

## Manchester City Council Report for Resolution

**Report to:** The Executive – 24 July 2019

**Subject:** The Christie

**Report of:** The Chief Executive

---

### Summary

This report informs the Executive of the outcome of a public consultation exercise on an addendum to the 2014 Christie Strategic Planning Framework (SDF) and seeks the Executive's approval of the Framework.

### Recommendations

The Executive is recommended to:

- i. Note the outcome of the public consultation on the Addendum to the 2014 Christie Strategic Planning Framework
  - ii. Approve the addendum to the 2014 Christie Strategic Planning Framework (SDF) and request that the Planning and Highways Committee take the Framework into account as a material consideration when determining planning applications for the site.
- 

**Wards Affected:** Withington, Old Moat, Didsbury West, Didsbury East

Manchester Strategy outcomes	Summary of the contribution to the strategy
A thriving and sustainable city: supporting a diverse and distinctive economy that creates jobs and opportunities	The City Region is a driving force in the regional and national economy. It accounts for 52% of the North West's total economic output and 5% of UK output. The health sector plays a central role within this and employment has grown in the sector by 13% between 2001 and 2011 and it is the second largest employer in the city region, employing over 150,000 people. The NHS spends on goods and services across the North West, of which 40% is retained in the region. In Manchester, the health sector employs 40,500 people contributing over £1bn per annum to the economy.
A highly skilled city: world class and home grown talent sustaining the city's economic success	The Christie employ 2,850 people plus around 300 volunteers and there are 300 University staff with 21% of the workforce living in the M14, M20 and M21 post codes, 38% in Manchester as a

	whole and 49% elsewhere in Greater Manchester.
A progressive and equitable city: making a positive contribution by unlocking the potential of our communities	The SRF would help to ensure that The Christie will remain a strategically significant clinical, research and employment facility in the city and the region.
A liveable and low carbon city: a destination of choice to live, visit, work	The development aspirations of the Christie would be accommodated in a manner that respects local character and amenity and key issues that have caused ongoing problems in the area regarding parking are being addressed.
A connected city: world class infrastructure and connectivity to drive growth	The Green Travel Plan aims to ensure that staff and visitors use sustainable forms of transport including buses, trams, cycling and walking. This should help to alleviate issues on streets in the area.

**Full details are in the body of the report, along with any implications for:**

Equal Opportunities Policy  
Risk Management  
Legal Considerations

#### **Financial Consequences – Revenue**

None

#### **Financial Consequences – Capital**

None

#### **Contact Officers:**

Name: Eddie Smith  
Position: Strategic Director Growth and Development  
Telephone: 0161 234 5515  
E-mail: e.smithi@manchester.gov.uk

Name: Dave Roscoe  
Position: Deputy Director Planning  
Telephone: 0161 234 4567  
Email: d.roscoe@manchester.gov.uk

#### **Background documents (available for public inspection):**

Addendum to the Christie Strategic Planning Framework 2019  
The Christie Strategic Planning Framework 2014

## **1.0 Introduction**

- 1.1 In March 2019, the Executive endorsed, in principle, an Addendum to The Christie Strategic Planning Framework 2019 and requested that the Chief Executive undertake a public consultation exercise. This report summarises the outcome of that public consultation.
- 1.2 The Paterson Redevelopment Project would provide one of the world's top five cancer research centres and improve patient outcomes in Manchester and across the globe. The recently announced investment by the Research England UK Research Partnership Investment Fund, alongside the strong partnership between the University of Manchester, Cancer Research UK and The Christie will help to cement Manchester's reputation as a centre of research and innovation.
- 1.3 The Greater Manchester Local Industrial Strategy identifies health innovation as one of the city region's unique sector strengths which, if capitalised on, will drive growth and productivity. The Strategy recognises that Greater Manchester has the potential to become a global leader on health innovation which will increase the adoption of new health and care technologies, processes and services which will improve the health of the local population.

## **2.0 Background**

- 2.1 Following the fire at the Paterson building The Partners have reviewed how the site could most effectively contribute to the delivery of first class clinical, scientific and research at The Christie. Successful research outcomes require intimate interaction between clinicians and scientists to discuss ideas and data and the physical proximity of lab to clinics is vital to this communication. The translation of research to patient care is accelerated when doctors, nurses, researchers and scientists all work together in one building. New treatments are developed faster and better outcomes are achieved for patients where clinicians and researchers interact.
- 2.2 A 'world-class' cancer research centre is proposed for the site that would be unique in UK where different research groups, disciplines, and clinical scientists/ academic clinicians would co-locate in the same building as key allied health professionals from The Christie. This would enable a 'Team Science' approach to be created that would accelerate cancer research, devise new treatments, and enhance patient care. The integration of translational research through to clinical delivery, would enable cancer research in Manchester to reach its full potential.
- 2.3 The proximity to patient wards would permit clinicians, scientists and researchers to move from 'bed-to-bench side'. Laboratory research could be used directly to develop new ways of treating patients. This proximity is vital and would create the only research facility of its kind in Europe. It would be the focal point for the integration of activities across the entire campus.

## **3.0 The Consultation Process and Issues Raised**

- 3.1 Consultation letters were sent out to around 4000 local residents, landowners, members and stakeholders, informing them of the process, how to participate, and engage and where to access the document. It was made available on the Council's website, and comments invited. The formal consultation closed on 16 May 2019 after a six week period.
- 3.2 Around 500 individual responses were received opposing the addendum including representations from The Withington Civic Society and The Withington Village Regeneration Partnership. Many of those who have objected recognise and value the work undertaken at The Christie but cannot support what Addendum suggests. Many of these are long impassioned letters expressing strong opposition. A significant proportion use a standard format but also include additional individual comments. Two petitions have been received, one online that has 280 signatures and one hand written with 121 signatures. Responses have been received from the Withington Civic Society and from the Withington Village. .
- 3.3 Forty individual responses have been received in support. 2000 postcards obtained from around sites in Greater Manchester express support.
- 3.4 Responses have been received from Councillors Stanton, Leech, Kilpatrick, Kelly Simcock, Wilson and Chambers.

### **The Issues Raised in the Consultation**

- 3.5 The objections broadly fall into five categories, namely:
- the process of producing an addendum is not appropriate;
  - the building is too big for the site and the area;
  - it would be possible to distribute the floorspace more efficiently at a lower height which would provide larger floorplates;
  - the adverse impact of car parking and traffic; and
  - detailed issues about the impact on amenity at nearby homes and the area.

The detail in each of these categories is set out below.

### **The process of producing an addendum is not appropriate**

- 3.6 It has been suggested that the impact of The Christie is now so significant that they should relocate to an alternative site altogether rather than continuing to increase density in this area to the detriment of the neighbourhood. The Christie has clearly outgrown the site and the fact that they continue to acquire property around in the area is clear evidence of this.

- 3.7 It is not necessary or appropriate to consider an addendum, as the existing SPF remains fit for purpose, respects the neighbourhood and presents a 15 year vision up until 2028. This provides the community with safeguards against over development. The Paterson, like most of the site, was operational at the time of the SRF and is clearly included within it. The established principles of the SPF should apply across the site, including that which requires development to be appropriate in terms of local character.
- 3.8 The addendum must be read together with the main text of the Strategic Planning Framework. The proposal is vast, 150 feet high and 350 feet long, comprising 25,000 square metres and would breach every single principle in the current Strategic Planning Framework. This is a complete rewriting, disposing all the design principles previously approved.
- 3.9 The addendum does not reflect important key principles within the original document in relation to height and the impact on the area. The framework sought to ensure that new development around the edges of the site should respect the height of nearby houses and that any height should be contained within the centre of the operational area. The consultation process has been wholly inadequate and has not reflected legislative or statutory requirements as set out in the NPPF, The Town and Country Planning Acts, The Localism Act and the Core Strategy and is therefore subject to challenge.
- 3.10 The Addendum does not give a sense of the local impact and relative scale of the building. Small pictures of the street scene with line drawings are shown but no estimates of height or length are provided. No scale model nor scale drawings were presented to the Executive.
- 3.11 Both the Trust and MCC are legally obliged to follow the principles of public law, including fulfilling legitimate expectation, making rational decisions and acting legally, complying with NPPF, HRA, all primary and secondary legislation, and MCC policies
- 3.12 The detrimental impact on the locality, is completely disproportionate to the Trust's aims and the addendum clearly breaches the Core Strategy and policies on Tall Buildings, the National Planning Policy Framework, does not fulfil the Sustainability Criteria and does not take heritage into consideration, particularly the proximity of the Withington Conservation Area.
- 3.13 It is suggested that the consultation process undertaken breaches the Town and Planning Act 2008, as amended by the Localism Act 2011. Accepting the addendum would breach the Human Rights Act 1998, and Residents' peaceful enjoyment of their home and local amenity and breaches the Residents Legitimate Expectation. Approving the proposal would be irrational and illegal.
- 3.14 It is suggested that the Executive cannot credibly conclude that the need for a building of this scale, on this site, has been established.

### **The building is too big for the site and the area**

- 3.15 The building at around 48.5m is far too large and would totally dominate this residential area. It is totally inappropriate, ill-conceived and completely ignores the predominant nature of the area. The design has been entirely driven by its internal requirements which have been stacked upon one another. The size could have been reduced by extending the foot print or building over adjoining buildings.
- 3.16 It would be the equivalent of 15 residential storeys and two and a half times as high as the recently approved proton beam therapy centre. It would fundamentally change the character of the area and have an adverse effect on residential amenity.
- 3.17 There are no buildings of comparable height in the area with the only large building being the toast rack. This would set an undesirable precedent and could result in further proposals coming forward for tall buildings. There would be no such building within 5 miles of the site with the nearest being in the city Centre. This would be contrary to the Councils decision on a six storey building in Northenden. It would be contrary to Core Strategy proposals for the area including EN2 regarding Tall Buildings.
- 3.18 The proximity to the Withington Conservation Area is not identified in the Addendum.
- 3.19 Some consider the building to be ugly but others note that it is well designed but would dominate the skyline in all directions and stick out like a sore thumb being as tall as Nelson's Column, or, a cruise ship. The effect will be to create a concrete canyon on Wilmslow Road.

### **It would be possible to distribute the floorspace more efficiently in a less invasive manner**

- 3.20 The Trust have failed to consider alternatives and failed to explain the reason why developing across their land at a lower level on the main site, isn't feasible.
- 3.21 The rationale for the choice of location and the specification of the building has been challenged with some commenting that vertical segregation does not assist the 'team science' approach. Others consider that the research work can and should be done remotely as it is at present and technology would allow and support this.
- 3.22 A high rise building with researchers and consultants on different floors would not create the desired co-location and would not be an appropriate way of developing a Team Science culture.
- 3.23 The 11 thin floors is not conducive to sharing information and creates inefficiencies. Researchers prefer to work on single floors. Building over the

service road would create larger more efficient floorplates and allow the height to be reduced.

- 3.24 There is limited evidence of the benefits of bringing different disciplines together in a single building. The document has failed to identify that the scale and massing of the building is needed.
- 3.25 The fire has given rise to an opportunity to develop a new approach and the “Team Science” approach clearly has benefits to The Christie. Some of the rationale is counter- intuitive at a time when efforts are being made to develop treatment centres away from the main site and the benefits of instant worldwide electronic communication are ever more apparent. The community supports The Christie but there has to be a limit to what is achievable in a residential area.
- 3.26 It should be possible to redistribute the floorscape within or by extending existing older buildings on the campus.
- 3.27 There may be alternative means of providing the accommodation using other areas of the site which would lead to a reduction in its height and scale. The report states that alternatives have been discounted but provides no detail.
- 3.28 As a significant amount of radiotherapy and chemotherapy treatment is now provided remotely, could this facility be built at another more appropriate Christie site.
- 3.29 Even if 25,000 square metres is required, there may well be another way of delivering this. An option has been prepared which illustrates how the same space could be added at only half the height in a manner that is much less damaging to the neighbourhood and would comply with the Design Principles set out in the existing SPF. No alternatives are offered or considered. The impression given therefore is that the “consultation” is little more than a box ticking exercise.
- 3.30 The provision of facilities on site that would compete Withington Village are not supported. Local people already use the retail offer on campus which has a negative effect on the vitality and economic sustainability of the Village. The Christie should be an asset to the Village. Environmental improvements such as street trees are needed between the hospital and the Village to encourage staff and visitors to engage more with it. A better connection to the Christie could help sustain the regeneration of Village and benefit the wider community and provide an improved experience for Christie staff and visitors.

#### **The adverse impact of parking and traffic**

- 3.31 This would lead to additional traffic, congestion and air pollution during construction and in use. There would be multiple contractors on site during the build period and the area could not cope with the impact of contractors vehicles. It would be detrimental to the health of the 800 primary school

children within metres of the site and have a damaging impact on air quality. This could have implications for lung cancer.

- 3.32 When in use it would accommodate additional workers, there would be more visitors and servicing vehicles. All of this would lead to a deterioration of air quality and would in particular have an adverse impact on children at nearby schools. The increased traffic movements would create road safety issues in an area close to schools and where there are large volumes of pedestrians.
- 3.33 The significant parking problems in the area would be worsened. This manifests itself in different ways including parking problems for residents, congestion on local roads, air quality issues, impact on local schools and impacts on amenity.
- 3.34 The eventual influx of 956 staff will hugely increase the local staff parking burden and reverse the effect of the Christie Green Travel Plan (GTP) in mitigating this. The GTP will have to run very fast just to stand still.
- 3.35 The Christie green travel plan is largely ineffective, the Christie controlled parking zone just does not work for local residents, and Christie staff continue to intrude by parking across drives and garage-ways, affecting the lifestyle of local residents in an unacceptable way.
- 3.36 New cycle paths have made an extra lane to cross, when turning onto Wilmslow Road which is fraught with difficulty and danger with the lack of awareness of some cyclists. The level of traffic and the present bottlenecks due to cycle lanes and the new builds cause traffic build-ups of traffic and difficulty for buses.
- 3.37 The parking constraints and permits have caused problems and many residents have torn up most of their previously green front gardens to make parking areas. This green space helped to counteract pollutants and support rainfall retention.
- 3.38 There will be an impact on the City and the NHS of increased respiratory disease/cardiovascular disease/increased traffic accidents and injury or fatality/ increased time for access by emergency 999 vehicles and risk to life and limb due to this increased response time
- 3.39 There would be additional staff travelling to and from the site causing parking, pollution and congestion problems. The new car park would not address this.
- 3.40 There is no estimate of the increase in staff & visitor numbers, nor the effect on traffic and parking.

**Detailed issues were raised were raised about the impact on amenity at nearby homes**

- 3.41 Loss of amenity as a result of noise, air pollution, privacy, right to light, light pollution, loss of sunlight, overshadowing; loss of evening sunshine; gardens

being permanently in shadow; loss of TV reception; loss of privacy; nuisance from construction; devaluation of property; noise from plant etc

- 3.42 Impact on house prices. Residents find it difficult to align the fact that we have put our whole lives and money into our homes to have our surroundings affected in this manner. Their lifestyles will be affected dramatically by this build.
- 3.43 Impact on access for emergency vehicles to residents. Access for people with mobility issues who do not possess a disabled badge and who cannot find a parking space near to their home is will only be exacerbated.

### **Responses from local Councillors**

- 3.44 **Councillor Kelly Simcock** is supportive of the need to redevelop the Christie, supports the upgrade of research facilities and is aware that clinicians have reported a negative impact on their work with research colleagues relocated remotely and therefore understands the rationale for developing a facility that can address these issues alone.
- 3.45 However, this proposal is centrally located in a residential area and is a matter of great concern for some residents. Shops and other facilities are not necessary with local amenities a short walk away. The height is one of the biggest causes for concern. Using and reallocating space on the ground floor, for example, could surely help reduce this? A reduction should impact on the research capability but suggests that alternatives are explored to consider how this could be achieved differently using space available.
- 3.46 The SPF should be amended to reflect the extended Controlled Parking Zone (CPZ) and a formal consultation for the extension of the CPZ be included.
- 3.47 **Councillor James Wilson** acknowledges the need to amend the SPF in light of the destruction of the Paterson Institute and supports the replacement and upgrading of the research facilities which were lost. Clinicians have advised that research has suffered following their relocation to Alderley Park as close proximity to where patients are receiving treatment is very useful and, modern research labs are taller than those constructed at the time when the Paterson Institute was first built. The replacement building would need to be taller than the current building, which justifies the amendment to the SPF.
- 3.48 However, this would be a major development in a residential area and its scale has caused some concern among residents. For this reason, the Council and Christie should explore whether elements of the building that are not essential to its function as a research facility could be removed to reduce its height. In particular, the ground floor is mainly publicly-accessible space- could some of this be sacrificed to take a storey off the building. There are plenty of shopping and dining facilities a short walk away in Withington village. Could the space vacated by the 350 employees who are moving into the new building from elsewhere in the campus be used for the community engagement talked about in the document to free up more space.

- 3.49 The SPF should be amended to reflect the extended CPZ and a formal consultation for the extension of the CPZ should be brought forward as a priority.
- 3.50 **Councillor Greg Stanton** he and ward colleagues remain supportive of the Christie as a whole. However, the Council has not properly made the case for why a building of this size is required, and a full review of the SPF would be appropriate because the impact that the development would have on the entire site and nearby residents.
- 3.51 The SPF was fit for purpose prior to the fire which raises the question as to why an addendum is now required. The building should not be taller than the Paterson Institute. Whilst the opportunity to improve the facilities is recognised, a lower rise building almost equal in volume could be constructed over a greater footprint with a potentially deeper excavation to maintain space.
- 3.52 In respect of traffic and parking, it would be unwise to increase employees at the site in large numbers and it would be better to house some staff at other Christie facilities or at the university as travel time between the two is short and they could visit as necessary rather than being permanently tethered to a facility essentially in the middle of a residential area. The knock on effect of increased standing traffic cannot be ignored when considering air quality within the locality.
- 3.53 The building is out of keeping with anything else in the area and would set a dangerous precedent about the height of future builds on-campus and beyond in the locality. We will continue to push hard to ensure a dialogue is maintained between the developer, the Christie and the City on the best way forward to deliver a world class facility without disamenity to those in its shadow.
- 3.54 **Councillor Richard Kilpatrick** The community and residents value the work of The Christie, are proud to have the facilities on their door step and proud of its international recognition.
- 3.55 It has always been difficult to bring the future plans for the Christie and the concerns of residents together in a consociate way and this is another example of how more must be done to meet residents' concerns.
- 3.56 The requirement of having the biomedical services, university and labs in one building is of clear advantage and this is a perfect time to review what a modern Patterson facility should include. But many residents feel that the size and imposing nature of the building would set a precedent and give the Christie the opportunity to increase the height of other facilities. It should be made clear that this would not set a precedent.
- 3.57 The coffee and reception facilities on the ground floor should be reduced to reduce the size of the building. Its footprint will be small but the impact of the

skyline very impacting and a full justification for the height is required and a softer finish to the aesthetic.

3.58 There is a greater issue of parking and the impact that a new, bigger building will have on parking and the CPZ review and extension. All that exists in the SPF document is a commitment to "Demonstrate a clear strategy regarding staff travel to and from the site including measures to encourage further modal shift to more sustainable modes". The parking issues requires a more sustainable and substantial strategy that takes into consideration the changes to the SPF. As a result, a parking and traffic policy should be established alongside this SPF to address the following outstanding issues:

- CPZ review and extension
- Lack of parking for employees
- Take up of sustainable travel to work schemes
- On site car parking
- Park and ride schemes

and this proposed policy should be a condition of the SPF.

3.59 The building should be reduced in size where possible and its appearance should be less imposing. The building at its current size should not be supported without a guarantee that future buildings will not be of this height and a condition on the SPF should restrict height across other buildings on the site

3.60 **Councillor John Leech** does not think that the addendum gives any justification for the need for a building of 25000 sq metres. Everybody recognises that the old building was not fit for purpose and more space is needed, but there is no evidence why it needs to be this big. That is not to say that there is not any justification, but simply that the case has been made.

3.61 There are no definite figures for staff numbers and an assessment of whether parking provision will be sufficient.

3.62 The massive potential expansion of research could have a much wider impact on the whole site, and this has not been dealt with by the addendum, and is the reason why there should have been consideration to review the whole SPF, rather than consider the Paterson site in isolation through an addendum to the existing SPF.

3.63 **Councillor Becky Chambers** is extremely proud to live in the vicinity of a facility that provides world-leading treatment and care for people with cancer and values the great work done by Christie in the field of cancer research and appreciates the various operational and financial benefits of containing the research on one site.

3.64 The proposal is generally welcomed and the design of a good standard. However, the height is a concern and she can sympathise with the concerns

that the proposal is too tall. All design options should be considered and a reduction in height would make it less imposing on the visual landscape of the area. The impact of the building should be minimised. The Green Travel Plan should reduce the number of single occupancy vehicles travelling to the site and the availability of public transport and bike facilities in the area should be highlighted and promoted. The impact of construction traffic should be minimal. A full disability assessment should be carried out on both the proposed building and the impact on disabled pedestrians whilst works are taking place. The Christie should continue to engage with the Withington Regeneration Partnership and demonstrate their stated commitment to a thriving Withington. Staff should be encouraged to use Withington village by promoting the food and beverage offer and the diverse selection of shops that Withington offers.

#### **4.0 Response to the Issues Raised**

- 4.1 A development of this nature clearly has strategic significance to the City, the region and the Northern Powerhouse. Life sciences and healthcare are key growth areas that help to underpin the region's economy and continued growth in these sectors is essential. This proposal would secure around 150m of capital investment. The work in the new building would generate a direct contribution to the GM economy worth £43million GVA per annum, an uplift of £10.4m compared to the productivity at the former Paterson building and indirect benefits to the GM economy worth £16.1m GVA per annum, an uplift of £3.8m. This is therefore of considerable strategic significance. However, the facility has very specific locational requirements and has to be within the existing campus and has to be next to patients' beds
- 4.2 If the framework is endorsed, this ultimately has to be balanced with the location of the Christie within a residential area and the impact that a building of the size required would have within that area.
- 4.3 In respect of the five categories of objection raised the following response is put forward.

#### **The process of producing an addendum is not appropriate**

- 4.4 The existing strategic planning framework establishes a broad vision for the development of the Christie site. It is not a formal planning policy document and it is not a site allocations document, nor is it a supplementary planning document that adds further detail to the development plan. It is essentially a statement of ambition which is a material factor in the determination of planning applications.
- 4.5 This addendum acknowledges and has responded to a specific issue that has arisen at the site, ie the fire at the Paterson building and sets out an ambition to develop a major clinical and research facility at the site. However, the approval of this addendum would not be an overriding factor in terms of determining any planning application. All planning applications have to be determined through the statutory planning processes. This would include a

full and robust assessment of a proposal in strict accordance with both national and local planning policy and any other material considerations.

### **The building is too big for the site and the area**

- 4.6 The space requirements and the size of the building were determined following consultation with various specialist 'user groups' within The Christie. This has identified the need for the building to accommodate 23,800 sq. metres (NIA) of floor-space if a world-class facility is to be created. This floor-space would accommodate:
- Eight state of the art laboratories and associated write up space to replace that lost in the Paterson fire (4,700 m<sup>2</sup>);
  - Four state of the art laboratories and associated write up space for the Manchester Centre for Biomarker services (1,500 m<sup>2</sup>).
  - Consultant workspace to accommodate The Christie's clinical and research staff that are critical collaborators and whose expertise is critical to successful translational research (2,800 m<sup>2</sup>). These staff are presently dispersed across the Withington Site in often low quality accommodation.
  - Collaboration and engagement spaces including meeting rooms (4,350 m<sup>2</sup>);
  - Highly specialised plant and equipment (5,500 m<sup>2</sup>)
  - Space for facilities management (700 m<sup>2</sup>)
  - Circulation spaces such as corridors / stair-wells etc (4,200 m<sup>2</sup>)
- 4.7 The accommodation has to be 'stacked' vertically and horizontally in a very particular way to ensure the full integration of scientific research and to ensure that relevant staff are located on the correct level, for example some Consultant Workspace is required to be located on level 1 to connect directly into the existing drugs trial wards.
- 4.8 The overall floor-space requirement for the laboratories, write-up and research space has increased by c.18% in order to ensure that the new accommodation meets modern design standards.
- 4.9 The requirement for a specific quantum of floor-space, the need for that accommodation to be arranged in a particular way, the need for enhanced floor-ceiling heights within the laboratories and the constrained nature of the site all combine to result in the height of the building proposed.
- 4.10 The expansion of the Manchester Centre for Cancer Biomarker Sciences (MCCBS) was originally planned to be accommodated within an independent building alongside the Oglesby Cancer Research building (formerly MCRC).

That proposal is superseded by the PRP. Therefore there are no longer any plans to build on the land adjacent to the Oglesby building. Provision of the expanded MCCBS within the PRP development provides the opportunity to fully integrate biomarker research alongside a wide range of other specialist activities thereby allowing it to make a greater contribution to Team Science and the faster translation of research into patient care. This physical integration has substantial research benefits that would not be achieved if MCCBS were provided in a standalone building.

- 4.11 The support for the facility that would be provided by the endorsement of this addendum does not mean that planning permission would inevitably be granted. All of the concerns that have been raised about the impact of the scale of the building would have are critical and must be fully addressed as part of the determination of any planning application by the Local Planning Authority. As set out above, the approval of this addendum would not override existing national and local planning policy and the application would have to be fully justified in that context.

**It would be possible to distribute the floorspace more efficiently in a less invasive manner**

- 4.12 The Team Science approach requires much greater levels of integration between those involved in the research pipeline. Consideration was given to whether this could be achieved through developing a number of standalone buildings but this would fundamentally fail to deliver the world-class collaborative working environment sought by the Partners.
- 4.13 Similar facilities in North America and elsewhere demonstrates that such co-location accelerates the rate at which new discoveries in the laboratory are translated into clinical trials and ultimately into new treatments for patients. The world of cancer research is changing and evolving from the traditional reliance on the creativity of individuals to the central need of multidisciplinary collaboration involving biologists, clinicians, chemists, computational biologists, statisticians and engineers: the bringing together of scientists and clinicians with different and diverse ideas and expertise to work together to accelerate the translation of breakthrough discovery research into patient benefits.
- 4.14 The co-location of activities has huge advantages over a more traditional dispersed model as it: increases the opportunities for mixing and thereby encourages informal discussions, sharing of ideas and sharing of technologies; it stimulates discussion of pressing scientific and clinical problems; it helps to remove barriers that in the past have impeded interaction and common understanding; it creates a vibrant, lively community best suited to building relationships and new ways of working together; it creates a unique and exciting environment and culture that is different from traditional discipline-focussed centres and will attract other leaders from around the world that share the team science philosophy and in so doing deliver a powerful multiplier effect that will build strength and depth; it provides the ideal training environment to develop the next

generation of cancer researchers and practitioners who will be schooled in the principles of team science

- 4.15 It maximises the potential of translating knowledge into new ways of treating patients. A dispersed model would not achieve these objectives or deliver the same benefits. If that approach could work, it would require the demolition and re-provision of some existing buildings containing essential services which would create a number of additional operational challenges.
- 4.16 The brief was developed in consultation with the clinicians and researchers and addresses specific needs. A range of options were considered about how the space could be configured around the site but it has to be on a single site within a single building.
- 4.17 It was originally intended to incorporate facilities and amenities for local residents and the community within the ground floor but this has been removed and the ground floor would accommodate the main entrance, reception, café, public engagement area, lab services accommodation, lab changing area, goods in and out area, physics workshop, freezer room, HV & LV switch-rooms, lab plant room and a cycle hub

#### **The adverse impact of parking and traffic**

- 4.18 There were c.3,815 total staff employed at the Christie Withington Site in January 2017 prior to the fire in April 2017, of which c.3,052 were typically on site at any one time. At present 3,485 are based at the site of which c.2,780 are typically on site at any one time. If the PRP is implemented, 3,870 staff would be employed at the site on its first day of operation in 2022 3,096 may be on site at any one time. This represents an increase of 55 on pre-fire levels.
- 4.19 When the PRP is full occupied, 4055 could be based at the site in 2030 which represents an increase of +185 staff from 2022 and +240 from pre-fire levels. 3,244 may be on site at any one time.
- 4.20 There can be no doubt that there have been real tensions in the area as a result of staff, visitors and patients parking on nearby streets and from the volume of traffic that the site attracts. This issue has to some extent been addressed by the modal shift away from private car as a result of the introduction of the Green Travel Plan and through the introduction of a controlled parking scheme, funded by The Christie. However, whilst the CPZ has been successful in terms of addressing the problem on those streets included, some issues have arisen elsewhere as parking has been displaced onto other streets.
- 4.21 The Green Travel Plan prioritises journeys on foot, by bike and by public transport and has encouraged car sharing and other measures. It has resulted in a modal shift and has achieved the Transport for Greater Manchester “Gold Standard” for the past two years. The Christie have been awarded the Travel Choices “Active Travel Award” for excellence in

promoting cycling and walking. Around 45% of staff now use sustainable transport and the GTP aims to increase this to 60% of all journeys which is more ambitious than many other GTP's. Physical works have been carried out at the site, such as the provision of more shower and changing facilities and secure cycle parking. Other initiatives include: "Walking Wednesday", free bicycle training, free bicycle maintenance and individual public travel packs for staff

- 4.22 The Christie has since received permission for a car park to increase on site provision. As part of this approval, the Christie has made a financial contribution through S106 to expand the CPZ significantly and there is a report elsewhere on the agenda regarding this. The implementation the car park and the expansion of the CPZ will further help to address problems being experienced on nearby streets and should ease parking problems in the area.
- 4.23 These issues would be addressed in detail as part of the consideration of the Planning application.

#### **Detailed issues about the impact on amenity at nearby homes**

- 4.24 Many issues are raised about the impact of the scheme on the amenity of residents in the area. These are very important matters that have to be fully addressed as part of the consideration and determination of the planning application. They do not however come within the remit of the Executive in terms of this addendum.

### **5.0 Concluding Remarks**

- 5.1 The addendum recognises and seeks to capture a major research and medical facility within Manchester which would have significant medical and economic benefits for the City and the region.
- 5.2 Whilst residents in the area do value the work undertaken at the Christie they have very considerable concerns about how it impacts on their community and neighbourhood and this has been expressed over many years in relation specifically to parking issues. In response to this specific addendum, the height of the building has been a major cause for concern.
- 5.3 The draft addendum does not set out a policy position but recognises that there is an opportunity to develop a facility of national and international significance at the site.
- 5.4 A planning application is currently being considered. This is the subject of public consultation and will be determined in due course by the Local Planning Authority.
- 5.5 Detailed recommendations appear at the front of this Report.

### **6.0 Contributing to the Manchester Strategy Outcomes**

**(a) A thriving and sustainable city: supporting a diverse and distinctive economy that creates jobs and opportunities**

6.1 The City Region is a driving force in the regional and national economy. It accounts for 52% of the North West's total economic output and 5% of UK output. The health sector plays a central role within this and employment has grown in the sector by 13% between 2001 and 2011 and it is the second largest employer in the city region, employing over 150,000 people. The NHS spends on goods and services across the North West, of which 40% is retained in the region. In Manchester, the health sector employs 40,500 people contributing over £1bn per annum to the economy.

**(b) A highly skilled city: world class and home grown talent sustaining the city's economic success**

6.2 The Christie employ 2,850 people plus around 300 volunteers and there are 300 University staff with 21% of the workforce living in the M14, M20 and M21 post codes, 38% in Manchester as a whole and 49% elsewhere in Greater Manchester.

**(c) A progressive and equitable city: making a positive contribution by unlocking the potential of our communities**

6.3 The SRF would help to ensure that The Christie will remain a strategically significant clinical, research and employment facility in the city and the region.

**(d) A liveable and low carbon city: a destination of choice to live, visit, work**

6.4 The development aspirations of the Christie would be accommodated in a manner that respects local character and amenity and key issues that have caused ongoing problems in the area regarding parking are being addressed.

**(e) A connected city: world class infrastructure and connectivity to drive growth**

6.5 The Green Travel Plan aims to ensure that staff and visitors use sustainable forms of transport including buses, trams, cycling and walking. This should help to alleviate issues on streets in the area.

## **7.0 Key Policies and Considerations**

### **(a) Equal Opportunities**

7.1 The site provides a significant number of jobs which are easily accessible to nearby residents. There is a commitment to ensure that design standards

throughout the development will comply with the highest standards of accessibility.

**(b) Risk Management**

7.2 Not applicable

**(c) Legal Considerations**

7.3 If the addendum to the SRF is approved by the City Council, it would become a material consideration for the Council as Local Planning Authority