Why can't we just go to the top people making these decisions and talk to them. (Others interjected "we tried"). "Did they understand your views and did you understand theirs?"

Res.21: "Nobody is listening."

Res.22 near Fog Lane Park: My children go past The Christie every day on the way to [St. Cuthbert's] school. The Christie holds open days for the schools. It's an inspiration to walk past The Christie every day, and I encourage my children to grow up and do good things as they do there. We have many problems with our youngsters, and we need this inspiration for the younger generation.

Res.23: On the diagrams that are shown, we have a big tall tower. Could they not have a building half the height and over a wider area?

Don asked George to respond:

The building is very tall. By their nature, tall buildings are not efficient. (George showed a sketch as attached of the section through the site and Wilmslow Road looking toward Withington Village.) There is the new building, a service road, then a two storey building. The budget we've heard is £80m - £150m. A better building could be designed and be built over the top of existing buildings.

The history of The Christie site is that all around there were two storey buildings on the edge, and then larger buildings in the middle rising to five storeys.

You could have the same size building as that proposed that is horizontal and builds across the buildings at the back and is within the existing height requirements.

But if The Christie get the SPF Addendum approval, then you set a precedent, and any existing low storey buildings could be re-built much higher, and that's why we think they don't want the horizontal building.

This Paterson redevelopment should be the height of the Proton Therapy Beam building and no higher!

Res.24: If my memory serves me correctly, they were going to use some space behind the white building [MCRC on the Kinnaird Road site]. That must give them some wriggle room on the size of the proposed building.

Res.25: A question about the process: is it to stop changes to the SPF?

Res.26 Everett Road: I went to the Turley open events and I was appalled at the questionnaire developed by them. It was badly skewed and full of loaded questions. For example, one asked if you wanted a world class cancer hospital in the area. "Who would answer no?"

Res.15: (who spoke previously) I can see chimneys on the Christie site and at about 3-4am there is smoke coming out. We want the pollution on Oak Road to be measured. 8

Res.27: We can't stop the [re]build, but when they get the go ahead, we need to insist on commitments to privacy, and issues like light pollution and health. These need to be prioritized and then hold them to it [conditions for carrying out works].

Res.28: The four storey Paterson was destroyed by fire. It's strange that now they want to build an even taller 150ft high building, which would be harder for the fire service to tackle if there were another fire. Losing another building to fire would be awful.

Res.29: I can't understand (Read out was an extract from page 27 of the SPF Addendum) "The aspiration is to deliver a building which is lightweight and transparent in its design to ensure the activities within the building are visible from outside and the activity on the inside provides natural surveillance to the activities in the street at all levels."

Res.16: (researcher who spoke earlier) Encourage everyone to read the documents on the Paterson Redevelopment website.

Res.6 Westholme Road: (disabled resident, who spoke earlier) This is a fascinating meeting. There will be a building. How do we get answers to technical questions? How do we get an impact assessment of a high building before the planning application is approved? My concern in particular is that even MCC [Executive] didn't have the right information. How can we comment adequately when we don't have accurate information, eg. when false promises are made about assurances that buildings will meet requirements and policies for accessibility?

Res.31: stated that it needs to be clear whether this is an addendum or an amendment to the Strategic Planning Framework as this has great significance.

Ann: I wanted to make two more comments.

In relation to the Paterson building, why is this being built on the Withington site when the Christie now operates from four sites?

Turley says this will bring the City Centre skyline to Withington.

Don called an end to questions at that time and thanked all for their contributions. He invited Clare, a local resident and retired GP to speak about positive actions.

Clare: An enormous thank you to everyone for turning out tonight. I am a retired GP who has the health and wellbeing of people at heart. We want world class medical care and world class research, and a building that meets our needs without destroying our homes and neighbourhood.

1) You have until 16 May to submit objections to MCC. The MCC Planning Department address is on the posters around the hall, please take photos and take the details home. Please post your objections no later than 13 May.

2) There is also a petition that you can sign

3) There is an email: m20residents@outlook.com a web page: www.m20residents.com and a FaceBook page.

The more you can individualise your letter, the more MCC will have to take note. Please add a personal comment on the template letter.

Don then opened the floor for comments on the process.

Res.31: Is this going to the Planning Committee or the Executive Committee?

Local councillor David Ellison, who is also Chair of the Planning Committee, responded on condition he kept politics out of his response. David replied that the consultation on the SPF Addendum [to allow a much higher building than the current 4.5 storey limit] goes to the Executive Committee. They can modify or ratify it at that stage. It is a crucial step. The planning application for the new [MCRC/Patterson] building would be to the Planning Committee and would go through the planning process.

Res.32: Can we have a flow chart of the process?

Clare responded that time and resources are short. The most important thing is to respond before 16th May.

Res.33: I've heard that some of the councilors are compromised because of their links to the Christie. Is that right?

Don replied that at least one of the councilors [for Withington] works for, or is on the Board of Cancer Research UK and has excluded herself from any involvement

Res.34: Can we take the petition door to door?

George: Final comment: the core is that there are 12 labs on 4 floors. Put the labs on 3 floors, and then build backwards [over existing buildings]. Whatever the brief to the architects, it has resulted in a poor building design.

Don closed the meeting around 8.40pm and thanked everyone for attending.

Post Meeting:

The petition was available at the meeting and individual letters were completed. These have been sent (by email and post) to Manchester City Council Planning Department

Actions:

Contact Mcr City Council Executive.

Reference: The Paterson Development—Concerns

Post before Monday 13th of May

Postal Address: Planning Building Control and Licensing Strategic Development Directorate, Manchester City Council, PO Box 532, Town Hall Extension, Albert Square, M60 2LA

Email by Wednesday 15th May

Email: dmenquiries@manchester.gov.uk