

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: Neighbour

Stance: Customer objects to the Planning Application

Comment Reasons:

Comment: I am writing as a local resident to formally object to the proposed amendment to Condition 30 of planning permission 137399/FO/2023, concerning the Purpose Built Student Accommodation (PBSA) at Upper Brook Street, Kincardine Road, and Cottenham Street.

As part of the purchase of my property in the area, I was required to sign a legal agreement prohibiting short-term letting. This proposal appears inconsistent with the standards applied to long-term residents and raises concerns about fairness and planning integrity.

I object to the amendment, which seeks to allow up to 35% of PBSA rooms to be used for short-term summer lets outside of term time, for the following reasons:

1. Increased Noise and Disturbance: Short-term tenants, frequent move-ins and move-outs, and related servicing activities (e.g., deliveries, cleaning, etc.) are likely to generate ongoing noise and disruption, particularly during the summer months.
2. High Turnover of Occupants: Short-term use typically results in a transient population, which inhibits the development of community ties and undermines residential stability in the area.
3. Community Cohesion: The original restriction on year-round PBSA use was intended to preserve a balance between permanent and temporary residents. The proposed amendment contradicts this aim and could contribute to further community fragmentation.
4. Risk of Unregulated Use: The potential for the property to operate in a way similar to short-term holiday or party let platforms (e.g., Airbnb) raises concerns about anti-social behaviour and enforcement challenges.
5. Impact on Local Infrastructure: Increased turnover and short stays place additional strain on local streets and services. The assumption that arrivals and departures will be "spread out" is

speculative and not practically enforceable.

6. Planning Precedent: Approving this amendment may set a precedent for other PBSA schemes in Manchester to request similar occupancy changes, undermining the intent of Condition 30 and the wider planning policy objectives. The planning department included this condition originally, there is no reason for this to now change.

7. Questionable Financial Viability: The development was approved on the basis that it was financially viable under the original conditions. If the developer is now claiming otherwise, it calls into question the validity of their initial submission. Planning decisions should not be revisited solely on the basis of changes in the developer's financial model, especially where this may negatively affect local residents.

I respectfully request that Manchester City Council maintain the original terms of Condition 30 to uphold the integrity of the planning process and protect existing residents.