

Comments for Planning Application 143469/JO/2025

Application Summary

Application Number: 143469/JO/2025

Address: Land Bounded By Upper Brook Street, Cottenham Street & Kincardine Road Manchester M13 9TD

Proposal: Variation to condition 30 (Use of Building) attached to planning permission 137399/FO/2023 to allow use of building outside of term time

Case Officer: Jennifer Atkinson

Customer Details

Name: Not Available

Address: Not Available

Comment Details

Commenter Type: Councillor

Stance: Customer objects to the Planning Application

Comment Reasons:

Comment: I am writing as a local councillor on behalf of residents in the Brunswick estate to strongly object to the proposed amendment to Condition 30 of planning permission 137399/FO/2023 for the Purpose Built Student Accommodation at Upper Brook Street, Kincardine Road, and Cottenham Street.

As the Committee is aware, the Brunswick estate community expressed overwhelming upset and anger about the already approved PBSA on Upper Brook Street, particularly regarding how this development's density and height would severely impact residents living directly opposite the site.

A major concern directly relevant to this planning proposal is that the approved development will house a high volume of people when complete, and this is before we even consider the additional impact of the proposed short-term lets and the occupancy rate that would bring.

The community already experiences excessive commuter traffic and parking problems due to existing pressures from the University, city centre and Hospital, and this is before the development is even near completion.

These traffic and parking issues have been continually raised as core community concerns about how the approved development will worsen an already critical situation, both during construction and once operational. Despite extensive pressure from councillors, these fundamental issues remain unresolved.

This application for short-term lets would dramatically compound an already unsustainable

situation, adding intensive holiday occupation on top of an approved development that the community knows will already overwhelm local infrastructure.

Key Objections

1. Inconsistent with Established Council Policy

Manchester City Council's planning team specifically imposed Condition 30 to prevent short-term summer lets in this PBSA development. This demonstrates that the Council recognised the particular sensitivity of this location and the need for additional protection for local residents. Removing this condition would create an unfair precedent and undermine the Council's own considered planning judgment.

2. Severe Traffic and Parking Impact

The existing development is already designated as "car free" with no parking provision, even though there will be thousands of people living and working in this small area once it is completed. The local area is already experiencing significant pressure on street parking and traffic congestion. The proposed short-term lets would exacerbate these problems through:

- Increased frequency of drop-offs, pick-ups and deliveries during summer months
- Higher turnover of occupants requiring more servicing and waste collection
- Additional pressure on already strained local parking, particularly affecting existing residents who rely on street parking

The current construction phase has already demonstrated the development's impact on local traffic flow and parking availability, with roads or lanes on major routes being closed.

Adding short-term holiday lets would compound these existing problems year-round.

3. Community Cohesion and Residential Amenity

Condition 30 was specifically designed to maintain the balance between permanent and transient residents in existing established communities. The proposed amendment would:

- Transform the development into a quasi-aparthotel during university holidays
- Increase noise and disturbance through higher occupancy turnover
- Create an imbalance because local residents cannot operate short-term lets from their own homes based on council decisions to develop cohesive and strong communities, whilst at the same time providing commercial operators the opportunity to profit from doing so
- Undermine the community stability that the original condition sought to protect

4. Financial Justification Should Not Override Planning Policy

Whilst the applicant argues that short-term lets are necessary for financial viability, this should not take precedence over the legitimate planning concerns that led to Condition 30's original imposition. The Council's duty is to protect existing residents' amenity, not to guarantee developers' profit margins.

If the short term lets were so important and necessary for financial viability, then why was it not included in the original planning application?

Condition 30 serves a vital purpose in protecting our community from the detrimental effects of excessive transient occupation. The proposed amendment would fundamentally alter the character of the approved development and create significant additional harm to local residents.

The Council was right to impose this restriction initially, recognising the particular sensitivities of this location. I urge you to refuse this application.