Outlook

Fw: Comment on Planning Application 142888/FO/2025

From Planning <[redacted]>
Date Mon 30/06/2025 11:11
To Lucy Harrison <[redacted]>

Information, Delivery & Support Team
Planning, Building Control & Licensing
Growth & Development Directorate
Postal address: Manchester City Council, P O Box 532, Town Hall, Manchester M60 2LA
Location address: Level 6 Town Hall Extension, Manchester M2 5DB
Tel: 0161 234 4516

Please consider the environment before printing an e-mail.

From: [redacted]
Sent: 30 June 2025 11:07
To: Planning <[redacted]>
Subject: Comment on Planning Application 142888/FO/2025

You don't often get email from [redacted] Learn why this is important

ALERT This message originated outside of the Manchester City Council network. **BE CAUTIOUS** before clicking any links or opening any attachments. Please remember your Cyber Training and report anything suspicious.

Dear Manchester Planning team,
I am writing to lodge an objection to planning application **142888/FO/2025** – Cambridge Halls Of Residence Cavendish Street Manchester M15 6TT.
My primary objection is that the proposals have been designed to deter cyclists from using the safest and most direct route through the site. This route has been open to cyclists ever since the road was first built; it is an essential, well-used part of the city's cycling network and therefore the proposal to deter and/or divert cycles away from Cavendish Street is directly at odds with Manchester City Council's planning, sustainability and transport policies.
I've used this cycling link frequently over the past 20 years, it connects two of the main cycling routes in Manchester and it's removal would significantly impact the connectivity of the cycling network. Removal of this vital link seems totally contrary to the European Capital of Cycling 2024 status which Manchester enjoyed.
The applicant has also made misleading claims regarding the road's legal status and regarding pedestrian safety which I will outline below.
I am asking that the council **refuse** this application, and invite the developer to come back with a proposal that maintains direct cycle as well as pedestrian access along Cavendish Street, designed to modern standards set out in Greater Manchester's Streets For All design guide and in Department for Transport guidance note LTN 1/20. I am sure that the Highways team at MCC and the Active Travel team at TfGM will, if asked, be happy to comment on how such a route could be provided within the space available.

I am also asking that the council **make a Section 106 agreement (s106)** with the applicant to fund safety improvements for pedestrians and cyclists at the junction of Cavendish Street and Higher Cambridge Street – the applicant themselves discuss the shortcomings of the existing junction layout in Section 4.2.1 of the Transport Statement ("*Cyclists have also been observed to queue on the footway to gain direct access to the Higher Cambridge Street/Cavendish Street junction (via a gap in the guard railings) rather than following the road markings which advise cyclists to dismount and use the controlled pedestrian crossings*"). The improvements might take the form of a CYCLOPS junction. CYCLOPS is a homegrown Greater Manchester innovation now frequently used on Highways schemes across the country to deliver safe pedestrian and cycle movements without undue impact on traffic flows.

For prospective occupants and passers-by alike, in line with the S106 tests as set out in Paragraph 58 of the National Planning Policy Framework (NPPF) 2024, a contribution to junction safety improvements improvement would be 'necessary to make the development acceptable in planning terms' (by contributing to an appropriate movement strategy for the site), 'directly related to the development' (given its proximity, the pressure added to the junction by the proposed threefold increase in residents, and in light of the wholly inadequate mitigation route proposed by the applicant), and 'fairly and reasonably related in scale and kind to the development' (given the stated threefold increase in residents explained by the applicant, so directly adding more pressure to the junction).

1 Legal Status of Cavendish Street

This section of Cavendish Street, an adopted Highway, was subject to a stopping up order dated 14.06.1996. That order required that "the Developer shall provide a new highway which shall be a footpath/cycleway". MMU have since installed physical signage stating that Cavendish Street "has not been dedicated as a Highway" and have bolted down uncomfortable and restrictive speed bumps across the route in an apparent attempt to dissuade cyclists from exercising their legal rights over this space. Both measures may be unlawful, as my understanding is that cyclists do retain a legal Right of Way along Cavendish Street, unchanged from when the entire road was an adopted highway, and the speed bumps are inaccessible to some Disabled users.

2 Cycling routes and planning policy

The case for walking and cycling and specifically for maintaining and improving high quality cycling networks is clear at every level of modern planning policy, including:

- NPPF 2024's "vision-led approach"
- LTN 1/20
- Places For Everyone Joint Development Plan Objectives 6, 7 and 10
- Places for Everyone Joint Development Plan policies JP-Strat14, JP-C1, JP-C5 and JP-C6
- GM Transport Strategy 2040 and the "Right Mix" targets
- Greater Manchester Streets for All strategy and Streets for All design guide
- Manchester City Council's Active Travel Strategy
- Manchester City Council's commitment to be a Zero Carbon city by 2038

The policy position is absolutely clear – changes to the existing road and cycle networks should make cycling more convenient for people, not less convenient.

This specific stretch of Cavendish Street is a key part of the existing cycle network. It appears on TfGM's Bee Network map as a Beeway ("the routes that get people from A to B … representing the most direct routes between crossing points.") and connects to the Stretford Road Busy Beeway ("corridors or crossing points on busier roads that will require a higher level of design intervention to improve cycling and walking.") It is also mapped on the TfGM Cycle Network.

The national standard for cycling infrastructure is DfT guidance note LTN 1/20. LTN 1/20 advises above all else that cycle routes and networks should be Safe, Direct, Comfortable, Attractive and Coherent. Introducing unnecessary diversions, junctions and bends into a well-used existing route

undermines all of these core principles, resulting in a lower quality cycle network which will make it harder for the council to achieve its cycling objectives.

The applicant has offered various reasons why diverting cyclists is necessary but all of these reasons seem to be either existing problems, or problems designed into the scheme. The proposal is to demolish and redevelop the site – so considerations like limited space and the placement of entrances, shop frontages, planting and pedestrian areas are entirely within the applicant's scope to manage. Instead of starting with the problem "there is an existing busy cycle route across this site, how can I design to accommodate everyone's needs?", it seems the applicant has started with the conclusion "cyclists must be deterred" and instructed their consultants to post-rationalise that decision.

3 Misleading claims regarding safety

Page 22 of the Design & Access Statement refers to the "existing controversial link along Cavendish St., which is resulting in collisions of pedestrians, electric scooters, cyclists, etc."

However the map of recorded collisions, on page 18 of the Transport Statement submitted in the same planning application, shows no recorded collisions whatsoever on this link, only on the adjacent main roads.

It appears the applicant is attempting to restrict cycle access based on a "problem" for which they have no evidence.

Yours sincerely,

[redacted]

****

This email and any files transmitted with it are confidential and intended solely for the use of the individual or entity to whom they are addressed. If you have received this email in error, please notify the sender, or [redacted] and then permanently delete the email, attachments and all copies.

The full text of the Council's email disclaimer is available at: www.manchester.gov.uk/emaildisclaimer.

Your personal data is very important to us. Please refer to our privacy notice at: www.manchester.gov.uk/privacy for further information.

This footnote also confirms that this email message has been swept for the presence of computer viruses.

****

Outlook

Fw: Comment on Planning Application 142888/FO/2025

From Planning <[redacted]
Date Mon 30/06/2025 10:35
To Lucy Harrison <[redacted]

Information, Delivery & Support Team
Planning, Building Control & Licensing
Growth & Development Directorate
Postal address: Manchester City Council, P O Box 532, Town Hall, Manchester M60 2LA
Location address: Level 6 Town Hall Extension, Manchester M2 5DB
Tel: 0161 234 4516

Please consider the environment before printing an e-mail.

From: [redacted]
Sent: 30 June 2025 09:08
To: Planning <[redacted]
Subject: Comment on Planning Application 142888/FO/2025

You don't often get email from [redacted] Learn why this is important

ALERT This message originated outside of the Manchester City Council network. **BE CAUTIOUS** before clicking any links or opening any attachments. Please remember your Cyber Training and report anything suspicious.

Dear Manchester Planning team,

I am writing to lodge an objection to planning application 142888/FO/2025 – Cambridge Halls Of Residence Cavendish Street Manchester M15 6TT.

My primary objection is that the proposals have been designed to deter cyclists from using the safest and most direct route through the site. This route has been open to cyclists ever since the road was first built; it is an essential, well-used part of the city's cycling network and therefore the proposal to deter and/or divert cycles away from Cavendish Street is directly at odds with Manchester City Council's planning, sustainability and transport policies.

I live in Chorlton and work in Ardwick and I've used this route for over 20 years cycling to and from work, to shops on Oxford Road or to go into town. The cycle provision is very tight and could be improved but because it exists, vehicles are usually considerate to cyclists. If it's altered it would make the crossing more dangerous for cyclists.

The applicant has also made misleading claims regarding the road's legal status and regarding pedestrian safety which I will outline below.

I am asking that the council refuse this application, and invite the developer to come back with a proposal that maintains direct cycle as well as pedestrian access along Cavendish Street, designed to modern standards set out in Greater Manchester's Streets For All design guide and in Department for Transport guidance note LTN 1/20. I am sure that the Highways team at MCC and the Active Travel team at TfGM will, if asked, be happy to comment on how such a route could be provided within the space available.

I am also asking that the council make a Section 106 agreement (s106) with the applicant to fund safety improvements for pedestrians and cyclists at the junction of Cavendish Street and Higher Cambridge Street – the

applicant themselves discuss the shortcomings of the existing junction layout in Section 4.2.1 of the Transport Statement (“Cyclists have also been observed to queue on the footway to gain direct access to the Higher Cambridge Street/Cavendish Street junction (via a gap in the guard railings) rather than following the road markings which advise cyclists to dismount and use the controlled pedestrian crossings”). The improvements might take the form of a CYCLOPS junction. CYCLOPS is a homegrown Greater Manchester innovation now frequently used on Highways schemes across the country to deliver safe pedestrian and cycle movements without undue impact on traffic flows.

For prospective occupants and passers-by alike, in line with the S106 tests as set out in Paragraph 58 of the National Planning Policy Framework (NPPF) 2024, a contribution to junction safety improvements improvement would be ‘necessary to make the development acceptable in planning terms’ (by contributing to an appropriate movement strategy for the site), ‘directly related to the development’ (given its proximity, the pressure added to the junction by the proposed threefold increase in residents, and in light of the wholly inadequate mitigation route proposed by the applicant), and ‘fairly and reasonably related in scale and kind to the development’ (given the stated threefold increase in residents explained by the applicant, so directly adding more pressure to the junction).

1 Legal Status of Cavendish Street

This section of Cavendish Street, an adopted Highway, was subject to a stopping up order dated 14.06.1996. That order required that “the Developer shall provide a new highway which shall be a footpath/cycleway”. MMU have since installed physical signage stating that Cavendish Street “has not been dedicated as a Highway” and have bolted down uncomfortable and restrictive speed bumps across the route in an apparent attempt to dissuade cyclists from exercising their legal rights over this space. Both measures may be unlawful, as my understanding is that cyclists do retain a legal Right of Way along Cavendish Street, unchanged from when the entire road was an adopted highway, and the speed bumps are inaccessible to some Disabled users.

2 Cycling routes and planning policy

The case for walking and cycling and specifically for maintaining and improving high quality cycling networks is clear at every level of modern planning policy, including:

NPPF 2024’s “vision-led approach”
LTN 1/20
Places For Everyone Joint Development Plan Objectives 6, 7 and 10
Places for Everyone Joint Development Plan policies JP-Strat14, JP-C1, JP-C5 and JP-C6
GM Transport Strategy 2040 and the “Right Mix” targets
Greater Manchester Streets for All strategy and Streets for All design guide
Manchester City Council’s Active Travel Strategy
Manchester City Council’s commitment to be a Zero Carbon city by 2038
The policy position is absolutely clear – changes to the existing road and cycle networks should make cycling more convenient for people, not less convenient.

This specific stretch of Cavendish Street is a key part of the existing cycle network. It appears on TfGM’s Bee Network map as a Beeway (“the routes that get people from A to B … representing the most direct routes between crossing points.”) and connects to the Stretford Road Busy Beeway (“corridors or crossing points on busier roads that will require a higher level of design intervention to improve cycling and walking.”) It is also mapped on the TfGM Cycle Network.

The national standard for cycling infrastructure is DfT guidance note LTN 1/20. LTN 1/20 advises above all else that cycle routes and networks should be Safe, Direct, Comfortable, Attractive and Coherent. Introducing unnecessary diversions, junctions and bends into a well-used existing route undermines all of these core principles, resulting in a lower quality cycle network which will make it harder for the council to achieve its cycling objectives.

The applicant has offered various reasons why diverting cyclists is necessary but all of these reasons seem to be either existing problems, or problems designed into the scheme. The proposal is to demolish and redevelop the site – so considerations like limited space and the placement of entrances, shop frontages, planting and pedestrian areas are entirely within the applicant’s scope to manage. Instead of starting with the problem “there is an existing busy cycle route across this site, how can I design to accommodate everyone’s needs?”, it seems the applicant has started with the conclusion “cyclists must be deterred” and instructed their consultants to post-rationalise that decision.

3 Misleading claims regarding safety

Page 22 of the Design & Access Statement refers to the “existing controversial link along Cavendish St., which is resulting in collisions of pedestrians, electric scooters, cyclists, etc.”

However the map of recorded collisions, on page 18 of the Transport Statement submitted in the same planning application, shows no recorded collisions whatsoever on this link, only on the adjacent main roads.

It appears the applicant is attempting to restrict cycle access based on a “problem” for which they have no evidence.

Yours sincerely,

[redacted]

****
This email and any files transmitted with it are confidential and intended solely for the use of the individual or entity to whom they are addressed.
If you have received this email in error, please notify the sender, or [redacted] and then permanently delete the email, attachments and all copies.
The full text of the Council's email disclaimer is available at: www.manchester.gov.uk/emaildisclaimer.
Your personal data is very important to us. Please refer to our privacy notice at: www.manchester.gov.uk/privacy for further information.

This footnote also confirms that this email message has been swept for the presence of computer viruses.
****

Outlook

Fw: 202650628 - Comment on Planning Application 142888/FO/2025 (Objection)

From Planning <[redacted]
Date Fri 04/07/2025 14:09
To Lucy Harrison <[redacted]

Information, Delivery & Support Team
Planning, Building Control & Licensing
Growth & Development Directorate
Postal address: Manchester City Council, P O Box 532, Town Hall, Manchester M60 2LA
Location address: Level 6 Town Hall Extension, Manchester M2 5DB
Tel: 0161 234 4516

Please consider the environment before printing an e-mail.

From: [redacted]
Sent: 28 June 2025 13:19
To: Planning <[redacted]
Subject: 202650628 - Comment on Planning Application 142888/FO/2025 (Objection)

You don't often get email from [redacted] Learn why this is important

ALERT This message originated outside of the Manchester City Council network. **BE CAUTIOUS** before clicking any links or opening any attachments. Please remember your Cyber Training and report anything suspicious.

Dear Manchester Planning team,

I write to lodge an objection to planning application **142888/FO/2025** – Cambridge Halls Of Residence Cavendish Street Manchester M15 6TT.

My primary objection is that the proposals have been designed to deter cyclists from using the safest and most direct route through the site. This route has been open to cyclists ever since the road was first built; it is an essential, well-used part of the city's cycling network and therefore the proposal to deter and/or divert cycles away from Cavendish Street is directly at odds with Manchester City Council's planning, sustainability and transport policies.

While I live in Rochdale, I regularly visit the Oxford Road corridor with work and I have seen the effect the protected Oxford Road cycle lane has had on reducing traffic over the years. Cavendish Street is an important perpendicular route, and as we know safe and direct routes are a major driver encouraging people to cycle, with the health, decarbonisation and air quality benefits this brings, instead of driving.

The applicant has also made misleading claims regarding the road's legal status and regarding pedestrian safety which I will outline below.

I am asking that the council **refuse** this application, and invite the developer to come back with a proposal that maintains direct cycle as well as pedestrian access along Cavendish Street, designed to modern standards set out in Greater Manchester's Streets For All design guide and in Department for Transport guidance note LTN 1/20. I am sure that the Highways team at MCC and the Active Travel team at TfGM will, if asked, be happy to comment on how such a route could be provided within the space available.

I am also asking that the council **make a Section 106 agreement (s106)** with the applicant to fund safety improvements for pedestrians and cyclists at the junction of Cavendish Street and Higher Cambridge Street, such as a CYCLOPS junction – the applicant themselves discuss the shortcomings of the existing junction layout in Section 4.2.1 of the Transport Statement ("*Cyclists have also been observed to queue on the footway to gain direct access to the Higher Cambridge Street/Cavendish Street junction (via a gap in the guard railings) rather than following the road markings which advise cyclists to dismount and use the controlled pedestrian crossings*").

For prospective occupants and passers-by alike, in line with the S106 tests as set out in Paragraph 58 of the National Planning Policy Framework (NPPF) 2024, a contribution to junction safety improvements improvement would be 'necessary to make the development acceptable in planning terms' (by contributing to an appropriate movement strategy for the site), 'directly related to the development' (given its proximity, the pressure added to the junction by the proposed threefold increase in residents, and in light of the wholly inadequate mitigation route proposed by the applicant), and 'fairly and reasonably related in scale and kind to the development' (given the stated threefold increase in residents explained by the applicant, so directly adding more pressure to the junction).

1) Legal Status of Cavendish Street

This section of Cavendish Street, an adopted Highway, was subject to a stopping up order dated 14.06.1996. That order required that "the Developer shall provide a new highway which shall be a footpath/cycleway". MMU have since installed physical signage stating that Cavendish Street "has not been dedicated as a Highway" and have bolted down uncomfortable and restrictive speed bumps across the route in an apparent attempt to dissuade cyclists from exercising their legal rights over this space. Both measures may be unlawful, as my understanding is that cyclists do retain a legal Right of Way along Cavendish Street, unchanged from when the entire road was an adopted highway, and the speed bumps are inaccessible to some Disabled users.

2) Cycling routes and planning policy

The case for walking and cycling and specifically for maintaining and improving high quality cycling networks is clear at every level of modern planning policy, including:

- NPPF 2024's "vision-led approach"
- LTN 1/20
- Places For Everyone Joint Development Plan Objectives 6, 7 and 10
- Places for Everyone Joint Development Plan policies JP-Strat14, JP-C1, JP-C5 and JP-C6
- GM Transport Strategy 2040 and the "Right Mix" targets
- Greater Manchester Streets for All strategy and Streets for All design guide
- Manchester City Council's Active Travel Strategy

- Manchester City Council's commitment to be a Zero Carbon city by 2038

The policy position is absolutely clear – changes to the existing road and cycle networks should make cycling more convenient for people, not less convenient.

This specific stretch of Cavendish Street is a key part of the existing cycle network. It appears on TfGM's Bee Network map as a Beeway ("the routes that get people from A to B … representing the most direct routes between crossing points.") and connects to the Stretford Road Busy Beeway ("corridors or crossing points on busier roads that will require a higher level of design intervention to improve cycling and walking.") It is also mapped on the TfGM Cycle Network.

The national standard for cycling infrastructure is DfT guidance note LTN 1/20. LTN 1/20 advises above all else that cycle routes and networks should be Safe, Direct, Comfortable, Attractive and Coherent. Introducing unnecessary diversions, junctions and bends into a well-used existing route undermines all of these core principles, resulting in a lower quality cycle network which will make it harder for the council to achieve its cycling objectives.

The applicant has offered various reasons why diverting cyclists is necessary but all of these reasons seem to be either existing problems, or problems designed into the scheme. The proposal is to demolish and redevelop the site – so considerations like limited space and the placement of entrances, shop frontages, planting and pedestrian areas are entirely within the applicant's scope to manage. Instead of starting with the problem "there is an existing busy cycle route across this site, how can I design to accommodate everyone's needs?", it seems the applicant has started with the conclusion "cyclists must be deterred" and instructed their consultants to post-rationalise that decision.

3) Misleading claims regarding safety

Page 22 of the Design & Access Statement refers to the "existing controversial link along Cavendish St., which is resulting in collisions of pedestrians, electric scooters, cyclists, etc."

However the map of recorded collisions, on page 18 of the Transport Statement submitted in the same planning application, shows no recorded collisions whatsoever on this link, only on the adjacent main roads.

It appears the applicant is attempting to restrict cycle access based on a "problem" for which they have no evidence.

Yours sincerely,

[redacted]

[redacted]

[redacted]

****
This email and any files transmitted with it are confidential and intended solely for the use of the individual or entity to whom they are addressed.
If you have received this email in error, please notify the sender, or [redacted] and then permanently delete the email, attachments and all copies.
The full text of the Council's email disclaimer is available at: www.manchester.gov.uk/emaildisclaimer.
Your personal data is very important to us. Please refer to our privacy notice at: www.manchester.gov.uk/privacy for further information.

This footnote also confirms that this email message has been swept for the presence of computer viruses.
****

Outlook

Fw: Comment on Planning Application 142888/FO/2025

From Planning <[redacted]
Date Mon 14/07/2025 14:06
To Lucy Harrison <[redacted]

Information, Delivery & Support Team
Planning, Building Control & Licensing
Growth & Development Directorate
Postal address: Manchester City Council, P O Box 532, Town Hall, Manchester M60 2LA
Location address: Level 6 Town Hall Extension, Manchester M2 5DB
Tel: 0161 234 4516

Please consider the environment before printing an e-mail.

From: [redacted]
Sent: 11 July 2025 14:14
To: Planning <[redacted]
Subject: Comment on Planning Application 142888/FO/2025

You don't often get email from [redacted] Learn why this is important

ALERT This message originated outside of the Manchester City Council network. **BE CAUTIOUS** before clicking any links or opening any attachments. Please remember your Cyber Training and report anything suspicious.

Dear Manchester Planning team,

I am writing to object to planning application **142888/FO/2025** – Cambridge Halls Of Residence Cavendish Street Manchester M15 6TT.

My main objection is that the proposals have been designed to deter cyclists from using the safest and most direct route through the site. This route is an essential, well-used part of the city's cycling network; the proposal to deter and/or divert cycles away from Cavendish Street is directly in contradiction of Manchester City Council's planning, sustainability and transport policies.

The applicant has also made misleading claims regarding the road's legal status and pedestrian safety:

1. Legal Status of Cavendish Street

This section of Cavendish Street, an adopted Highway, was subject to a stopping up order dated 14.06.1996. That order required that “the Developer shall provide a new highway which shall be a footpath/cycleway”. MMU have since installed physical signage stating that Cavendish Street “has not been dedicated as a Highway” and have bolted down speed bumps across the route in an apparent attempt to dissuade cyclists from exercising their legal rights over this space. Both measures may well be unlawful, and the speed bumps are inaccessible to some Disabled users.

2. Cycling routes and planning policy

The case for walking and cycling, and specifically for maintaining and improving high quality cycling networks, is clear at every level of modern planning policy, including NPPF 2024’s “vision-led approach”, LTN 1/20, Places For Everyone Joint Development Plan Objectives 6, 7 and 10, Places for Everyone Joint Development Plan policies JP-Strat14, JP-C1, JP-C5 and JP-C6, GM Transport Strategy 2040 and the “Right Mix” targets, Greater Manchester Streets for All strategy and Streets for All design guide, Manchester City Council’s Active Travel Strategy and Manchester City Council’s commitment to be a Zero Carbon city by 2038. The policy position is clear – changes to the existing road and cycle networks should make cycling more convenient for people, not less.

The applicant has offered various reasons why diverting cyclists is necessary but all of these seem to be either existing problems, or problems designed into the scheme. Instead of starting with the question “there is an existing busy cycle route across this site, how can I design to accommodate everyone’s needs?”, it seems the applicant has started with the mindset that “cyclists must be deterred” and instructed their consultants to retrospectively rationalise that decision.

3. Misleading claims regarding safety

Page 22 of the Design & Access Statement refers to the “existing controversial link along Cavendish St., which is resulting in collisions of pedestrians, electric scooters, cyclists, etc.” However the map of recorded collisions, on page 18 of the Transport Statement submitted in the same planning application, shows no recorded collisions whatsoever on this link, only on the adjacent main roads. It appears that the applicant is attempting to restrict cycle access based on a “problem” for which there is no evidence.

Please refuse this application.

Yours sincerely,

[redacted]tt

[redacted]

****
This email and any files transmitted with it are confidential and intended solely for the use of the individual or entity to whom they are addressed.

If you have received this email in error, please notify the sender, or [redacted] and then permanently delete the email, attachments and all copies.
The full text of the Council's email disclaimer is available at: www.manchester.gov.uk/emaildisclaimer.
Your personal data is very important to us. Please refer to our privacy notice at: www.manchester.gov.uk/privacy for further information.

This footnote also confirms that this email message has been swept for the presence of computer viruses.
****

Outlook

Fw: Comment on Planning Application 142888/FO/2025

From Planning <[redacted]
Date Fri 04/07/2025 14:10
To Lucy Harrison <[redacted]

Information, Delivery & Support Team
Planning, Building Control & Licensing
Growth & Development Directorate
Postal address: Manchester City Council, P O Box 532, Town Hall, Manchester M60 2LA
Location address: Level 6 Town Hall Extension, Manchester M2 5DB
Tel: 0161 234 4516

Please consider the environment before printing an e-mail.

From: [redacted]
Sent: 30 June 2025 18:24
To: Planning <[redacted]
Subject: Comment on Planning Application 142888/FO/2025

You don't often get email from [redacted] Learn why this is important

ALERT This message originated outside of the Manchester City Council network. **BE CAUTIOUS** before clicking any links or opening any attachments. Please remember your Cyber Training and report anything suspicious.

Dear Manchester Planning team,

I am writing to lodge an objection to planning application **142888/FO/2025** – Cambridge Halls Of Residence Cavendish Street Manchester M15 6TT.

My primary objection is that the proposals have been designed to deter cyclists from using the safest and most direct route through the site. This route has been open to cyclists ever since the road was first built; it is an essential, well-used part of the city's cycling network and therefore the proposal to deter and/or divert cycles away from Cavendish Street is directly at odds with Manchester City Council's planning, sustainability and transport policies.

I frequently use this route to get directly through from Hulme to Oxford Road as it provides me with a safe section of cycling. My son used this route

when attending lectures at Manchester Met for the same reasons.

The applicant has also made misleading claims regarding the road's legal status and regarding pedestrian safety which I will outline below.

I am asking that the council **refuse** this application, and invite the developer to come back with a proposal that maintains direct cycle as well as pedestrian access along Cavendish Street, designed to modern standards set out in Greater Manchester's Streets For All design guide and in Department for Transport guidance note LTN 1/20. I am sure that the Highways team at MCC and the Active Travel team at TfGM will, if asked, be happy to comment on how such a route could be provided within the space available.

I am also asking that the council **make a Section 106 agreement (s106)** with the applicant to fund safety improvements for pedestrians and cyclists at the junction of Cavendish Street and Higher Cambridge Street – the applicant themselves discuss the shortcomings of the existing junction layout in Section 4.2.1 of the Transport Statement ("*Cyclists have also been observed to queue on the footway to gain direct access to the Higher Cambridge Street/Cavendish Street junction (via a gap in the guard railings) rather than following the road markings which advise cyclists to dismount and use the controlled pedestrian crossings*"). The improvements might take the form of a CYCLOPS junction. CYCLOPS is a homegrown Greater Manchester innovation now frequently used on Highways schemes across the country to deliver safe pedestrian and cycle movements without undue impact on traffic flows.
For prospective occupants and passers-by alike, in line with the S106 tests as set out in Paragraph 58 of the National Planning Policy Framework (NPPF) 2024, a contribution to junction safety improvements improvement would be 'necessary to make the development acceptable in planning terms' (by contributing to an appropriate movement strategy for the site), 'directly related to the development' (given its proximity, the pressure added to the junction by the proposed threefold increase in residents, and in light of the wholly inadequate mitigation route proposed by the applicant), and 'fairly and reasonably related in scale and kind to the development' (given the stated threefold increase in residents explained by the applicant, so directly adding more pressure to the junction).

1 Legal Status of Cavendish Street

This section of Cavendish Street, an adopted Highway, was subject to a stopping up order dated 14.06.1996. That order required that "the

Developer shall provide a new highway which shall be a footpath/cycleway". MMU have since installed physical signage stating that Cavendish Street "has not been dedicated as a Highway" and have bolted down uncomfortable and restrictive speed bumps across the route in an apparent attempt to dissuade cyclists from exercising their legal rights over this space. Both measures may be unlawful, as my understanding is that cyclists do retain a legal Right of Way along Cavendish Street, unchanged from when the entire road was an adopted highway, and the speed bumps are inaccessible to some Disabled users.

2 Cycling routes and planning policy

The case for walking and cycling and specifically for maintaining and improving high quality cycling networks is clear at every level of modern planning policy, including:

- NPPF 2024's "vision-led approach"
- LTN 1/20
- Places For Everyone Joint Development Plan Objectives 6, 7 and 10
- Places for Everyone Joint Development Plan policies JP-Strat14, JP-C1, JP-C5 and JP-C6
- GM Transport Strategy 2040 and the "Right Mix" targets
- Greater Manchester Streets for All strategy and Streets for All design guide
- Manchester City Council's Active Travel Strategy
- Manchester City Council's commitment to be a Zero Carbon city by 2038

The policy position is absolutely clear – changes to the existing road and cycle networks should make cycling more convenient for people, not less convenient.

This specific stretch of Cavendish Street is a key part of the existing cycle network. It appears on TfGM's Bee Network map as a Beeway ("the routes that get people from A to B … representing the most direct routes between crossing points.") and connects to the Stretford Road Busy Beeway ("corridors or crossing points on busier roads that will require a higher level of design intervention to improve cycling and walking.") It is also mapped on the TfGM Cycle Network.

The national standard for cycling infrastructure is DfT guidance note LTN 1/20. LTN 1/20 advises above all else that cycle routes and networks should be Safe, Direct, Comfortable, Attractive and Coherent. Introducing

unnecessary diversions, junctions and bends into a well-used existing route undermines all of these core principles, resulting in a lower quality cycle network which will make it harder for the council to achieve its cycling objectives.

The applicant has offered various reasons why diverting cyclists is necessary but all of these reasons seem to be either existing problems, or problems designed into the scheme. The proposal is to demolish and redevelop the site – so considerations like limited space and the placement of entrances, shop frontages, planting and pedestrian areas are entirely within the applicant's scope to manage. Instead of starting with the problem "there is an existing busy cycle route across this site, how can I design to accommodate everyone's needs?", it seems the applicant has started with the conclusion "cyclists must be deterred" and instructed their consultants to post-rationalise that decision.

3 Misleading claims regarding safety

Page 22 of the Design & Access Statement refers to the "existing controversial link along Cavendish St., which is resulting in collisions of pedestrians, electric scooters, cyclists, etc."

However the map of recorded collisions, on page 18 of the Transport Statement submitted in the same planning application, shows no recorded collisions whatsoever on this link, only on the adjacent main roads.

It appears the applicant is attempting to restrict cycle access based on a "problem" for which they have no evidence.

Yours sincerely,

[redacted]

[redacted]

[redacted]

****
This email and any files transmitted with it are confidential and intended solely for the use of the individual or entity to whom they are addressed.
If you have received this email in error, please notify the sender, or [redacted] and then permanently delete the email, attachments and all copies.
The full text of the Council's email disclaimer is available at: www.manchester.gov.uk/emaildisclaimer.
Your personal data is very important to us. Please refer to our privacy notice at: www.manchester.gov.uk/privacy for further information.

This footnote also confirms that this email message has been swept for the presence of computer viruses.
****

Outlook

Fw: Planning Application 142888/FO/2025

From Planning <[redacted]>
Date Mon 14/07/2025 14:08
To Lucy Harrison <[redacted]>

Information, Delivery & Support Team
Planning, Building Control & Licensing
Growth & Development Directorate
Postal address: Manchester City Council, P O Box 532, Town Hall, Manchester M60 2LA
Location address: Level 6 Town Hall Extension, Manchester M2 5DB
Tel: 0161 234 4516

Please consider the environment before printing an e-mail.

From: [redacted]
Sent: 10 July 2025 21:24
To: Planning <[redacted]>
Subject: Planning Application 142888/FO/2025

You don't often get email from [redacted] Learn why this is important

ALERT This message originated outside of the Manchester City Council network. **BE CAUTIOUS** before clicking any links or opening any attachments. Please remember your Cyber Training and report anything suspicious.

Hello,
I'm writing about the proposal to redevelop Cambridge Halls of residence (14288/FO/2025).

I use the cycle route 3 times a week as a direct, safe (albeit not perfect) route which takes me from Whalley Range to my work across Oxford Road. It's a very well-used route by both pedestrians and cyclists and it's overwhelmingly used in a safe, responsible way. With the proposed building work there is a fantastic opportunity to make this imperfect but well used route even better and create proper segregated cycle path and a signalised (CYCLOPS crossing).

Instead, the proposal to divert the cycle route makes no sense, will endanger cyclists and will reduce the number of people cycling. This will directly impact MCC's active travel objectives.

The applicant is also claiming that the route is not a legal route, which is incorrect.

Please consider the impact of this application on the thousands who use this route to cycle each year when you are assessing it.

Best wishes
[redacted]

****
This email and any files transmitted with it are confidential and intended solely for the use of the individual or entity to whom they are addressed.

If you have received this email in error, please notify the sender, or [redacted] and then permanently delete the email, attachments and all copies.
The full text of the Council's email disclaimer is available at: www.manchester.gov.uk/emaildisclaimer.
Your personal data is very important to us. Please refer to our privacy notice at: www.manchester.gov.uk/privacy for further information.

This footnote also confirms that this email message has been swept for the presence of computer viruses.
****

Outlook

Fw: Comment on Planning Application 142888/FO/2025

From Planning <[redacted]
Date Mon 30/06/2025 08:51
To Lucy Harrison <[redacted]

Information, Delivery & Support Team
Planning, Building Control & Licensing
Growth & Development Directorate
Postal address: Manchester City Council, P O Box 532, Town Hall, Manchester M60 2LA
Location address: Level 6 Town Hall Extension, Manchester M2 5DB
Tel: 0161 234 4516

Please consider the environment before printing an e-mail.

From: [redacted]
Sent: 28 June 2025 14:32
To: Planning <[redacted]
Subject: Comment on Planning Application 142888/FO/2025

You don't often get email from [redacted] Learn why this is important

ALERT This message originated outside of the Manchester City Council network. **BE CAUTIOUS** before clicking any links or opening any attachments. Please remember your Cyber Training and report anything suspicious.

Dear Manchester Planning team,

I am writing to lodge an objection to planning application **142888/FO/2025** – Cambridge Halls Of Residence Cavendish Street Manchester M15 6TT.

My primary objection is that the proposals have been designed to deter cyclists from using the safest and most direct route through the site. This route has been open to cyclists ever since the road was first built; it is an essential, well-used part of the city's cycling network and therefore the proposal to deter and/or divert cycles away from Cavendish Street is directly at odds with Manchester City Council's planning, sustainability and transport policies.

The applicant has also made misleading claims regarding the road's legal status and regarding pedestrian safety which I will outline below.

I am asking that the council **refuse** this application, and invite the developer to come back with a proposal that maintains direct cycle as well as pedestrian access along Cavendish Street, designed to modern standards set out in Greater Manchester's Streets For All design guide and in Department for Transport guidance note LTN 1/20. I am sure that the Highways team at MCC and the Active Travel team at TfGM will, if asked, be happy to comment on how such a route could be provided within the space available.

I am also asking that the council **make a Section 106 agreement (s106)** with the applicant to fund safety improvements for pedestrians and cyclists at the junction of Cavendish Street and Higher Cambridge Street – the applicant themselves discuss the shortcomings of the existing junction layout in Section 4.2.1 of the Transport Statement ("*Cyclists have also been observed to queue on the footway to gain direct access to the Higher Cambridge Street/Cavendish Street junction (via a gap in the guard railings) rather than following the road markings which advise cyclists to dismount and use the controlled pedestrian crossings*"). The improvements might take the form of a CYCLOPS junction. CYCLOPS is a homegrown Greater Manchester innovation now frequently used on Highways schemes across the country to deliver safe pedestrian and cycle movements without undue impact on traffic flows.

For prospective occupants and passers-by alike, in line with the S106 tests as set out in Paragraph 58 of the National Planning Policy Framework (NPPF) 2024, a contribution to junction safety improvements improvement would be 'necessary to make the development acceptable in planning terms' (by contributing to an appropriate movement strategy for the site), 'directly related to the development' (given its proximity, the pressure added to the junction by the proposed threefold increase in residents, and in light of the wholly inadequate mitigation route proposed by the applicant), and 'fairly and reasonably related in scale and kind to the development' (given the stated threefold increase in residents explained by the applicant, so directly adding more pressure to the junction).

1 Legal Status of Cavendish Street

This section of Cavendish Street, an adopted Highway, was subject to a stopping up order dated 14.06.1996. That order required that "the Developer shall provide a new highway which shall be a footpath/cycleway". MMU have since installed physical signage stating that Cavendish Street "has not been dedicated as a Highway" and have bolted down uncomfortable and restrictive speed bumps across the route in an apparent attempt to dissuade cyclists from exercising their legal rights over this space. Both measures may be unlawful, as my understanding is that cyclists do retain a legal Right of Way along Cavendish

Street, unchanged from when the entire road was an adopted highway, and the speed bumps are inaccessible to some Disabled users.

2 Cycling routes and planning policy

The case for walking and cycling and specifically for maintaining and improving high quality cycling networks is clear at every level of modern planning policy, including:

- NPPF 2024's "vision-led approach"
- LTN 1/20
- Places For Everyone Joint Development Plan Objectives 6, 7 and 10
- Places for Everyone Joint Development Plan policies JP-Strat14, JP-C1, JP-C5 and JP-C6
- GM Transport Strategy 2040 and the "Right Mix" targets
- Greater Manchester Streets for All strategy and Streets for All design guide
- Manchester City Council's Active Travel Strategy
- Manchester City Council's commitment to be a Zero Carbon city by 2038

The policy position is absolutely clear – changes to the existing road and cycle networks should make cycling more convenient for people, not less convenient.

This specific stretch of Cavendish Street is a key part of the existing cycle network. It appears on TfGM's Bee Network map as a Beeway ("the routes that get people from A to B … representing the most direct routes between crossing points.") and connects to the Stretford Road Busy Beeway ("corridors or crossing points on busier roads that will require a higher level of design intervention to improve cycling and walking.") It is also mapped on the TfGM Cycle Network.

The national standard for cycling infrastructure is DfT guidance note LTN 1/20. LTN 1/20 advises above all else that cycle routes and networks should be Safe, Direct, Comfortable, Attractive and Coherent. Introducing unnecessary diversions, junctions and bends into a well-used existing route undermines all of these core principles, resulting in a lower quality cycle network which will make it harder for the council to achieve its cycling objectives.

The applicant has offered various reasons why diverting cyclists is necessary but all of these reasons seem to be either existing problems, or problems designed into the scheme. The proposal is to demolish and redevelop the site – so considerations like limited space and the placement of entrances, shop frontages,

planting and pedestrian areas are entirely within the applicant's scope to manage. Instead of starting with the problem "there is an existing busy cycle route across this site, how can I design to accommodate everyone's needs?", it seems the applicant has started with the conclusion "cyclists must be deterred" and instructed their consultants to post-rationalise that decision.

3 Misleading claims regarding safety

Page 22 of the Design & Access Statement refers to the "existing controversial link along Cavendish St., which is resulting in collisions of pedestrians, electric scooters, cyclists, etc."

However the map of recorded collisions, on page 18 of the Transport Statement submitted in the same planning application, shows no recorded collisions whatsoever on this link, only on the adjacent main roads.

It appears the applicant is attempting to restrict cycle access based on a "problem" for which they have no evidence.

Yours sincerely,

[redacted]

****
This email and any files transmitted with it are confidential and intended solely for the use of the individual or entity to whom they are addressed.
If you have received this email in error, please notify the sender, or [redacted] and then permanently delete the email, attachments and all copies.
The full text of the Council's email disclaimer is available at: www.manchester.gov.uk/emaildisclaimer.
Your personal data is very important to us. Please refer to our privacy notice at: www.manchester.gov.uk/privacy for further information.

This footnote also confirms that this email message has been swept for the presence of computer viruses.
****

Outlook

Fw: Comment on Planning Application 142888/FO/2025

From Planning <[redacted]>
Date Mon 30/06/2025 14:10
To Lucy Harrison <[redacted]>

Information, Delivery & Support Team
Planning, Building Control & Licensing
Growth & Development Directorate
Postal address: Manchester City Council, P O Box 532, Town Hall, Manchester M60 2LA
Location address: Level 6 Town Hall Extension, Manchester M2 5DB
Tel: 0161 234 4516

Please consider the environment before printing an e-mail.

From: [redacted]
Sent: 30 June 2025 13:59
To: Planning <[redacted]>
Subject: Comment on Planning Application 142888/FO/2025

You don't often get email from [redacted] Learn why this is important

ALERT This message originated outside of the Manchester City Council network. **BE CAUTIOUS** before clicking any links or opening any attachments. Please remember your Cyber Training and report anything suspicious.

Dear Manchester Planning team,

I am writing to lodge an objection to planning application 142888/FO/2025 – Cambridge Halls Of Residence Cavendish Street Manchester M15 6TT.

My primary objection is that the proposals have been designed to deter cyclists from using the safest and most direct route through the site. This route has been open to cyclists ever since the road was first built; it is an essential, well-used part of the city's cycling network and therefore the proposal to deter and/or divert cycles away from Cavendish Street is directly at odds with Manchester City Council's planning, sustainability and transport policies.

I use Cavendish Street, as a runner and cyclist on a daily basis to safely commute to and from work. It's a perfect way to link to the safe cycle lanes and pavements from my office on Princess Street to Stretford road. I then continue my journey safely to Timperley along the Bridgewater canal.

The applicant has also made misleading claims regarding the road's legal status and regarding pedestrian safety which I will outline below.

I am asking that the council refuse this application, and invite the developer to come back with a proposal that maintains direct cycle as well as pedestrian access along Cavendish Street, designed to modern standards set out in Greater Manchester's Streets For All design guide and in Department for Transport guidance note LTN 1/20. I am sure that the Highways team at MCC and the Active Travel team at TfGM will, if asked, be happy to comment on how such a route could be provided within the space available.

I am also asking that the council make a Section 106 agreement (s106) with the applicant to fund safety improvements for pedestrians and cyclists at the junction of Cavendish Street and Higher Cambridge Street – the applicant themselves discuss the shortcomings of the existing junction layout in Section 4.2.1 of the Transport Statement ("Cyclists have also

been observed to queue on the footway to gain direct access to the Higher Cambridge Street/Cavendish Street junction (via a gap in the guard railings) rather than following the road markings which advise cyclists to dismount and use the controlled pedestrian crossings"). The improvements might take the form of a CYCLOPS junction. CYCLOPS is a homegrown Greater Manchester innovation now frequently used on Highways schemes across the country to deliver safe pedestrian and cycle movements without undue impact on traffic flows.

For prospective occupants and passers-by alike, in line with the S106 tests as set out in Paragraph 58 of the National Planning Policy Framework (NPPF) 2024, a contribution to junction safety improvements improvement would be 'necessary to make the development acceptable in planning terms' (by contributing to an appropriate movement strategy for the site), 'directly related to the development' (given its proximity, the pressure added to the junction by the proposed threefold increase in residents, and in light of the wholly inadequate mitigation route proposed by the applicant), and 'fairly and reasonably related in scale and kind to the development' (given the stated threefold increase in residents explained by the applicant, so directly adding more pressure to the junction).

1 Legal Status of Cavendish Street

This section of Cavendish Street, an adopted Highway, was subject to a stopping up order dated 14.06.1996. That order required that "the Developer shall provide a new highway which shall be a footpath/cycleway". MMU have since installed physical signage stating that Cavendish Street "has not been dedicated as a Highway" and have bolted down uncomfortable and restrictive speed bumps across the route in an apparent attempt to dissuade cyclists from exercising their legal rights over this space. Both measures may be unlawful, as my understanding is that cyclists do retain a legal Right of Way along Cavendish Street, unchanged from when the entire road was an adopted highway, and the speed bumps are inaccessible to some Disabled users.

2 Cycling routes and planning policy

The case for walking and cycling and specifically for maintaining and improving high quality cycling networks is clear at every level of modern planning policy, including:

NPPF 2024's "vision-led approach"
LTN 1/20
Places For Everyone Joint Development Plan Objectives 6, 7 and 10
Places for Everyone Joint Development Plan policies JP-Strat14, JP-C1, JP-C5 and JP-C6
GM Transport Strategy 2040 and the "Right Mix" targets
Greater Manchester Streets for All strategy and Streets for All design guide
Manchester City Council's Active Travel Strategy
Manchester City Council's commitment to be a Zero Carbon city by 2038
The policy position is absolutely clear – changes to the existing road and cycle networks should make cycling more convenient for people, not less convenient.

This specific stretch of Cavendish Street is a key part of the existing cycle network. It appears on TfGM's Bee Network map as a Beeway ("the routes that get people from A to B … representing the most direct routes between crossing points.") and connects to the Stretford Road Busy Beeway ("corridors or crossing points on busier roads that will require a higher level of design intervention to improve cycling and walking.") It is also mapped on the TfGM Cycle Network.

The national standard for cycling infrastructure is DfT guidance note LTN 1/20. LTN 1/20 advises above all else that cycle routes and networks should be Safe, Direct, Comfortable, Attractive and Coherent. Introducing unnecessary diversions, junctions and bends into a well-used existing route undermines all of these core principles, resulting in a lower quality cycle network which will make it harder for the council to achieve its cycling objectives.

The applicant has offered various reasons why diverting cyclists is necessary but all of these reasons seem to be either existing problems, or problems designed into the scheme. The proposal is to demolish and redevelop the site – so considerations like limited space and the placement of entrances, shop frontages, planting and pedestrian areas are entirely within the applicant's scope to manage. Instead of starting with the problem "there is an existing busy cycle route across this site, how can I design to accommodate everyone's needs?", it seems the applicant has started with the conclusion "cyclists must be deterred" and instructed their consultants to post-rationalise that decision.

3 Misleading claims regarding safety

Page 22 of the Design & Access Statement refers to the "existing controversial link along Cavendish St., which is resulting in collisions of pedestrians, electric scooters, cyclists, etc."

However the map of recorded collisions, on page 18 of the Transport Statement submitted in the same planning application, shows no recorded collisions whatsoever on this link, only on the adjacent main roads.

It appears the applicant is attempting to restrict cycle access based on a "problem" for which they have no evidence.

Yours sincerely,

[redacted]

Thanks

--

[redacted]

[redacted]

[redacted]

[redacted]

This message is private and confidential. If you have received this message in error, please notify us and remove it from your system.

****

This email and any files transmitted with it are confidential and intended solely for the use of the individual or entity to whom they are addressed.
If you have received this email in error, please notify the sender, or [redacted] and then permanently delete the email, attachments and all copies.
The full text of the Council's email disclaimer is available at: www.manchester.gov.uk/emaildisclaimer.
Your personal data is very important to us. Please refer to our privacy notice at: www.manchester.gov.uk/privacy for further information.

This footnote also confirms that this email message has been swept for the presence of computer viruses.
****

Outlook

Fw: 142888/FO/2025

From Planning <[redacted]
Date Tue 01/07/2025 09:08
To Lucy Harrison <[redacted]

Information, Delivery & Support Team
Planning, Building Control & Licensing
Growth & Development Directorate
Postal address: Manchester City Council, P O Box 532, Town Hall, Manchester M60 2LA
Location address: Level 6 Town Hall Extension, Manchester M2 5DB
Tel: 0161 234 4516

Please consider the environment before printing an e-mail.

From: [redacted]
Sent: 30 June 2025 17:56
To: Planning <[redacted]
Subject: 142888/FO/2025

You don't often get email from [redacted] Learn why this is important

ALERT This message originated outside of the Manchester City Council network. **BE CAUTIOUS** before clicking any links or opening any attachments. Please remember your Cyber Training and report anything suspicious.

Dear Manchester Planning team,

I am writing to lodge an objection to planning application **142888/FO/2025** – Cambridge Halls Of Residence Cavendish Street Manchester M15 6TT.

My primary objection is that the proposals have been designed to deter cyclists from using the safest and most direct route through the site. This route has been open to cyclists ever since the road was first built; it is an essential, well-used part of the city's cycling network and therefore the proposal to deter and/or divert cycles away from Cavendish Street is directly at odds with Manchester City Council's planning, sustainability and transport policies.

I live locally (on Chester Road) and regularly use this route to get to work, Piccadilly Station, 8th Day and the Oxford Road corridor (amongst many other places). I do not own a car and cycle everywhere I can.

The applicant has also made misleading claims regarding the road's legal status and regarding pedestrian safety which I will outline below.

I am asking that the council **refuse** this application, and invite the developer to come back with a proposal that maintains direct cycle as well as pedestrian access along Cavendish Street, designed to modern standards set out in Greater Manchester's Streets For All design guide and in Department for Transport guidance note LTN 1/20. I am sure that the Highways team at MCC and the Active Travel team at TfGM will, if asked, be happy to comment on how such a route could be provided within the space available.

I am also asking that the council **make a Section 106 agreement (s106)** with the applicant to fund safety improvements for pedestrians and cyclists at the junction of Cavendish Street and Higher Cambridge Street – the applicant themselves discuss the shortcomings of the existing junction layout in Section 4.2.1 of the Transport Statement ("*Cyclists have also been observed to queue on the footway to gain direct access to the Higher Cambridge Street/Cavendish Street junction (via a gap in the guard railings) rather than following the road markings which advise cyclists to dismount and use the controlled pedestrian crossings*"). The improvements might take the form of a CYCLOPS junction. CYCLOPS is a homegrown Greater Manchester innovation now frequently used on Highways schemes across the country to deliver safe pedestrian and cycle movements without undue impact on traffic flows.

For prospective occupants and passers-by alike, in line with the S106 tests as set out in Paragraph 58 of the National Planning Policy

Framework (NPPF) 2024, a contribution to junction safety improvements improvement would be ‘necessary to make the development acceptable in planning terms’ (by contributing to an appropriate movement strategy for the site), ‘directly related to the development’ (given its proximity, the pressure added to the junction by the proposed threefold increase in residents, and in light of the wholly inadequate mitigation route proposed by the applicant), and ‘fairly and reasonably related in scale and kind to the development’ (given the stated threefold increase in residents explained by the applicant, so directly adding more pressure to the junction).

1 Legal Status of Cavendish Street

This section of Cavendish Street, an adopted Highway, was subject to a stopping up order dated 14.06.1996. That order required that “the Developer shall provide a new highway which shall be a footpath/cycleway”. MMU have since installed physical signage stating that Cavendish Street “has not been dedicated as a Highway” and have bolted down uncomfortable and restrictive speed bumps across the route in an apparent attempt to dissuade cyclists from exercising their legal rights over this space. Both measures may be unlawful, as my understanding is that cyclists do retain a legal Right of Way along Cavendish Street, unchanged from when the entire road was an adopted highway, and the speed bumps are inaccessible to some Disabled users.

2 Cycling routes and planning policy

The case for walking and cycling and specifically for maintaining and improving high quality cycling networks is clear at every level of modern planning policy, including:

- NPPF 2024’s “vision-led approach”
- LTN 1/20

- Places For Everyone Joint Development Plan Objectives 6, 7 and 10
- Places for Everyone Joint Development Plan policies JP-Strat14, JP-C1, JP-C5 and JP-C6
- GM Transport Strategy 2040 and the “Right Mix” targets
- Greater Manchester Streets for All strategy and Streets for All design guide
- Manchester City Council’s Active Travel Strategy
- Manchester City Council’s commitment to be a Zero Carbon city by 2038

The policy position is absolutely clear – changes to the existing road and cycle networks should make cycling more convenient for people, not less convenient.

This specific stretch of Cavendish Street is a key part of the existing cycle network. It appears on TfGM’s Bee Network map as a Beeway (“the routes that get people from A to B … representing the most direct routes between crossing points.”) and connects to the Stretford Road Busy Beeway (“corridors or crossing points on busier roads that will require a higher level of design intervention to improve cycling and walking.”) It is also mapped on the TfGM Cycle Network.

The national standard for cycling infrastructure is DfT guidance note LTN 1/20. LTN 1/20 advises above all else that cycle routes and networks should be Safe, Direct, Comfortable, Attractive and Coherent. Introducing unnecessary diversions, junctions and bends into a well-used existing route undermines all of these core principles, resulting in a lower quality cycle network which will make it harder for the council to achieve its cycling objectives.

The applicant has offered various reasons why diverting cyclists is necessary but all of these reasons seem to be either existing problems, or problems designed into the scheme. The proposal is to demolish and redevelop the site – so considerations like limited space

and the placement of entrances, shop frontages, planting and pedestrian areas are entirely within the applicant's scope to manage. Instead of starting with the problem "there is an existing busy cycle route across this site, how can I design to accommodate everyone's needs?", it seems the applicant has started with the conclusion "cyclists must be deterred" and instructed their consultants to post-rationalise that decision.

3 Misleading claims regarding safety

Page 22 of the Design & Access Statement refers to the "existing controversial link along Cavendish St., which is resulting in collisions of pedestrians, electric scooters, cyclists, etc."

However the map of recorded collisions, on page 18 of the Transport Statement submitted in the same planning application, shows no recorded collisions whatsoever on this link, only on the adjacent main roads.

It appears the applicant is attempting to restrict cycle access based on a "problem" for which they have no evidence.

Yours sincerely,

[redacted]

****
This email and any files transmitted with it are confidential and intended solely for the use of the individual or entity to whom they are addressed.
If you have received this email in error, please notify the sender, or [redacted] and then permanently delete the email, attachments and all copies.
The full text of the Council's email disclaimer is available at: www.manchester.gov.uk/emaildisclaimer.
Your personal data is very important to us. Please refer to our privacy notice at: www.manchester.gov.uk/privacy for further information.

This footnote also confirms that this email message has been swept for the presence of computer viruses.
****

Outlook

Fw: Comment on Planning Application 142888/FO/2025

From Planning <[redacted]>
Date Fri 04/07/2025 14:10
To Lucy Harrison <[redacted]>

Information, Delivery & Support Team
Planning, Building Control & Licensing
Growth & Development Directorate
Postal address: Manchester City Council, P O Box 532, Town Hall, Manchester M60 2LA
Location address: Level 6 Town Hall Extension, Manchester M2 5DB
Tel: 0161 234 4516

Please consider the environment before printing an e-mail.

From: [redacted]
Sent: 01 July 2025 11:27
To: Planning <[redacted]>
Subject: Comment on Planning Application 142888/FO/2025

You don't often get email from [redacted] Learn why this is important

ALERT This message originated outside of the Manchester City Council network. **BE CAUTIOUS** before clicking any links or opening any attachments. Please remember your Cyber Training and report anything suspicious.

Dear MCC planning team,

I am writing to lodge an objection to planning application 142888/FO/2025 – Cambridge Halls Of Residence Cavendish Street Manchester M15 6TT.

My primary objection is that the proposals have been designed to deter cyclists from using the safest and most direct route through the site. This route has been open to cyclists ever since the road was first built; it is an essential, well-used part of the city's cycling network and therefore the proposal to deter and/or divert cycles away from Cavendish Street is directly at odds with Manchester City Council's planning, sustainability and transport policies.

The applicant has also made misleading claims regarding the road's legal status and regarding pedestrian safety which I will outline below.

I am asking that the council refuse this application, and invite the developer to come back with a proposal that maintains direct cycle as well as pedestrian access along Cavendish Street, designed to modern standards set out in Greater Manchester's Streets For All design guide and in Department for Transport guidance note LTN 1/20. I am sure that the Highways team at MCC and the Active Travel team at TfGM will, if asked, be happy to comment on how such a route could be provided within the space available.

I am also asking that the council make a Section 106 agreement (s106) with the applicant to fund safety improvements for pedestrians and cyclists at the junction of Cavendish Street and Higher Cambridge Street – the applicant themselves discuss the shortcomings of the existing junction layout in Section 4.2.1 of the Transport Statement ("Cyclists have also been observed to queue on the footway to gain direct access to the Higher Cambridge Street/Cavendish Street junction (via a gap in the guard railings) rather than following the road markings which advise cyclists to dismount and use the controlled pedestrian crossings").

For prospective occupants and passers-by alike, in line with the S106 tests as set out in Paragraph 58 of the National Planning Policy Framework (NPPF) 2024, a contribution to junction safety improvements improvement would be 'necessary to make the development acceptable in planning terms' (by contributing to an appropriate movement strategy for the site), 'directly related to the development' (given its proximity, the pressure added to the junction by the proposed threefold increase in residents, and in light of the wholly inadequate mitigation route proposed by the applicant), and 'fairly and reasonably related in scale and kind to the development' (given the stated threefold increase in residents explained by the applicant, so directly adding more pressure to the junction).

1 Legal Status of Cavendish Street

This section of Cavendish Street, an adopted Highway, was subject to a stopping up order dated 14.06.1996. That order required that "the Developer shall provide a new highway which shall be a footpath/cycleway". MMU have since installed physical signage stating that Cavendish Street "has not been dedicated as a Highway" and have bolted down uncomfortable and restrictive speed bumps across the route in an apparent attempt to dissuade cyclists from exercising their legal rights over this space. Both measures may be unlawful, as my understanding is that cyclists do retain a legal Right of Way along Cavendish Street, unchanged from when the entire road was an adopted highway, and the speed bumps are inaccessible to some Disabled users.

2 Cycling routes and planning policy

The case for walking and cycling and specifically for maintaining and improving high quality cycling networks is clear at every level of modern planning policy, including:

NPPF 2024's "vision-led approach"
LTN 1/20
Places For Everyone Joint Development Plan Objectives 6, 7 and 10
Places for Everyone Joint Development Plan policies JP-Strat14, JP-C1, JP-C5 and JP-C6
GM Transport Strategy 2040 and the "Right Mix" targets
Greater Manchester Streets for All strategy and Streets for All design guide
Manchester City Council's Active Travel Strategy
Manchester City Council's commitment to be a Zero Carbon city by 2038
The policy position is absolutely clear – changes to the existing road and cycle networks should make cycling more convenient for people, not less convenient.

This specific stretch of Cavendish Street is a key part of the existing cycle network that I personally use frequently. It appears on TfGM's Bee Network map as a Beeway ("the routes that get people from A to B … representing the most direct routes between crossing points.") and connects to the Stretford Road Busy Beeway ("corridors or crossing points on busier roads that will require a higher level of design intervention to improve cycling and walking.") It is also mapped on the TfGM Cycle Network.

The national standard for cycling infrastructure is DfT guidance note LTN 1/20. LTN 1/20 advises above all else that cycle routes and networks should be Safe, Direct, Comfortable, Attractive and Coherent. Introducing unnecessary diversions, junctions and bends into a well-used existing route undermines all of these core principles, resulting in a lower quality cycle network which will make it harder for the council to achieve its cycling objectives.

The applicant has offered various reasons why diverting cyclists is necessary but all of these reasons seem to be either existing problems, or problems designed into the scheme. The proposal is to demolish and redevelop the site – so considerations like limited space and the placement of entrances, shop frontages, planting and pedestrian areas are entirely within the applicant's scope to manage. Instead of starting with the problem "there is an existing busy cycle route across this site, how can I design to accommodate everyone's needs?", it seems the applicant has started with the conclusion "cyclists must be deterred" and instructed their consultants to post-rationalise that decision.

3 Misleading claims regarding safety

Page 22 of the Design & Access Statement refers to the "existing controversial link along Cavendish St., which is resulting in collisions of pedestrians, electric scooters, cyclists, etc."

However the map of recorded collisions, on page 18 of the Transport Statement submitted in the same planning application, shows no recorded collisions whatsoever on this link, only on the adjacent main roads.

It appears the applicant is attempting to restrict cycle access based on a "problem" for which they have no evidence.

Yours sincerely,

[redacted]

****
This email and any files transmitted with it are confidential and intended solely for the use of the individual or entity to whom they are addressed.
If you have received this email in error, please notify the sender, or [redacted] and then permanently delete the email, attachments and all copies.
The full text of the Council's email disclaimer is available at: www.manchester.gov.uk/emaildisclaimer.
Your personal data is very important to us. Please refer to our privacy notice at: www.manchester.gov.uk/privacy for further information.

This footnote also confirms that this email message has been swept for the presence of computer viruses.
****

Outlook

Fw: Cambridge halls of residence

From Planning <[redacted]>
Date Wed 02/07/2025 08:50
To Lucy Harrison <[redacted]>

Information, Delivery & Support Team
Planning, Building Control & Licensing
Growth & Development Directorate
Postal address: Manchester City Council, P O Box 532, Town Hall, Manchester M60 2LA
Location address: Level 6 Town Hall Extension, Manchester M2 5DB
Tel: 0161 234 4516

Please consider the environment before printing an e-mail.

From: [redacted]
Sent: 01 July 2025 16:22
To: Planning <[redacted]>
Subject: Cambridge halls of residence

You don't often get email from [redacted] Learn why this is important

ALERT This message originated outside of the Manchester City Council network. **BE CAUTIOUS** before clicking any links or opening any attachments. Please remember your Cyber Training and report anything suspicious.

Dear Manchester Planning team,

I am writing to lodge an objection to planning application **142888/FO/2025** – Cambridge Halls Of Residence Cavendish Street Manchester M15 6TT.

My primary objection is that the proposals have been designed to deter cyclists from using the safest and most direct route through the site. This route has been open to cyclists ever since the road was first built; it is an essential, well-used part of the city's cycling network and therefore the proposal to deter and/or divert cycles away from Cavendish Street is directly at odds with Manchester City Council's planning, sustainability and transport policies.

I strongly believe the A5067 continuing to Cavendish Street and Grosvenor street should be one of the flagship routes in the fledgling cycle network. Some of this route has segregated cycle lanes, but much of it does not, and this is a key

missing link. I was knocked off my bike near the Hulme arch last year, in fact by a Manchester city councillor who was driving to work.

The applicant has also made misleading claims regarding the road's legal status and regarding pedestrian safety which I will outline below.

I am asking that the council **refuse** this application, and invite the developer to come back with a proposal that maintains direct cycle as well as pedestrian access along Cavendish Street, designed to modern standards set out in Greater Manchester's Streets For All design guide and in Department for Transport guidance note LTN 1/20. I am sure that the Highways team at MCC and the Active Travel team at TfGM will, if asked, be happy to comment on how such a route could be provided within the space available.

I am also asking that the council **make a Section 106 agreement (s106)** with the applicant to fund safety improvements for pedestrians and cyclists at the junction of Cavendish Street and Higher Cambridge Street – the applicant themselves discuss the shortcomings of the existing junction layout in Section 4.2.1 of the Transport Statement ("*Cyclists have also been observed to queue on the footway to gain direct access to the Higher Cambridge Street/Cavendish Street junction (via a gap in the guard railings) rather than following the road markings which advise cyclists to dismount and use the controlled pedestrian crossings*"). The improvements might take the form of a CYCLOPS junction. CYCLOPS is a homegrown Greater Manchester innovation now frequently used on Highways schemes across the country to deliver safe pedestrian and cycle movements without undue impact on traffic flows.

For prospective occupants and passers-by alike, in line with the S106 tests as set out in Paragraph 58 of the National Planning Policy Framework (NPPF) 2024, a contribution to junction safety improvements improvement would be 'necessary to make the development acceptable in planning terms' (by contributing to an appropriate movement strategy for the site), 'directly related to the development' (given its proximity, the pressure added to the junction by the proposed threefold increase in residents, and in light of the wholly inadequate mitigation route proposed by the applicant), and 'fairly and reasonably related in scale and kind to the development' (given the stated threefold increase in residents explained by the applicant, so directly adding more pressure to the junction).

1 Legal Status of Cavendish Street

This section of Cavendish Street, an adopted Highway, was subject to a stopping up order dated 14.06.1996. That order required that "the Developer shall provide

a new highway which shall be a footpath/cycleway". MMU have since installed physical signage stating that Cavendish Street "has not been dedicated as a Highway" and have bolted down uncomfortable and restrictive speed bumps across the route in an apparent attempt to dissuade cyclists from exercising their legal rights over this space. Both measures may be unlawful, as my understanding is that cyclists do retain a legal Right of Way along Cavendish Street, unchanged from when the entire road was an adopted highway, and the speed bumps are inaccessible to some Disabled users.

2 Cycling routes and planning policy

The case for walking and cycling and specifically for maintaining and improving high quality cycling networks is clear at every level of modern planning policy, including:

- NPPF 2024's "vision-led approach"
- LTN 1/20
- Places For Everyone Joint Development Plan Objectives 6, 7 and 10
- Places for Everyone Joint Development Plan policies JP-Strat14, JP-C1, JP-C5 and JP-C6
- GM Transport Strategy 2040 and the "Right Mix" targets
- Greater Manchester Streets for All strategy and Streets for All design guide
- Manchester City Council's Active Travel Strategy
- Manchester City Council's commitment to be a Zero Carbon city by 2038

The policy position is absolutely clear – changes to the existing road and cycle networks should make cycling more convenient for people, not less convenient.

This specific stretch of Cavendish Street is a key part of the existing cycle network. It appears on TfGM's Bee Network map as a Beeway ("the routes that get people from A to B … representing the most direct routes between crossing points.") and connects to the Stretford Road Busy Beeway ("corridors or crossing points on busier roads that will require a higher level of design intervention to improve cycling and walking.") It is also mapped on the TfGM Cycle Network.

The national standard for cycling infrastructure is DfT guidance note LTN 1/20. LTN 1/20 advises above all else that cycle routes and networks should be Safe, Direct, Comfortable, Attractive and Coherent. Introducing unnecessary diversions, junctions and bends into a well-used existing route undermines all of these core

principles, resulting in a lower quality cycle network which will make it harder for the council to achieve its cycling objectives.

The applicant has offered various reasons why diverting cyclists is necessary but all of these reasons seem to be either existing problems, or problems designed into the scheme. The proposal is to demolish and redevelop the site – so considerations like limited space and the placement of entrances, shop frontages, planting and pedestrian areas are entirely within the applicant's scope to manage. Instead of starting with the problem "there is an existing busy cycle route across this site, how can I design to accommodate everyone's needs?", it seems the applicant has started with the conclusion "cyclists must be deterred" and instructed their consultants to post-rationalise that decision.

3 Misleading claims regarding safety

Page 22 of the Design & Access Statement refers to the "existing controversial link along Cavendish St., which is resulting in collisions of pedestrians, electric scooters, cyclists, etc."

However the map of recorded collisions, on page 18 of the Transport Statement submitted in the same planning application, shows no recorded collisions whatsoever on this link, only on the adjacent main roads.

It appears the applicant is attempting to restrict cycle access based on a "problem" for which they have no evidence.

Yours sincerely,

[redacted]

****
This email and any files transmitted with it are confidential and intended solely for the use of the individual or entity to whom they are addressed.
If you have received this email in error, please notify the sender, or [redacted] and then permanently delete the email, attachments and all copies.
The full text of the Council's email disclaimer is available at: www.manchester.gov.uk/emaildisclaimer.
Your personal data is very important to us. Please refer to our privacy notice at: www.manchester.gov.uk/privacy for further information.

This footnote also confirms that this email message has been swept for the presence of computer viruses.
****

Outlook

Fw: Comment on Planning Application 142888/FO/2025

From Planning <[redacted]
Date Mon 30/06/2025 10:57
To Lucy Harrison <[redacted]

Information, Delivery & Support Team
Planning, Building Control & Licensing
Growth & Development Directorate
Postal address: Manchester City Council, P O Box 532, Town Hall, Manchester M60 2LA
Location address: Level 6 Town Hall Extension, Manchester M2 5DB
Tel: 0161 234 4516

Please consider the environment before printing an e-mail.

From: [redacted]
Sent: 30 June 2025 10:53
To: Planning <[redacted]
Subject: Comment on Planning Application 142888/FO/2025

You don't often get email from [redacted] Learn why this is important

ALERT This message originated outside of the Manchester City Council network. **BE CAUTIOUS** before clicking any links or opening any attachments. Please remember your Cyber Training and report anything suspicious.

I am writing to lodge an objection to planning application **142888/FO/2025** – Cambridge Halls of Residence Cavendish Street Manchester M15 6TT.

My primary objection is that the proposals have been designed to deter cyclists from using the safest and most direct route through the site. This route has been open to cyclists ever since the road was first built; it is an essential, well-used part of the city's cycling network, especially for staff and students at both Universities, and therefore the proposal to deter and/or divert cycles away from Cavendish Street is directly at odds with Manchester City Council's planning, sustainability and transport policies.

I regularly use this route to commute to work at Manchester University and on other utility trips in and out of Manchester city centre and it provides excellent amenity and a safe space not available from other options. Indeed this route has seen several improvements over the years.

The applicant has also made misleading claims regarding the road's legal status and regarding pedestrian safety outlined below.

I am asking that the council **refuse** this application and invite the developer to come back with a proposal that maintains direct cycle as well as pedestrian access along Cavendish Street, designed to modern standards set out in Greater Manchester's Streets For All design guide and in

Department for Transport guidance note LTN 1/20. The Highways team at MCC and the Active Travel team at TfGM can advise on how such a route could be provided within the space available to further enhance the Bee Network.

Given the applicant themselves discuss the shortcomings of the existing junction layout in Section 4.2.1 of the Transport Statement, the Council should **make a Section 106 agreement (s106)** with the applicant to fund safety improvements for pedestrians and cyclists at the junction of Cavendish Street and Higher Cambridge Street. The improvements might take the form of a CYCLOPS junction, a Manchester innovation now frequently used on Highways schemes across the country to deliver safe pedestrian and cycle movements without undue impact on traffic flows.

For prospective occupants and passers-by alike, in line with the S106 tests as set out in Paragraph 58 of the National Planning Policy Framework (NPPF) 2024, a contribution to junction safety improvements improvement would be 'necessary to make the development acceptable in planning terms' (by contributing to an appropriate movement strategy for the site), 'directly related to the development' (given its proximity, the pressure added to the junction by the proposed threefold increase in residents, and in light of the wholly inadequate mitigation route proposed by the applicant), and 'fairly and reasonably related in scale and kind to the development' (given the stated threefold increase in residents explained by the applicant, so directly adding more pressure to the junction).

1 Legal Status of Cavendish Street

This section of Cavendish Street, an adopted Highway, was subject to a stopping up order dated 14.06.1996. That order required that "the Developer shall provide a new highway which shall be a footpath/cycleway". MMU have since installed physical signage stating that Cavendish Street "has not been dedicated as a Highway" and have bolted down uncomfortable and restrictive speed bumps across the route in an apparent attempt to dissuade cyclists from exercising their legal rights over this space. Both measures may be unlawful, as my understanding is that cyclists do retain a legal Right of Way along Cavendish Street, unchanged from when the entire road was an adopted highway, and the speed bumps are inaccessible to some Disabled users.

2 Cycling routes and planning policy

The case for walking and cycling and specifically for maintaining and improving high quality cycling networks is clear at every level of modern planning policy, including:

- NPPF 2024's "vision-led approach"
- LTN 1/20
- Places For Everyone Joint Development Plan Objectives 6, 7 and 10
- Places for Everyone Joint Development Plan policies JP-Strat14, JP-C1, JP-C5 and JP-C6
- GM Transport Strategy 2040 and the "Right Mix" targets
- Greater Manchester Streets for All strategy and Streets for All design guide
- Manchester City Council's Active Travel Strategy
- Manchester City Council's commitment to be a Zero Carbon city by 2038

The policy position is absolutely clear – changes to the existing road and cycle networks should make cycling more convenient for people, not less convenient.

This specific stretch of Cavendish Street is a key part of the existing cycle network. It appears on TfGM's Bee Network map as a Beeway ("the routes that get people from A to B … representing the

most direct routes between crossing points.") and connects to the Stretford Road Busy Beeway ("corridors or crossing points on busier roads that will require a higher level of design intervention to improve cycling and walking.") It is also mapped on the TfGM Cycle Network.

The national standard for cycling infrastructure is DfT guidance note LTN 1/20. LTN 1/20 advises above all else that cycle routes and networks should be Safe, Direct, Comfortable, Attractive and Coherent. Introducing unnecessary diversions, junctions and bends into a well-used existing route undermines all of these core principles, resulting in a lower quality cycle network which will make it harder for the council to achieve its cycling objectives.

The applicant has offered various reasons why diverting cyclists is necessary but all of these reasons seem to be either existing problems, or problems designed into the scheme. The proposal is to demolish and redevelop the site – so considerations like limited space and the placement of entrances, shop frontages, planting and pedestrian areas are entirely within the applicant's scope to manage. Instead of starting with the problem "there is an existing busy cycle route across this site, how can I design to accommodate everyone's needs?", it seems the applicant has started with the conclusion "cyclists must be deterred" and instructed their consultants to post-rationalise that decision.

3 Misleading claims regarding safety

Page 22 of the Design & Access Statement refers to the "existing controversial link along Cavendish St., which is resulting in collisions of pedestrians, electric scooters, cyclists, etc."

However the map of recorded collisions, on page 18 of the Transport Statement submitted in the same planning application, shows no recorded collisions whatsoever on this link, only on the adjacent main roads, which are likely to be exacerbated rather than mitigated by the applications proposals.

Yours sincerely,

[redacted]

****
This email and any files transmitted with it are confidential and intended solely for the use of the individual or entity to whom they are addressed.
If you have received this email in error, please notify the sender, or [redacted] and then permanently delete the email, attachments and all copies.
The full text of the Council's email disclaimer is available at: www.manchester.gov.uk/emaildisclaimer.
Your personal data is very important to us. Please refer to our privacy notice at: www.manchester.gov.uk/privacy for further information.

This footnote also confirms that this email message has been swept for the presence of computer viruses.
****

Outlook

Fw: Comment on Planning Application 142888/FO/2025

From Planning <[redacted]
Date Wed 02/07/2025 08:50
To Lucy Harrison <[redacted]

Information, Delivery & Support Team
Planning, Building Control & Licensing
Growth & Development Directorate
Postal address: Manchester City Council, P O Box 532, Town Hall, Manchester M60 2LA
Location address: Level 6 Town Hall Extension, Manchester M2 5DB
Tel: 0161 234 4516

Please consider the environment before printing an e-mail.

From: [redacted]
Sent: 01 July 2025 18:52
To: Planning <[redacted]
Subject: Comment on Planning Application 142888/FO/2025

You don't often get email from [redacted] Learn why this is important

ALERT This message originated outside of the Manchester City Council network. **BE CAUTIOUS** before clicking any links or opening any attachments. Please remember your Cyber Training and report anything suspicious.

Dear Manchester Planning team,

I am writing to lodge an objection to planning application **142888/FO/2025** – Cambridge Halls Of Residence Cavendish Street Manchester M15 6TT.

My primary objection is that the proposals have been designed to deter cyclists from using the safest and most direct route through the site. This route has been open to cyclists ever since the road was first built; it is an essential, well-used part of the city's cycling network and therefore the proposal to deter and/or divert cycles away from Cavendish Street is directly at odds with Manchester City Council's planning, sustainability and transport policies.

I regularly use this route with my family from Trafford to access Manchester Museum and Oxford road corridor safely.

The applicant has also made misleading claims regarding the road's legal status and regarding pedestrian safety which I will outline below.

I am asking that the council **refuse** this application, and invite the developer to come back with a proposal that maintains direct cycle as well as pedestrian access along Cavendish Street, designed to modern standards set out in Greater Manchester's Streets For All design guide and in Department for Transport guidance note LTN 1/20. I am sure that the Highways team at MCC and the Active Travel team at TfGM will, if asked, be happy to comment on how such a route could be provided within the space available.

I am also asking that the council **make a Section 106 agreement (s106)** with the applicant to fund safety improvements for pedestrians and cyclists at the junction of Cavendish Street and Higher Cambridge Street – the applicant themselves discuss the shortcomings of the existing junction layout in Section 4.2.1 of the Transport Statement ("*Cyclists have also been observed to queue on the footway to gain direct access to the Higher Cambridge Street/Cavendish Street junction (via a gap in the guard railings) rather than following the road markings which advise cyclists to dismount and use the controlled pedestrian crossings*"). The improvements might take the form of a CYCLOPS junction. CYCLOPS is a homegrown Greater Manchester innovation now frequently used on Highways schemes across the country to deliver safe pedestrian and cycle movements without undue impact on traffic flows.

For prospective occupants and passers-by alike, in line with the S106 tests as set out in Paragraph 58 of the National Planning Policy Framework (NPPF) 2024, a contribution to junction safety improvements improvement would be 'necessary to make the development acceptable in planning terms' (by contributing to an appropriate movement strategy for the site), 'directly related to the development' (given its proximity, the pressure added to the junction by the proposed threefold increase in residents, and in light of the wholly inadequate mitigation route proposed by the applicant), and 'fairly and reasonably related in scale and kind to the development' (given the stated threefold increase in residents explained by the applicant, so directly adding more pressure to the junction).

1 Legal Status of Cavendish Street

This section of Cavendish Street, an adopted Highway, was subject to a stopping up order dated 14.06.1996. That order required that "the Developer shall provide a new highway which shall be a footpath/cycleway". MMU have since installed physical signage stating that Cavendish Street "has not been dedicated as a Highway" and have bolted down uncomfortable and restrictive speed bumps

across the route in an apparent attempt to dissuade cyclists from exercising their legal rights over this space. Both measures may be unlawful, as my understanding is that cyclists do retain a legal Right of Way along Cavendish Street, unchanged from when the entire road was an adopted highway, and the speed bumps are inaccessible to some Disabled users.

2 Cycling routes and planning policy

The case for walking and cycling and specifically for maintaining and improving high quality cycling networks is clear at every level of modern planning policy, including:

- NPPF 2024's "vision-led approach"
- LTN 1/20
- Places For Everyone Joint Development Plan Objectives 6, 7 and 10
- Places for Everyone Joint Development Plan policies JP-Strat14, JP-C1, JP-C5 and JP-C6
- GM Transport Strategy 2040 and the "Right Mix" targets
- Greater Manchester Streets for All strategy and Streets for All design guide
- Manchester City Council's Active Travel Strategy
- Manchester City Council's commitment to be a Zero Carbon city by 2038

The policy position is absolutely clear – changes to the existing road and cycle networks should make cycling more convenient for people, not less convenient.

This specific stretch of Cavendish Street is a key part of the existing cycle network. It appears on TfGM's Bee Network map as a Beeway ("the routes that get people from A to B … representing the most direct routes between crossing points.") and connects to the Stretford Road Busy Beeway ("corridors or crossing points on busier roads that will require a higher level of design intervention to improve cycling and walking.") It is also mapped on the TfGM Cycle Network.

The national standard for cycling infrastructure is DfT guidance note LTN 1/20. LTN 1/20 advises above all else that cycle routes and networks should be Safe, Direct, Comfortable, Attractive and Coherent. Introducing unnecessary diversions, junctions and bends into a well-used existing route undermines all of these core principles, resulting in a lower quality cycle network which will make it harder for the council to achieve its cycling objectives.

The applicant has offered various reasons why diverting cyclists is necessary but all of these reasons seem to be either existing problems, or problems designed into the scheme. The proposal is to demolish and redevelop the site – so considerations like limited space and the placement of entrances, shop frontages, planting and pedestrian areas are entirely within the applicant's scope to manage. Instead of starting with the problem "there is an existing busy cycle route across this site, how can I design to accommodate everyone's needs?", it seems the applicant has started with the conclusion "cyclists must be deterred" and instructed their consultants to post-rationalise that decision.

3 Misleading claims regarding safety

Page 22 of the Design & Access Statement refers to the "existing controversial link along Cavendish St., which is resulting in collisions of pedestrians, electric scooters, cyclists, etc."

However the map of recorded collisions, on page 18 of the Transport Statement submitted in the same planning application, shows no recorded collisions whatsoever on this link, only on the adjacent main roads.

It appears the applicant is attempting to restrict cycle access based on a "problem" for which they have no evidence.

Yours sincerely,

[redacted]

[redacted]

[redacted]

****
This email and any files transmitted with it are confidential and intended solely for the use of the individual or entity to whom they are addressed.
If you have received this email in error, please notify the sender, or [redacted] and then permanently delete the email, attachments and all copies.
The full text of the Council's email disclaimer is available at: www.manchester.gov.uk/emaildisclaimer.
Your personal data is very important to us. Please refer to our privacy notice at: www.manchester.gov.uk/privacy for further information.

This footnote also confirms that this email message has been swept for the presence of computer viruses.
****

Outlook

Fw: Comment on Planning Application 142888/FO/2025

From Planning <[redacted]
Date Tue 01/07/2025 11:22
To Lucy Harrison <[redacted]

Information, Delivery & Support Team
Planning, Building Control & Licensing
Growth & Development Directorate
Postal address: Manchester City Council, P O Box 532, Town Hall, Manchester M60 2LA
Location address: Level 6 Town Hall Extension, Manchester M2 5DB
Tel: 0161 234 4516

Please consider the environment before printing an e-mail.

From: [redacted]
Sent: 01 July 2025 10:35
To: Planning <[redacted]
Subject: Comment on Planning Application 142888/FO/2025

You don't often get email from [redacted] Learn why this is important

ALERT This message originated outside of the Manchester City Council network. **BE CAUTIOUS** before clicking any links or opening any attachments. Please remember your Cyber Training and report anything suspicious.

Dear Manchester Planning team,

I am writing to lodge an objection to planning application **142888/FO/2025** – Cambridge Halls Of Residence Cavendish Street Manchester M15 6TT.

My primary objection is that the proposals have been designed to deter cyclists from using the safest and most direct route through the site. This route has been open to cyclists ever since the road was first built; it is an essential, well-used part of the city's cycling network and therefore the proposal to deter and/or divert cycles away from Cavendish Street is directly at odds with Manchester City Council's planning, sustainability and transport policies.

I regularly use this route to cycle from my home in Levenshulme to Hulme, to see friends or access the garden centre.

The applicant has also made misleading claims regarding the road's legal status and regarding pedestrian safety which I will outline below.

I am asking that the council **refuse** this application, and invite the developer to come back with a proposal that maintains direct cycle as well as pedestrian access along Cavendish Street, designed to modern standards set out in Greater Manchester's Streets For All design guide and in Department for Transport guidance note LTN 1/20. I am sure that the Highways team at MCC and

the Active Travel team at TfGM will, if asked, be happy to comment on how such a route could be provided within the space available.

I am also asking that the council **make a Section 106 agreement (s106)** with the applicant to fund safety improvements for pedestrians and cyclists at the junction of Cavendish Street and Higher Cambridge Street – the applicant themselves discuss the shortcomings of the existing junction layout in Section 4.2.1 of the Transport Statement ("Cyclists have also been observed to queue on the footway to gain direct access to the Higher Cambridge Street/Cavendish Street junction (via a gap in the guard railings) rather than following the road markings which advise cyclists to dismount and use the controlled pedestrian crossings"). The improvements might take the form of a CYCLOPS junction. CYCLOPS is a homegrown Greater Manchester innovation now frequently used on Highways schemes across the country to deliver safe pedestrian and cycle movements without undue impact on traffic flows.
For prospective occupants and passers-by alike, in line with the S106 tests as set out in Paragraph 58 of the National Planning Policy Framework (NPPF) 2024, a contribution to junction safety improvements improvement would be 'necessary to make the development acceptable in planning terms' (by contributing to an appropriate movement strategy for the site), 'directly related to the development' (given its proximity, the pressure added to the junction by the proposed threefold increase in residents, and in light of the wholly inadequate mitigation route proposed by the applicant), and 'fairly and reasonably related in scale and kind to the development' (given the stated threefold increase in residents explained by the applicant, so directly adding more pressure to the junction).

1 Legal Status of Cavendish Street

This section of Cavendish Street, an adopted Highway, was subject to a stopping up order dated 14.06.1996. That order required that "the Developer shall provide a new highway which shall be a footpath/cycleway". MMU have since installed physical signage stating that Cavendish Street "has not been dedicated as a Highway" and have bolted down uncomfortable and restrictive speed bumps across the route in an apparent attempt to dissuade cyclists from exercising their legal rights over this space. Both measures may be unlawful, as my understanding is that cyclists do retain a legal Right of Way along Cavendish Street, unchanged from when the entire road was an adopted highway, and the speed bumps are inaccessible to some Disabled users.

2 Cycling routes and planning policy

The case for walking and cycling and specifically for maintaining and improving high quality cycling networks is clear at every level of modern planning policy, including:

- NPPF 2024's "vision-led approach"
- LTN 1/20
- Places For Everyone Joint Development Plan Objectives 6, 7 and 10
- Places for Everyone Joint Development Plan policies JP-Strat14, JP-C1, JP-C5 and JP-C6
- GM Transport Strategy 2040 and the "Right Mix" targets
- Greater Manchester Streets for All strategy and Streets for All design guide
- Manchester City Council's Active Travel Strategy
- Manchester City Council's commitment to be a Zero Carbon city by 2038

The policy position is absolutely clear – changes to the existing road and cycle networks should make cycling more convenient for people, not less convenient.

This specific stretch of Cavendish Street is a key part of the existing cycle network. It appears on TfGM's Bee Network map as a Beeway ("the routes that get people from A to B … representing the most direct routes between crossing points.") and connects to the Stretford Road Busy Beeway

("corridors or crossing points on busier roads that will require a higher level of design intervention to improve cycling and walking.") It is also mapped on the TfGM Cycle Network.

The national standard for cycling infrastructure is DfT guidance note LTN 1/20. LTN 1/20 advises above all else that cycle routes and networks should be Safe, Direct, Comfortable, Attractive and Coherent. Introducing unnecessary diversions, junctions and bends into a well-used existing route undermines all of these core principles, resulting in a lower quality cycle network which will make it harder for the council to achieve its cycling objectives.

The applicant has offered various reasons why diverting cyclists is necessary but all of these reasons seem to be either existing problems, or problems designed into the scheme. The proposal is to demolish and redevelop the site – so considerations like limited space and the placement of entrances, shop frontages, planting and pedestrian areas are entirely within the applicant's scope to manage. Instead of starting with the problem "there is an existing busy cycle route across this site, how can I design to accommodate everyone's needs?", it seems the applicant has started with the conclusion "cyclists must be deterred" and instructed their consultants to post-rationalise that decision.

3 Misleading claims regarding safety

Page 22 of the Design & Access Statement refers to the "existing controversial link along Cavendish St., which is resulting in collisions of pedestrians, electric scooters, cyclists, etc."

However the map of recorded collisions, on page 18 of the Transport Statement submitted in the same planning application, shows no recorded collisions whatsoever on this link, only on the adjacent main roads.

It appears the applicant is attempting to restrict cycle access based on a "problem" for which they have no evidence.

Yours sincerely,

[redacted]

****
This email and any files transmitted with it are confidential and intended solely for the use of the individual or entity to whom they are addressed.
If you have received this email in error, please notify the sender, or [redacted] and then permanently delete the email, attachments and all copies.
The full text of the Council's email disclaimer is available at: www.manchester.gov.uk/emaildisclaimer.
Your personal data is very important to us. Please refer to our privacy notice at: www.manchester.gov.uk/privacy for further information.

This footnote also confirms that this email message has been swept for the presence of computer viruses.
****

Outlook

Fw: Comment on Planning Application 142888/FO/2025

From Planning <[redacted]>
Date Wed 02/07/2025 08:50
To Lucy Harrison <[redacted]>

Information, Delivery & Support Team
Planning, Building Control & Licensing
Growth & Development Directorate
Postal address: Manchester City Council, P O Box 532, Town Hall, Manchester M60 2LA
Location address: Level 6 Town Hall Extension, Manchester M2 5DB
Tel: 0161 234 4516

Please consider the environment before printing an e-mail.

From: [redacted]
Sent: 01 July 2025 16:42
To: Planning <[redacted]>
Subject: Comment on Planning Application 142888/FO/2025

You don't often get email from [redacted] Learn why this is important

ALERT This message originated outside of the Manchester City Council network. **BE CAUTIOUS** before clicking any links or opening any attachments. Please remember your Cyber Training and report anything suspicious.

Dear Manchester Planning team,

I am writing to lodge an objection to planning application 142888/FO/2025 – Cambridge Halls Of Residence Cavendish Street Manchester M15 6TT.

My primary objection is that the proposals have been designed to deter cyclists from using the safest and most direct route through the site. This route has been open to cyclists ever since the road was first built; it is an essential, well-used part of the city's cycling network and therefore the proposal to deter and/or divert cycles away from Cavendish Street is directly at odds with Manchester City Council's planning, sustainability and transport policies.

I use this route regularly when I cycle between Manchester Piccadilly Station and the Salford Community rugby stadium. It is much more convenient and, more importantly, safe.

The applicant has also made misleading claims regarding the road's legal status and regarding pedestrian safety which I will outline below.

I am asking that the council refuse this application, and invite the developer to come back with a proposal that maintains direct cycle as well as pedestrian access along Cavendish Street, designed

to modern standards set out in Greater Manchester's Streets For All design guide and in Department for Transport guidance note LTN 1/20. I am sure that the Highways team at MCC and the Active Travel team at TfGM will, if asked, be happy to comment on how such a route could be provided within the space available.

I am also asking that the council make a Section 106 agreement (s106) with the applicant to fund safety improvements for pedestrians and cyclists at the junction of Cavendish Street and Higher Cambridge Street – the applicant themselves discuss the shortcomings of the existing junction layout in Section 4.2.1 of the Transport Statement ("Cyclists have also been observed to queue on the footway to gain direct access to the Higher Cambridge Street/Cavendish Street junction (via a gap in the guard railings) rather than following the road markings which advise cyclists to dismount and use the controlled pedestrian crossings"). The improvements might take the form of a CYCLOPS junction. CYCLOPS is a homegrown Greater Manchester innovation now frequently used on Highways schemes across the country to deliver safe pedestrian and cycle movements without undue impact on traffic flows.

For prospective occupants and passers-by alike, in line with the S106 tests as set out in Paragraph 58 of the National Planning Policy Framework (NPPF) 2024, a contribution to junction safety improvements improvement would be 'necessary to make the development acceptable in planning terms' (by contributing to an appropriate movement strategy for the site), 'directly related to the development' (given its proximity, the pressure added to the junction by the proposed threefold increase in residents, and in light of the wholly inadequate mitigation route proposed by the applicant), and 'fairly and reasonably related in scale and kind to the development' (given the stated threefold increase in residents explained by the applicant, so directly adding more pressure to the junction).

1 Legal Status of Cavendish Street

This section of Cavendish Street, an adopted Highway, was subject to a stopping up order dated 14.06.1996. That order required that "the Developer shall provide a new highway which shall be a footpath/cycleway". MMU have since installed physical signage stating that Cavendish Street "has not been dedicated as a Highway" and have bolted down uncomfortable and restrictive speed bumps across the route in an apparent attempt to dissuade cyclists from exercising their legal rights over this space. Both measures may be unlawful, as my understanding is that cyclists do retain a legal Right of Way along Cavendish Street, unchanged from when the entire road was an adopted highway, and the speed bumps are inaccessible to some Disabled users.

2 Cycling routes and planning policy

The case for walking and cycling and specifically for maintaining and improving high quality cycling networks is clear at every level of modern planning policy, including:

NPPF 2024's "vision-led approach"
LTN 1/20
Places For Everyone Joint Development Plan Objectives 6, 7 and 10
Places for Everyone Joint Development Plan policies JP-Strat14, JP-C1, JP-C5 and JP-C6
GM Transport Strategy 2040 and the "Right Mix" targets
Greater Manchester Streets for All strategy and Streets for All design guide
Manchester City Council's Active Travel Strategy
Manchester City Council's commitment to be a Zero Carbon city by 2038
The policy position is absolutely clear – changes to the existing road and cycle networks should make cycling more convenient for people, not less convenient.

This specific stretch of Cavendish Street is a key part of the existing cycle network. It appears on TfGM's Bee Network map as a Beeway ("the routes that get people from A to B … representing the most direct routes between crossing points.") and connects to the Stretford Road Busy Beeway ("corridors or crossing points on busier roads that will require a higher level of design intervention to improve cycling and walking.") It is also mapped on the TfGM Cycle Network.

The national standard for cycling infrastructure is DfT guidance note LTN 1/20. LTN 1/20 advises above all else that cycle routes and networks should be Safe, Direct, Comfortable, Attractive and Coherent. Introducing unnecessary diversions, junctions and bends into a well-used existing route undermines all of these core principles, resulting in a lower quality cycle network which will make it harder for the council to achieve its cycling objectives.

The applicant has offered various reasons why diverting cyclists is necessary but all of these reasons seem to be either existing problems, or problems designed into the scheme. The proposal is to demolish and redevelop the site – so considerations like limited space and the placement of entrances, shop frontages, planting and pedestrian areas are entirely within the applicant's scope to manage. Instead of starting with the problem "there is an existing busy cycle route across this site, how can I design to accommodate everyone's needs?", it seems the applicant has started with the conclusion "cyclists must be deterred" and instructed their consultants to post-rationalise that decision.

3 Misleading claims regarding safety

Page 22 of the Design & Access Statement refers to the "existing controversial link along Cavendish St., which is resulting in collisions of pedestrians, electric scooters, cyclists, etc."

However the map of recorded collisions, on page 18 of the Transport Statement submitted in the same planning application, shows no recorded collisions whatsoever on this link, only on the adjacent main roads.

It appears the applicant is attempting to restrict cycle access based on a "problem" for which they have no evidence.

Yours sincerely,

[redacted]

[redacted]

[redacted]

****
This email and any files transmitted with it are confidential and intended solely for the use of the individual or entity to whom they are addressed.
If you have received this email in error, please notify the sender, or [redacted] and then permanently delete the email, attachments and all copies.
The full text of the Council's email disclaimer is available at: www.manchester.gov.uk/emaildisclaimer.
Your personal data is very important to us. Please refer to our privacy notice at: www.manchester.gov.uk/privacy for further information.

This footnote also confirms that this email message has been swept for the presence of computer viruses.
****

Outlook

Fw: Comment on Planning Application 142888/FO/2025

From Planning <[redacted]
Date Mon 14/07/2025 14:06
To Lucy Harrison <[redacted]

Information, Delivery & Support Team
Planning, Building Control & Licensing
Growth & Development Directorate
Postal address: Manchester City Council, P O Box 532, Town Hall, Manchester M60 2LA
Location address: Level 6 Town Hall Extension, Manchester M2 5DB
Tel: 0161 234 4516

Please consider the environment before printing an e-mail.

From: [redacted]
Sent: 11 July 2025 13:31
To: Planning <[redacted]
Subject: Comment on Planning Application 142888/FO/2025

You don't often get email from [redacted] Learn why this is important

ALERT This message originated outside of the Manchester City Council network. **BE CAUTIOUS** before clicking any links or opening any attachments. Please remember your Cyber Training and report anything suspicious.

Dear Manchester Planning team,

I am writing to lodge an objection to planning application 142888/FO/2025 – Cambridge Halls Of Residence Cavendish Street Manchester M15 6TT.

My primary objection is that the proposals have been designed to deter cyclists from using the safest and most direct route through the site. This route has been open to cyclists ever since the road was first built; it is an essential, well-used part of the city's cycling network and therefore the proposal to deter and/or divert cycles away from Cavendish Street is directly at odds with Manchester City Council's planning, sustainability and transport policies.

I have been using this cycling infrastructure for over 15 years while living in Whalley Range and Chorlton, and it makes a huge difference to my journeys into town using a bike. It is very well used and in all this time I have never seen any issues regarding cyclists and pedestrians coming into contact. If anything the junction should be redesigned to allow people using bikes a safer entry and exit to the road from the underpass at the halls of residence.

The applicant has also made misleading claims regarding the road's legal status and regarding pedestrian safety which I will outline below.

I am asking that the council refuse this application, and invite the developer to come back with a proposal that maintains direct cycle as well as pedestrian access along Cavendish Street, designed to modern standards set out in Greater Manchester's Streets For All design guide and in Department for Transport guidance note LTN 1/20. I am sure that the Highways team at MCC and the Active Travel team at TfGM will, if asked, be happy to comment on how such a route could be provided within the space available.

I am also asking that the council make a Section 106 agreement (s106) with the applicant to fund safety improvements for pedestrians and cyclists at the junction of Cavendish Street and Higher Cambridge Street – the applicant themselves discuss the shortcomings of the existing junction layout in Section 4.2.1 of the Transport Statement ("Cyclists have also been observed to queue on the footway to gain direct access to the Higher Cambridge Street/Cavendish Street junction (via a gap in the guard railings) rather than following the road markings which advise cyclists to dismount and use the controlled pedestrian crossings"). The improvements might take the form of a CYCLOPS junction. CYCLOPS is a homegrown Greater Manchester innovation now frequently used on Highways schemes across the country to deliver safe pedestrian and cycle movements without undue impact on traffic flows.

For prospective occupants and passers-by alike, in line with the S106 tests as set out in Paragraph 58 of the National Planning Policy Framework (NPPF) 2024, a contribution to junction safety improvements improvement would be 'necessary to make the development acceptable in planning terms' (by contributing to an appropriate movement strategy for the site), 'directly related to the development' (given its proximity, the pressure added to the junction by the proposed threefold increase in residents, and in light of the wholly inadequate mitigation route proposed by the applicant), and 'fairly and reasonably related in scale and kind to the development' (given the stated threefold increase in residents explained by the applicant, so directly adding more pressure to the junction).

1 Legal Status of Cavendish Street

This section of Cavendish Street, an adopted Highway, was subject to a stopping up order dated 14.06.1996. That order required that "the Developer shall provide a new highway which shall be a footpath/cycleway". MMU have since installed physical signage stating that Cavendish Street "has not been dedicated as a Highway" and have bolted down uncomfortable and restrictive speed bumps across the route in an apparent attempt to dissuade cyclists from exercising their legal rights over this space. Both measures may be unlawful, as my understanding is that cyclists do retain a legal Right of Way along Cavendish Street, unchanged from when the entire road was an adopted highway, and the speed bumps are inaccessible to some Disabled users.

2 Cycling routes and planning policy

The case for walking and cycling and specifically for maintaining and improving high quality cycling networks is clear at every level of modern planning policy, including:

NPPF 2024's "vision-led approach"
LTN 1/20
Places For Everyone Joint Development Plan Objectives 6, 7 and 10
Places for Everyone Joint Development Plan policies JP-Strat14, JP-C1, JP-C5 and JP-C6
GM Transport Strategy 2040 and the "Right Mix" targets
Greater Manchester Streets for All strategy and Streets for All design guide
Manchester City Council's Active Travel Strategy
Manchester City Council's commitment to be a Zero Carbon city by 2038

The policy position is absolutely clear – changes to the existing road and cycle networks should make cycling more convenient for people, not less convenient.

This specific stretch of Cavendish Street is a key part of the existing cycle network. It appears on TfGM's Bee Network map as a Beeway ("the routes that get people from A to B … representing the most direct routes between crossing points.") and connects to the Stretford Road Busy Beeway ("corridors or crossing points on busier roads that will require a higher level of design intervention to improve cycling and walking.") It is also mapped on the TfGM Cycle Network.

The national standard for cycling infrastructure is DfT guidance note LTN 1/20. LTN 1/20 advises above all else that cycle routes and networks should be Safe, Direct, Comfortable, Attractive and Coherent. Introducing unnecessary diversions, junctions and bends into a well-used existing route undermines all of these core principles, resulting in a lower quality cycle network which will make it harder for the council to achieve its cycling objectives.

The applicant has offered various reasons why diverting cyclists is necessary but all of these reasons seem to be either existing problems, or problems designed into the scheme. The proposal is to demolish and redevelop the site – so considerations like limited space and the placement of entrances, shop frontages, planting and pedestrian areas are entirely within the applicant's scope to manage. Instead of starting with the problem "there is an existing busy cycle route across this site, how can I design to accommodate everyone's needs?", it seems the applicant has started with the conclusion "cyclists must be deterred" and instructed their consultants to post-rationalise that decision.

3 Misleading claims regarding safety

Page 22 of the Design & Access Statement refers to the "existing controversial link along Cavendish St., which is resulting in collisions of pedestrians, electric scooters, cyclists, etc."

However the map of recorded collisions, on page 18 of the Transport Statement submitted in the same planning application, shows no recorded collisions whatsoever on this link, only on the adjacent main roads.

It appears the applicant is attempting to restrict cycle access based on a "problem" for which they have no evidence.

Yours sincerely,

[redacted]

****
This email and any files transmitted with it are confidential and intended solely for the use of the individual or entity to whom they are addressed.
If you have received this email in error, please notify the sender, or [redacted] and then permanently delete the email, attachments and all copies.
The full text of the Council's email disclaimer is available at: www.manchester.gov.uk/emaildisclaimer.
Your personal data is very important to us. Please refer to our privacy notice at: www.manchester.gov.uk/privacy for further information.

This footnote also confirms that this email message has been swept for the presence of computer viruses.
****

Outlook

Fw: Comment on Planning Application 142888/FO/2025

From Planning <[redacted]
Date Mon 30/06/2025 08:49
To Lucy Harrison <[redacted]

Information, Delivery & Support Team
Planning, Building Control & Licensing
Growth & Development Directorate
Postal address: Manchester City Council, P O Box 532, Town Hall, Manchester M60 2LA
Location address: Level 6 Town Hall Extension, Manchester M2 5DB
Tel: 0161 234 4516

Please consider the environment before printing an e-mail.

From: [redacted]
Sent: 28 June 2025 18:59
To: Planning <[redacted]
Subject: Comment on Planning Application 142888/FO/2025

You don't often get email from [redacted] Learn why this is important

ALERT This message originated outside of the Manchester City Council network. **BE CAUTIOUS** before clicking any links or opening any attachments. Please remember your Cyber Training and report anything suspicious.

Dear Manchester Planning team,
I am writing to lodge an objection to planning application **142888/FO/2025** – Cambridge Halls Of Residence Cavendish Street Manchester M15 6TT.

My primary objection is that the proposals have been designed to deter cyclists from using the safest and most direct route through the site. This route has been open to cyclists ever since the road was first built; it is an essential, well-used part of the city's cycling network and therefore the proposal to deter and/or divert cycles away from Cavendish Street is directly at odds with Manchester City Council's planning, sustainability and transport policies.

I regularly use Cavendish street as I cycle north up Lloyd street then though to Wilmslow road and onward to town. Since the remodelling it has given much more space to all pedestrians and cyclists. I have never had any issue with shared space or seen any collisions.

The applicant has also made misleading claims regarding the road's legal status and regarding pedestrian safety which I will outline below.

I am asking that the council **refuse** this application, and invite the developer to come back with a proposal that maintains direct cycle as well as pedestrian access along Cavendish Street, designed to modern standards set

out in Greater Manchester's Streets For All design guide and in Department for Transport guidance note LTN 1/20. I am sure that the Highways team at MCC and the Active Travel team at TfGM will, if asked, be happy to comment on how such a route could be provided within the space available.

I am also asking that the council **make a Section 106 agreement (s106)** with the applicant to fund safety improvements for pedestrians and cyclists at the junction of Cavendish Street and Higher Cambridge Street – the applicant themselves discuss the shortcomings of the existing junction layout in Section 4.2.1 of the Transport Statement ("*Cyclists have also been observed to queue on the footway to gain direct access to the Higher Cambridge Street/Cavendish Street junction (via a gap in the guard railings) rather than following the road markings which advise cyclists to dismount and use the controlled pedestrian crossings*"). The improvements might take the form of a CYCLOPS junction. CYCLOPS is a homegrown Greater Manchester innovation now frequently used on Highways schemes across the country to deliver safe pedestrian and cycle movements without undue impact on traffic flows.

For prospective occupants and passers-by alike, in line with the S106 tests as set out in Paragraph 58 of the National Planning Policy Framework (NPPF) 2024, a contribution to junction safety improvements improvement would be 'necessary to make the development acceptable in planning terms' (by contributing to an appropriate movement strategy for the site), 'directly related to the development' (given its proximity, the pressure added to the junction by the proposed threefold increase in residents, and in light of the wholly inadequate mitigation route proposed by the applicant), and 'fairly and reasonably related in scale and kind to the development' (given the stated threefold increase in residents explained by the applicant, so directly adding more pressure to the junction).

1 Legal Status of Cavendish Street

This section of Cavendish Street, an adopted Highway, was subject to a stopping up order dated 14.06.1996. That order required that "the Developer shall provide a new highway which shall be a footpath/cycleway". MMU have since installed physical signage stating that Cavendish Street "has not been dedicated as a Highway" and have bolted down uncomfortable and restrictive speed bumps across the route in an apparent attempt to dissuade cyclists from exercising their legal rights over this space. Both measures may be unlawful, as my understanding is that cyclists do retain a legal Right of Way along Cavendish Street, unchanged from when the entire road was an adopted highway, and the speed bumps are inaccessible to some Disabled users.

2 Cycling routes and planning policy

The case for walking and cycling and specifically for maintaining and improving high quality cycling networks is clear at every level of modern planning policy, including:

- NPPF 2024's "vision-led approach"
- LTN 1/20
- Places For Everyone Joint Development Plan Objectives 6, 7 and 10
- Places for Everyone Joint Development Plan policies JP-Strat14, JP-C1, JP-C5 and JP-C6
- GM Transport Strategy 2040 and the "Right Mix" targets
- Greater Manchester Streets for All strategy and Streets for All design guide
- Manchester City Council's Active Travel Strategy
- Manchester City Council's commitment to be a Zero Carbon city by 2038

The policy position is absolutely clear – changes to the existing road and cycle networks should make cycling more convenient for people, not less convenient.

This specific stretch of Cavendish Street is a key part of the existing cycle network. It appears on TfGM's Bee Network map as a Beeway ("the routes that get people from A to B … representing the most direct routes between crossing points.") and connects to the Stretford Road Busy Beeway ("corridors or crossing points on busier roads that will require a higher level of design intervention to improve cycling and walking.") It is also mapped on the TfGM Cycle Network.

The national standard for cycling infrastructure is DfT guidance note LTN 1/20. LTN 1/20 advises above all else that cycle routes and networks should be Safe, Direct, Comfortable, Attractive and Coherent. Introducing unnecessary diversions, junctions and bends into a well-used existing route undermines all of these core principles, resulting in a lower quality cycle network which will make it harder for the council to achieve its cycling objectives.

The applicant has offered various reasons why diverting cyclists is necessary but all of these reasons seem to be either existing problems, or problems designed into the scheme. The proposal is to demolish and redevelop the site – so considerations like limited space and the placement of entrances, shop frontages, planting and pedestrian areas are entirely within the applicant's scope to manage. Instead of starting with the problem "there is an existing busy cycle route across this site, how can I design to accommodate everyone's needs?", it seems the applicant has started with the conclusion "cyclists must be deterred" and instructed their consultants to post-rationalise that decision.

3 Misleading claims regarding safety

Page 22 of the Design & Access Statement refers to the "existing controversial link along Cavendish St., which is resulting in collisions of pedestrians, electric scooters, cyclists, etc."

However the map of recorded collisions, on page 18 of the Transport Statement submitted in the same planning application, shows no recorded collisions whatsoever on this link, only on the adjacent main roads.

It appears the applicant is attempting to restrict cycle access based on a "problem" for which they have no evidence.

Yours sincerely,

[redacted]

[redacted]

****
This email and any files transmitted with it are confidential and intended solely for the use of the individual or entity to whom they are addressed.
If you have received this email in error, please notify the sender, or [redacted] and then permanently delete the email, attachments and all copies.
The full text of the Council's email disclaimer is available at: www.manchester.gov.uk/emaildisclaimer.
Your personal data is very important to us. Please refer to our privacy notice at: www.manchester.gov.uk/privacy for further information.

This footnote also confirms that this email message has been swept for the presence of computer viruses.
****

Outlook

Fw: Comment on Planning Application 142888/FO/2025

From Planning <[redacted]
Date Mon 30/06/2025 10:33
To Lucy Harrison <[redacted]

Information, Delivery & Support Team
Planning, Building Control & Licensing
Growth & Development Directorate
Postal address: Manchester City Council, P O Box 532, Town Hall, Manchester M60 2LA
Location address: Level 6 Town Hall Extension, Manchester M2 5DB
Tel: 0161 234 4516

Please consider the environment before printing an e-mail.

From: [redacted]
Sent: 30 June 2025 10:13
To: Planning <[redacted]
Subject: Comment on Planning Application 142888/FO/2025

You don't often get email from [redacted] Learn why this is important

ALERT This message originated outside of the Manchester City Council network. **BE CAUTIOUS** before clicking any links or opening any attachments. Please remember your Cyber Training and report anything suspicious.

Dear Manchester Planning team,

I am writing to lodge an objection to planning application **142888/FO/2025** – Cambridge Halls Of Residence Cavendish Street Manchester M15 6TT.

My primary objection is that the proposals have been designed to deter cyclists from using the safest and most direct route through the site. This route has been open to cyclists ever since the road was first built; it is an essential, well-used part of the city's cycling network and therefore the proposal to deter and/or divert cycles away from Cavendish Street is directly at odds with Manchester City Council's planning, sustainability and transport policies.

I regularly cycle through Cavendish Street and it is currently a very convenient and safe route with pedestrians and cycles coexisting well. I have never witness any incidents or conflicts. Removing this right of way will discourage people of cycling.

The applicant has also made misleading claims regarding the road's legal status and regarding pedestrian safety which I will outline below.

I am asking that the council **refuse** this application, and invite the developer to come back with a proposal that maintains direct cycle as well as pedestrian access along Cavendish Street, designed to modern standards set out in Greater Manchester's Streets For All design guide and in Department for Transport guidance note LTN 1/20. I am sure that the Highways team at MCC and the Active Travel team at TfGM will, if asked, be happy to comment on how such a route could be provided within the space available.

I am also asking that the council **make a Section 106 agreement (s106)** with the applicant to fund safety improvements for pedestrians and cyclists at the junction of Cavendish Street and Higher Cambridge Street – the applicant themselves discuss the shortcomings of the existing junction layout in Section 4.2.1 of the Transport Statement ("*Cyclists have also been observed to queue on the footway to gain direct access to the Higher Cambridge Street/Cavendish Street junction (via a gap in the guard railings) rather than following the road markings which advise cyclists to dismount and use the controlled pedestrian crossings*"). The improvements might take the form of a CYCLOPS junction. CYCLOPS is a homegrown Greater Manchester innovation now frequently used on Highways schemes across the country to deliver safe pedestrian and cycle movements without undue impact on traffic flows.

For prospective occupants and passers-by alike, in line with the S106 tests as set out in Paragraph 58 of the National Planning Policy Framework (NPPF) 2024, a contribution to junction safety improvements improvement would be 'necessary to make the development acceptable in planning terms' (by contributing to an appropriate movement strategy for the site), 'directly related to the development' (given its proximity, the pressure added to the junction by the proposed threefold increase in residents, and in light of the wholly inadequate mitigation route proposed by the applicant), and 'fairly and reasonably related in scale and kind to the development' (given the stated threefold increase in residents explained by the applicant, so directly adding more pressure to the junction).

1 Legal Status of Cavendish Street

This section of Cavendish Street, an adopted Highway, was subject to a stopping up order dated 14.06.1996. That order required that "the Developer shall provide a new highway which shall be a footpath/cycleway". MMU have since installed physical signage stating that Cavendish Street "has not been dedicated as a Highway" and have bolted down uncomfortable and restrictive speed bumps across the route in an apparent attempt to dissuade cyclists from exercising their legal rights over this space. Both measures may be unlawful, as my understanding is that cyclists do retain a legal Right of Way along Cavendish Street, unchanged from when the entire road was an adopted highway, and the speed bumps are inaccessible to some Disabled users.

2 Cycling routes and planning policy

The case for walking and cycling and specifically for maintaining and improving high quality cycling networks is clear at every level of modern planning policy, including:

- NPPF 2024's "vision-led approach"
- LTN 1/20
- Places For Everyone Joint Development Plan Objectives 6, 7 and 10
- Places for Everyone Joint Development Plan policies JP-Strat14, JP-C1, JP-C5 and JP-C6
- GM Transport Strategy 2040 and the "Right Mix" targets
- Greater Manchester Streets for All strategy and Streets for All design guide
- Manchester City Council's Active Travel Strategy
- Manchester City Council's commitment to be a Zero Carbon city by 2038

The policy position is absolutely clear – changes to the existing road and cycle networks should make cycling more convenient for people, not less convenient.

This specific stretch of Cavendish Street is a key part of the existing cycle network. It appears on TfGM's Bee Network map as a Beeway ("the routes that get people from A to B … representing the most direct routes between crossing points.") and connects to the Stretford Road Busy Beeway ("corridors or crossing points on busier roads that will require a higher level of design intervention to improve cycling and walking.") It is also mapped on the TfGM Cycle Network.

The national standard for cycling infrastructure is DfT guidance note LTN 1/20. LTN 1/20 advises above all else that cycle routes and networks should be Safe, Direct, Comfortable, Attractive and Coherent. Introducing unnecessary diversions,

junctions and bends into a well-used existing route undermines all of these core principles, resulting in a lower quality cycle network which will make it harder for the council to achieve its cycling objectives.

The applicant has offered various reasons why diverting cyclists is necessary but all of these reasons seem to be either existing problems, or problems designed into the scheme. The proposal is to demolish and redevelop the site – so considerations like limited space and the placement of entrances, shop frontages, planting and pedestrian areas are entirely within the applicant's scope to manage. Instead of starting with the problem "there is an existing busy cycle route across this site, how can I design to accommodate everyone's needs?", it seems the applicant has started with the conclusion "cyclists must be deterred" and instructed their consultants to post-rationalise that decision.

3 Misleading claims regarding safety

Page 22 of the Design & Access Statement refers to the "existing controversial link along Cavendish St., which is resulting in collisions of pedestrians, electric scooters, cyclists, etc."

However the map of recorded collisions, on page 18 of the Transport Statement submitted in the same planning application, shows no recorded collisions whatsoever on this link, only on the adjacent main roads.

It appears the applicant is attempting to restrict cycle access based on a "problem" for which they have no evidence.

Yours sincerely,

[redacted]

[redacted]

****
This email and any files transmitted with it are confidential and intended solely for the use of the individual or entity to whom they are addressed.
If you have received this email in error, please notify the sender, or [redacted] and then permanently delete the email, attachments and all copies.
The full text of the Council's email disclaimer is available at: www.manchester.gov.uk/emaildisclaimer.
Your personal data is very important to us. Please refer to our privacy notice at: www.manchester.gov.uk/privacy for further information.

This footnote also confirms that this email message has been swept for the presence of computer viruses.
****

Outlook

Fw: Subject: Comment on Planning Application 142888/FO/2025

From Planning <[redacted]
Date Mon 30/06/2025 08:47
To Lucy Harrison <[redacted]

Information, Delivery & Support Team
Planning, Building Control & Licensing
Growth & Development Directorate
Postal address: Manchester City Council, P O Box 532, Town Hall, Manchester M60 2LA
Location address: Level 6 Town Hall Extension, Manchester M2 5DB
Tel: 0161 234 4516

Please consider the environment before printing an e-mail.

From: [redacted]
Sent: 29 June 2025 13:07
To: Planning <[redacted]
Subject: Subject: Comment on Planning Application 142888/FO/2025

You don't often get email from [redacted] Learn why this is important

ALERT This message originated outside of the Manchester City Council network. **BE CAUTIOUS** before clicking any links or opening any attachments. Please remember your Cyber Training and report anything suspicious.

Dear Manchester Planning team,
I am writing to lodge an objection to planning application 142888/FO/2025 – Cambridge Halls Of Residence Cavendish Street Manchester M15 6TT.
My primary objection is that the proposals have been designed to deter cyclists from using the safest and most direct route through the site. This route has been open to cyclists ever since the road was first built; it is an essential, well-used part of the city's cycling network and therefore the proposal to deter and/or divert cycles away from Cavendish Street is directly at odds with Manchester City Council's planning, sustainability and transport policies.
The applicant has also made misleading claims regarding the road's legal status and regarding pedestrian safety which I will outline below.
I am asking that the council refuse this application, and invite the developer to come back with a proposal that maintains direct cycle as well as pedestrian access along Cavendish Street, designed to modern standards set out in Greater Manchester's Streets For All design guide and in Department for Transport guidance note LTN 1/20. I am sure that the Highways team at MCC and the Active Travel team at TfGM will, if asked, be happy to comment on how such a route could be provided within the space available.
I am also asking that the council make a Section 106 agreement (s106) with the applicant to fund safety improvements for pedestrians and cyclists at the junction of Cavendish Street and Higher Cambridge Street – the applicant themselves discuss the shortcomings of the existing junction layout in Section 4.2.1 of the Transport Statement ("Cyclists have also been observed to queue on

the footway to gain direct access to the Higher Cambridge Street/Cavendish Street junction (via a gap in the guard railings) rather than following the road markings which advise cyclists to dismount and use the controlled pedestrian crossings"). The improvements might take the form of a CYCLOPS junction. CYCLOPS is a homegrown Greater Manchester innovation now frequently used on Highways schemes across the country to deliver safe pedestrian and cycle movements without undue impact on traffic flows.

For prospective occupants and passers-by alike, in line with the S106 tests as set out in Paragraph 58 of the National Planning Policy Framework (NPPF) 2024, a contribution to junction safety improvements improvement would be 'necessary to make the development acceptable in planning terms' (by contributing to an appropriate movement strategy for the site), 'directly related to the development' (given its proximity, the pressure added to the junction by the proposed threefold increase in residents, and in light of the wholly inadequate mitigation route proposed by the applicant), and 'fairly and reasonably related in scale and kind to the development' (given the stated threefold increase in residents explained by the applicant, so directly adding more pressure to the junction).

1 Legal Status of Cavendish Street

This section of Cavendish Street, an adopted Highway, was subject to a stopping up order dated 14.06.1996. That order required that "the Developer shall provide a new highway which shall be a footpath/cycleway". MMU have since installed physical signage stating that Cavendish Street "has not been dedicated as a Highway" and have bolted down uncomfortable and restrictive speed bumps across the route in an apparent attempt to dissuade cyclists from exercising their legal rights over this space. Both measures may be unlawful, as my understanding is that cyclists do retain a legal Right of Way along Cavendish Street, unchanged from when the entire road was an adopted highway, and the speed bumps are inaccessible to some Disabled users.

2 Cycling routes and planning policy

The case for walking and cycling and specifically for maintaining and improving high quality cycling networks is clear at every level of modern planning policy, including:

NPPF 2024's "vision-led approach"
LTN 1/20
Places For Everyone Joint Development Plan Objectives 6, 7 and 10
Places for Everyone Joint Development Plan policies JP-Strat14, JP-C1, JP-C5 and JP-C6
GM Transport Strategy 2040 and the "Right Mix" targets
Greater Manchester Streets for All strategy and Streets for All design guide
Manchester City Council's Active Travel Strategy
Manchester City Council's commitment to be a Zero Carbon city by 2038

The policy position is absolutely clear – changes to the existing road and cycle networks should make cycling more convenient for people, not less convenient.

This specific stretch of Cavendish Street is a key part of the existing cycle network. It appears on TfGM's Bee Network map as a Beeway ("the routes that get people from A to B … representing the most direct routes between crossing points.") and connects to the Stretford Road Busy Beeway ("corridors or crossing points on busier roads that will require a higher level of design intervention to improve cycling and walking.") It is also mapped on the TfGM Cycle Network.

The national standard for cycling infrastructure is DfT guidance note LTN 1/20. LTN 1/20 advises above all else that cycle routes and networks should be Safe, Direct, Comfortable, Attractive and Coherent. Introducing unnecessary diversions, junctions and bends into a well-used existing route undermines all of these core principles, resulting in a lower quality cycle network which will make it harder for the council to achieve its cycling objectives.

The applicant has offered various reasons why diverting cyclists is necessary but all of these reasons seem to be either existing problems, or problems designed into the scheme. The proposal is to demolish and redevelop the site – so considerations like limited space and the placement of entrances, shop frontages, planting and pedestrian areas are entirely within the applicant's scope to manage. Instead of starting with the problem "there is an existing busy cycle route across this

site, how can I design to accommodate everyone's needs?", it seems the applicant has started with the conclusion "cyclists must be deterred" and instructed their consultants to post-rationalise that decision.

3 Misleading claims regarding safety

Page 22 of the Design & Access Statement refers to the "existing controversial link along Cavendish St., which is resulting in collisions of pedestrians, electric scooters, cyclists, etc."

However the map of recorded collisions, on page 18 of the Transport Statement submitted in the same planning application, shows no recorded collisions whatsoever on this link, only on the adjacent main roads.

It appears the applicant is attempting to restrict cycle access based on a "problem" for which they have no evidence.

Yours sincerely,

[redacted]

****

This email and any files transmitted with it are confidential and intended solely for the use of the individual or entity to whom they are addressed. If you have received this email in error, please notify the sender, or [redacted] and then permanently delete the email, attachments and all copies.

The full text of the Council's email disclaimer is available at: www.manchester.gov.uk/emaildisclaimer.

Your personal data is very important to us. Please refer to our privacy notice at: www.manchester.gov.uk/privacy for further information.

This footnote also confirms that this email message has been swept for the presence of computer viruses.

****

Outlook

Fw: Comment on Planning Application 142888/FO/202

From Planning <[redacted]
Date Mon 30/06/2025 14:49
To Lucy Harrison <[redacted]

Information, Delivery & Support Team
Planning, Building Control & Licensing
Growth & Development Directorate
Postal address: Manchester City Council, P O Box 532, Town Hall, Manchester M60 2LA
Location address: Level 6 Town Hall Extension, Manchester M2 5DB
Tel: 0161 234 4516

Please consider the environment before printing an e-mail.

From: [redacted]
Sent: 30 June 2025 14:44
To: Planning <[redacted]
Subject: Comment on Planning Application 142888/FO/202

You don't often get email from [redacted] Learn why this is important

ALERT This message originated outside of the Manchester City Council network. **BE CAUTIOUS** before clicking any links or opening any attachments. Please remember your Cyber Training and report anything suspicious.

Dear Manchester Planning team,

I am writing to lodge an objection to planning application 142888/FO/2025 – Cambridge Halls Of Residence Cavendish Street Manchester M15 6TT.

My primary objection is that the proposals have been designed to deter cyclists from using the safest and most direct route through the site. This route has been open to cyclists ever since the road was first built; it is an essential, well-used part of the city's cycling network and therefore the proposal to deter and/or divert cycles away

from Cavendish Street is directly at odds with Manchester City Council's planning, sustainability and transport policies.

I use this route routinely for commuting and getting into town with my children and have always been very grateful for how safe I feel.

The applicant has also made misleading claims regarding the road's legal status and regarding pedestrian safety which I will outline below.

I am asking that the council refuse this application, and invite the developer to come back with a proposal that maintains direct cycle as well as pedestrian access along Cavendish Street, designed to modern standards set out in Greater Manchester's Streets For All design guide and in Department for Transport guidance note LTN 1/20. I am sure that the Highways team at MCC and the Active Travel team at TfGM will, if asked, be happy to comment on how such a route could be provided within the space available.

I am also asking that the council make a Section 106 agreement (s106) with the applicant to fund safety improvements for pedestrians and cyclists at the junction of Cavendish Street and Higher Cambridge Street – the applicant themselves discuss the shortcomings of the existing junction layout in Section 4.2.1 of the Transport Statement ("Cyclists have also been observed to queue on the footway to gain direct access to the Higher Cambridge Street/Cavendish Street junction (via a gap in the guard railings) rather than following the road markings which advise cyclists to dismount and use the controlled pedestrian crossings"). The improvements might take the form of a CYCLOPS junction. CYCLOPS is a homegrown Greater Manchester innovation now frequently used on Highways schemes across the country to deliver safe pedestrian and cycle movements without undue impact on traffic flows.

For prospective occupants and passers-by alike, in line with the S106 tests as set out in Paragraph 58 of the National Planning Policy Framework (NPPF) 2024, a contribution to junction safety improvements improvement would be 'necessary to make the development acceptable in planning terms' (by contributing to an appropriate movement strategy for the site), 'directly related to the development' (given its proximity, the pressure added to the junction by the proposed threefold increase in residents, and in light of the wholly inadequate mitigation route proposed by the applicant), and 'fairly and reasonably related in scale and kind to the development' (given the stated threefold increase in residents explained by the applicant, so directly adding more pressure to the junction).

1 Legal Status of Cavendish Street

This section of Cavendish Street, an adopted Highway, was subject to a stopping up order dated 14.06.1996. That order required that "the Developer shall provide a new highway which shall be a footpath/cycleway". MMU have since installed physical signage stating that Cavendish Street "has not been dedicated as a Highway" and have bolted down uncomfortable and restrictive speed bumps across the route in an apparent attempt to dissuade cyclists from exercising their legal rights over this space. Both measures may be unlawful, as my understanding is that cyclists do retain a legal Right of Way along Cavendish Street, unchanged from when the entire road was an adopted highway, and the speed bumps are inaccessible to some Disabled users.

2 Cycling routes and planning policy

The case for walking and cycling and specifically for maintaining and improving high quality cycling networks is clear at every level of modern planning policy, including:

NPPF 2024's "vision-led approach"

LTN 1/20
Places For Everyone Joint Development Plan Objectives 6, 7 and 10
Places for Everyone Joint Development Plan policies JP-Strat14, JP-C1, JP-C5 and JP-C6
GM Transport Strategy 2040 and the “Right Mix” targets
Greater Manchester Streets for All strategy and Streets for All design guide
Manchester City Council’s Active Travel Strategy
Manchester City Council’s commitment to be a Zero Carbon city by 2038
The policy position is absolutely clear – changes to the existing road and cycle networks should make cycling more convenient for people, not less convenient.

This specific stretch of Cavendish Street is a key part of the existing cycle network. It appears on TfGM’s Bee Network map as a Beeway (“the routes that get people from A to B … representing the most direct routes between crossing points.”) and connects to the Stretford Road Busy Beeway (“corridors or crossing points on busier roads that will require a higher level of design intervention to improve cycling and walking.”) It is also mapped on the TfGM Cycle Network.

The national standard for cycling infrastructure is DfT guidance note LTN 1/20. LTN 1/20 advises above all else that cycle routes and networks should be Safe, Direct, Comfortable, Attractive and Coherent. Introducing unnecessary diversions, junctions and bends into a well-used existing route undermines all of these core principles, resulting in a lower quality cycle network which will make it harder for the council to achieve its cycling objectives.

The applicant has offered various reasons why diverting cyclists is necessary but all of these reasons seem to be either existing problems, or problems designed into the scheme. The proposal is to demolish and redevelop the site – so considerations like limited space and the placement of entrances, shop frontages, planting and pedestrian areas are entirely within the applicant’s scope to manage. Instead of starting with the problem “there is an existing busy cycle route across this site, how can I design to accommodate everyone’s needs?”, it seems the applicant has started with the conclusion “cyclists must be deterred” and instructed their consultants to post-rationalise that decision.

3 Misleading claims regarding safety

Page 22 of the Design & Access Statement refers to the “existing controversial link along Cavendish St., which is resulting in collisions of pedestrians, electric scooters, cyclists, etc.”

However the map of recorded collisions, on page 18 of the Transport Statement submitted in the same planning application, shows no recorded collisions whatsoever on this link, only on the adjacent main roads.

It appears the applicant is attempting to restrict cycle access based on a “problem” for which they have no evidence.

Yours sincerely,

[redacted]

****
This email and any files transmitted with it are confidential and intended solely for the use of the individual or entity to whom they are addressed.
If you have received this email in error, please notify the sender, or [redacted] and then permanently delete the email, attachments and all copies.
The full text of the Council's email disclaimer is available at: www.manchester.gov.uk/emaildisclaimer.
Your personal data is very important to us. Please refer to our privacy notice at: www.manchester.gov.uk/privacy for further information.

This footnote also confirms that this email message has been swept for the presence of computer viruses.
****

Outlook

Fw: Objection to planning application 142888/FO/2025 – Cambridge Halls Of Residence, Cavendish Street, Manchester M15 6TT

From Planning <[redacted]
Date Mon 07/07/2025 11:05
To Lucy Harrison <[redacted]

Information, Delivery & Support Team
Planning, Building Control & Licensing
Growth & Development Directorate
Postal address: Manchester City Council, P O Box 532, Town Hall, Manchester M60 2LA
Location address: Level 6 Town Hall Extension, Manchester M2 5DB
Tel: 0161 234 4516

Please consider the environment before printing an e-mail.

From: [redacted]
Sent: 06 July 2025 10:15
To: Planning <[redacted]
Subject: Objection to planning application 142888/FO/2025 – Cambridge Halls Of Residence, Cavendish Street, Manchester M15 6TT

You don't often get email from [redacted] Learn why this is important

ALERT This message originated outside of the Manchester City Council network. **BE CAUTIOUS** before clicking any links or opening any attachments. Please remember your Cyber Training and report anything suspicious.

Dear Manchester Planning team

I am writing to lodge an objection to planning application 142888/FO/2025 – Cambridge Halls Of Residence, Cavendish Street, Manchester M15 6TT.

My objection is that the proposals have been designed to deter cyclists from using the safest and most direct route through the site. This route has been open to cyclists ever since the road was first built; it is an essential, well-used part of the city's cycling network and therefore the proposal to deter and/or divert cycles away from Cavendish Street is directly at odds with Manchester City Council's planning, sustainability and transport policies.

It's my direct cycling route from the east, where I both live and work, to the west. It's also on the safest route from the city centre towards the protected cycle lanes and junctions at the Chorlton cycleway and into Trafford – which are often shown off by local cyclists and highways teams to visiting cyclists and local authorities from around the country as an exemplar of active travel. To take a step back on this would be ridiculous at this point in Manchester's country-leading active travel quality story.

I am asking that the council refuse this application, and invite the developer to come back with a proposal that maintains direct cycle as well as pedestrian access along Cavendish Street, designed to modern standards set out in Greater Manchester's Streets For All design guide and in Department for Transport guidance note LTN 1/20.

I am also asking that the council make a Section 106 agreement (s106) with the applicant to fund safety improvements for pedestrians and cyclists at the junction of Cavendish Street and Higher

Cambridge Street – the applicant discusses the shortcomings of the existing junction layout in Section 4.2.1 of the Transport Statement (“Cyclists have also been observed to queue on the footway to gain direct access to the Higher Cambridge Street/Cavendish Street junction (via a gap in the guard railings) rather than following the road markings which advise cyclists to dismount and use the controlled pedestrian crossings”). The improvements might take the form of a protected junction to provide safety for all road users, especially pedestrians and cyclists. The junction has been poorly laid out and confusing for cyclists for a long time, and all improvements would be welcomed.

This specific stretch of Cavendish Street is a key part of the existing cycle network. It appears on TfGM’s Bee Network map as a Beeway (“the routes that get people from A to B … representing the most direct routes between crossing points.”) and connects to the Stretford Road Busy Beeway (“corridors or crossing points on busier roads that will require a higher level of design intervention to improve cycling and walking.”) It is also mapped on the TfGM Cycle Network.

The national standard for cycling infrastructure is DfT guidance note LTN 1/20. LTN 1/20 advises above all else that cycle routes and networks should be Safe, Direct, Comfortable, Attractive and Coherent. Introducing unnecessary diversions, junctions and bends into a well-used existing route undermines all of these core principles, resulting in a lower quality cycle network which will make it harder for the council to achieve its cycling objectives.

Yours sincerely

[redacted]

****
This email and any files transmitted with it are confidential and intended solely for the use of the individual or entity to whom they are addressed.
If you have received this email in error, please notify the sender, or [redacted] and then permanently delete the email, attachments and all copies.
The full text of the Council's email disclaimer is available at: www.manchester.gov.uk/emaildisclaimer.
Your personal data is very important to us. Please refer to our privacy notice at: www.manchester.gov.uk/privacy for further information.

This footnote also confirms that this email message has been swept for the presence of computer viruses.
****

Outlook

Fw: Comment on Planning Application 142888/FO/2025

From Planning <[redacted]
Date Mon 30/06/2025 08:52
To Lucy Harrison <[redacted]

Information, Delivery & Support Team
Planning, Building Control & Licensing
Growth & Development Directorate
Postal address: Manchester City Council, P O Box 532, Town Hall, Manchester M60 2LA
Location address: Level 6 Town Hall Extension, Manchester M2 5DB
Tel: 0161 234 4516

Please consider the environment before printing an e-mail.

From: [redacted]
Sent: 28 June 2025 13:49
To: Planning <[redacted]
Subject: Comment on Planning Application 142888/FO/2025

You don't often get email from [redacted] Learn why this is important

ALERT This message originated outside of the Manchester City Council network. **BE CAUTIOUS** before clicking any links or opening any attachments. Please remember your Cyber Training and report anything suspicious.

Dear Manchester Planning team,

I am writing to lodge an objection to planning application **142888/FO/2025**– Cambridge Halls Of Residence Cavendish Street Manchester M15 6TT.

My primary objection is that the proposals have been designed to deter cyclists from using the safest and most direct route through the site. This route has been open to cyclists ever since the road was first built; it is an essential, well-used part of the city's cycling network and therefore the proposal to deter and/or divert cycles away from Cavendish Street is directly at odds with Manchester City Council's planning, sustainability and transport policies.

I have used this route as a through route as both a pedestrian, alighting buses from the south at All Saints Park, in order to walk to destinations in Hulme

including my workplace. Additionally it provides a direct cycling route from the A6 and the Oxford Road corridor to other locations in the south of the city.

The applicant has also made misleading claims regarding the road's legal status and regarding pedestrian safety which I will outline below.

I am asking that the council **refuse** this application, and invite the developer to come back with a proposal that maintains direct cycle as well as pedestrian access along Cavendish Street, designed to modern standards set out in Greater Manchester's Streets For All design guide and in Department for Transport guidance note LTN 1/20. I am sure that the Highways team at MCC and the Active Travel team at TfGM will, if asked, be happy to comment on how such a route could be provided within the space available.

I am also asking that the council **make a Section 106 agreement (s106)** with the applicant to fund safety improvements for pedestrians and cyclists at the junction of Cavendish Street and Higher Cambridge Street – the applicant themselves discuss the shortcomings of the existing junction layout in Section 4.2.1 of the Transport Statement ("*Cyclists have also been observed to queue on the footway to gain direct access to the Higher Cambridge Street/Cavendish Street junction (via a gap in the guard railings) rather than following the road markings which advise cyclists to dismount and use the controlled pedestrian crossings*"). The improvements might take the form of a CYCLOPS junction. CYCLOPS is a homegrown Greater Manchester innovation now frequently used on Highways schemes across the country to deliver safe pedestrian and cycle movements without undue impact on traffic flows.

For prospective occupants and passers-by alike, in line with the S106 tests as set out in Paragraph 58 of the National Planning Policy Framework (NPPF) 2024, a contribution to junction safety improvements improvement would be 'necessary to make the development acceptable in planning terms' (by contributing to an appropriate movement strategy for the site), 'directly related to the development' (given its proximity, the pressure added to the junction by the proposed threefold increase in residents, and in light of the wholly inadequate mitigation route proposed by the applicant), and 'fairly and reasonably related in scale and kind to the development' (given the stated threefold increase in residents explained by the applicant, so directly adding more pressure to the junction).

1 Legal Status of Cavendish Street

This section of Cavendish Street, an adopted Highway, was subject to a stopping up order dated 14.06.1996. That order required that "the Developer shall provide

a new highway which shall be a footpath/cycleway". MMU have since installed physical signage stating that Cavendish Street "has not been dedicated as a Highway" and have bolted down uncomfortable and restrictive speed bumps across the route in an apparent attempt to dissuade cyclists from exercising their legal rights over this space. Both measures may be unlawful, as my understanding is that cyclists do retain a legal Right of Way along Cavendish Street, unchanged from when the entire road was an adopted highway, and the speed bumps are inaccessible to some Disabled users.

2 Cycling routes and planning policy

The case for walking and cycling and specifically for maintaining and improving high quality cycling networks is clear at every level of modern planning policy, including:

- NPPF 2024's "vision-led approach"
- LTN 1/20
- Places For Everyone Joint Development Plan Objectives 6, 7 and 10
- Places for Everyone Joint Development Plan policies JP-Strat14, JP-C1, JP-C5 and JP-C6
- GM Transport Strategy 2040 and the "Right Mix" targets
- Greater Manchester Streets for All strategy and Streets for All design guide
- Manchester City Council's Active Travel Strategy
- Manchester City Council's commitment to be a Zero Carbon city by 2038

The policy position is absolutely clear – changes to the existing road and cycle networks should make cycling more convenient for people, not less convenient.

This specific stretch of Cavendish Street is a key part of the existing cycle network. It appears on TfGM's Bee Network map as a Beeway ("the routes that get people from A to B … representing the most direct routes between crossing points.") and connects to the Stretford Road Busy Beeway ("corridors or crossing points on busier roads that will require a higher level of design intervention to improve cycling and walking.") It is also mapped on the TfGM Cycle Network.

The national standard for cycling infrastructure is DfT guidance note LTN 1/20. LTN 1/20 advises above all else that cycle routes and networks should be Safe, Direct, Comfortable, Attractive and Coherent. Introducing unnecessary diversions, junctions and bends into a well-used existing route undermines all of these core

principles, resulting in a lower quality cycle network which will make it harder for the council to achieve its cycling objectives.

The applicant has offered various reasons why diverting cyclists is necessary but all of these reasons seem to be either existing problems, or problems designed into the scheme. The proposal is to demolish and redevelop the site – so considerations like limited space and the placement of entrances, shop frontages, planting and pedestrian areas are entirely within the applicant's scope to manage. Instead of starting with the problem "there is an existing busy cycle route across this site, how can I design to accommodate everyone's needs?", it seems the applicant has started with the conclusion "cyclists must be deterred" and instructed their consultants to post-rationalise that decision.

3 Misleading claims regarding safety

Page 22 of the Design & Access Statement refers to the "existing controversial link along Cavendish St., which is resulting in collisions of pedestrians, electric scooters, cyclists, etc."

However the map of recorded collisions, on page 18 of the Transport Statement submitted in the same planning application, shows no recorded collisions whatsoever on this link, only on the adjacent main roads.

It appears the applicant is attempting to restrict cycle access based on a "problem" for which they have no evidence.

Yours sincerely,

[redacted]

****
This email and any files transmitted with it are confidential and intended solely for the use of the individual or entity to whom they are addressed.
If you have received this email in error, please notify the sender, or [redacted] and then permanently delete the email, attachments and all copies.
The full text of the Council's email disclaimer is available at: www.manchester.gov.uk/emaildisclaimer.
Your personal data is very important to us. Please refer to our privacy notice at: www.manchester.gov.uk/privacy for further information.

This footnote also confirms that this email message has been swept for the presence of computer viruses.
****

Outlook

Fw: Comment on Planning Application 142888/FO/2025

From Planning <[redacted]
Date Tue 01/07/2025 11:57
To Lucy Harrison <[redacted]

Information, Delivery & Support Team
Planning, Building Control & Licensing
Growth & Development Directorate
Postal address: Manchester City Council, P O Box 532, Town Hall, Manchester M60 2LA
Location address: Level 6 Town Hall Extension, Manchester M2 5DB
Tel: 0161 234 4516

Please consider the environment before printing an e-mail.

From: [redacted]
Sent: 01 July 2025 11:40
To: Planning <[redacted]
Subject: Comment on Planning Application 142888/FO/2025

You don't often get email from [redacted] Learn why this is important

ALERT This message originated outside of the Manchester City Council network. **BE CAUTIOUS** before clicking any links or opening any attachments. Please remember your Cyber Training and report anything suspicious.

Dear Manchester Planning team,

I am writing to lodge an objection to planning application 142888/FO/2025 – Cambridge Halls Of Residence Cavendish Street Manchester M15 6TT.

My primary objection is that the proposals have been designed to deter cyclists from using the safest and most direct route through the site. This route has been open to cyclists ever since the road was first built; it is an essential, well-used part of the city's cycling network and therefore the proposal to deter and/or divert cycles away from Cavendish Street is directly at odds with Manchester City Council's planning, sustainability and transport policies.

I work in central Manchester and rely on this route and others like it. I really appreciate the steps MCC have taken in recent years to make cycling more accessible, convenient and safe – which is partly why it's so important not to let the Cavendish Street route be taken away. I would love to see the opposite – an upgrade to the existing route to comply with LTN 1/20 and to allow cyclists to cross to/from Stretford Road in both directions.

The applicant has also made misleading claims regarding the road's legal status and regarding pedestrian safety which I will outline below.

I am asking that the council refuse this application, and invite the developer to come back with a proposal that maintains direct cycle as well as pedestrian access along Cavendish Street, designed to modern standards set out in Greater Manchester's Streets For All design guide and in Department for Transport guidance note LTN 1/20. I am sure that the Highways team at MCC and the Active Travel team at TfGM will, if asked, be happy to comment on how such a route could be provided within the space available.

I am also asking that the council make a Section 106 agreement (s106) with the applicant to fund safety improvements for pedestrians and cyclists at the junction of Cavendish Street and Higher Cambridge Street – the applicant themselves discuss the shortcomings of the existing junction layout in Section 4.2.1 of the Transport Statement ("Cyclists have also been observed to queue on the footway to gain direct access to the Higher Cambridge Street/Cavendish Street junction (via a gap in the guard railings) rather than following the road markings which advise cyclists to dismount and use the controlled pedestrian crossings"). The improvements might take the form of a CYCLOPS junction. CYCLOPS is a homegrown Greater Manchester innovation now frequently used on Highways schemes across the country to deliver safe pedestrian and cycle movements without undue impact on traffic flows.

For prospective occupants and passers-by alike, in line with the S106 tests as set out in Paragraph 58 of the National Planning Policy Framework (NPPF) 2024, a contribution to junction safety improvements improvement would be 'necessary to make the development acceptable in planning terms' (by contributing to an appropriate movement strategy for the site), 'directly related to the development' (given its proximity, the pressure added to the junction by the proposed threefold increase in residents, and in light of the wholly inadequate mitigation route proposed by the applicant), and 'fairly and reasonably related in scale and kind to the development' (given the stated threefold increase in residents explained by the applicant, so directly adding more pressure to the junction).

1 Legal Status of Cavendish Street

This section of Cavendish Street, an adopted Highway, was subject to a stopping up order dated 14.06.1996. That order required that "the Developer shall provide a new highway which shall be a footpath/cycleway". MMU have since installed physical signage stating that Cavendish Street "has not been dedicated as a Highway" and have bolted down uncomfortable and restrictive speed bumps across the route in an apparent attempt to dissuade cyclists from exercising their legal rights over this space. Both measures may be unlawful, as my understanding is that cyclists do retain a legal Right of Way along Cavendish Street, unchanged from when the entire road was an adopted highway, and the speed bumps are inaccessible to some Disabled users.

2 Cycling routes and planning policy

The case for walking and cycling and specifically for maintaining and improving high quality cycling networks is clear at every level of modern planning policy, including:

- NPPF 2024's "vision-led approach"
- LTN 1/20
- Places For Everyone Joint Development Plan Objectives 6, 7 and 10
- Places for Everyone Joint Development Plan policies JP-Strat14, JP-C1, JP-C5 and JP-C6
- GM Transport Strategy 2040 and the "Right Mix" targets
- Greater Manchester Streets for All strategy and Streets for All design guide
- Manchester City Council's Active Travel Strategy
- Manchester City Council's commitment to be a Zero Carbon city by 2038

- The policy position is absolutely clear – changes to the existing road and cycle networks should make cycling more convenient for people, not less convenient.

This specific stretch of Cavendish Street is a key part of the existing cycle network. It appears on TfGM's Bee Network map as a Beeway ("the routes that get people from A to B … representing the most direct routes between crossing points.") and connects to the Stretford Road Busy Beeway ("corridors or crossing points on busier roads that will require a higher level of design intervention to improve cycling and walking.") It is also mapped on the TfGM Cycle Network.

The national standard for cycling infrastructure is DfT guidance note LTN 1/20. LTN 1/20 advises above all else that cycle routes and networks should be Safe, Direct, Comfortable, Attractive and Coherent. Introducing unnecessary diversions, junctions and bends into a well-used existing route undermines all of these core principles, resulting in a lower quality cycle network which will make it harder for the council to achieve its cycling objectives.

The applicant has offered various reasons why diverting cyclists is necessary but all of these reasons seem to be either existing problems, or problems designed into the scheme. The proposal is to demolish and redevelop the site – so considerations like limited space and the placement of entrances, shop frontages, planting and pedestrian areas are entirely within the applicant's scope to manage. Instead of starting with the problem "there is an existing busy cycle route across this site, how can I design to accommodate everyone's needs?", it seems the applicant has started with the conclusion "cyclists must be deterred" and instructed their consultants to post-rationalise that decision.

3 Misleading claims regarding safety

Page 22 of the Design & Access Statement refers to the "existing controversial link along Cavendish St., which is resulting in collisions of pedestrians, electric scooters, cyclists, etc."

However the map of recorded collisions, on page 18 of the Transport Statement submitted in the same planning application, shows no recorded collisions whatsoever on this link, only on the adjacent main roads.

It appears the applicant is attempting to restrict cycle access based on a "problem" for which they have no evidence.

Yours sincerely,

[redacted]

****
This email and any files transmitted with it are confidential and intended solely for the use of the individual or entity to whom they are addressed.
If you have received this email in error, please notify the sender, or [redacted] and then permanently delete the email, attachments and all copies.
The full text of the Council's email disclaimer is available at: www.manchester.gov.uk/emaildisclaimer.
Your personal data is very important to us. Please refer to our privacy notice at: www.manchester.gov.uk/privacy for further information.

This footnote also confirms that this email message has been swept for the presence of computer viruses.
****

Outlook

Fw: Comment on Planning Application 142888/FO/2025

From Planning <[redacted]>
Date Mon 14/07/2025 14:07
To Lucy Harrison <[redacted]>

Information, Delivery & Support Team
Planning, Building Control & Licensing
Growth & Development Directorate
Postal address: Manchester City Council, P O Box 532, Town Hall, Manchester M60 2LA
Location address: Level 6 Town Hall Extension, Manchester M2 5DB
Tel: 0161 234 4516

Please consider the environment before printing an e-mail.

From: [redacted]
Sent: 11 July 2025 10:40
To: Planning <[redacted]>
Subject: Comment on Planning Application 142888/FO/2025

You don't often get email from [redacted] Learn why this is important

ALERT This message originated outside of the Manchester City Council network. **BE CAUTIOUS** before clicking any links or opening any attachments. Please remember your Cyber Training and report anything suspicious.

Dear Manchester Planning team,

I am writing to lodge an objection to planning application 142888/FO/2025 – Cambridge Halls Of Residence Cavendish Street Manchester M15 6TT.

My primary objection is that the proposals have been designed to deter cyclists from using the safest and most direct route through the site. This route has been open to cyclists ever since the road was first built; it is an essential, well-used part of the city's cycling network and therefore the proposal to deter and/or divert cycles away from Cavendish Street is directly at odds with Manchester City Council's planning, sustainability and transport policies.

The applicant has also made misleading claims regarding the road's legal status and regarding pedestrian safety which I will outline below.

I am asking that the council **refuse** this application, and invite the developer to come back with a proposal that maintains direct cycle as well as pedestrian access along Cavendish Street, designed to modern standards set out in Greater Manchester's Streets For All design guide and in Department for Transport guidance note LTN 1/20. I am sure that the Highways team at MCC

and the Active Travel team at TfGM will, if asked, be happy to comment on how such a route could be provided within the space available.

I am also asking that the council **make a Section 106 agreement (s106)** with the applicant to fund safety improvements for pedestrians and cyclists at the junction of Cavendish Street and Higher Cambridge Street – the applicant themselves discuss the shortcomings of the existing junction layout in Section 4.2.1 of the Transport Statement ("*Cyclists have also been observed to queue on the footway to gain direct access to the Higher Cambridge Street/Cavendish Street junction (via a gap in the guard railings) rather than following the road markings which advise cyclists to dismount and use the controlled pedestrian crossings*"). The improvements might take the form of a CYCLOPS junction. CYCLOPS is a homegrown Greater Manchester innovation now frequently used on Highways schemes across the country to deliver safe pedestrian and cycle movements without undue impact on traffic flows.

For prospective occupants and passers-by alike, in line with the S106 tests as set out in Paragraph 58 of the National Planning Policy Framework (NPPF) 2024, a contribution to junction safety improvements improvement would be 'necessary to make the development acceptable in planning terms' (by contributing to an appropriate movement strategy for the site), 'directly related to the development' (given its proximity, the pressure added to the junction by the proposed threefold increase in residents, and in light of the wholly inadequate mitigation route proposed by the applicant), and 'fairly and reasonably related in scale and kind to the development' (given the stated threefold increase in residents explained by the applicant, so directly adding more pressure to the junction).

1 Legal Status of Cavendish Street

This section of Cavendish Street, an adopted Highway, was subject to a stopping up order dated 14.06.1996. That order required that "the Developer shall provide a new highway which shall be a footpath/cycleway". MMU have since installed physical signage stating that Cavendish Street "has not been dedicated as a Highway" and have bolted down uncomfortable and restrictive speed bumps across the route in an apparent attempt to dissuade cyclists from exercising their legal rights over this space. Both measures may be unlawful, as my understanding is that cyclists do retain a legal Right of Way along Cavendish Street, unchanged from when the entire road was an adopted highway, and the speed bumps are inaccessible to some Disabled users.

2 Cycling routes and planning policy

The case for walking and cycling and specifically for maintaining and improving high quality cycling networks is clear at every level of modern planning policy, including:

NPPF 2024's "vision-led approach"

LTN 1/20

Places For Everyone Joint Development Plan Objectives 6, 7 and 10

Places for Everyone Joint Development Plan policies JP-Strat14, JP-C1, JP-C5 and JP-C6

GM Transport Strategy 2040 and the "Right Mix" targets

Greater Manchester Streets for All strategy and Streets for All design guide

Manchester City Council's Active Travel Strategy

Manchester City Council's commitment to be a Zero Carbon city by 2038

The policy position is absolutely clear – changes to the existing road and cycle networks should make cycling more convenient for people, not less convenient.

This specific stretch of Cavendish Street is a key part of the existing cycle network. It appears on TfGM's Bee Network map as a Beeway ("the routes that get people from A to B … representing the most direct routes between crossing points.") and connects to the Stretford Road Busy Beeway ("corridors or crossing points on busier roads that will require a higher level of design intervention to improve cycling and walking.") It is also mapped on the TfGM Cycle Network.

The national standard for cycling infrastructure is DfT guidance note LTN 1/20. LTN 1/20 advises above all else that cycle routes and networks should be Safe, Direct, Comfortable, Attractive and Coherent. Introducing unnecessary diversions, junctions and bends into a well-used existing route undermines all of these core principles, resulting in a lower quality cycle network which will make it harder for the council to achieve its cycling objectives.

The applicant has offered various reasons why diverting cyclists is necessary but all of these reasons seem to be either existing problems, or problems designed into the scheme. The proposal is to demolish and redevelop the site – so considerations like limited space and the placement of entrances, shop frontages, planting and pedestrian areas are entirely within the applicant's scope to manage. Instead of starting with the problem "there is an existing busy cycle route across this site, how can I design to accommodate everyone's needs?", it seems the applicant has started with the conclusion "cyclists must be deterred" and instructed their consultants to post-rationalise that decision.

3 Misleading claims regarding safety

Page 22 of the Design & Access Statement refers to the "existing controversial link along Cavendish St., which is resulting in collisions of pedestrians, electric scooters, cyclists, etc."

However the map of recorded collisions, on page 18 of the Transport Statement submitted in the same planning application, shows no recorded collisions whatsoever on this link, only on the adjacent main roads.

It appears the applicant is attempting to restrict cycle access based on a "problem" for which they have no evidence.

Yours sincerely

[redacted]

[redacted]

****
This email and any files transmitted with it are confidential and intended solely for the use of the individual or entity to whom they are addressed.
If you have received this email in error, please notify the sender, or [redacted] and then permanently delete the email, attachments and all copies.
The full text of the Council's email disclaimer is available at: www.manchester.gov.uk/emaildisclaimer.
Your personal data is very important to us. Please refer to our privacy notice at: www.manchester.gov.uk/privacy for further information.

This footnote also confirms that this email message has been swept for the presence of computer viruses.
****

Outlook

Fw: Comment on Planning Application 142888/FO/2025

From Planning <[redacted]
Date Fri 04/07/2025 14:09
To Lucy Harrison <[redacted]

Information, Delivery & Support Team
Planning, Building Control & Licensing
Growth & Development Directorate
Postal address: Manchester City Council, P O Box 532, Town Hall, Manchester M60 2LA
Location address: Level 6 Town Hall Extension, Manchester M2 5DB
Tel: 0161 234 4516

Please consider the environment before printing an e-mail.

From: [redacted]
Sent: 28 June 2025 15:33
To: Planning <[redacted]
Subject: Comment on Planning Application 142888/FO/2025

You don't often get email from [redacted] Learn why this is important

ALERT This message originated outside of the Manchester City Council network. **BE CAUTIOUS** before clicking any links or opening any attachments. Please remember your Cyber Training and report anything suspicious.

Subject: Comment on Planning Application 142888/FO/2025

Dear Manchester Planning team,

I am writing to lodge an objection to planning application **142888/FO/2025** – Cambridge Halls Of Residence Cavendish Street Manchester M15 6TT.

My primary objection is that the proposals have been designed to deter cyclists from using the safest and most direct route through the site. This route has been open to cyclists ever since the road was first built; it is an essential, well-used part of the city's cycling network and therefore the proposal to deter and/or divert

cycles away from Cavendish Street is directly at odds with Manchester City Council's planning, sustainability and transport policies.

Personally, closing this route will affect my leisure and commuting journeys, the alternative put cyclists into busy traffic route.

The applicant has also made misleading claims regarding the road's legal status and regarding pedestrian safety which I will outline below.

I am asking that the council **refuse** this application, and invite the developer to come back with a proposal that maintains direct cycle as well as pedestrian access along Cavendish Street, designed to modern standards set out in Greater Manchester's Streets For All design guide and in Department for Transport guidance note LTN 1/20. I am sure that the Highways team at MCC and the Active Travel team at TfGM will, if asked, be happy to comment on how such a route could be provided within the space available.

I am also asking that the council **make a Section 106 agreement (s106)** with the applicant to fund safety improvements for pedestrians and cyclists at the junction of Cavendish Street and Higher Cambridge Street – the applicant themselves discuss the shortcomings of the existing junction layout in Section 4.2.1 of the Transport Statement ("*Cyclists have also been observed to queue on the footway to gain direct access to the Higher Cambridge Street/Cavendish Street junction (via a gap in the guard railings) rather than following the road markings which advise cyclists to dismount and use the controlled pedestrian crossings*"). The improvements might take the form of a CYCLOPS junction. CYCLOPS is a homegrown Greater Manchester innovation now frequently used on Highways schemes across the country to deliver safe pedestrian and cycle movements without undue impact on traffic flows.

For prospective occupants and passers-by alike, in line with the S106 tests as set out in Paragraph 58 of the National Planning Policy Framework (NPPF) 2024, a contribution to junction safety improvements improvement would be 'necessary to make the development acceptable in planning terms' (by contributing to an appropriate movement strategy for the site), 'directly related to the development' (given its proximity, the pressure added to the junction by the proposed threefold increase in residents, and in light of the wholly inadequate mitigation route proposed by the applicant), and 'fairly and reasonably related in scale and kind to the development' (given the stated threefold increase in residents explained by the applicant, so directly adding more pressure to the junction).

1 Legal Status of Cavendish Street

This section of Cavendish Street, an adopted Highway, was subject to a stopping up order dated 14.06.1996. That order required that "the Developer shall provide a new highway which shall be a footpath/cycleway". MMU have since installed physical signage stating that Cavendish Street "has not been dedicated as a Highway" and have bolted down uncomfortable and restrictive speed bumps across the route in an apparent attempt to dissuade cyclists from exercising their legal rights over this space. Both measures may be unlawful, as my understanding is that cyclists do retain a legal Right of Way along Cavendish Street, unchanged from when the entire road was an adopted highway, and the speed bumps are inaccessible to some Disabled users.

2 Cycling routes and planning policy

The case for walking and cycling and specifically for maintaining and improving high quality cycling networks is clear at every level of modern planning policy, including:

- NPPF 2024's "vision-led approach"
- LTN 1/20
- Places For Everyone Joint Development Plan Objectives 6, 7 and 10
- Places for Everyone Joint Development Plan policies JP-Strat14, JP-C1, JP-C5 and JP-C6
- GM Transport Strategy 2040 and the "Right Mix" targets
- Greater Manchester Streets for All strategy and Streets for All design guide
- Manchester City Council's Active Travel Strategy
- Manchester City Council's commitment to be a Zero Carbon city by 2038

The policy position is absolutely clear – changes to the existing road and cycle networks should make cycling more convenient for people, not less convenient.

This specific stretch of Cavendish Street is a key part of the existing cycle network. It appears on TfGM's Bee Network map as a Beeway ("the routes that get people from A to B … representing the most direct routes between crossing points.") and connects to the Stretford Road Busy Beeway ("corridors or crossing points on busier roads that will require a higher level of design intervention to improve cycling and walking.") It is also mapped on the TfGM Cycle Network.

The national standard for cycling infrastructure is DfT guidance note LTN 1/20. LTN 1/20 advises above all else that cycle routes and networks should be Safe, Direct, Comfortable, Attractive and Coherent. Introducing unnecessary diversions,

junctions and bends into a well-used existing route undermines all of these core principles, resulting in a lower quality cycle network which will make it harder for the council to achieve its cycling objectives.

The applicant has offered various reasons why diverting cyclists is necessary but all of these reasons seem to be either existing problems, or problems designed into the scheme. The proposal is to demolish and redevelop the site – so considerations like limited space and the placement of entrances, shop frontages, planting and pedestrian areas are entirely within the applicant's scope to manage. Instead of starting with the problem "there is an existing busy cycle route across this site, how can I design to accommodate everyone's needs?", it seems the applicant has started with the conclusion "cyclists must be deterred" and instructed their consultants to post-rationalise that decision.

3 Misleading claims regarding safety

Page 22 of the Design & Access Statement refers to the "existing controversial link along Cavendish St., which is resulting in collisions of pedestrians, electric scooters, cyclists, etc."

However the map of recorded collisions, on page 18 of the Transport Statement submitted in the same planning application, shows no recorded collisions whatsoever on this link, only on the adjacent main roads.

It appears the applicant is attempting to restrict cycle access based on a "problem" for which they have no evidence.

Yours sincerely,

[redacted]

****
This email and any files transmitted with it are confidential and intended solely for the use of the individual or entity to whom they are addressed.
If you have received this email in error, please notify the sender, or [redacted] and then permanently delete the email, attachments and all copies.
The full text of the Council's email disclaimer is available at: www.manchester.gov.uk/emaildisclaimer.
Your personal data is very important to us. Please refer to our privacy notice at: www.manchester.gov.uk/privacy for further information.

This footnote also confirms that this email message has been swept for the presence of computer viruses.
****

Outlook

Fw: Comment on Planning Application 142888/FO/2025

From Planning <[redacted]
Date Mon 14/07/2025 14:05
To Lucy Harrison <[redacted]

Information, Delivery & Support Team
Planning, Building Control & Licensing
Growth & Development Directorate
Postal address: Manchester City Council, P O Box 532, Town Hall, Manchester M60 2LA
Location address: Level 6 Town Hall Extension, Manchester M2 5DB
Tel: 0161 234 4516

Please consider the environment before printing an e-mail.

From: [redacted]
Sent: 11 July 2025 19:51
To: Planning <[redacted]
Subject: Comment on Planning Application 142888/FO/2025

You don't often get email from [redacted] Learn why this is important

ALERT This message originated outside of the Manchester City Council network. **BE CAUTIOUS** before clicking any links or opening any attachments. Please remember your Cyber Training and report anything suspicious.

Dear Manchester Planning team,

I am writing to lodge an objection to planning application **142888/FO/2025** – Cambridge Halls Of Residence Cavendish Street Manchester M15 6TT.

My primary objection is that the proposals have been designed to deter cyclists from using the safest and most direct route through the site. This route has been open to cyclists ever since the road was first built; it is an essential, well-used part of the city's cycling network and therefore the proposal to deter and/or divert cycles away from Cavendish Street is directly at odds with Manchester City Council's planning, sustainability and transport policies.

I regularly cycle on this route to Oxford Road and the city centre, it is part of a route I take from where I live in Whalley Range with minimal road traffic.

The applicant has also made misleading claims regarding the road's legal status and regarding pedestrian safety which I will outline below.

I am asking that the council **refuse** this application, and invite the developer to come back with a proposal that maintains direct cycle as well as pedestrian access along Cavendish Street, designed to modern standards set out in Greater Manchester's Streets For All design guide and in Department for Transport guidance note LTN 1/20. I am sure that the Highways team at MCC and the Active Travel

team at TfGM will, if asked, be happy to comment on how such a route could be provided within the space available.

I am also asking that the council **make a Section 106 agreement (s106)** with the applicant to fund safety improvements for pedestrians and cyclists at the junction of Cavendish Street and Higher Cambridge Street – the applicant themselves discuss the shortcomings of the existing junction layout in Section 4.2.1 of the Transport Statement ("*Cyclists have also been observed to queue on the footway to gain direct access to the Higher Cambridge Street/Cavendish Street junction (via a gap in the guard railings) rather than following the road markings which advise cyclists to dismount and use the controlled pedestrian crossings*"). The improvements might take the form of a CYCLOPS junction. CYCLOPS is a homegrown Greater Manchester innovation now frequently used on Highways schemes across the country to deliver safe pedestrian and cycle movements without undue impact on traffic flows.

For prospective occupants and passers-by alike, in line with the S106 tests as set out in Paragraph 58 of the National Planning Policy Framework (NPPF) 2024, a contribution to junction safety improvements improvement would be 'necessary to make the development acceptable in planning terms' (by contributing to an appropriate movement strategy for the site), 'directly related to the development' (given its proximity, the pressure added to the junction by the proposed threefold increase in residents, and in light of the wholly inadequate mitigation route proposed by the applicant), and 'fairly and reasonably related in scale and kind to the development' (given the stated threefold increase in residents explained by the applicant, so directly adding more pressure to the junction).

1 Legal Status of Cavendish Street

This section of Cavendish Street, an adopted Highway, was subject to a stopping up order dated 14.06.1996. That order required that "the Developer shall provide a new highway which shall be a footpath/cycleway". MMU have since installed physical signage stating that Cavendish Street "has not been dedicated as a Highway" and have bolted down uncomfortable and restrictive speed bumps across the route in an apparent attempt to dissuade cyclists from exercising their legal rights over this space. Both measures may be unlawful, as my understanding is that cyclists do retain a legal Right of Way along Cavendish Street, unchanged from when the entire road was an adopted highway, and the speed bumps are inaccessible to some Disabled users.

2 Cycling routes and planning policy

The case for walking and cycling and specifically for maintaining and improving high quality cycling networks is clear at every level of modern planning policy, including:

- NPPF 2024's "vision-led approach"
- LTN 1/20
- Places For Everyone Joint Development Plan Objectives 6, 7 and 10
- Places for Everyone Joint Development Plan policies JP-Strat14, JP-C1, JP-C5 and JP-C6
- GM Transport Strategy 2040 and the "Right Mix" targets
- Greater Manchester Streets for All strategy and Streets for All design guide
- Manchester City Council's Active Travel Strategy
- Manchester City Council's commitment to be a Zero Carbon city by 2038

The policy position is absolutely clear – changes to the existing road and cycle networks should make cycling more convenient for people, not less convenient.

This specific stretch of Cavendish Street is a key part of the existing cycle network. It appears on TfGM's Bee Network map as a Beeway ("the routes that get people from A to B … representing the most direct routes between crossing points.") and connects to the Stretford Road Busy Beeway

("corridors or crossing points on busier roads that will require a higher level of design intervention to improve cycling and walking.") It is also mapped on the TfGM Cycle Network.

The national standard for cycling infrastructure is DfT guidance note LTN 1/20. LTN 1/20 advises above all else that cycle routes and networks should be Safe, Direct, Comfortable, Attractive and Coherent. Introducing unnecessary diversions, junctions and bends into a well-used existing route undermines all of these core principles, resulting in a lower quality cycle network which will make it harder for the council to achieve its cycling objectives.

The applicant has offered various reasons why diverting cyclists is necessary but all of these reasons seem to be either existing problems, or problems designed into the scheme. The proposal is to demolish and redevelop the site – so considerations like limited space and the placement of entrances, shop frontages, planting and pedestrian areas are entirely within the applicant's scope to manage. Instead of starting with the problem "there is an existing busy cycle route across this site, how can I design to accommodate everyone's needs?", it seems the applicant has started with the conclusion "cyclists must be deterred" and instructed their consultants to post-rationalise that decision.

3 Misleading claims regarding safety

Page 22 of the Design & Access Statement refers to the "existing controversial link along Cavendish St., which is resulting in collisions of pedestrians, electric scooters, cyclists, etc."

However the map of recorded collisions, on page 18 of the Transport Statement submitted in the same planning application, shows no recorded collisions whatsoever on this link, only on the adjacent main roads.

It appears the applicant is attempting to restrict cycle access based on a "problem" for which they have no evidence.

Yours sincerely,

[redacted]

[redacted]

[redacted]

[redacted]

[redacted]

****
This email and any files transmitted with it are confidential and intended solely for the use of the individual or entity to whom they are addressed.
If you have received this email in error, please notify the sender, or [redacted] and then permanently delete the email, attachments and all copies.
The full text of the Council's email disclaimer is available at: www.manchester.gov.uk/emaildisclaimer.
Your personal data is very important to us. Please refer to our privacy notice at: www.manchester.gov.uk/privacy for further information.

This footnote also confirms that this email message has been swept for the presence of computer viruses.
****

Outlook

Fw: 142888/FO/2025

From Planning <[redacted]
Date Mon 30/06/2025 08:50
To Lucy Harrison <[redacted]

Information, Delivery & Support Team
Planning, Building Control & Licensing
Growth & Development Directorate
Postal address: Manchester City Council, P O Box 532, Town Hall, Manchester M60 2LA
Location address: Level 6 Town Hall Extension, Manchester M2 5DB
Tel: 0161 234 4516

Please consider the environment before printing an e-mail.

From: [redacted]
Sent: 28 June 2025 16:10
To: Planning <[redacted] Bev Woodward <[redacted]
Subject: 142888/FO/2025

You don't often get email from [redacted] Learn why this is important

ALERT This message originated outside of the Manchester City Council network. **BE CAUTIOUS** before clicking any links or opening any attachments. Please remember your Cyber Training and report anything suspicious.

Subject: Comment on Planning Application 142888/FO/2025

Dear Manchester Planning team,

I am writing to lodge an objection to planning application **142888/FO/2025** – Cambridge Halls Of Residence Cavendish Street Manchester M15 6TT.

My primary objection is that the proposals have been designed to deter cyclists from using the safest and most direct route through the site. This route has been open to cyclists ever since the road was first built; it is an essential, well-used part of the city's cycling network and therefore the proposal to deter and/or divert cycles away from Cavendish Street is directly at odds with Manchester City Council's planning, sustainability and transport policies.

The applicant has also made misleading claims regarding the road's legal status and regarding pedestrian safety which I will outline below.

I am asking that the council **refuse** this application, and invite the developer to come back with a proposal that maintains direct cycle as well as pedestrian access along Cavendish Street, designed to modern standards set out in Greater Manchester's Streets For All design guide and in Department for Transport guidance note LTN 1/20. I am sure that the Highways team at MCC and the Active Travel team at TfGM will, if asked, be happy to comment on how such a route could be provided within the space available.

I am also asking that the council **make a Section 106 agreement (s106)** with the applicant to fund safety improvements for pedestrians and cyclists at the junction of Cavendish Street and Higher Cambridge Street – the applicant themselves discuss the shortcomings of the existing junction layout in Section 4.2.1 of the Transport Statement ("*Cyclists have also been observed to queue on the footway to gain direct access to the Higher Cambridge Street/Cavendish Street junction (via a gap in the guard railings) rather than following the road markings which advise cyclists to dismount and use the controlled pedestrian crossings*"). The improvements might take the form of a CYCLOPS junction. CYCLOPS is a homegrown Greater Manchester innovation now frequently used on Highways schemes across the country to deliver safe pedestrian and cycle movements without undue impact on traffic flows.

For prospective occupants and passers-by alike, in line with the S106 tests as set out in Paragraph 58 of the National Planning Policy Framework (NPPF) 2024, a contribution to junction safety improvements improvement would be ‘necessary to make the development acceptable in planning terms’ (by contributing to an appropriate movement strategy for the site), ‘directly related to the development’ (given its proximity, the pressure added to the junction by the proposed threefold increase in residents, and in light of the wholly inadequate mitigation route proposed by the applicant), and ‘fairly and reasonably related in scale and kind to the development’ (given the stated threefold increase in residents explained by the applicant, so directly adding more pressure to the junction).

1 Legal Status of Cavendish Street

This section of Cavendish Street, an adopted Highway, was subject to a stopping up order dated 14.06.1996. That order required that “the Developer shall provide a new highway which shall be a footpath/cycleway”. MMU have since installed physical signage stating that Cavendish Street “has not been dedicated as a Highway” and have bolted down uncomfortable and restrictive speed bumps across the route in an apparent attempt to dissuade cyclists from exercising their legal rights over this space. Both measures may be unlawful, as my understanding is that cyclists do retain a legal Right of Way along Cavendish Street, unchanged from when the entire road was an adopted highway, and the speed bumps are inaccessible to some Disabled users.

2 Cycling routes and planning policy

The case for walking and cycling and specifically for maintaining and improving high quality cycling networks is clear at every level of modern planning policy, including:

- NPPF 2024's "vision-led approach"
- LTN 1/20
- Places For Everyone Joint Development Plan Objectives 6, 7 and 10
- Places for Everyone Joint Development Plan policies JP-Strat14, JP-C1, JP-C5 and JP-C6
- GM Transport Strategy 2040 and the "Right Mix" targets
- Greater Manchester Streets for All strategy and Streets for All design guide
- Manchester City Council's Active Travel Strategy
- Manchester City Council's commitment to be a Zero Carbon city by 2038

The policy position is absolutely clear – changes to the existing road and cycle networks should make cycling more convenient for people, not less convenient.

This specific stretch of Cavendish Street is a key part of the existing cycle network. It appears on TfGM's Bee Network map as a Beeway ("the routes that get people from A to B … representing the most direct routes between crossing points.") and connects to the Stretford Road Busy Beeway ("corridors or crossing points on busier roads that will require a higher level of design intervention to improve cycling and walking.") It is also mapped on the TfGM Cycle Network.

The national standard for cycling infrastructure is DfT guidance note LTN 1/20. LTN 1/20 advises above all else that cycle routes and networks should be Safe, Direct, Comfortable, Attractive and Coherent. Introducing unnecessary diversions, junctions and bends into a well-used existing route undermines all of these core principles, resulting in a lower quality cycle network which will make it harder for the council to achieve its cycling objectives.

The applicant has offered various reasons why diverting cyclists is necessary but all of these reasons seem to be either existing problems, or problems designed into the scheme. The proposal is to demolish and redevelop the site – so considerations like limited space and the placement of entrances, shop frontages, planting and pedestrian areas are entirely within the applicant's scope to manage. Instead of starting with the problem "there is an existing busy cycle route across this site, how can I design to accommodate everyone's needs?", it seems the applicant has started with the conclusion "cyclists must be deterred" and instructed their consultants to post-rationalise that decision.

3 Misleading claims regarding safety

Page 22 of the Design & Access Statement refers to the "existing controversial link along Cavendish St., which is resulting in collisions of pedestrians, electric scooters, cyclists, etc."

However the map of recorded collisions, on page 18 of the Transport Statement submitted in the same planning application, shows no recorded collisions whatsoever on this link, only on the adjacent main roads.

It appears the applicant is attempting to restrict cycle access based on a "problem" for which they have no evidence.

Yours sincerely,

[redacted]

[redacted]

[redacted]

[redacted]

****
This email and any files transmitted with it are confidential and intended solely for the use of the individual or entity to whom they are addressed.
If you have received this email in error, please notify the sender, or [redacted] and then permanently delete the email, attachments and all copies.
The full text of the Council's email disclaimer is available at: www.manchester.gov.uk/emaildisclaimer.
Your personal data is very important to us. Please refer to our privacy notice at: www.manchester.gov.uk/privacy for further information.

This footnote also confirms that this email message has been swept for the presence of computer viruses.
****

Outlook

Fw: Comment on Planning Application 142888/FO/2025

From Planning <[redacted]
Date Mon 07/07/2025 13:45
To Lucy Harrison <[redacted]

Information, Delivery & Support Team
Planning, Building Control & Licensing
Growth & Development Directorate
Postal address: Manchester City Council, P O Box 532, Town Hall, Manchester M60 2LA
Location address: Level 6 Town Hall Extension, Manchester M2 5DB
Tel: 0161 234 4516

Please consider the environment before printing an e-mail.

From: [redacted]
Sent: 07 July 2025 13:35
To: Planning <[redacted]
Subject: Comment on Planning Application 142888/FO/2025

You don't often get email from [redacted] Learn why this is important

ALERT This message originated outside of the Manchester City Council network. **BE CAUTIOUS** before clicking any links or opening any attachments. Please remember your Cyber Training and report anything suspicious.

Dear Manchester Planning team,

I am writing to lodge an objection to planning application 142888/FO/2025 – Cambridge Halls Of Residence Cavendish Street Manchester M15 6TT.

My primary objection is that the proposals have been designed to deter cyclists from using the safest and most direct route through the site. This route has been open to cyclists ever since the road was first built; it is an essential, well-used part of the city's cycling network and therefore the proposal to deter and/or divert cycles away from Cavendish Street is directly at odds with Manchester City Council's planning, sustainability and transport policies.

I live in Whalley Range and use this route almost daily to commute to work, go to the gym and meet friends in the city centre or along oxford road.

The applicant has also made misleading claims regarding the road's legal status and regarding pedestrian safety which I will outline below.

I am asking that the council refuse this application, and invite the developer to come back with a proposal that maintains direct cycle as well as pedestrian access along Cavendish Street, designed to modern standards set out in Greater Manchester's Streets For All design guide and in

Department for Transport guidance note LTN 1/20. I am sure that the Highways team at MCC and the Active Travel team at TfGM will, if asked, be happy to comment on how such a route could be provided within the space available.

I am also asking that the council make a Section 106 agreement (s106) with the applicant to fund safety improvements for pedestrians and cyclists at the junction of Cavendish Street and Higher Cambridge Street – the applicant themselves discuss the shortcomings of the existing junction layout in Section 4.2.1 of the Transport Statement ("Cyclists have also been observed to queue on the footway to gain direct access to the Higher Cambridge Street/Cavendish Street junction (via a gap in the guard railings) rather than following the road markings which advise cyclists to dismount and use the controlled pedestrian crossings"). The improvements might take the form of a CYCLOPS junction. CYCLOPS is a homegrown Greater Manchester innovation now frequently used on Highways schemes across the country to deliver safe pedestrian and cycle movements without undue impact on traffic flows.

For prospective occupants and passers-by alike, in line with the S106 tests as set out in Paragraph 58 of the National Planning Policy Framework (NPPF) 2024, a contribution to junction safety improvements improvement would be 'necessary to make the development acceptable in planning terms' (by contributing to an appropriate movement strategy for the site), 'directly related to the development' (given its proximity, the pressure added to the junction by the proposed threefold increase in residents, and in light of the wholly inadequate mitigation route proposed by the applicant), and 'fairly and reasonably related in scale and kind to the development' (given the stated threefold increase in residents explained by the applicant, so directly adding more pressure to the junction).

1 Legal Status of Cavendish Street

This section of Cavendish Street, an adopted Highway, was subject to a stopping up order dated 14.06.1996. That order required that "the Developer shall provide a new highway which shall be a footpath/cycleway". MMU have since installed physical signage stating that Cavendish Street "has not been dedicated as a Highway" and have bolted down uncomfortable and restrictive speed bumps across the route in an apparent attempt to dissuade cyclists from exercising their legal rights over this space. Both measures may be unlawful, as my understanding is that cyclists do retain a legal Right of Way along Cavendish Street, unchanged from when the entire road was an adopted highway, and the speed bumps are inaccessible to some Disabled users.

2 Cycling routes and planning policy

The case for walking and cycling and specifically for maintaining and improving high quality cycling networks is clear at every level of modern planning policy, including:

NPPF 2024's "vision-led approach"
LTN 1/20
Places For Everyone Joint Development Plan Objectives 6, 7 and 10
Places for Everyone Joint Development Plan policies JP-Strat14, JP-C1, JP-C5 and JP-C6
GM Transport Strategy 2040 and the "Right Mix" targets
Greater Manchester Streets for All strategy and Streets for All design guide
Manchester City Council's Active Travel Strategy
Manchester City Council's commitment to be a Zero Carbon city by 2038
The policy position is absolutely clear – changes to the existing road and cycle networks should make cycling more convenient for people, not less convenient.

This specific stretch of Cavendish Street is a key part of the existing cycle network. It appears on TfGM's Bee Network map as a Beeway ("the routes that get people from A to B … representing the most direct routes between crossing points.") and connects to the Stretford Road Busy Beeway ("corridors or crossing points on busier roads that will require a higher level of design intervention to improve cycling and walking.") It is also mapped on the TfGM Cycle Network.

The national standard for cycling infrastructure is DfT guidance note LTN 1/20. LTN 1/20 advises above all else that cycle routes and networks should be Safe, Direct, Comfortable, Attractive and Coherent. Introducing unnecessary diversions, junctions and bends into a well-used existing route undermines all of these core principles, resulting in a lower quality cycle network which will make it harder for the council to achieve its cycling objectives.

The applicant has offered various reasons why diverting cyclists is necessary but all of these reasons seem to be either existing problems, or problems designed into the scheme. The proposal is to demolish and redevelop the site – so considerations like limited space and the placement of entrances, shop frontages, planting and pedestrian areas are entirely within the applicant's scope to manage. Instead of starting with the problem "there is an existing busy cycle route across this site, how can I design to accommodate everyone's needs?", it seems the applicant has started with the conclusion "cyclists must be deterred" and instructed their consultants to post-rationalise that decision.

3 Misleading claims regarding safety

Page 22 of the Design & Access Statement refers to the "existing controversial link along Cavendish St., which is resulting in collisions of pedestrians, electric scooters, cyclists, etc."

However the map of recorded collisions, on page 18 of the Transport Statement submitted in the same planning application, shows no recorded collisions whatsoever on this link, only on the adjacent main roads.

It appears the applicant is attempting to restrict cycle access based on a "problem" for which they have no evidence.

Yours sincerely,

[redacted]

****
This email and any files transmitted with it are confidential and intended solely for the use of the individual or entity to whom they are addressed. If you have received this email in error, please notify the sender, or [redacted] and then permanently delete the email, attachments and all copies.
The full text of the Council's email disclaimer is available at: www.manchester.gov.uk/emaildisclaimer.
Your personal data is very important to us. Please refer to our privacy notice at: www.manchester.gov.uk/privacy for further information.

This footnote also confirms that this email message has been swept for the presence of computer viruses.
****

Outlook

Fw: Subject: Comment on Planning Application 142888/FO/2025

From Planning <[redacted]
Date Mon 30/06/2025 08:52
To Lucy Harrison <[redacted]

Information, Delivery & Support Team
Planning, Building Control & Licensing
Growth & Development Directorate
Postal address: Manchester City Council, P O Box 532, Town Hall, Manchester M60 2LA
Location address: Level 6 Town Hall Extension, Manchester M2 5DB
Tel: 0161 234 4516

Please consider the environment before printing an e-mail.

From: [redacted]
Sent: 28 June 2025 13:09
To: Planning <[redacted]
Subject: Subject: Comment on Planning Application 142888/FO/2025

You don't often get email from [redacted] Learn why this is important

ALERT This message originated outside of the Manchester City Council network. **BE CAUTIOUS** before clicking any links or opening any attachments. Please remember your Cyber Training and report anything suspicious.

Dear Manchester Planning team,
I am writing to lodge an objection to planning application **142888/FO/2025** – Cambridge Halls Of Residence Cavendish Street Manchester M15 6TT.

My primary objection is that the proposals have been designed to deter cyclists from using the safest and most direct route through the site. This route has been open to cyclists ever since the road was first built; it is an essential, well-used part of the city's cycling network and therefore the proposal to deter and/or divert cycles away from Cavendish Street is directly at odds with Manchester City Council's planning, sustainability and transport policies.

Cycling is not easy around the city and more should be done to make it so.

Yours faithfully

[redacted]

****
This email and any files transmitted with it are confidential and intended solely for the use of the individual or entity to whom they are addressed. If you have received this email in error, please notify the sender, or [redacted] and then permanently delete the email, attachments and all copies.
The full text of the Council's email disclaimer is available at: www.manchester.gov.uk/emaildisclaimer.
Your personal data is very important to us. Please refer to our privacy notice at: www.manchester.gov.uk/privacy for further information.

This footnote also confirms that this email message has been swept for the presence of computer viruses.
****

Outlook

Fw: Comment on planning application 142888/FO/25

From Planning <[redacted]
Date Tue 01/07/2025 09:08
To Lucy Harrison <[redacted]

Information, Delivery & Support Team
Planning, Building Control & Licensing
Growth & Development Directorate
Postal address: Manchester City Council, P O Box 532, Town Hall, Manchester M60 2LA
Location address: Level 6 Town Hall Extension, Manchester M2 5DB
Tel: 0161 234 4516

Please consider the environment before printing an e-mail.

From: [redacted]
Sent: 30 June 2025 19:18
To: Planning <[redacted]
Subject: Comment on planning application 142888/FO/25

You don't often get email from [redacted] Learn why this is important

ALERT This message originated outside of the Manchester City Council network. **BE CAUTIOUS** before clicking any links or opening any attachments. Please remember your Cyber Training and report anything suspicious.

Dear Manchester Planning team,

I am writing to lodge an objection to planning application **142888/FO/2025** – Cambridge Halls Of Residence Cavendish Street Manchester M15 6TT.

My primary objection is that the proposals have been designed to deter cyclists from using the safest and most direct route through the site. This route has been open to cyclists ever since the road was first built; it is an essential, well-used part of the city's cycling network and therefore the proposal to deter and/or divert cycles away from Cavendish Street is directly at odds with Manchester City Council's planning, sustainability and transport policies.

I am a cyclist who regularly uses the Cavendish Street route through MMU. It helps me to get from Old Trafford to Manchester Piccadilly train station amongst other places without having to negotiate busy and dangerous roads.

The applicant has also made misleading claims regarding the road's legal status and regarding pedestrian safety which I will outline below.

I am asking that the council **refuse** this application, and invite the developer to come back with a proposal that maintains direct cycle as well as pedestrian access along Cavendish Street, designed to modern standards set out in Greater Manchester's Streets For All design guide and in Department for Transport guidance note LTN 1/20. I am sure that the Highways team at MCC and the Active Travel team at TfGM will, if asked, be happy to comment on how such a route could be provided within the space available.

I am also asking that the council **make a Section 106 agreement (s106)** with the applicant to fund safety improvements for pedestrians and cyclists at the junction of Cavendish Street and Higher Cambridge Street – the applicant themselves discuss the shortcomings of the existing junction layout in Section 4.2.1 of the Transport Statement ("*Cyclists have also been observed to queue on the footway to gain direct access to the Higher Cambridge Street/Cavendish Street junction (via a gap in the guard railings) rather than following the road markings which advise cyclists to dismount and use the controlled pedestrian crossings*"). The improvements might take the form of a CYCLOPS junction. CYCLOPS is a homegrown Greater Manchester innovation now frequently used on Highways schemes across the country to deliver safe pedestrian and cycle movements without undue impact on traffic flows.

For prospective occupants and passers-by alike, in line with the S106 tests as set out in Paragraph 58 of the National Planning Policy Framework (NPPF) 2024, a contribution to junction safety improvements improvement would be 'necessary to make the development acceptable in planning terms' (by contributing to an appropriate movement strategy for the site), 'directly related to the development' (given its proximity, the pressure added to the junction by the proposed threefold increase in residents, and in light of the wholly inadequate mitigation route proposed by the applicant), and 'fairly and reasonably related in scale and kind to the development' (given the stated threefold increase in residents explained by the applicant, so directly adding more pressure to the junction).

1 Legal Status of Cavendish Street

This section of Cavendish Street, an adopted Highway, was subject to a stopping up order dated 14.06.1996. That order required that "the Developer shall provide a new highway which shall be a footpath/cycleway". MMU have since installed physical signage stating that Cavendish Street "has not been dedicated as a Highway" and have bolted down uncomfortable and restrictive speed bumps across the route in an apparent attempt to dissuade cyclists from exercising their legal rights over this space. Both measures may be unlawful, as my understanding is that cyclists do retain a legal Right of Way along Cavendish Street, unchanged from when the entire road was an adopted highway, and the speed bumps are inaccessible to some Disabled users.

2 Cycling routes and planning policy

The case for walking and cycling and specifically for maintaining and improving high quality cycling networks is clear at every level of modern planning policy, including:

- NPPF 2024's "vision-led approach"
- LTN 1/20
- Places For Everyone Joint Development Plan Objectives 6, 7 and 10
- Places for Everyone Joint Development Plan policies JP-Strat14, JP-C1, JP-C5 and JP-C6
- GM Transport Strategy 2040 and the "Right Mix" targets
- Greater Manchester Streets for All strategy and Streets for All design guide
- Manchester City Council's Active Travel Strategy
- Manchester City Council's commitment to be a Zero Carbon city by 2038

The policy position is absolutely clear – changes to the existing road and cycle networks should make cycling more convenient for people, not less convenient.

This specific stretch of Cavendish Street is a key part of the existing cycle network. It appears on TfGM's Bee Network map as a Beeway ("the routes that get people from A to B … representing the most direct routes between crossing points.") and connects to the Stretford Road Busy Beeway ("corridors or crossing points on busier roads that will require a higher level of design intervention to improve cycling and walking.") It is also mapped on the TfGM Cycle Network.

The national standard for cycling infrastructure is DfT guidance note LTN 1/20. LTN 1/20 advises above all else that cycle routes and networks should be Safe, Direct, Comfortable, Attractive and Coherent. Introducing unnecessary diversions, junctions and bends into a well-used existing route undermines all of these core principles, resulting in a lower quality cycle network which will make it harder for the council to achieve its cycling objectives.

The applicant has offered various reasons why diverting cyclists is necessary but all of these reasons seem to be either existing problems, or problems designed into the scheme. The proposal is to demolish and redevelop the site – so considerations like limited space and the placement of entrances, shop frontages, planting and pedestrian areas are entirely within the applicant's scope to manage. Instead of starting with the problem "there is an existing busy cycle route across this site, how can I design to accommodate everyone's needs?", it seems the applicant has started with the conclusion "cyclists must be deterred" and instructed their consultants to post-rationalise that decision.

3 Misleading claims regarding safety

Page 22 of the Design & Access Statement refers to the "existing controversial link along Cavendish St., which is resulting in collisions of pedestrians, electric scooters, cyclists, etc."

However the map of recorded collisions, on page 18 of the Transport Statement submitted in the same planning application, shows no recorded collisions whatsoever on this link, only on the adjacent main roads.

It appears the applicant is attempting to restrict cycle access based on a “problem” for which they have no evidence.

Yours sincerely,

[redacted]

[redacted]

Sent from my Galaxy

****
This email and any files transmitted with it are confidential and intended solely for the use of the individual or entity to whom they are addressed.
If you have received this email in error, please notify the sender, or [redacted] and then permanently delete the email, attachments and all copies.
The full text of the Council's email disclaimer is available at: www.manchester.gov.uk/emaildisclaimer.
Your personal data is very important to us. Please refer to our privacy notice at: www.manchester.gov.uk/privacy for further information.

This footnote also confirms that this email message has been swept for the presence of computer viruses.
****

Outlook

Fw: Comment on Planning Application 142888/FO/2025

From Planning <[redacted]>
Date Tue 01/07/2025 09:07
To Lucy Harrison <[redacted]>

Information, Delivery & Support Team
Planning, Building Control & Licensing
Growth & Development Directorate
Postal address: Manchester City Council, P O Box 532, Town Hall, Manchester M60 2LA
Location address: Level 6 Town Hall Extension, Manchester M2 5DB
Tel: 0161 234 4516

Please consider the environment before printing an e-mail.

From: [redacted]
Sent: 30 June 2025 15:52
To: Planning <[redacted]>
Subject: Comment on Planning Application 142888/FO/2025

You don't often get email from [redacted] Learn why this is important

ALERT This message originated outside of the Manchester City Council network. **BE CAUTIOUS** before clicking any links or opening any attachments. Please remember your Cyber Training and report anything suspicious.

Dear Manchester Planning team,

I am writing to lodge an objection to planning application 142888/FO/2025 – Cambridge Halls Of Residence Cavendish Street Manchester M15 6TT.

My primary objection is that the proposals have been designed to deter cyclists from using the safest and most direct route through the site. This route has been open to cyclists ever since the road was first built; it is an essential, well-used part of the city's cycling network and therefore the proposal to deter and/or divert cycles away from Cavendish Street is directly at odds with Manchester City Council's planning, sustainability and transport policies.

I regularly use this section of cycleway as a connecting link from the Upper Chorlton Road cycleway across to the Oxford Road cycleway. This is a key linkage in the cycle networks of South Manchester and the proposals by the developer seem to just be a shirking of their responsibilities in ensuring the development adheres to equality and access guidelines. Merely forcing cyclists out of the space will not solve anything. If this route was removed I would be forced to cycle further on more dangerous roads.

The applicant has also made misleading claims regarding the road's legal status and regarding pedestrian safety which I will outline below.

I am asking that the council refuse this application, and invite the developer to come back with a proposal that maintains direct cycle as well as pedestrian access along Cavendish Street, designed to modern standards set out in Greater Manchester's Streets For All design guide and in Department for Transport guidance note LTN 1/20. I am sure that the Highways team at MCC and the Active Travel team at TfGM will, if asked, be happy to comment on how such a route could be provided within the space available.

I am also asking that the council make a Section 106 agreement (s106) with the applicant to fund safety improvements for pedestrians and cyclists at the junction of Cavendish Street and Higher Cambridge Street – the applicant themselves discuss the shortcomings of the existing junction layout in Section 4.2.1 of the Transport Statement ("Cyclists have also been observed to queue on the footway to gain direct access to the Higher Cambridge Street/Cavendish Street junction (via a gap in the guard railings) rather than following the road markings which advise cyclists to dismount and use the controlled pedestrian crossings"). The improvements might take the form of a CYCLOPS junction. CYCLOPS is a homegrown Greater Manchester innovation now frequently used on Highways schemes across the country to deliver safe pedestrian and cycle movements without undue impact on traffic flows.

For prospective occupants and passers-by alike, in line with the S106 tests as set out in Paragraph 58 of the National Planning Policy Framework (NPPF) 2024, a contribution to junction safety improvements improvement would be 'necessary to make the development acceptable in planning terms' (by contributing to an appropriate movement strategy for the site), 'directly related to the development' (given its proximity, the pressure added to the junction by the proposed threefold increase in residents, and in light of the wholly inadequate mitigation route proposed by the applicant), and 'fairly and reasonably related in scale and kind to the development' (given the stated threefold increase in residents explained by the applicant, so directly adding more pressure to the junction).

1 Legal Status of Cavendish Street

This section of Cavendish Street, an adopted Highway, was subject to a stopping up order dated 14.06.1996. That order required that "the Developer shall provide a new highway which shall be a footpath/cycleway". MMU have since installed physical signage stating that Cavendish Street "has not been dedicated as a Highway" and have bolted down uncomfortable and restrictive speed bumps across the route in an apparent attempt to dissuade cyclists from exercising their legal rights over this space. Both measures may be unlawful, as my understanding is that cyclists do retain a legal Right of Way along Cavendish Street, unchanged from when the entire road was an adopted highway, and the speed bumps are inaccessible to some Disabled users.

2 Cycling routes and planning policy

The case for walking and cycling and specifically for maintaining and improving high quality cycling networks is clear at every level of modern planning policy, including:

NPPF 2024's "vision-led approach"
LTN 1/20
Places For Everyone Joint Development Plan Objectives 6, 7 and 10
Places for Everyone Joint Development Plan policies JP-Strat14, JP-C1, JP-C5 and JP-C6
GM Transport Strategy 2040 and the "Right Mix" targets
Greater Manchester Streets for All strategy and Streets for All design guide
Manchester City Council's Active Travel Strategy

Manchester City Council's commitment to be a Zero Carbon city by 2038

The policy position is absolutely clear – changes to the existing road and cycle networks should make cycling more convenient for people, not less convenient.

This specific stretch of Cavendish Street is a key part of the existing cycle network. It appears on TfGM's Bee Network map as a Beeway ("the routes that get people from A to B … representing the most direct routes between crossing points.") and connects to the Stretford Road Busy Beeway ("corridors or crossing points on busier roads that will require a higher level of design intervention to improve cycling and walking.") It is also mapped on the TfGM Cycle Network.

The national standard for cycling infrastructure is DfT guidance note LTN 1/20. LTN 1/20 advises above all else that cycle routes and networks should be Safe, Direct, Comfortable, Attractive and Coherent. Introducing unnecessary diversions, junctions and bends into a well-used existing route undermines all of these core principles, resulting in a lower quality cycle network which will make it harder for the council to achieve its cycling objectives.

The applicant has offered various reasons why diverting cyclists is necessary but all of these reasons seem to be either existing problems, or problems designed into the scheme. The proposal is to demolish and redevelop the site – so considerations like limited space and the placement of entrances, shop frontages, planting and pedestrian areas are entirely within the applicant's scope to manage. Instead of starting with the problem "there is an existing busy cycle route across this site, how can I design to accommodate everyone's needs?", it seems the applicant has started with the conclusion "cyclists must be deterred" and instructed their consultants to post-rationalise that decision.

3 Misleading claims regarding safety

Page 22 of the Design & Access Statement refers to the "existing controversial link along Cavendish St., which is resulting in collisions of pedestrians, electric scooters, cyclists, etc."

However the map of recorded collisions, on page 18 of the Transport Statement submitted in the same planning application, shows no recorded collisions whatsoever on this link, only on the adjacent main roads.

It appears the applicant is attempting to restrict cycle access based on a "problem" for which they have no evidence.

Yours sincerely,

[redacted]

****
This email and any files transmitted with it are confidential and intended solely for the use of the individual or entity to whom they are addressed.
If you have received this email in error, please notify the sender, or [redacted] and then permanently delete the email, attachments and all copies.
The full text of the Council's email disclaimer is available at: www.manchester.gov.uk/emaildisclaimer.
Your personal data is very important to us. Please refer to our privacy notice at: www.manchester.gov.uk/privacy for further information.

This footnote also confirms that this email message has been swept for the presence of computer viruses.
****

Outlook

Fw: Comment on Planning Application 142888/FO/2025

From Planning <[redacted]>
Date Mon 14/07/2025 14:07
To Lucy Harrison <[redacted]>

Information, Delivery & Support Team
Planning, Building Control & Licensing
Growth & Development Directorate
Postal address: Manchester City Council, P O Box 532, Town Hall, Manchester M60 2LA
Location address: Level 6 Town Hall Extension, Manchester M2 5DB
Tel: 0161 234 4516

Please consider the environment before printing an e-mail.

From: [redacted]
Sent: 11 July 2025 10:37
To: Planning <[redacted]>
Subject: Comment on Planning Application 142888/FO/2025

You don't often get email from [redacted] Learn why this is important

ALERT This message originated outside of the Manchester City Council network. **BE CAUTIOUS** before clicking any links or opening any attachments. Please remember your Cyber Training and report anything suspicious.

Dear Manchester Planning team,

I am writing to lodge an objection to planning application 142888/FO/2025 – Cambridge Halls Of Residence Cavendish Street Manchester M15 6TT.

My primary objection is that the proposals have been designed to deter cyclists from using the safest and most direct route through the site. This route has been open to cyclists ever since the road was first built; it is an essential, well-used part of the city's cycling network and therefore the proposal to deter and/or divert cycles away from Cavendish Street is directly at odds with Manchester City Council's planning, sustainability and transport policies.

The applicant has also made misleading claims regarding the road's legal status and regarding pedestrian safety which I will outline below.

I am asking that the council **refuse** this application, and invite the developer to come back with a proposal that maintains direct cycle as well as pedestrian access along Cavendish Street, designed to modern standards set out in Greater Manchester's Streets For All design guide and in Department for Transport guidance note LTN 1/20. I am sure that the Highways team at MCC and

the Active Travel team at TfGM will, if asked, be happy to comment on how such a route could be provided within the space available.

I am also asking that the council **make a Section 106 agreement (s106)** with the applicant to fund safety improvements for pedestrians and cyclists at the junction of Cavendish Street and Higher Cambridge Street – the applicant themselves discuss the shortcomings of the existing junction layout in Section 4.2.1 of the Transport Statement ("*Cyclists have also been observed to queue on the footway to gain direct access to the Higher Cambridge Street/Cavendish Street junction (via a gap in the guard railings) rather than following the road markings which advise cyclists to dismount and use the controlled pedestrian crossings*"). The improvements might take the form of a CYCLOPS junction. CYCLOPS is a homegrown Greater Manchester innovation now frequently used on Highways schemes across the country to deliver safe pedestrian and cycle movements without undue impact on traffic flows.

For prospective occupants and passers-by alike, in line with the S106 tests as set out in Paragraph 58 of the National Planning Policy Framework (NPPF) 2024, a contribution to junction safety improvements improvement would be 'necessary to make the development acceptable in planning terms' (by contributing to an appropriate movement strategy for the site), 'directly related to the development' (given its proximity, the pressure added to the junction by the proposed threefold increase in residents, and in light of the wholly inadequate mitigation route proposed by the applicant), and 'fairly and reasonably related in scale and kind to the development' (given the stated threefold increase in residents explained by the applicant, so directly adding more pressure to the junction).

1 Legal Status of Cavendish Street

This section of Cavendish Street, an adopted Highway, was subject to a stopping up order dated 14.06.1996. That order required that "the Developer shall provide a new highway which shall be a footpath/cycleway". MMU have since installed physical signage stating that Cavendish Street "has not been dedicated as a Highway" and have bolted down uncomfortable and restrictive speed bumps across the route in an apparent attempt to dissuade cyclists from exercising their legal rights over this space. Both measures may be unlawful, as my understanding is that cyclists do retain a legal Right of Way along Cavendish Street, unchanged from when the entire road was an adopted highway, and the speed bumps are inaccessible to some Disabled users.

2 Cycling routes and planning policy

The case for walking and cycling and specifically for maintaining and improving high quality cycling networks is clear at every level of modern planning policy, including:

NPPF 2024's "vision-led approach"

LTN 1/20

Places For Everyone Joint Development Plan Objectives 6, 7 and 10

Places for Everyone Joint Development Plan policies JP-Strat14, JP-C1, JP-C5 and JP-C6

GM Transport Strategy 2040 and the "Right Mix" targets

Greater Manchester Streets for All strategy and Streets for All design guide

Manchester City Council's Active Travel Strategy

Manchester City Council's commitment to be a Zero Carbon city by 2038

The policy position is absolutely clear – changes to the existing road and cycle networks should make cycling more convenient for people, not less convenient.

This specific stretch of Cavendish Street is a key part of the existing cycle network. It appears on TfGM's Bee Network map as a Beeway ("the routes that get people from A to B … representing the most direct routes between crossing points.") and connects to the Stretford Road Busy Beeway ("corridors or crossing points on busier roads that will require a higher level of design intervention to improve cycling and walking.") It is also mapped on the TfGM Cycle Network.

The national standard for cycling infrastructure is DfT guidance note LTN 1/20. LTN 1/20 advises above all else that cycle routes and networks should be Safe, Direct, Comfortable, Attractive and Coherent. Introducing unnecessary diversions, junctions and bends into a well-used existing route undermines all of these core principles, resulting in a lower quality cycle network which will make it harder for the council to achieve its cycling objectives.

The applicant has offered various reasons why diverting cyclists is necessary but all of these reasons seem to be either existing problems, or problems designed into the scheme. The proposal is to demolish and redevelop the site – so considerations like limited space and the placement of entrances, shop frontages, planting and pedestrian areas are entirely within the applicant's scope to manage. Instead of starting with the problem "there is an existing busy cycle route across this site, how can I design to accommodate everyone's needs?", it seems the applicant has started with the conclusion "cyclists must be deterred" and instructed their consultants to post-rationalise that decision.

3 Misleading claims regarding safety

Page 22 of the Design & Access Statement refers to the "existing controversial link along Cavendish St., which is resulting in collisions of pedestrians, electric scooters, cyclists, etc."

However the map of recorded collisions, on page 18 of the Transport Statement submitted in the same planning application, shows no recorded collisions whatsoever on this link, only on the adjacent main roads.

It appears the applicant is attempting to restrict cycle access based on a "problem" for which they have no evidence.

Yours sincerely,

[redacted]

[redacted]

[redacted]

****
This email and any files transmitted with it are confidential and intended solely for the use of the individual or entity to whom they are addressed.
If you have received this email in error, please notify the sender, or [redacted] and then permanently delete the email, attachments and all copies.
The full text of the Council's email disclaimer is available at: www.manchester.gov.uk/emaildisclaimer.

Your personal data is very important to us. Please refer to our privacy notice at: www.manchester.gov.uk/privacy for further information.

This footnote also confirms that this email message has been swept for the presence of computer viruses.
****

Outlook

Fw: Subject: Comment on Planning Application 142888/FO/2025

From Planning <[redacted]
Date Mon 30/06/2025 08:48
To Lucy Harrison <[redacted]

Information, Delivery & Support Team
Planning, Building Control & Licensing
Growth & Development Directorate
Postal address: Manchester City Council, P O Box 532, Town Hall, Manchester M60 2LA
Location address: Level 6 Town Hall Extension, Manchester M2 5DB
Tel: 0161 234 4516

Please consider the environment before printing an e-mail.

From: [redacted]
Sent: 29 June 2025 09:52
To: Planning <[redacted]
Subject: Subject: Comment on Planning Application 142888/FO/2025

You don't often get email from [redacted] Learn why this is important

ALERT This message originated outside of the Manchester City Council network. **BE CAUTIOUS** before clicking any links or opening any attachments. Please remember your Cyber Training and report anything suspicious.

Dear Manchester Planning team,

I am writing to lodge an objection to planning application **142888/FO/2025** – Cambridge Halls Of Residence Cavendish Street Manchester M15 6TT.

My primary objection is that the proposals have been designed to deter cyclists from using the safest and most direct route through the site. This route has been open to cyclists ever since the road was first built; it is an essential, well-used part of the city's cycling network and therefore the proposal to deter and/or divert cycles away from Cavendish Street is directly at odds with Manchester City Council's planning, sustainability and transport policies.

I cycle through the city centre several times a week and note the many opportunities to make our streets safer for cyclists; this is one of them. Of course making cycling safer is key to encouraging more people to use their bikes, thus reducing air pollution and carbon emissions.

The applicant has also made misleading claims regarding the road's legal status and regarding pedestrian safety which I will outline below.

I am asking that the council **refuse** this application, and invite the developer to come back with a proposal that maintains direct cycle as well as pedestrian access along Cavendish Street, designed to modern standards set out in Greater Manchester's Streets For All design guide and in Department for Transport guidance note LTN 1/20. I am sure that the Highways team at MCC and the Active Travel team at TfGM will, if asked, be happy to comment on how such a route could be provided within the space available.

I am also asking that the council **make a Section 106 agreement (s106)** with the applicant to fund safety improvements for pedestrians and cyclists at the junction of Cavendish Street and Higher Cambridge Street – the applicant themselves discuss the shortcomings of the existing junction layout in Section 4.2.1 of the Transport Statement ("*Cyclists have also been observed to queue on the footway to gain direct access to the Higher Cambridge Street/Cavendish Street junction (via a gap in the guard railings) rather than following the road markings which advise cyclists to dismount and use the controlled pedestrian crossings*"). The improvements could take the form of a CYCLOPS junction. CYCLOPS is a homegrown Greater Manchester innovation

now frequently used on Highways schemes across the country to deliver safe pedestrian and cycle movements without undue impact on traffic flows.

1 Legal Status of Cavendish Street

This section of Cavendish Street, an adopted Highway, was subject to a stopping up order dated 14.06.1996. That order required that “the Developer shall provide a new highway which shall be a footpath/cycleway”. MMU have since installed physical signage stating that Cavendish Street “has not been dedicated as a Highway” and have bolted down uncomfortable and restrictive speed bumps across the route in an apparent attempt to dissuade cyclists from exercising their legal rights over this space. Both measures may be unlawful, as my understanding is that cyclists do retain a legal Right of Way along Cavendish Street, unchanged from when the entire road was an adopted highway, and the speed bumps are inaccessible to some Disabled users.

2 Cycling routes and planning policy

The case for walking and cycling and specifically for maintaining and improving high quality cycling networks is clear at every level of modern planning policy, including:

- NPPF 2024’s “vision-led approach”
- LTN 1/20
- Places For Everyone Joint Development Plan Objectives 6, 7 and 10
- Places for Everyone Joint Development Plan policies JP-Strat14, JP-C1, JP-C5 and JP-C6
- GM Transport Strategy 2040 and the “Right Mix” targets

- Greater Manchester Streets for All strategy and Streets for All design guide
- Manchester City Council's Active Travel Strategy
- Manchester City Council's commitment to be a Zero Carbon city by 2038

The policy position is absolutely clear – changes to the existing road and cycle networks should make cycling more convenient for people, not less convenient.

This specific stretch of Cavendish Street is a key part of the existing cycle network. It appears on TfGM's Bee Network map as a Beeway ("the routes that get people from A to B … representing the most direct routes between crossing points.") and connects to the Stretford Road Busy Beeway ("corridors or crossing points on busier roads that will require a higher level of design intervention to improve cycling and walking.") It is also mapped on the TfGM Cycle Network.

The national standard for cycling infrastructure is DfT guidance note LTN 1/20. LTN 1/20 advises above all else that cycle routes and networks should be Safe, Direct, Comfortable, Attractive and Coherent. Introducing unnecessary diversions, junctions and bends into a well-used existing route undermines all of these core principles, resulting in a lower quality cycle network which will make it harder for the council to achieve its cycling objectives.

The applicant has offered various reasons why diverting cyclists is necessary but all of these reasons seem to be either existing problems, or problems designed into the scheme. The proposal is to demolish and redevelop the site – so considerations like limited space and the placement of entrances, shop frontages, planting and pedestrian areas are entirely within the applicant's scope to manage. Instead of starting with the problem "there is an existing busy cycle

route across this site, how can I design to accommodate everyone's needs?", it seems the applicant has started with the conclusion "cyclists must be deterred" and instructed their consultants to post-rationalise that decision.

3 Misleading claims regarding safety

Page 22 of the Design & Access Statement refers to the "existing controversial link along Cavendish St., which is resulting in collisions of pedestrians, electric scooters, cyclists, etc."

However the map of recorded collisions, on page 18 of the Transport Statement submitted in the same planning application, shows no recorded collisions whatsoever on this link, only on the adjacent main roads.

It appears the applicant is attempting to restrict cycle access based on a "problem" for which they have no evidence.

Yours sincerely,

[redacted]

[redacted]

[redacted]

****
This email and any files transmitted with it are confidential and intended solely for the use of the individual or entity to whom they are addressed.
If you have received this email in error, please notify the sender, or [redacted] and then permanently delete the email, attachments and all copies.
The full text of the Council's email disclaimer is available at: www.manchester.gov.uk/emaildisclaimer.
Your personal data is very important to us. Please refer to our privacy notice at: www.manchester.gov.uk/privacy for further information.

This footnote also confirms that this email message has been swept for the presence of computer viruses.
****

Outlook

Fw: Comment on Planning Application 142888/FO/2025

From Planning <[redacted]>
Date Mon 14/07/2025 14:04
To Lucy Harrison <[redacted]>

Information, Delivery & Support Team
Planning, Building Control & Licensing
Growth & Development Directorate
Postal address: Manchester City Council, P O Box 532, Town Hall, Manchester M60 2LA
Location address: Level 6 Town Hall Extension, Manchester M2 5DB
Tel: 0161 234 4516

Please consider the environment before printing an e-mail.

From: [redacted] <[redacted]>
Sent: 11 July 2025 22:43
To: Planning <[redacted]>
Subject: Comment on Planning Application 142888/FO/2025

You don't often get email from [redacted] Learn why this is important

ALERT This message originated outside of the Manchester City Council network. **BE CAUTIOUS** before clicking any links or opening any attachments. Please remember your Cyber Training and report anything suspicious.

Dear Manchester Planning team,

I am writing to lodge an objection to planning application **142888/FO/2025**– Cambridge Halls Of Residence Cavendish Street Manchester M15 6TT.

My primary objection is that the proposals have been designed to deter cyclists from using the safest and most direct route through the site. This route has been open to cyclists ever since the road was first built; it is an essential, well-used part of the city's cycling network and therefore the proposal to deter and/or divert cycles away from Cavendish Street is directly at odds with Manchester City Council's planning, sustainability and transport policies.

The applicant has also made misleading claims regarding the road's legal status and regarding pedestrian safety which I will outline below.

I am asking that the council **refuse** this application, and invite the developer to come back with a proposal that maintains direct cycle as well as pedestrian access along Cavendish Street, designed to modern standards set out in Greater Manchester's Streets For All design guide and in Department for Transport guidance note LTN 1/20. I am sure that the Highways team at MCC and the Active Travel team at TfGM will, if asked, be happy to comment on how such a route could be provided within the space available.

I am also asking that the council **make a Section 106 agreement (s106)** with the applicant to fund safety improvements for pedestrians and cyclists at the junction of Cavendish Street and Higher Cambridge Street – the applicant themselves discuss the shortcomings of the existing junction layout in Section 4.2.1 of the Transport Statement ("*Cyclists have also been observed to queue on the footway to gain direct access to the Higher Cambridge Street/Cavendish Street junction (via a gap in the guard railings) rather than following the road markings which advise cyclists to dismount and use the controlled pedestrian crossings*"). The improvements might take the form of a CYCLOPS junction. CYCLOPS is a homegrown Greater Manchester innovation now frequently used on Highways schemes across the country to deliver safe pedestrian and cycle movements without undue impact on traffic flows.

For prospective occupants and passers-by alike, in line with the S106 tests as set out in Paragraph 58 of the National Planning Policy Framework (NPPF) 2024, a contribution to junction safety improvements improvement would be 'necessary to make the development acceptable in planning terms' (by contributing to an appropriate movement strategy for the site), 'directly related to the development' (given its proximity, the pressure added to the junction by the proposed threefold increase in residents, and in light of the wholly inadequate mitigation route proposed by the applicant), and 'fairly and reasonably related in scale and kind to the development' (given the stated threefold increase in residents explained by the applicant, so directly adding more pressure to the junction).

1 Legal Status of Cavendish Street

This section of Cavendish Street, an adopted Highway, was subject to a stopping up order dated 14.06.1996. That order required that "the Developer shall provide a new highway which shall be a footpath/cycleway". MMU have since installed physical signage stating that Cavendish Street "has not been dedicated as a Highway" and have bolted down uncomfortable and restrictive speed bumps across the route in an apparent attempt to dissuade cyclists from exercising their legal rights over this space. Both measures may be unlawful, as my understanding is that cyclists do retain a legal Right of Way along Cavendish

Street, unchanged from when the entire road was an adopted highway, and the speed bumps are inaccessible to some Disabled users.

2 Cycling routes and planning policy

The case for walking and cycling and specifically for maintaining and improving high quality cycling networks is clear at every level of modern planning policy, including:

- NPPF 2024's "vision-led approach"
- LTN 1/20
- Places For Everyone Joint Development Plan Objectives 6, 7 and 10
- Places for Everyone Joint Development Plan policies JP-Strat14, JP-C1, JP-C5 and JP-C6
- GM Transport Strategy 2040 and the "Right Mix" targets
- Greater Manchester Streets for All strategy and Streets for All design guide
- Manchester City Council's Active Travel Strategy
- Manchester City Council's commitment to be a Zero Carbon city by 2038

The policy position is absolutely clear – changes to the existing road and cycle networks should make cycling more convenient for people, not less convenient.

This specific stretch of Cavendish Street is a key part of the existing cycle network. It appears on TfGM's Bee Network map as a Beeway ("the routes that get people from A to B … representing the most direct routes between crossing points.") and connects to the Stretford Road Busy Beeway ("corridors or crossing points on busier roads that will require a higher level of design intervention to improve cycling and walking.") It is also mapped on the TfGM Cycle Network.

The national standard for cycling infrastructure is DfT guidance note LTN 1/20. LTN 1/20 advises above all else that cycle routes and networks should be Safe, Direct, Comfortable, Attractive and Coherent. Introducing unnecessary diversions, junctions and bends into a well-used existing route undermines all of these core principles, resulting in a lower quality cycle network which will make it harder for the council to achieve its cycling objectives.

The applicant has offered various reasons why diverting cyclists is necessary but all of these reasons seem to be either existing problems, or problems designed into the scheme. The proposal is to demolish and redevelop the site – so considerations like limited space and the placement of entrances, shop frontages,

planting and pedestrian areas are entirely within the applicant's scope to manage. Instead of starting with the problem "there is an existing busy cycle route across this site, how can I design to accommodate everyone's needs?", it seems the applicant has started with the conclusion "cyclists must be deterred" and instructed their consultants to post-rationalise that decision.

3 Misleading claims regarding safety

Page 22 of the Design & Access Statement refers to the "existing controversial link along Cavendish St., which is resulting in collisions of pedestrians, electric scooters, cyclists, etc."

However the map of recorded collisions, on page 18 of the Transport Statement submitted in the same planning application, shows no recorded collisions whatsoever on this link, only on the adjacent main roads.

It appears the applicant is attempting to restrict cycle access based on a "problem" for which they have no evidence.

Yours sincerely,

[redacted]

[redacted]

[redacted]

[redacted]

Sent from my iPhone

****
This email and any files transmitted with it are confidential and intended solely for the use of the individual or entity to whom they are addressed.
If you have received this email in error, please notify the sender, or [redacted] and then permanently delete the email, attachments and all copies.
The full text of the Council's email disclaimer is available at: www.manchester.gov.uk/emaildisclaimer.
Your personal data is very important to us. Please refer to our privacy notice at: www.manchester.gov.uk/privacy for further information.

This footnote also confirms that this email message has been swept for the presence of computer viruses.
****

Outlook

Fw: Subject: Comment on Planning Application 142888/FO/2025

From Planning <[redacted]
Date Mon 30/06/2025 08:50
To Lucy Harrison <[redacted]

Information, Delivery & Support Team
Planning, Building Control & Licensing
Growth & Development Directorate
Postal address: Manchester City Council, P O Box 532, Town Hall, Manchester M60 2LA
Location address: Level 6 Town Hall Extension, Manchester M2 5DB
Tel: 0161 234 4516

Please consider the environment before printing an e-mail.

From: [redacted]
Sent: 28 June 2025 16:14
To: Planning <[redacted]
Subject: Subject: Comment on Planning Application 142888/FO/2025

You don't often get email from [redacted] Learn why this is important

ALERT This message originated outside of the Manchester City Council network. **BE CAUTIOUS** before clicking any links or opening any attachments. Please remember your Cyber Training and report anything suspicious.

Dear Manchester Planning team,

I am writing to lodge an objection to planning application **142888/FO/2025** – Cambridge Halls Of Residence Cavendish Street Manchester M15 6TT.

My primary objection is that the proposals have been designed to deter cyclists from using the safest and most direct route through the site. This route has been open to cyclists ever since the road was first built; it is an essential, well-used part of the city's cycling network and therefore the proposal to deter and/or divert cycles away from Cavendish Street is directly at odds with Manchester City Council's planning, sustainability and transport policies.

I have been using this route since 1985 for safe travel by bicycle and as a pedestrian to link safely and efficiently to All Saints and Oxford Road from my homes during that time in Hulme, then Whalley Range and now Chorlton. This currently provides a safe link between quality separate cycling provision from

Chorlton to the City Centre and sits well with the new redevelopment at All Saints (although the cycle path design along A5067 Stretford Road needs addressing)

The applicant has also made misleading claims regarding the road's legal status and regarding pedestrian safety which I will outline below.

I am asking that the council **refuse** this application, and invite the developer to come back with a proposal that maintains direct cycle as well as pedestrian access along Cavendish Street, designed to modern standards set out in Greater Manchester's Streets For All design guide and in Department for Transport guidance note LTN 1/20. I am sure that the Highways team at MCC and the Active Travel team at TfGM will, if asked, be happy to comment on how such a route could be provided within the space available.

I am also asking that the council **make a Section 106 agreement (s106)** with the applicant to fund safety improvements for pedestrians and cyclists at the junction of Cavendish Street and Higher Cambridge Street – the applicant themselves discuss the shortcomings of the existing junction layout in Section 4.2.1 of the Transport Statement ("*Cyclists have also been observed to queue on the footway to gain direct access to the Higher Cambridge Street/Cavendish Street junction (via a gap in the guard railings) rather than following the road markings which advise cyclists to dismount and use the controlled pedestrian crossings*"). The improvements might take the form of a CYCLOPS junction. CYCLOPS is a homegrown Greater Manchester innovation now frequently used on Highways schemes across the country to deliver safe pedestrian and cycle movements without undue impact on traffic flows.

For prospective occupants and passers-by alike, in line with the S106 tests as set out in Paragraph 58 of the National Planning Policy Framework (NPPF) 2024, a contribution to junction safety improvements improvement would be 'necessary to make the development acceptable in planning terms' (by contributing to an appropriate movement strategy for the site), 'directly related to the development' (given its proximity, the pressure added to the junction by the proposed threefold increase in residents, and in light of the wholly inadequate mitigation route proposed by the applicant), and 'fairly and reasonably related in scale and kind to the development' (given the stated threefold increase in residents explained by the applicant, so directly adding more pressure to the junction).

1 Legal Status of Cavendish Street

This section of Cavendish Street, an adopted Highway, was subject to a stopping up order dated 14.06.1996. That order required that "the Developer shall provide

a new highway which shall be a footpath/cycleway". MMU have since installed physical signage stating that Cavendish Street "has not been dedicated as a Highway" and have bolted down uncomfortable and restrictive speed bumps across the route in an apparent attempt to dissuade cyclists from exercising their legal rights over this space. Both measures may be unlawful, as my understanding is that cyclists do retain a legal Right of Way along Cavendish Street, unchanged from when the entire road was an adopted highway, and the speed bumps are inaccessible to some Disabled users.

2 Cycling routes and planning policy

The case for walking and cycling and specifically for maintaining and improving high quality cycling networks is clear at every level of modern planning policy, including:

- NPPF 2024's "vision-led approach"
- LTN 1/20
- Places For Everyone Joint Development Plan Objectives 6, 7 and 10
- Places for Everyone Joint Development Plan policies JP-Strat14, JP-C1, JP-C5 and JP-C6
- GM Transport Strategy 2040 and the "Right Mix" targets
- Greater Manchester Streets for All strategy and Streets for All design guide
- Manchester City Council's Active Travel Strategy
- Manchester City Council's commitment to be a Zero Carbon city by 2038

The policy position is absolutely clear – changes to the existing road and cycle networks should make cycling more convenient for people, not less convenient.

This specific stretch of Cavendish Street is a key part of the existing cycle network. It appears on TfGM's Bee Network map as a Beeway ("the routes that get people from A to B … representing the most direct routes between crossing points.") and connects to the Stretford Road Busy Beeway ("corridors or crossing points on busier roads that will require a higher level of design intervention to improve cycling and walking.") It is also mapped on the TfGM Cycle Network.

The national standard for cycling infrastructure is DfT guidance note LTN 1/20. LTN 1/20 advises above all else that cycle routes and networks should be Safe, Direct, Comfortable, Attractive and Coherent. Introducing unnecessary diversions, junctions and bends into a well-used existing route undermines all of these core

principles, resulting in a lower quality cycle network which will make it harder for the council to achieve its cycling objectives.

The applicant has offered various reasons why diverting cyclists is necessary but all of these reasons seem to be either existing problems, or problems designed into the scheme. The proposal is to demolish and redevelop the site – so considerations like limited space and the placement of entrances, shop frontages, planting and pedestrian areas are entirely within the applicant's scope to manage. Instead of starting with the problem "there is an existing busy cycle route across this site, how can I design to accommodate everyone's needs?", it seems the applicant has started with the conclusion "cyclists must be deterred" and instructed their consultants to post-rationalise that decision.

3 Misleading claims regarding safety

Page 22 of the Design & Access Statement refers to the "existing controversial link along Cavendish St., which is resulting in collisions of pedestrians, electric scooters, cyclists, etc."

However the map of recorded collisions, on page 18 of the Transport Statement submitted in the same planning application, shows no recorded collisions whatsoever on this link, only on the adjacent main roads.

It appears the applicant is attempting to restrict cycle access based on a "problem" for which they have no evidence.

Yours sincerely,

[redacted]

[redacted]

****
This email and any files transmitted with it are confidential and intended solely for the use of the individual or entity to whom they are addressed.
If you have received this email in error, please notify the sender, or [redacted] and then permanently delete the email, attachments and all copies.
The full text of the Council's email disclaimer is available at: www.manchester.gov.uk/emaildisclaimer.
Your personal data is very important to us. Please refer to our privacy notice at: www.manchester.gov.uk/privacy for further information.

This footnote also confirms that this email message has been swept for the presence of computer viruses.
****

Outlook

Fw: Subject: Comment on Planning Application 142888/FO/2025

From Planning <[redacted]
Date Mon 30/06/2025 08:48
To Lucy Harrison <[redacted]

Information, Delivery & Support Team
Planning, Building Control & Licensing
Growth & Development Directorate
Postal address: Manchester City Council, P O Box 532, Town Hall, Manchester M60 2LA
Location address: Level 6 Town Hall Extension, Manchester M2 5DB
Tel: 0161 234 4516

Please consider the environment before printing an e-mail.

From: [redacted]
Sent: 28 June 2025 19:27
To: Planning <[redacted]
Subject: Subject: Comment on Planning Application 142888/FO/2025

You don't often get email from [redacted] Learn why this is important

ALERT This message originated outside of the Manchester City Council network. **BE CAUTIOUS** before clicking any links or opening any attachments. Please remember your Cyber Training and report anything suspicious.

Dear Manchester Planning team,

I am writing to lodge an objection to planning application **142888/FO/2025** – Cambridge Halls Of Residence Cavendish Street Manchester M15 6TT.

My primary objection is that the proposals have been designed to deter cyclists from using the safest and most direct route through the site. This route has been open to cyclists and pedestrians ever since the road was first built; it is an essential, well-used part of the city's

cycling network and therefore the proposal to deter and/or divert cycles away from Cavendish Street is directly at odds with Manchester City Council's planning, sustainability and transport policies.

MMU and before this Manchester Polytechnic have had a dead hand on this highway ever since first closing it, and have subsequently refused requests to reinstate it as a road carrying buses and other vehicular traffic. Since then, in particular over the last few years, the general direction of travel has been improvement of pedestrian, wheelchair, cycle and wheeling access, particularly with the removal of cars from the areas in front of St Augustine's Church and the Faculty of Arts Office and also the former Chorlton on Medlock Town Hall, Grosvenor Building. It would be perverse to trample on these improvements which help create a safer route from Stretford to the Etihad Stadium and Co-op Arena.

I have used this route myself for many years as a pedestrian and cyclist, including when I had an office within Grosvenor Building, and believe MMU should be offering to enhance the existing route eg by improving the junction on the Hulme side (see below) rather than detracting from it.

The applicant has also made misleading claims regarding the road's legal status and regarding pedestrian safety which I will outline below.

I am asking that the council **refuse** this application, and invite the developer to come back with a proposal that maintains direct cycle as well as pedestrian access along Cavendish Street, designed to modern standards set out in Greater Manchester's Streets For All design guide and in Department for Transport guidance note LTN 1/20. I am sure that the Highways team at MCC and the Active Travel team at TfGM will, if asked, be happy to comment on how such a route could be provided within the space available.

I am also asking that the council **make a Section 106 agreement (s106)** with the applicant to fund safety improvements for pedestrians and cyclists at the junction of Cavendish Street and Higher Cambridge Street – the applicant themselves discuss the shortcomings of the existing junction layout in Section 4.2.1 of the Transport Statement ("*Cyclists have also been observed to queue on the footway to gain direct access to the Higher Cambridge Street/Cavendish Street junction (via a gap in the guard railings) rather than following the road markings which advise cyclists to dismount and use the controlled pedestrian crossings*"). The improvements might take the form of a CYCLOPS junction. CYCLOPS is a homegrown Greater Manchester innovation now frequently used on Highways schemes across the country to deliver safe pedestrian and cycle movements without minimal or even positive impact on vehicle flows and certainly on people in any mode through each junction.

For prospective occupants and passers-by alike, in line with the S106 tests as set out in Paragraph 58 of the National Planning Policy Framework (NPPF) 2024, a contribution to junction safety improvements improvement would be 'necessary to make the development acceptable in planning terms' (by contributing to an appropriate movement strategy for the site), 'directly related to the development' (given its proximity, the pressure added to the junction by the proposed threefold increase in residents, and in light of the wholly inadequate mitigation route proposed by the applicant), and 'fairly and reasonably related in scale and kind to the development' (given the stated threefold increase in residents explained by the applicant, so directly adding more pressure to the junction).

1 Legal Status of Cavendish Street

This section of Cavendish Street, an adopted Highway, was subject to a stopping up order dated 14.06.1996. That order required that "the Developer shall provide a new highway which shall be a

footpath/cycleway". MMU have since installed physical signage stating that Cavendish Street "has not been dedicated as a Highway" and have bolted down uncomfortable and restrictive speed bumps across the route in an apparent attempt to dissuade cyclists from exercising their legal rights over this space. Both measures may be unlawful, as my understanding is that cyclists do retain a legal Right of Way along Cavendish Street, unchanged from when the entire road was an adopted highway, and the speed bumps are inaccessible to some Disabled users.

2 Cycling routes and planning policy

The case for walking and cycling and specifically for maintaining and improving high quality cycling networks is clear at every level of modern planning policy, including:

- NPPF 2024's "vision-led approach"
- LTN 1/20
- Places For Everyone Joint Development Plan Objectives 6, 7 and 10
- Places for Everyone Joint Development Plan policies JP-Strat14, JP-C1, JP-C5 and JP-C6
- GM Transport Strategy 2040 and the "Right Mix" targets
- Greater Manchester Streets for All strategy and Streets for All design guide
- Manchester City Council's Active Travel Strategy
- Manchester City Council's commitment to be a Zero Carbon city by 2038

The policy position is absolutely clear – changes to the existing road and cycle networks should make cycling more convenient for people, not less convenient.

This specific stretch of Cavendish Street is a key part of the existing cycle network. It appears on TfGM's Bee Network map as a Beeway ("the routes that get people from A to B … representing the most direct routes between crossing points.") and connects to the Stretford Road Busy Beeway ("corridors or crossing points on busier roads that will require a higher level of design intervention to improve cycling and walking.") It is also mapped on the TfGM Cycle Network.

The national standard for cycling infrastructure is DfT guidance note LTN 1/20. LTN 1/20 advises above all else that cycle routes and networks should be Safe, Direct, Comfortable, Attractive and Coherent. Introducing unnecessary diversions, junctions and bends into a well-used existing route undermines all of these core principles, resulting in a lower quality cycle network which will make it harder for the council to achieve its cycling objectives.

The applicant has offered various reasons why diverting cyclists is necessary but all of these reasons seem to be either existing problems, or problems designed into the scheme. The proposal is to demolish and redevelop the site – so considerations like limited space and the placement of entrances, shop frontages, planting and pedestrian areas are entirely within the applicant's scope to manage. Instead of starting with the problem "there is an existing busy cycle route across this site, how can I design to accommodate everyone's needs?", it seems the applicant has started with the conclusion "cyclists must be deterred" and instructed their consultants to post-rationalise that decision.

3 Misleading claims regarding safety

Page 22 of the Design & Access Statement refers to the "existing controversial link along Cavendish St., which is resulting in collisions of pedestrians, electric scooters, cyclists, etc."

However the map of recorded collisions, on page 18 of the Transport Statement submitted in the same planning application, shows no recorded collisions whatsoever on this link, only on the adjacent main roads.

It appears the applicant is attempting to restrict cycle access based on a “problem” for which they have no evidence.

Yours sincerely,

[redacted]

****
This email and any files transmitted with it are confidential and intended solely for the use of the individual or entity to whom they are addressed.
If you have received this email in error, please notify the sender, or [redacted] and then permanently delete the email, attachments and all copies.
The full text of the Council's email disclaimer is available at: www.manchester.gov.uk/emaildisclaimer.
Your personal data is very important to us. Please refer to our privacy notice at: www.manchester.gov.uk/privacy for further information.

This footnote also confirms that this email message has been swept for the presence of computer viruses.
****

Outlook

Fw: Comment on Planning Application 142888/FO/2025

From Planning <[redacted]>
Date Mon 07/07/2025 11:00
To Lucy Harrison <[redacted]>

Information, Delivery & Support Team
Planning, Building Control & Licensing
Growth & Development Directorate
Postal address: Manchester City Council, P O Box 532, Town Hall, Manchester M60 2LA
Location address: Level 6 Town Hall Extension, Manchester M2 5DB
Tel: 0161 234 4516

Please consider the environment before printing an e-mail.

From: [redacted]
Sent: 04 July 2025 19:36
To: Planning <[redacted]>
Subject: Comment on Planning Application 142888/FO/2025

You don't often get email from [redacted] Learn why this is important

ALERT This message originated outside of the Manchester City Council network. **BE CAUTIOUS** before clicking any links or opening any attachments. Please remember your Cyber Training and report anything suspicious.

Dear Manchester Planning team,

I am writing to lodge an objection to planning application 142888/FO/2025 – Cambridge Halls Of Residence Cavendish Street Manchester M15 6TT.

My primary objection is that the proposals have been designed to deter cyclists from using the safest and most direct route through the site. This route has been open to cyclists ever since the road was first built; it is an essential, well-used part of the city's cycling network and therefore the proposal to deter and/or divert cycles away from Cavendish Street is directly at odds with Manchester City Council's planning, sustainability and transport policies.

Personally, I use this route often, a few times a week, - traveling between home in Castlefield and Oxford Road. There isn't an easy way to navigate this junction and I fear the plans will only make this worse.

The applicant has also made misleading claims regarding the road's legal status and regarding pedestrian safety which I will outline below.

I am asking that the council refuse this application, and invite the developer to come back with a proposal that maintains direct cycle as well as pedestrian access along Cavendish Street, designed

to modern standards set out in Greater Manchester's Streets For All design guide and in Department for Transport guidance note LTN 1/20. I am sure that the Highways team at MCC and the Active Travel team at TfGM will, if asked, be happy to comment on how such a route could be provided within the space available.

I am also asking that the council make a Section 106 agreement (s106) with the applicant to fund safety improvements for pedestrians and cyclists at the junction of Cavendish Street and Higher Cambridge Street – the applicant themselves discuss the shortcomings of the existing junction layout in Section 4.2.1 of the Transport Statement ("Cyclists have also been observed to queue on the footway to gain direct access to the Higher Cambridge Street/Cavendish Street junction (via a gap in the guard railings) rather than following the road markings which advise cyclists to dismount and use the controlled pedestrian crossings"). The improvements might take the form of a CYCLOPS junction. CYCLOPS is a homegrown Greater Manchester innovation now frequently used on Highways schemes across the country to deliver safe pedestrian and cycle movements without undue impact on traffic flows.

For prospective occupants and passers-by alike, in line with the S106 tests as set out in Paragraph 58 of the National Planning Policy Framework (NPPF) 2024, a contribution to junction safety improvements improvement would be 'necessary to make the development acceptable in planning terms' (by contributing to an appropriate movement strategy for the site), 'directly related to the development' (given its proximity, the pressure added to the junction by the proposed threefold increase in residents, and in light of the wholly inadequate mitigation route proposed by the applicant), and 'fairly and reasonably related in scale and kind to the development' (given the stated threefold increase in residents explained by the applicant, so directly adding more pressure to the junction).

1 Legal Status of Cavendish Street

This section of Cavendish Street, an adopted Highway, was subject to a stopping up order dated 14.06.1996. That order required that "the Developer shall provide a new highway which shall be a footpath/cycleway". MMU have since installed physical signage stating that Cavendish Street "has not been dedicated as a Highway" and have bolted down uncomfortable and restrictive speed bumps across the route in an apparent attempt to dissuade cyclists from exercising their legal rights over this space. Both measures may be unlawful, as my understanding is that cyclists do retain a legal Right of Way along Cavendish Street, unchanged from when the entire road was an adopted highway, and the speed bumps are inaccessible to some Disabled users.

2 Cycling routes and planning policy

The case for walking and cycling and specifically for maintaining and improving high quality cycling networks is clear at every level of modern planning policy, including:

- NPPF 2024's "vision-led approach"
- LTN 1/20
- Places For Everyone Joint Development Plan Objectives 6, 7 and 10
- Places for Everyone Joint Development Plan policies JP-Strat14, JP-C1, JP-C5 and JP-C6
- GM Transport Strategy 2040 and the "Right Mix" targets
- Greater Manchester Streets for All strategy and Streets for All design guide
- Manchester City Council's Active Travel Strategy
- Manchester City Council's commitment to be a Zero Carbon city by 2038

The policy position is absolutely clear – changes to the existing road and cycle networks should make cycling more convenient for people, not less convenient.

This specific stretch of Cavendish Street is a key part of the existing cycle network. It appears on TfGM's Bee Network map as a Beeway ("the routes that get people from A to B … representing the most direct routes between crossing points.") and connects to the Stretford Road Busy Beeway ("corridors or crossing points on busier roads that will require a higher level of design intervention to improve cycling and walking.") It is also mapped on the TfGM Cycle Network.

The national standard for cycling infrastructure is DfT guidance note LTN 1/20. LTN 1/20 advises above all else that cycle routes and networks should be Safe, Direct, Comfortable, Attractive and Coherent. Introducing unnecessary diversions, junctions and bends into a well-used existing route undermines all of these core principles, resulting in a lower quality cycle network which will make it harder for the council to achieve its cycling objectives.

The applicant has offered various reasons why diverting cyclists is necessary but all of these reasons seem to be either existing problems, or problems designed into the scheme. The proposal is to demolish and redevelop the site – so considerations like limited space and the placement of entrances, shop frontages, planting and pedestrian areas are entirely within the applicant's scope to manage. Instead of starting with the problem "there is an existing busy cycle route across this site, how can I design to accommodate everyone's needs?", it seems the applicant has started with the conclusion "cyclists must be deterred" and instructed their consultants to post-rationalise that decision.

3 Misleading claims regarding safety

Page 22 of the Design & Access Statement refers to the "existing controversial link along Cavendish St., which is resulting in collisions of pedestrians, electric scooters, cyclists, etc."

However the map of recorded collisions, on page 18 of the Transport Statement submitted in the same planning application, shows no recorded collisions whatsoever on this link, only on the adjacent main roads.

It appears the applicant is attempting to restrict cycle access based on a "problem" for which they have no evidence.

Yours sincerely,

[redacted]

****
This email and any files transmitted with it are confidential and intended solely for the use of the individual or entity to whom they are addressed.
If you have received this email in error, please notify the sender, or [redacted] and then permanently delete the email, attachments and all copies.
The full text of the Council's email disclaimer is available at: www.manchester.gov.uk/emaildisclaimer.
Your personal data is very important to us. Please refer to our privacy notice at: www.manchester.gov.uk/privacy for further information.

This footnote also confirms that this email message has been swept for the presence of computer viruses.
****

Outlook

Fw: Comment on Planning Application 142888/FO/2025

From Planning <[redacted]
Date Tue 01/07/2025 14:49
To Lucy Harrison <[redacted]

Information, Delivery & Support Team
Planning, Building Control & Licensing
Growth & Development Directorate
Postal address: Manchester City Council, P O Box 532, Town Hall, Manchester M60 2LA
Location address: Level 6 Town Hall Extension, Manchester M2 5DB
Tel: 0161 234 4516

Please consider the environment before printing an e-mail.

From: [redacted]
Sent: 01 July 2025 14:41
To: Planning <[redacted]
Subject: Comment on Planning Application 142888/FO/2025

You don't often get email from [redacted] Learn why this is important

ALERT This message originated outside of the Manchester City Council network. **BE CAUTIOUS** before clicking any links or opening any attachments. Please remember your Cyber Training and report anything suspicious.

Dear Manchester Planning team,

I am writing to lodge an objection to planning application **142888/FO/2025** – Cambridge Halls Of Residence Cavendish Street Manchester M15 6TT.

The following text comes from 6 and sets the issues out clearly. I want to endorse this personally. At 62 years old, I'm three times the age of many of the students, but still cycling because of my profound concern for the environment. I regularly use this route between my home in Whalley Range and offices in the city centre, because I feel secure cycling this route. Manchester needs more of such support to help people of my generation stay active, protecting the immediate

environment against pollution and the global atmosphere against greenhouse gases. I urge you to reconsider this plan.

My primary objection is that the proposals have been designed to deter cyclists from using the safest and most direct route through the site. This route has been open to cyclists ever since the road was first built; it is an essential, well-used part of the city's cycling network and therefore the proposal to deter and/or divert cycles away from Cavendish Street is directly at odds with Manchester City Council's planning, sustainability and transport policies.

[INSERT HERE OR DELETE THIS SECTION describe your own experience of using Cavendish Street, as a pedestrian, cyclist or other road user. Do you live or work nearby or use the route regularly? What difference has this active travel route made to your life? How would you be impacted if it were removed?]

The applicant has also made misleading claims regarding the road's legal status and regarding pedestrian safety which I will outline below.

I am asking that the council **refuse** this application, and invite the developer to come back with a proposal that maintains direct cycle as well as pedestrian access along Cavendish Street, designed to modern standards set out in Greater Manchester's Streets For All design guide and in Department for Transport guidance note LTN 1/20. I am sure that the Highways team at MCC and the Active Travel team at TfGM will, if asked, be happy to comment on how such a route could be provided within the space available.

I am also asking that the council **make a Section 106 agreement (s106)** with the applicant to fund safety improvements for pedestrians and cyclists at the junction of Cavendish Street and Higher Cambridge Street – the applicant themselves discuss the shortcomings of the existing junction layout in Section 4.2.1 of the Transport Statement

("*Cyclists have also been observed to queue on the footway to gain direct access to the Higher Cambridge Street/Cavendish Street junction (via a gap in the guard railings) rather than following the road markings which advise cyclists to dismount and use the controlled pedestrian crossings*"). The improvements might take the form of a CYCLOPS junction. CYCLOPS is a homegrown Greater Manchester innovation now frequently used on Highways schemes across the country to deliver safe pedestrian and cycle movements without undue impact on traffic flows.

For prospective occupants and passers-by alike, in line with the S106 tests as set out in Paragraph 58 of the National Planning Policy Framework (NPPF) 2024, a contribution to junction safety improvements improvement would be 'necessary to make the development acceptable in planning terms' (by contributing to an appropriate movement strategy for the site), 'directly related to the development' (given its proximity, the pressure added to the junction by the proposed threefold increase in residents, and in light of the wholly inadequate mitigation route proposed by the applicant), and 'fairly and reasonably related in scale and kind to the development' (given the stated threefold increase in residents explained by the applicant, so directly adding more pressure to the junction).

1 Legal Status of Cavendish Street

This section of Cavendish Street, an adopted Highway, was subject to a stopping up order dated 14.06.1996. That order required that "the Developer shall provide a new highway which shall be a footpath/cycleway". MMU have since installed physical signage stating that Cavendish Street "has not been dedicated as a Highway" and have bolted down uncomfortable and restrictive speed bumps across the route in an apparent attempt to dissuade cyclists from exercising their legal rights over this space. Both measures may be unlawful, as my understanding is that cyclists do retain a legal Right of

Way along Cavendish Street, unchanged from when the entire road was an adopted highway, and the speed bumps are inaccessible to some Disabled users.

2 Cycling routes and planning policy

The case for walking and cycling and specifically for maintaining and improving high quality cycling networks is clear at every level of modern planning policy, including:

- NPPF 2024's "vision-led approach"
- LTN 1/20
- Places For Everyone Joint Development Plan Objectives 6, 7 and 10
- Places for Everyone Joint Development Plan policies JP-Strat14, JP-C1, JP-C5 and JP-C6
- GM Transport Strategy 2040 and the "Right Mix" targets
- Greater Manchester Streets for All strategy and Streets for All design guide
- Manchester City Council's Active Travel Strategy
- Manchester City Council's commitment to be a Zero Carbon city by 2038

The policy position is absolutely clear – changes to the existing road and cycle networks should make cycling more convenient for people, not less convenient.

This specific stretch of Cavendish Street is a key part of the existing cycle network. It appears on TfGM's Bee Network map as a Beeway ("the routes that get people from A to B … representing the most direct routes between crossing points.") and connects to the Stretford Road Busy Beeway ("corridors or crossing points on busier roads that will

require a higher level of design intervention to improve cycling and walking.") It is also mapped on the TfGM Cycle Network.

The national standard for cycling infrastructure is DfT guidance note LTN 1/20. LTN 1/20 advises above all else that cycle routes and networks should be Safe, Direct, Comfortable, Attractive and Coherent. Introducing unnecessary diversions, junctions and bends into a well-used existing route undermines all of these core principles, resulting in a lower quality cycle network which will make it harder for the council to achieve its cycling objectives.

The applicant has offered various reasons why diverting cyclists is necessary but all of these reasons seem to be either existing problems, or problems designed into the scheme. The proposal is to demolish and redevelop the site – so considerations like limited space and the placement of entrances, shop frontages, planting and pedestrian areas are entirely within the applicant's scope to manage. Instead of starting with the problem "there is an existing busy cycle route across this site, how can I design to accommodate everyone's needs?", it seems the applicant has started with the conclusion "cyclists must be deterred" and instructed their consultants to post-rationalise that decision.

3 Misleading claims regarding safety

Page 22 of the Design & Access Statement refers to the "existing controversial link along Cavendish St., which is resulting in collisions of pedestrians, electric scooters, cyclists, etc."

However the map of recorded collisions, on page 18 of the Transport Statement submitted in the same planning application, shows no recorded collisions whatsoever on this link, only on the adjacent main roads.

It appears the applicant is attempting to restrict cycle access based on a “problem” for which they have no evidence.

Yours sincerely,

[redacted]

****
This email and any files transmitted with it are confidential and intended solely for the use of the individual or entity to whom they are addressed.
If you have received this email in error, please notify the sender, or [redacted] and then permanently delete the email, attachments and all copies.
The full text of the Council's email disclaimer is available at: www.manchester.gov.uk/emaildisclaimer.
Your personal data is very important to us. Please refer to our privacy notice at: www.manchester.gov.uk/privacy for further information.

This footnote also confirms that this email message has been swept for the presence of computer viruses.
****

Outlook

Fw: Comment on Planning Application 142888/FO/2025

From Planning <[redacted]
Date Mon 14/07/2025 14:05
To Lucy Harrison <[redacted]

Information, Delivery & Support Team
Planning, Building Control & Licensing
Growth & Development Directorate
Postal address: Manchester City Council, P O Box 532, Town Hall, Manchester M60 2LA
Location address: Level 6 Town Hall Extension, Manchester M2 5DB
Tel: 0161 234 4516

Please consider the environment before printing an e-mail.

From: [redacted]
Sent: 11 July 2025 17:22
To: Planning <[redacted]
Subject: Comment on Planning Application 142888/FO/2025

You don't often get email from [redacted] Learn why this is important

ALERT This message originated outside of the Manchester City Council network. **BE CAUTIOUS** before clicking any links or opening any attachments. Please remember your Cyber Training and report anything suspicious.

Dear Manchester Planning team,

I am writing to lodge an objection to planning application 142888/FO/2025 – Cambridge Halls Of Residence Cavendish Street Manchester M15 6TT.

My primary objection is that the proposals have been designed to deter cyclists from using the safest and most direct route through the site. This route has been open to cyclists ever since the road was first built; it is an essential, well-used part of the city's cycling network and therefore the proposal to deter and/or divert cycles away from Cavendish Street is directly at odds with Manchester City Council's planning, sustainability and transport policies.

7 and 10
Places for Everyone Joint Development Plan policies JP-Strat14, JP-C1, JP-C5 and JP-C6
GM Transport Strategy 2040 and the "Right Mix" targets
Greater Manchester Streets for All strategy and Streets for All design guide
Manchester City Council's Active Travel Strategy
Manchester City Council's commitment to be a Zero Carbon city by 2038

"cyclists must be deterred" and instructed their consultants to post-rationalise that decision.

3 Misleading claims regarding safety

Page 22 of the Design & Access Statement refers to the “existing controversial link along Cavendish St., which is resulting in collisions of pedestrians, electric scooters, cyclists, etc.”

However the map of recorded collisions, on page 18 of the Transport Statement submitted in the same planning application, shows no recorded collisions whatsoever on this link, only on the adjacent main roads.

It appears the applicant is attempting to restrict cycle access based on a “problem” for which they have no evidence.

Yours sincerely,

[redacted]

****
This email and any files transmitted with it are confidential and intended solely for the use of the individual or entity to whom they are addressed.
If you have received this email in error, please notify the sender, or [redacted] and then permanently delete the email, attachments and all copies.
The full text of the Council's email disclaimer is available at: www.manchester.gov.uk/emaildisclaimer.
Your personal data is very important to us. Please refer to our privacy notice at: www.manchester.gov.uk/privacy for further information.

This footnote also confirms that this email message has been swept for the presence of computer viruses.
****

Outlook

Fw: Subject: Comment on Planning Application 142888/FO/2025

From Planning <[redacted]
Date Mon 30/06/2025 08:51
To Lucy Harrison <[redacted]

Information, Delivery & Support Team
Planning, Building Control & Licensing
Growth & Development Directorate
Postal address: Manchester City Council, P O Box 532, Town Hall, Manchester M60 2LA
Location address: Level 6 Town Hall Extension, Manchester M2 5DB
Tel: 0161 234 4516

Please consider the environment before printing an e-mail.

From: [redacted]
Sent: 28 June 2025 14:42
To: Planning <[redacted]
Subject: Subject: Comment on Planning Application 142888/FO/2025

You don't often get email from [redacted] Learn why this is important

ALERT This message originated outside of the Manchester City Council network. **BE CAUTIOUS** before clicking any links or opening any attachments. Please remember your Cyber Training and report anything suspicious.

Dear Manchester Planning team,

I am writing to lodge an objection to planning application **142888/FO/2025** – Cambridge Halls Of Residence Cavendish Street Manchester M15 6TT.

My primary objection is that the proposals have been designed to deter cyclists from using the safest and most direct route through the site. This route has been open to cyclists ever since the road was first built; it is an essential, well-used part of the city's cycling network and therefore the proposal to deter and/or divert cycles away from Cavendish Street is directly at odds with Manchester City Council's planning, sustainability and transport policies.

This route is key for my active travel journey, connecting Stretford Rd with Oxford Rd and providing an almost completed protected cycle route from Chorlton into the City Centre or even to Picadilly Station.

The applicant has also made misleading claims regarding the road's legal status and regarding pedestrian safety which I will outline below.

I am asking that the council **refuse** this application, and invite the developer to come back with a proposal that maintains direct cycle as well as pedestrian access along Cavendish Street, designed to modern standards set out in Greater Manchester's Streets For All design guide and in Department for Transport guidance note LTN

1/20. I am sure that the Highways team at MCC and the Active Travel team at TfGM will, if asked, be happy to comment on how such a route could be provided within the space available.

I am also asking that the council **make a Section 106 agreement (s106)** with the applicant to fund safety improvements for pedestrians and cyclists at the junction of Cavendish Street and Higher Cambridge Street – the applicant themselves discuss the shortcomings of the existing junction layout in Section 4.2.1 of the Transport Statement ("*Cyclists have also been observed to queue on the footway to gain direct access to the Higher Cambridge Street/Cavendish Street junction (via a gap in the guard railings) rather than following the road markings which advise cyclists to dismount and use the controlled pedestrian crossings*"). The improvements might take the form of a CYCLOPS junction. CYCLOPS is a homegrown Greater Manchester innovation now frequently used on Highways schemes across the country to deliver safe pedestrian and cycle movements without undue impact on traffic flows.

For prospective occupants and passers-by alike, in line with the S106 tests as set out in Paragraph 58 of the National Planning Policy Framework (NPPF) 2024, a contribution to junction safety improvements improvement would be 'necessary to make the development acceptable in planning terms' (by contributing to an appropriate movement strategy for the site), 'directly related to the development' (given its proximity, the pressure added to the junction by the proposed threefold increase in residents, and in light of the wholly inadequate mitigation route proposed by the applicant), and 'fairly and reasonably related in scale and kind to the development' (given the stated threefold increase in residents explained by the applicant, so directly adding more pressure to the junction).

1 Legal Status of Cavendish Street

This section of Cavendish Street, an adopted Highway, was subject to a stopping up order dated 14.06.1996. That order required that "the Developer shall provide a new highway which shall be a footpath/cycleway". MMU have since installed physical signage stating that Cavendish Street "has not been dedicated as a Highway" and have bolted down uncomfortable and restrictive speed bumps across the route in an apparent attempt to dissuade cyclists from exercising their legal rights over this space. Both measures may be unlawful, as my understanding is that cyclists do retain a legal Right of Way along Cavendish Street, unchanged from when the entire road was an adopted highway, and the speed bumps are inaccessible to some Disabled users.

2 Cycling routes and planning policy

The case for walking and cycling and specifically for maintaining and improving high quality cycling networks is clear at every level of modern planning policy, including:

- NPPF 2024's "vision-led approach"
- LTN 1/20
- Places For Everyone Joint Development Plan Objectives 6, 7 and 10
- Places for Everyone Joint Development Plan policies JP-Strat14, JP-C1, JP-C5 and JP-C6
- GM Transport Strategy 2040 and the "Right Mix" targets
- Greater Manchester Streets for All strategy and Streets for All design guide
- Manchester City Council's Active Travel Strategy
- Manchester City Council's commitment to be a Zero Carbon city by 2038

The policy position is absolutely clear – changes to the existing road and cycle networks should make cycling more convenient for people, not less convenient.

This specific stretch of Cavendish Street is a key part of the existing cycle network. It appears on TfGM's Bee Network map as a Beeway ("the routes that get people from A to B … representing the most direct routes

between crossing points.") and connects to the Stretford Road Busy Beeway ("corridors or crossing points on busier roads that will require a higher level of design intervention to improve cycling and walking.") It is also mapped on the TfGM Cycle Network.

The national standard for cycling infrastructure is DfT guidance note LTN 1/20. LTN 1/20 advises above all else that cycle routes and networks should be Safe, Direct, Comfortable, Attractive and Coherent. Introducing unnecessary diversions, junctions and bends into a well-used existing route undermines all of these core principles, resulting in a lower quality cycle network which will make it harder for the council to achieve its cycling objectives.

The applicant has offered various reasons why diverting cyclists is necessary but all of these reasons seem to be either existing problems, or problems designed into the scheme. The proposal is to demolish and redevelop the site – so considerations like limited space and the placement of entrances, shop frontages, planting and pedestrian areas are entirely within the applicant's scope to manage. Instead of starting with the problem "there is an existing busy cycle route across this site, how can I design to accommodate everyone's needs?", it seems the applicant has started with the conclusion "cyclists must be deterred" and instructed their consultants to post-rationalise that decision.

3 Misleading claims regarding safety

Page 22 of the Design & Access Statement refers to the "existing controversial link along Cavendish St., which is resulting in collisions of pedestrians, electric scooters, cyclists, etc."

However the map of recorded collisions, on page 18 of the Transport Statement submitted in the same planning application, shows no recorded collisions whatsoever on this link, only on the adjacent main roads.

It appears the applicant is attempting to restrict cycle access based on a "problem" for which they have no evidence.

Yours sincerely,

[redacted]

****
This email and any files transmitted with it are confidential and intended solely for the use of the individual or entity to whom they are addressed.
If you have received this email in error, please notify the sender, or [redacted] and then permanently delete the email, attachments and all copies.
The full text of the Council's email disclaimer is available at: www.manchester.gov.uk/emaildisclaimer.
Your personal data is very important to us. Please refer to our privacy notice at: www.manchester.gov.uk/privacy for further information.

This footnote also confirms that this email message has been swept for the presence of computer viruses.
****

Outlook

Fw: Comment on Planning Application 142888/FO/2025

From Planning <[redacted]>
Date Mon 30/06/2025 08:47
To Lucy Harrison <[redacted]>

Information, Delivery & Support Team
Planning, Building Control & Licensing
Growth & Development Directorate
Postal address: Manchester City Council, P O Box 532, Town Hall, Manchester M60 2LA
Location address: Level 6 Town Hall Extension, Manchester M2 5DB
Tel: 0161 234 4516

Please consider the environment before printing an e-mail.

From: [redacted]
Sent: 29 June 2025 10:07
To: Planning <[redacted]>
Subject: Comment on Planning Application 142888/FO/2025

You don't often get email from [redacted] Learn why this is important

ALERT This message originated outside of the Manchester City Council network. **BE CAUTIOUS** before clicking any links or opening any attachments. Please remember your Cyber Training and report anything suspicious.

Dear Manchester Planning team,

I am writing to lodge an objection to planning application 142888/FO/2025 – Cambridge Halls Of Residence Cavendish Street Manchester M15 6TT.

My primary objection is that the proposals have been designed to deter cyclists from using the safest and most direct route through the site. This route has been open to cyclists ever since the road was first built; it is an essential, well-used part of the city's cycling network and therefore the proposal to deter and/or divert cycles away from Cavendish Street is directly at odds with Manchester City Council's planning, sustainability and transport policies.

I live in Chorlton and cycle to the city centre regularly for work and pleasure. My preferred route for getting to Oxford Road/Piccadilly/Ancoats is to take the Chorlton Cycleway and then head along Stretford Road, Cavendish Street and to then pick up the Oxford Road protected cycle way from there. Changing the Cavendish Street junction in the way you have outlined will make my journey less convenient and, by requiring me to mix with road traffic, more dangerous.

The applicant has also made misleading claims regarding the road's legal status and regarding pedestrian safety which I will outline below.

I am asking that the council refuse this application, and invite the developer to come back with a proposal that maintains direct cycle as well as pedestrian access along Cavendish Street, designed to modern standards set out in Greater Manchester's Streets For All design guide and in Department for Transport guidance note LTN 1/20. I am sure that the Highways team at MCC and the Active Travel team at TfGM will, if asked, be happy to comment on how such a route could be provided within the space available.

I am also asking that the council make a Section 106 agreement (s106) with the applicant to fund safety improvements for pedestrians and cyclists at the junction of Cavendish Street and Higher Cambridge Street – the applicant themselves discuss the shortcomings of the existing junction layout in Section 4.2.1 of the Transport Statement ("Cyclists have also been observed to queue on the footway to gain direct access to the Higher Cambridge Street/Cavendish Street junction (via a gap in the guard railings) rather than following the road markings which advise cyclists to dismount and use the controlled pedestrian crossings"). The improvements might take the form of a CYCLOPS junction. CYCLOPS is a homegrown Greater Manchester innovation now frequently used on Highways schemes across the country to deliver safe pedestrian and cycle movements without undue impact on traffic flows.

For prospective occupants and passers-by alike, in line with the S106 tests as set out in Paragraph 58 of the National Planning Policy Framework (NPPF) 2024, a contribution to junction safety improvements improvement would be 'necessary to make the development acceptable in planning terms' (by contributing to an appropriate movement strategy for the site), 'directly related to the development' (given its proximity, the pressure added to the junction by the proposed threefold increase in residents, and in light of the wholly inadequate mitigation route proposed by the applicant), and 'fairly and reasonably related in scale and kind to the development' (given the stated threefold increase in residents explained by the applicant, so directly adding more pressure to the junction).

1 Legal Status of Cavendish Street

This section of Cavendish Street, an adopted Highway, was subject to a stopping up order dated 14.06.1996. That order required that "the Developer shall provide a new highway which shall be a footpath/cycleway". MMU have since installed physical signage stating that Cavendish Street "has not been dedicated as a Highway" and have bolted down uncomfortable and restrictive speed bumps across the route in an apparent attempt to dissuade cyclists from exercising their legal rights over this space. Both measures may be unlawful, as my understanding is that cyclists do retain a legal Right of Way along Cavendish Street, unchanged from when the entire road was an adopted highway, and the speed bumps are inaccessible to some Disabled users.

2 Cycling routes and planning policy

The case for walking and cycling and specifically for maintaining and improving high quality cycling networks is clear at every level of modern planning policy, including:

- NPPF 2024's "vision-led approach"
- LTN 1/20
- Places For Everyone Joint Development Plan Objectives 6, 7 and 10
- Places for Everyone Joint Development Plan policies JP-Strat14, JP-C1, JP-C5 and JP-C6
- GM Transport Strategy 2040 and the "Right Mix" targets
- Greater Manchester Streets for All strategy and Streets for All design guide
- Manchester City Council's Active Travel Strategy
- Manchester City Council's commitment to be a Zero Carbon city by 2038

The policy position is absolutely clear – changes to the existing road and cycle networks should make cycling more convenient for people, not less convenient.

This specific stretch of Cavendish Street is a key part of the existing cycle network. It appears on TfGM's Bee Network map as a Beeway ("the routes that get people from A to B … representing the most direct routes between crossing points.") and connects to the Stretford Road Busy Beeway ("corridors or crossing points on busier roads that will require a higher level of design intervention to improve cycling and walking.") It is also mapped on the TfGM Cycle Network.

The national standard for cycling infrastructure is DfT guidance note LTN 1/20. LTN 1/20 advises above all else that cycle routes and networks should be Safe, Direct, Comfortable, Attractive and Coherent. Introducing unnecessary diversions, junctions and bends into a well-used existing route undermines all of these core principles, resulting in a lower quality cycle network which will make it harder for the council to achieve its cycling objectives.

The applicant has offered various reasons why diverting cyclists is necessary but all of these reasons seem to be either existing problems, or problems designed into the scheme. The proposal is to demolish and redevelop the site – so considerations like limited space and the placement of entrances, shop frontages, planting and pedestrian areas are entirely within the applicant's scope to manage. Instead of starting with the problem "there is an existing busy cycle route across this site, how can I design to accommodate everyone's needs?", it seems the applicant has started with the conclusion "cyclists must be deterred" and instructed their consultants to post-rationalise that decision.

3 Misleading claims regarding safety

Page 22 of the Design & Access Statement refers to the "existing controversial link along Cavendish St., which is resulting in collisions of pedestrians, electric scooters, cyclists, etc."

However the map of recorded collisions, on page 18 of the Transport Statement submitted in the same planning application, shows no recorded collisions whatsoever on this link, only on the adjacent main roads.

It appears the applicant is attempting to restrict cycle access based on a "problem" for which they have no evidence.

Yours sincerely,

[redacted]

****
This email and any files transmitted with it are confidential and intended solely for the use of the individual or entity to whom they are addressed.
If you have received this email in error, please notify the sender, or [redacted] and then permanently delete the email, attachments and all copies.
The full text of the Council's email disclaimer is available at: www.manchester.gov.uk/emaildisclaimer.
Your personal data is very important to us. Please refer to our privacy notice at: www.manchester.gov.uk/privacy for further information.

This footnote also confirms that this email message has been swept for the presence of computer viruses.
****

Outlook

Fw: Comment on Planning Application 142888/FO/2025

From Planning <[redacted]
Date Tue 01/07/2025 11:22
To Lucy Harrison <[redacted]

Information, Delivery & Support Team
Planning, Building Control & Licensing
Growth & Development Directorate
Postal address: Manchester City Council, P O Box 532, Town Hall, Manchester M60 2LA
Location address: Level 6 Town Hall Extension, Manchester M2 5DB
Tel: 0161 234 4516

Please consider the environment before printing an e-mail.

From: [redacted]
Sent: 01 July 2025 10:13
To: Planning <[redacted]
Subject: Comment on Planning Application 142888/FO/2025

You don't often get email from [redacted] Learn why this is important

ALERT This message originated outside of the Manchester City Council network. **BE CAUTIOUS** before clicking any links or opening any attachments. Please remember your Cyber Training and report anything suspicious.

Dear Manchester Planning team,

I am writing to lodge an objection to planning application 142888/FO/2025 – Cambridge Halls Of Residence Cavendish Street Manchester M15 6TT.

My primary objection is that the proposals have been designed to deter cyclists from using the safest and most direct route through the site. This route has been open to cyclists ever since the road was first built; it is an essential, well-used part of the city's cycling network and therefore the proposal to deter and/or divert cycles away from Cavendish Street is directly at odds with Manchester City Council's planning, sustainability and transport policies.

If as proposed as a cyclist I would need to share the road with cars I would simply stop cycling and use my car again as it is not a safe practice for cyclists and cars to share routes. I would encourage you to plan a segregated cycle lane along the route that connects suburban areas to the city centre.

The applicant has also made misleading claims regarding the road's legal status and regarding pedestrian safety which I will outline below.

I am asking that the council refuse this application, and invite the developer to come back with a

proposal that maintains direct cycle as well as pedestrian access along Cavendish Street, designed to modern standards set out in Greater Manchester's Streets For All design guide and in Department for Transport guidance note LTN 1/20. I am sure that the Highways team at MCC and the Active Travel team at TfGM will, if asked, be happy to comment on how such a route could be provided within the space available.

I am also asking that the council make a Section 106 agreement (s106) with the applicant to fund safety improvements for pedestrians and cyclists at the junction of Cavendish Street and Higher Cambridge Street – the applicant themselves discuss the shortcomings of the existing junction layout in Section 4.2.1 of the Transport Statement ("Cyclists have also been observed to queue on the footway to gain direct access to the Higher Cambridge Street/Cavendish Street junction (via a gap in the guard railings) rather than following the road markings which advise cyclists to dismount and use the controlled pedestrian crossings"). The improvements might take the form of a CYCLOPS junction. CYCLOPS is a homegrown Greater Manchester innovation now frequently used on Highways schemes across the country to deliver safe pedestrian and cycle movements without undue impact on traffic flows.

For prospective occupants and passers-by alike, in line with the S106 tests as set out in Paragraph 58 of the National Planning Policy Framework (NPPF) 2024, a contribution to junction safety improvements improvement would be 'necessary to make the development acceptable in planning terms' (by contributing to an appropriate movement strategy for the site), 'directly related to the development' (given its proximity, the pressure added to the junction by the proposed threefold increase in residents, and in light of the wholly inadequate mitigation route proposed by the applicant), and 'fairly and reasonably related in scale and kind to the development' (given the stated threefold increase in residents explained by the applicant, so directly adding more pressure to the junction).

1 Legal Status of Cavendish Street

This section of Cavendish Street, an adopted Highway, was subject to a stopping up order dated 14.06.1996. That order required that "the Developer shall provide a new highway which shall be a footpath/cycleway". MMU have since installed physical signage stating that Cavendish Street "has not been dedicated as a Highway" and have bolted down uncomfortable and restrictive speed bumps across the route in an apparent attempt to dissuade cyclists from exercising their legal rights over this space. Both measures may be unlawful, as my understanding is that cyclists do retain a legal Right of Way along Cavendish Street, unchanged from when the entire road was an adopted highway, and the speed bumps are inaccessible to some Disabled users.

2 Cycling routes and planning policy

The case for walking and cycling and specifically for maintaining and improving high quality cycling networks is clear at every level of modern planning policy, including:

NPPF 2024's "vision-led approach"
LTN 1/20
Places For Everyone Joint Development Plan Objectives 6, 7 and 10
Places for Everyone Joint Development Plan policies JP-Strat14, JP-C1, JP-C5 and JP-C6
GM Transport Strategy 2040 and the "Right Mix" targets
Greater Manchester Streets for All strategy and Streets for All design guide
Manchester City Council's Active Travel Strategy
Manchester City Council's commitment to be a Zero Carbon city by 2038
The policy position is absolutely clear – changes to the existing road and cycle networks should

make cycling more convenient for people, not less convenient.

This specific stretch of Cavendish Street is a key part of the existing cycle network. It appears on TfGM's Bee Network map as a Beeway ("the routes that get people from A to B … representing the most direct routes between crossing points.") and connects to the Stretford Road Busy Beeway ("corridors or crossing points on busier roads that will require a higher level of design intervention to improve cycling and walking.") It is also mapped on the TfGM Cycle Network.

The national standard for cycling infrastructure is DfT guidance note LTN 1/20. LTN 1/20 advises above all else that cycle routes and networks should be Safe, Direct, Comfortable, Attractive and Coherent. Introducing unnecessary diversions, junctions and bends into a well-used existing route undermines all of these core principles, resulting in a lower quality cycle network which will make it harder for the council to achieve its cycling objectives.

The applicant has offered various reasons why diverting cyclists is necessary but all of these reasons seem to be either existing problems, or problems designed into the scheme. The proposal is to demolish and redevelop the site – so considerations like limited space and the placement of entrances, shop frontages, planting and pedestrian areas are entirely within the applicant's scope to manage. Instead of starting with the problem "there is an existing busy cycle route across this site, how can I design to accommodate everyone's needs?", it seems the applicant has started with the conclusion "cyclists must be deterred" and instructed their consultants to post-rationalise that decision.

3 Misleading claims regarding safety

Page 22 of the Design & Access Statement refers to the "existing controversial link along Cavendish St., which is resulting in collisions of pedestrians, electric scooters, cyclists, etc."

However the map of recorded collisions, on page 18 of the Transport Statement submitted in the same planning application, shows no recorded collisions whatsoever on this link, only on the adjacent main roads.

It appears the applicant is attempting to restrict cycle access based on a "problem" for which they have no evidence.

Yours sincerely,

[redacted]

****
This email and any files transmitted with it are confidential and intended solely for the use of the individual or entity to whom they are addressed.
If you have received this email in error, please notify the sender, or [redacted] and then permanently delete the email, attachments and all copies.
The full text of the Council's email disclaimer is available at: www.manchester.gov.uk/emaildisclaimer.
Your personal data is very important to us. Please refer to our privacy notice at: www.manchester.gov.uk/privacy for further information.

This footnote also confirms that this email message has been swept for the presence of computer viruses.
****

Outlook

Fw: Objection to Planning Application 142888/FO/2025 – Cavendish Street

From Planning <[redacted]
Date Mon 30/06/2025 08:47
To Lucy Harrison <[redacted]

Information, Delivery & Support Team
Planning, Building Control & Licensing
Growth & Development Directorate
Postal address: Manchester City Council, P O Box 532, Town Hall, Manchester M60 2LA
Location address: Level 6 Town Hall Extension, Manchester M2 5DB
Tel: 0161 234 4516

Please consider the environment before printing an e-mail.

From: [redacted]
Sent: 29 June 2025 10:40
To: Planning <[redacted]
Cc: [redacted]
Subject: Objection to Planning Application 142888/FO/2025 – Cavendish Street

You don't often get email from [redacted] Learn why this is important

ALERT This message originated outside of the Manchester City Council network. **BE CAUTIOUS** before clicking any links or opening any attachments. Please remember your Cyber Training and report anything suspicious.

Subject: Objection to Planning Application 142888/FO/2025 – Cavendish Street

Dear Manchester Planning Team,

I am writing to object to planning application 142888/FO/2025 – Cambridge Halls of Residence, Cavendish Street, Manchester M15 6TT.

As someone who lives in the city centre and works at Manchester Grammar School, this route is part of my daily commute. When I changed jobs three years ago, one of the key reasons was to enable myself to commute via a safer cycling route. Cavendish Street forms an essential part of that route. Many of the students I teach also cycle to school, and for some of them, this is part of their route too. Manchester often describes itself as a "cycling city", but decisions like this directly contradict that aspiration.

The proposals seem deliberately designed to discourage cyclists from using what is currently the safest, most direct route through this part of the city. This is a route that has long been open to cyclists and is vital for active travel between key parts of Manchester. Removing or diverting cycle access here would have a real and negative impact not just on my own daily travel, but also on the journeys of students and many others who rely on it for safe, sustainable transport.

I'm disappointed to see the applicant presenting misleading information about the legal status of Cavendish Street and falsely suggesting safety issues without evidence to back this up. In fact, the applicant's own submitted collision data shows that there are no recorded incidents on Cavendish Street itself — only on the surrounding roads.

I urge the council to reject this application in its current form and require the developer to submit revised plans that maintain direct cycle access in line with modern standards such as *Streets for All* and LTN 1/20. It's absolutely possible to design a site that works for pedestrians, cyclists, and residents alike — and Manchester should be demanding nothing less.

Furthermore, I ask the council to include a Section 106 agreement requiring the developer to fund long-overdue improvements at the dangerous junction of Cavendish Street and Higher Cambridge Street. The developer themselves acknowledges the issues here in their own Transport Statement. A CYCLOPS junction at this location would be a fitting and effective solution — delivering safety for both pedestrians and cyclists while future-proofing the area's transport network.

This objection isn't about inconvenience — it's about safety, sustainability, and consistency with Manchester's own policies and climate commitments. Decisions like this will determine whether Manchester truly becomes a city that supports active travel, or whether it continues to undermine it through poor planning choices.

Yours sincerely,

[redacted]

****
This email and any files transmitted with it are confidential and intended solely for the use of the individual or entity to whom they are addressed.
If you have received this email in error, please notify the sender, or [redacted] and then permanently delete the email, attachments and all copies.
The full text of the Council's email disclaimer is available at: www.manchester.gov.uk/emaildisclaimer.
Your personal data is very important to us. Please refer to our privacy notice at: www.manchester.gov.uk/privacy for further information.

This footnote also confirms that this email message has been swept for the presence of computer viruses.
****

Outlook

Fw: Subject: Comment on Planning Application 142888/FO/2025

From Planning <[redacted]>
Date Mon 14/07/2025 14:04
To Lucy Harrison <[redacted]>

Information, Delivery & Support Team
Planning, Building Control & Licensing
Growth & Development Directorate
Postal address: Manchester City Council, P O Box 532, Town Hall, Manchester M60 2LA
Location address: Level 6 Town Hall Extension, Manchester M2 5DB
Tel: 0161 234 4516

Please consider the environment before printing an e-mail.

From: [redacted]
Sent: 12 July 2025 08:24
To: Planning <[redacted]>
Subject: Subject: Comment on Planning Application 142888/FO/2025

You don't often get email from [redacted] Learn why this is important

ALERT This message originated outside of the Manchester City Council network. **BE CAUTIOUS** before clicking any links or opening any attachments. Please remember your Cyber Training and report anything suspicious.

Dear Manchester Planning team,

I am writing to lodge an objection to planning application **142888/FO/2025** – Cambridge Halls Of Residence Cavendish Street Manchester M15 6TT.

My primary objection is that the proposals have been designed to deter cyclists from using the safest and most direct route through the site. This route has been open to cyclists ever since the road was first built; it is an essential, well-used part of the city's cycling network and therefore the proposal to deter and/or divert cycles away from Cavendish Street is directly at odds with Manchester City Council's planning, sustainability and transport policies.

existing route undermines all of these core principles, resulting in a lower quality cycle network which will make it harder for the council to achieve its cycling objectives.

The applicant has offered various reasons why diverting cyclists is necessary but all of these reasons seem to be either existing problems, or problems designed into the scheme. The proposal is to demolish and redevelop the site – so considerations like limited space and the placement of entrances, shop frontages, planting and pedestrian areas are entirely within the applicant's scope to manage. Instead of starting with the problem "there is an existing busy cycle route across this site, how can I design to accommodate everyone's needs?", it seems the applicant has started with the conclusion "cyclists must be deterred" and instructed their consultants to post-rationalise that decision.

3 Misleading claims regarding safety

Page 22 of the Design & Access Statement refers to the "existing controversial link along Cavendish St., which is resulting in collisions of pedestrians, electric scooters, cyclists, etc."

However the map of recorded collisions, on page 18 of the Transport Statement submitted in the same planning application, shows no recorded collisions whatsoever on this link, only on the adjacent main roads.

It appears the applicant is attempting to restrict cycle access based on a "problem" for which they have no evidence.

Yours sincerely,

[redacted]

Sent from my Galaxy

****
This email and any files transmitted with it are confidential and intended solely for the use of the individual or entity to whom they are addressed.
If you have received this email in error, please notify the sender, or [redacted] and then permanently delete the email, attachments and all copies.
The full text of the Council's email disclaimer is available at: www.manchester.gov.uk/emaildisclaimer.
Your personal data is very important to us. Please refer to our privacy notice at: www.manchester.gov.uk/privacy for further information.

This footnote also confirms that this email message has been swept for the presence of computer viruses.
****

Outlook

Fw: Comment on Planning Application 142888/FO/2025

From Planning <[redacted]
Date Mon 30/06/2025 08:50
To Lucy Harrison <[redacted]

Information, Delivery & Support Team
Planning, Building Control & Licensing
Growth & Development Directorate
Postal address: Manchester City Council, P O Box 532, Town Hall, Manchester M60 2LA
Location address: Level 6 Town Hall Extension, Manchester M2 5DB
Tel: 0161 234 4516

Please consider the environment before printing an e-mail.

From: [redacted]
Sent: 28 June 2025 15:24
To: Planning <[redacted]
Subject: Comment on Planning Application 142888/FO/2025

[You don't often get email from [redacted] Learn why this is important at https://aka.ms/LearnAboutSenderIdentification]

ALERT This message originated outside of the Manchester City Council network. BE CAUTIOUS before clicking any links or opening any attachments. Please remember your Cyber Training and report anything suspicious.

Dear Manchester Planning team,

I am writing to lodge an objection to planning application 142888/FO/2025 – Cambridge Halls Of Residence Cavendish Street Manchester M15 6TT.

My primary objection is that the proposals have been designed to deter cyclists from using the safest and most direct route through the site. This route has been open to cyclists ever since the road was first built; it is an essential, well-used part of the city's cycling network and therefore the proposal to deter and/or divert cycles away from Cavendish Street is directly at odds with Manchester City Council's planning, sustainability and transport policies.

The applicant has also made misleading claims regarding the road's legal status and regarding pedestrian safety which I will outline below.

I am asking that the council refuse this application, and invite the developer to come back with a proposal that maintains direct cycle as well as pedestrian access along Cavendish Street, designed to modern standards set out in Greater Manchester's Streets For All design guide and in Department for Transport guidance note LTN 1/20. I am sure that the Highways team at MCC and the Active Travel team at TfGM will, if asked, be happy to comment on how such a route could be provided within the space available.

I am also asking that the council make a Section 106 agreement (s106) with the applicant to fund safety improvements for pedestrians and cyclists at the junction of Cavendish Street and Higher Cambridge Street – the applicant themselves discuss the shortcomings of the existing junction layout in Section 4.2.1 of the Transport Statement ("Cyclists have also been observed to queue on the footway to gain direct access to the Higher Cambridge Street/Cavendish Street junction (via a gap in the guard railings) rather than following the road markings which advise cyclists to dismount and use the controlled pedestrian crossings"). The improvements might take the form of a CYCLOPS junction. CYCLOPS is a homegrown Greater Manchester innovation now frequently used on Highways schemes across the country to deliver safe pedestrian and cycle movements without undue impact on traffic flows.

For prospective occupants and passers-by alike, in line with the S106 tests as set out in Paragraph 58 of the National Planning Policy Framework (NPPF) 2024, a contribution to junction safety improvements improvement would be 'necessary to make the development acceptable in planning terms' (by contributing to an appropriate movement strategy for the site), 'directly related to the development' (given its proximity, the pressure added to the junction by the proposed threefold increase in residents, and in light of the wholly inadequate mitigation route proposed by the applicant), and 'fairly and reasonably related in scale and kind to the development' (given the stated threefold increase in residents explained by the applicant, so directly adding more pressure to the junction).

1 Legal Status of Cavendish Street

This section of Cavendish Street, an adopted Highway, was subject to a stopping up order dated 14.06.1996. That order required that "the Developer shall provide a new highway which shall be a footpath/cycleway". MMU have since installed physical signage stating that Cavendish Street "has not been dedicated as a Highway" and have bolted down uncomfortable and restrictive speed bumps across the route in an apparent attempt to dissuade cyclists from exercising their legal rights over this space. Both measures may be unlawful, as my understanding is that cyclists do retain a legal Right of Way along Cavendish Street, unchanged from when the entire road was an adopted highway, and the speed bumps are inaccessible to some Disabled users.

2 Cycling routes and planning policy

The case for walking and cycling and specifically for maintaining and improving high quality cycling networks is clear at every level of modern planning policy, including:

NPPF 2024's "vision-led approach"
LTN 1/20
Places For Everyone Joint Development Plan Objectives 6, 7 and 10
Places for Everyone Joint Development Plan policies JP-Strat14, JP-C1, JP-C5 and JP-C6
GM Transport Strategy 2040 and the "Right Mix" targets
Greater Manchester Streets for All strategy and Streets for All design guide
Manchester City Council's Active Travel Strategy
Manchester City Council's commitment to be a Zero Carbon city by 2038
The policy position is absolutely clear – changes to the existing road and cycle networks should make cycling more convenient for people, not less convenient.

This specific stretch of Cavendish Street is a key part of the existing cycle network. It appears on TfGM's Bee Network map as a Beeway ("the routes that get people from A to B … representing the most direct routes between crossing points.") and connects to the Stretford Road Busy Beeway ("corridors or crossing points on busier roads that will require a higher level of design intervention to improve cycling and walking.") It is also mapped on the TfGM Cycle Network.

The national standard for cycling infrastructure is DfT guidance note LTN 1/20. LTN 1/20 advises above all else that cycle routes and networks should be Safe, Direct, Comfortable, Attractive and Coherent. Introducing unnecessary diversions, junctions and bends into a well-used existing route undermines all of these core principles, resulting in a lower quality cycle network which will make it harder for the council to achieve its cycling objectives.

The applicant has offered various reasons why diverting cyclists is necessary but all of these reasons seem to be either existing problems, or problems designed into the scheme. The proposal is to demolish and redevelop the site – so considerations like limited space and the placement of entrances, shop frontages, planting and pedestrian areas are entirely within the applicant's scope to manage. Instead of starting with the problem "there is an existing busy cycle route across this site, how can I design to accommodate everyone's needs?", it seems the applicant has started with the conclusion "cyclists must be deterred" and instructed their consultants to post-rationalise that decision.

3 Misleading claims regarding safety

Page 22 of the Design & Access Statement refers to the "existing controversial link along Cavendish St., which is resulting in

collisions of pedestrians, electric scooters, cyclists, etc."

However the map of recorded collisions, on page 18 of the Transport Statement submitted in the same planning application, shows no recorded collisions whatsoever on this link, only on the adjacent main roads.

It appears the applicant is attempting to restrict cycle access based on a "problem" for which they have no evidence.

Yours sincerely,

[redacted]

****
This email and any files transmitted with it are confidential and intended solely for the use of the individual or entity to whom they are addressed. If you have received this email in error, please notify the sender, or [redacted] and then permanently delete the email, attachments and all copies.
The full text of the Council's email disclaimer is available at: www.manchester.gov.uk/emaildisclaimer.
Your personal data is very important to us. Please refer to our privacy notice at: www.manchester.gov.uk/privacy for further information.

This footnote also confirms that this email message has been swept for the presence of computer viruses.
****

Outlook

Fw: Comment on Planning Application 142888/FO/2025

From Planning <[redacted]
Date Mon 07/07/2025 11:05
To Lucy Harrison <[redacted]

Information, Delivery & Support Team
Planning, Building Control & Licensing
Growth & Development Directorate
Postal address: Manchester City Council, P O Box 532, Town Hall, Manchester M60 2LA
Location address: Level 6 Town Hall Extension, Manchester M2 5DB
Tel: 0161 234 4516

Please consider the environment before printing an e-mail.

From: [redacted]
Sent: 06 July 2025 19:00
To: Planning <[redacted]
Subject: Comment on Planning Application 142888/FO/2025

You don't often get email from [redacted] Learn why this is important

ALERT This message originated outside of the Manchester City Council network. **BE CAUTIOUS** before clicking any links or opening any attachments. Please remember your Cyber Training and report anything suspicious.

Dear Manchester Planning team,

I am writing to lodge an objection to planning application **142888/FO/2025** – Cambridge Halls Of Residence Cavendish Street Manchester M15 6TT.

My primary objection is that the proposals have been designed to deter cyclists from using the safest and most direct route through the site. This route has been open to cyclists ever since the road was first built; it is an essential, well-used part of the city's cycling network and therefore the proposal to deter and/or divert cycles away from Cavendish Street is directly at odds with Manchester City Council's planning, sustainability and transport policies.

I used the road extensively pre 1990 and have continued to use its current format to access east-west journeys south of the city.

The applicant has also made misleading claims regarding the road's legal status and regarding pedestrian safety which I will outline below.

I am asking that the council **refuse** this application, and invite the developer to come back with a proposal that maintains direct cycle as well as pedestrian access along Cavendish Street, designed to modern standards set out in Greater Manchester's Streets For All design guide and in Department for Transport guidance note LTN 1/20. I am sure that the Highways team at MCC and the Active Travel team at TfGM will, if asked, be happy to comment on how such a route could be provided within the space available.

I am also asking that the council **make a Section 106 agreement (s106)** with the applicant to fund safety improvements for pedestrians and cyclists at the junction of Cavendish Street and Higher Cambridge Street – the applicant themselves discuss the shortcomings of the existing junction layout in Section 4.2.1 of the Transport Statement ("*Cyclists have also been observed to queue on the footway to gain direct access to the Higher Cambridge Street/Cavendish Street junction (via a gap in the guard railings) rather than following the road markings which advise cyclists to dismount and use the controlled pedestrian crossings*"). The improvements might take the form of a CYCLOPS junction. CYCLOPS is a homegrown Greater Manchester innovation now frequently used on Highways schemes across the country to deliver safe pedestrian and cycle movements without undue impact on traffic flows.

For prospective occupants and passers-by alike, in line with the S106 tests as set out in Paragraph 58 of the National Planning Policy Framework (NPPF) 2024, a contribution to junction safety improvements improvement would be 'necessary to make the development acceptable in planning terms' (by contributing to an appropriate movement strategy for the site), 'directly related to the development' (given its proximity, the pressure added to the junction by the proposed threefold increase in residents, and in light of the wholly inadequate mitigation route proposed by the applicant), and 'fairly and reasonably related in scale and kind to the development' (given the stated threefold increase in residents explained by the applicant, so directly adding more pressure to the junction).

1 Legal Status of Cavendish Street
This section of Cavendish Street, an adopted Highway, was subject to a stopping up order dated 14.06.1996. That order required that "the Developer shall provide a new highway which shall be a footpath/cycleway". MMU have since installed physical signage stating that Cavendish Street "has not been dedicated as a Highway" and have bolted down uncomfortable and restrictive speed bumps across the route in an apparent attempt to dissuade cyclists from exercising their legal rights over this space. Both measures may be unlawful, as my understanding is that cyclists do retain a legal Right of Way along Cavendish Street, unchanged from when the entire road was an adopted highway, and the speed bumps are inaccessible to some Disabled users.

2 Cycling routes and planning policy
The case for walking and cycling and specifically for maintaining and improving high quality cycling networks is clear at every level of modern planning policy, including:

- NPPF 2024's "vision-led approach"
- LTN 1/20
- Places For Everyone Joint Development Plan Objectives 6, 7 and 10
- Places for Everyone Joint Development Plan policies JP-Strat14, JP-C1, JP-C5 and JP-C6
- GM Transport Strategy 2040 and the "Right Mix" targets
- Greater Manchester Streets for All strategy and Streets for All design guide
- Manchester City Council's Active Travel Strategy
- Manchester City Council's commitment to be a Zero Carbon city by 2038

The policy position is absolutely clear – changes to the existing road and cycle networks should make cycling more convenient for people, not less convenient. This specific stretch of Cavendish Street is a key part of the existing cycle network. It appears on TfGM's Bee Network map as a Beeway ("the routes that get people from A to B … representing the most direct routes between crossing points.") and connects to the Stretford Road Busy Beeway ("corridors or crossing points on busier roads that will require a higher level of design intervention to improve cycling and walking.") It is also mapped on the TfGM Cycle Network.

The national standard for cycling infrastructure is DfT guidance note LTN 1/20. LTN 1/20 advises above all else that cycle routes and networks should be Safe, Direct, Comfortable, Attractive and Coherent. Introducing unnecessary diversions, junctions and bends into a well-used existing route undermines all of these core principles, resulting in a lower quality cycle network which will make it harder for the council to achieve its cycling objectives.

The applicant has offered various reasons why diverting cyclists is necessary but all of these reasons seem to be either existing problems, or problems designed into the scheme. The proposal is to demolish and redevelop the site – so considerations like limited space and the placement of entrances, shop frontages, planting and pedestrian areas are entirely within the applicant's scope to manage. Instead of starting with the problem "there is an existing busy cycle route across this site, how can I design to accommodate everyone's needs?", it seems the applicant has started with the conclusion "cyclists must be deterred" and instructed their consultants to post-rationalise that decision.

3 Misleading claims regarding safety
Page 22 of the Design & Access Statement refers to the "existing controversial link along Cavendish St., which is resulting in collisions of pedestrians, electric scooters, cyclists, etc."
However the map of recorded collisions, on page 18 of the Transport Statement submitted in the same planning application, shows no recorded collisions whatsoever on this link, only on the adjacent main roads.
It appears the applicant is attempting to restrict cycle access based on a "problem" for which they have no evidence.

access to the Higher Cambridge Street/Cavendish Street junction (via a gap in the guard railings) rather than following the road markings which advise cyclists to dismount and use the controlled pedestrian crossings"). The improvements might take the form of a CYCLOPS junction. CYCLOPS is a homegrown Greater Manchester innovation now

frequently used on Highways schemes across the country to deliver safe pedestrian and cycle movements without undue impact on traffic flows.

For prospective occupants and passers-by alike, in line with the S106 tests as set out in Paragraph 58 of the National Planning Policy Framework (NPPF) 2024, a contribution to junction safety improvements improvement would be 'necessary to make the development acceptable in planning terms' (by contributing to an appropriate movement strategy for the site), 'directly related to the development' (given its proximity, the pressure added to the junction by the proposed threefold increase in residents, and in light of the wholly inadequate mitigation route proposed by the applicant), and 'fairly and reasonably related in scale and kind to the development' (given the stated threefold increase in residents explained by the applicant, so directly adding more pressure to the junction).

1 Legal Status of Cavendish Street
This section of Cavendish Street, an adopted Highway, was subject to a stopping up order dated 14.06.1996. That order required that "the Developer shall provide a new highway which shall be a footpath/cycleway". MMU have since installed physical signage stating that Cavendish Street "has not been dedicated as a Highway" and have bolted down uncomfortable and restrictive speed bumps across the route in an apparent attempt to dissuade cyclists from exercising their legal rights over this space. Both measures may be unlawful, as my understanding is that cyclists do retain a legal Right of Way along Cavendish Street, unchanged from when the entire road was an adopted highway, and the speed bumps are inaccessible to some Disabled users.

2 Cycling routes and planning policy
The case for walking and cycling and specifically for maintaining and improving high quality cycling networks is clear at every level of modern planning policy, including:

- NPPF 2024's "vision-led approach"
- LTN 1/20
- Places For Everyone Joint Development Plan Objectives 6, 7 and 10
- Places for Everyone Joint Development Plan policies JP-Strat14, JP-C1, JP-C5 and JP-C6
- GM Transport Strategy 2040 and the "Right Mix" targets
- Greater Manchester Streets for All strategy and Streets for All design guide
- Manchester City Council's Active Travel Strategy
- Manchester City Council's commitment to be a Zero Carbon city by 2038

The policy position is absolutely clear – changes to the existing road and cycle networks should make cycling more convenient for people, not less convenient. This specific stretch of Cavendish Street is a key part of the existing cycle network. It appears on TfGM's Bee Network map as a Beeway ("the routes that

get people from A to B … representing the most direct routes between crossing points.") and connects to the Stretford Road Busy Beeway ("corridors or crossing points on busier roads that will require a higher level of design intervention to improve cycling and walking.") It is also mapped on the TfGM Cycle Network.

The national standard for cycling infrastructure is DfT guidance note LTN 1/20. LTN 1/20 advises above all else that cycle routes and networks should be Safe, Direct, Comfortable, Attractive and Coherent. Introducing unnecessary diversions, junctions and bends into a well-used existing route undermines all of these core principles, resulting in a lower quality cycle network which will make it harder for the council to achieve its cycling objectives.
The applicant has offered various reasons why diverting cyclists is necessary but all of these reasons seem to be either existing problems, or problems designed into the scheme. The proposal is to demolish and redevelop the site – so considerations like limited space and the placement of entrances, shop frontages, planting and pedestrian areas are entirely within the applicant's scope to manage. Instead of starting with the problem "there is an existing busy cycle route across this site, how can I design to accommodate everyone's needs?", it seems the applicant has started with the conclusion "cyclists must be deterred" and instructed their consultants to post-rationalise that decision.

3 Misleading claims regarding safety
Page 22 of the Design & Access Statement refers to the "existing controversial link along Cavendish St., which is resulting in collisions of pedestrians, electric scooters, cyclists, etc."
However the map of recorded collisions, on page 18 of the Transport Statement submitted in the same planning application, shows no recorded collisions whatsoever on this link, only on the adjacent main roads.
It appears the applicant is attempting to restrict cycle access based on a "problem" for which they have no evidence.

Yours sincerely,

[redacted]

****
This email and any files transmitted with it are confidential and intended solely for the use of the individual or entity to whom they are addressed.
If you have received this email in error, please notify the sender, or [redacted] and then permanently delete the email, attachments and all copies.
The full text of the Council's email disclaimer is available at: www.manchester.gov.uk/emaildisclaimer.
Your personal data is very important to us. Please refer to our privacy notice at: www.manchester.gov.uk/privacy for further information.

This footnote also confirms that this email message has been swept for the presence of computer viruses.
****

Outlook

Fw: Comment on Planning Application 142888/FO/2025

From Planning <[redacted]>
Date Mon 30/06/2025 08:50
To Lucy Harrison <[redacted]>

Information, Delivery & Support Team
Planning, Building Control & Licensing
Growth & Development Directorate
Postal address: Manchester City Council, P O Box 532, Town Hall, Manchester M60 2LA
Location address: Level 6 Town Hall Extension, Manchester M2 5DB
Tel: 0161 234 4516

Please consider the environment before printing an e-mail.

From: [redacted]
Sent: 28 June 2025 15:18
To: Planning <[redacted]>
Subject: Comment on Planning Application 142888/FO/2025

You don't often get email from [redacted] Learn why this is important

ALERT This message originated outside of the Manchester City Council network. **BE CAUTIOUS** before clicking any links or opening any attachments. Please remember your Cyber Training and report anything suspicious.

Dear Manchester Planning team, I am writing to lodge an objection to planning application 142888/FO/2025 – Cambridge Halls Of Residence Cavendish Street Manchester M15 6TT.
I use this route frequently and whilst I do agree that there does need to be clearer segregation of pedestrians and cyclists, the answer should be a cycle way designed to meet the standard requirements for the new protected cycle lanes within the Bee network. There is no reason why this can't be done, and to divert cyclists around would be unnecessarily obstructive when this route connects two of the busiest cycle lanes in Manchester - Chorlton Road and Oxford Road.

In fact, a proper cycle route with protected cycle lanes connecting Chorlton Road and Oxford Road along Stretford Road or similar direct route is desperately needed. There are lots of cyclists using this route and it feels quite unsafe, cars pass very close and pull out of junctions frequently. For such a busy route the current infrastructure is poor. The University corridor is a major site of employment and many people need to make this journey.
These proposals have been designed to deter cyclists from using the safest and most direct route through the site. This route has been open to cyclists ever since the road was first built; it is an essential, well-used part of the city's cycling network and therefore the proposal to deter and/or divert cycles away

from Cavendish Street is directly at odds with Manchester City Council's planning, sustainability and transport policies.
I am asking that the council refuse this application, and invite the developer to come back with a proposal that maintains direct cycle as well as pedestrian access along Cavendish Street, designed to modern standards set out in Greater Manchester's Streets For All design guide and in Department for Transport guidance note LTN 1/20. I am sure that the Highways team at MCC and the Active Travel team at TfGM will, if asked, be happy to comment on how such a route could be provided within the space available. I am also asking that the council make a Section 106 agreement (s106) with the applicant to fund safety improvements for pedestrians and cyclists at the junction of Cavendish Street and Higher Cambridge Street – the applicant themselves discuss the shortcomings of the existing junction layout in Section 4.2.1 of the Transport Statement ("Cyclists have also been observed to queue on the footway to gain direct access to the Higher Cambridge Street/Cavendish Street junction (via a gap in the guard railings) rather than following the road markings which advise cyclists to dismount and use the controlled pedestrian crossings"). The improvements might take the form of a CYCLOPS junction. CYCLOPS is a homegrown Greater Manchester innovation now frequently used on Highways schemes across the country to deliver safe pedestrian and cycle movements without undue impact on traffic flows. For prospective occupants and passers-by alike, in line with the S106 tests as set out in Paragraph 58 of the National Planning Policy Framework (NPPF) 2024, a contribution to junction safety improvements improvement would be 'necessary to make the development acceptable in planning terms' (by contributing to an appropriate movement strategy for the site), 'directly related to the development' (given its proximity, the pressure added to the junction by the proposed threefold increase in residents, and in light of the wholly inadequate mitigation route proposed by the applicant), and 'fairly and reasonably related in scale and kind to the development' (given the stated threefold increase in residents explained by the applicant, so directly adding more pressure to the junction).
Further objections:
1 Legal Status of Cavendish Street This section of Cavendish Street, an adopted Highway, was subject to a stopping up order dated 14.06.1996. That order required that "the Developer shall provide a new highway which shall be a footpath/cycleway". MMU have since installed physical signage stating that Cavendish Street "has not been dedicated as a Highway" and have bolted down uncomfortable and restrictive speed bumps across the route in an apparent attempt to dissuade cyclists from exercising their legal rights over this space. Both measures may be unlawful, as my understanding is that cyclists do retain a legal Right of Way along Cavendish Street, unchanged from when the entire road was an adopted highway, and the speed bumps are inaccessible to some Disabled users. 2 Cycling routes and planning policy The case for walking and cycling and specifically for maintaining and improving high quality cycling networks is clear at every level of modern planning policy, including: NPPF 2024's "vision-led approach" LTN 1/20 Places For Everyone Joint Development Plan Objectives 6, 7 and 10 Places for Everyone Joint Development Plan policies JP-Strat14, JP-C1, JP-C5 and JP-C6 GM Transport Strategy 2040 and the "Right Mix" targets Greater Manchester Streets for All strategy and Streets for All design guide Manchester City Council's Active Travel Strategy Manchester City Council's commitment to be a Zero Carbon city by 2038 The policy position is absolutely clear – changes to the existing road and cycle networks should make cycling more convenient for

people, not less convenient. This specific stretch of Cavendish Street is a key part of the existing cycle network. It appears on TfGM's Bee Network map as a Beeway ("the routes that get people from A to B … representing the most direct routes between crossing points.") and connects to the Stretford Road Busy Beeway ("corridors or crossing points on busier roads that will require a higher level of design intervention to improve cycling and walking.") It is also mapped on the TfGM Cycle Network. The national standard for cycling infrastructure is DfT guidance note LTN 1/20. LTN 1/20 advises above all else that cycle routes and networks should be Safe, Direct, Comfortable, Attractive and Coherent. Introducing unnecessary diversions, junctions and bends into a well-used existing route undermines all of these core principles, resulting in a lower quality cycle network which will make it harder for the council to achieve its cycling objectives. The applicant has offered various reasons why diverting cyclists is necessary but all of these reasons seem to be either existing problems, or problems designed into the scheme. The proposal is to demolish and redevelop the site – so considerations like limited space and the placement of entrances, shop frontages, planting and pedestrian areas are entirely within the applicant's scope to manage. Instead of starting with the problem "there is an existing busy cycle route across this site, how can I design to accommodate everyone's needs?", it seems the applicant has started with the conclusion "cyclists must be deterred" and instructed their consultants to post-rationalise that decision. 3 Misleading claims regarding safety Page 22 of the Design & Access Statement refers to the "existing controversial link along Cavendish St., which is resulting in collisions of pedestrians, electric scooters, cyclists, etc." However the map of recorded collisions, on page 18 of the Transport Statement submitted in the same planning application, shows no recorded collisions whatsoever on this link, only on the adjacent main roads. It appears the applicant is attempting to restrict cycle access based on a "problem" for which they have no evidence. Yours sincerely, [redacted]

[redacted]

[redacted]

[redacted]

****
This email and any files transmitted with it are confidential and intended solely for the use of the individual or entity to whom they are addressed.
If you have received this email in error, please notify the sender, or [redacted] and then permanently delete the email, attachments and all copies.
The full text of the Council's email disclaimer is available at: www.manchester.gov.uk/emaildisclaimer.
Your personal data is very important to us. Please refer to our privacy notice at: www.manchester.gov.uk/privacy for further information.

This footnote also confirms that this email message has been swept for the presence of computer viruses.
****

Outlook

Fw: Comment on Planning Application 142888/FO/2025

From Planning <[redacted]
Date Wed 02/07/2025 08:50
To Lucy Harrison <[redacted]

Information, Delivery & Support Team
Planning, Building Control & Licensing
Growth & Development Directorate
Postal address: Manchester City Council, P O Box 532, Town Hall, Manchester M60 2LA
Location address: Level 6 Town Hall Extension, Manchester M2 5DB
Tel: 0161 234 4516

Please consider the environment before printing an e-mail.

From: [redacted]
Sent: 01 July 2025 16:05
To: Planning <[redacted]
Subject: Comment on Planning Application 142888/FO/2025

You don't often get email from [redacted] Learn why this is important

ALERT This message originated outside of the Manchester City Council network. **BE CAUTIOUS** before clicking any links or opening any attachments. Please remember your Cyber Training and report anything suspicious.

Dear Manchester Planning team,

I am writing to lodge an objection to planning application 142888/FO/2025 – Cambridge Halls Of Residence Cavendish Street Manchester M15 6TT.

My primary objection is that the proposals have been designed to deter cyclists from using the safest and most direct route through the site. This route has been open to cyclists ever since the road was first built; it is an essential, well-used part of the city's cycling network and therefore the proposal to deter and/or divert cycles away from Cavendish Street is directly at odds with Manchester City Council's planning, sustainability and transport policies.

I regularly use it to cycle to work, and would feel considerably less safe if forced to find an alternative route in close proximity to traffic.

The applicant has also made misleading claims regarding the road's legal status and regarding pedestrian safety which I will outline below.

I am asking that the council refuse this application, and invite the developer to come back with a proposal that maintains direct cycle as well as pedestrian access along Cavendish Street, designed to modern standards set out in Greater Manchester's Streets For All design guide and in

Department for Transport guidance note LTN 1/20. I am sure that the Highways team at MCC and the Active Travel team at TfGM will, if asked, be happy to comment on how such a route could be provided within the space available.

I am also asking that the council make a Section 106 agreement (s106) with the applicant to fund safety improvements for pedestrians and cyclists at the junction of Cavendish Street and Higher Cambridge Street – the applicant themselves discuss the shortcomings of the existing junction layout in Section 4.2.1 of the Transport Statement ("Cyclists have also been observed to queue on the footway to gain direct access to the Higher Cambridge Street/Cavendish Street junction (via a gap in the guard railings) rather than following the road markings which advise cyclists to dismount and use the controlled pedestrian crossings"). The improvements might take the form of a CYCLOPS junction. CYCLOPS is a homegrown Greater Manchester innovation now frequently used on Highways schemes across the country to deliver safe pedestrian and cycle movements without undue impact on traffic flows.

For prospective occupants and passers-by alike, in line with the S106 tests as set out in Paragraph 58 of the National Planning Policy Framework (NPPF) 2024, a contribution to junction safety improvements improvement would be 'necessary to make the development acceptable in planning terms' (by contributing to an appropriate movement strategy for the site), 'directly related to the development' (given its proximity, the pressure added to the junction by the proposed threefold increase in residents, and in light of the wholly inadequate mitigation route proposed by the applicant), and 'fairly and reasonably related in scale and kind to the development' (given the stated threefold increase in residents explained by the applicant, so directly adding more pressure to the junction).

1 Legal Status of Cavendish Street

This section of Cavendish Street, an adopted Highway, was subject to a stopping up order dated 14.06.1996. That order required that "the Developer shall provide a new highway which shall be a footpath/cycleway". MMU have since installed physical signage stating that Cavendish Street "has not been dedicated as a Highway" and have bolted down uncomfortable and restrictive speed bumps across the route in an apparent attempt to dissuade cyclists from exercising their legal rights over this space. Both measures may be unlawful, as my understanding is that cyclists do retain a legal Right of Way along Cavendish Street, unchanged from when the entire road was an adopted highway, and the speed bumps are inaccessible to some Disabled users.

2 Cycling routes and planning policy

The case for walking and cycling and specifically for maintaining and improving high quality cycling networks is clear at every level of modern planning policy, including:

- NPPF 2024's "vision-led approach"
- LTN 1/20
- Places For Everyone Joint Development Plan Objectives 6, 7 and 10
- Places for Everyone Joint Development Plan policies JP-Strat14, JP-C1, JP-C5 and JP-C6
- GM Transport Strategy 2040 and the "Right Mix" targets
- Greater Manchester Streets for All strategy and Streets for All design guide

- Manchester City Council's Active Travel Strategy
- Manchester City Council's commitment to be a Zero Carbon city by 2038

The policy position is absolutely clear – changes to the existing road and cycle networks should make cycling more convenient for people, not less convenient.

This specific stretch of Cavendish Street is a key part of the existing cycle network. It appears on TfGM's Bee Network map as a Beeway ("the routes that get people from A to B … representing the most direct routes between crossing points.") and connects to the Stretford Road Busy Beeway ("corridors or crossing points on busier roads that will require a higher level of design intervention to improve cycling and walking.") It is also mapped on the TfGM Cycle Network.

The national standard for cycling infrastructure is DfT guidance note LTN 1/20. LTN 1/20 advises above all else that cycle routes and networks should be Safe, Direct, Comfortable, Attractive and Coherent. Introducing unnecessary diversions, junctions and bends into a well-used existing route undermines all of these core principles, resulting in a lower quality cycle network which will make it harder for the council to achieve its cycling objectives.

The applicant has offered various reasons why diverting cyclists is necessary but all of these reasons seem to be either existing problems, or problems designed into the scheme. The proposal is to demolish and redevelop the site – so considerations like limited space and the placement of entrances, shop frontages, planting and pedestrian areas are entirely within the applicant's scope to manage. Instead of starting with the problem "there is an existing busy cycle route across this site, how can I design to accommodate everyone's needs?", it seems the applicant has started with the conclusion "cyclists must be deterred" and instructed their consultants to post-rationalise that decision.

3 Misleading claims regarding safety

Page 22 of the Design & Access Statement refers to the "existing controversial link along Cavendish St., which is resulting in collisions of pedestrians, electric scooters, cyclists, etc."

However the map of recorded collisions, on page 18 of the Transport Statement submitted in the same planning application, shows no recorded collisions whatsoever on this link, only on the adjacent main roads.

It appears the applicant is attempting to restrict cycle access based on a "problem" for which they have no evidence.

Yours sincerely,

[redacted]

****
This email and any files transmitted with it are confidential and intended solely for the use of the individual or entity to whom they are addressed.
If you have received this email in error, please notify the sender, or [redacted] and then permanently delete the email, attachments and all copies.
The full text of the Council's email disclaimer is available at: www.manchester.gov.uk/emaildisclaimer.
Your personal data is very important to us. Please refer to our privacy notice at: www.manchester.gov.uk/privacy for further information.

This footnote also confirms that this email message has been swept for the presence of computer viruses.
****

Outlook

Fw: Subject: Comment on Planning Application 142888/FO/2025

From Planning <[redacted]
Date Mon 30/06/2025 08:51
To Lucy Harrison <[redacted]

Information, Delivery & Support Team
Planning, Building Control & Licensing
Growth & Development Directorate
Postal address: Manchester City Council, P O Box 532, Town Hall, Manchester M60 2LA
Location address: Level 6 Town Hall Extension, Manchester M2 5DB
Tel: 0161 234 4516

Please consider the environment before printing an e-mail.

From: [redacted]
Sent: 28 June 2025 14:30
To: Planning <[redacted]
Subject: Subject: Comment on Planning Application 142888/FO/2025

You don't often get email from [redacted] Learn why this is important

ALERT This message originated outside of the Manchester City Council network. **BE CAUTIOUS** before clicking any links or opening any attachments. Please remember your Cyber Training and report anything suspicious.

Dear Manchester Planning team,

I am writing to lodge an objection to planning application **142888/FO/2025** – Cambridge Halls Of Residence Cavendish Street Manchester M15 6TT.

My primary objection is that the proposals have been designed to deter cyclists from using the safest and most direct route through the site. This route has been open to cyclists ever since the road was first built; it is an essential, well-used part of the city's cycling network and therefore the proposal to deter and/or divert cycles away from Cavendish Street is directly at odds with Manchester City Council's planning, sustainability and transport policies.

I regularly use this route when cycling and the proposed change would make cycling less safe.

The applicant has also made misleading claims regarding the road's legal status and regarding pedestrian safety which I will outline below.

I am asking that the council **refuse** this application, and invite the developer to come back with a proposal that maintains direct cycle as well as pedestrian access along Cavendish Street, designed to

modern standards set out in Greater Manchester's Streets For All design guide and in Department for Transport guidance note LTN 1/20. I am sure that the Highways team at MCC and the Active Travel team at TfGM will, if asked, be happy to comment on how such a route could be provided within the space available.

I am also asking that the council **make a Section 106 agreement (s106)** with the applicant to fund safety improvements for pedestrians and cyclists at the junction of Cavendish Street and Higher Cambridge Street – the applicant themselves discuss the shortcomings of the existing junction layout in Section 4.2.1 of the Transport Statement ("*Cyclists have also been observed to queue on the footway to gain direct access to the Higher Cambridge Street/Cavendish Street junction (via a gap in the guard railings) rather than following the road markings which advise cyclists to dismount and use the controlled pedestrian crossings*"). The improvements might take the form of a CYCLOPS junction. CYCLOPS is a homegrown Greater Manchester innovation now frequently used on Highways schemes across the country to deliver safe pedestrian and cycle movements without undue impact on traffic flows.

For prospective occupants and passers-by alike, in line with the S106 tests as set out in Paragraph 58 of the National Planning Policy Framework (NPPF) 2024, a contribution to junction safety improvements improvement would be 'necessary to make the development acceptable in planning terms' (by contributing to an appropriate movement strategy for the site), 'directly related to the development' (given its proximity, the pressure added to the junction by the proposed threefold increase in residents, and in light of the wholly inadequate mitigation route proposed by the applicant), and 'fairly and reasonably related in scale and kind to the development' (given the stated threefold increase in residents explained by the applicant, so directly adding more pressure to the junction).

1 Legal Status of Cavendish Street

This section of Cavendish Street, an adopted Highway, was subject to a stopping up order dated 14.06.1996. That order required that "the Developer shall provide a new highway which shall be a footpath/cycleway". MMU have since installed physical signage stating that Cavendish Street "has not been dedicated as a Highway" and have bolted down uncomfortable and restrictive speed bumps across the route in an apparent attempt to dissuade cyclists from exercising their legal rights over this space. Both measures may be unlawful, as my understanding is that cyclists do retain a legal Right of Way along Cavendish Street, unchanged from when the entire road was an adopted highway, and the speed bumps are inaccessible to some Disabled users.

2 Cycling routes and planning policy

The case for walking and cycling and specifically for maintaining and improving high quality cycling networks is clear at every level of modern planning policy, including:

- NPPF 2024's "vision-led approach"
- LTN 1/20

- Places For Everyone Joint Development Plan Objectives 6, 7 and 10
- Places for Everyone Joint Development Plan policies JP-Strat14, JP-C1, JP-C5 and JP-C6
- GM Transport Strategy 2040 and the "Right Mix" targets
- Greater Manchester Streets for All strategy and Streets for All design guide
- Manchester City Council's Active Travel Strategy
- Manchester City Council's commitment to be a Zero Carbon city by 2038

The policy position is absolutely clear – changes to the existing road and cycle networks should make cycling more convenient for people, not less convenient.

This specific stretch of Cavendish Street is a key part of the existing cycle network. It appears on TfGM's Bee Network map as a Beeway ("the routes that get people from A to B … representing the most direct routes between crossing points.") and connects to the Stretford Road Busy Beeway ("corridors or crossing points on busier roads that will require a higher level of design intervention to improve cycling and walking.") It is also mapped on the TfGM Cycle Network.

The national standard for cycling infrastructure is DfT guidance note LTN 1/20. LTN 1/20 advises above all else that cycle routes and networks should be Safe, Direct, Comfortable, Attractive and Coherent. Introducing unnecessary diversions, junctions and bends into a well-used existing route undermines all of these core principles, resulting in a lower quality cycle network which will make it harder for the council to achieve its cycling objectives.

The applicant has offered various reasons why diverting cyclists is necessary but all of these reasons seem to be either existing problems, or problems designed into the scheme. The proposal is to demolish and redevelop the site – so considerations like limited space and the placement of entrances, shop frontages, planting and pedestrian areas are entirely within the applicant's scope to manage. Instead of starting with the problem "there is an existing busy cycle route across this site, how can I design to accommodate everyone's needs?", it seems the applicant has started with the conclusion "cyclists must be deterred" and instructed their consultants to post-rationalise that decision.

3 Misleading claims regarding safety

Page 22 of the Design & Access Statement refers to the "existing controversial link along Cavendish St., which is resulting in collisions of pedestrians, electric scooters, cyclists, etc."

However the map of recorded collisions, on page 18 of the Transport Statement submitted in the same planning application, shows no recorded collisions whatsoever on this link, only on the adjacent main roads.

It appears the applicant is attempting to restrict cycle access based on a "problem" for which they have no evidence.

Yours sincerely,

[redacted]

[redacted]

****
This email and any files transmitted with it are confidential and intended solely for the use of the individual or entity to whom they are addressed.
If you have received this email in error, please notify the sender, or [redacted] and then permanently delete the email, attachments and all copies.
The full text of the Council's email disclaimer is available at: www.manchester.gov.uk/emaildisclaimer.
Your personal data is very important to us. Please refer to our privacy notice at: www.manchester.gov.uk/privacy for further information.

This footnote also confirms that this email message has been swept for the presence of computer viruses.
****

Outlook

Fw: Comment on Planning Application 142888/FO/2025

From Planning <[redacted]
Date Mon 07/07/2025 11:11
To Lucy Harrison <[redacted]

Information, Delivery & Support Team
Planning, Building Control & Licensing
Growth & Development Directorate
Postal address: Manchester City Council, P O Box 532, Town Hall, Manchester M60 2LA
Location address: Level 6 Town Hall Extension, Manchester M2 5DB
Tel: 0161 234 4516

Please consider the environment before printing an e-mail.

From: [redacted]
Sent: 04 July 2025 20:15
To: Planning <[redacted]
Subject: Comment on Planning Application 142888/FO/2025

You don't often get email from [redacted] Learn why this is important

ALERT This message originated outside of the Manchester City Council network. **BE CAUTIOUS** before clicking any links or opening any attachments. Please remember your Cyber Training and report anything suspicious.

Dear Manchester Planning team,

I am writing to lodge an objection to planning application **142888/FO/2025** – Cambridge Halls Of Residence Cavendish Street Manchester M15 6TT.

My primary objection is that the proposals have been designed to deter cyclists from using the safest and most direct route through the site. This route has been open to cyclists ever since the road was first built; it is an essential, well-used part of the city's cycling network and therefore the proposal to deter and/or divert cycles away from Cavendish Street is directly at odds with Manchester City Council's planning, sustainability and transport policies.

The applicant has also made misleading claims regarding the road's legal status and regarding pedestrian safety which I will outline below.

I am asking that the council **refuse** this application, and invite the developer to come back with a proposal that maintains direct cycle as well as pedestrian access along Cavendish Street, designed to modern standards set out in Greater Manchester's Streets For All design guide and in Department for

Transport guidance note LTN 1/20. I am sure that the Highways team at MCC and the Active Travel team at TfGM will, if asked, be happy to comment on how such a route could be provided within the space available.

I am also asking that the council **make a Section 106 agreement (s106)** with the applicant to fund safety improvements for pedestrians and cyclists at the junction of Cavendish Street and Higher Cambridge Street – the applicant themselves discuss the shortcomings of the existing junction layout in Section 4.2.1 of the Transport Statement ("*Cyclists have also been observed to queue on the footway to gain direct access to the Higher Cambridge Street/Cavendish Street junction (via a gap in the guard railings) rather than following the road markings which advise cyclists to dismount and use the controlled pedestrian crossings*"). The improvements might take the form of a CYCLOPS junction. CYCLOPS is a homegrown Greater Manchester innovation now frequently used on Highways schemes across the country to deliver safe pedestrian and cycle movements without undue impact on traffic flows.

For prospective occupants and passers-by alike, in line with the S106 tests as set out in Paragraph 58 of the National Planning Policy Framework (NPPF) 2024, a contribution to junction safety improvements improvement would be 'necessary to make the development acceptable in planning terms' (by contributing to an appropriate movement strategy for the site), 'directly related to the development' (given its proximity, the pressure added to the junction by the proposed threefold increase in residents, and in light of the wholly inadequate mitigation route proposed by the applicant), and 'fairly and reasonably related in scale and kind to the development' (given the stated threefold increase in residents explained by the applicant, so directly adding more pressure to the junction).

1 Legal Status of Cavendish Street

This section of Cavendish Street, an adopted Highway, was subject to a stopping up order dated 14.06.1996. That order required that "the Developer shall provide a new highway which shall be a footpath/cycleway". MMU have since installed physical signage stating that Cavendish Street "has not been dedicated as a Highway" and have bolted down uncomfortable and restrictive speed bumps across the route in an apparent attempt to dissuade cyclists from exercising their legal rights over this space. Both measures may be unlawful, as my understanding is that cyclists do retain a legal Right of Way along Cavendish Street, unchanged from when the entire road was an adopted highway, and the speed bumps are inaccessible to some Disabled users.

2 Cycling routes and planning policy

The case for walking and cycling and specifically for maintaining and improving high quality cycling networks is clear at every level of modern planning policy, including:

- NPPF 2024's "vision-led approach"
- LTN 1/20
- Places For Everyone Joint Development Plan Objectives 6, 7 and 10

- Places for Everyone Joint Development Plan policies JP-Strat14, JP-C1, JP-C5 and JP-C6
- GM Transport Strategy 2040 and the "Right Mix" targets
- Greater Manchester Streets for All strategy and Streets for All design guide
- Manchester City Council's Active Travel Strategy
- Manchester City Council's commitment to be a Zero Carbon city by 2038

The policy position is absolutely clear – changes to the existing road and cycle networks should make cycling more convenient for people, not less convenient.

This specific stretch of Cavendish Street is a key part of the existing cycle network. It appears on TfGM's Bee Network map as a Beeway ("the routes that get people from A to B … representing the most direct routes between crossing points.") and connects to the Stretford Road Busy Beeway ("corridors or crossing points on busier roads that will require a higher level of design intervention to improve cycling and walking.") It is also mapped on the TfGM Cycle Network.

The national standard for cycling infrastructure is DfT guidance note LTN 1/20. LTN 1/20 advises above all else that cycle routes and networks should be Safe, Direct, Comfortable, Attractive and Coherent. Introducing unnecessary diversions, junctions and bends into a well-used existing route undermines all of these core principles, resulting in a lower quality cycle network which will make it harder for the council to achieve its cycling objectives.

The applicant has offered various reasons why diverting cyclists is necessary but all of these reasons seem to be either existing problems, or problems designed into the scheme. The proposal is to demolish and redevelop the site – so considerations like limited space and the placement of entrances, shop frontages, planting and pedestrian areas are entirely within the applicant's scope to manage. Instead of starting with the problem "there is an existing busy cycle route across this site, how can I design to accommodate everyone's needs?", it seems the applicant has started with the conclusion "cyclists must be deterred" and instructed their consultants to post-rationalise that decision.

3 Misleading claims regarding safety

Page 22 of the Design & Access Statement refers to the "existing controversial link along Cavendish St., which is resulting in collisions of pedestrians, electric scooters, cyclists, etc."

However the map of recorded collisions, on page 18 of the Transport Statement submitted in the same planning application, shows no recorded collisions whatsoever on this link, only on the adjacent main roads.

It appears the applicant is attempting to restrict cycle access based on a "problem" for which they have no evidence.

Yours sincerely

[redacted]

[redacted]

[redacted]

****
This email and any files transmitted with it are confidential and intended solely for the use of the individual or entity to whom they are addressed.
If you have received this email in error, please notify the sender, or [redacted] and then permanently delete the email, attachments and all copies.
The full text of the Council's email disclaimer is available at: www.manchester.gov.uk/emaildisclaimer.
Your personal data is very important to us. Please refer to our privacy notice at: www.manchester.gov.uk/privacy for further information.

This footnote also confirms that this email message has been swept for the presence of computer viruses.
****

Outlook

Fw: Comment on Planning Application 142888/FO/2025

From Planning <[redacted]
Date Mon 14/07/2025 14:07
To Lucy Harrison <[redacted]

Information, Delivery & Support Team
Planning, Building Control & Licensing
Growth & Development Directorate
Postal address: Manchester City Council, P O Box 532, Town Hall, Manchester M60 2LA
Location address: Level 6 Town Hall Extension, Manchester M2 5DB
Tel: 0161 234 4516

Please consider the environment before printing an e-mail.

From: [redacted]
Sent: 11 July 2025 09:53
To: Planning <[redacted]
Subject: Comment on Planning Application 142888/FO/2025

You don't often get email from [redacted] Learn why this is important

ALERT This message originated outside of the Manchester City Council network. **BE CAUTIOUS** before clicking any links or opening any attachments. Please remember your Cyber Training and report anything suspicious.

Dear Manchester Planning team,
I am writing to lodge an objection to planning application **142888/FO/2025** – Cambridge Halls Of Residence Cavendish Street Manchester M15 6TT.
My primary objection is that the proposals have been designed to deter cyclists from using the safest and most direct route through the site. This route has been open to cyclists ever since the road was first built; it is an essential, well-used part of the city's cycling network and therefore the proposal to deter and/or divert cycles away from Cavendish Street is directly at odds with Manchester City Council's planning, sustainability and transport policies.
I personally use this route up to 6 times a week, I mainly use it to cycle into the office or when i'm cycling into town. I have not once seen any issues with the shared nature of the route. My cycle journey into town is almost entirely on protected bike lanes. The massively increased safety those bike lanes give my cycle journey into town has increased the amount I choose to cycle. Before they were completed I would never have thought of cycling into town. The listed alternative route would require me to do a far less safe right turn onto a very busy road which would make cycling the entire journey a lot less appealing and would lower the amount I would cycle in. I see myself as a fairly confident cyclist so I can only imagine removing a safe and direct route and replacing it with a more dangerous alternative would only stop other people choosing to cycle.
The applicant has also made misleading claims regarding the road's legal status and regarding pedestrian safety which I will outline below.

I am asking that the council **refuse** this application, and invite the developer to come back with a proposal that maintains direct cycle as well as pedestrian access along Cavendish Street, designed to modern standards set out in Greater Manchester's Streets For All design guide and in Department for Transport guidance note LTN 1/20. I am sure that the Highways team at MCC and the Active Travel team at TfGM will, if asked, be happy to comment on how such a route could be provided within the space available.

I am also asking that the council **make a Section 106 agreement (s106)** with the applicant to fund safety improvements for pedestrians and cyclists at the junction of Cavendish Street and Higher Cambridge Street – the applicant themselves discuss the shortcomings of the existing junction layout in Section 4.2.1 of the Transport Statement ("*Cyclists have also been observed to queue on the footway to gain direct access to the Higher Cambridge Street/Cavendish Street junction (via a gap in the guard railings) rather than following the road markings which advise cyclists to dismount and use the controlled pedestrian crossings*"). The improvements might take the form of a CYCLOPS junction. CYCLOPS is a homegrown Greater Manchester innovation now frequently used on Highways schemes across the country to deliver safe pedestrian and cycle movements without undue impact on traffic flows.

For prospective occupants and passers-by alike, in line with the S106 tests as set out in Paragraph 58 of the National Planning Policy Framework (NPPF) 2024, a contribution to junction safety improvements improvement would be 'necessary to make the development acceptable in planning terms' (by contributing to an appropriate movement strategy for the site), 'directly related to the development' (given its proximity, the pressure added to the junction by the proposed threefold increase in residents, and in light of the wholly inadequate mitigation route proposed by the applicant), and 'fairly and reasonably related in scale and kind to the development' (given the stated threefold increase in residents explained by the applicant, so directly adding more pressure to the junction).

1 Legal Status of Cavendish Street

This section of Cavendish Street, an adopted Highway, was subject to a stopping up order dated 14.06.1996. That order required that "the Developer shall provide a new highway which shall be a footpath/cycleway". MMU have since installed physical signage stating that Cavendish Street "has not been dedicated as a Highway" and have bolted down uncomfortable and restrictive speed bumps across the route in an apparent attempt to dissuade cyclists from exercising their legal rights over this space. Both measures may be unlawful, as my understanding is that cyclists do retain a legal Right of Way along Cavendish Street, unchanged from when the entire road was an adopted highway, and the speed bumps are inaccessible to some Disabled users.

2 Cycling routes and planning policy

The case for walking and cycling and specifically for maintaining and improving high quality cycling networks is clear at every level of modern planning policy, including:

- NPPF 2024's "vision-led approach"
- LTN 1/20
- Places For Everyone Joint Development Plan Objectives 6, 7 and 10
- Places for Everyone Joint Development Plan policies JP-Strat14, JP-C1, JP-C5 and JP-C6
- GM Transport Strategy 2040 and the "Right Mix" targets
- Greater Manchester Streets for All strategy and Streets for All design guide
- Manchester City Council's Active Travel Strategy
- Manchester City Council's commitment to be a Zero Carbon city by 2038

The policy position is absolutely clear – changes to the existing road and cycle networks should make cycling more convenient for people, not less convenient.

This specific stretch of Cavendish Street is a key part of the existing cycle network. It appears on TfGM's Bee Network map as a Beeway ("the routes that get people from A to B … representing the most direct routes between crossing points.") and connects to the Stretford Road Busy Beeway

("corridors or crossing points on busier roads that will require a higher level of design intervention to improve cycling and walking.") It is also mapped on the TfGM Cycle Network.
The national standard for cycling infrastructure is DfT guidance note LTN 1/20. LTN 1/20 advises above all else that cycle routes and networks should be Safe, Direct, Comfortable, Attractive and Coherent. Introducing unnecessary diversions, junctions and bends into a well-used existing route undermines all of these core principles, resulting in a lower quality cycle network which will make it harder for the council to achieve its cycling objectives.
The applicant has offered various reasons why diverting cyclists is necessary but all of these reasons seem to be either existing problems, or problems designed into the scheme. The proposal is to demolish and redevelop the site – so considerations like limited space and the placement of entrances, shop frontages, planting and pedestrian areas are entirely within the applicant's scope to manage. Instead of starting with the problem "there is an existing busy cycle route across this site, how can I design to accommodate everyone's needs?", it seems the applicant has started with the conclusion "cyclists must be deterred" and instructed their consultants to post-rationalise that decision.
3 Misleading claims regarding safety
Page 22 of the Design & Access Statement refers to the "existing controversial link along Cavendish St., which is resulting in collisions of pedestrians, electric scooters, cyclists, etc."
However the map of recorded collisions, on page 18 of the Transport Statement submitted in the same planning application, shows no recorded collisions whatsoever on this link, only on the adjacent main roads.
It appears the applicant is attempting to restrict cycle access based on a "problem" for which they have no evidence.
Yours sincerely,
[redacted]

****
This email and any files transmitted with it are confidential and intended solely for the use of the individual or entity to whom they are addressed.
If you have received this email in error, please notify the sender, or [redacted] and then permanently delete the email, attachments and all copies.
The full text of the Council's email disclaimer is available at: www.manchester.gov.uk/emaildisclaimer.
Your personal data is very important to us. Please refer to our privacy notice at: www.manchester.gov.uk/privacy for further information.

This footnote also confirms that this email message has been swept for the presence of computer viruses.
****

Outlook

Fw: Comment on Planning Application 142888/FO/2025

From Planning <[redacted]>
Date Mon 07/07/2025 11:05
To Lucy Harrison <[redacted]>

Information, Delivery & Support Team
Planning, Building Control & Licensing
Growth & Development Directorate
Postal address: Manchester City Council, P O Box 532, Town Hall, Manchester M60 2LA
Location address: Level 6 Town Hall Extension, Manchester M2 5DB
Tel: 0161 234 4516

Please consider the environment before printing an e-mail.

From: [redacted]
Sent: 06 July 2025 22:03
To: Planning <[redacted]>
Subject: Comment on Planning Application 142888/FO/2025

You don't often get email from [redacted] Learn why this is important

ALERT This message originated outside of the Manchester City Council network. **BE CAUTIOUS** before clicking any links or opening any attachments. Please remember your Cyber Training and report anything suspicious.

Dear Manchester Planning team,

I am writing to lodge an objection to planning application 142888/FO/2025 – Cambridge Halls Of Residence Cavendish Street Manchester M15 6TT.

My primary objection is that the proposals have been designed to deter cyclists from using the safest and most direct route through the site. This route has been open to cyclists ever since the road was first built; it is an essential, well-used part of the city's cycling network and therefore the proposal to deter and/or divert cycles away from Cavendish Street is directly at odds with Manchester City Council's planning, sustainability and transport policies.

I regularly use the existing route with my two young daughters. I travel from Old Trafford along Stretford Road and the seamless transition from the suburban estate into the heart of the university district is such a positive experience. My daughters love that moment of arrival at All Saints; straight from the contrast of a busy inner city commuter road .

I love this transition too and the presence of this specific cycleway directly onto oxford road factors into my decision to choose to cycle rather than other higher carbon footprint options.
There are so many obstacles already to cycling in manchester eg. bad weather, inconsistent quality/quantity of cycle lanes, rush hour traffic etc etc. It's the small wins that help me

continue to cycle at all. And the Cavendish Street cycleway is one of those wins.
The idea of heading up Stretford road only to face a deadend; a shear wall that forces cyclists elsewhere makes me question the net benefit of choosing to cycle this route.
Being forced to have to negotiate more queues of vehicles and to have to sidewind around the back of a new massif; only to to end up where previously I would have arrived within seconds, seems to completely contradict the apparent desire of Manchester's authorities to make the city cycle friendly. A city where the predictable behaviour is to leave the bike at home if there are too many obstacles in the way, both psychologically and physically.
Please don't allow the creation of a new such obstacle under your stewardship of Manchester's transition to being a world class bike friendly city.

The applicant has also made misleading claims regarding the road's legal status and regarding pedestrian safety which I will outline below.

I am asking that the council refuse this application, and invite the developer to come back with a proposal that maintains direct cycle as well as pedestrian access along Cavendish Street, designed to modern standards set out in Greater Manchester's Streets For All design guide and in Department for Transport guidance note LTN 1/20. I am sure that the Highways team at MCC and the Active Travel team at TfGM will, if asked, be happy to comment on how such a route could be provided within the space available.

I am also asking that the council make a Section 106 agreement (s106) with the applicant to fund safety improvements for pedestrians and cyclists at the junction of Cavendish Street and Higher Cambridge Street – the applicant themselves discuss the shortcomings of the existing junction layout in Section 4.2.1 of the Transport Statement ("Cyclists have also been observed to queue on the footway to gain direct access to the Higher Cambridge Street/Cavendish Street junction (via a gap in the guard railings) rather than following the road markings which advise cyclists to dismount and use the controlled pedestrian crossings"). The improvements might take the form of a CYCLOPS junction. CYCLOPS is a homegrown Greater Manchester innovation now frequently used on Highways schemes across the country to deliver safe pedestrian and cycle movements without undue impact on traffic flows.

For prospective occupants and passers-by alike, in line with the S106 tests as set out in Paragraph 58 of the National Planning Policy Framework (NPPF) 2024, a contribution to junction safety improvements improvement would be 'necessary to make the development acceptable in planning terms' (by contributing to an appropriate movement strategy for the site), 'directly related to the development' (given its proximity, the pressure added to the junction by the proposed threefold increase in residents, and in light of the wholly inadequate mitigation route proposed by the applicant), and 'fairly and reasonably related in scale and kind to the development' (given the stated threefold increase in residents explained by the applicant, so directly adding more pressure to the junction).

1 Legal Status of Cavendish Street

This section of Cavendish Street, an adopted Highway, was subject to a stopping up order dated 14.06.1996. That order required that "the Developer shall provide a new highway which shall be a footpath/cycleway". MMU have since installed physical signage stating that Cavendish Street "has not been dedicated as a Highway" and have bolted down uncomfortable and restrictive speed bumps across the route in an apparent attempt to dissuade cyclists from exercising their legal rights over this space. Both measures may be unlawful, as my understanding is that cyclists do retain a legal Right of Way along Cavendish Street, unchanged from when the entire road was an adopted highway, and the speed bumps are inaccessible to some Disabled users.

2 Cycling routes and planning policy

The case for walking and cycling and specifically for maintaining and improving high quality cycling networks is clear at every level of modern planning policy, including:

NPPF 2024's "vision-led approach"
LTN 1/20
Places For Everyone Joint Development Plan Objectives 6, 7 and 10
Places for Everyone Joint Development Plan policies JP-Strat14, JP-C1, JP-C5 and JP-C6
GM Transport Strategy 2040 and the "Right Mix" targets
Greater Manchester Streets for All strategy and Streets for All design guide
Manchester City Council's Active Travel Strategy
Manchester City Council's commitment to be a Zero Carbon city by 2038
The policy position is absolutely clear – changes to the existing road and cycle networks should make cycling more convenient for people, not less convenient.

This specific stretch of Cavendish Street is a key part of the existing cycle network. It appears on TfGM's Bee Network map as a Beeway ("the routes that get people from A to B … representing the most direct routes between crossing points.") and connects to the Stretford Road Busy Beeway ("corridors or crossing points on busier roads that will require a higher level of design intervention to improve cycling and walking.") It is also mapped on the TfGM Cycle Network.

The national standard for cycling infrastructure is DfT guidance note LTN 1/20. LTN 1/20 advises above all else that cycle routes and networks should be Safe, Direct, Comfortable, Attractive and Coherent. Introducing unnecessary diversions, junctions and bends into a well-used existing route undermines all of these core principles, resulting in a lower quality cycle network which will make it harder for the council to achieve its cycling objectives.

The applicant has offered various reasons why diverting cyclists is necessary but all of these reasons seem to be either existing problems, or problems designed into the scheme. The proposal is to demolish and redevelop the site – so considerations like limited space and the placement of entrances, shop frontages, planting and pedestrian areas are entirely within the applicant's scope to manage. Instead of starting with the problem "there is an existing busy cycle route across this site, how can I design to accommodate everyone's needs?", it seems the applicant has started with the conclusion "cyclists must be deterred" and instructed their consultants to post-rationalise that decision.

3 Misleading claims regarding safety

Page 22 of the Design & Access Statement refers to the "existing controversial link along Cavendish St., which is resulting in collisions of pedestrians, electric scooters, cyclists, etc."

However the map of recorded collisions, on page 18 of the Transport Statement submitted in the same planning application, shows no recorded collisions whatsoever on this link, only on the adjacent main roads.

It appears the applicant is attempting to restrict cycle access based on a "problem" for which they have no evidence.

Yours sincerely,

[redacted]

****

This email and any files transmitted with it are confidential and intended solely for the use of the individual or entity to whom they are addressed.
If you have received this email in error, please notify the sender, or [redacted] and then permanently delete the email, attachments and all copies.
The full text of the Council's email disclaimer is available at: www.manchester.gov.uk/emaildisclaimer.
Your personal data is very important to us. Please refer to our privacy notice at: www.manchester.gov.uk/privacy for further information.

This footnote also confirms that this email message has been swept for the presence of computer viruses.
****

Outlook

Fw: Comment on Planning Application 142888/FO/2025

From Planning <[redacted]
Date Mon 07/07/2025 11:11
To Lucy Harrison <[redacted]

Information, Delivery & Support Team
Planning, Building Control & Licensing
Growth & Development Directorate
Postal address: Manchester City Council, P O Box 532, Town Hall, Manchester M60 2LA
Location address: Level 6 Town Hall Extension, Manchester M2 5DB
Tel: 0161 234 4516

Please consider the environment before printing an e-mail.

From: [redacted]
Sent: 06 July 2025 21:56
To: Planning <[redacted]
Subject: Comment on Planning Application 142888/FO/2025

You don't often get email from [redacted] Learn why this is important

ALERT This message originated outside of the Manchester City Council network. **BE CAUTIOUS** before clicking any links or opening any attachments. Please remember your Cyber Training and report anything suspicious.

Dear Manchester Planning team,

I am writing to lodge an objection to planning application 142888/FO/2025 – Cambridge Halls Of Residence Cavendish Street Manchester M15 6TT.

Firstly I would refer you to planning application NATTRAN/NW/S247/4554 - Proposed Stopping Up - Lower Ormond Street & Cavendish Street. In March 2022 I received an email from Paul McCullough of Manchester Metropolitan University addressing my objection to this planning application. The response specifically noted that the concerns about public access had been noted all through the application and had been addressed by ensuring that a Public Right of Way is maintained across the site and noting that the existing cycle route is part of the Manchester cycle network and will be retained in accordance with the planning approval associated with the stopping up application (MCC Planning ref. 128485/FO/2020).

Despite this the new proposals have been designed to deter cyclists from using the most direct and safest route through the site. This route has been open to cyclists since the road was first built; it is an essential, well-used part of the city's cycling network and the proposal to deter and/or divert cycles away from Cavendish Street is directly at odds with Manchester City Council's planning, sustainability and transport policies. The applicant has also made misleading claims regarding the road's legal status and regarding pedestrian safety.

I am asking that the council refuse this application, and ask the developer to return with a proposal that maintains direct cycle as well as pedestrian access along Cavendish Street, designed to modern standards set out in Greater Manchester's Streets For All design guide and in Department for Transport guidance note LTN 1/20.

I am also requesting that the council make a Section 106 agreement (s106) with the applicant to fund safety improvements for pedestrians and cyclists at the junction of Cavendish Street and Higher Cambridge Street. The applicant references the shortcomings of the existing junction layout in Section 4.2.1 of the Transport Statement: ("Cyclists have also been observed to queue on the footway to gain direct access to the Higher Cambridge Street/Cavendish Street junction (via a gap in the guard railings) rather than following the road markings which advise cyclists to dismount and use the controlled pedestrian crossings"). The improvements might take the form of a CYCLOPS junction.

For prospective occupants and passers-by alike, in line with the S106 tests as set out in Paragraph 58 of the National Planning Policy Framework (NPPF) 2024, a contribution to junction safety improvements improvement would be 'necessary to make the development acceptable in planning terms' (by contributing to an appropriate movement strategy for the site), 'directly related to the development' (given its proximity, the pressure added to the junction by the proposed threefold increase in residents, and in light of the wholly inadequate mitigation route proposed by the applicant), and 'fairly and reasonably related in scale and kind to the development' (given the stated threefold increase in residents explained by the applicant, so directly adding more pressure to the junction).

1 Legal Status of Cavendish Street

This section of Cavendish Street, an adopted Highway, was subject to a stopping up order dated 14.06.1996. That order required that "the Developer shall provide a new highway which shall be a footpath/cycleway". MMU have since installed physical signage stating that Cavendish Street "has not been dedicated as a Highway" and have bolted down uncomfortable and restrictive speed bumps across the route in an apparent attempt to dissuade cyclists from exercising their legal rights over this space. Both measures may be unlawful, as my understanding is that cyclists do retain a legal Right of Way along Cavendish Street, unchanged from when the entire road was an adopted highway, and the speed bumps are inaccessible to some Disabled users.

2 Cycling routes and planning policy

The case for walking and cycling and specifically for maintaining and improving high quality cycling networks is clear at every level of modern planning policy, including:

NPPF 2024's "vision-led approach"
LTN 1/20
Places For Everyone Joint Development Plan Objectives 6, 7 and 10
Places for Everyone Joint Development Plan policies JP-Strat14, JP-C1, JP-C5 and JP-C6
GM Transport Strategy 2040 and the "Right Mix" targets
Greater Manchester Streets for All strategy and Streets for All design guide
Manchester City Council's Active Travel Strategy
Manchester City Council's commitment to be a Zero Carbon city by 2038
The policy position is absolutely clear – changes to the existing road and cycle networks should make cycling more convenient for people, not less convenient.

This specific stretch of Cavendish Street is a key part of the existing cycle network. It appears on TfGM's Bee Network map as a Beeway ("the routes that get people from A to B … representing the most direct routes between crossing points.") and connects to the Stretford Road Busy Beeway

("corridors or crossing points on busier roads that will require a higher level of design intervention to improve cycling and walking.") It is also mapped on the TfGM Cycle Network.

The national standard for cycling infrastructure is DfT guidance note LTN 1/20. LTN 1/20 advises above all else that cycle routes and networks should be Safe, Direct, Comfortable, Attractive and Coherent. Introducing unnecessary diversions, junctions and bends into a well-used existing route undermines all of these core principles, resulting in a lower quality cycle network which will make it harder for the council to achieve its cycling objectives.

The applicant has offered various reasons why diverting cyclists is necessary but all of these reasons seem to be either existing problems, or problems designed into the scheme. The proposal is to demolish and redevelop the site – so considerations such as limited space, the placement of entrances, shop frontages, planting and pedestrian areas are entirely within the applicant's scope to manage. Instead of starting with the problem "there is an existing busy cycle route across this site, how can I design to accommodate everyone's needs?", it seems the applicant has started with the conclusion "cyclists must be deterred" and instructed their consultants to post-rationalise that decision.

3 Misleading claims regarding safety

Page 22 of the Design & Access Statement refers to the "existing controversial link along Cavendish St., which is resulting in collisions of pedestrians, electric scooters, cyclists, etc." P82 refers to "cyclists, particularly e-bikes (?) ride through Cambridge Halls in an uncontrolled manner that lacks courtesy to pedestrians causing a serious safety risk".

However, the map of recorded collisions, on page 18 of the Transport Statement submitted in the same planning application, shows no recorded collisions whatsoever on this link, only on the adjacent main roads.

It appears the applicant is attempting to restrict cycle access based on a "problem" for which they have no evidence and using flimsy, anecdotal, unsupported remarks. Page 91, section 8.14 refers to deterring cyclists.

Yours sincerely,

[redacted]

****
This email and any files transmitted with it are confidential and intended solely for the use of the individual or entity to whom they are addressed. If you have received this email in error, please notify the sender, or [redacted] and then permanently delete the email, attachments and all copies.
The full text of the Council's email disclaimer is available at: www.manchester.gov.uk/emaildisclaimer.
Your personal data is very important to us. Please refer to our privacy notice at: www.manchester.gov.uk/privacy for further information.

This footnote also confirms that this email message has been swept for the presence of computer viruses.
****

Outlook

Fw: Comment on Planning Application 142888/FO/2025

From Planning <[redacted]
Date Mon 30/06/2025 14:10
To Lucy Harrison <[redacted]

Information, Delivery & Support Team
Planning, Building Control & Licensing
Growth & Development Directorate
Postal address: Manchester City Council, P O Box 532, Town Hall, Manchester M60 2LA
Location address: Level 6 Town Hall Extension, Manchester M2 5DB
Tel: 0161 234 4516

Please consider the environment before printing an e-mail.

From: [redacted]
Sent: 30 June 2025 13:15
To: Planning <[redacted]
Subject: Comment on Planning Application 142888/FO/2025

You don't often get email from [redacted] Learn why this is important

ALERT This message originated outside of the Manchester City Council network. **BE CAUTIOUS** before clicking any links or opening any attachments. Please remember your Cyber Training and report anything suspicious.

Dear Manchester Planning team,

I am writing to lodge an objection to planning application 142888/FO/2025 – Cambridge Halls Of Residence Cavendish Street Manchester M15 6TT.

My primary objection is that the proposals have been designed to deter cyclists from using the safest and most direct route through the site. This route has been open to cyclists ever since the road was first built; it is an essential, well-used part of the city's cycling network and therefore the proposal to deter and/or divert cycles away from Cavendish Street is directly at odds with Manchester City Council's planning, sustainability and transport policies.

The applicant has also made misleading claims regarding the road's legal status and regarding pedestrian safety which I will outline below.

I am asking that the council refuse this application, and invite the developer to come back with a proposal that maintains direct cycle as well as pedestrian access along Cavendish Street, designed to modern standards set out in Greater Manchester's Streets For All design guide and in Department for Transport guidance note LTN 1/20. I am sure that the Highways team at MCC and the Active Travel team at TfGM will, if asked, be happy to comment on how such a route could be provided within the space available.

I am also asking that the council make a Section 106 agreement (s106) with the applicant to fund safety improvements for pedestrians and cyclists at the junction of Cavendish Street and Higher Cambridge Street – the applicant themselves discuss the shortcomings of the existing junction layout in Section 4.2.1 of the Transport Statement ("Cyclists have also been observed to queue on the footway to gain direct access to the Higher Cambridge Street/Cavendish Street junction (via a gap in the guard railings) rather than following the road markings which advise cyclists to dismount and use the controlled pedestrian crossings"). The improvements might take the form of a CYCLOPS junction. CYCLOPS is a homegrown Greater Manchester innovation now frequently used on Highways schemes across the country to deliver safe pedestrian and cycle movements without undue impact on traffic flows.

For prospective occupants and passers-by alike, in line with the S106 tests as set out in Paragraph 58 of the National Planning Policy Framework (NPPF) 2024, a contribution to junction safety improvements improvement would be 'necessary to make the development acceptable in planning terms' (by contributing to an appropriate movement strategy for the site), 'directly related to the development' (given its proximity, the pressure added to the junction by the proposed threefold increase in residents, and in light of the wholly inadequate mitigation route proposed by the applicant), and 'fairly and reasonably related in scale and kind to the development' (given the stated threefold increase in residents explained by the applicant, so directly adding more pressure to the junction).

1 Legal Status of Cavendish Street

This section of Cavendish Street, an adopted Highway, was subject to a stopping up order dated 14.06.1996. That order required that "the Developer shall provide a new highway which shall be a footpath/cycleway". MMU have since installed physical signage stating that Cavendish Street "has not been dedicated as a Highway" and have bolted down uncomfortable and restrictive speed bumps across the route in an apparent attempt to dissuade cyclists from exercising their legal rights over this space. Both measures may be unlawful, as my understanding is that cyclists do retain a legal Right of Way along Cavendish Street, unchanged from when the entire road was an adopted highway, and the speed bumps are inaccessible to some Disabled users.

2 Cycling routes and planning policy

The case for walking and cycling and specifically for maintaining and improving high quality cycling networks is clear at every level of modern planning policy, including:

NPPF 2024's "vision-led approach"
LTN 1/20
Places For Everyone Joint Development Plan Objectives 6, 7 and 10
Places for Everyone Joint Development Plan policies JP-Strat14, JP-C1, JP-C5 and JP-C6
GM Transport Strategy 2040 and the "Right Mix" targets
Greater Manchester Streets for All strategy and Streets for All design guide
Manchester City Council's Active Travel Strategy
Manchester City Council's commitment to be a Zero Carbon city by 2038
The policy position is absolutely clear – changes to the existing road and cycle networks should make cycling more convenient for people, not less convenient.

This specific stretch of Cavendish Street is a key part of the existing cycle network. It appears on TfGM's Bee Network map as a Beeway ("the routes that get people from A to B … representing the most direct routes between crossing points.") and connects to the Stretford Road Busy Beeway ("corridors or crossing points on busier roads that will require a higher level of design intervention to improve cycling and walking.") It is also mapped on the TfGM Cycle Network.

The national standard for cycling infrastructure is DfT guidance note LTN 1/20. LTN 1/20 advises above all else that cycle routes and networks should be Safe, Direct, Comfortable, Attractive and Coherent. Introducing unnecessary diversions, junctions and bends into a well-used existing route undermines all of these core principles, resulting in a lower quality cycle network which will make it harder for the council to achieve its cycling objectives.

The applicant has offered various reasons why diverting cyclists is necessary but all of these reasons seem to be either existing problems, or problems designed into the scheme. The proposal is to demolish and redevelop the site – so considerations like limited space and the placement of entrances, shop frontages, planting and pedestrian areas are entirely within the applicant's scope to manage. Instead of starting with the problem "there is an existing busy cycle route across this site, how can I design to accommodate everyone's needs?", it seems the applicant has started with the conclusion "cyclists must be deterred" and instructed their consultants to post-rationalise that decision.

3 Misleading claims regarding safety

Page 22 of the Design & Access Statement refers to the "existing controversial link along Cavendish St., which is resulting in collisions of pedestrians, electric scooters, cyclists, etc."

However the map of recorded collisions, on page 18 of the Transport Statement submitted in the same planning application, shows no recorded collisions whatsoever on this link, only on the adjacent main roads.

It appears the applicant is attempting to restrict cycle access based on a "problem" for which they have no evidence.

Yours sincerely,

[redacted]

****
This email and any files transmitted with it are confidential and intended solely for the use of the individual or entity to whom they are addressed.
If you have received this email in error, please notify the sender, or [redacted] and then permanently delete the email, attachments and all copies.
The full text of the Council's email disclaimer is available at: www.manchester.gov.uk/emaildisclaimer.
Your personal data is very important to us. Please refer to our privacy notice at: www.manchester.gov.uk/privacy for further information.

This footnote also confirms that this email message has been swept for the presence of computer viruses.
****

Outlook

Fw: Comment on Planning Application 142888/FO/2025

From Planning <[redacted]
Date Mon 07/07/2025 11:00
To Lucy Harrison <[redacted]

Information, Delivery & Support Team
Planning, Building Control & Licensing
Growth & Development Directorate
Postal address: Manchester City Council, P O Box 532, Town Hall, Manchester M60 2LA
Location address: Level 6 Town Hall Extension, Manchester M2 5DB
Tel: 0161 234 4516

Please consider the environment before printing an e-mail.

From: [redacted]
Sent: 04 July 2025 22:02
To: Planning <[redacted]
Cc: [redacted]
Subject: Comment on Planning Application 142888/FO/2025

Some people who received this message don't often get email from [redacted] Learn why this is important

ALERT This message originated outside of the Manchester City Council network. **BE CAUTIOUS** before clicking any links or opening any attachments. Please remember your Cyber Training and report anything suspicious.

Subject: Comment on Planning Application 142888/FO/2025

Dear Manchester Planning team,

I am writing to lodge an objection to planning application **142888/FO/2025** – Cambridge Halls Of Residence Cavendish Street Manchester M15 6TT.

My primary objection is that the proposals have been designed to deter cyclists from using the safest and most direct route through the site. This route has been

open to cyclists ever since the road was first built; it is an essential, well-used part of the city's cycling network and therefore the proposal to deter and/or divert cycles away from Cavendish Street is directly at odds with Manchester City Council's planning, sustainability and transport policies.

I have used this route as long as I can remember. I live in Whalley Range and use it to commute to Oxford Road Station to travel to Liverpool to work, I have used it to travel to MMU as a student and in previous jobs to work in town and for leisure etc now I use it with my child. It connected 2 of the main protected cycling routes in the city(Chorlton Road and Oxford Road) . I don't think it's an exaggeration to say I have regularly used this route for 25 years. I objected to the stopping up of Grovesner St because of this important route. Part of that route has remained open as a right of way and it is really disappointing to see MMU close this route reducing the permeability of the city and destroying a very well established active travel route. Although I realised it is a permitted path i am shocked at the idea this could be lost. I don't think it's necessary to lose this route. Densification could occur without losing permeability. They are not mutually exclusive. We need more safe routes, not fewer. This would be a serious and unacceptable loss.

The applicant has also made misleading claims regarding the road's legal status and regarding pedestrian safety which I will outline below.

I am asking that the council **refuse** this application, and invite the developer to come back with a proposal that maintains direct cycle as well as pedestrian access along Cavendish Street, designed to modern standards set out in Greater Manchester's Streets For All design guide and in Department for Transport guidance note LTN 1/20. I am sure that the Highways team at MCC and the Active Travel team at TfGM will, if asked, be happy to comment on how such a route could be provided within the space available.

I am also asking that the council **make a Section 106 agreement (s106)** with the applicant to fund safety improvements for pedestrians and cyclists at the junction of Cavendish Street and Higher Cambridge Street – the applicant themselves discuss the shortcomings of the existing junction layout in Section 4.2.1 of the Transport Statement ("*Cyclists have also been observed to queue on the footway to gain direct access to the Higher Cambridge Street/Cavendish Street junction (via a gap in the guard railings) rather than following the road markings which advise cyclists to dismount and use the controlled pedestrian crossings*"). The improvements might take the form of a CYCLOPS junction. CYCLOPS is a homegrown Greater Manchester innovation now frequently used on Highways

schemes across the country to deliver safe pedestrian and cycle movements without undue impact on traffic flows.

For prospective occupants and passers-by alike, in line with the S106 tests as set out in Paragraph 58 of the National Planning Policy Framework (NPPF) 2024, a contribution to junction safety improvements improvement would be ‘necessary to make the development acceptable in planning terms’ (by contributing to an appropriate movement strategy for the site), ‘directly related to the development’ (given its proximity, the pressure added to the junction by the proposed threefold increase in residents, and in light of the wholly inadequate mitigation route proposed by the applicant), and ‘fairly and reasonably related in scale and kind to the development’ (given the stated threefold increase in residents explained by the applicant, so directly adding more pressure to the junction).

1 Legal Status of Cavendish Street

This section of Cavendish Street, an adopted Highway, was subject to a stopping up order dated 14.06.1996. That order required that “the Developer shall provide a new highway which shall be a footpath/cycleway”. MMU have since installed physical signage stating that Cavendish Street “has not been dedicated as a Highway” and have bolted down uncomfortable and restrictive speed bumps across the route in an apparent attempt to dissuade cyclists from exercising their legal rights over this space. Both measures may be unlawful, as my understanding is that cyclists do retain a legal Right of Way along Cavendish Street, unchanged from when the entire road was an adopted highway, and the speed bumps are inaccessible to some Disabled users.

2 Cycling routes and planning policy

The case for walking and cycling and specifically for maintaining and improving high quality cycling networks is clear at every level of modern planning policy, including:

- NPPF 2024’s “vision-led approach”
- LTN 1/20
- Places For Everyone Joint Development Plan Objectives 6, 7 and 10
- Places for Everyone Joint Development Plan policies JP-Strat14, JP-C1, JP-C5 and JP-C6
- GM Transport Strategy 2040 and the “Right Mix” targets
- Greater Manchester Streets for All strategy and Streets for All design guide

- Manchester City Council's Active Travel Strategy
- Manchester City Council's commitment to be a Zero Carbon city by 2038

The policy position is absolutely clear – changes to the existing road and cycle networks should make cycling more convenient for people, not less convenient.

This specific stretch of Cavendish Street is a key part of the existing cycle network. It appears on TfGM's Bee Network map as a Beeway ("the routes that get people from A to B … representing the most direct routes between crossing points.") and connects to the Stretford Road Busy Beeway ("corridors or crossing points on busier roads that will require a higher level of design intervention to improve cycling and walking.") It is also mapped on the TfGM Cycle Network.

The national standard for cycling infrastructure is DfT guidance note LTN 1/20. LTN 1/20 advises above all else that cycle routes and networks should be Safe, Direct, Comfortable, Attractive and Coherent. Introducing unnecessary diversions, junctions and bends into a well-used existing route undermines all of these core principles, resulting in a lower quality cycle network which will make it harder for the council to achieve its cycling objectives.

The applicant has offered various reasons why diverting cyclists is necessary but all of these reasons seem to be either existing problems, or problems designed into the scheme. The proposal is to demolish and redevelop the site – so considerations like limited space and the placement of entrances, shop frontages, planting and pedestrian areas are entirely within the applicant's scope to manage. Instead of starting with the problem "there is an existing busy cycle route across this site, how can I design to accommodate everyone's needs?", it seems the applicant has started with the conclusion "cyclists must be deterred" and instructed their consultants to post-rationalise that decision.

3 Misleading claims regarding safety

Page 22 of the Design & Access Statement refers to the "existing controversial link along Cavendish St., which is resulting in collisions of pedestrians, electric scooters, cyclists, etc."

However the map of recorded collisions, on page 18 of the Transport Statement submitted in the same planning application, shows no recorded collisions whatsoever on this link, only on the adjacent main roads.

It appears the applicant is attempting to restrict cycle access based on a "problem" for which they have no evidence.

Yours sincerely,

[redacted]

[redacted]

[redacted]

****
This email and any files transmitted with it are confidential and intended solely for the use of the individual or entity to whom they are addressed.
If you have received this email in error, please notify the sender, or [redacted] and then permanently delete the email, attachments and all copies.
The full text of the Council's email disclaimer is available at: www.manchester.gov.uk/emaildisclaimer.
Your personal data is very important to us. Please refer to our privacy notice at: www.manchester.gov.uk/privacy for further information.

This footnote also confirms that this email message has been swept for the presence of computer viruses.
****

Outlook

Fw: Comment on 142888/FO/2025

From Planning <[redacted]
Date Mon 30/06/2025 08:52
To Lucy Harrison <[redacted]

Information, Delivery & Support Team
Planning, Building Control & Licensing
Growth & Development Directorate
Postal address: Manchester City Council, P O Box 532, Town Hall, Manchester M60 2LA
Location address: Level 6 Town Hall Extension, Manchester M2 5DB
Tel: 0161 234 4516

Please consider the environment before printing an e-mail.

From: [redacted]
Sent: 28 June 2025 13:43
To: Planning <[redacted]
Subject: Comment on 142888/FO/2025

You don't often get email from [redacted] Learn why this is important

ALERT This message originated outside of the Manchester City Council network. **BE CAUTIOUS** before clicking any links or opening any attachments. Please remember your Cyber Training and report anything suspicious.

Dear Sir or Madam,

I wish to register an objection to planning application 142888/FO/2025 – Cambridge Halls Of Residence Cavendish Street Manchester M15 6TT.

My primary objection is that the proposals have been designed to deter cyclists from using the safest and most direct route through the site. This route has been open to cyclists ever since the road was first built; it is an essential, well-used part of the city's cycling network and therefore the proposal to deter and/or divert cycles away from Cavendish Street is directly at odds with Manchester City Council's planning, sustainability and transport policies.

I have used this route commuting to my job at the university almost daily and it's one of the more pleasant and saver parts of my routes.

The applicant has also made misleading claims regarding the road's legal status and regarding pedestrian safety which I will outline below.

I am asking that the council refuse this application, and invite the developer to come back with a proposal that maintains direct cycle as well as pedestrian access along Cavendish Street, designed to modern standards set out in Greater Manchester's Streets For All design guide and in

Department for Transport guidance note LTN 1/20. I am sure that the Highways team at MCC and the Active Travel team at TfGM will, if asked, be happy to comment on how such a route could be provided within the space available.

I am also asking that the council make a Section 106 agreement (s106) with the applicant to fund safety improvements for pedestrians and cyclists at the junction of Cavendish Street and Higher Cambridge Street – the applicant themselves discuss the shortcomings of the existing junction layout in Section 4.2.1 of the Transport Statement ("Cyclists have also been observed to queue on the footway to gain direct access to the Higher Cambridge Street/Cavendish Street junction (via a gap in the guard railings) rather than following the road markings which advise cyclists to dismount and use the controlled pedestrian crossings"). The improvements might take the form of a CYCLOPS junction. CYCLOPS is a homegrown Greater Manchester innovation now frequently used on Highways schemes across the country to deliver safe pedestrian and cycle movements without undue impact on traffic flows.

For prospective occupants and passers-by alike, in line with the S106 tests as set out in Paragraph 58 of the National Planning Policy Framework (NPPF) 2024, a contribution to junction safety improvements improvement would be 'necessary to make the development acceptable in planning terms' (by contributing to an appropriate movement strategy for the site), 'directly related to the development' (given its proximity, the pressure added to the junction by the proposed threefold increase in residents, and in light of the wholly inadequate mitigation route proposed by the applicant), and 'fairly and reasonably related in scale and kind to the development' (given the stated threefold increase in residents explained by the applicant, so directly adding more pressure to the junction).

1 Legal Status of Cavendish Street

This section of Cavendish Street, an adopted Highway, was subject to a stopping up order dated 14.06.1996. That order required that "the Developer shall provide a new highway which shall be a footpath/cycleway". MMU have since installed physical signage stating that Cavendish Street "has not been dedicated as a Highway" and have bolted down uncomfortable and restrictive speed bumps across the route in an apparent attempt to dissuade cyclists from exercising their legal rights over this space. Both measures may be unlawful, as my understanding is that cyclists do retain a legal Right of Way along Cavendish Street, unchanged from when the entire road was an adopted highway, and the speed bumps are inaccessible to some Disabled users.

2 Cycling routes and planning policy

The case for walking and cycling and specifically for maintaining and improving high quality cycling networks is clear at every level of modern planning policy, including:

NPPF 2024's "vision-led approach"
LTN 1/20
Places For Everyone Joint Development Plan Objectives 6, 7 and 10
Places for Everyone Joint Development Plan policies JP-Strat14, JP-C1, JP-C5 and JP-C6
GM Transport Strategy 2040 and the "Right Mix" targets
Greater Manchester Streets for All strategy and Streets for All design guide
Manchester City Council's Active Travel Strategy
Manchester City Council's commitment to be a Zero Carbon city by 2038
The policy position is absolutely clear – changes to the existing road and cycle networks should make cycling more convenient for people, not less convenient.

This specific stretch of Cavendish Street is a key part of the existing cycle network. It appears on TfGM's Bee Network map as a Beeway ("the routes that get people from A to B … representing the most direct routes between crossing points.") and connects to the Stretford Road Busy Beeway ("corridors or crossing points on busier roads that will require a higher level of design intervention to improve cycling and walking.") It is also mapped on the TfGM Cycle Network.

The national standard for cycling infrastructure is DfT guidance note LTN 1/20. LTN 1/20 advises above all else that cycle routes and networks should be Safe, Direct, Comfortable, Attractive and Coherent. Introducing unnecessary diversions, junctions and bends into a well-used existing route undermines all of these core principles, resulting in a lower quality cycle network which will make it harder for the council to achieve its cycling objectives.

The applicant has offered various reasons why diverting cyclists is necessary but all of these reasons seem to be either existing problems, or problems designed into the scheme. The proposal is to demolish and redevelop the site – so considerations like limited space and the placement of entrances, shop frontages, planting and pedestrian areas are entirely within the applicant's scope to manage. Instead of starting with the problem "there is an existing busy cycle route across this site, how can I design to accommodate everyone's needs?", it seems the applicant has started with the conclusion "cyclists must be deterred" and instructed their consultants to post-rationalise that decision.

3 Misleading claims regarding safety

Page 22 of the Design & Access Statement refers to the "existing controversial link along Cavendish St., which is resulting in collisions of pedestrians, electric scooters, cyclists, etc."

However the map of recorded collisions, on page 18 of the Transport Statement submitted in the same planning application, shows no recorded collisions whatsoever on this link, only on the adjacent main roads.

It appears the applicant is attempting to restrict cycle access based on a "problem" for which they have no evidence.

Yours sincerely,

[redacted]

****
This email and any files transmitted with it are confidential and intended solely for the use of the individual or entity to whom they are addressed.
If you have received this email in error, please notify the sender, or [redacted] and then permanently delete the email, attachments and all copies.
The full text of the Council's email disclaimer is available at: www.manchester.gov.uk/emaildisclaimer.
Your personal data is very important to us. Please refer to our privacy notice at: www.manchester.gov.uk/privacy for further information.

This footnote also confirms that this email message has been swept for the presence of computer viruses.
****

Outlook

Fw: Objection: 142888/FO/2025

From Planning <[redacted]
Date Mon 14/07/2025 14:04
To Lucy Harrison <[redacted]

Information, Delivery & Support Team
Planning, Building Control & Licensing
Growth & Development Directorate
Postal address: Manchester City Council, P O Box 532, Town Hall, Manchester M60 2LA
Location address: Level 6 Town Hall Extension, Manchester M2 5DB
Tel: 0161 234 4516

Please consider the environment before printing an e-mail.

From: [redacted]
Sent: 11 July 2025 22:09
To: Planning <[redacted]
Subject: Objection: 142888/FO/2025

You don't often get email from [redacted] Learn why this is important

ALERT This message originated outside of the Manchester City Council network. **BE CAUTIOUS** before clicking any links or opening any attachments. Please remember your Cyber Training and report anything suspicious.

Dear Manchester Planning team, I am writing to lodge an objection to planning application 142888/FO/2025 – Cambridge Halls Of Residence Cavendish Street Manchester M15 6TT. My primary objection is that the proposals have been designed to deter cyclists from using the safest and most direct route through the site. **I work for the charity Rekindle in Hulme, and myself and many of the young people who attend Rekindle ride through this route every day to travel between home/school and Rekindle safely. I have tried lots of different variations of routes, however have come to use it, along with the young people of Rekindle, every day in order to put their safety first, since when going from the centre to much of South Manchester, it is by a long way, the safest route to take between the city centre and Rekindle.**

This route has been open to cyclists ever since the road was first built; it is an essential, well-used part of the city's cycling network and therefore the proposal to deter and/or divert cycles away from Cavendish Street is directly at odds with Manchester City Council's planning, sustainability and transport policies. The applicant has also made misleading claims regarding the road's legal status and regarding

pedestrian safety which I will outline below. I am asking that the council refuse this application, and invite the developer to come back with a proposal that maintains direct cycle as well as pedestrian access along Cavendish Street, designed to modern standards set out in Greater Manchester's Streets For All design guide and in Department for Transport guidance note LTN 1/20. I am sure that the Highways team at MCC and the Active Travel team at TfGM will, if asked, be happy to comment on how such a route could be provided within the space available. I am also asking that the council make a Section 106 agreement (s106) with the applicant to fund safety improvements for pedestrians and cyclists at the junction of Cavendish Street and Higher Cambridge Street – the applicant themselves discuss the shortcomings of the existing junction layout in Section 4.2.1 of the Transport Statement ("Cyclists have also been observed to queue on the footway to gain direct access to the Higher Cambridge Street/Cavendish Street junction (via a gap in the guard railings) rather than following the road markings which advise cyclists to dismount and use the controlled pedestrian crossings"). The improvements might take the form of a CYCLOPS junction. CYCLOPS is a homegrown Greater Manchester innovation now frequently used on Highways schemes across the country to deliver safe pedestrian and cycle movements without undue impact on traffic flows. For prospective occupants and passers-by alike, in line with the S106 tests as set out in Paragraph 58 of the National Planning Policy Framework (NPPF) 2024, a contribution to junction safety improvements improvement would be 'necessary to make the development acceptable in planning terms' (by contributing to an appropriate movement strategy for the site), 'directly related to the development' (given its proximity, the pressure added to the junction by the proposed threefold increase in residents, and in light of the wholly inadequate mitigation route proposed by the applicant), and 'fairly and reasonably related in scale and kind to the development' (given the stated threefold increase in residents explained by the applicant, so directly adding more pressure to the junction). 1 Legal Status of Cavendish Street This section of Cavendish Street, an adopted Highway, was subject to a stopping up order dated 14.06.1996. That order required that "the Developer shall provide a new highway which shall be a footpath/cycleway". MMU have since installed physical signage stating that Cavendish Street "has not been dedicated as a Highway" and have bolted down uncomfortable and restrictive speed bumps across the route in an apparent attempt to dissuade cyclists from exercising their legal rights over this space. Both measures may be unlawful, as my understanding is that cyclists do retain a legal Right of Way along Cavendish Street, unchanged from when the entire road was an adopted highway, and the speed bumps are inaccessible to some Disabled users. 2 Cycling routes and planning policy The case for walking and cycling and specifically for maintaining and improving high quality cycling networks is clear at every level of modern planning policy, including: NPPF 2024's "vision-led approach" LTN 1/20 Places For Everyone Joint Development Plan Objectives 6, 7 and 10 Places for Everyone Joint Development Plan policies JP-Strat14, JP-C1, JP-C5 and JP-C6 GM Transport Strategy 2040 and the "Right Mix" targets Greater Manchester Streets for All strategy and Streets for All design guide Manchester City Council's Active Travel Strategy Manchester City Council's commitment to be a Zero Carbon city by 2038 The policy position is absolutely clear – changes to the existing road and cycle networks

should make cycling more convenient for people, not less convenient. This specific stretch of Cavendish Street is a key part of the existing cycle network. It appears on TfGM's Bee Network map as a Beeway ("the routes that get people from A to B … representing the most direct routes between crossing points.") and connects to the Stretford Road Busy Beeway ("corridors or crossing points on busier roads that will require a higher level of design intervention to improve cycling and walking.") It is also mapped on the TfGM Cycle Network. The national standard for cycling infrastructure is DfT guidance note LTN 1/20. LTN 1/20 advises above all else that cycle routes and networks should be Safe, Direct, Comfortable, Attractive and Coherent. Introducing unnecessary diversions, junctions and bends into a well-used existing route undermines all of these core principles, resulting in a lower quality cycle network which will make it harder for the council to achieve its cycling objectives. The applicant has offered various reasons why diverting cyclists is necessary but all of these reasons seem to be either existing problems, or problems designed into the scheme. The proposal is to demolish and redevelop the site – so considerations like limited space and the placement of entrances, shop frontages, planting and pedestrian areas are entirely within the applicant's scope to manage. Instead of starting with the problem "there is an existing busy cycle route across this site, how can I design to accommodate everyone's needs?", it seems the applicant has started with the conclusion "cyclists must be deterred" and instructed their consultants to post-rationalise that decision. 3 Misleading claims regarding safety Page 22 of the Design & Access Statement refers to the "existing controversial link along Cavendish St., which is resulting in collisions of pedestrians, electric scooters, cyclists, etc." However the map of recorded collisions, on page 18 of the Transport Statement submitted in the same planning application, shows no recorded collisions whatsoever on this link, only on the adjacent main roads. It appears the applicant is attempting to restrict cycle access based on a "problem" for which they have no evidence. Yours sincerely, [redacted]

****
This email and any files transmitted with it are confidential and intended solely for the use of the individual or entity to whom they are addressed. If you have received this email in error, please notify the sender, or [redacted] and then permanently delete the email, attachments and all copies.
The full text of the Council's email disclaimer is available at: www.manchester.gov.uk/emaildisclaimer.
Your personal data is very important to us. Please refer to our privacy notice at: www.manchester.gov.uk/privacy for further information.

This footnote also confirms that this email message has been swept for the presence of computer viruses.
****

Outlook

Fw: Planning application 142888/FO/2025 - Cambridge Halls Of Residence Cavendish Street Manchester M15 6TT

From Planning <[redacted]>
Date Fri 04/07/2025 08:37
To Lucy Harrison <[redacted]>

Information, Delivery & Support Team
Planning, Building Control & Licensing
Growth & Development Directorate
Postal address: Manchester City Council, P O Box 532, Town Hall, Manchester M60 2LA
Location address: Level 6 Town Hall Extension, Manchester M2 5DB
Tel: 0161 234 4516

Please consider the environment before printing an e-mail.

From: [redacted] <[redacted]>
Sent: 03 July 2025 22:09
To: Planning <[redacted]>
Subject: Planning application 142888/FO/2025 - Cambridge Halls Of Residence Cavendish Street Manchester M15 6TT

You don't often get email from [redacted] Learn why this is important

ALERT This message originated outside of the Manchester City Council network. **BE CAUTIOUS** before clicking any links or opening any attachments. Please remember your Cyber Training and report anything suspicious.

Dear Manchester Planning team,

I am writing to object to planning application 142888/FO/2025 – Cambridge Halls of Residence Cavendish Street Manchester M15 6TT.

My primary objection is that the proposals include the removal of a safe and direct cycling route through the site. This route has been open to cyclists ever since the road was first built; it is an essential, well-used part of the city's cycling network, so the proposal to divert cycles away from Cavendish Street is directly at odds with Manchester City Council's planning, sustainability and transport policies. Making this route less direct would be a significant step back in Manchester's journey towards a coherent cycle network that is useable by everyone.

In my own case, this route is invaluable for cycling between my home in Whalley Range to Piccadilly station and the nearby areas (including the Northern Quarter, Ancoats and New Islington); the lack of good north-south routes through the City Centre makes it particularly important. It connects the existing cycle paths on Grosvenor Street and London Road to those on Stretford Road, and thence to the Chorlton Cycleway and the new protected lanes on Old Chester Road, Talbot Road and the A56. In spite of the shortcomings of the Cavendish Street/Higher Cambridge Street junction, it is the simplest and most direct route, and reduces the amount of time I have to share space with motor vehicles, making cycling this journey quicker, safer and more appealing.

I hope that the council will refuse this application, and invite the developer to come back with a proposal that maintains direct cycle as well as pedestrian access along Cavendish Street, designed to modern standards set out in Greater Manchester's *Streets For All* design guide and in Department for Transport guidance note LTN 1/20. I am sure that the Highways team at MCC and the Active Travel team at TfGM will, if asked, be happy to comment on how much space would be required within the development to provide such a route.

I am also asking that the council make a Section 106 agreement (s106) with the applicant to fund safety improvements for pedestrians and cyclists at the junction of Cavendish Street and Higher Cambridge Street – the applicant themselves discuss the shortcomings of the existing junction layout in Section 4.2.1 of the Transport Statement ("Cyclists have also been observed to queue on the footway to gain direct access to the Higher Cambridge Street/Cavendish Street junction (via a gap in the guard railings) rather than following the road markings which advise cyclists to dismount and use the controlled pedestrian crossings"). The improvements might take the form of a CYCLOPS jction. CYCLOPS is a homegrown Greater Manchester innovation now frequently used on Highways schemes across the country to deliver safe pedestrian and cycle movements without undue impact on traffic flows. For prospective occupants and passers-by alike, in line with the S106 tests as set out in Paragraph 58 of the National Planning Policy Framework (NPPF) 2024, a contribution to junction safety improvements improvement would be 'necessary to make the development acceptable in planning terms' (by contributing to an appropriate movement strategy for the site), 'directly related to the development' (given its proximity, the pressure added to the junction by the proposed threefold increase in residents, and in light of the wholly inadequate mitigation route proposed by the applicant), and 'fairly and reasonably related in scale and kind to the development' (given the stated threefold increase in residents explained by the applicant, so directly adding more pressure to the junction).

Cycling routes and planning policy

The case for walking and cycling and specifically for maintaining and improving high quality cycling networks is clear at every level of modern planning policy, including: NPPF 2024's "vision-led approach" LTN 1/20 Places For Everyone Joint Development Plan Objectives 6, 7 and 10 Places for Everyone Joint Development Plan policies JP-Strat14, JP-C1, JP-C5 and JP-C6 GM Transport Strategy 2040 and the "Right Mix" targets Greater Manchester Streets for All strategy and Streets for All design guide Manchester City Council's Active Travel Strategy Manchester City Council's commitment to be a Zero Carbon city by 2038 The policy position is absolutely clear – changes to the existing road and cycle networks should make cycling more convenient for people, not less convenient. This specific stretch of Cavendish Street is a key part of the existing cycle network. It appears on TfGM's Bee Network map as a Beeway ("the routes that get people from A to B … representing the most direct routes between crossing points.") and connects to the Stretford Road Busy Beeway ("corridors or crossing points on busier roads that will require a higher level of design intervention to improve cycling and walking.") It is also mapped on the TfGM Cycle Network.

The national standard for cycling infrastructure is DfT guidance note LTN 1/20. LTN 1/20 advises above all else that cycle routes and networks should be Safe, Direct, Comfortable, Attractive and Coherent. Introducing unnecessary diversions, junctions and bends into a well-used existing route undermines all these principles, resulting in a lower quality cycle network which will make it harder for the council to achieve its cycling objectives. The applicant has offered various reasons why diverting cyclists is necessary, but all these reasons seem to be either existing problems, or problems designed into the scheme. The proposal is to demolish and redevelop the site – so considerations like limited space and the placement of entrances, shop frontages, planting and pedestrian areas are entirely within the applicant's scope to manage. Instead of starting with "there is an existing busy cycle route across this site, how can I accommodate or improve this?", they seem to have decided that they are entitled to remove this existing legal right; they have designed the development on this basis, and are now disingenuously trying to claim that there is no room for cycling within it.

Legal Status of Cavendish Street

This section of Cavendish Street, an adopted Highway, was subject to a stopping up order dated 14.06.1996. That order required that "the Developer shall provide a new highway which shall be a footpath/cycleway". MMU have since installed physical signage stating that Cavendish Street "has not been dedicated as a Highway" and have bolted down uncomfortable and restrictive speed bumps across the route in an apparent attempt to dissuade cyclists from exercising their legal rights over this space. Both measures may be unlawful, because my understanding is that cyclists do retain a legal Right of Way along Cavendish Street, unchanged from when the entire road was an adopted highway; and the speed bumps are inaccessible to some Disabled users.

Misleading claims regarding safety

Page 22 of the Design & Access Statement refers to the “existing controversial link along Cavendish St., which is resulting in collisions of pedestrians, electric scooters, cyclists, etc.” - “controversial” in this case apparently meaning that it is not universally loved. However the map of recorded collisions, on page 18 of the Transport Statement submitted in the same planning application, shows no recorded collisions whatsoever on this link, only on the adjacent main roads. It appears the applicant is attempting to restrict cycle access based on a “problem” for which they have no evidence.

For all these reasons, I very much hope that this application will be refused until a safe, direct cycle route is included within it.

Yours sincerely,

[redacted]

****
This email and any files transmitted with it are confidential and intended solely for the use of the individual or entity to whom they are addressed. If you have received this email in error, please notify the sender, or [redacted] and then permanently delete the email, attachments and all copies.
The full text of the Council's email disclaimer is available at: www.manchester.gov.uk/emaildisclaimer.
Your personal data is very important to us. Please refer to our privacy notice at: www.manchester.gov.uk/privacy for further information.

This footnote also confirms that this email message has been swept for the presence of computer viruses.
****

Outlook

Fw: Comment on Planning Application 142888/FO/2025

From Planning <[redacted]
Date Mon 14/07/2025 14:06
To Lucy Harrison <[redacted]

Information, Delivery & Support Team
Planning, Building Control & Licensing
Growth & Development Directorate
Postal address: Manchester City Council, P O Box 532, Town Hall, Manchester M60 2LA
Location address: Level 6 Town Hall Extension, Manchester M2 5DB
Tel: 0161 234 4516

Please consider the environment before printing an e-mail.

From: [redacted]
Sent: 11 July 2025 16:35
To: Planning <[redacted]
Subject: Comment on Planning Application 142888/FO/2025

You don't often get email from [redacted] Learn why this is important

ALERT This message originated outside of the Manchester City Council network. **BE CAUTIOUS** before clicking any links or opening any attachments. Please remember your Cyber Training and report anything suspicious.

Dear Manchester Planning team,

I am writing to lodge an objection to planning application **142888/FO/2025**– Cambridge Halls Of Residence Cavendish Street Manchester M15 6TT.

My primary objection is that the proposals have been designed to deter cyclists from using the safest and most direct route through the site. This route has been open to cyclists ever since the road was first built; it is an essential, well-used part of the city's cycling network and therefore the proposal to deter and/or divert cycles away from Cavendish Street is directly at odds with Manchester City Council's planning, sustainability and transport policies.

The applicant has also made misleading claims regarding the road's legal status and regarding pedestrian safety which I will outline below.

I am asking that the council **refuse** this application, and invite the developer to come back with a proposal that maintains direct cycle as well as pedestrian

access along Cavendish Street, designed to modern standards set out in Greater Manchester's Streets For All design guide and in Department for Transport guidance note LTN 1/20. I am sure that the Highways team at MCC and the Active Travel team at TfGM will, if asked, be happy to comment on how such a route could be provided within the space available.

I am also asking that the council **make a Section 106 agreement (s106)** with the applicant to fund safety improvements for pedestrians and cyclists at the junction of Cavendish Street and Higher Cambridge Street – the applicant themselves discuss the shortcomings of the existing junction layout in Section 4.2.1 of the Transport Statement ("*Cyclists have also been observed to queue on the footway to gain direct access to the Higher Cambridge Street/Cavendish Street junction (via a gap in the guard railings) rather than following the road markings which advise cyclists to dismount and use the controlled pedestrian crossings*"). The improvements might take the form of a CYCLOPS junction. CYCLOPS is a homegrown Greater Manchester innovation now frequently used on Highways schemes across the country to deliver safe pedestrian and cycle movements without undue impact on traffic flows.

For prospective occupants and passers-by alike, in line with the S106 tests as set out in Paragraph 58 of the National Planning Policy Framework (NPPF) 2024, a contribution to junction safety improvements improvement would be 'necessary to make the development acceptable in planning terms' (by contributing to an appropriate movement strategy for the site), 'directly related to the development' (given its proximity, the pressure added to the junction by the proposed threefold increase in residents, and in light of the wholly inadequate mitigation route proposed by the applicant), and 'fairly and reasonably related in scale and kind to the development' (given the stated threefold increase in residents explained by the applicant, so directly adding more pressure to the junction).

1 Legal Status of Cavendish Street

This section of Cavendish Street, an adopted Highway, was subject to a stopping up order dated 14.06.1996. That order required that "the Developer shall provide a new highway which shall be a footpath/cycleway". MMU have since installed physical signage stating that Cavendish Street "has not been dedicated as a Highway" and have bolted down uncomfortable and restrictive speed bumps across the route in an apparent attempt to dissuade cyclists from exercising their legal rights over this space. Both measures may be unlawful, as my understanding is that cyclists do retain a legal Right of Way along Cavendish Street, unchanged from when the entire road was an adopted highway, and the speed bumps are inaccessible to some Disabled users.

2 Cycling routes and planning policy

The case for walking and cycling and specifically for maintaining and improving high quality cycling networks is clear at every level of modern planning policy, including:

- NPPF 2024's "vision-led approach"
- LTN 1/20
- Places For Everyone Joint Development Plan Objectives 6, 7 and 10
- Places for Everyone Joint Development Plan policies JP-Strat14, JP-C1, JP-C5 and JP-C6
- GM Transport Strategy 2040 and the "Right Mix" targets
- Greater Manchester Streets for All strategy and Streets for All design guide
- Manchester City Council's Active Travel Strategy
- Manchester City Council's commitment to be a Zero Carbon city by 2038

The policy position is absolutely clear – changes to the existing road and cycle networks should make cycling more convenient for people, not less convenient.

This specific stretch of Cavendish Street is a key part of the existing cycle network. It appears on TfGM's Bee Network map as a Beeway ("the routes that get people from A to B … representing the most direct routes between crossing points.") and connects to the Stretford Road Busy Beeway ("corridors or crossing points on busier roads that will require a higher level of design intervention to improve cycling and walking.") It is also mapped on the TfGM Cycle Network.

The national standard for cycling infrastructure is DfT guidance note LTN 1/20. LTN 1/20 advises above all else that cycle routes and networks should be Safe, Direct, Comfortable, Attractive and Coherent. Introducing unnecessary diversions, junctions and bends into a well-used existing route undermines all of these core principles, resulting in a lower quality cycle network which will make it harder for the council to achieve its cycling objectives.

The applicant has offered various reasons why diverting cyclists is necessary but all of these reasons seem to be either existing problems, or problems designed into the scheme. The proposal is to demolish and redevelop the site – so considerations like limited space and the placement of entrances, shop frontages, planting and pedestrian areas are entirely within the applicant's scope to manage. Instead of starting with the problem "there is an existing busy cycle route across this site, how can I design to accommodate everyone's needs?", it seems the

applicant has started with the conclusion “cyclists must be deterred” and instructed their consultants to post-rationalise that decision.

3 Misleading claims regarding safety

Page 22 of the Design & Access Statement refers to the “existing controversial link along Cavendish St., which is resulting in collisions of pedestrians, electric scooters, cyclists, etc.”

However the map of recorded collisions, on page 18 of the Transport Statement submitted in the same planning application, shows no recorded collisions whatsoever on this link, only on the adjacent main roads.

It appears the applicant is attempting to restrict cycle access based on a “problem” for which they have no evidence.

Yours sincerely,

[redacted]

Sent from Outlook for iOS

****
This email and any files transmitted with it are confidential and intended solely for the use of the individual or entity to whom they are addressed.
If you have received this email in error, please notify the sender, or [redacted] and then permanently delete the email, attachments and all copies.
The full text of the Council's email disclaimer is available at: www.manchester.gov.uk/emaildisclaimer.
Your personal data is very important to us. Please refer to our privacy notice at: www.manchester.gov.uk/privacy for further information.

This footnote also confirms that this email message has been swept for the presence of computer viruses.
****

Outlook

Fw: RE planning application 142888/FO/2025 – Cambridge Halls Of Residence Cavendish Street Manchester M15 6TT.

From Planning <[redacted]
Date Mon 30/06/2025 08:51
To Lucy Harrison <[redacted]

Information, Delivery & Support Team
Planning, Building Control & Licensing
Growth & Development Directorate
Postal address: Manchester City Council, P O Box 532, Town Hall, Manchester M60 2LA
Location address: Level 6 Town Hall Extension, Manchester M2 5DB
Tel: 0161 234 4516

Please consider the environment before printing an e-mail.

From: [redacted]
Sent: 28 June 2025 14:19
To: Planning <[redacted]
Subject: RE planning application 142888/FO/2025 – Cambridge Halls Of Residence Cavendish Street Manchester M15 6TT.

You don't often get email from [redacted] Learn why this is important

ALERT This message originated outside of the Manchester City Council network. **BE CAUTIOUS** before clicking any links or opening any attachments. Please remember your Cyber Training and report anything suspicious.

Dear Manchester Planning team,

I am writing to lodge an objection to planning application 142888/FO/2025 – Cambridge Halls Of Residence Cavendish Street Manchester M15 6TT.

My primary objection is that the proposals have been designed to deter cyclists from using the safest and most direct route through the site. This route has been open to cyclists ever since the road was first built; it is an essential, well-used part of the city's cycling network and therefore the proposal to deter and/or divert cycles away from Cavendish Street is directly at odds with Manchester City Council's planning, sustainability and transport policies.

The applicant has also made misleading claims regarding the road's legal status and regarding pedestrian safety which I will outline below.

I am asking that the council refuse this application, and invite the developer to come back with a proposal that maintains direct cycle as well as pedestrian access along Cavendish Street, designed to modern standards set out in Greater Manchester's Streets For All design guide and in Department for Transport guidance note LTN 1/20. I am sure that the Highways team at MCC and

the Active Travel team at TfGM will, if asked, be happy to comment on how such a route could be provided within the space available.

I am also asking that the council make a Section 106 agreement (s106) with the applicant to fund safety improvements for pedestrians and cyclists at the junction of Cavendish Street and Higher Cambridge Street – the applicant themselves discuss the shortcomings of the existing junction layout in Section 4.2.1 of the Transport Statement ("Cyclists have also been observed to queue on the footway to gain direct access to the Higher Cambridge Street/Cavendish Street junction (via a gap in the guard railings) rather than following the road markings which advise cyclists to dismount and use the controlled pedestrian crossings"). The improvements might take the form of a CYCLOPS junction. CYCLOPS is a homegrown Greater Manchester innovation now frequently used on Highways schemes across the country to deliver safe pedestrian and cycle movements without undue impact on traffic flows.

For prospective occupants and passers-by alike, in line with the S106 tests as set out in Paragraph 58 of the National Planning Policy Framework (NPPF) 2024, a contribution to junction safety improvements improvement would be 'necessary to make the development acceptable in planning terms' (by contributing to an appropriate movement strategy for the site), 'directly related to the development' (given its proximity, the pressure added to the junction by the proposed threefold increase in residents, and in light of the wholly inadequate mitigation route proposed by the applicant), and 'fairly and reasonably related in scale and kind to the development' (given the stated threefold increase in residents explained by the applicant, so directly adding more pressure to the junction).

1 Legal Status of Cavendish Street

This section of Cavendish Street, an adopted Highway, was subject to a stopping up order dated 14.06.1996. That order required that "the Developer shall provide a new highway which shall be a footpath/cycleway". MMU have since installed physical signage stating that Cavendish Street "has not been dedicated as a Highway" and have bolted down uncomfortable and restrictive speed bumps across the route in an apparent attempt to dissuade cyclists from exercising their legal rights over this space. Both measures may be unlawful, as my understanding is that cyclists do retain a legal Right of Way along Cavendish Street, unchanged from when the entire road was an adopted highway, and the speed bumps are inaccessible to some Disabled users.

2 Cycling routes and planning policy

The case for walking and cycling and specifically for maintaining and improving high quality cycling networks is clear at every level of modern planning policy, including:

NPPF 2024's "vision-led approach"
LTN 1/20
Places For Everyone Joint Development Plan Objectives 6, 7 and 10
Places for Everyone Joint Development Plan policies JP-Strat14, JP-C1, JP-C5 and JP-C6
GM Transport Strategy 2040 and the "Right Mix" targets
Greater Manchester Streets for All strategy and Streets for All design guide
Manchester City Council's Active Travel Strategy
Manchester City Council's commitment to be a Zero Carbon city by 2038
The policy position is absolutely clear – changes to the existing road and cycle networks should make cycling more convenient for people, not less convenient.

This specific stretch of Cavendish Street is a key part of the existing cycle network. It appears on

TfGM's Bee Network map as a Beeway ("the routes that get people from A to B … representing the most direct routes between crossing points.") and connects to the Stretford Road Busy Beeway ("corridors or crossing points on busier roads that will require a higher level of design intervention to improve cycling and walking.") It is also mapped on the TfGM Cycle Network.

The national standard for cycling infrastructure is DfT guidance note LTN 1/20. LTN 1/20 advises above all else that cycle routes and networks should be Safe, Direct, Comfortable, Attractive and Coherent. Introducing unnecessary diversions, junctions and bends into a well-used existing route undermines all of these core principles, resulting in a lower quality cycle network which will make it harder for the council to achieve its cycling objectives.

The applicant has offered various reasons why diverting cyclists is necessary but all of these reasons seem to be either existing problems, or problems designed into the scheme. The proposal is to demolish and redevelop the site – so considerations like limited space and the placement of entrances, shop frontages, planting and pedestrian areas are entirely within the applicant's scope to manage. Instead of starting with the problem "there is an existing busy cycle route across this site, how can I design to accommodate everyone's needs?", it seems the applicant has started with the conclusion "cyclists must be deterred" and instructed their consultants to post-rationalise that decision.

3 Misleading claims regarding safety

Page 22 of the Design & Access Statement refers to the "existing controversial link along Cavendish St., which is resulting in collisions of pedestrians, electric scooters, cyclists, etc."

However the map of recorded collisions, on page 18 of the Transport Statement submitted in the same planning application, shows no recorded collisions whatsoever on this link, only on the adjacent main roads.

It appears the applicant is attempting to restrict cycle access based on a "problem" for which they have no evidence.

Yours sincerely,

[redacted]

****
This email and any files transmitted with it are confidential and intended solely for the use of the individual or entity to whom they are addressed.
If you have received this email in error, please notify the sender, or [redacted] and then permanently delete the email, attachments and all copies.
The full text of the Council's email disclaimer is available at: www.manchester.gov.uk/emaildisclaimer.
Your personal data is very important to us. Please refer to our privacy notice at: www.manchester.gov.uk/privacy for further information.

This footnote also confirms that this email message has been swept for the presence of computer viruses.
****

Outlook

Fw: Comment on Planning Application 142888/FO/2025

From Planning <[redacted]
Date Mon 14/07/2025 14:04
To Lucy Harrison <[redacted]

Information, Delivery & Support Team
Planning, Building Control & Licensing
Growth & Development Directorate
Postal address: Manchester City Council, P O Box 532, Town Hall, Manchester M60 2LA
Location address: Level 6 Town Hall Extension, Manchester M2 5DB
Tel: 0161 234 4516

Please consider the environment before printing an e-mail.

From: [redacted]
Sent: 12 July 2025 09:59
To: Planning <[redacted]
Subject: Comment on Planning Application 142888/FO/2025

You don't often get email from [redacted] Learn why this is important

ALERT This message originated outside of the Manchester City Council network. **BE CAUTIOUS** before clicking any links or opening any attachments. Please remember your Cyber Training and report anything suspicious.

Dear Manchester Planning team,

I am writing to lodge an objection to planning application 142888/FO/2025 – Cambridge Halls Of Residence Cavendish Street Manchester M15 6TT.

My primary objection is that the proposals have been designed to deter cyclists from using the safest and most direct route through the site. This route has been open to cyclists ever since the road was first built; it is an essential, well-used part of the city's cycling network and therefore the proposal to deter and/or divert cycles away from Cavendish Street is directly at odds with Manchester City Council's planning, sustainability and transport policies.

As a family, we cycle through Cavendish Street regularly for children's activities, shopping and work. Blocking the way would be unsafe for children cycling. We live in Hulme and this is a safe connection to Oxford Road cycle routes.

The applicant has also made misleading claims regarding the road's legal status and regarding pedestrian safety which I will outline below.

I am asking that the council refuse this application, and invite the developer to come back with a proposal that maintains direct cycle as well as pedestrian access along Cavendish Street, designed

to modern standards set out in Greater Manchester's Streets For All design guide and in Department for Transport guidance note LTN 1/20. I am sure that the Highways team at MCC and the Active Travel team at TfGM will, if asked, be happy to comment on how such a route could be provided within the space available.

I am also asking that the council make a Section 106 agreement (s106) with the applicant to fund safety improvements for pedestrians and cyclists at the junction of Cavendish Street and Higher Cambridge Street – the applicant themselves discuss the shortcomings of the existing junction layout in Section 4.2.1 of the Transport Statement ("Cyclists have also been observed to queue on the footway to gain direct access to the Higher Cambridge Street/Cavendish Street junction (via a gap in the guard railings) rather than following the road markings which advise cyclists to dismount and use the controlled pedestrian crossings"). The improvements might take the form of a CYCLOPS junction. CYCLOPS is a homegrown Greater Manchester innovation now frequently used on Highways schemes across the country to deliver safe pedestrian and cycle movements without undue impact on traffic flows.

For prospective occupants and passers-by alike, in line with the S106 tests as set out in Paragraph 58 of the National Planning Policy Framework (NPPF) 2024, a contribution to junction safety improvements improvement would be 'necessary to make the development acceptable in planning terms' (by contributing to an appropriate movement strategy for the site), 'directly related to the development' (given its proximity, the pressure added to the junction by the proposed threefold increase in residents, and in light of the wholly inadequate mitigation route proposed by the applicant), and 'fairly and reasonably related in scale and kind to the development' (given the stated threefold increase in residents explained by the applicant, so directly adding more pressure to the junction).

1 Legal Status of Cavendish Street

This section of Cavendish Street, an adopted Highway, was subject to a stopping up order dated 14.06.1996. That order required that "the Developer shall provide a new highway which shall be a footpath/cycleway". MMU have since installed physical signage stating that Cavendish Street "has not been dedicated as a Highway" and have bolted down uncomfortable and restrictive speed bumps across the route in an apparent attempt to dissuade cyclists from exercising their legal rights over this space. Both measures may be unlawful, as my understanding is that cyclists do retain a legal Right of Way along Cavendish Street, unchanged from when the entire road was an adopted highway, and the speed bumps are inaccessible to some Disabled users.

2 Cycling routes and planning policy

The case for walking and cycling and specifically for maintaining and improving high quality cycling networks is clear at every level of modern planning policy, including:

NPPF 2024's "vision-led approach"
LTN 1/20
Places For Everyone Joint Development Plan Objectives 6, 7 and 10
Places for Everyone Joint Development Plan policies JP-Strat14, JP-C1, JP-C5 and JP-C6
GM Transport Strategy 2040 and the "Right Mix" targets
Greater Manchester Streets for All strategy and Streets for All design guide
Manchester City Council's Active Travel Strategy
Manchester City Council's commitment to be a Zero Carbon city by 2038
The policy position is absolutely clear – changes to the existing road and cycle networks should make cycling more convenient for people, not less convenient.

This specific stretch of Cavendish Street is a key part of the existing cycle network. It appears on TfGM's Bee Network map as a Beeway ("the routes that get people from A to B … representing the most direct routes between crossing points.") and connects to the Stretford Road Busy Beeway ("corridors or crossing points on busier roads that will require a higher level of design intervention to improve cycling and walking.") It is also mapped on the TfGM Cycle Network.

The national standard for cycling infrastructure is DfT guidance note LTN 1/20. LTN 1/20 advises above all else that cycle routes and networks should be Safe, Direct, Comfortable, Attractive and Coherent. Introducing unnecessary diversions, junctions and bends into a well-used existing route undermines all of these core principles, resulting in a lower quality cycle network which will make it harder for the council to achieve its cycling objectives.

The applicant has offered various reasons why diverting cyclists is necessary but all of these reasons seem to be either existing problems, or problems designed into the scheme. The proposal is to demolish and redevelop the site – so considerations like limited space and the placement of entrances, shop frontages, planting and pedestrian areas are entirely within the applicant's scope to manage. Instead of starting with the problem "there is an existing busy cycle route across this site, how can I design to accommodate everyone's needs?", it seems the applicant has started with the conclusion "cyclists must be deterred" and instructed their consultants to post-rationalise that decision.

3 Misleading claims regarding safety

Page 22 of the Design & Access Statement refers to the "existing controversial link along Cavendish St., which is resulting in collisions of pedestrians, electric scooters, cyclists, etc."

However the map of recorded collisions, on page 18 of the Transport Statement submitted in the same planning application, shows no recorded collisions whatsoever on this link, only on the adjacent main roads.

It appears the applicant is attempting to restrict cycle access based on a "problem" for which they have no evidence.

Yours sincerely,

[redacted]

****
This email and any files transmitted with it are confidential and intended solely for the use of the individual or entity to whom they are addressed.
If you have received this email in error, please notify the sender, or [redacted] and then permanently delete the email, attachments and all copies.
The full text of the Council's email disclaimer is available at: www.manchester.gov.uk/emaildisclaimer.
Your personal data is very important to us. Please refer to our privacy notice at: www.manchester.gov.uk/privacy for further information.

This footnote also confirms that this email message has been swept for the presence of computer viruses.
****

Outlook

Fw: Comment on Planning Application 142888/FO/2025 - OBJECTION

From Planning <[redacted]
Date Mon 07/07/2025 11:00
To Lucy Harrison <[redacted]

Information, Delivery & Support Team
Planning, Building Control & Licensing
Growth & Development Directorate
Postal address: Manchester City Council, P O Box 532, Town Hall, Manchester M60 2LA
Location address: Level 6 Town Hall Extension, Manchester M2 5DB
Tel: 0161 234 4516

Please consider the environment before printing an e-mail.

From: [redacted]
Sent: 04 July 2025 17:54
To: Planning <[redacted]
Subject: Comment on Planning Application 142888/FO/2025 - OBJECTION

You don't often get email from [redacted] Learn why this is important

ALERT This message originated outside of the Manchester City Council network. **BE CAUTIOUS** before clicking any links or opening any attachments. Please remember your Cyber Training and report anything suspicious.

Dear Manchester Planning team,

I am writing to lodge an objection to planning application **142888/FO/2025**– Cambridge Halls Of Residence Cavendish Street Manchester M15 6TT.

My primary objection is that the proposals have been designed to deter cyclists from using the safest and most direct route through the site. This route has been open to cyclists ever since the road was first built; and I have used it for the 25yrs I've lived in Manchester. It's been my route to work and now my route into Manchester and the best way for my to connect with the cycle paths on Oxford Road. It is an essential, well-used part of the city's cycling network and therefore the proposal to deter and/or divert cycles away from Cavendish Street is directly at odds with Manchester City Council's planning, sustainability and transport policies.

If this route was to be removed I would be forced to take a detour away from the most direct route and I'd have to use a more dangerous junction to turn into/out of Boundary Street West.

The applicant has also made misleading claims regarding the road's legal status and regarding pedestrian safety which I will outline below.

I am asking that the council **refuse** this application, and invite the developer to come back with a proposal that maintains direct cycle as well as pedestrian access along Cavendish Street, designed to modern standards set out in Greater Manchester's Streets For All design guide and in Department for Transport guidance note LTN 1/20. I am sure that the Highways team at MCC and the Active Travel team at TfGM will, if asked, be happy to comment on how such a route could be provided within the space available.

I am also asking that the council **make a Section 106 agreement (s106)** with the applicant to fund safety improvements for pedestrians and cyclists at the junction of Cavendish Street and Higher Cambridge Street – the applicant themselves discuss the shortcomings of the existing junction layout in Section 4.2.1 of the Transport Statement ("*Cyclists have also been observed to queue on the footway to gain direct access to the Higher Cambridge Street/Cavendish Street junction (via a gap in the guard railings) rather than following the road markings which advise cyclists to dismount and use the controlled pedestrian crossings*"). The improvements might take the form of a CYCLOPS junction. CYCLOPS is a homegrown Greater Manchester innovation now frequently used on Highways schemes across the country to deliver safe pedestrian and cycle movements without undue impact on traffic flows.

For prospective occupants and passers-by alike, in line with the S106 tests as set out in Paragraph 58 of the National Planning Policy Framework (NPPF) 2024, a contribution to junction safety improvements improvement would be 'necessary to make the development acceptable in planning terms' (by contributing to an appropriate movement strategy for the site), 'directly related to the development' (given its proximity, the pressure added to the junction by the proposed threefold increase in residents, and in light of the wholly inadequate mitigation route proposed by the applicant), and 'fairly and reasonably related in scale and kind to the development' (given the stated threefold increase in residents explained by the applicant, so directly adding more pressure to the junction).

1 Legal Status of Cavendish Street

This section of Cavendish Street, an adopted Highway, was subject to a stopping up order dated 14.06.1996. That order required that "the Developer shall provide a new highway which shall be a footpath/cycleway". MMU have since installed physical signage stating that Cavendish Street "has not been dedicated as a Highway" and have bolted down uncomfortable and restrictive speed bumps across the route in an apparent attempt to dissuade cyclists from exercising their legal rights over this space. Both measures may be unlawful, as my understanding is that cyclists do retain a legal Right of Way along Cavendish Street, unchanged from when the entire road was an adopted highway, and the speed bumps are inaccessible to some Disabled users.

2 Cycling routes and planning policy

The case for walking and cycling and specifically for maintaining and improving high quality cycling networks is clear at every level of modern planning policy, including:

- NPPF 2024's "vision-led approach"
- LTN 1/20
- Places For Everyone Joint Development Plan Objectives 6, 7 and 10
- Places for Everyone Joint Development Plan policies JP-Strat14, JP-C1, JP-C5 and JP-C6
- GM Transport Strategy 2040 and the "Right Mix" targets
- Greater Manchester Streets for All strategy and Streets for All design guide
- Manchester City Council's Active Travel Strategy
- Manchester City Council's commitment to be a Zero Carbon city by 2038

The policy position is absolutely clear – changes to the existing road and cycle networks should make cycling more convenient for people, not less convenient.

This specific stretch of Cavendish Street is a key part of the existing cycle network. It appears on TfGM's Bee Network map as a Beeway ("the routes that get people from A to B … representing the most direct routes between crossing points.") and connects to the Stretford Road Busy Beeway ("corridors or crossing points on busier roads that will require a higher level of design intervention to improve cycling and walking.") It is also mapped on the TfGM Cycle Network.

The national standard for cycling infrastructure is DfT guidance note LTN 1/20. LTN 1/20 advises above all else that cycle routes and networks should be Safe, Direct, Comfortable, Attractive and Coherent. Introducing unnecessary diversions,

junctions and bends into a well-used existing route undermines all of these core principles, resulting in a lower quality cycle network which will make it harder for the council to achieve its cycling objectives.

The applicant has offered various reasons why diverting cyclists is necessary but all of these reasons seem to be either existing problems, or problems designed into the scheme. The proposal is to demolish and redevelop the site – so considerations like limited space and the placement of entrances, shop frontages, planting and pedestrian areas are entirely within the applicant's scope to manage. Instead of starting with the problem "there is an existing busy cycle route across this site, how can I design to accommodate everyone's needs?", it seems the applicant has started with the conclusion "cyclists must be deterred" and instructed their consultants to post-rationalise that decision.

3 Misleading claims regarding safety

Page 22 of the Design & Access Statement refers to the "existing controversial link along Cavendish St., which is resulting in collisions of pedestrians, electric scooters, cyclists, etc."

However the map of recorded collisions, on page 18 of the Transport Statement submitted in the same planning application, shows no recorded collisions whatsoever on this link, only on the adjacent main roads.

It appears the applicant is attempting to restrict cycle access based on a "problem" for which they have no evidence.

The approach so far has been hugely disappointing, but I hope if this version is refused, then the scheme can be revised and active travel becomes a key part of the new design.

Yours sincerely,

[redacted]

[redacted]

****
This email and any files transmitted with it are confidential and intended solely for the use of the individual or entity to whom they are addressed.
If you have received this email in error, please notify the sender, or [redacted] and then permanently delete the email, attachments and all copies.
The full text of the Council's email disclaimer is available at: www.manchester.gov.uk/emaildisclaimer.
Your personal data is very important to us. Please refer to our privacy notice at: www.manchester.gov.uk/privacy for further information.

This footnote also confirms that this email message has been swept for the presence of computer viruses.
****

Outlook

Fw: Comment on Planning Application 142888/FO/2025

From Planning <[redacted]
Date Mon 14/07/2025 14:05
To Lucy Harrison <[redacted]

Information, Delivery & Support Team
Planning, Building Control & Licensing
Growth & Development Directorate
Postal address: Manchester City Council, P O Box 532, Town Hall, Manchester M60 2LA
Location address: Level 6 Town Hall Extension, Manchester M2 5DB
Tel: 0161 234 4516

Please consider the environment before printing an e-mail.

From: [redacted]
Sent: 11 July 2025 19:30
To: Planning <[redacted]
Subject: Comment on Planning Application 142888/FO/2025

You don't often get email from [redacted] Learn why this is important

ALERT This message originated outside of the Manchester City Council network. **BE CAUTIOUS** before clicking any links or opening any attachments. Please remember your Cyber Training and report anything suspicious.

Dear Manchester Planning team,

I am writing to lodge an objection to planning application 142888/FO/2025 – Cambridge Halls Of Residence Cavendish Street Manchester M15 6TT.

My primary objection is that the proposals have been designed to deter cyclists from using the safest and most direct route through the site. This route has been open to cyclists ever since the road was first built; it is an essential, well-used part of the city's cycling network and therefore the proposal to deter and/or divert cycles away from Cavendish Street is directly at odds with Manchester City Council's planning, sustainability and transport policies.

I have lived in Hulme since 1997 and use this cycle route almost every day to reach work or town, and would feel massively inconvenienced to have to detour round a building after 28 years of unimpeded access despite MMU having already built 2 halls of residences over what used to be a through road.

The applicant has also made misleading claims regarding the road's legal status and regarding pedestrian safety which I will outline below.

I am asking that the council refuse this application, and invite the developer to come back with a proposal that maintains direct cycle as well as pedestrian access along Cavendish Street, designed to modern standards set out in Greater Manchester's Streets For All design guide and in Department for Transport guidance note LTN

1/20. I am sure that the Highways team at MCC and the Active Travel team at TfGM will, if asked, be happy to comment on how such a route could be provided within the space available.

I am also asking that the council make a Section 106 agreement (s106) with the applicant to fund safety improvements for pedestrians and cyclists at the junction of Cavendish Street and Higher Cambridge Street – the applicant themselves discuss the shortcomings of the existing junction layout in Section 4.2.1 of the Transport Statement ("Cyclists have also been observed to queue on the footway to gain direct access to the Higher Cambridge Street/Cavendish Street junction (via a gap in the guard railings) rather than following the road markings which advise cyclists to dismount and use the controlled pedestrian crossings"). The improvements might take the form of a CYCLOPS junction. CYCLOPS is a homegrown Greater Manchester innovation now frequently used on Highways schemes across the country to deliver safe pedestrian and cycle movements without undue impact on traffic flows.

For prospective occupants and passers-by alike, in line with the S106 tests as set out in Paragraph 58 of the National Planning Policy Framework (NPPF) 2024, a contribution to junction safety improvements improvement would be 'necessary to make the development acceptable in planning terms' (by contributing to an appropriate movement strategy for the site), 'directly related to the development' (given its proximity, the pressure added to the junction by the proposed threefold increase in residents, and in light of the wholly inadequate mitigation route proposed by the applicant), and 'fairly and reasonably related in scale and kind to the development' (given the stated threefold increase in residents explained by the applicant, so directly adding more pressure to the junction).

1 Legal Status of Cavendish Street

This section of Cavendish Street, an adopted Highway, was subject to a stopping up order dated 14.06.1996. That order required that "the Developer shall provide a new highway which shall be a footpath/cycleway". MMU have since installed physical signage stating that Cavendish Street "has not been dedicated as a Highway" and have bolted down uncomfortable and restrictive speed bumps across the route in an apparent attempt to dissuade cyclists from exercising their legal rights over this space. Both measures may be unlawful, as my understanding is that cyclists do retain a legal Right of Way along Cavendish Street, unchanged from when the entire road was an adopted highway, and the speed bumps are inaccessible to some Disabled users.

2 Cycling routes and planning policy

The case for walking and cycling and specifically for maintaining and improving high quality cycling networks is clear at every level of modern planning policy, including:

NPPF 2024's "vision-led approach"
LTN 1/20
Places For Everyone Joint Development Plan Objectives 6, 7 and 10
Places for Everyone Joint Development Plan policies JP-Strat14, JP-C1, JP-C5 and JP-C6
GM Transport Strategy 2040 and the "Right Mix" targets
Greater Manchester Streets for All strategy and Streets for All design guide
Manchester City Council's Active Travel Strategy
Manchester City Council's commitment to be a Zero Carbon city by 2038
The policy position is absolutely clear – changes to the existing road and cycle networks should make cycling more convenient for people, not less convenient.

This specific stretch of Cavendish Street is a key part of the existing cycle network. It appears on TfGM's Bee Network map as a Beeway ("the routes that get people from A to B … representing the most direct routes between crossing points.") and connects to the Stretford Road Busy Beeway ("corridors or crossing points on busier roads that will require a higher level of design intervention to improve cycling and walking.") It is also mapped on the TfGM Cycle Network.

The national standard for cycling infrastructure is DfT guidance note LTN 1/20. LTN 1/20 advises above all else that cycle routes and networks should be Safe, Direct, Comfortable, Attractive and Coherent. Introducing unnecessary diversions, junctions and bends into a well-used existing route undermines all of these core principles, resulting in a lower quality cycle network which will make it harder for the council to achieve its cycling objectives.

The applicant has offered various reasons why diverting cyclists is necessary but all of these reasons seem to be either existing problems, or problems designed into the scheme. The proposal is to demolish and redevelop the site – so considerations like limited space and the placement of entrances, shop frontages, planting and pedestrian areas are entirely within the applicant's scope to manage. Instead of starting with the problem "there is an existing busy cycle route across this site, how can I design to accommodate everyone's needs?", it seems the applicant has started with the conclusion "cyclists must be deterred" and instructed their consultants to post-rationalise that decision.

3 Misleading claims regarding safety

Page 22 of the Design & Access Statement refers to the "existing controversial link along Cavendish St., which is resulting in collisions of pedestrians, electric scooters, cyclists, etc."

However the map of recorded collisions, on page 18 of the Transport Statement submitted in the same planning application, shows no recorded collisions whatsoever on this link, only on the adjacent main roads.

It appears the applicant is attempting to restrict cycle access based on a "problem" for which they have no evidence.

Yours sincerely,

[redacted]

****
This email and any files transmitted with it are confidential and intended solely for the use of the individual or entity to whom they are addressed.
If you have received this email in error, please notify the sender, or [redacted] and then permanently delete the email, attachments and all copies.
The full text of the Council's email disclaimer is available at: www.manchester.gov.uk/emaildisclaimer.
Your personal data is very important to us. Please refer to our privacy notice at: www.manchester.gov.uk/privacy for further information.

This footnote also confirms that this email message has been swept for the presence of computer viruses.
****

Outlook

Fw: Comment on Planning Application 142888/FO/2025

From Planning <[redacted]>
Date Thu 10/07/2025 08:57
To Lucy Harrison <[redacted]>

Information, Delivery & Support Team
Planning, Building Control & Licensing
Growth & Development Directorate
Postal address: Manchester City Council, P O Box 532, Town Hall, Manchester M60 2LA
Location address: Level 6 Town Hall Extension, Manchester M2 5DB
Tel: 0161 234 4516

Please consider the environment before printing an e-mail.

From: [redacted]
Sent: 10 July 2025 08:23
To: Planning <[redacted]>
Subject: Comment on Planning Application 142888/FO/2025

You don't often get email from [redacted] Learn why this is important

ALERT This message originated outside of the Manchester City Council network. **BE CAUTIOUS** before clicking any links or opening any attachments. Please remember your Cyber Training and report anything suspicious.

Dear Manchester Planning team,
I am writing to lodge an objection to planning application **142888/FO/2025** – Cambridge Halls Of Residence Cavendish Street Manchester M15 6TT.
My primary objection is that the proposals have been designed to deter cyclists from using the safest and most direct route through the site.
I understand this route has been open to cyclists ever since the road was first built; it is an essential, well-used part of the city's cycling network and therefore the proposal to deter and/or divert cycles away from Cavendish Street is directly at odds with Manchester City Council's planning, sustainability and transport policies.
It's also, I believe, at odds to the future health and wellbeing of students and their opinion of Manchester as a place to live, work and raise a family. It is the little things that make a difference and an awkward more dangerous route implies that Manchester does not care for humans - whereas a safe, direct route implies that people are important to the community.
Best wishes
[redacted]

****
This email and any files transmitted with it are confidential and intended solely for the use of the individual or entity to whom they are addressed. If you have received this email in error, please notify the sender, or [redacted] and then permanently delete the email, attachments and all copies.
The full text of the Council's email disclaimer is available at: www.manchester.gov.uk/emaildisclaimer.

Your personal data is very important to us. Please refer to our privacy notice at: www.manchester.gov.uk/privacy for further information.

This footnote also confirms that this email message has been swept for the presence of computer viruses.
****

Outlook

Fw: Subject: Comment on Planning Application 142888/FO/2025

From Planning <[redacted]
Date Tue 08/07/2025 07:53
To Lucy Harrison <[redacted]

Information, Delivery & Support Team
Planning, Building Control & Licensing
Growth & Development Directorate
Postal address: Manchester City Council, P O Box 532, Town Hall, Manchester M60 2LA
Location address: Level 6 Town Hall Extension, Manchester M2 5DB
Tel: 0161 234 4516

Please consider the environment before printing an e-mail.

From: [redacted] <[redacted]
Sent: 07 July 2025 18:50
To: Planning <[redacted]
Subject: Subject: Comment on Planning Application 142888/FO/2025

You don't often get email from [redacted] Learn why this is important

ALERT This message originated outside of the Manchester City Council network. **BE CAUTIOUS** before clicking any links or opening any attachments. Please remember your Cyber Training and report anything suspicious.

Subject: Comment on Planning Application 142888/FO/2025
Dear Manchester Planning team,

I am writing to lodge an objection to planning application 142888/FO/2025 – Cambridge Halls Of Residence Cavendish Street Manchester M15 6TT.

My primary objection is that the proposals have been designed to deter cyclists from using the safest and most direct route through the site. This route has been open to cyclists ever since the road was first built; it is an essential, well-used part of the city's cycling network and therefore the proposal to deter and/or divert cycles away from Cavendish Street is directly at odds with Manchester City Council's planning, sustainability and transport policies.

The applicant has made misleading claims regarding the road's legal status and regarding pedestrian safety which I will outline below.

I am asking that the council refuse this application, and invite the developer to come back with a proposal that maintains direct cycle as well as pedestrian access along Cavendish Street, designed to modern standards set out in Greater Manchester's Streets For All design guide and in Department for Transport guidance note LTN 1/20. I am sure that the Highways team at MCC and the Active Travel team at TfGM will, if asked, be happy to comment on how such a route could be provided within the space available.

I am also asking that the council make a Section 106 agreement (s106) with the applicant to fund safety improvements for pedestrians and cyclists at the junction of Cavendish Street and Higher Cambridge Street – the applicant themselves discuss the shortcomings of the existing junction layout

in Section 4.2.1 of the Transport Statement ("Cyclists have also been observed to queue on the footway to gain direct access to the Higher Cambridge Street/Cavendish Street junction (via a gap in the guard railings) rather than following the road markings which advise cyclists to dismount and use the controlled pedestrian crossings"). The improvements might take the form of a CYCLOPS junction. CYCLOPS is a homegrown Greater Manchester innovation now frequently used on Highways schemes across the country to deliver safe pedestrian and cycle movements without undue impact on traffic flows.

For prospective occupants and passers-by alike, in line with the S106 tests as set out in Paragraph 58 of the National Planning Policy Framework (NPPF) 2024, a contribution to junction safety improvements improvement would be 'necessary to make the development acceptable in planning terms' (by contributing to an appropriate movement strategy for the site), 'directly related to the development' (given its proximity, the pressure added to the junction by the proposed threefold increase in residents, and in light of the wholly inadequate mitigation route proposed by the applicant), and 'fairly and reasonably related in scale and kind to the development' (given the stated threefold increase in residents explained by the applicant, so directly adding more pressure to the junction).

1 Legal Status of Cavendish Street

This section of Cavendish Street, an adopted Highway, was subject to a stopping up order dated 14.06.1996. That order required that "the Developer shall provide a new highway which shall be a footpath/cycleway". MMU have since installed physical signage stating that Cavendish Street "has not been dedicated as a Highway" and have bolted down uncomfortable and restrictive speed bumps across the route in an apparent attempt to dissuade cyclists from exercising their legal rights over this space. Both measures may be unlawful, as my understanding is that cyclists do retain a legal Right of Way along Cavendish Street, unchanged from when the entire road was an adopted highway, and the speed bumps are inaccessible to some Disabled users.

2 Cycling routes and planning policy

The case for walking and cycling and specifically for maintaining and improving high quality cycling networks is clear at every level of modern planning policy, including:

NPPF 2024's "vision-led approach"
LTN 1/20
Places For Everyone Joint Development Plan Objectives 6, 7 and 10
Places for Everyone Joint Development Plan policies JP-Strat14, JP-C1, JP-C5 and JP-C6
GM Transport Strategy 2040 and the "Right Mix" targets
Greater Manchester Streets for All strategy and Streets for All design guide
Manchester City Council's Active Travel Strategy
Manchester City Council's commitment to be a Zero Carbon city by 2038
The policy position is absolutely clear – changes to the existing road and cycle networks should make cycling more convenient for people, not less convenient.

This specific stretch of Cavendish Street is a key part of the existing cycle network. It appears on TfGM's Bee Network map as a Beeway ("the routes that get people from A to B … representing the most direct routes between crossing points.") and connects to the Stretford Road Busy Beeway ("corridors or crossing points on busier roads that will require a higher level of design intervention to improve cycling and walking.") It is also mapped on the TfGM Cycle Network.

The national standard for cycling infrastructure is DfT guidance note LTN 1/20. LTN 1/20 advises above all else that cycle routes and networks should be Safe, Direct, Comfortable, Attractive and Coherent. Introducing unnecessary diversions, junctions and bends into a well-used existing route undermines all of these core principles, resulting in a lower quality cycle network which will make it harder for the council to achieve its cycling objectives.

The applicant has offered various reasons why diverting cyclists is necessary but all of these reasons seem to be either existing problems, or problems designed into the scheme. The proposal is to demolish and redevelop the site – so considerations like limited space and the placement of entrances, shop frontages, planting and pedestrian areas are entirely within the applicant's scope to manage. Instead of starting with the problem "there is an existing busy cycle route across this site, how can I design to accommodate everyone's needs?", it seems the applicant has started with the conclusion "cyclists must be deterred" and instructed their consultants to post-rationalise that decision.

3 Misleading claims regarding safety

Page 22 of the Design & Access Statement refers to the “existing controversial link along Cavendish St., which is resulting in collisions of pedestrians, electric scooters, cyclists, etc.”

However the map of recorded collisions, on page 18 of the Transport Statement submitted in the same planning application, shows no recorded collisions whatsoever on this link, only on the adjacent main roads.

It appears the applicant is attempting to restrict cycle access based on a “problem” for which they have no evidence.

Yours sincerely,

[redacted]

[redacted]

[redacted]

****
This email and any files transmitted with it are confidential and intended solely for the use of the individual or entity to whom they are addressed.
If you have received this email in error, please notify the sender, or [redacted] and then permanently delete the email, attachments and all copies.
The full text of the Council's email disclaimer is available at: www.manchester.gov.uk/emaildisclaimer.
Your personal data is very important to us. Please refer to our privacy notice at: www.manchester.gov.uk/privacy for further information.

This footnote also confirms that this email message has been swept for the presence of computer viruses.
****

Outlook

Fw: Comment on Planning Application 142888/FO/2025

From Planning <[redacted]>
Date Mon 14/07/2025 14:07
To Lucy Harrison <[redacted]>

Information, Delivery & Support Team
Planning, Building Control & Licensing
Growth & Development Directorate
Postal address: Manchester City Council, P O Box 532, Town Hall, Manchester M60 2LA
Location address: Level 6 Town Hall Extension, Manchester M2 5DB
Tel: 0161 234 4516

Please consider the environment before printing an e-mail.

From: [redacted]
Sent: 11 July 2025 10:12
To: Planning <[redacted]>
Subject: Comment on Planning Application 142888/FO/2025

You don't often get email from [redacted] Learn why this is important

ALERT This message originated outside of the Manchester City Council network. **BE CAUTIOUS** before clicking any links or opening any attachments. Please remember your Cyber Training and report anything suspicious.

Dear Manchester Planning team, I am writing to lodge an objection to planning application 142888/FO/2025 – Cambridge Halls Of Residence Cavendish Street Manchester M15 6TT. My primary objection is that the proposals have been designed to deter cyclists from using the safest and most direct route through the site. This route has been open to cyclists ever since the road was first built; it is an essential, well-used part of the city's cycling network and therefore the proposal to deter and/or divert cycles away from Cavendish Street is directly at odds with Manchester City Council's planning, sustainability and transport policies. The applicant has also made misleading claims regarding the road's legal status and regarding pedestrian safety which I will outline below. I am asking that the council refuse this application, and invite the developer to come back with a proposal that maintains direct cycle as well as pedestrian access along Cavendish Street, designed to modern standards set out in Greater Manchester's Streets For All design guide and in Department for Transport guidance note LTN 1/20. I am sure that the Highways team at MCC and the Active Travel team at TfGM will, if asked, be happy to comment on how such a route could be provided within the space available. I am also asking that the council make a Section 106 agreement (s106) with the applicant to fund safety improvements for pedestrians and cyclists at the junction of Cavendish Street and Higher Cambridge Street – the applicant themselves discuss the shortcomings of the existing

junction layout in Section 4.2.1 of the Transport Statement (“Cyclists have also been observed to queue on the footway to gain direct access to the Higher Cambridge Street/Cavendish Street junction (via a gap in the guard railings) rather than following the road markings which advise cyclists to dismount and use the controlled pedestrian crossings”). The improvements might take the form of a CYCLOPS junction. CYCLOPS is a homegrown Greater Manchester innovation now frequently used on Highways schemes across the country to deliver safe pedestrian and cycle movements without undue impact on traffic flows. For prospective occupants and passers-by alike, in line with the S106 tests as set out in Paragraph 58 of the National Planning Policy Framework (NPPF) 2024, a contribution to junction safety improvements improvement would be ‘necessary to make the development acceptable in planning terms’ (by contributing to an appropriate movement strategy for the site), ‘directly related to the development’ (given its proximity, the pressure added to the junction by the proposed threefold increase in residents, and in light of the wholly inadequate mitigation route proposed by the applicant), and ‘fairly and reasonably related in scale and kind to the development’ (given the stated threefold increase in residents explained by the applicant, so directly adding more pressure to the junction). 1 Legal Status of Cavendish Street This section of Cavendish Street, an adopted Highway, was subject to a stopping up order dated 14.06.1996. That order required that “the Developer shall provide a new highway which shall be a footpath/cycleway”. MMU have since installed physical signage stating that Cavendish Street “has not been dedicated as a Highway” and have bolted down uncomfortable and restrictive speed bumps across the route in an apparent attempt to dissuade cyclists from exercising their legal rights over this space. Both measures may be unlawful, as my understanding is that cyclists do retain a legal Right of Way along Cavendish Street, unchanged from when the entire road was an adopted highway, and the speed bumps are inaccessible to some Disabled users. 2 Cycling routes and planning policy The case for walking and cycling and specifically for maintaining and improving high quality cycling networks is clear at every level of modern planning policy, including: NPPF 2024’s “vision-led approach” LTN 1/20 Places For Everyone Joint Development Plan Objectives 6, 7 and 10 Places for Everyone Joint Development Plan policies JP-Strat14, JP-C1, JP-C5 and JP-C6 GM Transport Strategy 2040 and the “Right Mix” targets Greater Manchester Streets for All strategy and Streets for All design guide Manchester City Council’s Active Travel Strategy Manchester City Council’s commitment to be a Zero Carbon city by 2038 The policy position is absolutely clear – changes to the existing road and cycle networks should make cycling more convenient for people, not less convenient. This specific stretch of Cavendish Street is a key part of the existing cycle network. It appears on TfGM’s Bee Network map as a Beeway (“the routes that get people from A to B … representing the most direct routes between crossing points.”) and connects to the Stretford Road Busy Beeway (“corridors or crossing points on busier roads that will require a higher level of design intervention to improve cycling and walking.”) It is also mapped on the TfGM Cycle Network. The national standard for cycling infrastructure is DfT guidance note LTN 1/20. LTN 1/20 advises above all else that cycle routes and networks should be Safe, Direct, Comfortable, Attractive and Coherent. Introducing unnecessary diversions, junctions and bends into a well-used existing route undermines all of these core principles, resulting in a lower quality cycle network which will make it harder for the council to achieve its cycling objectives. The applicant has offered various reasons why diverting cyclists is necessary but all of these reasons seem to be either existing problems, or

problems designed into the scheme. The proposal is to demolish and redevelop the site – so considerations like limited space and the placement of entrances, shop frontages, planting and pedestrian areas are entirely within the applicant's scope to manage. Instead of starting with the problem "there is an existing busy cycle route across this site, how can I design to accommodate everyone's needs?", it seems the applicant has started with the conclusion "cyclists must be deterred" and instructed their consultants to post-rationalise that decision. 3 Misleading claims regarding safety Page 22 of the Design & Access Statement refers to the "existing controversial link along Cavendish St., which is resulting in collisions of pedestrians, electric scooters, cyclists, etc." However the map of recorded collisions, on page 18 of the Transport Statement submitted in the same planning application, shows no recorded collisions whatsoever on this link, only on the adjacent main roads. It appears the applicant is attempting to restrict cycle access based on a "problem" for which they have no evidence. Yours sincerely, [redacted]

[redacted]

[redacted]

[redacted]

****
This email and any files transmitted with it are confidential and intended solely for the use of the individual or entity to whom they are addressed. If you have received this email in error, please notify the sender, or [redacted] and then permanently delete the email, attachments and all copies.
The full text of the Council's email disclaimer is available at: www.manchester.gov.uk/emaildisclaimer.
Your personal data is very important to us. Please refer to our privacy notice at: www.manchester.gov.uk/privacy for further information.

This footnote also confirms that this email message has been swept for the presence of computer viruses.
****

Outlook

Fw: Comment on Planning Application 142888/FO/2025

From Planning <[redacted]
Date Mon 30/06/2025 10:33
To Lucy Harrison <[redacted]

Information, Delivery & Support Team
Planning, Building Control & Licensing
Growth & Development Directorate
Postal address: Manchester City Council, P O Box 532, Town Hall, Manchester M60 2LA
Location address: Level 6 Town Hall Extension, Manchester M2 5DB
Tel: 0161 234 4516

Please consider the environment before printing an e-mail.

From: [redacted]
Sent: 30 June 2025 10:20
To: Planning <[redacted]
Subject: Comment on Planning Application 142888/FO/2025

You don't often get email from [redacted] Learn why this is important

ALERT This message originated outside of the Manchester City Council network. **BE CAUTIOUS** before clicking any links or opening any attachments. Please remember your Cyber Training and report anything suspicious.

Dear Manchester Planning team,

I am writing to lodge an objection to planning application **142888/FO/2025** – Cambridge Halls Of Residence Cavendish Street Manchester M15 6TT.

My primary objection is that the proposals have been designed to deter cyclists from using the safest and most direct route through the site. This route has been open to cyclists ever since the road was first built; it is an essential, well-used part of the city's cycling network and therefore the proposal to deter and/or divert cycles away from Cavendish Street is directly at odds with Manchester City Council's planning, sustainability and transport policies.

I have been using this route since I moved to Manchester 20 years ago. I worked at the MMU Art school for 10 years and cycled to and from work every day.
Now I have a child I use this route as the safest way to get into town joining up with the oxford road cycle paths. It makes coming into a busy city more enjoyable, safer and with less air pollution for myself and my son. We need to make this city more connected up with cycle routes. Active travel needs to be the easiest and preferable choice for people to get them out of their cars and onto bikes or on foot. Removing this access is short sighted and would have a huge impact on myself and my families life. Diverting us alongside traffic. It is so good to have a break from fumes on any cycle ride.

The applicant has also made misleading claims regarding the road's legal status and regarding pedestrian safety which I will outline below.

I am asking that the council **refuse** this application, and invite the developer to come back with a proposal that maintains direct cycle as well as pedestrian access along Cavendish Street, designed to modern standards set out in Greater Manchester's Streets For All design guide and in Department for Transport guidance note LTN 1/20. I am sure that the Highways team at MCC and the Active Travel team at TfGM will, if asked, be happy to comment on how such a route could be provided within the space available.

I am also asking that the council **make a Section 106 agreement (s106)** with the applicant to fund safety improvements for pedestrians and cyclists at the junction of Cavendish Street and Higher Cambridge Street – the applicant themselves discuss the shortcomings of the existing junction layout in Section 4.2.1 of the Transport Statement ("*Cyclists have also been observed to queue on the footway to gain direct access to the Higher Cambridge Street/Cavendish Street junction (via a gap in the guard railings) rather than following the road markings which advise cyclists to dismount and use the controlled pedestrian crossings*"). The improvements might take the form of a CYCLOPS junction. CYCLOPS is a homegrown Greater Manchester innovation now frequently used on Highways schemes across the country to deliver safe pedestrian and cycle movements without undue impact on traffic flows.

For prospective occupants and passers-by alike, in line with the S106 tests as set out in Paragraph 58 of the National Planning Policy Framework (NPPF) 2024, a contribution to junction safety improvements improvement would be 'necessary to make the development acceptable in planning terms' (by contributing to an appropriate movement strategy for the site), 'directly related to the development' (given its proximity, the pressure added to the junction by the proposed threefold increase in residents, and in light of the wholly inadequate mitigation route proposed by the applicant), and 'fairly and reasonably related in scale and kind to the development' (given the stated threefold increase in residents explained by the applicant, so directly adding more pressure to the junction).

1 Legal Status of Cavendish Street

This section of Cavendish Street, an adopted Highway, was subject to a stopping up order dated 14.06.1996. That order required that "the Developer shall provide a new highway which shall be a footpath/cycleway". MMU have since installed physical signage stating that Cavendish Street "has not been dedicated as a Highway" and have bolted down uncomfortable and restrictive speed bumps across the route in an apparent attempt to dissuade cyclists from exercising their legal rights over this space. Both measures may be unlawful, as my understanding is that cyclists do retain a legal Right of Way along Cavendish Street, unchanged from when the entire road was an adopted highway, and the speed bumps are inaccessible to some Disabled users.

2 Cycling routes and planning policy

The case for walking and cycling and specifically for maintaining and improving high quality cycling networks is clear at every level of modern planning policy, including:

- NPPF 2024's "vision-led approach"
- LTN 1/20
- Places For Everyone Joint Development Plan Objectives 6, 7 and 10
- Places for Everyone Joint Development Plan policies JP-Strat14, JP-C1, JP-C5 and JP-C6
- GM Transport Strategy 2040 and the "Right Mix" targets
- Greater Manchester Streets for All strategy and Streets for All design guide
- Manchester City Council's Active Travel Strategy
- Manchester City Council's commitment to be a Zero Carbon city by 2038

The policy position is absolutely clear – changes to the existing road and cycle networks should make cycling more convenient for people, not less convenient.

This specific stretch of Cavendish Street is a key part of the existing cycle network. It appears on TfGM's Bee Network map as a Beeway ("the routes that get people from A to B … representing the most direct routes between crossing points.") and connects to the Stretford Road Busy Beeway ("corridors or crossing points on busier roads that will require a higher level of design intervention to improve cycling and walking.") It is also mapped on the TfGM Cycle Network.

The national standard for cycling infrastructure is DfT guidance note LTN 1/20. LTN 1/20 advises above all else that cycle routes and networks should be Safe, Direct, Comfortable, Attractive and Coherent. Introducing unnecessary diversions, junctions and bends into a well-used existing route undermines all of these core principles, resulting in a lower quality cycle network which will make it harder for the council to achieve its cycling objectives.
The applicant has offered various reasons why diverting cyclists is necessary but all of these reasons seem to be either existing problems, or problems designed into the scheme. The proposal is to demolish and redevelop the site – so considerations like limited space and the placement of entrances, shop frontages, planting and pedestrian areas are entirely within the applicant's scope to manage. Instead of starting with the problem "there is an existing busy cycle route across this site, how can I design to accommodate everyone's needs?", it seems the applicant has started with the conclusion "cyclists must be deterred" and instructed their consultants to post-rationalise that decision.

3 Misleading claims regarding safety
Page 22 of the Design & Access Statement refers to the "existing controversial link along Cavendish St., which is resulting in collisions of pedestrians, electric scooters, cyclists, etc."
However the map of recorded collisions, on page 18 of the Transport Statement submitted in the same planning application, shows no recorded collisions whatsoever on this link, only on the adjacent main roads.

It appears the applicant is attempting to restrict cycle access based on a "problem" for which they have no evidence.
Yours sincerely,

[redacted]

****
This email and any files transmitted with it are confidential and intended solely for the use of the individual or entity to whom they are addressed. If you have received this email in error, please notify the sender, or [redacted] and then permanently delete the email, attachments and all copies.
The full text of the Council's email disclaimer is available at: www.manchester.gov.uk/emaildisclaimer.
Your personal data is very important to us. Please refer to our privacy notice at: www.manchester.gov.uk/privacy for further information.

This footnote also confirms that this email message has been swept for the presence of computer viruses.
****

Outlook

Fw: Comment on Planning Application 142888/FO/2025

From Planning <[redacted]
Date Mon 14/07/2025 14:07
To Lucy Harrison <[redacted]

Information, Delivery & Support Team
Planning, Building Control & Licensing
Growth & Development Directorate
Postal address: Manchester City Council, P O Box 532, Town Hall, Manchester M60 2LA
Location address: Level 6 Town Hall Extension, Manchester M2 5DB
Tel: 0161 234 4516

Please consider the environment before printing an e-mail.

From: [redacted]
Sent: 11 July 2025 10:10
To: Planning <[redacted]
Subject: Comment on Planning Application 142888/FO/2025

You don't often get email from [redacted] Learn why this is important

ALERT This message originated outside of the Manchester City Council network. **BE CAUTIOUS** before clicking any links or opening any attachments. Please remember your Cyber Training and report anything suspicious.

Dear Manchester Planning team,

I am writing to lodge an objection to planning application **142888/FO/2025**– Cambridge Halls Of Residence Cavendish Street Manchester M15 6TT.

My primary objection is that the proposals have been designed to deter cyclists from using the safest and most direct route through the site. This route has been open to cyclists ever since the road was first built; it is an essential, well-used part of the city's cycling network and therefore the proposal to deter and/or divert cycles away from Cavendish Street is directly at odds with Manchester City Council's planning, sustainability and transport policies.

The applicant has also made misleading claims regarding the road's legal status and regarding pedestrian safety which I will outline below.

I am asking that the council **refuse** this application, and invite the developer to come back with a proposal that maintains direct cycle as well as pedestrian access along Cavendish Street, designed to modern standards set out in Greater Manchester's Streets For All design guide and in Department for Transport guidance note LTN 1/20. I am sure that the Highways team at MCC and the Active Travel team at TfGM will, if asked, be happy to comment on how such a route could be provided within the space available.

I am also asking that the council **make a Section 106 agreement (s106)** with the applicant to fund safety improvements for pedestrians and cyclists at the junction of Cavendish Street and Higher Cambridge Street – the applicant themselves discuss the shortcomings of the existing junction layout in Section 4.2.1 of the Transport Statement ("*Cyclists have also been observed to queue on the footway to gain direct access to the Higher Cambridge Street/Cavendish Street junction (via a gap in the guard railings) rather than following the road markings which advise cyclists to dismount and use the controlled pedestrian crossings*"). The improvements might take the form of a CYCLOPS junction. CYCLOPS is a homegrown Greater Manchester innovation now frequently used on Highways schemes across the country to deliver safe pedestrian and cycle movements without undue impact on traffic flows.

For prospective occupants and passers-by alike, in line with the S106 tests as set out in Paragraph 58 of the National Planning Policy Framework (NPPF) 2024, a contribution to junction safety improvements improvement would be 'necessary to make the development acceptable in planning terms' (by contributing to an appropriate movement strategy for the site), 'directly related to the development' (given its proximity, the pressure added to the junction by the proposed threefold increase in residents, and in light of the wholly inadequate mitigation route proposed by the applicant), and 'fairly and reasonably related in scale and kind to the development' (given the stated threefold increase in residents explained by the applicant, so directly adding more pressure to the junction).

1 Legal Status of Cavendish Street

This section of Cavendish Street, an adopted Highway, was subject to a stopping up order dated 14.06.1996. That order required that "the Developer shall provide a new highway which shall be a footpath/cycleway". MMU have since installed physical signage stating that Cavendish Street "has not been dedicated as a Highway" and have bolted down uncomfortable and restrictive speed bumps across the route in an apparent attempt to dissuade cyclists from exercising their legal rights over this space. Both measures may be unlawful, as my understanding is that cyclists do retain a legal Right of Way along Cavendish

Street, unchanged from when the entire road was an adopted highway, and the speed bumps are inaccessible to some Disabled users.

2 Cycling routes and planning policy

The case for walking and cycling and specifically for maintaining and improving high quality cycling networks is clear at every level of modern planning policy, including:

- NPPF 2024's "vision-led approach"
- LTN 1/20
- Places For Everyone Joint Development Plan Objectives 6, 7 and 10
- Places for Everyone Joint Development Plan policies JP-Strat14, JP-C1, JP-C5 and JP-C6
- GM Transport Strategy 2040 and the "Right Mix" targets
- Greater Manchester Streets for All strategy and Streets for All design guide
- Manchester City Council's Active Travel Strategy
- Manchester City Council's commitment to be a Zero Carbon city by 2038

The policy position is absolutely clear – changes to the existing road and cycle networks should make cycling more convenient for people, not less convenient.

This specific stretch of Cavendish Street is a key part of the existing cycle network. It appears on TfGM's Bee Network map as a Beeway ("the routes that get people from A to B … representing the most direct routes between crossing points.") and connects to the Stretford Road Busy Beeway ("corridors or crossing points on busier roads that will require a higher level of design intervention to improve cycling and walking.") It is also mapped on the TfGM Cycle Network.

The national standard for cycling infrastructure is DfT guidance note LTN 1/20. LTN 1/20 advises above all else that cycle routes and networks should be Safe, Direct, Comfortable, Attractive and Coherent. Introducing unnecessary diversions, junctions and bends into a well-used existing route undermines all of these core principles, resulting in a lower quality cycle network which will make it harder for the council to achieve its cycling objectives.

The applicant has offered various reasons why diverting cyclists is necessary but all of these reasons seem to be either existing problems, or problems designed into the scheme. The proposal is to demolish and redevelop the site – so considerations like limited space and the placement of entrances, shop frontages,

planting and pedestrian areas are entirely within the applicant's scope to manage. Instead of starting with the problem "there is an existing busy cycle route across this site, how can I design to accommodate everyone's needs?", it seems the applicant has started with the conclusion "cyclists must be deterred" and instructed their consultants to post-rationalise that decision.

3 Misleading claims regarding safety

Page 22 of the Design & Access Statement refers to the "existing controversial link along Cavendish St., which is resulting in collisions of pedestrians, electric scooters, cyclists, etc."

However the map of recorded collisions, on page 18 of the Transport Statement submitted in the same planning application, shows no recorded collisions whatsoever on this link, only on the adjacent main roads.

It appears the applicant is attempting to restrict cycle access based on a "problem" for which they have no evidence.

Yours sincerely,

[redacted]

[redacted]

[redacted]

****
This email and any files transmitted with it are confidential and intended solely for the use of the individual or entity to whom they are addressed.
If you have received this email in error, please notify the sender, or [redacted] and then permanently delete the email, attachments and all copies.
The full text of the Council's email disclaimer is available at: www.manchester.gov.uk/emaildisclaimer.
Your personal data is very important to us. Please refer to our privacy notice at: www.manchester.gov.uk/privacy for further information.

This footnote also confirms that this email message has been swept for the presence of computer viruses.
****

Outlook

Fw: Comment on Planning Application 142888/FO/2025

From Planning <[redacted]
Date Mon 30/06/2025 08:49
To Lucy Harrison <[redacted]

Information, Delivery & Support Team
Planning, Building Control & Licensing
Growth & Development Directorate
Postal address: Manchester City Council, P O Box 532, Town Hall, Manchester M60 2LA
Location address: Level 6 Town Hall Extension, Manchester M2 5DB
Tel: 0161 234 4516

Please consider the environment before printing an e-mail.

From: [redacted]
Sent: 28 June 2025 16:52
To: Planning <[redacted]
Subject: Comment on Planning Application 142888/FO/2025

You don't often get email from [redacted] Learn why this is important

ALERT This message originated outside of the Manchester City Council network. **BE CAUTIOUS** before clicking any links or opening any attachments. Please remember your Cyber Training and report anything suspicious.

Dear Manchester Planning team,

I am writing to lodge an objection to planning application 142888/FO/2025 – Cambridge Halls Of Residence Cavendish Street Manchester M15 6TT.

I have lived and travelled by bike in South Manchester since the 1970s and am an ex-employee of MMU. I have seen cycling initiatives develop here over the years, with the potential to take cars off the road, reduce pollution and improve residents' health, so am very concerned by this application.

My primary objection is that the proposals have been designed to deter cyclists from using the safest and most direct route through the site. This route has been open to cyclists ever since the road was first built; it is an essential, well-used part of the city's cycling network and therefore the proposal to deter and/or divert cycles away from Cavendish Street is directly at odds with Manchester City Council's planning, sustainability and transport policies.

The applicant has also made misleading claims on the road's legal status and pedestrian safety.

I am asking that the council refuse this application, and invite the developer to come back with a proposal that maintains direct cycle as well as pedestrian access along Cavendish Street, designed to modern standards set out in Greater Manchester's *Streets For All* design guide and in Department for Transport *guidance note LTN 1/20*. I am sure that the Highways team at MCC and the Active Travel team at TfGM will, if asked, be happy to comment on how such a route could be provided within the space available.

I am also asking that the council make a Section 106 agreement (s106) with the applicant to fund safety improvements for pedestrians and cyclists at the junction of Cavendish Street and Higher Cambridge Street – the applicant themselves discuss the shortcomings of the existing junction layout in Section 4.2.1 of the Transport Statement ("Cyclists have also been observed to queue on the footway to gain direct access to the Higher Cambridge Street / Cavendish Street junction (via a gap in the guard railings) rather than following the road markings which advise cyclists to dismount and use the controlled pedestrian crossings"). The improvements might take the form of a CYCLOPS junction. CYCLOPS is a homegrown Greater Manchester innovation now frequently used on Highways schemes across the country to deliver safe pedestrian and cycle movements without undue impact on traffic flows.

For prospective occupants and passers-by alike, in line with the S106 tests as set out in Paragraph 58 of the National Planning Policy Framework (NPPF) 2024, a contribution to junction safety improvements improvement would be "necessary to make the development acceptable in planning terms" (by contributing to an appropriate movement strategy for the site), "directly related to the development" (given its proximity, the pressure added to the junction by the proposed threefold increase in residents, and in light of the wholly inadequate mitigation route proposed by the applicant), and "fairly and reasonably related in scale and kind to the development" (given the stated threefold increase in residents explained by the applicant, so directly adding more pressure to the junction).

1 Legal Status of Cavendish Street

This section of Cavendish Street, an adopted Highway, was subject to a stopping up order dated 14.06.1996. That order required that "the Developer shall provide a new highway which shall be a footpath / cycleway". MMU have since installed physical signage stating that Cavendish Street "has not been dedicated as a Highway" and have bolted down uncomfortable and restrictive speed bumps across the route in an apparent attempt to dissuade cyclists from exercising their legal rights over this space. Both measures may be unlawful, as my understanding is that cyclists do retain a legal Right of Way along Cavendish Street, unchanged from when the entire road was an adopted highway, and the speed bumps cause problems to some disabled people.

2 Cycling routes and planning policy

The case for walking and cycling, and specifically for maintaining and improving high quality cycling networks, is clear at every level of modern planning policy, including:

- NPPF 2024's "vision-led approach"
- LTN 1/20
- Places For Everyone Joint Development Plan Objectives 6, 7 and 10
- Places for Everyone Joint Development Plan policies JP-Strat14, JP-C1, JP-C5 and JP-C6
- GM Transport Strategy 2040 and the "Right Mix" targets
- Greater Manchester Streets for All strategy and Streets for All design guide
- Manchester City Council's Active Travel Strategy
- Manchester City Council's commitment to be a Zero Carbon city by 2038

The policy position is absolutely clear – changes to the existing road and cycle networks should make cycling more convenient for people, not less convenient.

This specific stretch of Cavendish Street is a key part of the existing cycle network. It appears on TfGM's Bee Network map as a Beeway ("the routes that get people from A to B … representing the most direct routes between crossing points.") and connects to the Stretford Road Busy Beeway ("corridors or crossing points on busier roads that will require a higher level of design intervention to improve cycling and walking.") It is also mapped on the TfGM Cycle Network.

The national standard for cycling infrastructure is DfT *guidance note LTN 1/20*. LTN 1/20 advises above all else that cycle routes and networks should be Safe, Direct, Comfortable, Attractive and Coherent. Introducing unnecessary diversions, junctions and bends into a well-used existing route undermines all of these core principles, resulting in a lower quality cycle network which will make it harder for the council to achieve its cycling objectives.

The applicant has offered various reasons why diverting cyclists is necessary but all of these reasons seem to be either existing problems, or problems designed into the scheme. The proposal is to demolish and redevelop the site – so considerations like limited space and the placement of entrances, shop frontages, planting and pedestrian areas are entirely within the applicant's scope to manage. Instead of starting with the problem "there is an existing busy cycle route across this site, how can I design to accommodate everyone's needs?", it seems the applicant has started with the conclusion "cyclists must be deterred" and instructed their consultants to post-rationalise that

decision.

3 Misleading claims regarding safety

Page 22 of the *Design & Access Statement* refers to the "existing controversial link along Cavendish St., which is resulting in collisions of pedestrians, electric scooters, cyclists, etc."

However the map of recorded collisions, on page 18 of the *Transport Statement* submitted in the same planning application, shows no recorded collisions whatsoever on this link, only on the adjacent main roads.

It appears the applicant is attempting to restrict cycle access based on a "problem" for which they have no evidence. Manchester was declared European Capital of Cycling in 2024, and this application seems to go completely against that spirit.

Yours sincerely,

[redacted]

****
This email and any files transmitted with it are confidential and intended solely for the use of the individual or entity to whom they are addressed. If you have received this email in error, please notify the sender, or [redacted] and then permanently delete the email, attachments and all copies.
The full text of the Council's email disclaimer is available at: www.manchester.gov.uk/emaildisclaimer.
Your personal data is very important to us. Please refer to our privacy notice at: www.manchester.gov.uk/privacy for further information.

This footnote also confirms that this email message has been swept for the presence of computer viruses.
****

Outlook

Fw: Comment on Planning Application 142888/FO/2025

From Planning <[redacted]>
Date Thu 10/07/2025 08:58
To Lucy Harrison <[redacted]>

Information, Delivery & Support Team
Planning, Building Control & Licensing
Growth & Development Directorate
Postal address: Manchester City Council, P O Box 532, Town Hall, Manchester M60 2LA
Location address: Level 6 Town Hall Extension, Manchester M2 5DB
Tel: 0161 234 4516

Please consider the environment before printing an e-mail.

From: [redacted]
Sent: 09 July 2025 16:24
To: Planning <[redacted]>
Subject: Comment on Planning Application 142888/FO/2025

You don't often get email from [redacted] Learn why this is important

ALERT This message originated outside of the Manchester City Council network. **BE CAUTIOUS** before clicking any links or opening any attachments. Please remember your Cyber Training and report anything suspicious.

Dear Manchester planning team,

I would like to register my objection to the proposed redevelopment of the Cambridge Halls site pending a redesign of the proposed redirection of the Bee Network cycling route. The redesign must ensure that this key cycling route is retained as part of the proposal.

Bee Network

Looking at the Bee Network map (located here: https://mappinggm.org.uk/bee-network/), the site lies on a route defined as a Beeway (i.e. "the routes that get people from A to B, including existing routes, along with proposed Bee Network routes, representing the most direct routes between crossing points."), and the ongoing route along Stretford Road is defined as a Busy Beeway (i.e. "corridors or crossing points on busier roads that will require a higher level of design intervention to improve cycling and walking.")



Legal Order

This section of Cavendish Street, an adopted Highway, was subject to a stopping up order dated 14.06.1996. That order required that "the Developer shall provide a new highway which shall be a footpath/cycleway". MMU has since installed physical signage stating that Cavendish Street "has not been dedicated as a Highway" and have bolted down uncomfortable and restrictive speed bumps across the route in an apparent attempt to dissuade cyclists from exercising their legal rights over this space. Both measures may be unlawful, as my understanding is that cyclists do retain a legal Right of Way along Cavendish Street, unchanged from when the entire road was an adopted highway, and the speed bumps are inaccessible to some disabled users.

Policy

It is the incremental inconveniences such as the proposed development's movement strategy and its indirect cycling diversion that have hindered the uptake of active travel modes for decades in this city. In this respect, the proposal is in conflict with the modern standards set out in Greater Manchester's Streets For All design guide and in the Department for Transport's LTN 1/20, as well as a range of other policies.

The policy position is absolutely clear – changes to the existing road and cycle networks should make cycling more convenient for people, not less convenient.

LTN 1/20 advises above all else that cycle routes and networks should be Safe, Direct, Comfortable, Attractive and Coherent. Introducing unnecessary diversions, junctions and bends into a well-used existing route undermines all of these core principles, resulting in a lower quality cycle network which will make it harder for the council to achieve its cycling objectives.

Application

The applicant has offered various reasons why diverting cyclists is necessary but all of these reasons seem to be either existing problems, or problems designed into the scheme. The proposal is to demolish and redevelop the site – so considerations like limited space and the placement of entrances, shop frontages, planting and pedestrian areas are entirely within the applicant's scope to manage. Instead of starting with the problem "there is an existing busy cycle route across this site, how can I design to accommodate everyone's needs?", it seems the applicant has started with the conclusion "cyclists must be deterred" and instructed their consultants to post-rationalise that decision.

Given the applicant's adoption of this design strategy, the application documents are flawed. For example, reviewing the Health Impact Assessment, it states that, "*Walking and cycling will be the primary form of transport through the Site as a result of landscaping and public realm*

improvements." However, the proposed design actively diverts people cycling away from the direct desire line.

I would propose that you give the applicant the opportunity to revise their application design to comply with the Bee Network mapping and extant legal order.

Section 106

I would also like to see a Section 106 agreement (S106) with the applicant to fund safety improvements for pedestrians and cyclists at the junction of Cavendish Street and Higher Cambridge Street. Indeed, the applicant discusses the shortcomings of the existing junction layout in Section 4.2.1 of the Transport Statement ("Cyclists have also been observed to queue on the footway to gain direct access to the Higher Cambridge Street/Cavendish Street junction (via a gap in the guard railings) rather than following the road markings which advise cyclists to dismount and use the controlled pedestrian crossings"). The improvements might take the form of a CYCLOPS junction. CYCLOPS is a homegrown Greater Manchester innovation now frequently used on Highways schemes across the country to deliver safe pedestrian and cycle movements without undue impact on traffic flows.

For prospective occupants and passers-by alike, in line with the S106 tests as set out in Paragraph 58 of the National Planning Policy Framework (NPPF) 2024, a contribution to junction safety improvements improvement would be 'necessary to make the development acceptable in planning terms' (by contributing to an appropriate movement strategy for the site), 'directly related to the development' (given its proximity, the pressure added to the junction by the proposed threefold increase in residents, and in light of the wholly inadequate mitigation route proposed by the applicant), and 'fairly and reasonably related in scale and kind to the development' (given the stated threefold increase in residents explained by the applicant, so directly adding more pressure to the junction).

Please acknowledge receipt of this representation.

Yours faithfully,

[redacted]

--

****
This email and any files transmitted with it are confidential and intended solely for the use of the individual or entity to whom they are addressed.
If you have received this email in error, please notify the sender, or [redacted] and then permanently delete the email, attachments and all copies.
The full text of the Council's email disclaimer is available at: www.manchester.gov.uk/emaildisclaimer.
Your personal data is very important to us. Please refer to our privacy notice at: www.manchester.gov.uk/privacy for further information.

This footnote also confirms that this email message has been swept for the presence of computer viruses.
****

Outlook

Fw: Comment on Planning Application 142888/FO/2025

From Planning <[redacted]>
Date Wed 02/07/2025 14:45
To Lucy Harrison <[redacted]>

Information, Delivery & Support Team
Planning, Building Control & Licensing
Growth & Development Directorate
Postal address: Manchester City Council, P O Box 532, Town Hall, Manchester M60 2LA
Location address: Level 6 Town Hall Extension, Manchester M2 5DB
Tel: 0161 234 4516

Please consider the environment before printing an e-mail.

From: [redacted]
Sent: 02 July 2025 10:40
To: Planning <[redacted]>
Subject: Comment on Planning Application 142888/FO/2025

You don't often get email from [redacted] Learn why this is important

ALERT This message originated outside of the Manchester City Council network. **BE CAUTIOUS** before clicking any links or opening any attachments. Please remember your Cyber Training and report anything suspicious.

Dear Manchester Planning team,

I am writing to lodge an objection to planning application 142888/FO/2025 – Cambridge Halls Of Residence Cavendish Street Manchester M15 6TT.

My primary objection is that the proposals have been designed to deter cyclists from using the safest and most direct route through the site. This route has been open to cyclists ever since the road was first built; it is an essential, well-used part of the city's cycling network and therefore the proposal to deter and/or divert cycles away from Cavendish Street is directly at odds with Manchester City Council's planning, sustainability and transport policies.

I occasionally use this route as the most convenient and safest link from the city centre that's Hulme and beyond. I have never felt that the route itself is dangerous and causes conflict between pedestrians and cyclists however the road furniture is somewhat hostile to cyclists, particular at the junction on the Hulme side.

The applicant has also made misleading claims regarding the road's legal status and regarding pedestrian safety which I will outline below.

I am asking that the council refuse this application, and invite the developer to come back with a proposal that maintains direct cycle as well as pedestrian access along Cavendish Street, designed to modern standards set out in Greater Manchester's Streets For All design guide and in Department for Transport guidance note LTN 1/20. I am sure that the Highways team at MCC and the Active Travel team at TfGM will, if asked, be happy to comment on how such a route could be provided within the space available.

I am also asking that the council make a Section 106 agreement (s106) with the applicant to fund safety improvements for pedestrians and cyclists at the junction of Cavendish Street and Higher Cambridge Street – the applicant themselves discuss the shortcomings of the existing junction layout in Section 4.2.1 of the Transport Statement ("Cyclists have also been observed to queue on the footway to gain direct access to the Higher Cambridge Street/Cavendish Street junction (via a gap in the guard railings) rather than following the road markings which advise cyclists to dismount and use the controlled pedestrian crossings"). The improvements might take the form of a CYCLOPS junction. CYCLOPS is a homegrown Greater Manchester innovation now frequently used on Highways schemes across the country to deliver safe pedestrian and cycle movements without undue impact on traffic flows.

For prospective occupants and passers-by alike, in line with the S106 tests as set out in Paragraph 58 of the National Planning Policy Framework (NPPF) 2024, a contribution to junction safety improvements improvement would be 'necessary to make the development acceptable in planning terms' (by contributing to an appropriate movement strategy for the site), 'directly related to the development' (given its proximity, the pressure added to the junction by the proposed threefold increase in residents, and in light of the wholly inadequate mitigation route proposed by the applicant), and 'fairly and reasonably related in scale and kind to the development' (given the stated threefold increase in residents explained by the applicant, so directly adding more pressure to the junction).

1 Legal Status of Cavendish Street

This section of Cavendish Street, an adopted Highway, was subject to a stopping up order dated 14.06.1996. That order required that "the Developer shall provide a new highway which shall be a footpath/cycleway". MMU have since installed physical signage stating that Cavendish Street "has not been dedicated as a Highway" and have bolted down uncomfortable and restrictive speed bumps across the route in an apparent attempt to dissuade cyclists from exercising their legal rights over this space. Both measures may be unlawful, as my understanding is that cyclists do retain a legal Right of Way along Cavendish Street, unchanged from when the entire road was an adopted highway, and the speed bumps are inaccessible to some Disabled users.

2 Cycling routes and planning policy

The case for walking and cycling and specifically for maintaining and improving high quality cycling networks is clear at every level of modern planning policy, including:

NPPF 2024's "vision-led approach"
LTN 1/20
Places For Everyone Joint Development Plan Objectives 6, 7 and 10
Places for Everyone Joint Development Plan policies JP-Strat14, JP-C1, JP-C5 and JP-C6
GM Transport Strategy 2040 and the "Right Mix" targets
Greater Manchester Streets for All strategy and Streets for All design guide
Manchester City Council's Active Travel Strategy
Manchester City Council's commitment to be a Zero Carbon city by 2038

The policy position is absolutely clear – changes to the existing road and cycle networks should make cycling more convenient for people, not less convenient.

This specific stretch of Cavendish Street is a key part of the existing cycle network. It appears on TfGM's Bee Network map as a Beeway ("the routes that get people from A to B … representing the most direct routes between crossing points.") and connects to the Stretford Road Busy Beeway ("corridors or crossing points on busier roads that will require a higher level of design intervention to improve cycling and walking.") It is also mapped on the TfGM Cycle Network.

The national standard for cycling infrastructure is DfT guidance note LTN 1/20. LTN 1/20 advises above all else that cycle routes and networks should be Safe, Direct, Comfortable, Attractive and Coherent. Introducing unnecessary diversions, junctions and bends into a well-used existing route undermines all of these core principles, resulting in a lower quality cycle network which will make it harder for the council to achieve its cycling objectives.

The applicant has offered various reasons why diverting cyclists is necessary but all of these reasons seem to be either existing problems, or problems designed into the scheme. The proposal is to demolish and redevelop the site – so considerations like limited space and the placement of entrances, shop frontages, planting and pedestrian areas are entirely within the applicant's scope to manage. Instead of starting with the problem "there is an existing busy cycle route across this site, how can I design to accommodate everyone's needs?", it seems the applicant has started with the conclusion "cyclists must be deterred" and instructed their consultants to post-rationalise that decision.

3 Misleading claims regarding safety

Page 22 of the Design & Access Statement refers to the "existing controversial link along Cavendish St., which is resulting in collisions of pedestrians, electric scooters, cyclists, etc."

However the map of recorded collisions, on page 18 of the Transport Statement submitted in the same planning application, shows no recorded collisions whatsoever on this link, only on the adjacent main roads.

It appears the applicant is attempting to restrict cycle access based on a "problem" for which they have no evidence.

Yours sincerely,

[redacted]

Sent from Outlook for Android

****
This email and any files transmitted with it are confidential and intended solely for the use of the individual or entity to whom they are addressed.
If you have received this email in error, please notify the sender, or [redacted] and then permanently delete the email, attachments and all copies.
The full text of the Council's email disclaimer is available at: www.manchester.gov.uk/emaildisclaimer.
Your personal data is very important to us. Please refer to our privacy notice at: www.manchester.gov.uk/privacy for further information.

This footnote also confirms that this email message has been swept for the presence of computer viruses.
****

Outlook

Fw: Comment on Planning Application 142888/FO/2025

From Planning <[redacted]
Date Tue 08/07/2025 11:12
To Lucy Harrison <[redacted]

Information, Delivery & Support Team
Planning, Building Control & Licensing
Growth & Development Directorate
Postal address: Manchester City Council, P O Box 532, Town Hall, Manchester M60 2LA
Location address: Level 6 Town Hall Extension, Manchester M2 5DB
Tel: 0161 234 4516

Please consider the environment before printing an e-mail.

From: [redacted]
Sent: 07 July 2025 19:04
To: Planning <[redacted]
Subject: Comment on Planning Application 142888/FO/2025

You don't often get email from [redacted] Learn why this is important

ALERT This message originated outside of the Manchester City Council network. **BE CAUTIOUS** before clicking any links or opening any attachments. Please remember your Cyber Training and report anything suspicious.

Dear Manchester Planning team,

I am writing to lodge an objection to planning application **142888/FO/2025** – Cambridge Halls Of Residence Cavendish Street Manchester M15 6TT.

My primary objection is that the proposals have been designed to deter cyclists from using the safest and most direct route through the site. This route has been open to cyclists ever since the road was first built; it is an essential, well-used part of the city's cycling network and therefore the proposal to deter and/or divert cycles away from Cavendish Street is directly at odds with Manchester City Council's planning, sustainability and transport policies.

The proposal makes cycling a less safe and practical choice and does not help to address the climate emergency, air quality or public health.

The applicant has also made misleading claims regarding the road's legal status and regarding pedestrian safety which I will outline below.

I am asking that the council **refuse** this application, and invite the developer to come back with a proposal that maintains direct cycle as well as pedestrian access along Cavendish Street, designed to modern standards set out in Greater Manchester's Streets For All design guide and in Department for Transport guidance note LTN 1/20. I am sure that the Highways team at MCC and the Active Travel team at TfGM will, if asked, be happy to comment on how such a route could be provided within the space available.

I am also asking that the council **make a Section 106 agreement (s106)** with the applicant to fund safety improvements for pedestrians and cyclists at the junction of Cavendish Street and Higher Cambridge Street – the applicant themselves discuss the shortcomings of the existing junction layout in Section 4.2.1 of the Transport Statement ("*Cyclists have also been observed to queue on the footway to gain direct access to the Higher Cambridge Street/Cavendish Street junction (via a gap in the guard railings) rather than following the road markings which advise cyclists to dismount and use the controlled pedestrian crossings*"). The improvements might take the form of a CYCLOPS junction. CYCLOPS is a homegrown Greater Manchester innovation now frequently used on Highways schemes across the country to deliver safe pedestrian and cycle movements without undue impact on traffic flows.

For prospective occupants and passers-by alike, in line with the S106 tests as set out in Paragraph 58 of the National Planning Policy Framework (NPPF) 2024, a contribution to junction safety improvements improvement would be 'necessary to make the development acceptable in planning terms' (by contributing to an appropriate movement strategy for the site), 'directly related to the development' (given its proximity, the pressure added to the junction by the proposed threefold increase in residents, and in light of the wholly inadequate mitigation route proposed by the applicant), and 'fairly and reasonably related in scale and kind to the development' (given the stated threefold increase in residents explained by the applicant, so directly adding more pressure to the junction).

1 Legal Status of Cavendish Street

This section of Cavendish Street, an adopted Highway, was subject to a stopping up order dated 14.06.1996. That order required that "the Developer shall provide a new highway which shall be a footpath/cycleway". MMU have since installed physical signage stating that Cavendish Street "has not been dedicated as a Highway" and have bolted down uncomfortable and restrictive speed bumps

across the route in an apparent attempt to dissuade cyclists from exercising their legal rights over this space. Both measures may be unlawful, as my understanding is that cyclists do retain a legal Right of Way along Cavendish Street, unchanged from when the entire road was an adopted highway, and the speed bumps are inaccessible to some Disabled users.

2 Cycling routes and planning policy

The case for walking and cycling and specifically for maintaining and improving high quality cycling networks is clear at every level of modern planning policy, including:

- NPPF 2024's "vision-led approach"
- LTN 1/20
- Places For Everyone Joint Development Plan Objectives 6, 7 and 10
- Places for Everyone Joint Development Plan policies JP-Strat14, JP-C1, JP-C5 and JP-C6
- GM Transport Strategy 2040 and the "Right Mix" targets
- Greater Manchester Streets for All strategy and Streets for All design guide
- Manchester City Council's Active Travel Strategy
- Manchester City Council's commitment to be a Zero Carbon city by 2038

The policy position is absolutely clear – changes to the existing road and cycle networks should make cycling more convenient for people, not less convenient.

This specific stretch of Cavendish Street is a key part of the existing cycle network. It appears on TfGM's Bee Network map as a Beeway ("the routes that get people from A to B … representing the most direct routes between crossing points.") and connects to the Stretford Road Busy Beeway ("corridors or crossing points on busier roads that will require a higher level of design intervention to improve cycling and walking.") It is also mapped on the TfGM Cycle Network.

The national standard for cycling infrastructure is DfT guidance note LTN 1/20. LTN 1/20 advises above all else that cycle routes and networks should be Safe, Direct, Comfortable, Attractive and Coherent. Introducing unnecessary diversions, junctions and bends into a well-used existing route undermines all of these core principles, resulting in a lower quality cycle network which will make it harder for the council to achieve its cycling objectives.

The applicant has offered various reasons why diverting cyclists is necessary but all of these reasons seem to be either existing problems, or problems designed into the scheme. The proposal is to demolish and redevelop the site – so considerations like limited space and the placement of entrances, shop frontages, planting and pedestrian areas are entirely within the applicant's scope to manage. Instead of starting with the problem "there is an existing busy cycle route across this site, how can I design to accommodate everyone's needs?", it seems the applicant has started with the conclusion "cyclists must be deterred" and instructed their consultants to post-rationalise that decision.

3 Misleading claims regarding safety

Page 22 of the Design & Access Statement refers to the "existing controversial link along Cavendish St., which is resulting in collisions of pedestrians, electric scooters, cyclists, etc."

However the map of recorded collisions, on page 18 of the Transport Statement submitted in the same planning application, shows no recorded collisions whatsoever on this link, only on the adjacent main roads.

It appears the applicant is attempting to restrict cycle access based on a "problem" for which they have no evidence.

Yours sincerely,

[redacted]

[redacted]

****
This email and any files transmitted with it are confidential and intended solely for the use of the individual or entity to whom they are addressed.
If you have received this email in error, please notify the sender, or [redacted] and then permanently delete the email, attachments and all copies.
The full text of the Council's email disclaimer is available at: www.manchester.gov.uk/emaildisclaimer.
Your personal data is very important to us. Please refer to our privacy notice at: www.manchester.gov.uk/privacy for further information.

This footnote also confirms that this email message has been swept for the presence of computer viruses.
****

Outlook

Fw: Comment on Planning Application 142888/FO/2025

From Planning <[redacted]>
Date Mon 14/07/2025 14:06
To Lucy Harrison <[redacted]>

Information, Delivery & Support Team
Planning, Building Control & Licensing
Growth & Development Directorate
Postal address: Manchester City Council, P O Box 532, Town Hall, Manchester M60 2LA
Location address: Level 6 Town Hall Extension, Manchester M2 5DB
Tel: 0161 234 4516

Please consider the environment before printing an e-mail.

From: [redacted]
Sent: 11 July 2025 12:25
To: Planning <[redacted]>
Subject: Comment on Planning Application 142888/FO/2025

You don't often get email from [redacted] Learn why this is important

ALERT This message originated outside of the Manchester City Council network. **BE CAUTIOUS** before clicking any links or opening any attachments. Please remember your Cyber Training and report anything suspicious.

Dear Manchester Planning team,

I am writing to lodge an objection to planning application 142888/FO/2025 – Cambridge Halls Of Residence Cavendish Street Manchester M15 6TT.

My primary objection is that the proposals have been designed to deter cyclists from using the safest and most direct route through the site. This route has been open to cyclists ever since the road was first built; it is an essential, well-used part of the city's cycling network and therefore the proposal to deter and/or divert cycles away from Cavendish Street is directly at odds with Manchester City Council's planning, sustainability and transport policies.

I personally use this safe and straightforward route every week to access the Salutation pub, and also as an integral part of my preferred route to cross the dual carriageway to Hulme via the main bridge. Its closure would be a total pain in the arse, make these places less accessible and would force me to use more dangerous right-hand turns on larger junctions by the RNCM, which I deliberately avoid.

The applicant has also made misleading claims regarding the road's legal status and regarding pedestrian safety which I will outline below.

I am asking that the council refuse this application, and invite the developer to come back with a proposal that maintains direct cycle as well as pedestrian access along Cavendish Street, designed to modern standards set out in Greater Manchester's Streets For All design guide and in Department for Transport guidance note LTN 1/20. I am sure that the Highways team at MCC and the Active Travel team at TfGM will, if asked, be happy to comment on how such a route could be provided within the space available.

I am also asking that the council make a Section 106 agreement (s106) with the applicant to fund safety improvements for pedestrians and cyclists at the junction of Cavendish Street and Higher Cambridge Street – the applicant themselves discuss the shortcomings of the existing junction layout in Section 4.2.1 of the Transport Statement ("Cyclists have also been observed to queue on the footway to gain direct access to the Higher Cambridge Street/Cavendish Street junction (via a gap in the guard railings) rather than following the road markings which advise cyclists to dismount and use the controlled pedestrian crossings"). The improvements might take the form of a CYCLOPS junction. CYCLOPS is a homegrown Greater Manchester innovation now frequently used on Highways schemes across the country to deliver safe pedestrian and cycle movements without undue impact on traffic flows.

For prospective occupants and passers-by alike, in line with the S106 tests as set out in Paragraph 58 of the National Planning Policy Framework (NPPF) 2024, a contribution to junction safety improvements improvement would be 'necessary to make the development acceptable in planning terms' (by contributing to an appropriate movement strategy for the site), 'directly related to the development' (given its proximity, the pressure added to the junction by the proposed threefold increase in residents, and in light of the wholly inadequate mitigation route proposed by the applicant), and 'fairly and reasonably related in scale and kind to the development' (given the stated threefold increase in residents explained by the applicant, so directly adding more pressure to the junction).

1 Legal Status of Cavendish Street

This section of Cavendish Street, an adopted Highway, was subject to a stopping up order dated 14.06.1996. That order required that "the Developer shall provide a new highway which shall be a footpath/cycleway". MMU have since installed physical signage stating that Cavendish Street "has not been dedicated as a Highway" and have bolted down uncomfortable and restrictive speed bumps across the route in an apparent attempt to dissuade cyclists from exercising their legal rights over this space. Both measures may be unlawful, as my understanding is that cyclists do retain a legal Right of Way along Cavendish Street, unchanged from when the entire road was an adopted highway, and the speed bumps are inaccessible to some Disabled users.

2 Cycling routes and planning policy

The case for walking and cycling and specifically for maintaining and improving high quality cycling networks is clear at every level of modern planning policy, including:

NPPF 2024's "vision-led approach"
LTN 1/20
Places For Everyone Joint Development Plan Objectives 6, 7 and 10
Places for Everyone Joint Development Plan policies JP-Strat14, JP-C1, JP-C5 and JP-C6
GM Transport Strategy 2040 and the "Right Mix" targets
Greater Manchester Streets for All strategy and Streets for All design guide
Manchester City Council's Active Travel Strategy
Manchester City Council's commitment to be a Zero Carbon city by 2038

The policy position is absolutely clear – changes to the existing road and cycle networks should make cycling more convenient for people, not less convenient.

This specific stretch of Cavendish Street is a key part of the existing cycle network. It appears on TfGM's Bee Network map as a Beeway ("the routes that get people from A to B … representing the most direct routes between crossing points.") and connects to the Stretford Road Busy Beeway ("corridors or crossing points on busier roads that will require a higher level of design intervention to improve cycling and walking.") It is also mapped on the TfGM Cycle Network.

The national standard for cycling infrastructure is DfT guidance note LTN 1/20. LTN 1/20 advises above all else that cycle routes and networks should be Safe, Direct, Comfortable, Attractive and Coherent. Introducing unnecessary diversions, junctions and bends into a well-used existing route undermines all of these core principles, resulting in a lower quality cycle network which will make it harder for the council to achieve its cycling objectives.

The applicant has offered various reasons why diverting cyclists is necessary but all of these reasons seem to be either existing problems, or problems designed into the scheme. The proposal is to demolish and redevelop the site – so considerations like limited space and the placement of entrances, shop frontages, planting and pedestrian areas are entirely within the applicant's scope to manage. Instead of starting with the problem "there is an existing busy cycle route across this site, how can I design to accommodate everyone's needs?", it seems the applicant has started with the conclusion "cyclists must be deterred" and instructed their consultants to post-rationalise that decision.

3 Misleading claims regarding safety

Page 22 of the Design & Access Statement refers to the "existing controversial link along Cavendish St., which is resulting in collisions of pedestrians, electric scooters, cyclists, etc."

However the map of recorded collisions, on page 18 of the Transport Statement submitted in the same planning application, shows no recorded collisions whatsoever on this link, only on the adjacent main roads.

It appears the applicant is attempting to restrict cycle access based on a "problem" for which they have no evidence.

Yours sincerely,

[redacted]

****
This email and any files transmitted with it are confidential and intended solely for the use of the individual or entity to whom they are addressed.
If you have received this email in error, please notify the sender, or [redacted] and then permanently delete the email, attachments and all copies.
The full text of the Council's email disclaimer is available at: www.manchester.gov.uk/emaildisclaimer.
Your personal data is very important to us. Please refer to our privacy notice at: www.manchester.gov.uk/privacy for further information.

This footnote also confirms that this email message has been swept for the presence of computer viruses.
****

Outlook

Fw: Objection to Planning Application 142888/FO/2025

From Planning <[redacted]
Date Mon 14/07/2025 14:07
To Lucy Harrison <[redacted]

Information, Delivery & Support Team
Planning, Building Control & Licensing
Growth & Development Directorate
Postal address: Manchester City Council, P O Box 532, Town Hall, Manchester M60 2LA
Location address: Level 6 Town Hall Extension, Manchester M2 5DB
Tel: 0161 234 4516

Please consider the environment before printing an e-mail.

From: [redacted]
Sent: 11 July 2025 10:02
To: Planning <[redacted]
Subject: Objection to Planning Application 142888/FO/2025

You don't often get email from [redacted] Learn why this is important

ALERT This message originated outside of the Manchester City Council network. **BE CAUTIOUS** before clicking any links or opening any attachments. Please remember your Cyber Training and report anything suspicious.

Dear Manchester Planning team,

I am writing to lodge an objection to planning application 142888/FO/2025 – Cambridge Halls Of Residence Cavendish Street Manchester M15 6TT.

My primary objection is that the proposals have been designed to deter cyclists from using the safest and most direct route through the site. This route has been open to cyclists ever since the road was first built; it is an essential, well-used part of the city's cycling network and therefore the proposal to deter and/or divert cycles away from Cavendish Street is directly at odds with Manchester City Council's planning, sustainability and transport policies.

As someone who commuter into the city via bike having safe routes across but also around the city are essential. Cavendish Street offers and excellent route for connection to the Trafford cycle link.

The applicant has also made misleading claims regarding the road's legal status and regarding pedestrian safety which I will outline below.

I am asking that the council refuse this application, and invite the developer to come back with a proposal that maintains direct cycle as well as pedestrian access along Cavendish Street, designed to modern standards set out in Greater Manchester's Streets For All design guide and in

Department for Transport guidance note LTN 1/20. I am sure that the Highways team at MCC and the Active Travel team at TfGM will, if asked, be happy to comment on how such a route could be provided within the space available.

I am also asking that the council make a Section 106 agreement (s106) with the applicant to fund safety improvements for pedestrians and cyclists at the junction of Cavendish Street and Higher Cambridge Street – the applicant themselves discuss the shortcomings of the existing junction layout in Section 4.2.1 of the Transport Statement ("Cyclists have also been observed to queue on the footway to gain direct access to the Higher Cambridge Street/Cavendish Street junction (via a gap in the guard railings) rather than following the road markings which advise cyclists to dismount and use the controlled pedestrian crossings"). The improvements might take the form of a CYCLOPS junction. CYCLOPS is a homegrown Greater Manchester innovation now frequently used on Highways schemes across the country to deliver safe pedestrian and cycle movements without undue impact on traffic flows.

For prospective occupants and passers-by alike, in line with the S106 tests as set out in Paragraph 58 of the National Planning Policy Framework (NPPF) 2024, a contribution to junction safety improvements improvement would be 'necessary to make the development acceptable in planning terms' (by contributing to an appropriate movement strategy for the site), 'directly related to the development' (given its proximity, the pressure added to the junction by the proposed threefold increase in residents, and in light of the wholly inadequate mitigation route proposed by the applicant), and 'fairly and reasonably related in scale and kind to the development' (given the stated threefold increase in residents explained by the applicant, so directly adding more pressure to the junction).

1 Legal Status of Cavendish Street

This section of Cavendish Street, an adopted Highway, was subject to a stopping up order dated 14.06.1996. That order required that "the Developer shall provide a new highway which shall be a footpath/cycleway". MMU have since installed physical signage stating that Cavendish Street "has not been dedicated as a Highway" and have bolted down uncomfortable and restrictive speed bumps across the route in an apparent attempt to dissuade cyclists from exercising their legal rights over this space. Both measures may be unlawful, as my understanding is that cyclists do retain a legal Right of Way along Cavendish Street, unchanged from when the entire road was an adopted highway, and the speed bumps are inaccessible to some Disabled users.

2 Cycling routes and planning policy

The case for walking and cycling and specifically for maintaining and improving high quality cycling networks is clear at every level of modern planning policy, including:

NPPF 2024's "vision-led approach"
LTN 1/20
Places For Everyone Joint Development Plan Objectives 6, 7 and 10
Places for Everyone Joint Development Plan policies JP-Strat14, JP-C1, JP-C5 and JP-C6
GM Transport Strategy 2040 and the "Right Mix" targets
Greater Manchester Streets for All strategy and Streets for All design guide
Manchester City Council's Active Travel Strategy
Manchester City Council's commitment to be a Zero Carbon city by 2038
The policy position is absolutely clear – changes to the existing road and cycle networks should make cycling more convenient for people, not less convenient.

This specific stretch of Cavendish Street is a key part of the existing cycle network. It appears on TfGM's Bee Network map as a Beeway ("the routes that get people from A to B … representing the most direct routes between crossing points.") and connects to the Stretford Road Busy Beeway ("corridors or crossing points on busier roads that will require a higher level of design intervention to improve cycling and walking.") It is also mapped on the TfGM Cycle Network.

The national standard for cycling infrastructure is DfT guidance note LTN 1/20. LTN 1/20 advises above all else that cycle routes and networks should be Safe, Direct, Comfortable, Attractive and Coherent. Introducing unnecessary diversions, junctions and bends into a well-used existing route undermines all of these core principles, resulting in a lower quality cycle network which will make it harder for the council to achieve its cycling objectives.

The applicant has offered various reasons why diverting cyclists is necessary but all of these reasons seem to be either existing problems, or problems designed into the scheme. The proposal is to demolish and redevelop the site – so considerations like limited space and the placement of entrances, shop frontages, planting and pedestrian areas are entirely within the applicant's scope to manage. Instead of starting with the problem "there is an existing busy cycle route across this site, how can I design to accommodate everyone's needs?", it seems the applicant has started with the conclusion "cyclists must be deterred" and instructed their consultants to post-rationalise that decision.

3 Misleading claims regarding safety

Page 22 of the Design & Access Statement refers to the "existing controversial link along Cavendish St., which is resulting in collisions of pedestrians, electric scooters, cyclists, etc."

However the map of recorded collisions, on page 18 of the Transport Statement submitted in the same planning application, shows no recorded collisions whatsoever on this link, only on the adjacent main roads.

It appears the applicant is attempting to restrict cycle access based on a "problem" for which they have no evidence.

Yours sincerely,

[redacted]

****
This email and any files transmitted with it are confidential and intended solely for the use of the individual or entity to whom they are addressed.
If you have received this email in error, please notify the sender, or [redacted] and then permanently delete the email, attachments and all copies.
The full text of the Council's email disclaimer is available at: www.manchester.gov.uk/emaildisclaimer.
Your personal data is very important to us. Please refer to our privacy notice at: www.manchester.gov.uk/privacy for further information.

This footnote also confirms that this email message has been swept for the presence of computer viruses.
****

Outlook

Fw: Comment on Planning Application 142888/FO/2025

From Planning <[redacted]>
Date Mon 14/07/2025 14:07
To Lucy Harrison <[redacted]>

Information, Delivery & Support Team
Planning, Building Control & Licensing
Growth & Development Directorate
Postal address: Manchester City Council, P O Box 532, Town Hall, Manchester M60 2LA
Location address: Level 6 Town Hall Extension, Manchester M2 5DB
Tel: 0161 234 4516

Please consider the environment before printing an e-mail.

From: [redacted]
Sent: 11 July 2025 10:44
To: Planning <[redacted]>
Subject: Comment on Planning Application 142888/FO/2025

You don't often get email from [redacted] Learn why this is important

ALERT This message originated outside of the Manchester City Council network. **BE CAUTIOUS** before clicking any links or opening any attachments. Please remember your Cyber Training and report anything suspicious.

Dear Manchester Planning team, I am writing to lodge an objection to planning application 142888/FO/2025 – Cambridge Halls Of Residence Cavendish Street Manchester M15 6TT. My primary objection is that the proposals have been designed to deter cyclists from using the safest and most direct route through the site. This route has been open to cyclists ever since the road was first built; it is an essential, well-used part of the city's cycling network and therefore the proposal to deter and/or divert cycles away from Cavendish Street is directly at odds with Manchester City Council's planning, sustainability and transport policies. The applicant has also made misleading claims regarding the road's legal status and regarding pedestrian safety which I will outline below. I am asking that the council refuse this application, and invite the developer to come back with a proposal that maintains direct cycle as well as pedestrian access along Cavendish Street, designed to modern standards set out in Greater Manchester's Streets For All design guide and in Department for Transport guidance note LTN 1/20. I am sure that the Highways team at MCC and the Active Travel team at TfGM will, if asked, be happy to comment on how such a route could be provided within the space available. I am also asking that the council make a Section 106 agreement (s106) with the applicant to fund safety improvements for pedestrians and cyclists at the junction of Cavendish Street and Higher Cambridge Street – the applicant themselves discuss the shortcomings of the existing

junction layout in Section 4.2.1 of the Transport Statement (“Cyclists have also been observed to queue on the footway to gain direct access to the Higher Cambridge Street/Cavendish Street junction (via a gap in the guard railings) rather than following the road markings which advise cyclists to dismount and use the controlled pedestrian crossings”). The improvements might take the form of a CYCLOPS junction. CYCLOPS is a homegrown Greater Manchester innovation now frequently used on Highways schemes across the country to deliver safe pedestrian and cycle movements without undue impact on traffic flows. For prospective occupants and passers-by alike, in line with the S106 tests as set out in Paragraph 58 of the National Planning Policy Framework (NPPF) 2024, a contribution to junction safety improvements improvement would be ‘necessary to make the development acceptable in planning terms’ (by contributing to an appropriate movement strategy for the site), ‘directly related to the development’ (given its proximity, the pressure added to the junction by the proposed threefold increase in residents, and in light of the wholly inadequate mitigation route proposed by the applicant), and ‘fairly and reasonably related in scale and kind to the development’ (given the stated threefold increase in residents explained by the applicant, so directly adding more pressure to the junction). 1 Legal Status of Cavendish Street This section of Cavendish Street, an adopted Highway, was subject to a stopping up order dated 14.06.1996. That order required that “the Developer shall provide a new highway which shall be a footpath/cycleway”. MMU have since installed physical signage stating that Cavendish Street “has not been dedicated as a Highway” and have bolted down uncomfortable and restrictive speed bumps across the route in an apparent attempt to dissuade cyclists from exercising their legal rights over this space. Both measures may be unlawful, as my understanding is that cyclists do retain a legal Right of Way along Cavendish Street, unchanged from when the entire road was an adopted highway, and the speed bumps are inaccessible to some Disabled users. 2 Cycling routes and planning policy The case for walking and cycling and specifically for maintaining and improving high quality cycling networks is clear at every level of modern planning policy, including: NPPF 2024’s “vision-led approach” LTN 1/20 Places For Everyone Joint Development Plan Objectives 6, 7 and 10 Places for Everyone Joint Development Plan policies JP-Strat14, JP-C1, JP-C5 and JP-C6 GM Transport Strategy 2040 and the “Right Mix” targets Greater Manchester Streets for All strategy and Streets for All design guide Manchester City Council’s Active Travel Strategy Manchester City Council’s commitment to be a Zero Carbon city by 2038 The policy position is absolutely clear – changes to the existing road and cycle networks should make cycling more convenient for people, not less convenient. This specific stretch of Cavendish Street is a key part of the existing cycle network. It appears on TfGM’s Bee Network map as a Beeway (“the routes that get people from A to B … representing the most direct routes between crossing points.”) and connects to the Stretford Road Busy Beeway (“corridors or crossing points on busier roads that will require a higher level of design intervention to improve cycling and walking.”) It is also mapped on the TfGM Cycle Network. The national standard for cycling infrastructure is DfT guidance note LTN 1/20. LTN 1/20 advises above all else that cycle routes and networks should be Safe, Direct, Comfortable, Attractive and Coherent. Introducing unnecessary diversions, junctions and bends into a well-used existing route undermines all of these core principles, resulting in a lower quality cycle network which will make it harder for the council to achieve its cycling objectives. The applicant has offered various reasons why diverting cyclists is necessary but all of these reasons seem to be either existing problems, or

problems designed into the scheme. The proposal is to demolish and redevelop the site – so considerations like limited space and the placement of entrances, shop frontages, planting and pedestrian areas are entirely within the applicant's scope to manage. Instead of starting with the problem "there is an existing busy cycle route across this site, how can I design to accommodate everyone's needs?", it seems the applicant has started with the conclusion "cyclists must be deterred" and instructed their consultants to post-rationalise that decision. 3 Misleading claims regarding safety Page 22 of the Design & Access Statement refers to the "existing controversial link along Cavendish St., which is resulting in collisions of pedestrians, electric scooters, cyclists, etc." However the map of recorded collisions, on page 18 of the Transport Statement submitted in the same planning application, shows no recorded collisions whatsoever on this link, only on the adjacent main roads. It appears the applicant is attempting to restrict cycle access based on a "problem" for which they have no evidence. Yours sincerely,

[redacted]

****
This email and any files transmitted with it are confidential and intended solely for the use of the individual or entity to whom they are addressed.
If you have received this email in error, please notify the sender, or [redacted] and then permanently delete the email, attachments and all copies.
The full text of the Council's email disclaimer is available at: www.manchester.gov.uk/emaildisclaimer.
Your personal data is very important to us. Please refer to our privacy notice at: www.manchester.gov.uk/privacy for further information.

This footnote also confirms that this email message has been swept for the presence of computer viruses.
****

Outlook

Fw: Comment on Planning Application 142888/FO/2025

From Planning <[redacted]
Date Mon 14/07/2025 14:07
To Lucy Harrison <[redacted]

Information, Delivery & Support Team
Planning, Building Control & Licensing
Growth & Development Directorate
Postal address: Manchester City Council, P O Box 532, Town Hall, Manchester M60 2LA
Location address: Level 6 Town Hall Extension, Manchester M2 5DB
Tel: 0161 234 4516

Please consider the environment before printing an e-mail.

From: [redacted]
Sent: 11 July 2025 10:34
To: Planning <[redacted]
Subject: Comment on Planning Application 142888/FO/2025

You don't often get email from [redacted] Learn why this is important

ALERT This message originated outside of the Manchester City Council network. **BE CAUTIOUS** before clicking any links or opening any attachments. Please remember your Cyber Training and report anything suspicious.

Dear Manchester Planning team,

I am writing to **lodge an objection** to planning application **142888/FO/2025** – Cambridge Halls of Residence Cavendish Street Manchester M15 6TT.

My primary objection is that the proposals have been designed to deter cyclists from using the safest and most direct route through the site. This route has been open to cyclists ever since the road was first built; it is an essential, well-used part of the city's cycling network and therefore the proposal to deter and/or divert cycles away from Cavendish Street is directly at odds with Manchester City Council's planning, sustainability and transport policies.

I frequently use this route to cycle between the east side of the city centre and Chorlton, and also to Manchester Piccadilly. It is a boon to have this section of the route separate from motor traffic and, crucially, direct. The applicant's proposed alternative route is convoluted, more dangerous and would be a very backward step in provision of infrastructure for active travel within the city.

The applicant has also made misleading claims regarding the road's legal status and regarding pedestrian safety which I will outline below.

I am asking that the council **refuse this application**, and invite the developer to come back with a proposal that maintains direct cycle as well as pedestrian access along Cavendish Street, designed to modern standards set out in Greater Manchester's Streets For All design guide and in Department for Transport guidance note LTN 1/20. I am sure that the Highways team at MCC and the Active Travel team at TfGM will, if asked, be happy to comment on how such a route could be provided within the space available.

I am also asking that the council **make a Section 106 agreement (s106)** with the applicant to fund safety improvements for pedestrians and cyclists at the junction of Cavendish Street and Higher Cambridge Street – the applicant themselves discuss the shortcomings of the existing junction layout in Section 4.2.1 of the Transport Statement ("Cyclists have also been observed to queue on the footway to gain direct access to the Higher Cambridge Street/Cavendish Street junction (via a gap in the guard railings) rather than following the road markings which advise cyclists to dismount and use the controlled pedestrian crossings"). The improvements might take the form of a CYCLOPS junction. CYCLOPS is a homegrown Greater Manchester innovation now frequently used on Highways schemes across the country to deliver safe pedestrian and cycle movements without undue impact on traffic flows.

For prospective occupants and passers-by alike, in line with the S106 tests as set out in Paragraph 58 of the National Planning Policy Framework (NPPF) 2024, a contribution to junction safety improvements improvement would be 'necessary to make the development acceptable in planning terms' (by contributing to an appropriate movement strategy for the site), 'directly related to the development' (given its proximity, the pressure added to the junction by the proposed threefold increase in residents, and in light of the wholly inadequate mitigation route proposed by the applicant), and 'fairly and reasonably related in scale and kind to the development' (given the stated threefold increase in residents explained by the applicant, so directly adding more pressure to the junction).

1 Legal Status of Cavendish Street

This section of Cavendish Street, an adopted Highway, was subject to a stopping up order dated 14.06.1996. That order required that "the Developer shall provide a new highway which shall be a footpath/cycleway". MMU have since installed physical signage stating that Cavendish Street "has not been dedicated as a Highway" and have previously bolted down uncomfortable and restrictive speed bumps across the route in an apparent attempt to dissuade cyclists from exercising their legal rights over this space (these humps have recently been removed). Both measures may be unlawful, as my understanding is that cyclists do retain a legal Right of Way along Cavendish Street, unchanged from when the entire road was an adopted highway, and the speed bumps are inaccessible to some Disabled users.

2 Cycling routes and planning policy

The case for walking and cycling and specifically for maintaining and improving high-quality cycling networks is clear at every level of modern planning policy, including:

- NPPF 2024's "vision-led approach"
- Local Transport Note 1/20 (LTN 1/20)
- Places For Everyone Joint Development Plan Objectives 6, 7 and 10
- Places for Everyone Joint Development Plan policies JP-Strat14, JP-C1, JP-C5 and JP-C6
- GM Transport Strategy 2040 and the "Right Mix" targets
- Greater Manchester Streets for All strategy and Streets for All design guide
- Manchester City Council's Active Travel Strategy
- Manchester City Council's commitment to be a Zero Carbon city by 2038

The policy position is absolutely clear – changes to the existing road and cycle networks should make cycling more convenient for people, not less convenient.

This specific stretch of Cavendish Street is a key part of the existing cycle network. It appears on TfGM's Bee Network map as a Beeway ("the routes that get people from A to B … representing the most direct routes between crossing points.") and connects to the Stretford Road Busy Beeway ("corridors or crossing points on busier roads that will require a higher level of design intervention to improve cycling and walking.") It is also mapped on the TfGM Cycle Network.

The national standard for cycling infrastructure is DfT guidance note LTN 1/20. LTN 1/20 advises above all else that cycle routes and networks should be Safe, Direct, Comfortable, Attractive and Coherent. Introducing unnecessary diversions, junctions and bends into a well-used existing route undermines all of these core principles, resulting in a lower-quality cycle network which will make it harder for the council to achieve its cycling objectives.

The applicant has offered various reasons why diverting cyclists is necessary but all of these reasons seem to be either existing problems, or problems designed into the scheme. The proposal is to demolish and redevelop the site – so considerations like limited space and the placement of entrances, shop frontages, planting and pedestrian areas are entirely within the applicant's scope to manage. Instead of starting with the problem "there is an existing busy cycle route across this site, how can I design to accommodate everyone's needs?", it seems the applicant has started with the conclusion "cyclists must be deterred" and instructed their consultants to post-rationalise that decision.

3 Misleading claims regarding safety

Page 22 of the Design & Access Statement refers to the "existing controversial link along Cavendish St., which is resulting in collisions of pedestrians, electric scooters, cyclists, etc." However the map of recorded collisions, on page 18 of the Transport Statement submitted in the same planning application, shows no recorded collisions whatsoever on this link, only on the adjacent main roads.

The proposals also state: "A gap in the roadside railings along Higher Cambridge Street is designed to allow cyclists one-way entry onto the shared route. However, some cyclists also use the gap to exit the route when travelling west and through to Stretford Road. This creates a risk of cyclist-on-cyclist and cyclist-on-vehicle collision as the controlled junction is not used as intended." None of this provides a sufficient reason for changing the route; in travelling from east to west the signage is currently poor and the crossing is not in fact a toucan crossing, so it is not obvious to many cyclists how to exit from the Cambridge Halls area and reach Stretford Road. Improving the junction with proper signage and a proper crossing which complies with design best practice (including LTN 1/20) would greatly alleviate these problems and be far more beneficial than the proposed re-routing.

The proposed alternative along Higher Cambridge Street, Higher Ormond Street and Boundary Street West may not offer the same level of safety and convenience as the current route. In particular, the direct route would be replaced by a route with right turns, which are more problematic for cyclists. Although the right turns could be properly engineered with best practice cycle-specific infrastructure, this would be a much bigger and more expensive development, with a less satisfactory outcome for active travel, than improving the existing junction as previously described.

It appears the applicant is attempting to restrict cycle access based on a "problem" for which they have no evidence.

Yours sincerely,

[redacted]

****
This email and any files transmitted with it are confidential and intended solely for the use of the individual or entity to whom they are addressed.
If you have received this email in error, please notify the sender, or [redacted] and then permanently delete the email, attachments and all copies.
The full text of the Council's email disclaimer is available at: www.manchester.gov.uk/emaildisclaimer.
Your personal data is very important to us. Please refer to our privacy notice at: www.manchester.gov.uk/privacy for further information.

This footnote also confirms that this email message has been swept for the presence of computer viruses.
****

Outlook

Fw:

From Planning <[redacted]
Date Mon 14/07/2025 14:03
To Lucy Harrison <[redacted]

Information, Delivery & Support Team
Planning, Building Control & Licensing
Growth & Development Directorate
Postal address: Manchester City Council, P O Box 532, Town Hall, Manchester M60 2LA
Location address: Level 6 Town Hall Extension, Manchester M2 5DB
Tel: 0161 234 4516

Please consider the environment before printing an e-mail.

From: [redacted]
Sent: 13 July 2025 07:17
To: Planning <[redacted]
Subject:

You don't often get email from [redacted] Learn why this is important

ALERT This message originated outside of the Manchester City Council network. **BE CAUTIOUS** before clicking any links or opening any attachments. Please remember your Cyber Training and report anything suspicious.

Dear Manchester Planning team,

I am writing to lodge an objection to planning application **142888/FO/2025** – Cambridge Halls Of Residence Cavendish Street Manchester M15 6TT.

My primary objection is that the proposals have been designed to deter cyclists from using the safest and most direct route through the site. This route has been open to cyclists ever since the road was first built; it is an essential, well-used part of the city's cycling network and therefore the proposal to deter and/or divert cycles away from Cavendish Street is directly at odds with Manchester City Council's planning, sustainability and transport policies.

The applicant has also made misleading claims regarding the road's legal status and regarding pedestrian safety which I will outline below.

I am asking that the council **refuse** this application, and invite the developer to come back with a proposal that maintains direct cycle as well as pedestrian access along Cavendish Street, designed to modern standards set out in Greater Manchester's Streets For All design guide and in Department for Transport guidance note LTN 1/20. I am sure that the Highways team at MCC and the Active Travel team at TfGM will, if asked, be happy to comment on how such a route could be provided within the space available.

I am also asking that the council **make a Section 106 agreement (s106)** with the applicant to fund safety improvements for pedestrians and cyclists at the junction of Cavendish Street and Higher Cambridge Street – the applicant themselves discuss the shortcomings of the existing junction layout in Section 4.2.1 of the Transport Statement ("*Cyclists have also been observed to queue on the footway to gain direct access to the Higher Cambridge Street/Cavendish Street junction (via a gap in the guard railings) rather than following the road markings which advise cyclists to dismount and use the controlled pedestrian crossings*"). The improvements might take the form of a CYCLOPS junction. CYCLOPS is a homegrown Greater Manchester innovation now frequently used on Highways schemes across the country to deliver safe pedestrian and cycle movements without undue impact on traffic flows.

For prospective occupants and passers-by alike, in line with the S106 tests as set out in Paragraph 58 of the National Planning Policy Framework (NPPF) 2024, a contribution to junction safety improvements improvement would be 'necessary to make the development acceptable in planning terms' (by contributing to an appropriate movement strategy for the site), 'directly related to the development' (given its proximity, the pressure added to the junction by the proposed threefold increase in residents, and in light of the wholly inadequate mitigation route proposed by the applicant), and 'fairly and reasonably related in scale and kind to the development' (given the stated threefold increase in residents explained by the applicant, so directly adding more pressure to the junction).

1 Legal Status of Cavendish Street

This section of Cavendish Street, an adopted Highway, was subject to a stopping up order dated 14.06.1996. That order required that "the Developer shall provide a new highway which shall be a footpath/cycleway". MMU have since installed physical signage stating that Cavendish Street "has not been dedicated as a Highway" and have bolted down uncomfortable and restrictive speed bumps across the route in an apparent attempt to dissuade cyclists from exercising their legal rights over this space. Both measures may be unlawful, as my understanding is that cyclists do retain a legal Right of Way along Cavendish

Street, unchanged from when the entire road was an adopted highway, and the speed bumps are inaccessible to some Disabled users.

2 Cycling routes and planning policy

The case for walking and cycling and specifically for maintaining and improving high quality cycling networks is clear at every level of modern planning policy, including:

- NPPF 2024's "vision-led approach"
- LTN 1/20
- Places For Everyone Joint Development Plan Objectives 6, 7 and 10
- Places for Everyone Joint Development Plan policies JP-Strat14, JP-C1, JP-C5 and JP-C6
- GM Transport Strategy 2040 and the "Right Mix" targets
- Greater Manchester Streets for All strategy and Streets for All design guide
- Manchester City Council's Active Travel Strategy
- Manchester City Council's commitment to be a Zero Carbon city by 2038

The policy position is absolutely clear – changes to the existing road and cycle networks should make cycling more convenient for people, not less convenient.

This specific stretch of Cavendish Street is a key part of the existing cycle network. It appears on TfGM's Bee Network map as a Beeway ("the routes that get people from A to B … representing the most direct routes between crossing points.") and connects to the Stretford Road Busy Beeway ("corridors or crossing points on busier roads that will require a higher level of design intervention to improve cycling and walking.") It is also mapped on the TfGM Cycle Network.

The national standard for cycling infrastructure is DfT guidance note LTN 1/20. LTN 1/20 advises above all else that cycle routes and networks should be Safe, Direct, Comfortable, Attractive and Coherent. Introducing unnecessary diversions, junctions and bends into a well-used existing route undermines all of these core principles, resulting in a lower quality cycle network which will make it harder for the council to achieve its cycling objectives.

The applicant has offered various reasons why diverting cyclists is necessary but all of these reasons seem to be either existing problems, or problems designed into the scheme. The proposal is to demolish and redevelop the site – so considerations like limited space and the placement of entrances, shop frontages,

planting and pedestrian areas are entirely within the applicant's scope to manage. Instead of starting with the problem "there is an existing busy cycle route across this site, how can I design to accommodate everyone's needs?", it seems the applicant has started with the conclusion "cyclists must be deterred" and instructed their consultants to post-rationalise that decision.

3 Misleading claims regarding safety

Page 22 of the Design & Access Statement refers to the "existing controversial link along Cavendish St., which is resulting in collisions of pedestrians, electric scooters, cyclists, etc."

However the map of recorded collisions, on page 18 of the Transport Statement submitted in the same planning application, shows no recorded collisions whatsoever on this link, only on the adjacent main roads.

It appears the applicant is attempting to restrict cycle access based on a "problem" for which they have no evidence.

Yours sincerely,

[redacted]

****
This email and any files transmitted with it are confidential and intended solely for the use of the individual or entity to whom they are addressed.
If you have received this email in error, please notify the sender, or [redacted] and then permanently delete the email, attachments and all copies.
The full text of the Council's email disclaimer is available at: www.manchester.gov.uk/emaildisclaimer.
Your personal data is very important to us. Please refer to our privacy notice at: www.manchester.gov.uk/privacy for further information.

This footnote also confirms that this email message has been swept for the presence of computer viruses.
****

Outlook

Fw: Comment on Planning Application 142888/FO/2025

From Planning <[redacted]>
Date Mon 14/07/2025 14:06
To Lucy Harrison <[redacted]>

Information, Delivery & Support Team
Planning, Building Control & Licensing
Growth & Development Directorate
Postal address: Manchester City Council, P O Box 532, Town Hall, Manchester M60 2LA
Location address: Level 6 Town Hall Extension, Manchester M2 5DB
Tel: 0161 234 4516

Please consider the environment before printing an e-mail.

From: [redacted]
Sent: 11 July 2025 11:20
To: Planning <[redacted]>
Subject: Comment on Planning Application 142888/FO/2025

You don't often get email from [redacted] Learn why this is important

ALERT This message originated outside of the Manchester City Council network. **BE CAUTIOUS** before clicking any links or opening any attachments. Please remember your Cyber Training and report anything suspicious.

Dear Manchester Planning team, I am writing to lodge an objection to planning application 142888/FO/2025 – Cambridge Halls Of Residence Cavendish Street Manchester M15 6TT. My primary objection is that the proposals have been designed to deter cyclists from using the safest and most direct route through the site. This route has been open to cyclists ever since the road was first built; it is an essential, well-used part of the city's cycling network and therefore the proposal to deter and/or divert cycles away from Cavendish Street is directly at odds with Manchester City Council's planning, sustainability and transport policies.

The applicant has also made misleading claims regarding the road's legal status and regarding pedestrian safety which I will outline below. I am asking that the council refuse this application, and invite the developer to come back with a proposal that maintains direct cycle as well as pedestrian access along Cavendish Street, designed to modern standards set out in Greater Manchester's Streets For All design guide and in Department for Transport guidance note LTN 1/20. I am sure that the Highways team at MCC and the Active Travel team at TfGM will, if asked, be happy to comment on how such a route

could be provided within the space available. I am also asking that the council make a Section 106 agreement (s106) with the applicant to fund safety improvements for pedestrians and cyclists at the junction of Cavendish Street and Higher Cambridge Street – the applicant themselves discuss the shortcomings of the existing junction layout in Section 4.2.1 of the Transport Statement ("Cyclists have also been observed to queue on the footway to gain direct access to the Higher Cambridge Street/Cavendish Street junction (via a gap in the guard railings) rather than following the road markings which advise cyclists to dismount and use the controlled pedestrian crossings"). The improvements might take the form of a CYCLOPS junction. CYCLOPS is a homegrown Greater Manchester innovation now frequently used on Highways schemes across the country to deliver safe pedestrian and cycle movements without undue impact on traffic flows. For prospective occupants and passers-by alike, in line with the S106 tests as set out in Paragraph 58 of the National Planning Policy Framework (NPPF) 2024, a contribution to junction safety improvements improvement would be 'necessary to make the development acceptable in planning terms' (by contributing to an appropriate movement strategy for the site), 'directly related to the development' (given its proximity, the pressure added to the junction by the proposed threefold increase in residents, and in light of the wholly inadequate mitigation route proposed by the applicant), and 'fairly and reasonably related in scale and kind to the development' (given the stated threefold increase in residents explained by the applicant, so directly adding more pressure to the junction). 1 Legal Status of Cavendish Street This section of Cavendish Street, an adopted Highway, was subject to a stopping up order dated 14.06.1996. That order required that "the Developer shall provide a new highway which shall be a footpath/cycleway". MMU have since installed physical signage stating that Cavendish Street "has not been dedicated as a Highway" and have bolted down uncomfortable and restrictive speed bumps across the route in an apparent attempt to dissuade cyclists from exercising their legal rights over this space. Both measures may be unlawful, as my understanding is that cyclists do retain a legal Right of Way along Cavendish Street, unchanged from when the entire road was an adopted highway, and the speed bumps are inaccessible to some Disabled users. 2 Cycling routes and planning policy The case for walking and cycling and specifically for maintaining and improving high quality cycling networks is clear at every level of modern planning policy, including: NPPF 2024's "vision-led approach" LTN 1/20 Places For Everyone Joint Development Plan Objectives 6, 7 and 10 Places for Everyone Joint Development Plan policies JP-Strat14, JP-C1, JP-C5 and JP-C6 GM Transport Strategy 2040 and the "Right Mix" targets Greater Manchester Streets for All strategy and Streets for All design guide Manchester City Council's Active Travel Strategy Manchester City Council's commitment to be a Zero Carbon city by 2038 The policy position is absolutely clear – changes to the existing road and cycle networks should make cycling more convenient for people, not less convenient. This specific stretch of Cavendish Street is a key part of the existing cycle network. It appears on TfGM's Bee Network map as a Beeway ("the routes that get people from A to B … representing the

most direct routes between crossing points.") and connects to the Stretford Road Busy Beeway ("corridors or crossing points on busier roads that will require a higher level of design intervention to improve cycling and walking.") It is also mapped on the TfGM Cycle Network. The national standard for cycling infrastructure is DfT guidance note LTN 1/20. LTN 1/20 advises above all else that cycle routes and networks should be Safe, Direct, Comfortable, Attractive and Coherent. Introducing unnecessary diversions, junctions and bends into a well-used existing route undermines all of these core principles, resulting in a lower quality cycle network which will make it harder for the council to achieve its cycling objectives. The applicant has offered various reasons why diverting cyclists is necessary but all of these reasons seem to be either existing problems, or problems designed into the scheme. The proposal is to demolish and redevelop the site – so considerations like limited space and the placement of entrances, shop frontages, planting and pedestrian areas are entirely within the applicant's scope to manage. Instead of starting with the problem "there is an existing busy cycle route across this site, how can I design to accommodate everyone's needs?", it seems the applicant has started with the conclusion "cyclists must be deterred" and instructed their consultants to post-rationalise that decision. 3 Misleading claims regarding safety Page 22 of the Design & Access Statement refers to the "existing controversial link along Cavendish St., which is resulting in collisions of pedestrians, electric scooters, cyclists, etc." However the map of recorded collisions, on page 18 of the Transport Statement submitted in the same planning application, shows no recorded collisions whatsoever on this link, only on the adjacent main roads. It appears the applicant is attempting to restrict cycle access based on a "problem" for which they have no evidence. Yours sincerely,

[redacted]

****
This email and any files transmitted with it are confidential and intended solely for the use of the individual or entity to whom they are addressed. If you have received this email in error, please notify the sender, or [redacted] and then permanently delete the email, attachments and all copies.
The full text of the Council's email disclaimer is available at: www.manchester.gov.uk/emaildisclaimer.
Your personal data is very important to us. Please refer to our privacy notice at: www.manchester.gov.uk/privacy for further information.

This footnote also confirms that this email message has been swept for the presence of computer viruses.
****

Outlook

Fw: Comment on Planning Application 142888/FO/2025

From Planning <[redacted]>
Date Wed 16/07/2025 15:33
To Lucy Harrison <[redacted]>

Information, Delivery & Support Team
Planning, Building Control & Licensing
Growth & Development Directorate
Postal address: Manchester City Council, P O Box 532, Town Hall, Manchester M60 2LA
Location address: Level 6 Town Hall Extension, Manchester M2 5DB
Tel: 0161 234 4516

Please consider the environment before printing an e-mail.

From: [redacted]
Sent: 15 July 2025 12:15
To: Planning <[redacted]>
Subject: Comment on Planning Application 142888/FO/2025

You don't often get email from [redacted] Learn why this is important

ALERT This message originated outside of the Manchester City Council network. **BE CAUTIOUS** before clicking any links or opening any attachments. Please remember your Cyber Training and report anything suspicious.

Dear Manchester Planning team,
I am writing to lodge an objection to planning application **142888/FO/2025** – Cambridge Halls Of Residence Cavendish Street Manchester M15 6TT.
My primary objection is that the proposals have been designed to deter cyclists from using the safest and most direct route through the site. This route has been open to cyclists ever since the road was first built; it is an essential, well-used part of the city's cycling network and therefore the proposal to deter and/or divert cycles away from Cavendish Street is directly at odds with Manchester City Council's planning, sustainability and transport policies.
I have used this route as a cyclist for over a decade, in particular when cycling home from visiting The Lowry theatre in Salford Quays, or the Depot Climbing centre in Old Trafford. Often these journeys are in the dark, and using the direct route onto Oxford Road feels the safest route for me - especially as a lone female. The proposed diversion on Higher Cambridge Street would mean I'd turn right onto Booth Street West - much more intimidating route to follow as a cyclist due to the speed of motorised vehicles here, especially as I'd need to move across one lane in order to turn right onto Oxford Road.

The applicant has also made misleading claims regarding the road's legal status and regarding pedestrian safety which I will outline below.
I am asking that the council **refuse** this application, and invite the developer to come back with a proposal that maintains direct cycle as well as pedestrian access along Cavendish Street, designed

to modern standards set out in Greater Manchester's Streets For All design guide and in Department for Transport guidance note LTN 1/20. I am sure that the Highways team at MCC and the Active Travel team at TfGM will, if asked, be happy to comment on how such a route could be provided within the space available.

I am also asking that the council **make a Section 106 agreement (s106)** with the applicant to fund safety improvements for pedestrians and cyclists at the junction of Cavendish Street and Higher Cambridge Street – the applicant themselves discuss the shortcomings of the existing junction layout in Section 4.2.1 of the Transport Statement ("*Cyclists have also been observed to queue on the footway to gain direct access to the Higher Cambridge Street/Cavendish Street junction (via a gap in the guard railings) rather than following the road markings which advise cyclists to dismount and use the controlled pedestrian crossings*"). The improvements might take the form of a CYCLOPS junction. CYCLOPS is a homegrown Greater Manchester innovation now frequently used on Highways schemes across the country to deliver safe pedestrian and cycle movements without undue impact on traffic flows.

For prospective occupants and passers-by alike, in line with the S106 tests as set out in Paragraph 58 of the National Planning Policy Framework (NPPF) 2024, a contribution to junction safety improvements improvement would be 'necessary to make the development acceptable in planning terms' (by contributing to an appropriate movement strategy for the site), 'directly related to the development' (given its proximity, the pressure added to the junction by the proposed threefold increase in residents, and in light of the wholly inadequate mitigation route proposed by the applicant), and 'fairly and reasonably related in scale and kind to the development' (given the stated threefold increase in residents explained by the applicant, so directly adding more pressure to the junction).

1 Legal Status of Cavendish Street

This section of Cavendish Street, an adopted Highway, was subject to a stopping up order dated 14.06.1996. That order required that "the Developer shall provide a new highway which shall be a footpath/cycleway". MMU have since installed physical signage stating that Cavendish Street "has not been dedicated as a Highway" and have bolted down uncomfortable and restrictive speed bumps across the route in an apparent attempt to dissuade cyclists from exercising their legal rights over this space. Both measures may be unlawful, as my understanding is that cyclists do retain a legal Right of Way along Cavendish Street, unchanged from when the entire road was an adopted highway, and the speed bumps are inaccessible to some Disabled users.

2 Cycling routes and planning policy

The case for walking and cycling and specifically for maintaining and improving high quality cycling networks is clear at every level of modern planning policy, including:

- NPPF 2024's "vision-led approach"
- LTN 1/20
- Places For Everyone Joint Development Plan Objectives 6, 7 and 10
- Places for Everyone Joint Development Plan policies JP-Strat14, JP-C1, JP-C5 and JP-C6
- GM Transport Strategy 2040 and the "Right Mix" targets
- Greater Manchester Streets for All strategy and Streets for All design guide
- Manchester City Council's Active Travel Strategy
- Manchester City Council's commitment to be a Zero Carbon city by 2038

The policy position is absolutely clear – changes to the existing road and cycle networks should make cycling more convenient for people, not less convenient.

This specific stretch of Cavendish Street is a key part of the existing cycle network. It appears on TfGM's Bee Network map as a Beeway ("the routes that get people from A to B … representing the most direct routes between crossing points.") and connects to the Stretford Road Busy Beeway ("corridors or crossing points on busier roads that will require a higher level of design intervention to improve cycling and walking.") It is also mapped on the TfGM Cycle Network.

The national standard for cycling infrastructure is DfT guidance note LTN 1/20. LTN 1/20 advises above all else that cycle routes and networks should be Safe, Direct, Comfortable, Attractive and Coherent. Introducing unnecessary diversions, junctions and bends into a well-used existing route undermines all of these core principles, resulting in a lower quality cycle network which will make it harder for the council to achieve its cycling objectives.

The applicant has offered various reasons why diverting cyclists is necessary but all of these reasons seem to be either existing problems, or problems designed into the scheme. The proposal is to demolish and redevelop the site – so considerations like limited space and the placement of entrances, shop frontages, planting and pedestrian areas are entirely within the applicant's scope to manage. Instead of starting with the problem "there is an existing busy cycle route across this site, how can I design to accommodate everyone's needs?", it seems the applicant has started with the conclusion "cyclists must be deterred" and instructed their consultants to post-rationalise that decision.

3 Misleading claims regarding safety

Page 22 of the Design & Access Statement refers to the "existing controversial link along Cavendish St., which is resulting in collisions of pedestrians, electric scooters, cyclists, etc."

However the map of recorded collisions, on page 18 of the Transport Statement submitted in the same planning application, shows no recorded collisions whatsoever on this link, only on the adjacent main roads.

It appears the applicant is attempting to restrict cycle access based on a "problem" for which they have no evidence.

Yours sincerely,

[redacted]

****
This email and any files transmitted with it are confidential and intended solely for the use of the individual or entity to whom they are addressed.
If you have received this email in error, please notify the sender, or [redacted] and then permanently delete the email, attachments and all copies.
The full text of the Council's email disclaimer is available at: www.manchester.gov.uk/emaildisclaimer.
Your personal data is very important to us. Please refer to our privacy notice at: www.manchester.gov.uk/privacy for further information.

This footnote also confirms that this email message has been swept for the presence of computer viruses.
****

Outlook

Fw: Comment on Planning Application 142888/FO/2025

From Planning <[redacted]
Date Mon 14/07/2025 14:07
To Lucy Harrison <[redacted]

Information, Delivery & Support Team
Planning, Building Control & Licensing
Growth & Development Directorate
Postal address: Manchester City Council, P O Box 532, Town Hall, Manchester M60 2LA
Location address: Level 6 Town Hall Extension, Manchester M2 5DB
Tel: 0161 234 4516

Please consider the environment before printing an e-mail.

From: [redacted]
Sent: 11 July 2025 10:37
To: Planning <[redacted]
Subject: Comment on Planning Application 142888/FO/2025

You don't often get email from [redacted] Learn why this is important

ALERT This message originated outside of the Manchester City Council network. **BE CAUTIOUS** before clicking any links or opening any attachments. Please remember your Cyber Training and report anything suspicious.

Dear Manchester Planning team,

I am writing to lodge an objection to planning application **142888/FO/2025** – Cambridge Halls Of Residence Cavendish Street Manchester M15 6TT.

My primary objection is that the proposals have been designed to deter cyclists from using the safest and most direct route through the site. This route has been open to cyclists ever since the road was first built; it is an essential, well-used part of the city's cycling network and therefore the proposal to deter and/or divert cycles away from Cavendish Street is directly at odds with Manchester City Council's planning, sustainability and transport policy.

I cycle this route every week and feel safe and protected by this.

The applicant has also made misleading claims regarding the road's legal status and regarding pedestrian safety which I will outline below.

I am asking that the council **refuse** this application, and invite the developer to come back with a proposal that maintains direct cycle as well as pedestrian access along Cavendish Street, designed to modern standards set out in Greater Manchester's Streets For All design guide and in Department for Transport guidance note LTN 1/20. I am sure that the Highways team at MCC and the Active Travel team at TfGM will, if asked, be happy to comment on how such a route could be provided within the space available.

I am also asking that the council **make a Section 106 agreement (s106)** with the applicant to fund safety improvements for pedestrians and cyclists at the junction of Cavendish Street and Higher Cambridge Street – the applicant themselves discuss the shortcomings of the existing junction layout in Section 4.2.1 of the Transport Statement ("*Cyclists have also been observed to queue on the footway to gain direct access to the Higher Cambridge Street/Cavendish Street junction (via a gap in the guard railings) rather than following the road markings which advise cyclists to dismount and use the controlled pedestrian crossings*"). The improvements might take the form of a CYCLOPS junction. CYCLOPS is a homegrown Greater Manchester innovation now frequently used on Highways schemes across the country to deliver safe pedestrian and cycle movements without undue impact on traffic flows.

For prospective occupants and passers-by alike, in line with the S106 tests as set out in Paragraph 58 of the National Planning Policy Framework (NPPF) 2024, a contribution to junction safety improvements improvement would be 'necessary to make the development acceptable in planning terms' (by contributing to an appropriate movement strategy for the site), 'directly related to the development' (given its proximity, the pressure added to the junction by the proposed threefold increase in residents, and in light of the wholly inadequate mitigation route proposed by the applicant), and 'fairly and reasonably related in scale and kind to the development' (given the stated threefold increase in residents explained by the applicant, so directly adding more pressure to the junction).

1 Legal Status of Cavendish Street

This section of Cavendish Street, an adopted Highway, was subject to a stopping up order dated 14.06.1996. That order required that "the Developer shall provide a new highway which shall be a footpath/cycleway". MMU have since installed physical signage stating that Cavendish Street "has not been dedicated as a Highway" and have bolted down uncomfortable and restrictive speed bumps across the route in an apparent attempt to dissuade cyclists from exercising their legal rights over this space. Both measures may be unlawful, as my understanding is that cyclists do retain a legal Right of Way along Cavendish

Street, unchanged from when the entire road was an adopted highway, and the speed bumps are inaccessible to some Disabled users.

2 Cycling routes and planning policy

The case for walking and cycling and specifically for maintaining and improving high quality cycling networks is clear at every level of modern planning policy, including:

- NPPF 2024's "vision-led approach"
- LTN 1/20
- Places For Everyone Joint Development Plan Objectives 6, 7 and 10
- Places for Everyone Joint Development Plan policies JP-Strat14, JP-C1, JP-C5 and JP-C6
- GM Transport Strategy 2040 and the "Right Mix" targets
- Greater Manchester Streets for All strategy and Streets for All design guide
- Manchester City Council's Active Travel Strategy
- Manchester City Council's commitment to be a Zero Carbon city by 2038

The policy position is absolutely clear – changes to the existing road and cycle networks should make cycling more convenient for people, not less convenient.

This specific stretch of Cavendish Street is a key part of the existing cycle network. It appears on TfGM's Bee Network map as a Beeway ("the routes that get people from A to B … representing the most direct routes between crossing points.") and connects to the Stretford Road Busy Beeway ("corridors or crossing points on busier roads that will require a higher level of design intervention to improve cycling and walking.") It is also mapped on the TfGM Cycle Network.

The national standard for cycling infrastructure is DfT guidance note LTN 1/20. LTN 1/20 advises above all else that cycle routes and networks should be Safe, Direct, Comfortable, Attractive and Coherent. Introducing unnecessary diversions, junctions and bends into a well-used existing route undermines all of these core principles, resulting in a lower quality cycle network which will make it harder for the council to achieve its cycling objectives.

The applicant has offered various reasons why diverting cyclists is necessary but all of these reasons seem to be either existing problems, or problems designed into the scheme. The proposal is to demolish and redevelop the site – so considerations like limited space and the placement of entrances, shop frontages,

planting and pedestrian areas are entirely within the applicant's scope to manage. Instead of starting with the problem "there is an existing busy cycle route across this site, how can I design to accommodate everyone's needs?", it seems the applicant has started with the conclusion "cyclists must be deterred" and instructed their consultants to post-rationalise that decision.

3 Misleading claims regarding safety

Page 22 of the Design & Access Statement refers to the "existing controversial link along Cavendish St., which is resulting in collisions of pedestrians, electric scooters, cyclists, etc."

However the map of recorded collisions, on page 18 of the Transport Statement submitted in the same planning application, shows no recorded collisions whatsoever on this link, only on the adjacent main roads.

It appears the applicant is attempting to restrict cycle access based on a "problem" for which they have no evidence.

Yours sincerely, [redacted]

****
This email and any files transmitted with it are confidential and intended solely for the use of the individual or entity to whom they are addressed.
If you have received this email in error, please notify the sender, or [redacted] and then permanently delete the email, attachments and all copies.
The full text of the Council's email disclaimer is available at: www.manchester.gov.uk/emaildisclaimer.
Your personal data is very important to us. Please refer to our privacy notice at: www.manchester.gov.uk/privacy for further information.

This footnote also confirms that this email message has been swept for the presence of computer viruses.
****

Outlook

Fw: Comment on Planning Application 142888/FO/2025

From Planning <[redacted]
Date Mon 30/06/2025 08:47
To Lucy Harrison <[redacted]

Information, Delivery & Support Team
Planning, Building Control & Licensing
Growth & Development Directorate
Postal address: Manchester City Council, P O Box 532, Town Hall, Manchester M60 2LA
Location address: Level 6 Town Hall Extension, Manchester M2 5DB
Tel: 0161 234 4516

Please consider the environment before printing an e-mail.

From: [redacted]
Sent: 29 June 2025 11:14
To: Planning <[redacted]
Subject: Comment on Planning Application 142888/FO/2025

You don't often get email from [redacted] Learn why this is important

ALERT This message originated outside of the Manchester City Council network. **BE CAUTIOUS** before clicking any links or opening any attachments. Please remember your Cyber Training and report anything suspicious.

Dear Manchester Planning team,

I am writing to lodge an objection to planning application **142888/FO/2025** – Cambridge Halls Of Residence Cavendish Street Manchester M15 6TT.

My primary objection is that the proposals have been designed to deter cyclists from using the safest and most direct route through the site. This route has been open to cyclists ever since the road was first built; it is an essential, well-used part of the city's cycling network and therefore the proposal to deter and/or divert cycles away from Cavendish Street is directly at odds with Manchester City Council's planning, sustainability and transport policies.

The applicant has also made misleading claims regarding the road's legal status and regarding pedestrian safety which I will outline below.

I am asking that the council **refuse** this application, and invite the developer to come back with a proposal that maintains direct cycle as well as pedestrian access along Cavendish Street, designed to modern standards set out in Greater Manchester's Streets For All design guide and in Department for Transport guidance note LTN 1/20. I am sure that the Highways team at MCC and the Active Travel team at TfGM will, if asked, be happy to comment on how such a route could be provided within the space available.

I am also asking that the council **make a Section 106 agreement (s106)** with the applicant to fund safety improvements for pedestrians and cyclists at the junction of Cavendish Street and Higher Cambridge Street – the applicant themselves discuss the shortcomings of the existing junction layout in Section 4.2.1 of the Transport Statement ("*Cyclists have also been observed to queue on the footway to gain direct access to the Higher Cambridge Street/Cavendish Street junction (via a gap in the guard railings) rather than following the road markings which advise cyclists to dismount and use the controlled pedestrian crossings*"). The improvements might take the form of a CYCLOPS junction. CYCLOPS is a homegrown Greater Manchester innovation now frequently used on Highways schemes across the country to deliver safe pedestrian and cycle movements without undue impact on traffic flows.

For prospective occupants and passers-by alike, in line with the S106 tests as set out in Paragraph 58 of the National Planning Policy Framework (NPPF) 2024, a contribution to junction safety improvements improvement would be 'necessary to make the development acceptable in planning terms' (by contributing to an appropriate movement strategy for the site), 'directly related to the development' (given its proximity, the pressure added to the junction by the proposed threefold increase in residents, and in light of the wholly inadequate mitigation route proposed by the applicant), and 'fairly and reasonably related in scale and kind to the development' (given the stated threefold increase in residents explained by the applicant, so directly adding more pressure to the junction).

1 Legal Status of Cavendish Street

This section of Cavendish Street, an adopted Highway, was subject to a stopping up order dated 14.06.1996. That order required that "the Developer shall provide a new highway which shall be a footpath/cycleway". MMU have since installed physical signage stating that Cavendish Street "has not been dedicated as a Highway" and have bolted down uncomfortable and restrictive speed bumps across the route in an apparent attempt to dissuade cyclists from exercising their legal rights over this space. Both measures may be unlawful, as my understanding is that cyclists do retain a legal Right of Way along Cavendish Street, unchanged from when the entire road was an adopted highway, and the speed bumps are inaccessible to some Disabled users.

2 Cycling routes and planning policy

The case for walking and cycling and specifically for maintaining and improving high quality cycling networks is clear at every level of modern planning policy, including:

- NPPF 2024's "vision-led approach"
- LTN 1/20
- Places For Everyone Joint Development Plan Objectives 6, 7 and 10
- Places for Everyone Joint Development Plan policies JP-Strat14, JP-C1, JP-C5 and JP-C6
- GM Transport Strategy 2040 and the "Right Mix" targets
- Greater Manchester Streets for All strategy and Streets for All design guide
- Manchester City Council's Active Travel Strategy
- Manchester City Council's commitment to be a Zero Carbon city by 2038

The policy position is absolutely clear – changes to the existing road and cycle networks should make cycling more convenient for people, not less convenient.

This specific stretch of Cavendish Street is a key part of the existing cycle network. It appears on TfGM's Bee Network map as a Beeway ("the routes that get people from A to B … representing the most direct routes between crossing points.") and connects to the Stretford Road Busy Beeway ("corridors or crossing points on busier roads that will require a higher level of design intervention to improve cycling and walking.") It is also mapped on the TfGM Cycle Network.

The national standard for cycling infrastructure is DfT guidance note LTN 1/20. LTN 1/20 advises above all else that cycle routes and networks should be Safe, Direct, Comfortable, Attractive and Coherent. Introducing unnecessary diversions, junctions and bends into a well-used existing route undermines all of these core principles, resulting in a lower quality cycle network which will make it harder for the council to achieve its cycling objectives.

The applicant has offered various reasons why diverting cyclists is necessary but all of these reasons seem to be either existing problems, or problems designed into the scheme. The proposal is to demolish and redevelop the site – so considerations like limited space and the placement of entrances, shop frontages, planting and pedestrian areas are entirely within the applicant's scope to manage. Instead of starting with the problem "there is an existing busy cycle route across this site, how can I design to accommodate everyone's needs?", it seems the applicant has started with the conclusion "cyclists must be deterred" and instructed their consultants to post-rationalise that decision.

3 Misleading claims regarding safety

Page 22 of the Design & Access Statement refers to the "existing controversial link along Cavendish St., which is resulting in collisions of pedestrians, electric scooters, cyclists, etc."

However the map of recorded collisions, on page 18 of the Transport Statement submitted in the same planning application, shows no recorded collisions whatsoever on this link, only on the adjacent main roads.

It appears the applicant is attempting to restrict cycle access based on a "problem" for which they have no evidence.

Yours sincerely

[redacted]

****
This email and any files transmitted with it are confidential and intended solely for the use of the individual or entity to whom they are addressed.
If you have received this email in error, please notify the sender, or [redacted] and then permanently delete the email, attachments and all copies.
The full text of the Council's email disclaimer is available at: www.manchester.gov.uk/emaildisclaimer.
Your personal data is very important to us. Please refer to our privacy notice at: www.manchester.gov.uk/privacy for further information.

This footnote also confirms that this email message has been swept for the presence of computer viruses.
****

Outlook

Fw: Comment on Planning Application 142888/FO/2025

From Planning <[redacted]>
Date Wed 02/07/2025 13:42
To Lucy Harrison <[redacted]>

Information, Delivery & Support Team
Planning, Building Control & Licensing
Growth & Development Directorate
Postal address: Manchester City Council, P O Box 532, Town Hall, Manchester M60 2LA
Location address: Level 6 Town Hall Extension, Manchester M2 5DB
Tel: 0161 234 4516

Please consider the environment before printing an e-mail.

From: [redacted]
Sent: 02 July 2025 13:00
To: Planning <[redacted]>
Subject: Comment on Planning Application 142888/FO/2025

[You don't often get email from [redacted] Learn why this is important at https://aka.ms/LearnAboutSenderIdentification]

ALERT This message originated outside of the Manchester City Council network. BE CAUTIOUS before clicking any links or opening any attachments. Please remember your Cyber Training and report anything suspicious.

Dear Manchester Planning team,

I am writing to lodge a strong objection to planning application 142888/FO/2025 – Cambridge Halls Of Residence Cavendish Street Manchester M15 6TT.

My primary objection is that the proposals have been designed to deter cyclists from using the safest and most direct route through the site and would disrupt a key cycling corridor. This route has been open to cyclists ever since the road was first built; it is an essential, well-used part of the city's cycling network and therefore the proposal to deter and/or divert cycles away from Cavendish Street is directly at odds with Manchester City Council's planning, sustainability and transport policies.

I personally use this route daily in my commute into Manchester. Redirecting people cycling to alternative streets would not only lengthen travel times but more importantly diminish the route's overall utility and appeal to people, myself included, negatively impacting the number of people actively or considering cycling into the city.

The applicant has also made misleading claims regarding the road's legal status and regarding

pedestrian safety which I will outline below.

I am asking that the council refuse this application, and invite the developer to come back with a proposal that maintains direct cycle as well as pedestrian access along Cavendish Street, designed to modern standards set out in Greater Manchester's Streets For All design guide and in Department for Transport guidance note LTN 1/20. I am sure that the Highways team at MCC and the Active Travel team at TfGM will, if asked, be happy to comment on how such a route could be provided within the space available.

I am also asking that the council make a Section 106 agreement (s106) with the applicant to fund safety improvements for pedestrians and cyclists at the junction of Cavendish Street and Higher Cambridge Street – the applicant themselves discuss the shortcomings of the existing junction layout in Section 4.2.1 of the Transport Statement ("Cyclists have also been observed to queue on the footway to gain direct access to the Higher Cambridge Street/Cavendish Street junction (via a gap in the guard railings) rather than following the road markings which advise cyclists to dismount and use the controlled pedestrian crossings"). The improvements might take the form of a CYCLOPS junction. CYCLOPS is a homegrown Greater Manchester innovation now frequently used on Highways schemes across the country to deliver safe pedestrian and cycle movements without undue impact on traffic flows.

For prospective occupants and passers-by alike, in line with the S106 tests as set out in Paragraph 58 of the National Planning Policy Framework (NPPF) 2024, a contribution to junction safety improvements improvement would be 'necessary to make the development acceptable in planning terms' (by contributing to an appropriate movement strategy for the site), 'directly related to the development' (given its proximity, the pressure added to the junction by the proposed threefold increase in residents, and in light of the wholly inadequate mitigation route proposed by the applicant), and 'fairly and reasonably related in scale and kind to the development' (given the stated threefold increase in residents explained by the applicant, so directly adding more pressure to the junction).

1 Legal Status of Cavendish Street

This section of Cavendish Street, an adopted Highway, was subject to a stopping up order dated 14.06.1996. That order required that "the Developer shall provide a new highway which shall be a footpath/cycleway". MMU have since installed physical signage stating that Cavendish Street "has not been dedicated as a Highway" and have previously bolted down uncomfortable and restrictive speed bumps across the route in an apparent attempt to dissuade cyclists (and some disabled users) from exercising their legal rights over this space. Both measures may be unlawful, as my understanding is that cyclists do retain a legal Right of Way along Cavendish Street, unchanged from when the entire road was an adopted highway. These speed bumps have now recently been removed.

2 Cycling routes and planning policy

The case for walking and cycling and specifically for maintaining and improving high quality cycling networks is clear at every level of modern planning policy, including:

NPPF 2024's "vision-led approach"
LTN 1/20
Places For Everyone Joint Development Plan Objectives 6, 7 and 10
Places for Everyone Joint Development Plan policies JP-Strat14, JP-C1, JP-C5 and JP-C6
GM Transport Strategy 2040 and the "Right Mix" targets

Greater Manchester Streets for All strategy and Streets for All design guide
Manchester City Council's Active Travel Strategy
Manchester City Council's commitment to be a Zero Carbon city by 2038
The policy position is absolutely clear – changes to the existing road and cycle networks should make cycling more convenient for people, not less convenient.

This specific stretch of Cavendish Street is a key part of the existing cycle network. It appears on TfGM's Bee Network map as a Beeway ("the routes that get people from A to B … representing the most direct routes between crossing points.") and connects to the Stretford Road Busy Beeway ("corridors or crossing points on busier roads that will require a higher level of design intervention to improve cycling and walking.") It is also mapped on the TfGM Cycle Network.

The national standard for cycling infrastructure is DfT guidance note LTN 1/20. LTN 1/20 advises above all else that cycle routes and networks should be Safe, Direct, Comfortable, Attractive and Coherent. Introducing unnecessary diversions, junctions and bends into a well-used existing route undermines all of these core principles, resulting in a lower quality cycle network which will make it harder for the council to achieve its cycling objectives.

The applicant has offered various reasons why diverting cyclists is necessary but all of these reasons seem to be either existing problems, or problems designed into the scheme. The proposal is to demolish and redevelop the site – so considerations like limited space and the placement of entrances, shop frontages, planting and pedestrian areas are entirely within the applicant's scope to manage. Instead of starting with the problem "there is an existing busy cycle route across this site, how can I design to accommodate everyone's needs?", it seems the applicant has started with the conclusion "cyclists must be deterred" and instructed their consultants to post-rationalise that decision.

3 Misleading claims regarding safety

Page 22 of the Design & Access Statement refers to the "existing controversial link along Cavendish St., which is resulting in collisions of pedestrians, electric scooters, cyclists, etc."

However the map of recorded collisions, on page 18 of the Transport Statement submitted in the same planning application, shows no recorded collisions whatsoever on this link, only on the adjacent main roads. These adjacent roads being the ones the applicant would like to redirect cyclists to, in so doing reducing safety and amenity for people cycling.

It appears the applicant is attempting to restrict cycle access based on a "problem" for which they have no evidence.

Yours sincerely,

[redacted]

****
This email and any files transmitted with it are confidential and intended solely for the use of the individual or entity to whom they are addressed.
If you have received this email in error, please notify the sender, or [redacted] and then permanently delete the email, attachments and all copies.
The full text of the Council's email disclaimer is available at: www.manchester.gov.uk/emaildisclaimer.

Your personal data is very important to us. Please refer to our privacy notice at: www.manchester.gov.uk/privacy for further information.

This footnote also confirms that this email message has been swept for the presence of computer viruses.
****

Outlook

Fw: Comment on Planning Application 142888/FO/2025

From Planning <[redacted]>
Date Thu 10/07/2025 15:58
To Lucy Harrison <[redacted]>

Information, Delivery & Support Team
Planning, Building Control & Licensing
Growth & Development Directorate
Postal address: Manchester City Council, P O Box 532, Town Hall, Manchester M60 2LA
Location address: Level 6 Town Hall Extension, Manchester M2 5DB
Tel: 0161 234 4516

Please consider the environment before printing an e-mail.

From: [redacted]
Sent: 09 July 2025 20:00
To: Planning <[redacted]>
Subject: Comment on Planning Application 142888/FO/2025

[You don't often get email from [redacted] Learn why this is important at https://aka.ms/LearnAboutSenderIdentification]

ALERT This message originated outside of the Manchester City Council network. BE CAUTIOUS before clicking any links or opening any attachments. Please remember your Cyber Training and report anything suspicious.

Dear Manchester Planning team,

I am writing to lodge an objection to planning application 142888/FO/2025 – Cambridge Halls Of Residence Cavendish Street Manchester M15 6TT.

In particular, I'd like to object to the "Cavendish Street movement strategy" and it's attempt to remove cyclists from Cavendish Street. As I understand it, the original 1996 stopping up order did not apply to pedal cycles, and indeed was part of the conditions of the stopping up. The claim that it is not a public right of way is clearly awkwardly worded to mask it's status.

This has always been a highly popular cycling route, back when I was a student and now. Not only is there obvious demand to-from the university, but it is also a key east/west route, linking Grosvenor Street (one of the first protected cycle ways I ever used) and the

network of protected routes on Stretford Road and beyond.

Most of their complaints seem to be centred around the junction connecting Cavendish Street to Cambridge Street. And yes, cycling at best is an afterthought in the junction design and it's very confusing to use, especially after being rattled by their speed bumps. However, the solution would be to remodel the junction as part of section 106 agreement. Indeed, there are several excellent examples just down the road at Chorton Road that can be learnt from. And hopefully one day link to.

Allowing MMU/Unite Students to sabotage a key east/west protected cycle route does not serve their own students & staff, let alone the wider city and it's aims to encourage active travel.

Thank you for your time,

[redacted]

****
This email and any files transmitted with it are confidential and intended solely for the use of the individual or entity to whom they are addressed.
If you have received this email in error, please notify the sender, or [redacted] and then permanently delete the email, attachments and all copies.
The full text of the Council's email disclaimer is available at: www.manchester.gov.uk/emaildisclaimer.
Your personal data is very important to us. Please refer to our privacy notice at: www.manchester.gov.uk/privacy for further information.

This footnote also confirms that this email message has been swept for the presence of computer viruses.
****

Outlook

Fw: Comment on Planning Application 142888/FO/2025

From Planning <[redacted]
Date Mon 14/07/2025 14:04
To Lucy Harrison <[redacted]

Information, Delivery & Support Team
Planning, Building Control & Licensing
Growth & Development Directorate
Postal address: Manchester City Council, P O Box 532, Town Hall, Manchester M60 2LA
Location address: Level 6 Town Hall Extension, Manchester M2 5DB
Tel: 0161 234 4516

Please consider the environment before printing an e-mail.

From: [redacted]
Sent: 12 July 2025 16:00
To: Planning <[redacted]
Subject: Comment on Planning Application 142888/FO/2025

[You don't often get email from [redacted] Learn why this is important at https://aka.ms/LearnAboutSenderIdentification]

ALERT This message originated outside of the Manchester City Council network. BE CAUTIOUS before clicking any links or opening any attachments. Please remember your Cyber Training and report anything suspicious.

Please rethink ~ It was me that did a mini road crossing event one day 28 years ago
I got over 800 signatures and compliments from pass ing Ambulance drivers as it was a dangerous T junction with no crossings for pedestrians or bikes !!!!
HeyHo the students arrived with more cash for us all to be able to cross a v busy road with no danger ~ Do not go backwards and let Everyone one cross safely. (Even the Primary school children from st. Phillips)

Thank You
[redacted]
Sent from my iPhone

****
This email and any files transmitted with it are confidential and intended solely for the use of the individual or entity to whom they are addressed. If you have received this email in error, please notify the sender, or [redacted] and then permanently delete the email, attachments and all copies.
The full text of the Council's email disclaimer is available at: www.manchester.gov.uk/emaildisclaimer.

Your personal data is very important to us. Please refer to our privacy notice at: www.manchester.gov.uk/privacy for further information.

This footnote also confirms that this email message has been swept for the presence of computer viruses.
****

Outlook

Fw: Comment on Planning Application 142888/FO/2025

From Planning <[redacted]
Date Mon 30/06/2025 08:47
To Lucy Harrison <[redacted]

Information, Delivery & Support Team
Planning, Building Control & Licensing
Growth & Development Directorate
Postal address: Manchester City Council, P O Box 532, Town Hall, Manchester M60 2LA
Location address: Level 6 Town Hall Extension, Manchester M2 5DB
Tel: 0161 234 4516

Please consider the environment before printing an e-mail.

From: [redacted]
Sent: 29 June 2025 10:51
To: Planning <[redacted]
Subject: Comment on Planning Application 142888/FO/2025

You don't often get email from [redacted] Learn why this is important

ALERT This message originated outside of the Manchester City Council network. **BE CAUTIOUS** before clicking any links or opening any attachments. Please remember your Cyber Training and report anything suspicious.

Dear planning,

I am writing to lodge an objection to planning application 142888/FO/2025 – Cambridge Halls Of Residence Cavendish Street Manchester M15 6TT.

My primary objection is that the proposals have been designed to deter cyclists from using the safest and most direct route through the site. This route has been open to cyclists ever since the road was first built; it is an essential, well-used part of the city's cycling network and therefore the proposal to deter and/or divert cycles away from Cavendish Street is directly at odds with Manchester City Council's planning, sustainability and transport policies.

I use this route daily on my way to work at Manchester Royal Infirmary. It provides a safe route, despite MMUs recent attempts to impede cyclists.

The applicant has also made misleading claims regarding the road's legal status and regarding pedestrian safety which I will outline below.

I am asking that the council refuse this application, and invite the developer to come back with a proposal that maintains direct cycle as well as pedestrian access along Cavendish Street, designed to modern standards set out in Greater Manchester's Streets For All design guide and in

Department for Transport guidance note LTN 1/20. I am sure that the Highways team at MCC and the Active Travel team at TfGM will, if asked, be happy to comment on how such a route could be provided within the space available.

I am also asking that the council make a Section 106 agreement (s106) with the applicant to fund safety improvements for pedestrians and cyclists at the junction of Cavendish Street and Higher Cambridge Street – the applicant themselves discuss the shortcomings of the existing junction layout in Section 4.2.1 of the Transport Statement ("Cyclists have also been observed to queue on the footway to gain direct access to the Higher Cambridge Street/Cavendish Street junction (via a gap in the guard railings) rather than following the road markings which advise cyclists to dismount and use the controlled pedestrian crossings"). The improvements might take the form of a CYCLOPS junction. CYCLOPS is a homegrown Greater Manchester innovation now frequently used on Highways schemes across the country to deliver safe pedestrian and cycle movements without undue impact on traffic flows.

For prospective occupants and passers-by alike, in line with the S106 tests as set out in Paragraph 58 of the National Planning Policy Framework (NPPF) 2024, a contribution to junction safety improvements improvement would be 'necessary to make the development acceptable in planning terms' (by contributing to an appropriate movement strategy for the site), 'directly related to the development' (given its proximity, the pressure added to the junction by the proposed threefold increase in residents, and in light of the wholly inadequate mitigation route proposed by the applicant), and 'fairly and reasonably related in scale and kind to the development' (given the stated threefold increase in residents explained by the applicant, so directly adding more pressure to the junction).

1 Legal Status of Cavendish Street

This section of Cavendish Street, an adopted Highway, was subject to a stopping up order dated 14.06.1996. That order required that "the Developer shall provide a new highway which shall be a footpath/cycleway". MMU have since installed physical signage stating that Cavendish Street "has not been dedicated as a Highway" and have bolted down uncomfortable and restrictive speed bumps across the route in an apparent attempt to dissuade cyclists from exercising their legal rights over this space. Both measures may be unlawful, as my understanding is that cyclists do retain a legal Right of Way along Cavendish Street, unchanged from when the entire road was an adopted highway, and the speed bumps are inaccessible to some Disabled users.

2 Cycling routes and planning policy

The case for walking and cycling and specifically for maintaining and improving high quality cycling networks is clear at every level of modern planning policy, including:

- NPPF 2024's "vision-led approach"
- LTN 1/20
- Places For Everyone Joint Development Plan Objectives 6, 7 and 10
- Places for Everyone Joint Development Plan policies JP-Strat14, JP-C1, JP-C5 and JP-C6
- GM Transport Strategy 2040 and the "Right Mix" targets
- Greater Manchester Streets for All strategy and Streets for All design guide
- Manchester City Council's Active Travel Strategy
- Manchester City Council's commitment to be a Zero Carbon city by 2038

The policy position is absolutely clear – changes to the existing road and cycle networks should make cycling more convenient for people, not less convenient.

This specific stretch of Cavendish Street is a key part of the existing cycle network. It appears on TfGM's Bee Network map as a Beeway ("the routes that get people from A to B … representing the most direct routes between crossing points.") and connects to the Stretford Road Busy Beeway ("corridors or crossing points on busier roads that will require a higher level of design intervention to improve cycling and walking.") It is also mapped on the TfGM Cycle Network.

The national standard for cycling infrastructure is DfT guidance note LTN 1/20. LTN 1/20 advises above all else that cycle routes and networks should be Safe, Direct, Comfortable, Attractive and Coherent. Introducing unnecessary diversions, junctions and bends into a well-used existing route undermines all of these core principles, resulting in a lower quality cycle network which will make it harder for the council to achieve its cycling objectives.

The applicant has offered various reasons why diverting cyclists is necessary but all of these reasons seem to be either existing problems, or problems designed into the scheme. The proposal is to demolish and redevelop the site – so considerations like limited space and the placement of entrances, shop frontages, planting and pedestrian areas are entirely within the applicant's scope to manage. Instead of starting with the problem "there is an existing busy cycle route across this site, how can I design to accommodate everyone's needs?", it seems the applicant has started with the conclusion "cyclists must be deterred" and instructed their consultants to post-rationalise that decision.

3 Misleading claims regarding safety

Page 22 of the Design & Access Statement refers to the "existing controversial link along Cavendish St., which is resulting in collisions of pedestrians, electric scooters, cyclists, etc."

However the map of recorded collisions, on page 18 of the Transport Statement submitted in the same planning application, shows no recorded collisions whatsoever on this link, only on the adjacent main roads.

It appears the applicant is attempting to restrict cycle access based on a "problem" for which they have no evidence.

Yours sincerely,

[redacted]

****
This email and any files transmitted with it are confidential and intended solely for the use of the individual or entity to whom they are addressed.
If you have received this email in error, please notify the sender, or [redacted] and then permanently delete the email, attachments and all copies.
The full text of the Council's email disclaimer is available at: www.manchester.gov.uk/emaildisclaimer.
Your personal data is very important to us. Please refer to our privacy notice at: www.manchester.gov.uk/privacy for further information.

This footnote also confirms that this email message has been swept for the presence of computer viruses.
****

Outlook

Fw: Comment on Planning Application 142888/FO/2025

From Planning <[redacted]
Date Mon 14/07/2025 14:08
To Lucy Harrison <[redacted]

Information, Delivery & Support Team
Planning, Building Control & Licensing
Growth & Development Directorate
Postal address: Manchester City Council, P O Box 532, Town Hall, Manchester M60 2LA
Location address: Level 6 Town Hall Extension, Manchester M2 5DB
Tel: 0161 234 4516

Please consider the environment before printing an e-mail.

From: [redacted]
Sent: 11 July 2025 09:31
To: Planning <[redacted]
Subject: Comment on Planning Application 142888/FO/2025

You don't often get email from [redacted] Learn why this is important

ALERT This message originated outside of the Manchester City Council network. **BE CAUTIOUS** before clicking any links or opening any attachments. Please remember your Cyber Training and report anything suspicious.

I am writing to lodge an objection to planning application **142888/FO/2025** – Cambridge Halls Of Residence Cavendish Street Manchester M15 6TT.

My primary objection is that the proposals have been designed to deter cyclists from using the safest and most direct route through the site. This route has been open to cyclists ever since the road was first built; it is an essential, well-used part of the city's cycling network and therefore the proposal to deter and/or divert cycles away from Cavendish Street is directly at odds with Manchester City Council's planning, sustainability and transport policies.

I use this often whilst going to Stretford. It is my preferred safe route.

Regards [redacted]

Yahoo Mail: Search, organise, conquer

****
This email and any files transmitted with it are confidential and intended solely for the use of the individual or entity to whom they are addressed.
If you have received this email in error, please notify the sender, or [redacted] and then permanently delete the email, attachments and all copies.
The full text of the Council's email disclaimer is available at: www.manchester.gov.uk/emaildisclaimer.
Your personal data is very important to us. Please refer to our privacy notice at: www.manchester.gov.uk/privacy for further information.

This footnote also confirms that this email message has been swept for the presence of computer viruses.
****

Outlook

Fw: Comment on Planning Application 142888/FO/2025

From Planning <[redacted]
Date Mon 30/06/2025 08:46
To Lucy Harrison <[redacted]

Information, Delivery & Support Team
Planning, Building Control & Licensing
Growth & Development Directorate
Postal address: Manchester City Council, P O Box 532, Town Hall, Manchester M60 2LA
Location address: Level 6 Town Hall Extension, Manchester M2 5DB
Tel: 0161 234 4516

Please consider the environment before printing an e-mail.

From: [redacted]
Sent: 29 June 2025 22:23
To: Planning <[redacted]
Cc: [redacted]
Subject: Comment on Planning Application 142888/FO/2025

You don't often get email from [redacted] Learn why this is important

ALERT This message originated outside of the Manchester City Council network. **BE CAUTIOUS** before clicking any links or opening any attachments. Please remember your Cyber Training and report anything suspicious.

Dear Manchester Planning team,
I am writing to lodge an objection to planning application **142888/FO/2025** – Cambridge Halls Of Residence Cavendish Street Manchester M15 6TT.
My primary objection is that the proposals have been designed to deter cyclists from using the safest and most direct route through the site. This route has been open to cyclists ever since the road was first built; it is an essential, well-used part of the city's cycling network and therefore the proposal to deter and/or divert cycles away from Cavendish Street is directly at odds with Manchester City Council's planning, sustainability and transport policies.

I am a senior lecturer at Manchester Metropolitan and I am dismayed that the organisation I work for is trying to make my daily cycle commute more dangerous with this act of urban vandalism. Especially when Manchester Met claims to be a sustainable University, I have cc'd Prof Liz Price who is our Pro-VC for sustainability, who I can only assume is not aware of these plans to block a sustainable, active travel route.
I object in the strongest possible terms to this ridiculous stopping up request. I regularly use this route both on foot and by bicycle and have never experienced any issues. Please look to European cities to see how this space could be designed into an excellent route for active travel alongside the proposed new student accommodation.

The applicant has also made misleading claims regarding the road's legal status and regarding pedestrian safety which I will outline below.
I am asking that the council **refuse** this application, and invite the developer to come back with a proposal that maintains direct cycle as well as pedestrian access along Cavendish Street, designed to modern standards set out in Greater Manchester's Streets For All design guide and in Department

for Transport guidance note LTN 1/20. I am sure that the Highways team at MCC and the Active Travel team at TfGM will, if asked, be happy to comment on how such a route could be provided within the space available.

I am also asking that the council **make a Section 106 agreement (s106)** with the applicant to fund safety improvements for pedestrians and cyclists at the junction of Cavendish Street and Higher Cambridge Street – the applicant themselves discuss the shortcomings of the existing junction layout in Section 4.2.1 of the Transport Statement ("*Cyclists have also been observed to queue on the footway to gain direct access to the Higher Cambridge Street/Cavendish Street junction (via a gap in the guard railings) rather than following the road markings which advise cyclists to dismount and use the controlled pedestrian crossings*"). The improvements might take the form of a CYCLOPS junction. CYCLOPS is a homegrown Greater Manchester innovation now frequently used on Highways schemes across the country to deliver safe pedestrian and cycle movements without undue impact on traffic flows.

For prospective occupants and passers-by alike, in line with the S106 tests as set out in Paragraph 58 of the National Planning Policy Framework (NPPF) 2024, a contribution to junction safety improvements improvement would be 'necessary to make the development acceptable in planning terms' (by contributing to an appropriate movement strategy for the site), 'directly related to the development' (given its proximity, the pressure added to the junction by the proposed threefold increase in residents, and in light of the wholly inadequate mitigation route proposed by the applicant), and 'fairly and reasonably related in scale and kind to the development' (given the stated threefold increase in residents explained by the applicant, so directly adding more pressure to the junction).

1 Legal Status of Cavendish Street

This section of Cavendish Street, an adopted Highway, was subject to a stopping up order dated 14.06.1996. That order required that "the Developer shall provide a new highway which shall be a footpath/cycleway". MMU have since installed physical signage stating that Cavendish Street "has not been dedicated as a Highway" and have bolted down uncomfortable and restrictive speed bumps across the route in an apparent attempt to dissuade cyclists from exercising their legal rights over this space. Both measures may be unlawful, as my understanding is that cyclists do retain a legal Right of Way along Cavendish Street, unchanged from when the entire road was an adopted highway, and the speed bumps are inaccessible to some Disabled users.

2 Cycling routes and planning policy

The case for walking and cycling and specifically for maintaining and improving high quality cycling networks is clear at every level of modern planning policy, including:

- NPPF 2024's "vision-led approach"
- LTN 1/20
- Places For Everyone Joint Development Plan Objectives 6, 7 and 10
- Places for Everyone Joint Development Plan policies JP-Strat14, JP-C1, JP-C5 and JP-C6
- GM Transport Strategy 2040 and the "Right Mix" targets
- Greater Manchester Streets for All strategy and Streets for All design guide
- Manchester City Council's Active Travel Strategy
- Manchester City Council's commitment to be a Zero Carbon city by 2038

The policy position is absolutely clear – changes to the existing road and cycle networks should make cycling more convenient for people, not less convenient.

This specific stretch of Cavendish Street is a key part of the existing cycle network. It appears on TfGM's Bee Network map as a Beeway ("the routes that get people from A to B … representing the most direct routes between crossing points.") and connects to the Stretford Road Busy Beeway ("corridors or crossing points on busier roads that will require a higher level of design intervention to improve cycling and walking.") It is also mapped on the TfGM Cycle Network.

The national standard for cycling infrastructure is DfT guidance note LTN 1/20. LTN 1/20 advises above all else that cycle routes and networks should be Safe, Direct, Comfortable, Attractive and Coherent. Introducing unnecessary diversions, junctions and bends into a well-used existing route undermines all of these core principles, resulting in a lower quality cycle network which will make it harder for the council to achieve its cycling objectives.

The applicant has offered various reasons why diverting cyclists is necessary but all of these reasons seem to be either existing problems, or problems designed into the scheme. The proposal is to demolish and redevelop the site – so considerations like limited space and the placement of entrances, shop frontages, planting and pedestrian areas are entirely within the applicant's scope to manage. Instead of starting with the problem "there is an existing busy cycle route across this site, how can I design to accommodate everyone's needs?", it seems the applicant has started with the conclusion "cyclists must be deterred" and instructed their consultants to post-rationalise that decision.

3 Misleading claims regarding safety

Page 22 of the Design & Access Statement refers to the "existing controversial link along Cavendish St., which is resulting in collisions of pedestrians, electric scooters, cyclists, etc."

However the map of recorded collisions, on page 18 of the Transport Statement submitted in the same planning application, shows no recorded collisions whatsoever on this link, only on the adjacent main roads.
It appears the applicant is attempting to restrict cycle access based on a “problem” for which they have no evidence.
Yours sincerely,

[redacted]

[redacted]

[redacted]

****
This email and any files transmitted with it are confidential and intended solely for the use of the individual or entity to whom they are addressed.
If you have received this email in error, please notify the sender, or [redacted] and then permanently delete the email, attachments and all copies.
The full text of the Council's email disclaimer is available at: www.manchester.gov.uk/emaildisclaimer.
Your personal data is very important to us. Please refer to our privacy notice at: www.manchester.gov.uk/privacy for further information.

This footnote also confirms that this email message has been swept for the presence of computer viruses.
****

Outlook

Fw: Comment on Planning Application 142888/FO/2025

From Planning <[redacted]
Date Mon 14/07/2025 14:06
To Lucy Harrison <[redacted]

Information, Delivery & Support Team
Planning, Building Control & Licensing
Growth & Development Directorate
Postal address: Manchester City Council, P O Box 532, Town Hall, Manchester M60 2LA
Location address: Level 6 Town Hall Extension, Manchester M2 5DB
Tel: 0161 234 4516

Please consider the environment before printing an e-mail.

From: [redacted]
Sent: 11 July 2025 12:49
To: Planning <[redacted]
Subject: Comment on Planning Application 142888/FO/2025

You don't often get email from [redacted] Learn why this is important

ALERT This message originated outside of the Manchester City Council network. **BE CAUTIOUS** before clicking any links or opening any attachments. Please remember your Cyber Training and report anything suspicious.

Dear Manchester Planning team,

I am writing to lodge an objection to planning application 142888/FO/2025 – Cambridge Halls Of Residence Cavendish Street Manchester M15 6TT.

My primary objection is that the proposals have been designed to deter cyclists from using the safest and most direct route through the site. This route has been open to cyclists ever since the road was first built; it is an essential, well-used part of the city's cycling network and therefore the proposal to deter and/or divert cycles away from Cavendish Street is directly at odds with Manchester City Council's planning, sustainability and transport policies.

The applicant has also made misleading claims regarding the road's legal status and regarding pedestrian safety which I will outline below.

I am asking that the council refuse this application, and invite the developer to come back with a proposal that maintains direct cycle as well as pedestrian access along Cavendish Street, designed to modern standards set out in Greater Manchester's Streets For All design guide and in Department for Transport guidance note LTN 1/20. I am sure that the Highways team at MCC and the Active Travel team at TfGM will, if asked, be happy to comment on how such a route could be provided within the space available.

I am also asking that the council make a Section 106 agreement (s106) with the applicant to fund safety improvements for pedestrians and cyclists at the junction of Cavendish Street and Higher Cambridge Street – the applicant themselves discuss the shortcomings of the existing junction layout in Section 4.2.1 of the Transport Statement ("Cyclists have also been observed to queue on the footway to gain direct access to the Higher Cambridge Street/Cavendish Street junction (via a gap in the guard railings) rather than following the road markings which advise cyclists to dismount and use the controlled pedestrian crossings"). The improvements might take the form of a CYCLOPS junction. CYCLOPS is a homegrown Greater Manchester innovation now frequently used on Highways schemes across the country to deliver safe pedestrian and cycle movements without undue impact on traffic flows.

For prospective occupants and passers-by alike, in line with the S106 tests as set out in Paragraph 58 of the National Planning Policy Framework (NPPF) 2024, a contribution to junction safety improvements improvement would be 'necessary to make the development acceptable in planning terms' (by contributing to an appropriate movement strategy for the site), 'directly related to the development' (given its proximity, the pressure added to the junction by the proposed threefold increase in residents, and in light of the wholly inadequate mitigation route proposed by the applicant), and 'fairly and reasonably related in scale and kind to the development' (given the stated threefold increase in residents explained by the applicant, so directly adding more pressure to the junction).

1 Legal Status of Cavendish Street

This section of Cavendish Street, an adopted Highway, was subject to a stopping up order dated 14.06.1996. That order required that "the Developer shall provide a new highway which shall be a footpath/cycleway". MMU have since installed physical signage stating that Cavendish Street "has not been dedicated as a Highway" and have bolted down uncomfortable and restrictive speed bumps across the route in an apparent attempt to dissuade cyclists from exercising their legal rights over this space. Both measures may be unlawful, as my understanding is that cyclists do retain a legal Right of Way along Cavendish Street, unchanged from when the entire road was an adopted highway, and the speed bumps are inaccessible to some Disabled users.

2 Cycling routes and planning policy

The case for walking and cycling and specifically for maintaining and improving high quality cycling networks is clear at every level of modern planning policy, including:

NPPF 2024's "vision-led approach"
LTN 1/20
Places For Everyone Joint Development Plan Objectives 6, 7 and 10
Places for Everyone Joint Development Plan policies JP-Strat14, JP-C1, JP-C5 and JP-C6
GM Transport Strategy 2040 and the "Right Mix" targets
Greater Manchester Streets for All strategy and Streets for All design guide
Manchester City Council's Active Travel Strategy
Manchester City Council's commitment to be a Zero Carbon city by 2038
The policy position is absolutely clear – changes to the existing road and cycle networks should make cycling more convenient for people, not less convenient.

This specific stretch of Cavendish Street is a key part of the existing cycle network. It appears on TfGM's Bee Network map as a Beeway ("the routes that get people from A to B … representing the most direct routes between crossing points.") and connects to the Stretford Road Busy Beeway ("corridors or crossing points on busier roads that will require a higher

level of design intervention to improve cycling and walking.") It is also mapped on the TfGM Cycle Network.

The national standard for cycling infrastructure is DfT guidance note LTN 1/20. LTN 1/20 advises above all else that cycle routes and networks should be Safe, Direct, Comfortable, Attractive and Coherent. Introducing unnecessary diversions, junctions and bends into a well-used existing route undermines all of these core principles, resulting in a lower quality cycle network which will make it harder for the council to achieve its cycling objectives.

The applicant has offered various reasons why diverting cyclists is necessary but all of these reasons seem to be either existing problems, or problems designed into the scheme. The proposal is to demolish and redevelop the site – so considerations like limited space and the placement of entrances, shop frontages, planting and pedestrian areas are entirely within the applicant's scope to manage. Instead of starting with the problem "there is an existing busy cycle route across this site, how can I design to accommodate everyone's needs?", it seems the applicant has started with the conclusion "cyclists must be deterred" and instructed their consultants to post-rationalise that decision.

3 Misleading claims regarding safety

Page 22 of the Design & Access Statement refers to the "existing controversial link along Cavendish St., which is resulting in collisions of pedestrians, electric scooters, cyclists, etc."

However the map of recorded collisions, on page 18 of the Transport Statement submitted in the same planning application, shows no recorded collisions whatsoever on this link, only on the adjacent main roads.

It appears the applicant is attempting to restrict cycle access based on a "problem" for which they have no evidence.

Yours sincerely,

[redacted]

Sent from Outlook for Android

****
This email and any files transmitted with it are confidential and intended solely for the use of the individual or entity to whom they are addressed.
If you have received this email in error, please notify the sender, or [redacted] and then permanently delete the email, attachments and all copies.
The full text of the Council's email disclaimer is available at: www.manchester.gov.uk/emaildisclaimer.
Your personal data is very important to us. Please refer to our privacy notice at: www.manchester.gov.uk/privacy for further information.

This footnote also confirms that this email message has been swept for the presence of computer viruses.
****

Outlook

Fw: Comment on Planning Application 142888/FO/2025

From Planning <[redacted]
Date Mon 30/06/2025 08:48
To Lucy Harrison <[redacted]

Information, Delivery & Support Team
Planning, Building Control & Licensing
Growth & Development Directorate
Postal address: Manchester City Council, P O Box 532, Town Hall, Manchester M60 2LA
Location address: Level 6 Town Hall Extension, Manchester M2 5DB
Tel: 0161 234 4516

Please consider the environment before printing an e-mail.

From: [redacted]
Sent: 29 June 2025 09:24
To: Planning <[redacted]
Subject: Comment on Planning Application 142888/FO/2025

You don't often get email from [redacted] Learn why this is important

ALERT This message originated outside of the Manchester City Council network. **BE CAUTIOUS** before clicking any links or opening any attachments. Please remember your Cyber Training and report anything suspicious.

Dear Manchester Planning team,

I am writing to lodge an objection to planning application **142888/FO/2025**– Cambridge Halls Of Residence Cavendish Street Manchester M15 6TT.

My primary objection is that the proposals have been designed to deter cyclists from using the safest and most direct route through the site. This route has been open to cyclists ever since the road was first built; it is an essential, well-used part of the city's cycling network and therefore the proposal to deter and/or divert cycles away from Cavendish Street is directly at odds with Manchester City Council's planning, sustainability and transport policies.

I use the route regularly to cycle from Chorlton where I work to Piccadilly station, almost entirely on protected cycle infrastructure. The directness of the route, and the feeling of safety are two critical reasons why I use it.

The applicant has also made misleading claims regarding the road's legal status and regarding pedestrian safety which I will outline below.

I am asking that the council **refuse** this application, and invite the developer to come back with a proposal that maintains direct cycle as well as pedestrian access along Cavendish Street, designed to modern standards set out in Greater Manchester's Streets For All design guide and in Department for Transport guidance note LTN 1/20. I am sure that the Highways team at MCC and the Active Travel team at TfGM will, if asked, be happy to comment on how such a route could be provided within the space available.

I am also asking that the council **make a Section 106 agreement (s106)** with the applicant to fund safety improvements for pedestrians and cyclists at the junction of Cavendish Street and Higher Cambridge Street – the applicant themselves discuss the shortcomings of the existing junction layout in Section 4.2.1 of the Transport Statement ("*Cyclists have also been observed to queue on the footway to gain direct access to the Higher Cambridge Street/Cavendish Street junction (via a gap in the guard railings) rather than following the road markings which advise cyclists to dismount and use the controlled pedestrian crossings*"). The improvements might take the form of a CYCLOPS junction. CYCLOPS is a homegrown Greater Manchester innovation now frequently used on Highways schemes across the country to deliver safe pedestrian and cycle movements without undue impact on traffic flows.

For prospective occupants and passers-by alike, in line with the S106 tests as set out in Paragraph 58 of the National Planning Policy Framework (NPPF) 2024, a contribution to junction safety improvements improvement would be 'necessary to make the development acceptable in planning terms' (by contributing to an appropriate movement strategy for the site), 'directly related to the development' (given its proximity, the pressure added to the junction by the proposed threefold increase in residents, and in light of the wholly inadequate mitigation route proposed by the applicant), and 'fairly and reasonably related in scale and kind to the development' (given the stated threefold increase in residents explained by the applicant, so directly adding more pressure to the junction).

1 Legal Status of Cavendish Street

This section of Cavendish Street, an adopted Highway, was subject to a stopping up order dated 14.06.1996. That order required that "the Developer shall provide a new highway which shall be a footpath/cycleway". MMU have since installed physical signage stating that Cavendish Street "has not been dedicated as a Highway" and have bolted down uncomfortable and restrictive speed bumps

across the route in an apparent attempt to dissuade cyclists from exercising their legal rights over this space. Both measures may be unlawful, as my understanding is that cyclists do retain a legal Right of Way along Cavendish Street, unchanged from when the entire road was an adopted highway, and the speed bumps are inaccessible to some Disabled users.

2 Cycling routes and planning policy

The case for walking and cycling and specifically for maintaining and improving high quality cycling networks is clear at every level of modern planning policy, including:

- NPPF 2024's "vision-led approach"
- LTN 1/20
- Places For Everyone Joint Development Plan Objectives 6, 7 and 10
- Places for Everyone Joint Development Plan policies JP-Strat14, JP-C1, JP-C5 and JP-C6
- GM Transport Strategy 2040 and the "Right Mix" targets
- Greater Manchester Streets for All strategy and Streets for All design guide
- Manchester City Council's Active Travel Strategy
- Manchester City Council's commitment to be a Zero Carbon city by 2038

The policy position is absolutely clear – changes to the existing road and cycle networks should make cycling more convenient for people, not less convenient.

This specific stretch of Cavendish Street is a key part of the existing cycle network. It appears on TfGM's Bee Network map as a Beeway ("the routes that get people from A to B … representing the most direct routes between crossing points.") and connects to the Stretford Road Busy Beeway ("corridors or crossing points on busier roads that will require a higher level of design intervention to improve cycling and walking.") It is also mapped on the TfGM Cycle Network.

The national standard for cycling infrastructure is DfT guidance note LTN 1/20. LTN 1/20 advises above all else that cycle routes and networks should be Safe, Direct, Comfortable, Attractive and Coherent. Introducing unnecessary diversions, junctions and bends into a well-used existing route undermines all of these core principles, resulting in a lower quality cycle network which will make it harder for the council to achieve its cycling objectives.

The applicant has offered various reasons why diverting cyclists is necessary but all of these reasons seem to be either existing problems, or problems designed into the scheme. The proposal is to demolish and redevelop the site – so considerations like limited space and the placement of entrances, shop frontages, planting and pedestrian areas are entirely within the applicant's scope to manage. Instead of starting with the problem "there is an existing busy cycle route across this site, how can I design to accommodate everyone's needs?", it seems the applicant has started with the conclusion "cyclists must be deterred" and instructed their consultants to post-rationalise that decision.

3 Misleading claims regarding safety

Page 22 of the Design & Access Statement refers to the "existing controversial link along Cavendish St., which is resulting in collisions of pedestrians, electric scooters, cyclists, etc."

However the map of recorded collisions, on page 18 of the Transport Statement submitted in the same planning application, shows no recorded collisions whatsoever on this link, only on the adjacent main roads.

It appears the applicant is attempting to restrict cycle access based on a "problem" for which they have no evidence.

Yours sincerely,

[redacted]

[redacted]

[redacted]

****
This email and any files transmitted with it are confidential and intended solely for the use of the individual or entity to whom they are addressed.
If you have received this email in error, please notify the sender, or [redacted] and then permanently delete the email, attachments and all copies.
The full text of the Council's email disclaimer is available at: www.manchester.gov.uk/emaildisclaimer.
Your personal data is very important to us. Please refer to our privacy notice at: www.manchester.gov.uk/privacy for further information.

This footnote also confirms that this email message has been swept for the presence of computer viruses.
****

Outlook

Fw: Comment on Planning Application 142888/FO/2025

From Planning <[redacted]
Date Mon 14/07/2025 14:04
To Lucy Harrison <[redacted]

Information, Delivery & Support Team
Planning, Building Control & Licensing
Growth & Development Directorate
Postal address: Manchester City Council, P O Box 532, Town Hall, Manchester M60 2LA
Location address: Level 6 Town Hall Extension, Manchester M2 5DB
Tel: 0161 234 4516

Please consider the environment before printing an e-mail.

From: [redacted]
Sent: 12 July 2025 12:57
To: Planning <[redacted]
Subject: Comment on Planning Application 142888/FO/2025

ALERT This message originated outside of the Manchester City Council network. **BE CAUTIOUS** before clicking any links or opening any attachments. Please remember your Cyber Training and report anything suspicious.

Subject: Comment on Planning Application 142888/FO/2025
Dear Manchester Planning team,

I am writing to lodge an objection to planning application 142888/FO/2025 – Cambridge Halls Of Residence Cavendish Street Manchester M15 6TT.

My primary objection is that the proposals have been designed to deter cyclists from using the safest and most direct route through the site. This route has been open to cyclists ever since the road was first built; it is an essential, well-used part of the city's cycling network and therefore the proposal to deter and/or divert cycles away from Cavendish Street is directly at odds with Manchester City Council's planning, sustainability and transport policies.

Yours sincerely,

[redacted]

Sent from Outlook for Android

****
This email and any files transmitted with it are confidential and intended solely for the use of the individual or entity to whom they are addressed.
If you have received this email in error, please notify the sender, or [redacted] and then permanently delete the email, attachments and all copies.
The full text of the Council's email disclaimer is available at: www.manchester.gov.uk/emaildisclaimer.
Your personal data is very important to us. Please refer to our privacy notice at: www.manchester.gov.uk/privacy for further information.

This footnote also confirms that this email message has been swept for the presence of computer viruses.
****

Outlook

Fw: Comment on Planning Application 142888/FO/2025

From Planning <[redacted]
Date Tue 01/07/2025 09:08
To Lucy Harrison <[redacted]

Information, Delivery & Support Team
Planning, Building Control & Licensing
Growth & Development Directorate
Postal address: Manchester City Council, P O Box 532, Town Hall, Manchester M60 2LA
Location address: Level 6 Town Hall Extension, Manchester M2 5DB
Tel: 0161 234 4516

Please consider the environment before printing an e-mail.

From: [redacted]
Sent: 30 June 2025 22:11
To: Planning <[redacted]
Subject: Comment on Planning Application 142888/FO/2025

[You don't often get email from [redacted] Learn why this is important at https://aka.ms/LearnAboutSenderIdentification]

ALERT This message originated outside of the Manchester City Council network. BE CAUTIOUS before clicking any links or opening any attachments. Please remember your Cyber Training and report anything suspicious.

Dear Manchester Planning team,

I am writing to lodge an objection to planning application 142888/FO/2025 – Cambridge Halls Of Residence Cavendish Street Manchester M15 6TT.

My primary objection is that the proposals have been designed to deter cyclists from using the safest and most direct route through the site. This route has been open to cyclists ever since the road was first built; it is an essential, well-used part of the city's cycling network and therefore the proposal to deter and/or divert cycles away from Cavendish Street is directly at odds with Manchester City Council's planning, sustainability and transport policies.

As a resident of south Manchester this route is important for me in accessing the businesses and facilities in the city centre, which I do frequently. It is also a route I cycle with my young children after visiting the museum on Oxford Road due to its safety.

The applicant has also made misleading claims regarding the road's legal status and regarding pedestrian safety which I will outline below.

I am asking that the council refuse this application, and invite the developer to come back with a proposal that maintains direct cycle as well as pedestrian access along Cavendish Street, designed to modern standards set out in Greater Manchester's Streets For All design guide and in Department for Transport guidance note LTN 1/20. I am sure that the Highways team at MCC and the Active Travel team at TfGM will, if asked, be happy to comment on how such a route could be provided within the space available.

I am also asking that the council make a Section 106 agreement (s106) with the applicant to fund safety improvements for pedestrians and cyclists at the junction of Cavendish Street and Higher Cambridge Street – the applicant themselves discuss the shortcomings of the existing junction layout in Section 4.2.1 of the Transport Statement ("Cyclists have also been observed to queue on the footway to gain direct access to the Higher Cambridge Street/Cavendish Street junction (via a gap in the guard railings) rather than following the road markings which advise cyclists to dismount and use the controlled pedestrian crossings"). The improvements might take the form of a CYCLOPS junction. CYCLOPS is a homegrown Greater Manchester innovation now frequently used on Highways schemes across the country to deliver safe pedestrian and cycle movements without undue impact on traffic flows.

For prospective occupants and passers-by alike, in line with the S106 tests as set out in Paragraph 58 of the National Planning Policy Framework (NPPF) 2024, a contribution to junction safety improvements improvement would be 'necessary to make the development acceptable in planning terms' (by contributing to an appropriate movement strategy for the site), 'directly related to the development' (given its proximity, the pressure added to the junction by the proposed threefold increase in residents, and in light of the wholly inadequate mitigation route proposed by the applicant), and 'fairly and reasonably related in scale and kind to the development' (given the stated threefold increase in residents explained by the applicant, so directly adding more pressure to the junction).

1 Legal Status of Cavendish Street

This section of Cavendish Street, an adopted Highway, was subject to a stopping up order dated 14.06.1996. That order required that "the Developer shall provide a new highway which shall be a footpath/cycleway". MMU have since installed physical signage stating that Cavendish Street "has not been dedicated as a Highway" and have bolted down uncomfortable and restrictive speed bumps across the route in an apparent attempt to dissuade cyclists from exercising their legal rights over this space. Both measures may be unlawful, as my understanding is that cyclists do retain a legal Right of Way along Cavendish Street, unchanged from when the entire road was an adopted highway, and the speed bumps are inaccessible to some Disabled users.

2 Cycling routes and planning policy

The case for walking and cycling and specifically for maintaining and improving high quality cycling networks is clear at every level of modern planning policy, including:

NPPF 2024's "vision-led approach"
LTN 1/20
Places For Everyone Joint Development Plan Objectives 6, 7 and 10
Places for Everyone Joint Development Plan policies JP-Strat14, JP-C1, JP-C5 and JP-C6
GM Transport Strategy 2040 and the "Right Mix" targets
Greater Manchester Streets for All strategy and Streets for All design guide
Manchester City Council's Active Travel Strategy

Manchester City Council's commitment to be a Zero Carbon city by 2038
The policy position is absolutely clear – changes to the existing road and cycle networks should make cycling more convenient for people, not less convenient.

This specific stretch of Cavendish Street is a key part of the existing cycle network. It appears on TfGM's Bee Network map as a Beeway ("the routes that get people from A to B … representing the most direct routes between crossing points.") and connects to the Stretford Road Busy Beeway ("corridors or crossing points on busier roads that will require a higher level of design intervention to improve cycling and walking.") It is also mapped on the TfGM Cycle Network.

The national standard for cycling infrastructure is DfT guidance note LTN 1/20. LTN 1/20 advises above all else that cycle routes and networks should be Safe, Direct, Comfortable, Attractive and Coherent. Introducing unnecessary diversions, junctions and bends into a well-used existing route undermines all of these core principles, resulting in a lower quality cycle network which will make it harder for the council to achieve its cycling objectives.

The applicant has offered various reasons why diverting cyclists is necessary but all of these reasons seem to be either existing problems, or problems designed into the scheme. The proposal is to demolish and redevelop the site – so considerations like limited space and the placement of entrances, shop frontages, planting and pedestrian areas are entirely within the applicant's scope to manage. Instead of starting with the problem "there is an existing busy cycle route across this site, how can I design to accommodate everyone's needs?", it seems the applicant has started with the conclusion "cyclists must be deterred" and instructed their consultants to post-rationalise that decision.

3 Misleading claims regarding safety

Page 22 of the Design & Access Statement refers to the "existing controversial link along Cavendish St., which is resulting in collisions of pedestrians, electric scooters, cyclists, etc."

However the map of recorded collisions, on page 18 of the Transport Statement submitted in the same planning application, shows no recorded collisions whatsoever on this link, only on the adjacent main roads.

It appears the applicant is attempting to restrict cycle access based on a "problem" for which they have no evidence.

Yours sincerely,

[redacted]

[redacted]

****
This email and any files transmitted with it are confidential and intended solely for the use of the individual or entity to whom they are addressed.
If you have received this email in error, please notify the sender, or [redacted] and then permanently delete the email, attachments and all copies.
The full text of the Council's email disclaimer is available at: www.manchester.gov.uk/emaildisclaimer.
Your personal data is very important to us. Please refer to our privacy notice at: www.manchester.gov.uk/privacy for further information.

This footnote also confirms that this email message has been swept for the presence of computer viruses.
****

Outlook

Fw: Planning objection

From Planning <[redacted]>
Date Wed 09/07/2025 09:24
To Lucy Harrison <[redacted]>

Information, Delivery & Support Team
Planning, Building Control & Licensing
Growth & Development Directorate
Postal address: Manchester City Council, P O Box 532, Town Hall, Manchester M60 2LA
Location address: Level 6 Town Hall Extension, Manchester M2 5DB
Tel: 0161 234 4516

Please consider the environment before printing an e-mail.

From: [redacted]
Sent: 08 July 2025 19:44
To: Planning <[redacted]>
Subject: Planning objection

You don't often get email from [redacted] Learn why this is important

ALERT This message originated outside of the Manchester City Council network. **BE CAUTIOUS** before clicking any links or opening any attachments. Please remember your Cyber Training and report anything suspicious.

Dear Manchester Planning team,

I am writing to lodge an objection to planning application 142888/FO/2025 – Cambridge Halls Of Residence Cavendish Street Manchester M15 6TT.

My primary objection is that the proposals have been designed to deter cyclists from using the safest and most direct route through the site. This route has been open to cyclists ever since the road was first built; it is an essential, well-used part of the city's cycling network and therefore the proposal to deter and/or divert cycles away from Cavendish Street is directly at odds with Manchester City Council's planning, sustainability and transport policies.

The applicant has also made misleading claims regarding the road's legal status and regarding pedestrian safety which I will outline below.

I am asking that the council refuse this application, and invite the developer to come back with a proposal that maintains direct cycle as well as pedestrian access along Cavendish Street, designed to modern standards set out in Greater Manchester's Streets For All design guide and in Department for Transport guidance note LTN 1/20. I am sure that the Highways team at MCC and the Active Travel team at TfGM will, if asked, be happy to comment on how such a route could be provided within the space available.

I am also asking that the council make a Section 106 agreement (s106) with the applicant to fund safety improvements for pedestrians and cyclists at the junction of Cavendish Street and Higher Cambridge Street – the applicant themselves discuss the shortcomings of the existing junction layout in Section 4.2.1 of the Transport Statement ("Cyclists have also been observed to queue on the footway to gain direct access to the Higher Cambridge Street/Cavendish Street junction (via a gap in the guard railings) rather than following the road markings which advise cyclists to dismount and use the controlled pedestrian crossings"). The improvements might take the form of a CYCLOPS junction. CYCLOPS is a homegrown Greater Manchester innovation now frequently used on Highways schemes across the country to deliver safe pedestrian and cycle movements without undue impact on traffic flows.

For prospective occupants and passers-by alike, in line with the S106 tests as set out in Paragraph 58 of the National Planning Policy Framework (NPPF) 2024, a contribution to junction safety improvements improvement would be 'necessary to make the development acceptable in planning terms' (by contributing to an appropriate movement strategy for the site), 'directly related to the development' (given its proximity, the pressure added to the junction by the proposed threefold increase in residents, and in light of the wholly inadequate mitigation route proposed by the applicant), and 'fairly and reasonably related in scale and kind to the development' (given the stated threefold increase in residents explained by the applicant, so directly adding more pressure to the junction).

1 Legal Status of Cavendish Street

This section of Cavendish Street, an adopted Highway, was subject to a stopping up order dated 14.06.1996. That order required that "the Developer shall provide a new highway which shall be a footpath/cycleway". MMU have since installed physical signage stating that Cavendish Street "has not been dedicated as a Highway" and have bolted down uncomfortable and restrictive speed bumps across the route in an apparent attempt to dissuade cyclists from exercising their legal rights over this space. Both measures may be unlawful, as my understanding is that cyclists do retain a legal Right of Way along Cavendish Street, unchanged from when the entire road was an adopted highway, and the speed bumps are inaccessible to some Disabled users.

2 Cycling routes and planning policy

The case for walking and cycling and specifically for maintaining and improving high quality cycling networks is clear at every level of modern planning policy, including:

NPPF 2024's "vision-led approach"
LTN 1/20
Places For Everyone Joint Development Plan Objectives 6, 7 and 10
Places for Everyone Joint Development Plan policies JP-Strat14, JP-C1, JP-C5 and JP-C6
GM Transport Strategy 2040 and the "Right Mix" targets
Greater Manchester Streets for All strategy and Streets for All design guide
Manchester City Council's Active Travel Strategy
Manchester City Council's commitment to be a Zero Carbon city by 2038
The policy position is absolutely clear – changes to the existing road and cycle networks should make cycling more convenient for people, not less convenient.

This specific stretch of Cavendish Street is a key part of the existing cycle network. It appears on TfGM's Bee Network map as a Beeway ("the routes that get people from A to B … representing the most direct routes between crossing points.") and connects to the Stretford Road Busy Beeway

("corridors or crossing points on busier roads that will require a higher level of design intervention to improve cycling and walking.") It is also mapped on the TfGM Cycle Network.

The national standard for cycling infrastructure is DfT guidance note LTN 1/20. LTN 1/20 advises above all else that cycle routes and networks should be Safe, Direct, Comfortable, Attractive and Coherent. Introducing unnecessary diversions, junctions and bends into a well-used existing route undermines all of these core principles, resulting in a lower quality cycle network which will make it harder for the council to achieve its cycling objectives.

The applicant has offered various reasons why diverting cyclists is necessary but all of these reasons seem to be either existing problems, or problems designed into the scheme. The proposal is to demolish and redevelop the site – so considerations like limited space and the placement of entrances, shop frontages, planting and pedestrian areas are entirely within the applicant's scope to manage. Instead of starting with the problem "there is an existing busy cycle route across this site, how can I design to accommodate everyone's needs?", it seems the applicant has started with the conclusion "cyclists must be deterred" and instructed their consultants to post-rationalise that decision.

3 Misleading claims regarding safety

Page 22 of the Design & Access Statement refers to the "existing controversial link along Cavendish St., which is resulting in collisions of pedestrians, electric scooters, cyclists, etc."

However the map of recorded collisions, on page 18 of the Transport Statement submitted in the same planning application, shows no recorded collisions whatsoever on this link, only on the adjacent main roads.

It appears the applicant is attempting to restrict cycle access based on a "problem" for which they have no evidence.

Yours sincerely,

[redacted]

****
This email and any files transmitted with it are confidential and intended solely for the use of the individual or entity to whom they are addressed.
If you have received this email in error, please notify the sender, or [redacted] and then permanently delete the email, attachments and all copies.
The full text of the Council's email disclaimer is available at: www.manchester.gov.uk/emaildisclaimer.
Your personal data is very important to us. Please refer to our privacy notice at: www.manchester.gov.uk/privacy for further information.

This footnote also confirms that this email message has been swept for the presence of computer viruses.
****

Outlook

Fw: Comment on Planning Application 142888/FO/2025

From Planning <[redacted]
Date Mon 14/07/2025 14:07
To Lucy Harrison <[redacted]

Information, Delivery & Support Team
Planning, Building Control & Licensing
Growth & Development Directorate
Postal address: Manchester City Council, P O Box 532, Town Hall, Manchester M60 2LA
Location address: Level 6 Town Hall Extension, Manchester M2 5DB
Tel: 0161 234 4516

Please consider the environment before printing an e-mail.

From: [redacted]
Sent: 11 July 2025 09:49
To: Planning <[redacted]
Subject: Comment on Planning Application 142888/FO/2025

You don't often get email from [redacted] Learn why this is important

ALERT This message originated outside of the Manchester City Council network. **BE CAUTIOUS** before clicking any links or opening any attachments. Please remember your Cyber Training and report anything suspicious.

Dear Manchester City Council Planning team,

I am writing to object to planning application **142888/FO/2025** – Cambridge Halls Of Residence Cavendish Street Manchester M15 6TT.

My primary objection is that the proposals have been designed to prevent cyclists from being able to use the most direct route through the site along Cavendish Street. This route has been open to cyclists ever since the road was first built; it is an essential, well-used part of the city's cycling network and therefore the proposal is directly at odds with Manchester City Council's planning, sustainability and transport policies.

I have personally used the route at times, because it is the most direct route across the south side of the city centre, in an area where there is little other safe east/west provision for cyclists. It is part of a direct route connecting from the A6 all the way through to Trafford.

I am asking that the council **refuse** this application, and invite the developer to come back with a proposal that maintains direct cycle as well as pedestrian access along Cavendish Street, designed to modern standards set out in Greater Manchester's Streets For All design guide and in Department for Transport guidance note LTN 1/20. I am sure that the Highways team at MCC and the Active Travel team at TfGM will, if asked, be happy to comment on how such a route could be provided within the space available.

Yours sincerely,

[redacted]

[redacted]

****
This email and any files transmitted with it are confidential and intended solely for the use of the individual or entity to whom they are addressed.
If you have received this email in error, please notify the sender, or [redacted] and then permanently delete the email, attachments and all copies.
The full text of the Council's email disclaimer is available at: www.manchester.gov.uk/emaildisclaimer.
Your personal data is very important to us. Please refer to our privacy notice at: www.manchester.gov.uk/privacy for further information.

This footnote also confirms that this email message has been swept for the presence of computer viruses.
****

Outlook

Fw: Comment on Planning Application 142888/FO/2025

From Planning <[redacted]
Date Mon 30/06/2025 08:47
To Lucy Harrison <[redacted]

Information, Delivery & Support Team
Planning, Building Control & Licensing
Growth & Development Directorate
Postal address: Manchester City Council, P O Box 532, Town Hall, Manchester M60 2LA
Location address: Level 6 Town Hall Extension, Manchester M2 5DB
Tel: 0161 234 4516

Please consider the environment before printing an e-mail.

From: [redacted]
Sent: 29 June 2025 12:19
To: Planning <[redacted]
Subject: Comment on Planning Application 142888/FO/2025

You don't often get email from [redacted] Learn why this is important

ALERT This message originated outside of the Manchester City Council network. **BE CAUTIOUS** before clicking any links or opening any attachments. Please remember your Cyber Training and report anything suspicious.

Dear Manchester Planning team,

I am writing to lodge an objection to planning application **142888/FO/2025** – Cambridge Halls Of Residence Cavendish Street Manchester M15 6TT.

My primary objection is that the proposals have been designed to deter cyclists from using the safest and most direct route through the site. This route has been open to cyclists ever since the road was first built; it is an essential, well-used part of the city's cycling network and therefore the proposal to deter and/or divert cycles away from Cavendish Street is directly at odds with Manchester City Council's planning, sustainability and transport policies.

The applicant has also made misleading claims regarding the road's legal status and regarding pedestrian safety which I will outline below.

I am asking that the council **refuse** this application, and invite the developer to come back with a proposal that maintains direct cycle as well as pedestrian access along Cavendish Street, designed to modern standards set out in Greater Manchester's Streets For All design guide and in Department for Transport guidance note LTN 1/20. I am sure that the Highways team at MCC and the Active Travel team at TfGM will, if asked, be happy to comment on how such a route could be provided within the space available.

I am also asking that the council **make a Section 106 agreement (s106)** with the applicant to fund safety improvements for pedestrians and cyclists at the junction of Cavendish Street and Higher Cambridge Street – the applicant themselves discuss the shortcomings of the existing junction layout in Section 4.2.1 of the Transport Statement ("*Cyclists have also been observed to queue on the footway to gain direct access to the Higher Cambridge Street/Cavendish Street junction (via a gap in the guard railings) rather than following the road markings which advise cyclists to dismount and use the controlled pedestrian crossings*"). The improvements might take the form of a CYCLOPS junction. CYCLOPS is a homegrown Greater Manchester innovation now frequently used on Highways schemes across the country to deliver safe pedestrian and cycle movements without undue impact on traffic flows.

For prospective occupants and passers-by alike, in line with the S106 tests as set out in Paragraph 58 of the National Planning Policy Framework (NPPF) 2024, a contribution to junction safety improvements improvement would be 'necessary to make the development acceptable in planning terms' (by contributing to an appropriate movement strategy for the site), 'directly related to the development' (given its proximity, the pressure added to the junction by the proposed threefold increase in residents, and in light of the wholly inadequate mitigation route proposed by the applicant), and 'fairly and reasonably related in scale and kind to the development' (given the stated threefold increase in residents explained by the applicant, so directly adding more pressure to the junction).

1 Legal Status of Cavendish Street

This section of Cavendish Street, an adopted Highway, was subject to a stopping up order dated 14.06.1996. That order required that "the Developer shall provide a new highway which shall be a footpath/cycleway". MMU have since installed physical signage stating that Cavendish Street "has not been dedicated as a Highway" and have bolted down uncomfortable and restrictive speed bumps across the route in an apparent attempt to dissuade cyclists from exercising their legal rights over this space. Both measures may be unlawful, as my understanding is that cyclists do retain a legal Right of Way along Cavendish

Street, unchanged from when the entire road was an adopted highway, and the speed bumps are inaccessible to some Disabled users.

2 Cycling routes and planning policy

The case for walking and cycling and specifically for maintaining and improving high quality cycling networks is clear at every level of modern planning policy, including:

- NPPF 2024's "vision-led approach"
- LTN 1/20
- Places For Everyone Joint Development Plan Objectives 6, 7 and 10
- Places for Everyone Joint Development Plan policies JP-Strat14, JP-C1, JP-C5 and JP-C6
- GM Transport Strategy 2040 and the "Right Mix" targets
- Greater Manchester Streets for All strategy and Streets for All design guide
- Manchester City Council's Active Travel Strategy
- Manchester City Council's commitment to be a Zero Carbon city by 2038

The policy position is absolutely clear – changes to the existing road and cycle networks should make cycling more convenient for people, not less convenient.

This specific stretch of Cavendish Street is a key part of the existing cycle network. It appears on TfGM's Bee Network map as a Beeway ("the routes that get people from A to B … representing the most direct routes between crossing points.") and connects to the Stretford Road Busy Beeway ("corridors or crossing points on busier roads that will require a higher level of design intervention to improve cycling and walking.") It is also mapped on the TfGM Cycle Network.

The national standard for cycling infrastructure is DfT guidance note LTN 1/20. LTN 1/20 advises above all else that cycle routes and networks should be Safe, Direct, Comfortable, Attractive and Coherent. Introducing unnecessary diversions, junctions and bends into a well-used existing route undermines all of these core principles, resulting in a lower quality cycle network which will make it harder for the council to achieve its cycling objectives.

The applicant has offered various reasons why diverting cyclists is necessary but all of these reasons seem to be either existing problems, or problems designed into the scheme. The proposal is to demolish and redevelop the site – so considerations like limited space and the placement of entrances, shop frontages,

planting and pedestrian areas are entirely within the applicant's scope to manage. Instead of starting with the problem "there is an existing busy cycle route across this site, how can I design to accommodate everyone's needs?", it seems the applicant has started with the conclusion "cyclists must be deterred" and instructed their consultants to post-rationalise that decision.

3 Misleading claims regarding safety

Page 22 of the Design & Access Statement refers to the "existing controversial link along Cavendish St., which is resulting in collisions of pedestrians, electric scooters, cyclists, etc."

However the map of recorded collisions, on page 18 of the Transport Statement submitted in the same planning application, shows no recorded collisions whatsoever on this link, only on the adjacent main roads.

It appears the applicant is attempting to restrict cycle access based on a "problem" for which they have no evidence.

Yours sincerely,

[redacted]

****
This email and any files transmitted with it are confidential and intended solely for the use of the individual or entity to whom they are addressed.
If you have received this email in error, please notify the sender, or [redacted] and then permanently delete the email, attachments and all copies.
The full text of the Council's email disclaimer is available at: www.manchester.gov.uk/emaildisclaimer.
Your personal data is very important to us. Please refer to our privacy notice at: www.manchester.gov.uk/privacy for further information.

This footnote also confirms that this email message has been swept for the presence of computer viruses.
****

Outlook

Fw: Comment on Planning Application 142888/FO/2025

From Planning <[redacted]>
Date Mon 14/07/2025 14:05
To Lucy Harrison <[redacted]>

Information, Delivery & Support Team
Planning, Building Control & Licensing
Growth & Development Directorate
Postal address: Manchester City Council, P O Box 532, Town Hall, Manchester M60 2LA
Location address: Level 6 Town Hall Extension, Manchester M2 5DB
Tel: 0161 234 4516

Please consider the environment before printing an e-mail.

From: [redacted]
Sent: 11 July 2025 20:56
To: Planning <[redacted]>
Subject: Comment on Planning Application 142888/FO/2025

You don't often get email from [redacted] Learn why this is important

ALERT This message originated outside of the Manchester City Council network. **BE CAUTIOUS** before clicking any links or opening any attachments. Please remember your Cyber Training and report anything suspicious.

Skip to the content

Walk Ride GM

Subject: Comment on Planning Application 142888/FO/2025

Dear Manchester Planning team,

I am writing to lodge an objection to planning application **142888/FO/2025** – Cambridge Halls Of Residence Cavendish Street Manchester M15 6TT.

My primary objection is that the proposals have been designed to deter cyclists from using the safest and most direct route through the site. This route has been open to cyclists ever since the road was first built; it is an essential, well-used part of the city's cycling network and therefore the proposal to deter and/or divert cycles away from Cavendish Street is directly at odds with Manchester City Council's planning, sustainability and transport policies.

[INSERT HERE OR DELETE THIS SECTION describe your own experience of using Cavendish Street, as a pedestrian, cyclist or other road user. Do you live or work nearby or use the route regularly? What difference has this active travel route made to your life? How would you be impacted if it were removed?]

The applicant has also made misleading claims regarding the road's legal status and regarding pedestrian safety which I will outline below.

I am asking that the council **refuse** this application, and invite the developer to come back with a proposal that maintains direct cycle as well as pedestrian access along Cavendish Street, designed to modern standards set out in Greater Manchester's Streets For All design guide and in Department for Transport guidance note LTN 1/20. I am sure that the Highways team at MCC and the Active Travel team at TfGM will, if asked, be happy to comment on how such a route could be provided within the space available.

I am also asking that the council **make a Section 106 agreement (s106)** with the applicant to fund safety improvements for pedestrians and cyclists at the junction of Cavendish Street and Higher Cambridge Street – the applicant themselves discuss the shortcomings of the existing junction layout in Section 4.2.1 of the Transport Statement ("*Cyclists have also been observed to queue on the footway to gain direct access to the Higher Cambridge Street/Cavendish Street junction (via a gap in the guard railings) rather than following the road markings which advise cyclists to dismount and use the controlled pedestrian crossings*"). The improvements might take the form of a CYCLOPS junction. CYCLOPS is a homegrown Greater

Manchester innovation now frequently used on Highways schemes across the country to deliver safe pedestrian and cycle movements without undue impact on traffic flows.

For prospective occupants and passers-by alike, in line with the S106 tests as set out in Paragraph 58 of the National Planning Policy Framework (NPPF) 2024, a contribution to junction safety improvements improvement would be 'necessary to make the development acceptable in planning terms' (by contributing to an appropriate movement strategy for the site), 'directly related to the development' (given its proximity, the pressure added to the junction by the proposed threefold increase in residents, and in light of the wholly inadequate mitigation route proposed by the applicant), and 'fairly and reasonably related in scale and kind to the development' (given the stated threefold increase in residents explained by the applicant, so directly adding more pressure to the junction).

1 Legal Status of Cavendish Street

This section of Cavendish Street, an adopted Highway, was subject to a stopping up order dated 14.06.1996. That order required that "the Developer shall provide a new highway which shall be a footpath/cycleway". MMU have since installed physical signage stating that Cavendish Street "has not been dedicated as a Highway" and have bolted down uncomfortable and restrictive speed bumps across the route in an apparent attempt to dissuade cyclists from exercising their legal rights over this space. Both measures may be unlawful, as my understanding is that cyclists do retain a legal Right of Way along Cavendish Street, unchanged from when the entire road was an adopted highway, and the speed bumps are inaccessible to some Disabled users.

2 Cycling routes and planning policy

The case for walking and cycling and specifically for maintaining and improving high quality cycling networks is clear at every level of modern planning policy, including:

- NPPF 2024's "vision-led approach"
- LTN 1/20
- Places For Everyone Joint Development Plan Objectives 6, 7 and 10
- Places for Everyone Joint Development Plan policies JP-Strat14, JP-C1, JP-C5 and JP-C6
- GM Transport Strategy 2040 and the "Right Mix" targets
- Greater Manchester Streets for All strategy and Streets for All design guide
- Manchester City Council's Active Travel Strategy
- Manchester City Council's commitment to be a Zero Carbon city by 2038

The policy position is absolutely clear – changes to the existing road and cycle networks should make cycling more convenient for people, not less convenient.

This specific stretch of Cavendish Street is a key part of the existing cycle network. It appears on TfGM's Bee Network map as a Beeway ("the routes that get people from A to B … representing the most direct routes between crossing points.") and connects to the Stretford Road Busy Beeway ("corridors or crossing points on busier roads that will require a higher level of design intervention to improve cycling and walking.") It is also mapped on the TfGM Cycle Network.

The national standard for cycling infrastructure is DfT guidance note LTN 1/20. LTN 1/20 advises above all else that cycle routes and networks should be Safe, Direct, Comfortable, Attractive and Coherent. Introducing unnecessary diversions, junctions and bends into a well-used existing route undermines all of these core principles, resulting in a lower quality cycle network which will make it harder for the council to achieve its cycling objectives.

The applicant has offered various reasons why diverting cyclists is necessary but all of these reasons seem to be either existing problems, or problems designed into the scheme. The proposal is to demolish and redevelop the site – so considerations like limited space and the placement of entrances, shop frontages, planting and pedestrian areas are entirely within the applicant's scope to manage. Instead of starting with the problem "there is an existing busy cycle route across this site, how can I design to accommodate everyone's needs?", it seems the applicant has started with the conclusion "cyclists must be deterred" and instructed their consultants to post-rationalise that decision.

3 Misleading claims regarding safety

Page 22 of the Design & Access Statement refers to the "existing controversial link along Cavendish St., which is resulting in collisions of pedestrians, electric scooters, cyclists, etc."

However the map of recorded collisions, on page 18 of the Transport Statement submitted in the same planning application, shows no recorded collisions whatsoever on this link, only on the adjacent main roads.

It appears the applicant is attempting to restrict cycle access based on a “problem” for which they have no evidence.

Yours sincerely,

[redacted]

Plain Text Version:

The applicant has also made misleading claims regarding the road’s legal status and regarding pedestrian safety which I will outline below.

I am asking that the council refuse this application, and invite the developer to come back with a proposal that maintains direct cycle as well as pedestrian access along Cavendish Street, designed to modern standards set out in Greater Manchester’s Streets For All design guide and in Department for Transport guidance note LTN 1/20. I am sure that the Highways team at MCC and the Active Travel team at TfGM will, if asked, be happy to comment on how such a route could be provided within the space available.

I am also asking that the council make a Section 106 agreement (s106) with the applicant to fund safety improvements for pedestrians and cyclists at the junction of Cavendish Street and Higher Cambridge Street – the applicant themselves discuss the shortcomings of the existing junction layout in Section 4.2.1 of the Transport Statement (“Cyclists have also been observed to queue on the footway to gain direct access to the Higher Cambridge Street/Cavendish Street junction (via a gap in the guard railings) rather than following the road markings which advise cyclists to dismount and use the controlled pedestrian crossings”). The improvements might take the form of a CYCLOPS junction. CYCLOPS is a homegrown Greater Manchester innovation now frequently used on Highways schemes across the country to deliver safe pedestrian and cycle movements without undue impact on traffic flows.

For prospective occupants and passers-by alike, in line with the S106 tests as set out in Paragraph 58 of the National Planning Policy Framework (NPPF) 2024, a contribution to junction safety improvements improvement would be ‘necessary to make the development acceptable in planning terms’ (by contributing to an appropriate movement strategy for the site), ‘directly related to the development’ (given its proximity, the pressure added to the junction by the proposed threefold increase in residents, and in light of the wholly inadequate mitigation route proposed by the applicant), and ‘fairly and reasonably related in scale and kind to the development’ (given the stated threefold increase in residents explained by the applicant, so directly adding more pressure to the junction).

1 Legal Status of Cavendish Street

This section of Cavendish Street, an adopted Highway, was subject to a stopping up order dated 14.06.1996. That order required that “the Developer shall provide a new highway which shall be a footpath/cycleway”. MMU have since installed physical signage stating that Cavendish Street “has not been dedicated as a Highway” and have bolted down uncomfortable and restrictive speed bumps across the route in an apparent attempt to dissuade cyclists from exercising their legal rights over this space. Both measures may be unlawful, as my understanding is that cyclists do retain a legal Right of Way along Cavendish Street, unchanged from when the entire road was an adopted highway, and the speed bumps are inaccessible to some Disabled users.

2 Cycling routes and planning policy

The case for walking and cycling and specifically for maintaining and improving high quality cycling networks is clear at every level of modern planning policy, including:

NPPF 2024’s “vision-led approach”
LTN 1/20

Places For Everyone Joint Development Plan Objectives 6, 7 and 10
Places for Everyone Joint Development Plan policies JP-Strat14, JP-C1, JP-C5 and JP-C6
GM Transport Strategy 2040 and the “Right Mix” targets
Greater Manchester Streets for All strategy and Streets for All design guide
Manchester City Council’s Active Travel Strategy
Manchester City Council’s commitment to be a Zero Carbon city by 2038
The policy position is absolutely clear – changes to the existing road and cycle networks should make cycling more convenient for people, not less convenient.

This specific stretch of Cavendish Street is a key part of the existing cycle network. It appears on TfGM’s Bee Network map as a Beeway (“the routes that get people from A to B … representing the most direct routes between crossing points.”) and connects to the Stretford Road Busy Beeway (“corridors or crossing points on busier roads that will require a higher level of design intervention to improve cycling and walking.”) It is also mapped on the TfGM Cycle Network.

The national standard for cycling infrastructure is DfT guidance note LTN 1/20. LTN 1/20 advises above all else that cycle routes and networks should be Safe, Direct, Comfortable, Attractive and Coherent. Introducing unnecessary diversions, junctions and bends into a well-used existing route undermines all of these core principles, resulting in a lower quality cycle network which will make it harder for the council to achieve its cycling objectives.

The applicant has offered various reasons why diverting cyclists is necessary but all of these reasons seem to be either existing problems, or problems designed into the scheme. The proposal is to demolish and redevelop the site – so considerations like limited space and the placement of entrances, shop frontages, planting and pedestrian areas are entirely within the applicant’s scope to manage. Instead of starting with the problem “there is an existing busy cycle route across this site, how can I design to accommodate everyone’s needs?”, it seems the applicant has started with the conclusion “cyclists must be deterred” and instructed their consultants to post-rationalise that decision.

3 Misleading claims regarding safety

Page 22 of the Design & Access Statement refers to the “existing controversial link along Cavendish St., which is resulting in collisions of pedestrians, electric scooters, cyclists, etc.”

However the map of recorded collisions, on page 18 of the Transport Statement submitted in the same planning application, shows no recorded collisions whatsoever on this link, only on the adjacent main roads.

It appears the applicant is attempting to restrict cycle access based on a “problem” for which they have no evidence.

Yours sincerely,

NAME
ADDRESS
POSTCODE

Stay up to date by joining our Discord server, signing up to our newsletter and following us on social media.

Find us on Facebook
Follow us on X/Twitter
Follow us on LinkedIn
Walk Ride GM on YouTube
Spotify

For general enquiries and press queries, please email [redacted]

Walk Ride GM is a CIC (Community Interest Company) number 12192799

Registered office: [redacted]

© 2025 Walk Ride GM

Privacy Policy

Up ↑

****
This email and any files transmitted with it are confidential and intended solely for the use of the individual or entity to whom they are addressed.
If you have received this email in error, please notify the sender, or [redacted] and then permanently delete the email, attachments and all copies.
The full text of the Council's email disclaimer is available at: www.manchester.gov.uk/emaildisclaimer.
Your personal data is very important to us. Please refer to our privacy notice at: www.manchester.gov.uk/privacy for further information.

This footnote also confirms that this email message has been swept for the presence of computer viruses.
****

Outlook

Fw: Comment on Planning Application 142888/FO/2025

From Planning <[redacted]
Date Mon 30/06/2025 08:51
To Lucy Harrison <[redacted]

Information, Delivery & Support Team
Planning, Building Control & Licensing
Growth & Development Directorate
Postal address: Manchester City Council, P O Box 532, Town Hall, Manchester M60 2LA
Location address: Level 6 Town Hall Extension, Manchester M2 5DB
Tel: 0161 234 4516

Please consider the environment before printing an e-mail.

From: [redacted]
Sent: 28 June 2025 15:00
To: Planning <[redacted]
Subject: Comment on Planning Application 142888/FO/2025

You don't often get email from [redacted] Learn why this is important

ALERT This message originated outside of the Manchester City Council network. **BE CAUTIOUS** before clicking any links or opening any attachments. Please remember your Cyber Training and report anything suspicious.

Dear Manchester Planning team,

I am writing to lodge an objection to planning application **142888/FO/2025**– Cambridge Halls Of Residence Cavendish Street Manchester M15 6TT.

My primary objection is that the proposals have been designed to deter cyclists from using the safest and most direct route through the site. This route has been open to cyclists ever since the road was first built; it is an essential, well-used part of the city's cycling network and therefore the proposal to deter and/or divert cycles away from Cavendish Street is directly at odds with Manchester City Council's planning, sustainability and transport policies.

The applicant has also made misleading claims regarding the road's legal status and regarding pedestrian safety which I will outline below.

I am asking that the council **refuse** this application, and invite the developer to come back with a proposal that maintains direct cycle as well as pedestrian access along Cavendish Street, designed to modern standards set out in Greater Manchester's Streets For All design guide and in Department for Transport guidance note LTN 1/20. I am sure that the Highways team at MCC and the Active Travel team at TfGM will, if asked, be happy to comment on how such a route could be provided within the space available.

I am also asking that the council **make a Section 106 agreement (s106)** with the applicant to fund safety improvements for pedestrians and cyclists at the junction of Cavendish Street and Higher Cambridge Street – the applicant themselves discuss the shortcomings of the existing junction layout in Section 4.2.1 of the Transport Statement ("*Cyclists have also been observed to queue on the footway to gain direct access to the Higher Cambridge Street/Cavendish Street junction (via a gap in the guard railings) rather than following the road markings which advise cyclists to dismount and use the controlled pedestrian crossings*"). The improvements might take the form of a CYCLOPS junction. CYCLOPS is a homegrown Greater Manchester innovation now frequently used on Highways schemes across the country to deliver safe pedestrian and cycle movements without undue impact on traffic flows.

For prospective occupants and passers-by alike, in line with the S106 tests as set out in Paragraph 58 of the National Planning Policy Framework (NPPF) 2024, a contribution to junction safety improvements improvement would be 'necessary to make the development acceptable in planning terms' (by contributing to an appropriate movement strategy for the site), 'directly related to the development' (given its proximity, the pressure added to the junction by the proposed threefold increase in residents, and in light of the wholly inadequate mitigation route proposed by the applicant), and 'fairly and reasonably related in scale and kind to the development' (given the stated threefold increase in residents explained by the applicant, so directly adding more pressure to the junction).

1 Legal Status of Cavendish Street

This section of Cavendish Street, an adopted Highway, was subject to a stopping up order dated 14.06.1996. That order required that "the Developer shall provide a new highway which shall be a footpath/cycleway". MMU have since installed physical signage stating that Cavendish Street "has not been dedicated as a Highway" and have bolted down uncomfortable and restrictive speed bumps across the route in an apparent attempt to dissuade cyclists from exercising their legal rights over this space. Both measures may be unlawful, as my understanding is that cyclists do retain a legal Right of Way along Cavendish

Street, unchanged from when the entire road was an adopted highway, and the speed bumps are inaccessible to some Disabled users.

2 Cycling routes and planning policy

The case for walking and cycling and specifically for maintaining and improving high quality cycling networks is clear at every level of modern planning policy, including:

- NPPF 2024's "vision-led approach"
- LTN 1/20
- Places For Everyone Joint Development Plan Objectives 6, 7 and 10
- Places for Everyone Joint Development Plan policies JP-Strat14, JP-C1, JP-C5 and JP-C6
- GM Transport Strategy 2040 and the "Right Mix" targets
- Greater Manchester Streets for All strategy and Streets for All design guide
- Manchester City Council's Active Travel Strategy
- Manchester City Council's commitment to be a Zero Carbon city by 2038

The policy position is absolutely clear – changes to the existing road and cycle networks should make cycling more convenient for people, not less convenient.

This specific stretch of Cavendish Street is a key part of the existing cycle network. It appears on TfGM's Bee Network map as a Beeway ("the routes that get people from A to B … representing the most direct routes between crossing points.") and connects to the Stretford Road Busy Beeway ("corridors or crossing points on busier roads that will require a higher level of design intervention to improve cycling and walking.") It is also mapped on the TfGM Cycle Network.

The national standard for cycling infrastructure is DfT guidance note LTN 1/20. LTN 1/20 advises above all else that cycle routes and networks should be Safe, Direct, Comfortable, Attractive and Coherent. Introducing unnecessary diversions, junctions and bends into a well-used existing route undermines all of these core principles, resulting in a lower quality cycle network which will make it harder for the council to achieve its cycling objectives.

The applicant has offered various reasons why diverting cyclists is necessary but all of these reasons seem to be either existing problems, or problems designed into the scheme. The proposal is to demolish and redevelop the site – so considerations like limited space and the placement of entrances, shop frontages, planting and pedestrian areas are entirely within the applicant's scope to manage. Instead of starting with the problem "there is an existing busy cycle route across this site, how can I design to accommodate everyone's needs?", it seems the

applicant has started with the conclusion “cyclists must be deterred” and instructed their consultants to post-rationalise that decision.

3 Misleading claims regarding safety
Page 22 of the Design & Access Statement refers to the “existing controversial link along Cavendish St., which is resulting in collisions of pedestrians, electric scooters, cyclists, etc.”

However the map of recorded collisions, on page 18 of the Transport Statement submitted in the same planning application, shows no recorded collisions whatsoever on this link, only on the adjacent main roads.

It appears the applicant is attempting to restrict cycle access based on a “problem” for which they have no evidence.

Yours sincerely,

[redacted]

****
This email and any files transmitted with it are confidential and intended solely for the use of the individual or entity to whom they are addressed.
If you have received this email in error, please notify the sender, or [redacted] and then permanently delete the email, attachments and all copies.
The full text of the Council's email disclaimer is available at: www.manchester.gov.uk/emaildisclaimer.
Your personal data is very important to us. Please refer to our privacy notice at: www.manchester.gov.uk/privacy for further information.

This footnote also confirms that this email message has been swept for the presence of computer viruses.
****

Outlook

Fw: Planning Applic'n 142888/FO/2025 MMU Cambridge halls cycle route - objection

From Planning <[redacted]>
Date Mon 14/07/2025 14:06
To Lucy Harrison <[redacted]>

Information, Delivery & Support Team
Planning, Building Control & Licensing
Growth & Development Directorate
Postal address: Manchester City Council, P O Box 532, Town Hall, Manchester M60 2LA
Location address: Level 6 Town Hall Extension, Manchester M2 5DB
Tel: 0161 234 4516

Please consider the environment before printing an e-mail.

From: [redacted]
Sent: 11 July 2025 12:02
To: Planning <[redacted]>
Cc: [redacted]
Subject: Planning Applic'n 142888/FO/2025 MMU Cambridge halls cycle route - objection

You don't often get email from [redacted] Learn why this is important

ALERT This message originated outside of the Manchester City Council network. **BE CAUTIOUS** before clicking any links or opening any attachments. Please remember your Cyber Training and report anything suspicious.

Please accept this as an objection to the above application from MMU for removing the cycle route through Cambridge Halls Of Residence Cavendish Street Manchester M15 6TT.

I am a regular user of the route and find it a safe and pleasant route to avoid the crammed, busy alternative routes. As a woman I find it safe at times I wouldn't use other traffic free routes. It is my regular route from home (Chorlton) to Piccadilly station. Alternatives feel uncomfortable given the weight and speed of other traffic.

I've been really impressed by Manchester's attempts to get more cycling, it has encouraged me to get out of my car and onto the bike and public transport. To remove this route is a backward step.
The junction from Cavendish street is clumsy, surely this is an ideal opportunity to improve the access not to deny it. The work in other parts of the city centre have shown how the design really helps clear traffic to make it more pleasant for those living nearby. Surely the University is a prime focus for this as most students do not use cars.

Thank you for your time.

[redacted]

[redacted]

****

This email and any files transmitted with it are confidential and intended solely for the use of the individual or entity to whom they are addressed.
If you have received this email in error, please notify the sender, or [redacted] and then permanently delete the email, attachments and all copies.
The full text of the Council's email disclaimer is available at: www.manchester.gov.uk/emaildisclaimer.
Your personal data is very important to us. Please refer to our privacy notice at: www.manchester.gov.uk/privacy for further information.

This footnote also confirms that this email message has been swept for the presence of computer viruses.

****

Outlook

Fw: Subject: Comment on Planning Application 142888/FO/2025

From Planning <[redacted]
Date Wed 02/07/2025 08:51
To Lucy Harrison <[redacted]

Information, Delivery & Support Team
Planning, Building Control & Licensing
Growth & Development Directorate
Postal address: Manchester City Council, P O Box 532, Town Hall, Manchester M60 2LA
Location address: Level 6 Town Hall Extension, Manchester M2 5DB
Tel: 0161 234 4516

Please consider the environment before printing an e-mail.

From: [redacted]
Sent: 01 July 2025 19:57
To: Planning <[redacted]
Subject: Subject: Comment on Planning Application 142888/FO/2025

You don't often get email from [redacted] Learn why this is important

ALERT This message originated outside of the Manchester City Council network. **BE CAUTIOUS** before clicking any links or opening any attachments. Please remember your Cyber Training and report anything suspicious.

Dear Manchester Planning team,

I am writing to lodge an objection to planning application **142888/FO/2025** – Cambridge Halls Of Residence Cavendish Street Manchester M15 6TT.

My primary objection is that the proposals have been designed to deter cyclists from using the safest and most direct route through the site. This route has been open to cyclists ever since the road was first built; it is an essential, well-used part of the city's cycling network and therefore the proposal to deter and/or divert cycles away from Cavendish Street is directly at odds with Manchester City Council's planning, sustainability and transport policies.

I think Manchester City Council should be enabling more direct cycling routes, not truncating and redirecting established ones.

The applicant has also made misleading claims regarding the road's legal status and regarding pedestrian safety which I will outline below.

I am asking that the council **refuse** this application, and invite the developer to come back with a proposal that maintains direct cycle as well as pedestrian access along Cavendish Street, designed to modern standards set out in Greater Manchester's Streets For All design guide and in Department for Transport guidance note LTN 1/20. I am sure that the Highways team at MCC and the Active Travel team at TfGM will, if asked, be happy to comment on how such a route could be provided within the space available.

I am also asking that the council **make a Section 106 agreement (s106)** with the applicant to fund safety improvements for pedestrians and cyclists at the junction of Cavendish Street and Higher Cambridge Street – the applicant themselves discuss the shortcomings of the existing junction layout in Section 4.2.1 of the Transport Statement ("*Cyclists have also been observed to queue on the footway to gain direct access to the Higher Cambridge Street/Cavendish Street junction (via a gap in the guard railings) rather than following the road markings which advise cyclists to dismount and use the controlled pedestrian crossings*"). The improvements might take the form of a CYCLOPS junction. CYCLOPS is a homegrown Greater Manchester innovation now frequently used on Highways schemes across the country to deliver safe pedestrian and cycle movements without undue impact on traffic flows.

For prospective occupants and passers-by alike, in line with the S106 tests as set out in Paragraph 58 of the National Planning Policy Framework (NPPF) 2024, a contribution to junction safety improvements improvement would be 'necessary to make the development acceptable in planning terms' (by contributing to an appropriate movement strategy for the site), 'directly related to the development' (given its proximity, the pressure added to the junction by the proposed threefold increase in residents, and in light of the wholly inadequate mitigation route proposed by the applicant), and 'fairly and reasonably related in scale and kind to the development' (given the stated threefold increase in residents explained by the applicant, so directly adding more pressure to the junction).

1 Legal Status of Cavendish Street

This section of Cavendish Street, an adopted Highway, was subject to a stopping up order dated 14.06.1996. That order required that "the Developer shall provide a new highway which shall be a footpath/cycleway". MMU have since installed physical signage stating that Cavendish Street "has not been dedicated as a Highway" and have bolted down uncomfortable and restrictive speed bumps

across the route in an apparent attempt to dissuade cyclists from exercising their legal rights over this space. Both measures may be unlawful, as my understanding is that cyclists do retain a legal Right of Way along Cavendish Street, unchanged from when the entire road was an adopted highway, and the speed bumps are inaccessible to some Disabled users.

2 Cycling routes and planning policy

The case for walking and cycling and specifically for maintaining and improving high quality cycling networks is clear at every level of modern planning policy, including:

- NPPF 2024's "vision-led approach"
- LTN 1/20
- Places For Everyone Joint Development Plan Objectives 6, 7 and 10
- Places for Everyone Joint Development Plan policies JP-Strat14, JP-C1, JP-C5 and JP-C6
- GM Transport Strategy 2040 and the "Right Mix" targets
- Greater Manchester Streets for All strategy and Streets for All design guide
- Manchester City Council's Active Travel Strategy
- Manchester City Council's commitment to be a Zero Carbon city by 2038

The policy position is absolutely clear – changes to the existing road and cycle networks should make cycling more convenient for people, not less convenient.

This specific stretch of Cavendish Street is a key part of the existing cycle network. It appears on TfGM's Bee Network map as a Beeway ("the routes that get people from A to B … representing the most direct routes between crossing points.") and connects to the Stretford Road Busy Beeway ("corridors or crossing points on busier roads that will require a higher level of design intervention to improve cycling and walking.") It is also mapped on the TfGM Cycle Network.

The national standard for cycling infrastructure is DfT guidance note LTN 1/20. LTN 1/20 advises above all else that cycle routes and networks should be Safe, Direct, Comfortable, Attractive and Coherent. Introducing unnecessary diversions, junctions and bends into a well-used existing route undermines all of these core principles, resulting in a lower quality cycle network which will make it harder for the council to achieve its cycling objectives.

The applicant has offered various reasons why diverting cyclists is necessary but all of these reasons seem to be either existing problems, or problems designed into the scheme. The proposal is to demolish and redevelop the site – so considerations like limited space and the placement of entrances, shop frontages, planting and pedestrian areas are entirely within the applicant's scope to manage. Instead of starting with the problem "there is an existing busy cycle route across this site, how can I design to accommodate everyone's needs?", it seems the applicant has started with the conclusion "cyclists must be deterred" and instructed their consultants to post-rationalise that decision.

3 Misleading claims regarding safety

Page 22 of the Design & Access Statement refers to the "existing controversial link along Cavendish St., which is resulting in collisions of pedestrians, electric scooters, cyclists, etc."

However the map of recorded collisions, on page 18 of the Transport Statement submitted in the same planning application, shows no recorded collisions whatsoever on this link, only on the adjacent main roads.

It appears the applicant is attempting to restrict cycle access based on a "problem" for which they have no evidence.

Yours sincerely,

[redacted]

Sent from my iPhone

****
This email and any files transmitted with it are confidential and intended solely for the use of the individual or entity to whom they are addressed.
If you have received this email in error, please notify the sender, or [redacted] and then permanently delete the email, attachments and all copies.
The full text of the Council's email disclaimer is available at: www.manchester.gov.uk/emaildisclaimer.
Your personal data is very important to us. Please refer to our privacy notice at: www.manchester.gov.uk/privacy for further information.

This footnote also confirms that this email message has been swept for the presence of computer viruses.
****

Outlook

Fw: Comment on Planning Application 142888/FO/2025

From Planning <[redacted]>
Date Mon 30/06/2025 10:57
To Lucy Harrison <[redacted]>

Information, Delivery & Support Team
Planning, Building Control & Licensing
Growth & Development Directorate
Postal address: Manchester City Council, P O Box 532, Town Hall, Manchester M60 2LA
Location address: Level 6 Town Hall Extension, Manchester M2 5DB
Tel: 0161 234 4516

Please consider the environment before printing an e-mail.

From: [redacted]
Sent: 30 June 2025 10:51
To: Planning <[redacted]>
Subject: Comment on Planning Application 142888/FO/2025

You don't often get email from [redacted] Learn why this is important

ALERT This message originated outside of the Manchester City Council network. **BE CAUTIOUS** before clicking any links or opening any attachments. Please remember your Cyber Training and report anything suspicious.

Dear Manchester Planning team, I am writing to lodge an objection to planning application 142888/FO/2025 – Cambridge Halls Of Residence Cavendish Street Manchester M15 6TT. My primary objection is that the proposals have been designed to deter cyclists from using the safest and most direct route through the site. This route has been open to cyclists ever since the road was first built; it is an essential, well-used part of the city's cycling network and therefore the proposal to deter and/or divert cycles away from Cavendish Street is directly at odds with Manchester City Council's planning, sustainability and transport policies. The applicant has also made misleading claims regarding the road's legal status and regarding pedestrian safety which I will outline below. I am asking that the council refuse this application, and invite the developer to come back with a proposal that maintains direct cycle as well as pedestrian access along Cavendish Street, designed to modern standards set out in Greater Manchester's Streets For All design guide and in Department for Transport guidance note LTN 1/20. I am sure that the Highways team at MCC and the Active Travel team at TfGM will, if asked, be happy to comment on how such a route could be provided within the space available. I am also asking that the council make a Section 106 agreement (s106) with the applicant to fund safety improvements for pedestrians and cyclists at the junction of Cavendish Street and Higher Cambridge Street – the applicant themselves discuss the shortcomings of the existing

junction layout in Section 4.2.1 of the Transport Statement (“Cyclists have also been observed to queue on the footway to gain direct access to the Higher Cambridge Street/Cavendish Street junction (via a gap in the guard railings) rather than following the road markings which advise cyclists to dismount and use the controlled pedestrian crossings”). The improvements might take the form of a CYCLOPS junction. CYCLOPS is a homegrown Greater Manchester innovation now frequently used on Highways schemes across the country to deliver safe pedestrian and cycle movements without undue impact on traffic flows. For prospective occupants and passers-by alike, in line with the S106 tests as set out in Paragraph 58 of the National Planning Policy Framework (NPPF) 2024, a contribution to junction safety improvements improvement would be ‘necessary to make the development acceptable in planning terms’ (by contributing to an appropriate movement strategy for the site), ‘directly related to the development’ (given its proximity, the pressure added to the junction by the proposed threefold increase in residents, and in light of the wholly inadequate mitigation route proposed by the applicant), and ‘fairly and reasonably related in scale and kind to the development’ (given the stated threefold increase in residents explained by the applicant, so directly adding more pressure to the junction). 1 Legal Status of Cavendish Street This section of Cavendish Street, an adopted Highway, was subject to a stopping up order dated 14.06.1996. That order required that “the Developer shall provide a new highway which shall be a footpath/cycleway”. MMU have since installed physical signage stating that Cavendish Street “has not been dedicated as a Highway” and have bolted down uncomfortable and restrictive speed bumps across the route in an apparent attempt to dissuade cyclists from exercising their legal rights over this space. Both measures may be unlawful, as my understanding is that cyclists do retain a legal Right of Way along Cavendish Street, unchanged from when the entire road was an adopted highway, and the speed bumps are inaccessible to some Disabled users. 2 Cycling routes and planning policy The case for walking and cycling and specifically for maintaining and improving high quality cycling networks is clear at every level of modern planning policy, including: NPPF 2024’s “vision-led approach” LTN 1/20 Places For Everyone Joint Development Plan Objectives 6, 7 and 10 Places for Everyone Joint Development Plan policies JP-Strat14, JP-C1, JP-C5 and JP-C6 GM Transport Strategy 2040 and the “Right Mix” targets Greater Manchester Streets for All strategy and Streets for All design guide Manchester City Council’s Active Travel Strategy Manchester City Council’s commitment to be a Zero Carbon city by 2038 The policy position is absolutely clear – changes to the existing road and cycle networks should make cycling more convenient for people, not less convenient. This specific stretch of Cavendish Street is a key part of the existing cycle network. It appears on TfGM’s Bee Network map as a Beeway (“the routes that get people from A to B … representing the most direct routes between crossing points.”) and connects to the Stretford Road Busy Beeway (“corridors or crossing points on busier roads that will require a higher level of design intervention to improve cycling and walking.”) It is also mapped on the TfGM Cycle Network. The national standard for cycling infrastructure is DfT guidance note LTN 1/20. LTN 1/20 advises above all else that cycle routes and networks should be Safe, Direct, Comfortable, Attractive and Coherent. Introducing unnecessary diversions, junctions and bends into a well-used existing route undermines all of these core principles, resulting in a lower quality cycle network which will make it harder for the council to achieve its cycling objectives. The applicant has offered various reasons why diverting cyclists is necessary but all of these reasons seem to be either existing problems, or

problems designed into the scheme. The proposal is to demolish and redevelop the site – so considerations like limited space and the placement of entrances, shop frontages, planting and pedestrian areas are entirely within the applicant's scope to manage. Instead of starting with the problem "there is an existing busy cycle route across this site, how can I design to accommodate everyone's needs?", it seems the applicant has started with the conclusion "cyclists must be deterred" and instructed their consultants to post-rationalise that decision. 3 Misleading claims regarding safety Page 22 of the Design & Access Statement refers to the "existing controversial link along Cavendish St., which is resulting in collisions of pedestrians, electric scooters, cyclists, etc." However the map of recorded collisions, on page 18 of the Transport Statement submitted in the same planning application, shows no recorded collisions whatsoever on this link, only on the adjacent main roads. It appears the applicant is attempting to restrict cycle access based on a "problem" for which they have no evidence. Yours sincerely,

[redacted]

"The only constant is change"

****
This email and any files transmitted with it are confidential and intended solely for the use of the individual or entity to whom they are addressed. If you have received this email in error, please notify the sender, or [redacted] and then permanently delete the email, attachments and all copies.
The full text of the Council's email disclaimer is available at: www.manchester.gov.uk/emaildisclaimer.
Your personal data is very important to us. Please refer to our privacy notice at: www.manchester.gov.uk/privacy for further information.

This footnote also confirms that this email message has been swept for the presence of computer viruses.
****

Outlook

Fw: Comment on Planning Application 142888/FO/2025

From Planning <[redacted]>
Date Mon 30/06/2025 10:35
To Lucy Harrison <[redacted]>

Information, Delivery & Support Team
Planning, Building Control & Licensing
Growth & Development Directorate
Postal address: Manchester City Council, P O Box 532, Town Hall, Manchester M60 2LA
Location address: Level 6 Town Hall Extension, Manchester M2 5DB
Tel: 0161 234 4516

Please consider the environment before printing an e-mail.

From: [redacted]
Sent: 30 June 2025 09:07
To: Planning <[redacted]>
Subject: Comment on Planning Application 142888/FO/2025

You don't often get email from [redacted] Learn why this is important

ALERT This message originated outside of the Manchester City Council network. **BE CAUTIOUS** before clicking any links or opening any attachments. Please remember your Cyber Training and report anything suspicious.

Dear Manchester Planning team,

I am writing to lodge an objection to planning application 142888/FO/2025 – Cambridge Halls Of Residence Cavendish Street Manchester M15 6TT.

My primary objection is that the proposals have been designed to deter cyclists from using the safest and most direct route through the site. This route has been open to cyclists ever since the road was first built; it is an essential, well-used part of the city's cycling network and therefore the proposal to deter and/or divert cycles away from Cavendish Street is directly at odds with Manchester City Council's planning, sustainability and transport policies.

As a cargo bike courier working in the city centre, I depend on safe, cycle friendly roads such as the one on Cavendish Street to make my way around and, ultimately, avoid motorists for their convenience too. I regularly cycle through Hulme onto Oxford Road and this route ensures I don't have to cross the path of double decker buses, as I would have to if the cut through road was removed. Out of all the ways to access Oxford Road, this is by far the safest for cyclists. I can't help but think this decision has been made by somebody who has never had to commute by bicycle through the city centre.

The applicant has also made misleading claims regarding the road's legal status and regarding

pedestrian safety which I will outline below.

I am asking that the council refuse this application, and invite the developer to come back with a proposal that maintains direct cycle as well as pedestrian access along Cavendish Street, designed to modern standards set out in Greater Manchester's Streets For All design guide and in Department for Transport guidance note LTN 1/20. I am sure that the Highways team at MCC and the Active Travel team at TfGM will, if asked, be happy to comment on how such a route could be provided within the space available.

I am also asking that the council make a Section 106 agreement (s106) with the applicant to fund safety improvements for pedestrians and cyclists at the junction of Cavendish Street and Higher Cambridge Street – the applicant themselves discuss the shortcomings of the existing junction layout in Section 4.2.1 of the Transport Statement ("Cyclists have also been observed to queue on the footway to gain direct access to the Higher Cambridge Street/Cavendish Street junction (via a gap in the guard railings) rather than following the road markings which advise cyclists to dismount and use the controlled pedestrian crossings"). The improvements might take the form of a CYCLOPS junction. CYCLOPS is a homegrown Greater Manchester innovation now frequently used on Highways schemes across the country to deliver safe pedestrian and cycle movements without undue impact on traffic flows.

For prospective occupants and passers-by alike, in line with the S106 tests as set out in Paragraph 58 of the National Planning Policy Framework (NPPF) 2024, a contribution to junction safety improvements improvement would be 'necessary to make the development acceptable in planning terms' (by contributing to an appropriate movement strategy for the site), 'directly related to the development' (given its proximity, the pressure added to the junction by the proposed threefold increase in residents, and in light of the wholly inadequate mitigation route proposed by the applicant), and 'fairly and reasonably related in scale and kind to the development' (given the stated threefold increase in residents explained by the applicant, so directly adding more pressure to the junction).

1 Legal Status of Cavendish Street

This section of Cavendish Street, an adopted Highway, was subject to a stopping up order dated 14.06.1996. That order required that "the Developer shall provide a new highway which shall be a footpath/cycleway". MMU have since installed physical signage stating that Cavendish Street "has not been dedicated as a Highway" and have bolted down uncomfortable and restrictive speed bumps across the route in an apparent attempt to dissuade cyclists from exercising their legal rights over this space. Both measures may be unlawful, as my understanding is that cyclists do retain a legal Right of Way along Cavendish Street, unchanged from when the entire road was an adopted highway, and the speed bumps are inaccessible to some Disabled users.

2 Cycling routes and planning policy

The case for walking and cycling and specifically for maintaining and improving high quality cycling networks is clear at every level of modern planning policy, including:

- NPPF 2024's "vision-led approach"
- LTN 1/20
- Places For Everyone Joint Development Plan Objectives 6, 7 and 10
- Places for Everyone Joint Development Plan policies JP-Strat14, JP-C1, JP-C5 and JP-C6
- GM Transport Strategy 2040 and the "Right Mix" targets
- Greater Manchester Streets for All strategy and Streets for All design guide

Manchester City Council's Active Travel Strategy
Manchester City Council's commitment to be a Zero Carbon city by 2038

The policy position is absolutely clear – changes to the existing road and cycle networks should make cycling more convenient for people, not less convenient.

This specific stretch of Cavendish Street is a key part of the existing cycle network. It appears on TfGM's Bee Network map as a Beeway ("the routes that get people from A to B … representing the most direct routes between crossing points.") and connects to the Stretford Road Busy Beeway ("corridors or crossing points on busier roads that will require a higher level of design intervention to improve cycling and walking.") It is also mapped on the TfGM Cycle Network.

The national standard for cycling infrastructure is DfT guidance note LTN 1/20. LTN 1/20 advises above all else that cycle routes and networks should be Safe, Direct, Comfortable, Attractive and Coherent. Introducing unnecessary diversions, junctions and bends into a well-used existing route undermines all of these core principles, resulting in a lower quality cycle network which will make it harder for the council to achieve its cycling objectives.

The applicant has offered various reasons why diverting cyclists is necessary but all of these reasons seem to be either existing problems, or problems designed into the scheme. The proposal is to demolish and redevelop the site – so considerations like limited space and the placement of entrances, shop frontages, planting and pedestrian areas are entirely within the applicant's scope to manage. Instead of starting with the problem "there is an existing busy cycle route across this site, how can I design to accommodate everyone's needs?", it seems the applicant has started with the conclusion "cyclists must be deterred" and instructed their consultants to post-rationalise that decision.

3 Misleading claims regarding safety

Page 22 of the Design & Access Statement refers to the "existing controversial link along Cavendish St., which is resulting in collisions of pedestrians, electric scooters, cyclists, etc."

However the map of recorded collisions, on page 18 of the Transport Statement submitted in the same planning application, shows no recorded collisions whatsoever on this link, only on the adjacent main roads.

It appears the applicant is attempting to restrict cycle access based on a "problem" for which they have no evidence.

Yours sincerely,

[redacted]

****
This email and any files transmitted with it are confidential and intended solely for the use of the individual or entity to whom they are addressed.
If you have received this email in error, please notify the sender, or [redacted] and then permanently delete the email, attachments and all copies.
The full text of the Council's email disclaimer is available at: www.manchester.gov.uk/emaildisclaimer.
Your personal data is very important to us. Please refer to our privacy notice at: www.manchester.gov.uk/privacy for further information.

This footnote also confirms that this email message has been swept for the presence of computer viruses.
****

Outlook

Fw: Comment on Planning Application 142888/FO/2025

From Planning <[redacted]>
Date Mon 14/07/2025 14:04
To Lucy Harrison <[redacted]>

Information, Delivery & Support Team
Planning, Building Control & Licensing
Growth & Development Directorate
Postal address: Manchester City Council, P O Box 532, Town Hall, Manchester M60 2LA
Location address: Level 6 Town Hall Extension, Manchester M2 5DB
Tel: 0161 234 4516

Please consider the environment before printing an e-mail.

From: [redacted]
Sent: 12 July 2025 15:22
To: Planning <[redacted]>
Subject: Comment on Planning Application 142888/FO/2025

You don't often get email from [redacted] Learn why this is important

ALERT This message originated outside of the Manchester City Council network. **BE CAUTIOUS** before clicking any links or opening any attachments. Please remember your Cyber Training and report anything suspicious.

Subject: Comment on Planning Application 142888/FO/2025

Dear Manchester Planning team,

I am writing to lodge an objection to planning application **142888/FO/2025** – Cambridge Halls Of Residence Cavendish Street Manchester M15 6TT.

My primary objection is that the proposals have been designed to deter cyclists from using the safest and most direct route through the site. This route has been open to cyclists ever since the road was first built; it is an essential, well-used part of the city's cycling network and therefore the proposal to deter and/or divert cycles away from Cavendish Street is directly at odds with Manchester City Council's planning, sustainability and transport policies.

I have lived in Hulme for 20 years and I have used Cavendish Street both as a pedestrian and a cyclist. It would be really inconvenient if cycle access was blocked. I would also urge the planning committee to prevent this increasing privatisation of public spaces. So many previously public, open spaces have been bought at giveaway prices and then enclosed (stolen) from the people of Manchester by Manchester Metropolitan University (MMU), and now MMU want to co-opt (steal) public highways too! Enough is enough. Hulme isn't (just) a university/student campus, it's a residential area, a real neighbourhood, with real people, many of whom have lived and/or worked here for decades. MMU is acting as if it owns the place, and is being aided and abetted by Manchester City Council. When MMU says 'Jump!' Manchester City Council must stop asking 'How high?' and doing its bidding. There are other stakeholders here in this community, not just the behemoth that is MMU. We local residents - many of whom are voters in local elections! - also matter too, and Manchester City Council would do well to remember that. You're answerable to the electorate, to the people, who entrust you with power and authority, and I would urge you to use it wisely.

Using the power and authority vested in you wisely means you shouldn't simply be capitulating to MMU's every demand and doing what *they* please. You need to bear in mind Manchester City Council's own responsibilities to the people of the city, including Hulme residents, and also residents of the wider city, in terms of your overall policies for green transport and cutting emissions, and also your own policies for actively promoting cycling through your Manchester Active Travel Strategy and Investment Plan (MATSIP), aiming to make walking and cycling the natural choice for short journeys. Closing a route that has been for many years accessible to cyclists runs counter to Manchester City Council's own environmental policies and MATSIP and on those grounds (amongst others) this application should be rejected. Some of the roads in Hulme featured in a Manchester Evening News article many years ago about roads with 'killer levels' of air pollution - bear in mind that since that article was published, air pollution has been recorded as the cause of death in the inquest into the death of Ella Kissi-Debrah, in London. Air pollution kills. Manchester City Council should not be closing cycle routes and making cycling more difficult and time-consuming, it should include this route in its active travel plan, to help reduce the number of vehicles on the road, reduce air pollution, promote active travel and healthy living and a better, cleaner environment.

In the circumstances, Manchester City Council ought to be facilitating and ensuring that this cycle route remains open and requiring MMU to ensure it is safe for cyclists and pedestrians alike.

[Sources:
Manchester Evening News - The map that shows the 152 Greater Manchester roads with killer levels of air pollution
The map that shows the 152 Greater Manchester roads with killer levels of air pollution - Manchester Evening News

Air pollution a cause in girl's death, coroner rules in landmark case
Air pollution a cause in girl's death, coroner rules in landmark case | London | The Guardian

The applicant has also made misleading claims regarding the road's legal status and regarding pedestrian safety which I will outline below.

I am asking that the council **refuse** this application, and invite the developer to come back with a proposal that maintains direct cycle as well as pedestrian access along Cavendish Street, designed to modern standards set out in Greater Manchester's Streets For All design guide and in Department for Transport guidance note LTN 1/20. I am sure that the Highways team at MCC and the Active Travel team at TfGM will, if asked, be happy to comment on how such a route could be provided within the space available.

I am also asking that the council **make a Section 106 agreement (s106)** with the applicant to fund safety improvements for pedestrians and cyclists at the junction of Cavendish Street and Higher Cambridge Street – the applicant themselves discuss the shortcomings of the existing junction layout in Section 4.2.1 of the Transport Statement ("*Cyclists have also been observed to queue on the footway to gain direct access to the Higher Cambridge Street/Cavendish Street junction (via a gap in the guard railings) rather than following the road markings which advise cyclists to dismount and use the controlled pedestrian crossings*"). The improvements might take the form of a CYCLOPS junction. CYCLOPS is a homegrown Greater Manchester innovation now frequently used on Highways schemes across the country to deliver safe pedestrian and cycle movements without undue impact on traffic flows.

For prospective occupants and passers-by alike, in line with the S106 tests as set out in Paragraph 58 of the National Planning Policy Framework (NPPF) 2024, a contribution to junction safety improvements improvement would be 'necessary to make the development acceptable in planning terms' (by contributing to an appropriate movement strategy for the site), 'directly related to the development' (given its proximity, the pressure added to the junction by the proposed threefold increase in residents, and in light of the wholly inadequate mitigation route proposed by the applicant), and 'fairly and reasonably related in scale and kind to the development' (given the stated threefold increase in residents explained by the applicant, so directly adding more pressure to the junction).

1 Legal Status of Cavendish Street

This section of Cavendish Street, an adopted Highway, was subject to a stopping up order dated 14.06.1996. That order required that "the Developer shall provide a new highway which shall be a footpath/cycleway". MMU have since installed physical signage stating that Cavendish Street "has not been dedicated as a Highway" and have bolted down uncomfortable and restrictive speed bumps across the route in an apparent attempt to dissuade cyclists from exercising their legal rights over this space. Both measures may be unlawful, as my understanding is that cyclists do retain a legal Right of Way along Cavendish Street, unchanged from when the entire road was an adopted highway, and the speed bumps are inaccessible to some Disabled users.

2 Cycling routes and planning policy

The case for walking and cycling and specifically for maintaining and improving high quality cycling networks is clear at every level of modern planning policy, including:

- NPPF 2024's "vision-led approach"
- LTN 1/20
- Places For Everyone Joint Development Plan Objectives 6, 7 and 10
- Places for Everyone Joint Development Plan policies JP-Strat14, JP-C1, JP-C5 and JP-C6
- GM Transport Strategy 2040 and the "Right Mix" targets
- Greater Manchester Streets for All strategy and Streets for All design guide
- Manchester City Council's Active Travel Strategy
- Manchester City Council's commitment to be a Zero Carbon city by 2038

The policy position is absolutely clear – changes to the existing road and cycle networks should make cycling more convenient for people, not less convenient.

This specific stretch of Cavendish Street is a key part of the existing cycle network. It appears on TfGM's Bee Network map as a Beeway ("the routes that get people from A to B … representing the most direct routes between crossing points.") and connects to the Stretford Road Busy Beeway ("corridors or crossing points on busier roads that will require a higher level of design intervention to improve cycling and walking.") It is also mapped on the TfGM Cycle Network.

The national standard for cycling infrastructure is DfT guidance note LTN 1/20. LTN 1/20 advises above all else that cycle routes and networks should be Safe, Direct, Comfortable, Attractive and Coherent. Introducing unnecessary diversions, junctions and bends into a well-used existing route undermines all of these core principles, resulting in a lower quality cycle network which will make it harder for the council to achieve its cycling objectives.

The applicant has offered various reasons why diverting cyclists is necessary but all of these reasons seem to be either existing problems, or problems designed into the scheme. The proposal is to demolish and redevelop the site – so considerations like limited space and the placement of entrances, shop frontages, planting and pedestrian areas are entirely within the applicant's scope to manage. Instead of starting with the problem "there is an existing busy cycle route across this site, how can I design to accommodate everyone's needs?", it seems the applicant has started with the conclusion "cyclists must be deterred" and instructed their consultants to post-rationalise that decision.

3 Misleading claims regarding safety

Page 22 of the Design & Access Statement refers to the “existing controversial link along Cavendish St., which is resulting in collisions of pedestrians, electric scooters, cyclists, etc.”

However the map of recorded collisions, on page 18 of the Transport Statement submitted in the same planning application, shows no recorded collisions whatsoever on this link, only on the adjacent main roads.

It appears the applicant is attempting to restrict cycle access based on a “problem” for which they have no evidence.

Yours sincerely,

[redacted]

****
This email and any files transmitted with it are confidential and intended solely for the use of the individual or entity to whom they are addressed.
If you have received this email in error, please notify the sender, or [redacted] and then permanently delete the email, attachments and all copies.
The full text of the Council's email disclaimer is available at: www.manchester.gov.uk/emaildisclaimer.
Your personal data is very important to us. Please refer to our privacy notice at: www.manchester.gov.uk/privacy for further information.

This footnote also confirms that this email message has been swept for the presence of computer viruses.
****

Outlook

Fw: Comment on Planning Application 142888/FO/2025

From Planning <[redacted]>
Date Tue 01/07/2025 09:06
To Lucy Harrison <[redacted]>

Information, Delivery & Support Team
Planning, Building Control & Licensing
Growth & Development Directorate
Postal address: Manchester City Council, P O Box 532, Town Hall, Manchester M60 2LA
Location address: Level 6 Town Hall Extension, Manchester M2 5DB
Tel: 0161 234 4516

Please consider the environment before printing an e-mail.

From: [redacted]
Sent: 30 June 2025 15:40
To: Planning <[redacted]>
Subject: Comment on Planning Application 142888/FO/2025

You don't often get email from [redacted] Learn why this is important

ALERT This message originated outside of the Manchester City Council network. **BE CAUTIOUS** before clicking any links or opening any attachments. Please remember your Cyber Training and report anything suspicious.

Dear Manchester Planning team,

I am writing to lodge an objection to planning application 142888/FO/2025 – Cambridge Halls Of Residence Cavendish Street Manchester M15 6TT.

My primary objection is that the proposals have been designed to deter cyclists from using the safest and most direct route through the site.

It is a really fundamental route for cyclists, and I have always used it. It feels wrong in 2025 for MMU to be making this move.

This route has been open to cyclists ever since the road was first built; it is an essential, well-used part of the city's cycling network and therefore the proposal to deter and/or divert cycles away from Cavendish Street is directly at odds with Manchester City Council's planning, sustainability and transport policies.

Please prevent MMU from further undermining cycling infrastructure in our city.

Best wishes

[redacted]

****

This email and any files transmitted with it are confidential and intended solely for the use of the individual or entity to whom they are addressed.
If you have received this email in error, please notify the sender, or [redacted] and then permanently delete the email, attachments and all copies.
The full text of the Council's email disclaimer is available at: www.manchester.gov.uk/emaildisclaimer.
Your personal data is very important to us. Please refer to our privacy notice at: www.manchester.gov.uk/privacy for further information.

This footnote also confirms that this email message has been swept for the presence of computer viruses.
****

Outlook

Fw: Comment on Planning Application 142888/FO/2025

From Planning <[redacted]
Date Tue 08/07/2025 07:15
To Lucy Harrison <[redacted]

Information, Delivery & Support Team
Planning, Building Control & Licensing
Growth & Development Directorate
Postal address: Manchester City Council, P O Box 532, Town Hall, Manchester M60 2LA
Location address: Level 6 Town Hall Extension, Manchester M2 5DB
Tel: 0161 234 4516

Please consider the environment before printing an e-mail.

From: [redacted]
Sent: 07 July 2025 17:46
To: Planning <[redacted]
Subject: Comment on Planning Application 142888/FO/2025

You don't often get email from [redacted] Learn why this is important

ALERT This message originated outside of the Manchester City Council network. **BE CAUTIOUS** before clicking any links or opening any attachments. Please remember your Cyber Training and report anything suspicious.

Dear Manchester Planning team,

I am writing to lodge an objection to planning application **142888/FO/2025** – Cambridge Halls Of Residence Cavendish Street Manchester M15 6TT.

My primary objection is that the proposals have been designed to deter cyclists from using the safest and most direct route through the site. This route has been open to cyclists ever since the road was first built; it is an essential, well-used part of the city's cycling network and therefore the proposal to deter and/or divert cycles away from Cavendish Street is directly at odds with Manchester City Council's planning, sustainability and transport policies.

When I work at MRI or go to MMU I use this a safe transit route, most of the areas roads are in a spoke pattern radiating out but once I have cycled into Manchester i need this type of route to cross to my final destination and not mix with rat running

commuting traffic. The Oxford road corridor is fantastic but like all good infrastructure it needs to connect.

The applicant has also made misleading claims regarding the road's legal status and regarding pedestrian safety which I will outline below.

I am asking that the council **refuse** this application, and invite the developer to come back with a proposal that maintains direct cycle as well as pedestrian access along Cavendish Street, designed to modern standards set out in Greater Manchester's Streets For All design guide and in Department for Transport guidance note LTN 1/20. I am sure that the Highways team at MCC and the Active Travel team at TfGM will, if asked, be happy to comment on how such a route could be provided within the space available.

I am also asking that the council **make a Section 106 agreement (s106)** with the applicant to fund safety improvements for pedestrians and cyclists at the junction of Cavendish Street and Higher Cambridge Street – the applicant themselves discuss the shortcomings of the existing junction layout in Section 4.2.1 of the Transport Statement ("*Cyclists have also been observed to queue on the footway to gain direct access to the Higher Cambridge Street/Cavendish Street junction (via a gap in the guard railings) rather than following the road markings which advise cyclists to dismount and use the controlled pedestrian crossings*"). The improvements might take the form of a CYCLOPS junction. CYCLOPS is a homegrown Greater Manchester innovation now frequently used on Highways schemes across the country to deliver safe pedestrian and cycle movements without undue impact on traffic flows.

For prospective occupants and passers-by alike, in line with the S106 tests as set out in Paragraph 58 of the National Planning Policy Framework (NPPF) 2024, a contribution to junction safety improvements improvement would be 'necessary to make the development acceptable in planning terms' (by contributing to an appropriate movement strategy for the site), 'directly related to the development' (given its proximity, the pressure added to the junction by the proposed threefold increase in residents, and in light of the wholly inadequate mitigation route proposed by the applicant), and 'fairly and reasonably related in scale and kind to the development' (given the stated threefold increase in residents explained by the applicant, so directly adding more pressure to the junction).

1 Legal Status of Cavendish Street

This section of Cavendish Street, an adopted Highway, was subject to a stopping up order dated 14.06.1996. That order required that "the Developer shall provide a new highway which shall be a footpath/cycleway". MMU have since installed

physical signage stating that Cavendish Street “has not been dedicated as a Highway” and have bolted down uncomfortable and restrictive speed bumps across the route in an apparent attempt to dissuade cyclists from exercising their legal rights over this space. Both measures may be unlawful, as my understanding is that cyclists do retain a legal Right of Way along Cavendish Street, unchanged from when the entire road was an adopted highway, and the speed bumps are inaccessible to some Disabled users.

2 Cycling routes and planning policy

The case for walking and cycling and specifically for maintaining and improving high quality cycling networks is clear at every level of modern planning policy, including:

- NPPF 2024’s “vision-led approach”
- LTN 1/20
- Places For Everyone Joint Development Plan Objectives 6, 7 and 10
- Places for Everyone Joint Development Plan policies JP-Strat14, JP-C1, JP-C5 and JP-C6
- GM Transport Strategy 2040 and the “Right Mix” targets
- Greater Manchester Streets for All strategy and Streets for All design guide
- Manchester City Council’s Active Travel Strategy
- Manchester City Council’s commitment to be a Zero Carbon city by 2038

The policy position is absolutely clear – changes to the existing road and cycle networks should make cycling more convenient for people, not less convenient.

This specific stretch of Cavendish Street is a key part of the existing cycle network. It appears on TfGM’s Bee Network map as a Beeway (“the routes that get people from A to B … representing the most direct routes between crossing points.”) and connects to the Stretford Road Busy Beeway (“corridors or crossing points on busier roads that will require a higher level of design intervention to improve cycling and walking.”) It is also mapped on the TfGM Cycle Network.

The national standard for cycling infrastructure is DfT guidance note LTN 1/20. LTN 1/20 advises above all else that cycle routes and networks should be Safe, Direct, Comfortable, Attractive and Coherent. Introducing unnecessary diversions, junctions and bends into a well-used existing route undermines all of these core principles, resulting in a lower quality cycle network which will make it harder for the council to achieve its cycling objectives.

The applicant has offered various reasons why diverting cyclists is necessary but all of these reasons seem to be either existing problems, or problems designed into the scheme. The proposal is to demolish and redevelop the site – so considerations like limited space and the placement of entrances, shop frontages, planting and pedestrian areas are entirely within the applicant's scope to manage. Instead of starting with the problem "there is an existing busy cycle route across this site, how can I design to accommodate everyone's needs?", it seems the applicant has started with the conclusion "cyclists must be deterred" and instructed their consultants to post-rationalise that decision.

3 Misleading claims regarding safety

Page 22 of the Design & Access Statement refers to the "existing controversial link along Cavendish St., which is resulting in collisions of pedestrians, electric scooters, cyclists, etc."

However the map of recorded collisions, on page 18 of the Transport Statement submitted in the same planning application, shows no recorded collisions whatsoever on this link, only on the adjacent main roads.

It appears the applicant is attempting to restrict cycle access based on a "problem" for which they have no evidence in fact support allowing vulnerable road users to move off the main road and use this access.

Yours sincerely,

[redacted]

[redacted]

[redacted]

[redacted]

[redacted]

[redacted]

[redacted]

[redacted]

[redacted]

[redacted]

[redacted]



****
** **********

This message may contain confidential information. If you are not the intended recipient please:
i) inform the sender that you have received the message in error before deleting it; and
ii) do not disclose, copy or distribute information in this e-mail or take any action in relation to its content (to do so is strictly prohibited and may be unlawful).
Thank you for your co-operation.

NHS.net Connect is the secure email, collaboration and directory service available for all NHS staff in England. NHS.net Connect is approved for exchanging patient data and other sensitive information with NHS.net Connect and other accredited email services.

For more information and to find out how you can switch visit Joining NHS.net Connect - NHS.net Connect Support

****
This email and any files transmitted with it are confidential and intended solely for the use of the individual or entity to whom they are addressed.
If you have received this email in error, please notify the sender, or [redacted] and then permanently delete the email, attachments and all copies.
The full text of the Council's email disclaimer is available at: www.manchester.gov.uk/emaildisclaimer.
Your personal data is very important to us. Please refer to our privacy notice at: www.manchester.gov.uk/privacy for further information.

This footnote also confirms that this email message has been swept for the presence of computer viruses.
****

Outlook

Fw: objection to planning application 142888/FO/2025 – Cambridge Halls Of Residence Cavendish Street Manchester M15 6TT.

From Planning <[redacted]>
Date Wed 02/07/2025 08:50
To Lucy Harrison <[redacted]>

Information, Delivery & Support Team
Planning, Building Control & Licensing
Growth & Development Directorate
Postal address: Manchester City Council, P O Box 532, Town Hall, Manchester M60 2LA
Location address: Level 6 Town Hall Extension, Manchester M2 5DB
Tel: 0161 234 4516

Please consider the environment before printing an e-mail.

From: [redacted]
Sent: 01 July 2025 19:00
To: Planning <[redacted]>
Subject: objection to planning application 142888/FO/2025 – Cambridge Halls Of Residence Cavendish Street Manchester M15 6TT.

You don't often get email from [redacted] Learn why this is important

ALERT This message originated outside of the Manchester City Council network. **BE CAUTIOUS** before clicking any links or opening any attachments. Please remember your Cyber Training and report anything suspicious.

Dear Manchester Planning team, I am writing to lodge an objection to planning application 142888/FO/2025 – Cambridge Halls Of Residence Cavendish Street Manchester M15 6TT. My primary objection is that the proposals have been designed to deter cyclists from using the safest and most direct route through the site. This route has been open to cyclists ever since the road was first built; it is an essential, well-used part of the city's cycling network and therefore the proposal to deter and/or divert cycles away from Cavendish Street is directly at odds with Manchester City Council's planning, sustainability and transport policies. The applicant has also made misleading claims regarding the road's legal status and regarding pedestrian safety which I will outline below. I am asking that the council refuse this application, and invite the developer to come back with a proposal that maintains direct cycle as well as pedestrian access along Cavendish Street, designed to modern standards set out in Greater Manchester's Streets For All design guide and in Department for Transport guidance note LTN 1/20. I am sure that the Highways team at MCC and the Active Travel team at TfGM will, if asked, be happy to comment on how such a route could be provided within the space available. I am also asking that the council make a Section 106 agreement (s106) with the applicant to fund safety improvements for

pedestrians and cyclists at the junction of Cavendish Street and Higher Cambridge Street – the applicant themselves discuss the shortcomings of the existing junction layout in Section 4.2.1 of the Transport Statement ("Cyclists have also been observed to queue on the footway to gain direct access to the Higher Cambridge Street/Cavendish Street junction (via a gap in the guard railings) rather than following the road markings which advise cyclists to dismount and use the controlled pedestrian crossings"). The improvements might take the form of a CYCLOPS junction. CYCLOPS is a homegrown Greater Manchester innovation now frequently used on Highways schemes across the country to deliver safe pedestrian and cycle movements without undue impact on traffic flows. For prospective occupants and passers-by alike, in line with the S106 tests as set out in Paragraph 58 of the National Planning Policy Framework (NPPF) 2024, a contribution to junction safety improvements improvement would be 'necessary to make the development acceptable in planning terms' (by contributing to an appropriate movement strategy for the site), 'directly related to the development' (given its proximity, the pressure added to the junction by the proposed threefold increase in residents, and in light of the wholly inadequate mitigation route proposed by the applicant), and 'fairly and reasonably related in scale and kind to the development' (given the stated threefold increase in residents explained by the applicant, so directly adding more pressure to the junction). 1 Legal Status of Cavendish Street This section of Cavendish Street, an adopted Highway, was subject to a stopping up order dated 14.06.1996. That order required that "the Developer shall provide a new highway which shall be a footpath/cycleway". MMU have since installed physical signage stating that Cavendish Street "has not been dedicated as a Highway" and have bolted down uncomfortable and restrictive speed bumps across the route in an apparent attempt to dissuade cyclists from exercising their legal rights over this space. Both measures may be unlawful, as my understanding is that cyclists do retain a legal Right of Way along Cavendish Street, unchanged from when the entire road was an adopted highway, and the speed bumps are inaccessible to some Disabled users. 2 Cycling routes and planning policy The case for walking and cycling and specifically for maintaining and improving high quality cycling networks is clear at every level of modern planning policy, including: NPPF 2024's "vision-led approach" LTN 1/20 Places For Everyone Joint Development Plan Objectives 6, 7 and 10 Places for Everyone Joint Development Plan policies JP-Strat14, JP-C1, JP-C5 and JP-C6 GM Transport Strategy 2040 and the "Right Mix" targets Greater Manchester Streets for All strategy and Streets for All design guide Manchester City Council's Active Travel Strategy Manchester City Council's commitment to be a Zero Carbon city by 2038 The policy position is absolutely clear – changes to the existing road and cycle networks should make cycling more convenient for people, not less convenient. This specific stretch of Cavendish Street is a key part of the existing cycle network. It appears on TfGM's Bee Network map as a Beeway ("the routes that get people from A to B … representing the most direct routes between crossing points.") and connects to the Stretford Road Busy Beeway ("corridors or crossing points on busier roads that will require a higher level of design intervention to improve cycling and walking.") It is also mapped on the TfGM Cycle Network. The national standard for cycling infrastructure is DfT guidance note LTN 1/20. LTN 1/20 advises above all else that cycle routes and networks should be Safe, Direct, Comfortable, Attractive and Coherent. Introducing unnecessary diversions, junctions and bends into a well-used existing route undermines all of these core principles, resulting in a lower quality cycle network which will make it harder for the council to achieve its cycling

objectives. The applicant has offered various reasons why diverting cyclists is necessary but all of these reasons seem to be either existing problems, or problems designed into the scheme. The proposal is to demolish and redevelop the site – so considerations like limited space and the placement of entrances, shop frontages, planting and pedestrian areas are entirely within the applicant's scope to manage. Instead of starting with the problem "there is an existing busy cycle route across this site, how can I design to accommodate everyone's needs?", it seems the applicant has started with the conclusion "cyclists must be deterred" and instructed their consultants to post-rationalise that decision. 3 Misleading claims regarding safety Page 22 of the Design & Access Statement refers to the "existing controversial link along Cavendish St., which is resulting in collisions of pedestrians, electric scooters, cyclists, etc." However the map of recorded collisions, on page 18 of the Transport Statement submitted in the same planning application, shows no recorded collisions whatsoever on this link, only on the adjacent main roads. It appears the applicant is attempting to restrict cycle access based on a "problem" for which they have no evidence. Yours sincerely,

[redacted]

[redacted]

****
This email and any files transmitted with it are confidential and intended solely for the use of the individual or entity to whom they are addressed.
If you have received this email in error, please notify the sender, or [redacted] and then permanently delete the email, attachments and all copies.
The full text of the Council's email disclaimer is available at: www.manchester.gov.uk/emaildisclaimer.
Your personal data is very important to us. Please refer to our privacy notice at: www.manchester.gov.uk/privacy for further information.

This footnote also confirms that this email message has been swept for the presence of computer viruses.
****

Outlook

Fw: Objection to planning application 142888/FO/2025 – Cambridge Galls

From Planning <[redacted]>
Date Tue 08/07/2025 07:13
To Lucy Harrison <[redacted]>

Information, Delivery & Support Team
Planning, Building Control & Licensing
Growth & Development Directorate
Postal address: Manchester City Council, P O Box 532, Town Hall, Manchester M60 2LA
Location address: Level 6 Town Hall Extension, Manchester M2 5DB
Tel: 0161 234 4516

Please consider the environment before printing an e-mail.

From: [redacted]
Sent: 07 July 2025 20:04
To: Planning <[redacted]>
Subject: Objection to planning application 142888/FO/2025 – Cambridge Galls

You don't often get email from [redacted] Learn why this is important

ALERT This message originated outside of the Manchester City Council network. **BE CAUTIOUS** before clicking any links or opening any attachments. Please remember your Cyber Training and report anything suspicious.

Dear Manchester Planning team,

I am writing to lodge an objection to planning application 142888/FO/2025 – Cambridge Halls Of Residence Cavendish Street Manchester

My objection is that the proposals have been designed to deter cyclists from using an non replaceable , historic route through the site.

This route has been open to cyclists ever since the road was first built; it is an essential, well-used part of the city's cycling network and therefore the proposal to deter and/or divert cycles away from Cavendish Street is directly at odds with Manchester City Council's planning, sustainability and transport policies.

I have been using this route multiple times a week for over 25 years and haven't seen much conflict with pedestrians. The planning application even states that no collisions hae taken place but yet this seems to be their main argument! The busy main road I'd be expected to navigate if this access was removed is a different matter. It's simply a non starter and would likely be the final straw to using my bike to come into the city. The junction needs an upgrade to be more bike friendly, not more restrictions !

I'm fairly certain this route was a public road at one point so I'm not sure how we can go from a road to cutting off one of the most essential bike arteries in the city ? Surely if they bought land with a right of way on it they can't just decide who can use it !

The proposal also seems to be against Manchester's own planning policy to increase cycling ?

The developers need to be sent away and do a redesign that's inclusive for everyone. Not just a few students that can afford to live there.

Yours sincerely

[redacted]

[redacted]

Sent from Outlook for Android

****
This email and any files transmitted with it are confidential and intended solely for the use of the individual or entity to whom they are addressed.
If you have received this email in error, please notify the sender, or [redacted] and then permanently delete the email, attachments and all copies.
The full text of the Council's email disclaimer is available at: www.manchester.gov.uk/emaildisclaimer.
Your personal data is very important to us. Please refer to our privacy notice at: www.manchester.gov.uk/privacy for further information.

This footnote also confirms that this email message has been swept for the presence of computer viruses.
****

Outlook

Fw: Comment on Planning Application 142888/FO/2025

From Planning <[redacted]>
Date Thu 10/07/2025 08:59
To Lucy Harrison <[redacted]>

Information, Delivery & Support Team
Planning, Building Control & Licensing
Growth & Development Directorate
Postal address: Manchester City Council, P O Box 532, Town Hall, Manchester M60 2LA
Location address: Level 6 Town Hall Extension, Manchester M2 5DB
Tel: 0161 234 4516

Please consider the environment before printing an e-mail.

From: [redacted] <[redacted]>
Sent: 09 July 2025 14:22
To: Planning <[redacted]>
Subject: Comment on Planning Application 142888/FO/2025

[You don't often get email from [redacted] Learn why this is important at https://aka.ms/LearnAboutSenderIdentification]

ALERT This message originated outside of the Manchester City Council network. BE CAUTIOUS before clicking any links or opening any attachments. Please remember your Cyber Training and report anything suspicious.

Dear Manchester Planning team,

I am writing to lodge an objection to planning application 142888/FO/2025 – Cambridge Halls Of Residence Cavendish Street Manchester M15 6TT.

My primary objection is that the proposals have been designed to deter cyclists from using the safest and most direct route through the site. This route has been open to cyclists ever since the road was first built; it is an essential, well-used part of the city's cycling network and therefore the proposal to deter and/or divert cycles away from Cavendish Street is directly at odds with Manchester City Council's planning, sustainability and transport policies.

I regularly use the Cavendish Street route to travel between Birley Fields and Oxford Road, both cycling and walking. The route is indispensable, and there are no good reasons to force cyclists onto busy main roads by closing this route to them. This would be discriminatory to cyclists at a time when we should be doing everything possible to encourage more people out of cars and onto bikes.

The applicant has also made misleading claims regarding the road's legal status and regarding

pedestrian safety which I will outline below.

I am asking that the council refuse this application, and invite the developer to come back with a proposal that maintains direct cycle as well as pedestrian access along Cavendish Street, designed to modern standards set out in Greater Manchester's Streets For All design guide and in Department for Transport guidance note LTN 1/20. I am sure that the Highways team at MCC and the Active Travel team at TfGM will, if asked, be happy to comment on how such a route could be provided within the space available.

I am also asking that the council make a Section 106 agreement (s106) with the applicant to fund safety improvements for pedestrians and cyclists at the junction of Cavendish Street and Higher Cambridge Street – the applicant themselves discuss the shortcomings of the existing junction layout in Section 4.2.1 of the Transport Statement ("Cyclists have also been observed to queue on the footway to gain direct access to the Higher Cambridge Street/Cavendish Street junction (via a gap in the guard railings) rather than following the road markings which advise cyclists to dismount and use the controlled pedestrian crossings"). The improvements might take the form of a CYCLOPS junction. CYCLOPS is a homegrown Greater Manchester innovation now frequently used on Highways schemes across the country to deliver safe pedestrian and cycle movements without undue impact on traffic flows.

For prospective occupants and passers-by alike, in line with the S106 tests as set out in Paragraph 58 of the National Planning Policy Framework (NPPF) 2024, a contribution to junction safety improvements improvement would be 'necessary to make the development acceptable in planning terms' (by contributing to an appropriate movement strategy for the site), 'directly related to the development' (given its proximity, the pressure added to the junction by the proposed threefold increase in residents, and in light of the wholly inadequate mitigation route proposed by the applicant), and 'fairly and reasonably related in scale and kind to the development' (given the stated threefold increase in residents explained by the applicant, so directly adding more pressure to the junction).

1 Legal Status of Cavendish Street

This section of Cavendish Street, an adopted Highway, was subject to a stopping up order dated 14.06.1996. That order required that "the Developer shall provide a new highway which shall be a footpath/cycleway". MMU have since installed physical signage stating that Cavendish Street "has not been dedicated as a Highway" and have bolted down uncomfortable and restrictive speed bumps across the route in an apparent attempt to dissuade cyclists from exercising their legal rights over this space. Both measures may be unlawful, as my understanding is that cyclists do retain a legal Right of Way along Cavendish Street, unchanged from when the entire road was an adopted highway, and the speed bumps are inaccessible to some Disabled users.

2 Cycling routes and planning policy

The case for walking and cycling and specifically for maintaining and improving high quality cycling networks is clear at every level of modern planning policy, including:

NPPF 2024's "vision-led approach"
LTN 1/20
Places For Everyone Joint Development Plan Objectives 6, 7 and 10
Places for Everyone Joint Development Plan policies JP-Strat14, JP-C1, JP-C5 and JP-C6
GM Transport Strategy 2040 and the "Right Mix" targets
Greater Manchester Streets for All strategy and Streets for All design guide

Manchester City Council's Active Travel Strategy
Manchester City Council's commitment to be a Zero Carbon city by 2038
The policy position is absolutely clear – changes to the existing road and cycle networks should make cycling more convenient for people, not less convenient.

This specific stretch of Cavendish Street is a key part of the existing cycle network. It appears on TfGM's Bee Network map as a Beeway ("the routes that get people from A to B … representing the most direct routes between crossing points.") and connects to the Stretford Road Busy Beeway ("corridors or crossing points on busier roads that will require a higher level of design intervention to improve cycling and walking.") It is also mapped on the TfGM Cycle Network.

The national standard for cycling infrastructure is DfT guidance note LTN 1/20. LTN 1/20 advises above all else that cycle routes and networks should be Safe, Direct, Comfortable, Attractive and Coherent. Introducing unnecessary diversions, junctions and bends into a well-used existing route undermines all of these core principles, resulting in a lower quality cycle network which will make it harder for the council to achieve its cycling objectives.

The applicant has offered various reasons why diverting cyclists is necessary but all of these reasons seem to be either existing problems, or problems designed into the scheme. The proposal is to demolish and redevelop the site – so considerations like limited space and the placement of entrances, shop frontages, planting and pedestrian areas are entirely within the applicant's scope to manage. Instead of starting with the problem "there is an existing busy cycle route across this site, how can I design to accommodate everyone's needs?", it seems the applicant has started with the conclusion "cyclists must be deterred" and instructed their consultants to post-rationalise that decision.

3 Misleading claims regarding safety

Page 22 of the Design & Access Statement refers to the "existing controversial link along Cavendish St., which is resulting in collisions of pedestrians, electric scooters, cyclists, etc."

However the map of recorded collisions, on page 18 of the Transport Statement submitted in the same planning application, shows no recorded collisions whatsoever on this link, only on the adjacent main roads.

It appears the applicant is attempting to restrict cycle access based on a "problem" for which they have no evidence.

Yours sincerely,

[redacted]

****
This email and any files transmitted with it are confidential and intended solely for the use of the individual or entity to whom they are addressed.
If you have received this email in error, please notify the sender, or [redacted] and then permanently delete the email, attachments and all copies.
The full text of the Council's email disclaimer is available at: www.manchester.gov.uk/emaildisclaimer.
Your personal data is very important to us. Please refer to our privacy notice at: www.manchester.gov.uk/privacy for further information.

This footnote also confirms that this email message has been swept for the presence of computer viruses.
****

Outlook

Fw: Comment on Planning Application 142888/FO/2025

From Planning <[redacted]
Date Thu 10/07/2025 15:56
To Lucy Harrison <[redacted]

Information, Delivery & Support Team
Planning, Building Control & Licensing
Growth & Development Directorate
Postal address: Manchester City Council, P O Box 532, Town Hall, Manchester M60 2LA
Location address: Level 6 Town Hall Extension, Manchester M2 5DB
Tel: 0161 234 4516

Please consider the environment before printing an e-mail.

From: [redacted]
Sent: 10 July 2025 13:56
To: Planning <[redacted]
Subject: Comment on Planning Application 142888/FO/2025

You don't often get email from [redacted] Learn why this is important

ALERT This message originated outside of the Manchester City Council network. **BE CAUTIOUS** before clicking any links or opening any attachments. Please remember your Cyber Training and report anything suspicious.

Dear Planning Team,

I am writing to formally object to planning application 142888/FO/2025 concerning the redevelopment of the Cambridge Halls of Residence on Cavendish Street.

My principal concern is that the proposed scheme appears deliberately designed to discourage cyclists from using Cavendish Street—a route that has long served as a safe, direct, and well-used link within Manchester's cycling network. The proposed diversion or restriction of cycle access is fundamentally inconsistent with Manchester City Council's own planning, transport, and sustainability policies, which prioritise active travel and the development of coherent, accessible cycling infrastructure.

The applicant has also made questionable and potentially misleading assertions regarding the legal status of Cavendish Street and the safety of its current use by cyclists and pedestrians. These claims are addressed in more detail below.

I respectfully urge the Council to refuse this application in its current form and to request that the applicant return with revised proposals that retain direct, high-quality cycle and pedestrian access along Cavendish Street. Such access should be designed in accordance with the Greater Manchester Streets for All Design Guide and the Department for Transport's LTN 1/20 guidance. I am confident that both the Council's Highways team and Transport for Greater Manchester's Active Travel team would be willing to advise on how this can be achieved within the available space.

In addition, I request that the Council secure a Section 106 agreement requiring the applicant to contribute to safety improvements at the junction of Cavendish Street and Higher Cambridge Street. The applicant's own Transport Statement (Section 4.2.1) acknowledges the current inadequacies of this junction, where cyclists are observed queuing on the footway due to poor infrastructure. A CYCLOPS junction—already widely adopted across Greater Manchester—would provide a safe and efficient solution for all users.

Such a contribution would meet the tests set out in Paragraph 58 of the National Planning Policy Framework (2024): it would be necessary to make the development acceptable in planning terms, directly related to the

development given the increased pressure on the junction, and proportionate in scale and kind to the proposed tripling of residential occupancy.

---

1. Legal Status of Cavendish Street

Cavendish Street remains an adopted highway, subject to a 1996 stopping-up order which required the developer to provide a new footpath/cycleway. Despite this, MMU has installed signage claiming the route is not a highway and has introduced physical deterrents such as restrictive speed bumps. These measures may be unlawful and are certainly contrary to the spirit of the original order. Cyclists retain a legal right of way, and the current design may also impede access for disabled users.

---

2. Cycling Policy and Network Integration

National and local planning policy strongly supports the promotion of cycling. Relevant documents include:

- NPPF 2024 (vision-led approach)
- DfT LTN 1/20
- Places for Everyone policies JP-Strat14, JP-C1, JP-C5, JP-C6
- GM Transport Strategy 2040 and “Right Mix” targets
- Greater Manchester Streets for All strategy
- Manchester’s Active Travel Strategy
- Manchester’s Zero Carbon 2038 commitment

Cavendish Street is identified on TfGM’s Bee Network map as a Beeway and connects to the Stretford Road Busy Beeway. It is a vital, direct link in the city’s cycle network. LTN 1/20 emphasises that cycle routes must be safe, direct, comfortable, attractive, and coherent. The proposed diversion undermines all of these principles.

---

3. Misleading Safety Claims

The Design & Access Statement refers to collisions involving pedestrians, cyclists, and e-scooters on Cavendish Street. However, the Transport Statement’s own collision map shows no recorded incidents on this stretch—only on adjacent roads. This undermines the applicant’s justification for restricting cycle access and suggests a lack of evidence-based reasoning.

This application, as currently proposed, would significantly degrade an important active travel route and contradicts both local and national policy objectives. I urge the Council to reject the application and to work with the applicant to deliver a scheme that supports, rather than obstructs, sustainable transport.

Yours sincerely,

[redacted]

****
This email and any files transmitted with it are confidential and intended solely for the use of the individual or entity to whom they are addressed.
If you have received this email in error, please notify the sender, or [redacted] and then permanently delete the email, attachments and all copies.
The full text of the Council's email disclaimer is available at: www.manchester.gov.uk/emaildisclaimer.
Your personal data is very important to us. Please refer to our privacy notice at: www.manchester.gov.uk/privacy for further information.

This footnote also confirms that this email message has been swept for the presence of computer viruses.
****

Outlook

Fw: Comment on Planning Application 142888/FO/2025

From Planning <[redacted]
Date Mon 30/06/2025 08:49
To Lucy Harrison <[redacted]

Information, Delivery & Support Team
Planning, Building Control & Licensing
Growth & Development Directorate
Postal address: Manchester City Council, P O Box 532, Town Hall, Manchester M60 2LA
Location address: Level 6 Town Hall Extension, Manchester M2 5DB
Tel: 0161 234 4516

Please consider the environment before printing an e-mail.

From: [redacted]
Sent: 28 June 2025 17:22
To: Planning <[redacted]
Subject: Comment on Planning Application 142888/FO/2025

You don't often get email from [redacted] Learn why this is important

ALERT This message originated outside of the Manchester City Council network. **BE CAUTIOUS** before clicking any links or opening any attachments. Please remember your Cyber Training and report anything suspicious.

Subject: Comment on Planning Application 142888/FO/2025

Dear Manchester Planning team,

I am writing to lodge an objection to planning application **142888/FO/2025** – Cambridge Halls Of Residence Cavendish Street Manchester M15 6TT.

My primary objection is that the proposals have been designed to deter cyclists from using the safest and most direct route through the site. This route has been open to cyclists ever since the road was first built; it is an essential, well-used part of the city's cycling network and therefore the proposal to deter and/or divert cycles away from Cavendish Street is directly at odds with Manchester City Council's planning, sustainability and transport policies.

The applicant has also made misleading claims regarding the road's legal status and regarding pedestrian safety which I will outline below.

I am asking that the council **refuse** this application, and invite the developer to come back with a proposal that maintains direct cycle as well as pedestrian access along Cavendish Street, designed to modern standards set out in Greater Manchester's Streets For All design guide and in Department for Transport guidance note LTN 1/20. I am sure that the Highways team at MCC and the Active Travel team at TfGM will, if asked, be happy to comment on how such a route could be provided within the space available.

I am also asking that the council **make a Section 106 agreement (s106)** with the applicant to fund safety improvements for pedestrians and cyclists at the junction of Cavendish Street and Higher Cambridge Street – the applicant themselves discuss the shortcomings of the existing junction layout in Section 4.2.1 of the Transport Statement ("*Cyclists have also been observed to queue on the footway to gain direct access to the Higher Cambridge Street/Cavendish Street junction (via a gap in the guard railings) rather than following the road markings which advise cyclists to dismount and use the controlled pedestrian crossings*"). The improvements might take the form of a CYCLOPS junction. CYCLOPS is a homegrown Greater Manchester innovation now frequently used on Highways schemes across the country to deliver safe pedestrian and cycle movements without undue impact on traffic flows.

For prospective occupants and passers-by alike, in line with the S106 tests as set out in Paragraph 58 of the National Planning Policy Framework (NPPF) 2024, a contribution to junction safety improvements improvement would be ‘necessary to make the development acceptable in planning terms’ (by contributing to an appropriate movement strategy for the site), ‘directly related to the development’ (given its proximity, the pressure added to the junction by the proposed threefold increase in residents, and in light of the wholly inadequate mitigation route proposed by the applicant), and ‘fairly and reasonably related in scale and kind to the development’ (given the stated threefold increase in residents explained by the applicant, so directly adding more pressure to the junction).

1 Legal Status of Cavendish Street

This section of Cavendish Street, an adopted Highway, was subject to a stopping up order dated 14.06.1996. That order required that “the Developer shall provide a new highway which shall be a footpath/cycleway”. MMU have since installed physical signage stating that Cavendish Street “has not been dedicated as a Highway” and have bolted down uncomfortable and restrictive speed bumps across the route in an apparent attempt to dissuade cyclists from exercising their legal rights over this space. Both measures may be unlawful, as my understanding is that cyclists do retain a legal Right of Way along Cavendish Street, unchanged from when the entire road was an adopted highway, and the speed bumps are inaccessible to some Disabled users.

2 Cycling routes and planning policy

The case for walking and cycling and specifically for maintaining and improving high quality cycling networks is clear at every level of modern planning policy, including:

- NPPF 2024's "vision-led approach"
- LTN 1/20
- Places For Everyone Joint Development Plan Objectives 6, 7 and 10
- Places for Everyone Joint Development Plan policies JP-Strat14, JP-C1, JP-C5 and JP-C6
- GM Transport Strategy 2040 and the "Right Mix" targets
- Greater Manchester Streets for All strategy and Streets for All design guide
- Manchester City Council's Active Travel Strategy
- Manchester City Council's commitment to be a Zero Carbon city by 2038

The policy position is absolutely clear – changes to the existing road and cycle networks should make cycling more convenient for people, not less convenient.

This specific stretch of Cavendish Street is a key part of the existing cycle network. It appears on TfGM's Bee Network map as a Beeway ("the routes that get people from A to B … representing the most direct routes between crossing points.") and connects to the Stretford Road Busy Beeway ("corridors or crossing points on busier roads that will require a higher level of design intervention to improve cycling and walking.") It is also mapped on the TfGM Cycle Network.

The national standard for cycling infrastructure is DfT guidance note LTN 1/20. LTN 1/20 advises above all else that cycle routes and networks should be Safe, Direct, Comfortable, Attractive and Coherent. Introducing unnecessary diversions, junctions and bends into a well-used existing route undermines all of these core principles, resulting in a lower quality cycle network which will make it harder for the council to achieve its cycling objectives.

The applicant has offered various reasons why diverting cyclists is necessary but all of these reasons seem to be either existing problems, or problems designed into the scheme. The proposal is to demolish and redevelop the site – so considerations like limited space and the placement of entrances, shop frontages, planting and pedestrian areas are entirely within the applicant's scope to manage. Instead of starting with the problem "there is an existing busy cycle route across this site, how can I design to accommodate everyone's needs?", it seems the applicant has started with the conclusion "cyclists must be deterred" and instructed their consultants to post-rationalise that decision.

3 Misleading claims regarding safety

Page 22 of the Design & Access Statement refers to the "existing controversial link along Cavendish St., which is resulting in collisions of pedestrians, electric scooters, cyclists, etc."

However the map of recorded collisions, on page 18 of the Transport Statement submitted in the same planning application, shows no recorded collisions whatsoever on this link, only on the adjacent main roads.

It appears the applicant is attempting to restrict cycle access based on a "problem" for which they have no evidence.

Yours sincerely,

[redacted]

****
This email and any files transmitted with it are confidential and intended solely for the use of the individual or entity to whom they are addressed. If you have received this email in error, please notify the sender, or [redacted] and then permanently delete the email, attachments and all copies.

The full text of the Council's email disclaimer is available at: www.manchester.gov.uk/emaildisclaimer.
Your personal data is very important to us. Please refer to our privacy notice at: www.manchester.gov.uk/privacy for further information.

This footnote also confirms that this email message has been swept for the presence of computer viruses.
****

Outlook

Fw: Comment on Planning Application 142888/FO/2025

From Planning <[redacted]>
Date Mon 14/07/2025 14:06
To Lucy Harrison <[redacted]>

Information, Delivery & Support Team
Planning, Building Control & Licensing
Growth & Development Directorate
Postal address: Manchester City Council, P O Box 532, Town Hall, Manchester M60 2LA
Location address: Level 6 Town Hall Extension, Manchester M2 5DB
Tel: 0161 234 4516

Please consider the environment before printing an e-mail.

From: [redacted]
Sent: 11 July 2025 14:44
To: Planning <[redacted]>
Subject: Comment on Planning Application 142888/FO/2025

You don't often get email from [redacted] Learn why this is important

ALERT This message originated outside of the Manchester City Council network. **BE CAUTIOUS** before clicking any links or opening any attachments. Please remember your Cyber Training and report anything suspicious.

Dear Manchester Planning team,

I am writing to lodge an objection to planning application 142888/FO/2025 – Cambridge Halls Of Residence Cavendish Street Manchester M15 6TT.

My primary objection is that the proposals have been designed to deter cyclists from using the safest and most direct route through the site. This route has been open to cyclists ever since the road was first built; it is an essential, well-used part of the city's cycling network and therefore the proposal to deter and/or divert cycles away from Cavendish Street is directly at odds with Manchester City Council's planning, sustainability and transport policies.

The applicant has also made misleading claims regarding the road's legal status and regarding pedestrian safety which I will outline below.

I am asking that the council refuse this application, and invite the developer to come back with a proposal that maintains direct cycle as well as pedestrian access along Cavendish Street, designed to modern standards set out in Greater Manchester's Streets For All design guide and in Department for Transport guidance note LTN 1/20. I am sure that the Highways team at MCC and the Active Travel team at TfGM will, if asked, be happy to comment on how such a route could be

provided within the space available.

I am also asking that the council make a Section 106 agreement (s106) with the applicant to fund safety improvements for pedestrians and cyclists at the junction of Cavendish Street and Higher Cambridge Street – the applicant themselves discuss the shortcomings of the existing junction layout in Section 4.2.1 of the Transport Statement ("Cyclists have also been observed to queue on the footway to gain direct access to the Higher Cambridge Street/Cavendish Street junction (via a gap in the guard railings) rather than following the road markings which advise cyclists to dismount and use the controlled pedestrian crossings"). The improvements might take the form of a CYCLOPS junction. CYCLOPS is a homegrown Greater Manchester innovation now frequently used on Highways schemes across the country to deliver safe pedestrian and cycle movements without undue impact on traffic flows.

For prospective occupants and passers-by alike, in line with the S106 tests as set out in Paragraph 58 of the National Planning Policy Framework (NPPF) 2024, a contribution to junction safety improvements improvement would be 'necessary to make the development acceptable in planning terms' (by contributing to an appropriate movement strategy for the site), 'directly related to the development' (given its proximity, the pressure added to the junction by the proposed threefold increase in residents, and in light of the wholly inadequate mitigation route proposed by the applicant), and 'fairly and reasonably related in scale and kind to the development' (given the stated threefold increase in residents explained by the applicant, so directly adding more pressure to the junction).

1 Legal Status of Cavendish Street

This section of Cavendish Street, an adopted Highway, was subject to a stopping up order dated 14.06.1996. That order required that "the Developer shall provide a new highway which shall be a footpath/cycleway". MMU have since installed physical signage stating that Cavendish Street "has not been dedicated as a Highway" and have bolted down uncomfortable and restrictive speed bumps across the route in an apparent attempt to dissuade cyclists from exercising their legal rights over this space. Both measures may be unlawful, as my understanding is that cyclists do retain a legal Right of Way along Cavendish Street, unchanged from when the entire road was an adopted highway, and the speed bumps are inaccessible to some Disabled users.

2 Cycling routes and planning policy

The case for walking and cycling and specifically for maintaining and improving high quality cycling networks is clear at every level of modern planning policy, including:

NPPF 2024's "vision-led approach"
LTN 1/20
Places For Everyone Joint Development Plan Objectives 6, 7 and 10
Places for Everyone Joint Development Plan policies JP-Strat14, JP-C1, JP-C5 and JP-C6
GM Transport Strategy 2040 and the "Right Mix" targets
Greater Manchester Streets for All strategy and Streets for All design guide
Manchester City Council's Active Travel Strategy
Manchester City Council's commitment to be a Zero Carbon city by 2038
The policy position is absolutely clear – changes to the existing road and cycle networks should make cycling more convenient for people, not less convenient.

This specific stretch of Cavendish Street is a key part of the existing cycle network. It appears on TfGM's Bee Network map as a Beeway ("the routes that get people from A to B … representing the

most direct routes between crossing points.") and connects to the Stretford Road Busy Beeway ("corridors or crossing points on busier roads that will require a higher level of design intervention to improve cycling and walking.") It is also mapped on the TfGM Cycle Network.

The national standard for cycling infrastructure is DfT guidance note LTN 1/20. LTN 1/20 advises above all else that cycle routes and networks should be Safe, Direct, Comfortable, Attractive and Coherent. Introducing unnecessary diversions, junctions and bends into a well-used existing route undermines all of these core principles, resulting in a lower quality cycle network which will make it harder for the council to achieve its cycling objectives.

The applicant has offered various reasons why diverting cyclists is necessary but all of these reasons seem to be either existing problems, or problems designed into the scheme. The proposal is to demolish and redevelop the site – so considerations like limited space and the placement of entrances, shop frontages, planting and pedestrian areas are entirely within the applicant's scope to manage. Instead of starting with the problem "there is an existing busy cycle route across this site, how can I design to accommodate everyone's needs?", it seems the applicant has started with the conclusion "cyclists must be deterred" and instructed their consultants to post-rationalise that decision.

3 Misleading claims regarding safety

Page 22 of the Design & Access Statement refers to the "existing controversial link along Cavendish St., which is resulting in collisions of pedestrians, electric scooters, cyclists, etc."

However the map of recorded collisions, on page 18 of the Transport Statement submitted in the same planning application, shows no recorded collisions whatsoever on this link, only on the adjacent main roads.

It appears the applicant is attempting to restrict cycle access based on a "problem" for which they have no evidence.

Yours sincerely,

[redacted]

****
This email and any files transmitted with it are confidential and intended solely for the use of the individual or entity to whom they are addressed.
If you have received this email in error, please notify the sender, or [redacted] and then permanently delete the email, attachments and all copies.
The full text of the Council's email disclaimer is available at: www.manchester.gov.uk/emaildisclaimer.
Your personal data is very important to us. Please refer to our privacy notice at: www.manchester.gov.uk/privacy for further information.

This footnote also confirms that this email message has been swept for the presence of computer viruses.
****

Outlook

Fw: 142888/FO/2025 Cavendish Street cycle route

From Planning <[redacted]
Date Mon 30/06/2025 08:50
To Lucy Harrison <[redacted]

Information, Delivery & Support Team
Planning, Building Control & Licensing
Growth & Development Directorate
Postal address: Manchester City Council, P O Box 532, Town Hall, Manchester M60 2LA
Location address: Level 6 Town Hall Extension, Manchester M2 5DB
Tel: 0161 234 4516

Please consider the environment before printing an e-mail.

From: [redacted]
Sent: 28 June 2025 16:50
To: Planning <[redacted]
Subject: 142888/FO/2025 Cavendish Street cycle route

You don't often get email from [redacted] Learn why this is important

ALERT This message originated outside of the Manchester City Council network. **BE CAUTIOUS** before clicking any links or opening any attachments. Please remember your Cyber Training and report anything suspicious.

Dear Manchester Planning team,

I am writing to lodge an objection to planning application **142888/FO/2025** – Cambridge Halls Of Residence Cavendish Street Manchester M15 6TT.

I regularly use this cycle route and My primary objection is that the proposals have been designed to deter cyclists from using the safest and most direct route through the site. This route has been open to cyclists ever since the road was first built; it is an essential, well-used part of the city's cycling network and therefore the proposal to deter and/or divert cycles away from Cavendish Street is directly at odds with Manchester City Council's planning, sustainability and transport policies.

I use this route most days commuting into city centre from Chorlton and the alter route would be less safe and longer.

The applicant has also made misleading claims regarding the road's legal status and regarding pedestrian safety which I will outline below.

I am asking that the council **refuse** this application, and invite the developer to come back with a proposal that maintains direct cycle as well as pedestrian access along Cavendish Street, designed to modern standards set out in Greater Manchester's Streets For All design guide and in Department for Transport guidance note LTN 1/20. I am sure that the Highways team at MCC and the Active Travel team at TfGM will, if asked, be happy to comment on how such a route could be provided within the space available.

I am also asking that the council **make a Section 106 agreement (s106)** with the applicant to fund safety improvements for pedestrians and cyclists at the junction of Cavendish Street and Higher Cambridge Street – the applicant themselves discuss the shortcomings of the existing junction layout in Section 4.2.1 of the Transport Statement ("*Cyclists have also been observed to queue on the footway to gain direct access to the Higher Cambridge Street/Cavendish Street junction (via a gap in the guard railings) rather than following the road markings which advise cyclists to dismount and use the controlled pedestrian crossings*"). The improvements might take the form of a CYCLOPS junction. CYCLOPS is a homegrown Greater Manchester innovation now frequently used on Highways schemes across the country to deliver safe pedestrian and cycle movements without undue impact on traffic flows.

For prospective occupants and passers-by alike, in line with the S106 tests as set out in Paragraph 58 of the National Planning Policy Framework (NPPF) 2024, a contribution to junction safety improvements improvement would be 'necessary to make the development acceptable in planning terms' (by contributing to an appropriate movement strategy for the site), 'directly related to the development' (given its proximity, the pressure added to the junction by the proposed threefold increase in residents, and in light of the wholly inadequate mitigation route proposed by the applicant), and 'fairly and reasonably related in scale and kind to the development' (given the stated threefold increase in residents explained by the applicant, so directly adding more pressure to the junction).

1 Legal Status of Cavendish Street

This section of Cavendish Street, an adopted Highway, was subject to a stopping up order dated 14.06.1996. That order required that "the Developer shall provide a new highway which shall be a footpath/cycleway". MMU have since installed physical signage stating that Cavendish Street "has not been dedicated as a Highway" and have bolted down uncomfortable and restrictive speed bumps

across the route in an apparent attempt to dissuade cyclists from exercising their legal rights over this space. Both measures may be unlawful, as my understanding is that cyclists do retain a legal Right of Way along Cavendish Street, unchanged from when the entire road was an adopted highway, and the speed bumps are inaccessible to some Disabled users.

2 Cycling routes and planning policy

The case for walking and cycling and specifically for maintaining and improving high quality cycling networks is clear at every level of modern planning policy, including:

- NPPF 2024's "vision-led approach"
- LTN 1/20
- Places For Everyone Joint Development Plan Objectives 6, 7 and 10
- Places for Everyone Joint Development Plan policies JP-Strat14, JP-C1, JP-C5 and JP-C6
- GM Transport Strategy 2040 and the "Right Mix" targets
- Greater Manchester Streets for All strategy and Streets for All design guide
- Manchester City Council's Active Travel Strategy
- Manchester City Council's commitment to be a Zero Carbon city by 2038

The policy position is absolutely clear – changes to the existing road and cycle networks should make cycling more convenient for people, not less convenient.

This specific stretch of Cavendish Street is a key part of the existing cycle network. It appears on TfGM's Bee Network map as a Beeway ("the routes that get people from A to B … representing the most direct routes between crossing points.") and connects to the Stretford Road Busy Beeway ("corridors or crossing points on busier roads that will require a higher level of design intervention to improve cycling and walking.") It is also mapped on the TfGM Cycle Network.

The national standard for cycling infrastructure is DfT guidance note LTN 1/20. LTN 1/20 advises above all else that cycle routes and networks should be Safe, Direct, Comfortable, Attractive and Coherent. Introducing unnecessary diversions, junctions and bends into a well-used existing route undermines all of these core principles, resulting in a lower quality cycle network which will make it harder for the council to achieve its cycling objectives.

The applicant has offered various reasons why diverting cyclists is necessary but all of these reasons seem to be either existing problems, or problems designed into the scheme. The proposal is to demolish and redevelop the site – so considerations like limited space and the placement of entrances, shop frontages, planting and pedestrian areas are entirely within the applicant's scope to manage. Instead of starting with the problem "there is an existing busy cycle route across this site, how can I design to accommodate everyone's needs?", it seems the applicant has started with the conclusion "cyclists must be deterred" and instructed their consultants to post-rationalise that decision.

3 Misleading claims regarding safety

Page 22 of the Design & Access Statement refers to the "existing controversial link along Cavendish St., which is resulting in collisions of pedestrians, electric scooters, cyclists, etc."

However the map of recorded collisions, on page 18 of the Transport Statement submitted in the same planning application, shows no recorded collisions whatsoever on this link, only on the adjacent main roads.

It appears the applicant is attempting to restrict cycle access based on a "problem" for which they have no evidence.

Yours sincerely,

[redacted]

[redacted]

****
This email and any files transmitted with it are confidential and intended solely for the use of the individual or entity to whom they are addressed.
If you have received this email in error, please notify the sender, or [redacted] and then permanently delete the email, attachments and all copies.
The full text of the Council's email disclaimer is available at: www.manchester.gov.uk/emaildisclaimer.
Your personal data is very important to us. Please refer to our privacy notice at: www.manchester.gov.uk/privacy for further information.

This footnote also confirms that this email message has been swept for the presence of computer viruses.
****

Outlook

Fw: Comment on Planning Application 142888/FO/2025

From Planning <[redacted]
Date Mon 30/06/2025 08:46
To Lucy Harrison <[redacted]

Information, Delivery & Support Team
Planning, Building Control & Licensing
Growth & Development Directorate
Postal address: Manchester City Council, P O Box 532, Town Hall, Manchester M60 2LA
Location address: Level 6 Town Hall Extension, Manchester M2 5DB
Tel: 0161 234 4516

Please consider the environment before printing an e-mail.

From: [redacted]
Sent: 29 June 2025 22:10
To: Planning <[redacted]
Subject: Comment on Planning Application 142888/FO/2025

You don't often get email from [redacted] Learn why this is important

ALERT This message originated outside of the Manchester City Council network. **BE CAUTIOUS** before clicking any links or opening any attachments. Please remember your Cyber Training and report anything suspicious.

Dear Manchester Planning team,

I am writing to lodge an objection to planning application 142888/FO/2025 – Cambridge Halls Of Residence Cavendish Street Manchester M15 6TT.

My primary objection is that the proposals have been designed to deter cyclists from using the safest and most direct route through the site. This route has been open to cyclists ever since the road was first built; it is an essential, well-used part of the city's cycling network and therefore the proposal to deter and/or divert cycles away from Cavendish Street is directly at odds with Manchester City Council's planning, sustainability and transport policies.

I have made frequent use of this cycle route over many years. It is part of the safest route between my house and Piccadilly station.

The applicant has also made misleading claims regarding the road's legal status and regarding pedestrian safety which I will outline below.

I am asking that the council refuse this application, and invite the developer to come back with a proposal that maintains direct cycle as well as pedestrian access along Cavendish Street, designed to modern standards set out in Greater Manchester's Streets For All design guide and in

Department for Transport guidance note LTN 1/20. I am sure that the Highways team at MCC and the Active Travel team at TfGM will, if asked, be happy to comment on how such a route could be provided within the space available.

I am also asking that the council make a Section 106 agreement (s106) with the applicant to fund safety improvements for pedestrians and cyclists at the junction of Cavendish Street and Higher Cambridge Street – the applicant themselves discuss the shortcomings of the existing junction layout in Section 4.2.1 of the Transport Statement ("Cyclists have also been observed to queue on the footway to gain direct access to the Higher Cambridge Street/Cavendish Street junction (via a gap in the guard railings) rather than following the road markings which advise cyclists to dismount and use the controlled pedestrian crossings"). The improvements might take the form of a CYCLOPS junction. CYCLOPS is a homegrown Greater Manchester innovation now frequently used on Highways schemes across the country to deliver safe pedestrian and cycle movements without undue impact on traffic flows.

For prospective occupants and passers-by alike, in line with the S106 tests as set out in Paragraph 58 of the National Planning Policy Framework (NPPF) 2024, a contribution to junction safety improvements improvement would be 'necessary to make the development acceptable in planning terms' (by contributing to an appropriate movement strategy for the site), 'directly related to the development' (given its proximity, the pressure added to the junction by the proposed threefold increase in residents, and in light of the wholly inadequate mitigation route proposed by the applicant), and 'fairly and reasonably related in scale and kind to the development' (given the stated threefold increase in residents explained by the applicant, so directly adding more pressure to the junction).

1 Legal Status of Cavendish Street

This section of Cavendish Street, an adopted Highway, was subject to a stopping up order dated 14.06.1996. That order required that "the Developer shall provide a new highway which shall be a footpath/cycleway". MMU have since installed physical signage stating that Cavendish Street "has not been dedicated as a Highway" and have bolted down uncomfortable and restrictive speed bumps across the route in an apparent attempt to dissuade cyclists from exercising their legal rights over this space. Both measures may be unlawful, as my understanding is that cyclists do retain a legal Right of Way along Cavendish Street, unchanged from when the entire road was an adopted highway, and the speed bumps are inaccessible to some Disabled users.

2 Cycling routes and planning policy

The case for walking and cycling and specifically for maintaining and improving high quality cycling networks is clear at every level of modern planning policy, including:

NPPF 2024's "vision-led approach"
LTN 1/20
Places For Everyone Joint Development Plan Objectives 6, 7 and 10
Places for Everyone Joint Development Plan policies JP-Strat14, JP-C1, JP-C5 and JP-C6
GM Transport Strategy 2040 and the "Right Mix" targets
Greater Manchester Streets for All strategy and Streets for All design guide
Manchester City Council's Active Travel Strategy
Manchester City Council's commitment to be a Zero Carbon city by 2038
The policy position is absolutely clear – changes to the existing road and cycle networks should make cycling more convenient for people, not less convenient.

This specific stretch of Cavendish Street is a key part of the existing cycle network. It appears on TfGM's Bee Network map as a Beeway ("the routes that get people from A to B … representing the most direct routes between crossing points.") and connects to the Stretford Road Busy Beeway ("corridors or crossing points on busier roads that will require a higher level of design intervention to improve cycling and walking.") It is also mapped on the TfGM Cycle Network.

The national standard for cycling infrastructure is DfT guidance note LTN 1/20. LTN 1/20 advises above all else that cycle routes and networks should be Safe, Direct, Comfortable, Attractive and Coherent. Introducing unnecessary diversions, junctions and bends into a well-used existing route undermines all of these core principles, resulting in a lower quality cycle network which will make it harder for the council to achieve its cycling objectives.

The applicant has offered various reasons why diverting cyclists is necessary but all of these reasons seem to be either existing problems, or problems designed into the scheme. The proposal is to demolish and redevelop the site – so considerations like limited space and the placement of entrances, shop frontages, planting and pedestrian areas are entirely within the applicant's scope to manage. Instead of starting with the problem "there is an existing busy cycle route across this site, how can I design to accommodate everyone's needs?", it seems the applicant has started with the conclusion "cyclists must be deterred" and instructed their consultants to post-rationalise that decision.

3 Misleading claims regarding safety

Page 22 of the Design & Access Statement refers to the "existing controversial link along Cavendish St., which is resulting in collisions of pedestrians, electric scooters, cyclists, etc."

However the map of recorded collisions, on page 18 of the Transport Statement submitted in the same planning application, shows no recorded collisions whatsoever on this link, only on the adjacent main roads.

It appears the applicant is attempting to restrict cycle access based on a "problem" for which they have no evidence.

Yours sincerely,

****
This email and any files transmitted with it are confidential and intended solely for the use of the individual or entity to whom they are addressed.
If you have received this email in error, please notify the sender, or [redacted] and then permanently delete the email, attachments and all copies.
The full text of the Council's email disclaimer is available at: www.manchester.gov.uk/emaildisclaimer.
Your personal data is very important to us. Please refer to our privacy notice at: www.manchester.gov.uk/privacy for further information.

This footnote also confirms that this email message has been swept for the presence of computer viruses.
****

Outlook

Fw: Comment on Planning Application 142888/FO/2025

From Planning <[redacted]
Date Mon 30/06/2025 08:48
To Lucy Harrison <[redacted]

Information, Delivery & Support Team
Planning, Building Control & Licensing
Growth & Development Directorate
Postal address: Manchester City Council, P O Box 532, Town Hall, Manchester M60 2LA
Location address: Level 6 Town Hall Extension, Manchester M2 5DB
Tel: 0161 234 4516

Please consider the environment before printing an e-mail.

From: [redacted]
Sent: 28 June 2025 23:08
To: Planning <[redacted]
Subject: Comment on Planning Application 142888/FO/2025

You don't often get email from [redacted] Learn why this is important

ALERT This message originated outside of the Manchester City Council network. **BE CAUTIOUS** before clicking any links or opening any attachments. Please remember your Cyber Training and report anything suspicious.

Dear Manchester Planning team,

I am writing to lodge an objection to planning application 142888/FO/2025 – Cambridge Halls Of Residence Cavendish Street Manchester M15 6TT.

My primary objection is that the proposals have been designed to deter cyclists from using the safest and most direct route through the site. This route has been open to cyclists ever since the road was first built; it is an essential, well-used part of the city's cycling network and therefore the proposal to deter and/or divert cycles away from Cavendish Street is directly at odds with Manchester City Council's planning, sustainability and transport policies.

I use Grosvenor street / Cavendish Street / Stretford Rd on regular basis for my commute from north of Manchester to South of Manchester as a cyclist. As well as, include Cavendish Street into the monthly guided rides of Manchester aimed

to explore the cities cycling infrastructure and get more people on bikes in the area.

The applicant has also made misleading claims regarding the road's legal status and regarding pedestrian safety which I will outline below.

I am asking that the council refuse this application, and invite the developer to come back with a proposal that maintains direct cycle as well as pedestrian access along Cavendish Street, designed to modern standards set out in Greater Manchester's Streets For All design guide and in Department for Transport guidance note LTN 1/20. I am sure that the Highways team at MCC and the Active Travel team at TfGM will, if asked, be happy to comment on how such a route could be provided within the space available.

I am also asking that the council make a Section 106 agreement (s106) with the applicant to fund safety improvements for pedestrians and cyclists at the junction of Cavendish Street and Higher Cambridge Street – the applicant themselves discuss the shortcomings of the existing junction layout in Section 4.2.1 of the Transport Statement ("Cyclists have also been observed to queue on the footway to gain direct access to the Higher Cambridge Street/Cavendish Street junction (via a gap in the guard railings) rather than following the road markings which advise cyclists to dismount and use the controlled pedestrian crossings"). The improvements might take the form of a CYCLOPS junction. CYCLOPS is a homegrown Greater Manchester innovation now frequently used on Highways schemes across the country to deliver safe pedestrian and cycle movements without undue impact on traffic flows.

For prospective occupants and passers-by alike, in line with the S106 tests as set out in Paragraph 58 of the National Planning Policy Framework (NPPF) 2024, a contribution to junction safety improvements improvement would be 'necessary to make the development acceptable in planning terms' (by contributing to an appropriate movement strategy for the site), 'directly related to the development' (given its proximity, the pressure added to the junction by the proposed threefold increase in residents, and in light of the wholly inadequate mitigation route proposed by the applicant), and 'fairly and reasonably related in scale and kind to the development' (given the stated threefold increase in residents explained by the applicant, so directly adding more pressure to the junction).

1 Legal Status of Cavendish Street

This section of Cavendish Street, an adopted Highway, was subject to a stopping up order dated 14.06.1996. That order required that "the Developer shall provide a

new highway which shall be a footpath/cycleway". MMU have since installed physical signage stating that Cavendish Street "has not been dedicated as a Highway" and have bolted down uncomfortable and restrictive speed bumps across the route in an apparent attempt to dissuade cyclists from exercising their legal rights over this space. Both measures may be unlawful, as my understanding is that cyclists do retain a legal Right of Way along Cavendish Street, unchanged from when the entire road was an adopted highway, and the speed bumps are inaccessible to some Disabled users.

2 Cycling routes and planning policy

The case for walking and cycling and specifically for maintaining and improving high quality cycling networks is clear at every level of modern planning policy, including:

NPPF 2024's "vision-led approach"

LTN 1/20

Places For Everyone Joint Development Plan Objectives 6, 7 and 10

Places for Everyone Joint Development Plan policies JP-Strat14, JP-C1, JP-C5 and JP-C6

GM Transport Strategy 2040 and the "Right Mix" targets

Greater Manchester Streets for All strategy and Streets for All design guide

Manchester City Council's Active Travel Strategy

Manchester City Council's commitment to be a Zero Carbon city by 2038

The policy position is absolutely clear – changes to the existing road and cycle networks should make cycling more convenient for people, not less convenient.

This specific stretch of Cavendish Street is a key part of the existing cycle network. It appears on TfGM's Bee Network map as a Beeway ("the routes that get people from A to B … representing the most direct routes between crossing points.") and connects to the Stretford Road Busy Beeway ("corridors or crossing points on busier roads that will require a higher level of design intervention to improve cycling and walking.") It is also mapped on the TfGM Cycle Network.

The national standard for cycling infrastructure is DfT guidance note LTN 1/20. LTN 1/20 advises above all else that cycle routes and networks should be Safe, Direct, Comfortable, Attractive and Coherent. Introducing unnecessary diversions, junctions and bends into a well-used existing route undermines all of these core principles, resulting in a lower quality cycle network which will make it harder for the council to achieve its cycling objectives.

The applicant has offered various reasons why diverting cyclists is necessary but all of these reasons seem to be either existing problems, or problems designed into the scheme. The proposal is to demolish and redevelop the site – so considerations like limited space and the placement of entrances, shop frontages, planting and pedestrian areas are entirely within the applicant's scope to manage. Instead of starting with the problem "there is an existing busy cycle route across this site, how can I design to accommodate everyone's needs?", it seems the applicant has started with the conclusion "cyclists must be deterred" and instructed their consultants to post-rationalise that decision.

3 Misleading claims regarding safety

Page 22 of the Design & Access Statement refers to the "existing controversial link along Cavendish St., which is resulting in collisions of pedestrians, electric scooters, cyclists, etc."

However the map of recorded collisions, on page 18 of the Transport Statement submitted in the same planning application, shows no recorded collisions whatsoever on this link, only on the adjacent main roads.

It appears the applicant is attempting to restrict cycle access based on a "problem" for which they have no evidence.

Yours sincerely,



[redacted]

[redacted]

****
This email and any files transmitted with it are confidential and intended solely for the use of the individual or entity to whom they are addressed.
If you have received this email in error, please notify the sender, or [redacted] and then permanently delete the email, attachments and all copies.
The full text of the Council's email disclaimer is available at: www.manchester.gov.uk/emaildisclaimer.
Your personal data is very important to us. Please refer to our privacy notice at: www.manchester.gov.uk/privacy for further information.

This footnote also confirms that this email message has been swept for the presence of computer viruses.
****

Outlook

Fw: Comment on Planning Application 142888/FO/2025

From Planning <[redacted]>
Date Mon 30/06/2025 11:54
To Lucy Harrison <[redacted]>

Information, Delivery & Support Team
Planning, Building Control & Licensing
Growth & Development Directorate
Postal address: Manchester City Council, P O Box 532, Town Hall, Manchester M60 2LA
Location address: Level 6 Town Hall Extension, Manchester M2 5DB
Tel: 0161 234 4516

Please consider the environment before printing an e-mail.

From: [redacted]
Sent: 30 June 2025 11:42
To: Planning <[redacted]>
Subject: Comment on Planning Application 142888/FO/2025

You don't often get email from [redacted] Learn why this is important

ALERT This message originated outside of the Manchester City Council network. **BE CAUTIOUS** before clicking any links or opening any attachments. Please remember your Cyber Training and report anything suspicious.

Dear Manchester Planning team,
I am writing to lodge an objection to planning application **142888/FO/2025** – Cambridge Halls Of Residence Cavendish Street Manchester M15 6TT.
My primary objection is that the proposals have been designed to deter cyclists from using the safest and most direct route through the site. This route has been open to cyclists ever since the road was first built; it is an essential, well-used part of the city's cycling network and therefore the proposal to deter and/or divert cycles away from Cavendish Street is directly at odds with Manchester City Council's planning, sustainability and transport policies.
I have cycled through Cavendish Street on a regular basis for the past six years on my way to and from work. It's a key part of the journey for me that links the (mostly) protected cycleway along Talbot and Stretford Roads to the Oxford Road cycleway (and beyond).
Rather than taking the simple route of blocking it off to cyclists, I feel MMU should be obliged to contribute to improving this junction, as it's confused going southbound (paint on the path suggests you can only go off to the left – when the majority of people are travelling straight on).
The applicant has also made misleading claims regarding the road's legal status and regarding pedestrian safety which I will outline below.
I am asking that the council **refuse** this application, and invite the developer to come back with a proposal that maintains direct cycle as well as pedestrian access along Cavendish Street, designed to modern standards set out in Greater Manchester's Streets For All design guide and in

Department for Transport guidance note LTN 1/20. I am sure that the Highways team at MCC and the Active Travel team at TfGM will, if asked, be happy to comment on how such a route could be provided within the space available.

I am also asking that the council **make a Section 106 agreement (s106)** with the applicant to fund safety improvements for pedestrians and cyclists at the junction of Cavendish Street and Higher Cambridge Street – the applicant themselves discuss the shortcomings of the existing junction layout in Section 4.2.1 of the Transport Statement ("*Cyclists have also been observed to queue on the footway to gain direct access to the Higher Cambridge Street/Cavendish Street junction (via a gap in the guard railings) rather than following the road markings which advise cyclists to dismount and use the controlled pedestrian crossings*"). The improvements might take the form of a CYCLOPS junction. CYCLOPS is a homegrown Greater Manchester innovation now frequently used on Highways schemes across the country to deliver safe pedestrian and cycle movements without undue impact on traffic flows.

For prospective occupants and passers-by alike, in line with the S106 tests as set out in Paragraph 58 of the National Planning Policy Framework (NPPF) 2024, a contribution to junction safety improvements improvement would be 'necessary to make the development acceptable in planning terms' (by contributing to an appropriate movement strategy for the site), 'directly related to the development' (given its proximity, the pressure added to the junction by the proposed threefold increase in residents, and in light of the wholly inadequate mitigation route proposed by the applicant), and 'fairly and reasonably related in scale and kind to the development' (given the stated threefold increase in residents explained by the applicant, so directly adding more pressure to the junction).

1 Legal Status of Cavendish Street

This section of Cavendish Street, an adopted Highway, was subject to a stopping up order dated 14.06.1996. That order required that "the Developer shall provide a new highway which shall be a footpath/cycleway". MMU have since installed physical signage stating that Cavendish Street "has not been dedicated as a Highway" and have bolted down uncomfortable and restrictive speed bumps across the route in an apparent attempt to dissuade cyclists from exercising their legal rights over this space. Both measures may be unlawful, as my understanding is that cyclists do retain a legal Right of Way along Cavendish Street, unchanged from when the entire road was an adopted highway, and the speed bumps are inaccessible to some Disabled users.

2 Cycling routes and planning policy

The case for walking and cycling and specifically for maintaining and improving high quality cycling networks is clear at every level of modern planning policy, including:

- NPPF 2024's "vision-led approach"
- LTN 1/20
- Places For Everyone Joint Development Plan Objectives 6, 7 and 10
- Places for Everyone Joint Development Plan policies JP-Strat14, JP-C1, JP-C5 and JP-C6
- GM Transport Strategy 2040 and the "Right Mix" targets
- Greater Manchester Streets for All strategy and Streets for All design guide
- Manchester City Council's Active Travel Strategy
- Manchester City Council's commitment to be a Zero Carbon city by 2038

The policy position is absolutely clear – changes to the existing road and cycle networks should make cycling more convenient for people, not less convenient.

This specific stretch of Cavendish Street is a key part of the existing cycle network. It appears on TfGM's Bee Network map as a Beeway ("the routes that get people from A to B … representing the most direct routes between crossing points.") and connects to the Stretford Road Busy Beeway ("corridors or crossing points on busier roads that will require a higher level of design intervention to improve cycling and walking.") It is also mapped on the TfGM Cycle Network.

The national standard for cycling infrastructure is DfT guidance note LTN 1/20. LTN 1/20 advises above all else that cycle routes and networks should be Safe, Direct, Comfortable, Attractive and Coherent. Introducing unnecessary diversions, junctions and bends into a well-used existing route undermines all of these core principles, resulting in a lower quality cycle network which will make it harder for the council to achieve its cycling objectives.

The applicant has offered various reasons why diverting cyclists is necessary but all of these reasons seem to be either existing problems, or problems designed into the scheme. The proposal is to demolish and redevelop the site – so considerations like limited space and the placement of entrances, shop frontages, planting and pedestrian areas are entirely within the applicant's scope to manage. Instead of starting with the problem "there is an existing busy cycle route across this site, how can I design to accommodate everyone's needs?", it seems the applicant has started with the conclusion "cyclists must be deterred" and instructed their consultants to post-rationalise that decision.

3 Misleading claims regarding safety

Page 22 of the Design & Access Statement refers to the "existing controversial link along Cavendish St., which is resulting in collisions of pedestrians, electric scooters, cyclists, etc."

However the map of recorded collisions, on page 18 of the Transport Statement submitted in the same planning application, shows no recorded collisions whatsoever on this link, only on the adjacent main roads.

It appears the applicant is attempting to restrict cycle access based on a "problem" for which they have no evidence.

Yours sincerely,

[redacted]

****
This email and any files transmitted with it are confidential and intended solely for the use of the individual or entity to whom they are addressed.
If you have received this email in error, please notify the sender, or [redacted] and then permanently delete the email, attachments and all copies.
The full text of the Council's email disclaimer is available at: www.manchester.gov.uk/emaildisclaimer.
Your personal data is very important to us. Please refer to our privacy notice at: www.manchester.gov.uk/privacy for further information.

This footnote also confirms that this email message has been swept for the presence of computer viruses.
****

Outlook

Fw: Comment on Planning Application 142888/FO/2025

From Planning <[redacted]
Date Mon 07/07/2025 11:04
To Lucy Harrison <[redacted]

Information, Delivery & Support Team
Planning, Building Control & Licensing
Growth & Development Directorate
Postal address: Manchester City Council, P O Box 532, Town Hall, Manchester M60 2LA
Location address: Level 6 Town Hall Extension, Manchester M2 5DB
Tel: 0161 234 4516

Please consider the environment before printing an e-mail.

From: [redacted]
Sent: 05 July 2025 21:26
To: Planning <[redacted]
Subject: Comment on Planning Application 142888/FO/2025

You don't often get email from [redacted] Learn why this is important

ALERT This message originated outside of the Manchester City Council network. **BE CAUTIOUS** before clicking any links or opening any attachments. Please remember your Cyber Training and report anything suspicious.

Dear Manchester Planning team,

I am writing to lodge an objection to planning application 142888/FO/2025 – Cambridge Halls Of Residence Cavendish Street Manchester M15 6TT.

My primary objection is that the proposals have been designed to deter cyclists from using the safest and most direct route through the site. This route has been open to cyclists ever since the road was first built; it is an essential, well-used part of the city's cycling network and therefore the proposal to deter and/or divert cycles away from Cavendish Street is directly at odds with Manchester City Council's planning, sustainability and transport policies.

I have used this route very regularly for over 15 years and never had any issue. Firstly, as a cyclist, when it provides a valuable off-road route. Secondly, I regularly use this route to walk from my home in Old Trafford into Manchester city centre and have never had any issues using the shared path.

The applicant has also made misleading claims regarding the road's legal status and regarding pedestrian safety which I will outline below.

I am asking that the council refuse this application, and invite the developer to come back with a

proposal that maintains direct cycle as well as pedestrian access along Cavendish Street, designed to modern standards set out in Greater Manchester's Streets For All design guide and in Department for Transport guidance note LTN 1/20. I am sure that the Highways team at MCC and the Active Travel team at TfGM will, if asked, be happy to comment on how such a route could be provided within the space available.

I am also asking that the council make a Section 106 agreement (s106) with the applicant to fund safety improvements for pedestrians and cyclists at the junction of Cavendish Street and Higher Cambridge Street – the applicant themselves discuss the shortcomings of the existing junction layout in Section 4.2.1 of the Transport Statement ("Cyclists have also been observed to queue on the footway to gain direct access to the Higher Cambridge Street/Cavendish Street junction (via a gap in the guard railings) rather than following the road markings which advise cyclists to dismount and use the controlled pedestrian crossings"). The improvements might take the form of a CYCLOPS junction. CYCLOPS is a homegrown Greater Manchester innovation now frequently used on Highways schemes across the country to deliver safe pedestrian and cycle movements without undue impact on traffic flows.

For prospective occupants and passers-by alike, in line with the S106 tests as set out in Paragraph 58 of the National Planning Policy Framework (NPPF) 2024, a contribution to junction safety improvements improvement would be 'necessary to make the development acceptable in planning terms' (by contributing to an appropriate movement strategy for the site), 'directly related to the development' (given its proximity, the pressure added to the junction by the proposed threefold increase in residents, and in light of the wholly inadequate mitigation route proposed by the applicant), and 'fairly and reasonably related in scale and kind to the development' (given the stated threefold increase in residents explained by the applicant, so directly adding more pressure to the junction).

1 Legal Status of Cavendish Street

This section of Cavendish Street, an adopted Highway, was subject to a stopping up order dated 14.06.1996. That order required that "the Developer shall provide a new highway which shall be a footpath/cycleway". MMU have since installed physical signage stating that Cavendish Street "has not been dedicated as a Highway" and have bolted down uncomfortable and restrictive speed bumps across the route in an apparent attempt to dissuade cyclists from exercising their legal rights over this space. Both measures may be unlawful, as my understanding is that cyclists do retain a legal Right of Way along Cavendish Street, unchanged from when the entire road was an adopted highway, and the speed bumps are inaccessible to some Disabled users.

2 Cycling routes and planning policy

The case for walking and cycling and specifically for maintaining and improving high quality cycling networks is clear at every level of modern planning policy, including:

NPPF 2024's "vision-led approach"
LTN 1/20
Places For Everyone Joint Development Plan Objectives 6, 7 and 10
Places for Everyone Joint Development Plan policies JP-Strat14, JP-C1, JP-C5 and JP-C6
GM Transport Strategy 2040 and the "Right Mix" targets
Greater Manchester Streets for All strategy and Streets for All design guide
Manchester City Council's Active Travel Strategy
Manchester City Council's commitment to be a Zero Carbon city by 2038

The policy position is absolutely clear – changes to the existing road and cycle networks should make cycling more convenient for people, not less convenient.

This specific stretch of Cavendish Street is a key part of the existing cycle network. It appears on TfGM's Bee Network map as a Beeway ("the routes that get people from A to B … representing the most direct routes between crossing points.") and connects to the Stretford Road Busy Beeway ("corridors or crossing points on busier roads that will require a higher level of design intervention to improve cycling and walking.") It is also mapped on the TfGM Cycle Network.

The national standard for cycling infrastructure is DfT guidance note LTN 1/20. LTN 1/20 advises above all else that cycle routes and networks should be Safe, Direct, Comfortable, Attractive and Coherent. Introducing unnecessary diversions, junctions and bends into a well-used existing route undermines all of these core principles, resulting in a lower quality cycle network which will make it harder for the council to achieve its cycling objectives.

The applicant has offered various reasons why diverting cyclists is necessary but all of these reasons seem to be either existing problems, or problems designed into the scheme. The proposal is to demolish and redevelop the site – so considerations like limited space and the placement of entrances, shop frontages, planting and pedestrian areas are entirely within the applicant's scope to manage. Instead of starting with the problem "there is an existing busy cycle route across this site, how can I design to accommodate everyone's needs?", it seems the applicant has started with the conclusion "cyclists must be deterred" and instructed their consultants to post-rationalise that decision.

3 Misleading claims regarding safety

Page 22 of the Design & Access Statement refers to the "existing controversial link along Cavendish St., which is resulting in collisions of pedestrians, electric scooters, cyclists, etc."

However the map of recorded collisions, on page 18 of the Transport Statement submitted in the same planning application, shows no recorded collisions whatsoever on this link, only on the adjacent main roads.

It appears the applicant is attempting to restrict cycle access based on a "problem" for which they have no evidence.

Yours sincerely,

[redacted]

****
This email and any files transmitted with it are confidential and intended solely for the use of the individual or entity to whom they are addressed.

If you have received this email in error, please notify the sender, or [redacted] and then permanently delete the email, attachments and all copies.
The full text of the Council's email disclaimer is available at: www.manchester.gov.uk/emaildisclaimer.
Your personal data is very important to us. Please refer to our privacy notice at: www.manchester.gov.uk/privacy for further information.

This footnote also confirms that this email message has been swept for the presence of computer viruses.
****

Outlook

Fw: Comment on Planning Application 142888/FO/2025

From Planning <[redacted]
Date Mon 30/06/2025 08:50
To Lucy Harrison <[redacted]

Information, Delivery & Support Team
Planning, Building Control & Licensing
Growth & Development Directorate
Postal address: Manchester City Council, P O Box 532, Town Hall, Manchester M60 2LA
Location address: Level 6 Town Hall Extension, Manchester M2 5DB
Tel: 0161 234 4516

Please consider the environment before printing an e-mail.

From: [redacted]
Sent: 28 June 2025 15:54
To: Planning <[redacted]
Subject: Comment on Planning Application 142888/FO/2025

You don't often get email from [redacted] Learn why this is important

ALERT This message originated outside of the Manchester City Council network. **BE CAUTIOUS** before clicking any links or opening any attachments. Please remember your Cyber Training and report anything suspicious.

Dear Manchester Planning team,

I am writing to lodge an objection to planning application **142888/FO/2025** – Cambridge Halls Of Residence Cavendish Street Manchester M15 6TT.

My primary objection is that the proposals have been designed to deter cyclists from using the safest and most direct route through the site. This route has been open to cyclists ever since the road was first built; it is an essential, well-used part of the city's cycling network and therefore the proposal to deter and/or divert cycles away from Cavendish Street is directly at odds with Manchester City Council's planning, sustainability and transport policies.

<Since no longer driving, safe cycling into Manchester from Altrincham has been vital for visiting and rail commuting via Piccadilly Station. Given the council's recent emphasis on all things cycle infrastructure, this proposed plan is disingenuous and completely at odds with the needs of the community>

The applicant has also made misleading claims regarding the road's legal status and regarding pedestrian safety which I will outline below.

I am asking that the council **refuse** this application, and invite the developer to come back with a proposal that maintains direct cycle as well as pedestrian access along Cavendish Street, designed to modern standards set out in Greater Manchester's Streets For All design guide and in Department for Transport guidance note LTN 1/20. I am sure that the Highways team at MCC and the Active Travel team at TfGM will, if asked, be happy to comment on how such a route could be provided within the space available.

I am also asking that the council **make a Section 106 agreement (s106)** with the applicant to fund safety improvements for pedestrians and cyclists at the junction of Cavendish Street and Higher Cambridge Street – the applicant themselves discuss the shortcomings of the existing junction layout in Section 4.2.1 of the Transport Statement ("*Cyclists have also been observed to queue on the footway to gain direct access to the Higher Cambridge Street/Cavendish Street junction (via a gap in the guard railings) rather than following the road markings which advise cyclists to dismount and use the controlled pedestrian crossings*"). The improvements might take the form of a CYCLOPS junction. CYCLOPS is a homegrown Greater Manchester innovation now frequently used on Highways schemes across the country to deliver safe pedestrian and cycle movements without undue impact on traffic flows.

For prospective occupants and passers-by alike, in line with the S106 tests as set out in Paragraph 58 of the National Planning Policy Framework (NPPF) 2024, a contribution to junction safety improvements improvement would be ‘necessary to make the development acceptable in planning terms’ (by contributing to an appropriate movement strategy for the site), ‘directly related to the development’ (given its proximity, the pressure added to the junction by the proposed threefold increase in residents, and in light of the wholly inadequate mitigation route proposed by the applicant), and ‘fairly and reasonably related in scale and kind to the development’ (given the stated threefold increase in residents explained by the applicant, so directly adding more pressure to the junction).

1 Legal Status of Cavendish Street

This section of Cavendish Street, an adopted Highway, was subject to a stopping up order dated 14.06.1996. That order required that “the Developer shall provide a new highway which shall be a footpath/cycleway”. MMU have since installed physical signage stating that Cavendish Street “has not been dedicated as a Highway” and have bolted down uncomfortable and restrictive speed bumps across the route in an apparent attempt to dissuade cyclists from exercising their legal rights over this space. Both measures may be unlawful, as my understanding is that cyclists do retain a legal Right of Way along Cavendish Street, unchanged from when the entire road was an adopted highway, and the speed bumps are inaccessible to some Disabled users.

2 Cycling routes and planning policy

The case for walking and cycling and specifically for maintaining and improving high quality cycling networks is clear at every level of modern planning policy, including:

- NPPF 2024's "vision-led approach"
- LTN 1/20
- Places For Everyone Joint Development Plan Objectives 6, 7 and 10
- Places for Everyone Joint Development Plan policies JP-Strat14, JP-C1, JP-C5 and JP-C6
- GM Transport Strategy 2040 and the "Right Mix" targets
- Greater Manchester Streets for All strategy and Streets for All design guide
- Manchester City Council's Active Travel Strategy
- Manchester City Council's commitment to be a Zero Carbon city by 2038

The policy position is absolutely clear – changes to the existing road and cycle networks should make cycling more convenient for people, not less convenient.

This specific stretch of Cavendish Street is a key part of the existing cycle network. It appears on TfGM's Bee Network map as a Beeway ("the routes that get people from A to B … representing the most direct routes between crossing points.") and connects to the Stretford Road Busy Beeway ("corridors or crossing points on busier roads that will require a higher level of design intervention to improve cycling and walking.") It is also mapped on the TfGM Cycle Network.

The national standard for cycling infrastructure is DfT guidance note LTN 1/20. LTN 1/20 advises above all else that cycle routes and networks should be Safe, Direct, Comfortable, Attractive and Coherent. Introducing unnecessary diversions, junctions and bends into a well-used existing route undermines all of these core principles, resulting in a lower quality cycle network which will make it harder for the council to achieve its cycling objectives.

The applicant has offered various reasons why diverting cyclists is necessary but all of these reasons seem to be either existing problems, or problems designed into the scheme. The proposal is to demolish and redevelop the site – so considerations like limited space and the placement of entrances, shop frontages, planting and pedestrian areas are entirely within the applicant's scope to manage. Instead of starting with the problem "there is an existing busy cycle route across this site, how can I design to accommodate everyone's needs?", it seems the applicant has started with the conclusion "cyclists must be deterred" and instructed their consultants to post-rationalise that decision.

3 Misleading claims regarding safety

Page 22 of the Design & Access Statement refers to the "existing controversial link along Cavendish St., which is resulting in collisions of pedestrians, electric scooters, cyclists, etc."

However the map of recorded collisions, on page 18 of the Transport Statement submitted in the same planning application, shows no recorded collisions whatsoever on this link, only on the adjacent main roads.

It appears the applicant is attempting to restrict cycle access based on a "problem" for which they have no evidence.

Yours sincerely,

[redacted]

[redacted]

[redacted]

****
This email and any files transmitted with it are confidential and intended solely for the use of the individual or entity to whom they are addressed.

If you have received this email in error, please notify the sender, or [redacted] and then permanently delete the email, attachments and all copies.
The full text of the Council's email disclaimer is available at: www.manchester.gov.uk/emaildisclaimer.
Your personal data is very important to us. Please refer to our privacy notice at: www.manchester.gov.uk/privacy for further information.

This footnote also confirms that this email message has been swept for the presence of computer viruses.
****

Outlook

Fw:

From Planning <[redacted]
Date Mon 14/07/2025 14:08
To Lucy Harrison <[redacted]

Information, Delivery & Support Team
Planning, Building Control & Licensing
Growth & Development Directorate
Postal address: Manchester City Council, P O Box 532, Town Hall, Manchester M60 2LA
Location address: Level 6 Town Hall Extension, Manchester M2 5DB
Tel: 0161 234 4516

Please consider the environment before printing an e-mail.

From: [redacted]
Sent: 02 July 2025 12:19
To: Planning <[redacted]
Subject:

You don't often get email from [redacted] Learn why this is important

ALERT This message originated outside of the Manchester City Council network. **BE CAUTIOUS** before clicking any links or opening any attachments. Please remember your Cyber Training and report anything suspicious.

Dear Manchester Planning team,

I am writing to lodge an objection to planning application **142888/FO/2025**– Cambridge Halls Of Residence Cavendish Street Manchester M15 6TT.

My primary objection is that the proposals have been designed to deter cyclists from using the safest and most direct route through the site. I have used this route for years - decades even; for me it is an essential part of the city's cycling network and in my experience used by many!

I believe the proposal to deter and/or divert cycles away from Cavendish Street is directly at odds with Manchester City Council's planning, sustainability and transport policies. At a time when we want to increase use of bicycles the idea of closing one so vital to the biking community is simply jaw-dropping!

I ask that the council refuses this application and invites the developer to revise their proposal to maintain cycle and pedestrian access though the entire length of Cavendish Street!

Yours sincerely

[redacted]

****
This email and any files transmitted with it are confidential and intended solely for the use of the individual or entity to whom they are addressed.
If you have received this email in error, please notify the sender, or [redacted] and then permanently delete the email, attachments and all copies.
The full text of the Council's email disclaimer is available at: www.manchester.gov.uk/emaildisclaimer.
Your personal data is very important to us. Please refer to our privacy notice at: www.manchester.gov.uk/privacy for further information.

This footnote also confirms that this email message has been swept for the presence of computer viruses.
****

Outlook

Fw: Comment on Planning Application 142888/FO/2025

From Planning <[redacted]
Date Tue 08/07/2025 11:11
To Lucy Harrison <[redacted]

Information, Delivery & Support Team
Planning, Building Control & Licensing
Growth & Development Directorate
Postal address: Manchester City Council, P O Box 532, Town Hall, Manchester M60 2LA
Location address: Level 6 Town Hall Extension, Manchester M2 5DB
Tel: 0161 234 4516

Please consider the environment before printing an e-mail.

From: [redacted]
Sent: 08 July 2025 10:55
To: Planning <[redacted]
Subject: Comment on Planning Application 142888/FO/2025

You don't often get email from [redacted] Learn why this is important

ALERT This message originated outside of the Manchester City Council network. **BE CAUTIOUS** before clicking any links or opening any attachments. Please remember your Cyber Training and report anything suspicious.

Dear Manchester Planning team,
I am writing to lodge an objection to planning application **142888/FO/2025** – Cambridge Halls Of Residence Cavendish Street Manchester M15 6TT.

My primary objection is that the proposals have been designed to deter cyclists from using the safest and most direct route through the site. This route has been open to cyclists ever since the road was first built; it is an essential, well-used part of the city's cycling network and therefore the proposal to deter and/or divert cycles away from Cavendish Street is directly at odds with Manchester City Council's planning, sustainability and transport policies.

Working in the Oxford Road area, I have used this path as a regular, safe commute route. It not only provides a shorter route, but it also diverts you away from busier roads. It would be a huge loss for it to be blocked.

The applicant has also made misleading claims regarding the road's legal status and regarding pedestrian safety which I will outline below.

I am asking that the council **refuse** this application, and invite the developer to come back with a proposal that maintains direct cycle as well as pedestrian access along Cavendish Street, designed to modern standards set out in Greater Manchester's Streets For All design guide and in Department for Transport guidance note LTN 1/20. I am sure that the Highways team at MCC and the Active Travel team at TfGM will, if asked, be happy to comment on how such a route could be provided within the space available.

I am also asking that the council **make a Section 106 agreement (s106)** with the applicant to fund safety improvements for pedestrians and cyclists at the junction of Cavendish Street and Higher Cambridge Street – the applicant themselves discuss the shortcomings of the existing junction layout in Section 4.2.1 of the Transport Statement ("*Cyclists have also been observed to queue on the footway to gain direct access to the Higher Cambridge Street/Cavendish Street junction (via a gap in the guard railings) rather than following the road markings which advise cyclists to dismount and use the controlled pedestrian crossings*"). The improvements might take the form of a CYCLOPS junction. CYCLOPS is a homegrown Greater Manchester innovation now frequently used on Highways schemes across the country to deliver safe pedestrian and cycle movements without undue impact on traffic flows.

For prospective occupants and passers-by alike, in line with the S106 tests as set out in Paragraph 58 of the National Planning Policy

Framework (NPPF) 2024, a contribution to junction safety improvements improvement would be ‘necessary to make the development acceptable in planning terms’ (by contributing to an appropriate movement strategy for the site), ‘directly related to the development’ (given its proximity, the pressure added to the junction by the proposed threefold increase in residents, and in light of the wholly inadequate mitigation route proposed by the applicant), and ‘fairly and reasonably related in scale and kind to the development’ (given the stated threefold increase in residents explained by the applicant, so directly adding more pressure to the junction).

1 Legal Status of Cavendish Street

This section of Cavendish Street, an adopted Highway, was subject to a stopping up order dated 14.06.1996. That order required that “the Developer shall provide a new highway which shall be a footpath/cycleway”. MMU have since installed physical signage stating that Cavendish Street “has not been dedicated as a Highway” and have bolted down uncomfortable and restrictive speed bumps across the route in an apparent attempt to dissuade cyclists from exercising their legal rights over this space. Both measures may be unlawful, as my understanding is that cyclists do retain a legal Right of Way along Cavendish Street, unchanged from when the entire road was an adopted highway, and the speed bumps are inaccessible to some Disabled users.

2 Cycling routes and planning policy

The case for walking and cycling and specifically for maintaining and improving high quality cycling networks is clear at every level of modern planning policy, including:

- NPPF 2024’s “vision-led approach”
- LTN 1/20

- Places For Everyone Joint Development Plan Objectives 6, 7 and 10
- Places for Everyone Joint Development Plan policies JP-Strat14, JP-C1, JP-C5 and JP-C6
- GM Transport Strategy 2040 and the “Right Mix” targets
- Greater Manchester Streets for All strategy and Streets for All design guide
- Manchester City Council’s Active Travel Strategy
- Manchester City Council’s commitment to be a Zero Carbon city by 2038

The policy position is absolutely clear – changes to the existing road and cycle networks should make cycling more convenient for people, not less convenient.

This specific stretch of Cavendish Street is a key part of the existing cycle network. It appears on TfGM’s Bee Network map as a Beeway (“the routes that get people from A to B … representing the most direct routes between crossing points.”) and connects to the Stretford Road Busy Beeway (“corridors or crossing points on busier roads that will require a higher level of design intervention to improve cycling and walking.”) It is also mapped on the TfGM Cycle Network.

The national standard for cycling infrastructure is DfT guidance note LTN 1/20. LTN 1/20 advises above all else that cycle routes and networks should be Safe, Direct, Comfortable, Attractive and Coherent. Introducing unnecessary diversions, junctions and bends into a well-used existing route undermines all of these core principles, resulting in a lower quality cycle network which will make it harder for the council to achieve its cycling objectives.

The applicant has offered various reasons why diverting cyclists is necessary but all of these reasons seem to be either existing

problems, or problems designed into the scheme. The proposal is to demolish and redevelop the site – so considerations like limited space and the placement of entrances, shop frontages, planting and pedestrian areas are entirely within the applicant's scope to manage. Instead of starting with the problem "there is an existing busy cycle route across this site, how can I design to accommodate everyone's needs?", it seems the applicant has started with the conclusion "cyclists must be deterred" and instructed their consultants to post-rationalise that decision.

3 Misleading claims regarding safety

Page 22 of the Design & Access Statement refers to the "existing controversial link along Cavendish St., which is resulting in collisions of pedestrians, electric scooters, cyclists, etc."

However the map of recorded collisions, on page 18 of the Transport Statement submitted in the same planning application, shows no recorded collisions whatsoever on this link, only on the adjacent main roads.

It appears the applicant is attempting to restrict cycle access based on a "problem" for which they have no evidence.

Yours sincerely,

[redacted]

[redacted]

[redacted]

Sent from my iPad

****
This email and any files transmitted with it are confidential and intended solely for the use of the individual or entity to whom they are addressed. If you have received this email in error, please notify the sender, or [redacted] and then permanently delete the email, attachments and all copies.

The full text of the Council's email disclaimer is available at: www.manchester.gov.uk/emaildisclaimer.
Your personal data is very important to us. Please refer to our privacy notice at: www.manchester.gov.uk/privacy for further information.

This footnote also confirms that this email message has been swept for the presence of computer viruses.
****

Outlook

Fw: Subject: Comment on Planning Application 142888/FO/2025

From Planning <[redacted]
Date Mon 14/07/2025 14:04
To Lucy Harrison <[redacted]

Information, Delivery & Support Team
Planning, Building Control & Licensing
Growth & Development Directorate
Postal address: Manchester City Council, P O Box 532, Town Hall, Manchester M60 2LA
Location address: Level 6 Town Hall Extension, Manchester M2 5DB
Tel: 0161 234 4516

Please consider the environment before printing an e-mail.

From: [redacted]
Sent: 11 July 2025 22:41
To: Planning <[redacted]
Subject: Subject: Comment on Planning Application 142888/FO/2025

You don't often get email from [redacted] Learn why this is important

ALERT This message originated outside of the Manchester City Council network. **BE CAUTIOUS** before clicking any links or opening any attachments. Please remember your Cyber Training and report anything suspicious.

Dear Manchester Planning team,

I am writing to lodge an objection to planning application **142888/FO/2025**– Cambridge Halls Of Residence Cavendish Street Manchester M15 6TT.

My primary objection is that the proposals have been designed to deter cyclists from using the safest and most direct route through the site. This route has been open to cyclists ever since the road was first built; it is an essential, well-used part of the city's cycling network and therefore the proposal to deter and/or divert cycles away from Cavendish Street is directly at odds with Manchester City Council's planning, sustainability and transport policies.

The applicant has also made misleading claims regarding the road's legal status and regarding pedestrian safety which I will outline below.

I am asking that the council **refuse** this application, and invite the developer to come back with a proposal that maintains direct cycle as well as pedestrian access along Cavendish Street, designed to modern standards set out in Greater Manchester's Streets For All design guide and in Department for Transport guidance note LTN 1/20. I am sure that the Highways team at MCC and the Active Travel team at TfGM will, if asked, be happy to comment on how such a route could be provided within the space available.

I am also asking that the council **make a Section 106 agreement (s106)** with the applicant to fund safety improvements for pedestrians and cyclists at the junction of Cavendish Street and Higher Cambridge Street – the applicant themselves discuss the shortcomings of the existing junction layout in Section 4.2.1 of the Transport Statement ("*Cyclists have also been observed to queue on the footway to gain direct access to the Higher Cambridge Street/Cavendish Street junction (via a gap in the guard railings) rather than following the road markings which advise cyclists to dismount and use the controlled pedestrian crossings*"). The improvements might take the form of a CYCLOPS junction. CYCLOPS is a homegrown Greater Manchester innovation now frequently used on Highways schemes across the country to deliver safe pedestrian and cycle movements without undue impact on traffic flows.

For prospective occupants and passers-by alike, in line with the S106 tests as set out in Paragraph 58 of the National Planning Policy Framework (NPPF) 2024, a contribution to junction safety improvements improvement would be 'necessary to make the development acceptable in planning terms' (by contributing to an appropriate movement strategy for the site), 'directly related to the development' (given its proximity, the pressure added to the junction by the proposed threefold increase in residents, and in light of the wholly inadequate mitigation route proposed by the applicant), and 'fairly and reasonably related in scale and kind to the development' (given the stated threefold increase in residents explained by the applicant, so directly adding more pressure to the junction).

1 Legal Status of Cavendish Street

This section of Cavendish Street, an adopted Highway, was subject to a stopping up order dated 14.06.1996. That order required that "the Developer shall provide a new highway which shall be a footpath/cycleway". MMU have since installed physical signage stating that Cavendish Street "has not been dedicated as a Highway" and have bolted down uncomfortable and restrictive speed bumps

across the route in an apparent attempt to dissuade cyclists from exercising their legal rights over this space. Both measures may be unlawful, as my understanding is that cyclists do retain a legal Right of Way along Cavendish Street, unchanged from when the entire road was an adopted highway, and the speed bumps are inaccessible to some Disabled users.

2 Cycling routes and planning policy

The case for walking and cycling and specifically for maintaining and improving high quality cycling networks is clear at every level of modern planning policy, including:

- NPPF 2024's "vision-led approach"
- LTN 1/20
- Places For Everyone Joint Development Plan Objectives 6, 7 and 10
- Places for Everyone Joint Development Plan policies JP-Strat14, JP-C1, JP-C5 and JP-C6
- GM Transport Strategy 2040 and the "Right Mix" targets
- Greater Manchester Streets for All strategy and Streets for All design guide
- Manchester City Council's Active Travel Strategy
- Manchester City Council's commitment to be a Zero Carbon city by 2038

The policy position is absolutely clear – changes to the existing road and cycle networks should make cycling more convenient for people, not less convenient.

This specific stretch of Cavendish Street is a key part of the existing cycle network. It appears on TfGM's Bee Network map as a Beeway ("the routes that get people from A to B … representing the most direct routes between crossing points.") and connects to the Stretford Road Busy Beeway ("corridors or crossing points on busier roads that will require a higher level of design intervention to improve cycling and walking.") It is also mapped on the TfGM Cycle Network.

The national standard for cycling infrastructure is DfT guidance note LTN 1/20. LTN 1/20 advises above all else that cycle routes and networks should be Safe, Direct, Comfortable, Attractive and Coherent. Introducing unnecessary diversions, junctions and bends into a well-used existing route undermines all of these core principles, resulting in a lower quality cycle network which will make it harder for the council to achieve its cycling objectives.

The applicant has offered various reasons why diverting cyclists is necessary but all of these reasons seem to be either existing problems, or problems designed into the scheme. The proposal is to demolish and redevelop the site – so considerations like limited space and the placement of entrances, shop frontages, planting and pedestrian areas are entirely within the applicant's scope to manage. Instead of starting with the problem "there is an existing busy cycle route across this site, how can I design to accommodate everyone's needs?", it seems the applicant has started with the conclusion "cyclists must be deterred" and instructed their consultants to post-rationalise that decision.

3 Misleading claims regarding safety

Page 22 of the Design & Access Statement refers to the "existing controversial link along Cavendish St., which is resulting in collisions of pedestrians, electric scooters, cyclists, etc."

However the map of recorded collisions, on page 18 of the Transport Statement submitted in the same planning application, shows no recorded collisions whatsoever on this link, only on the adjacent main roads.

It appears the applicant is attempting to restrict cycle access based on a "problem" for which they have no evidence.

Yours sincerely,

[redacted]

[redacted]

[redacted]

****
This email and any files transmitted with it are confidential and intended solely for the use of the individual or entity to whom they are addressed.
If you have received this email in error, please notify the sender, or [redacted] and then permanently delete the email, attachments and all copies.
The full text of the Council's email disclaimer is available at: www.manchester.gov.uk/emaildisclaimer.
Your personal data is very important to us. Please refer to our privacy notice at: www.manchester.gov.uk/privacy for further information.

This footnote also confirms that this email message has been swept for the presence of computer viruses.
****

Outlook

Fw: Comment on Planning Application 142888/FO/2025

From Planning <[redacted]
Date Mon 30/06/2025 12:47
To Lucy Harrison <[redacted]

Information, Delivery & Support Team
Planning, Building Control & Licensing
Growth & Development Directorate
Postal address: Manchester City Council, P O Box 532, Town Hall, Manchester M60 2LA
Location address: Level 6 Town Hall Extension, Manchester M2 5DB
Tel: 0161 234 4516

Please consider the environment before printing an e-mail.

From: [redacted]
Sent: 30 June 2025 11:57
To: Planning <[redacted]
Subject: Comment on Planning Application 142888/FO/2025

You don't often get email from [redacted] Learn why this is important

ALERT This message originated outside of the Manchester City Council network. **BE CAUTIOUS** before clicking any links or opening any attachments. Please remember your Cyber Training and report anything suspicious.

Dear Manchester Planning team,

I am writing to lodge an objection to planning application **142888/FO/2025 – Cambridge Halls Of Residence Cavendish Street Manchester M15 6TT**.

My primary objection is that the proposals have been designed to deter cyclists, including myself, from using the safest and most direct route through the site. This route has been open to cyclists ever since the road was first built; it is an essential, well-used part of the city's cycling network and therefore the proposal to deter and/or divert cycles away from Cavendish Street is directly at odds with Manchester City Council's planning, sustainability and transport policies.

As a resident of Old Trafford for 8 years, and previously of Chorlton for 10 years, I used this safe junction for cyclists when teaching at the University of Manchester, and supervising MMU dissertation students based at MMU's Righton Building. I felt safe cycling to my these destinations by proceeding along the Cavendish Street route. This is also my route to Manchester Piccadilly station due to the largely protected, traffic-free cycle route from Cavendish Street, then crossing over Oxford Road onto the designated cycle lane to head towards crossing over the A34. As I often have 2 x full panniers on my bike when heading to a work destination by train, or to visit/stay with my elderly mother once a month for a few days, the existing cycle route at Cavendish Street makes the cycle ride less stressful by not cycling directly alongside motor vehicles, shorter, and safer compared to

plans that have been proposed. It comes to my attention that the planning of many proposed new builds seems to lack tangible provisions that would promote safe active travel for both its future residents and those currently living nearby who prefer cycling or walking. Including or protecting existing safe, active travel provisions such as those from the Cavendish Street junction, must be ensured to help Manchester meet its sustainability, climate emergency, and public health declarations and or targets. Encouraging more people to walk and/or cycle rather than drive improves the quality of air we all need to breathe and reduce road traffic, making travelling around safer for people and public buses more likely to run on time.

The applicant has also made misleading claims regarding the road's legal status and regarding pedestrian safety which I will outline below.

I am asking that the council refuse this application, and invite the developer to come back with a proposal that maintains direct cycle as well as pedestrian access along Cavendish Street, designed to modern standards set out in Greater Manchester's Streets For All design guide and in Department for Transport guidance note LTN 1/20. I am sure that the Highways team at MCC and the Active Travel team at TfGM will, if asked, be happy to comment on how such a route could be provided within the space available.

I am also asking that the council make a Section 106 agreement (s106) with the applicant to fund safety improvements for pedestrians and cyclists at the junction of Cavendish Street and Higher Cambridge Street – the applicant themselves discuss the shortcomings of the existing junction layout in Section 4.2.1 of the Transport Statement ("Cyclists have also been observed to queue on the footway to gain direct access to the Higher Cambridge Street/Cavendish Street junction (via a gap in the guard railings) rather than following the road markings which advise cyclists to dismount and use the controlled pedestrian crossings"). The improvements might take the form of a CYCLOPS junction. CYCLOPS is a homegrown Greater Manchester innovation now frequently used on Highways schemes across the country to deliver safe pedestrian and cycle movements without undue impact on traffic flows. As an Old Trafford resident I greatly benefit from the safe route created by the CYCLOPS system at nearby busy junctions eg the Upper Chorlton Road/Chorlton Road junction; Stretford Road/Cholrton Road junction; the Rorce Road/Chorlton Road junction.

For prospective occupants and passers-by alike, in line with the S106 tests as set out in Paragraph 58 of the National Planning Policy Framework (NPPF) 2024, a contribution to junction safety improvements improvement would be 'necessary to make the development acceptable in planning terms' (by contributing to an appropriate movement strategy for the site), 'directly related to the development' (given its proximity, the pressure added to the junction by the proposed threefold increase in residents, and in light of the wholly inadequate mitigation route proposed by the applicant), and 'fairly and reasonably related in scale and kind to the development' (given the stated threefold increase in residents explained by the applicant, so directly adding more pressure to the junction).

1 Legal Status of Cavendish Street

This section of Cavendish Street, an adopted Highway, was subject to a stopping up order dated 14.06.1996. That order required that "the Developer shall provide a new highway which shall be a footpath/cycleway". MMU have since installed physical signage stating that Cavendish Street "has not been dedicated as a Highway" and have bolted down uncomfortable and restrictive speed bumps across the route in an apparent attempt to dissuade cyclists from exercising their legal rights over this space. Both measures may be unlawful, as my understanding is that cyclists do retain a legal Right of Way along Cavendish Street, unchanged from when the entire road was an adopted highway, and the speed bumps are inaccessible to some Disabled users.

2 Cycling routes and planning policy

The case for walking and cycling and specifically for maintaining and improving high quality cycling networks is clear at every level of modern planning policy, including:

NPPF 2024's "vision-led approach"
LTN 1/20
Places For Everyone Joint Development Plan Objectives 6, 7 and 10
Places for Everyone Joint Development Plan policies JP-Strat14, JP-C1, JP-C5 and JP-C6
GM Transport Strategy 2040 and the "Right Mix" targets
Greater Manchester Streets for All strategy and Streets for All design guide
Manchester City Council's Active Travel Strategy
Manchester City Council's commitment to be a Zero Carbon city by 2038
The policy position is absolutely clear – changes to the existing road and cycle networks should make cycling more convenient for people, not less convenient.

This specific stretch of Cavendish Street is a key part of the existing cycle network. It appears on TfGM's Bee Network map as a Beeway ("the routes that get people from A to B...representing the most direct routes between crossing points.") and connects to the Stretford Road Busy Beeway ("corridors or crossing points on busier roads that will require a higher level of design intervention to improve cycling and walking.") It is also mapped on the TfGM Cycle Network.

The national standard for cycling infrastructure is DfT guidance note LTN 1/20. LTN 1/20 advises above all else that cycle routes and networks should be Safe, Direct, Comfortable, Attractive and Coherent. Introducing unnecessary diversions, junctions and bends into a well-used existing route undermines all of these core principles, resulting in a lower quality cycle network which will make it harder for the council to achieve its cycling objectives.

The applicant has offered various reasons why diverting cyclists is necessary but all of these reasons seem to be either existing problems, or problems designed into the scheme. The proposal is to demolish and redevelop the site – so considerations like limited space and the placement of entrances, shop frontages, planting and pedestrian areas are entirely within the applicant's scope to manage. Instead of starting with the problem "there is an existing busy cycle route across this site, how can I design to accommodate everyone's needs?", it seems the applicant has started with the conclusion "cyclists must be deterred" and instructed their consultants to post-rationalise that decision.

3 Misleading claims regarding safety

Page 22 of the Design & Access Statement refers to the "existing controversial link along Cavendish St., which is resulting in collisions of pedestrians, electric scooters, cyclists, etc."

However the map of recorded collisions, on page 18 of the Transport Statement submitted in the same planning application, shows no recorded collisions whatsoever on this link, only on the adjacent main roads.

It appears the applicant is attempting to restrict cycle access based on a "problem" for which they have no evidence.

Yours sincerely,

[redacted]

****
This email and any files transmitted with it are confidential and intended solely for the use of the individual or entity to whom they are addressed.
If you have received this email in error, please notify the sender, or [redacted] and then permanently delete the email, attachments and

all copies.
The full text of the Council's email disclaimer is available at: www.manchester.gov.uk/emaildisclaimer.
Your personal data is very important to us. Please refer to our privacy notice at: www.manchester.gov.uk/privacy for further information.

This footnote also confirms that this email message has been swept for the presence of computer viruses.
****

Outlook

Fw: Comment on Planning Application 142888/FO/2025

From Planning <[redacted]>
Date Mon 30/06/2025 08:52
To Lucy Harrison <[redacted]>

Information, Delivery & Support Team
Planning, Building Control & Licensing
Growth & Development Directorate
Postal address: Manchester City Council, P O Box 532, Town Hall, Manchester M60 2LA
Location address: Level 6 Town Hall Extension, Manchester M2 5DB
Tel: 0161 234 4516

Please consider the environment before printing an e-mail.

From: [redacted]
Sent: 28 June 2025 14:18
To: Planning <[redacted]>
Subject: Comment on Planning Application 142888/FO/2025

You don't often get email from [redacted] Learn why this is important

ALERT This message originated outside of the Manchester City Council network. **BE CAUTIOUS** before clicking any links or opening any attachments. Please remember your Cyber Training and report anything suspicious.

Dear Manchester Planning team,

I am writing to lodge an objection to planning application 142888/FO/2025 – Cambridge Halls Of Residence Cavendish Street Manchester M15 6TT.

My primary objection is that the proposals have been designed to deter cyclists from using the safest and most direct route through the site. This route has been open to cyclists ever since the road was first built; it is an essential, well-used part of the city's cycling network and therefore the proposal to deter and/or divert cycles away from Cavendish Street is directly at odds with Manchester City Council's planning, sustainability and transport policies.

The applicant has also made misleading claims regarding the road's legal status and regarding pedestrian safety which I will outline below.

I am asking that the council refuse this application, and invite the developer to come back with a proposal that maintains direct cycle as well as pedestrian access along Cavendish Street, designed to modern standards set out in Greater Manchester's Streets For All design guide and in Department for Transport guidance note LTN 1/20. I am sure that the Highways team at MCC and the Active Travel team at TfGM will, if asked, be happy to comment on how such a route could be provided within the space available.

I am also asking that the council make a Section 106 agreement (s106) with the applicant to fund safety improvements for pedestrians and cyclists at the junction of Cavendish Street and Higher Cambridge Street – the applicant themselves discuss the shortcomings of the existing junction layout in Section 4.2.1 of the Transport Statement ("Cyclists have also been observed to queue on the footway to gain direct access to the Higher Cambridge Street/Cavendish Street junction (via a gap in the guard railings) rather than following the road markings which advise cyclists to dismount and use the controlled pedestrian crossings"). The improvements might take the form of a CYCLOPS junction. CYCLOPS is a homegrown Greater Manchester innovation now frequently used on Highways schemes across the country to deliver safe pedestrian and cycle movements without undue impact on traffic flows.

For prospective occupants and passers-by alike, in line with the S106 tests as set out in Paragraph 58 of the National Planning Policy Framework (NPPF) 2024, a contribution to junction safety improvements improvement would be 'necessary to make the development acceptable in planning terms' (by contributing to an appropriate movement strategy for the site), 'directly related to the development' (given its proximity, the pressure added to the junction by the proposed threefold increase in residents, and in light of the wholly inadequate mitigation route proposed by the applicant), and 'fairly and reasonably related in scale and kind to the development' (given the stated threefold increase in residents explained by the applicant, so directly adding more pressure to the junction).

1 Legal Status of Cavendish Street

This section of Cavendish Street, an adopted Highway, was subject to a stopping up order dated 14.06.1996. That order required that "the Developer shall provide a new highway which shall be a footpath/cycleway". MMU have since installed physical signage stating that Cavendish Street "has not been dedicated as a Highway" and have bolted down uncomfortable and restrictive speed bumps across the route in an apparent attempt to dissuade cyclists from exercising their legal rights over this space. Both measures may be unlawful, as my understanding is that cyclists do retain a legal Right of Way along Cavendish Street, unchanged from when the entire road was an adopted highway, and the speed bumps are inaccessible to some Disabled users.

2 Cycling routes and planning policy

The case for walking and cycling and specifically for maintaining and improving high quality cycling networks is clear at every level of modern planning policy, including:

NPPF 2024's "vision-led approach"
LTN 1/20
Places For Everyone Joint Development Plan Objectives 6, 7 and 10
Places for Everyone Joint Development Plan policies JP-Strat14, JP-C1, JP-C5 and JP-C6
GM Transport Strategy 2040 and the "Right Mix" targets
Greater Manchester Streets for All strategy and Streets for All design guide
Manchester City Council's Active Travel Strategy
Manchester City Council's commitment to be a Zero Carbon city by 2038
The policy position is absolutely clear – changes to the existing road and cycle networks should make cycling more convenient for people, not less convenient.

This specific stretch of Cavendish Street is a key part of the existing cycle network. It appears on TfGM's Bee Network map as a Beeway ("the routes that get people from A to B … representing the most direct routes between crossing points.") and connects to the Stretford Road Busy Beeway

("corridors or crossing points on busier roads that will require a higher level of design intervention to improve cycling and walking.") It is also mapped on the TfGM Cycle Network.

The national standard for cycling infrastructure is DfT guidance note LTN 1/20. LTN 1/20 advises above all else that cycle routes and networks should be Safe, Direct, Comfortable, Attractive and Coherent. Introducing unnecessary diversions, junctions and bends into a well-used existing route undermines all of these core principles, resulting in a lower quality cycle network which will make it harder for the council to achieve its cycling objectives.

The applicant has offered various reasons why diverting cyclists is necessary but all of these reasons seem to be either existing problems, or problems designed into the scheme. The proposal is to demolish and redevelop the site – so considerations like limited space and the placement of entrances, shop frontages, planting and pedestrian areas are entirely within the applicant's scope to manage. Instead of starting with the problem "there is an existing busy cycle route across this site, how can I design to accommodate everyone's needs?", it seems the applicant has started with the conclusion "cyclists must be deterred" and instructed their consultants to post-rationalise that decision.

3 Misleading claims regarding safety

Page 22 of the Design & Access Statement refers to the "existing controversial link along Cavendish St., which is resulting in collisions of pedestrians, electric scooters, cyclists, etc."

However the map of recorded collisions, on page 18 of the Transport Statement submitted in the same planning application, shows no recorded collisions whatsoever on this link, only on the adjacent main roads.

It appears the applicant is attempting to restrict cycle access based on a "problem" for which they have no evidence.

Yours sincerely,

[redacted]

****
This email and any files transmitted with it are confidential and intended solely for the use of the individual or entity to whom they are addressed.
If you have received this email in error, please notify the sender, or [redacted] and then permanently delete the email, attachments and all copies.
The full text of the Council's email disclaimer is available at: www.manchester.gov.uk/emaildisclaimer.
Your personal data is very important to us. Please refer to our privacy notice at: www.manchester.gov.uk/privacy for further information.

This footnote also confirms that this email message has been swept for the presence of computer viruses.
****

Outlook

Fw: Comment on Planning Application 142888/FO/2025

From Planning <[redacted]>
Date Fri 04/07/2025 14:09
To Lucy Harrison <[redacted]>

Information, Delivery & Support Team
Planning, Building Control & Licensing
Growth & Development Directorate
Postal address: Manchester City Council, P O Box 532, Town Hall, Manchester M60 2LA
Location address: Level 6 Town Hall Extension, Manchester M2 5DB
Tel: 0161 234 4516

Please consider the environment before printing an e-mail.

From: [redacted]
Sent: 28 June 2025 13:08
To: Planning <[redacted]>
Subject: Comment on Planning Application 142888/FO/2025

You don't often get email from [redacted] Learn why this is important

ALERT This message originated outside of the Manchester City Council network. **BE CAUTIOUS** before clicking any links or opening any attachments. Please remember your Cyber Training and report anything suspicious.

I am writing to lodge an objection to planning application 142888/FO/2025 – Cambridge Halls Of Residence Cavendish Street Manchester M15 6TT.

My primary objection is that the proposals have been designed to deter cyclists from using the safest and most direct route through the site. This route has been open to cyclists ever since the road was first built; it is an essential, well-used part of the city's cycling network and therefore the proposal to deter and/or divert cycles away from Cavendish Street is directly at odds with Manchester City Council's planning, sustainability and transport policies.

I have used this route several times, as a student in Manchester I often use this route to visit friends, attend events and do shopping. The route has provided benefit to my life and has made cycling within the city much easier.

The applicant has also made misleading claims regarding the road's legal status and regarding pedestrian safety which I will outline below.

I am asking that the council refuse this application, and invite the developer to come back with a proposal that maintains direct cycle as well as pedestrian access along Cavendish Street, designed to modern standards set out in Greater Manchester's Streets For All design guide and in Department for Transport guidance note LTN 1/20. I am sure that the Highways

team at MCC and the Active Travel team at TfGM will, if asked, be happy to comment on how such a route could be provided within the space available.

I am also asking that the council make a Section 106 agreement (s106) with the applicant to fund safety improvements for pedestrians and cyclists at the junction of Cavendish Street and Higher Cambridge Street – the applicant themselves discuss the shortcomings of the existing junction layout in Section 4.2.1 of the Transport Statement ("Cyclists have also been observed to queue on the footway to gain direct access to the Higher Cambridge Street/Cavendish Street junction (via a gap in the guard railings) rather than following the road markings which advise cyclists to dismount and use the controlled pedestrian crossings"). The improvements might take the form of a CYCLOPS junction. CYCLOPS is a homegrown Greater Manchester innovation now frequently used on Highways schemes across the country to deliver safe pedestrian and cycle movements without undue impact on traffic flows.

For prospective occupants and passers-by alike, in line with the S106 tests as set out in Paragraph 58 of the National Planning Policy Framework (NPPF) 2024, a contribution to junction safety improvements improvement would be 'necessary to make the development acceptable in planning terms' (by contributing to an appropriate movement strategy for the site), 'directly related to the development' (given its proximity, the pressure added to the junction by the proposed threefold increase in residents, and in light of the wholly inadequate mitigation route proposed by the applicant), and 'fairly and reasonably related in scale and kind to the development' (given the stated threefold increase in residents explained by the applicant, so directly adding more pressure to the junction).

1 Legal Status of Cavendish Street

This section of Cavendish Street, an adopted Highway, was subject to a stopping up order dated 14.06.1996. That order required that "the Developer shall provide a new highway which shall be a footpath/cycleway". MMU have since installed physical signage stating that Cavendish Street "has not been dedicated as a Highway" and have bolted down uncomfortable and restrictive speed bumps across the route in an apparent attempt to dissuade cyclists from exercising their legal rights over this space. Both measures may be unlawful, as my understanding is that cyclists do retain a legal Right of Way along Cavendish Street, unchanged from when the entire road was an adopted highway, and the speed bumps are inaccessible to some Disabled users.

2 Cycling routes and planning policy

The case for walking and cycling and specifically for maintaining and improving high quality cycling networks is clear at every level of modern planning policy, including:

NPPF 2024's "vision-led approach"
LTN 1/20
Places For Everyone Joint Development Plan Objectives 6, 7 and 10
Places for Everyone Joint Development Plan policies JP-Strat14, JP-C1, JP-C5 and JP-C6
GM Transport Strategy 2040 and the "Right Mix" targets
Greater Manchester Streets for All strategy and Streets for All design guide
Manchester City Council's Active Travel Strategy
Manchester City Council's commitment to be a Zero Carbon city by 2038
The policy position is absolutely clear – changes to the existing road and cycle networks should make cycling more convenient for people, not less convenient.

This specific stretch of Cavendish Street is a key part of the existing cycle network. It appears on TfGM's Bee Network map as a Beeway ("the routes that get people from A to B … representing the most direct routes between crossing points.") and connects to the Stretford Road Busy Beeway ("corridors or crossing points on busier roads that will require a

higher level of design intervention to improve cycling and walking.”) It is also mapped on the TfGM Cycle Network.

The national standard for cycling infrastructure is DfT guidance note LTN 1/20. LTN 1/20 advises above all else that cycle routes and networks should be Safe, Direct, Comfortable, Attractive and Coherent. Introducing unnecessary diversions, junctions and bends into a well-used existing route undermines all of these core principles, resulting in a lower quality cycle network which will make it harder for the council to achieve its cycling objectives.

The applicant has offered various reasons why diverting cyclists is necessary but all of these reasons seem to be either existing problems, or problems designed into the scheme. The proposal is to demolish and redevelop the site – so considerations like limited space and the placement of entrances, shop frontages, planting and pedestrian areas are entirely within the applicant’s scope to manage. Instead of starting with the problem “there is an existing busy cycle route across this site, how can I design to accommodate everyone’s needs?”, it seems the applicant has started with the conclusion “cyclists must be deterred” and instructed their consultants to post-rationalise that decision.

3 Misleading claims regarding safety

Page 22 of the Design & Access Statement refers to the “existing controversial link along Cavendish St., which is resulting in collisions of pedestrians, electric scooters, cyclists, etc.”

However the map of recorded collisions, on page 18 of the Transport Statement submitted in the same planning application, shows no recorded collisions whatsoever on this link, only on the adjacent main roads.

It appears the applicant is attempting to restrict cycle access based on a “problem” for which they have no evidence.

Kind Regards,
[redacted]

[redacted]

****
This email and any files transmitted with it are confidential and intended solely for the use of the individual or entity to whom they are addressed.
If you have received this email in error, please notify the sender, or [redacted] and then permanently delete the email, attachments and all copies.
The full text of the Council's email disclaimer is available at: www.manchester.gov.uk/emaildisclaimer.
Your personal data is very important to us. Please refer to our privacy notice at: www.manchester.gov.uk/privacy for further information.

This footnote also confirms that this email message has been swept for the presence of computer viruses.
****

Outlook

Fw: Comment on planning application 142888/FO/2025

From Planning <[redacted]>
Date Mon 14/07/2025 14:05
To Lucy Harrison <[redacted]>

Information, Delivery & Support Team
Planning, Building Control & Licensing
Growth & Development Directorate
Postal address: Manchester City Council, P O Box 532, Town Hall, Manchester M60 2LA
Location address: Level 6 Town Hall Extension, Manchester M2 5DB
Tel: 0161 234 4516

Please consider the environment before printing an e-mail.

From: [redacted]
Sent: 11 July 2025 20:54
To: Planning <[redacted]>
Subject: Comment on planning application 142888/FO/2025

You don't often get email from [redacted] Learn why this is important

ALERT This message originated outside of the Manchester City Council network. **BE CAUTIOUS** before clicking any links or opening any attachments. Please remember your Cyber Training and report anything suspicious.

Dear Manchester Planning team, I am writing to lodge an objection to planning application 142888/FO/2025 – Cambridge Halls Of Residence Cavendish Street Manchester M15 6TT. I have used this route when cycling in Manchester My primary objection is that the proposals have been designed to deter cyclists from using the safest and most direct route through the site. This route has been open to cyclists ever since the road was first built; it is an essential, well-used part of the city's cycling network and therefore the proposal to deter and/or divert cycles away from Cavendish Street is directly at odds with Manchester City Council's planning, sustainability and transport policies. The applicant has also made misleading claims regarding the road's legal status and regarding pedestrian safety which I will outline below. I am asking that the council refuse this application, and invite the developer to come back with a proposal that maintains direct cycle as well as pedestrian access along Cavendish Street, designed to modern standards set out in Greater Manchester's Streets For All design guide and in Department for Transport guidance note LTN 1/20. I am sure that the Highways team at MCC and the Active Travel team at TfGM will, if asked, be happy to comment on how such a route could be provided within the space available. I am also asking that the council make a

Section 106 agreement (s106) with the applicant to fund safety improvements for pedestrians and cyclists at the junction of Cavendish Street and Higher Cambridge Street – the applicant themselves discuss the shortcomings of the existing junction layout in Section 4.2.1 of the Transport Statement ("Cyclists have also been observed to queue on the footway to gain direct access to the Higher Cambridge Street/Cavendish Street junction (via a gap in the guard railings) rather than following the road markings which advise cyclists to dismount and use the controlled pedestrian crossings"). The improvements might take the form of a CYCLOPS junction. CYCLOPS is a homegrown Greater Manchester innovation now frequently used on Highways schemes across the country to deliver safe pedestrian and cycle movements without undue impact on traffic flows. For prospective occupants and passers-by alike, in line with the S106 tests as set out in Paragraph 58 of the National Planning Policy Framework (NPPF) 2024, a contribution to junction safety improvements improvement would be 'necessary to make the development acceptable in planning terms' (by contributing to an appropriate movement strategy for the site), 'directly related to the development' (given its proximity, the pressure added to the junction by the proposed threefold increase in residents, and in light of the wholly inadequate mitigation route proposed by the applicant), and 'fairly and reasonably related in scale and kind to the development' (given the stated threefold increase in residents explained by the applicant, so directly adding more pressure to the junction). 1 Legal Status of Cavendish Street This section of Cavendish Street, an adopted Highway, was subject to a stopping up order dated 14.06.1996. That order required that "the Developer shall provide a new highway which shall be a footpath/cycleway". MMU have since installed physical signage stating that Cavendish Street "has not been dedicated as a Highway" and have bolted down uncomfortable and restrictive speed bumps across the route in an apparent attempt to dissuade cyclists from exercising their legal rights over this space. Both measures may be unlawful, as my understanding is that cyclists do retain a legal Right of Way along Cavendish Street, unchanged from when the entire road was an adopted highway, and the speed bumps are inaccessible to some Disabled users. 2 Cycling routes and planning policy The case for walking and cycling and specifically for maintaining and improving high quality cycling networks is clear at every level of modern planning policy, including: NPPF 2024's "vision-led approach" LTN 1/20 Places For Everyone Joint Development Plan Objectives 6, 7 and 10 Places for Everyone Joint Development Plan policies JP-Strat14, JP-C1, JP-C5 and JP-C6 GM Transport Strategy 2040 and the "Right Mix" targets Greater Manchester Streets for All strategy and Streets for All design guide Manchester City Council's Active Travel Strategy Manchester City Council's commitment to be a Zero Carbon city by 2038 The policy position is absolutely clear – changes to the existing road and cycle networks should make cycling more convenient for people, not less convenient. This specific stretch of Cavendish Street is a key part of the existing cycle network. It appears on TfGM's Bee Network map as a Beeway ("the routes that get people from A to B … representing the most direct routes between crossing points.") and connects to the

Stretford Road Busy Beeway (“corridors or crossing points on busier roads that will require a higher level of design intervention to improve cycling and walking.”) It is also mapped on the TfGM Cycle Network. The national standard for cycling infrastructure is DfT guidance note LTN 1/20. LTN 1/20 advises above all else that cycle routes and networks should be Safe, Direct, Comfortable, Attractive and Coherent. Introducing unnecessary diversions, junctions and bends into a well-used existing route undermines all of these core principles, resulting in a lower quality cycle network which will make it harder for the council to achieve its cycling objectives. The applicant has offered various reasons why diverting cyclists is necessary but all of these reasons seem to be either existing problems, or problems designed into the scheme. The proposal is to demolish and redevelop the site – so considerations like limited space and the placement of entrances, shop frontages, planting and pedestrian areas are entirely within the applicant’s scope to manage. Instead of starting with the problem “there is an existing busy cycle route across this site, how can I design to accommodate everyone’s needs?”, it seems the applicant has started with the conclusion “cyclists must be deterred” and instructed their consultants to post-rationalise that decision. 3 Misleading claims regarding safety Page 22 of the Design & Access Statement refers to the “existing controversial link along Cavendish St., which is resulting in collisions of pedestrians, electric scooters, cyclists, etc.” However the map of recorded collisions, on page 18 of the Transport Statement submitted in the same planning application, shows no recorded collisions whatsoever on this link, only on the adjacent main roads. It appears the applicant is attempting to restrict cycle access based on a “problem” for which they have no evidence. Yours sincerely,

[redacted]

****
This email and any files transmitted with it are confidential and intended solely for the use of the individual or entity to whom they are addressed.
If you have received this email in error, please notify the sender, or [redacted] and then permanently delete the email, attachments and all copies.
The full text of the Council's email disclaimer is available at: www.manchester.gov.uk/emaildisclaimer.
Your personal data is very important to us. Please refer to our privacy notice at: www.manchester.gov.uk/privacy for further information.

This footnote also confirms that this email message has been swept for the presence of computer viruses.
****

Outlook

Fw: 142888/FO/2025

From Planning <[redacted]>
Date Mon 30/06/2025 08:49
To Lucy Harrison <[redacted]>

Information, Delivery & Support Team
Planning, Building Control & Licensing
Growth & Development Directorate
Postal address: Manchester City Council, P O Box 532, Town Hall, Manchester M60 2LA
Location address: Level 6 Town Hall Extension, Manchester M2 5DB
Tel: 0161 234 4516

Please consider the environment before printing an e-mail.

From: [redacted]
Sent: 28 June 2025 18:32
To: Planning <[redacted]>
Subject: 142888/FO/2025

You don't often get email from [redacted] Learn why this is important

ALERT This message originated outside of the Manchester City Council network. **BE CAUTIOUS** before clicking any links or opening any attachments. Please remember your Cyber Training and report anything suspicious.

Dear Manchester Planning team,

I am writing to lodge an objection to planning application 142888/FO/2025 – Cambridge Halls Of Residence Cavendish Street Manchester M15 6TT.

My primary objection is that the proposals have been designed to deter cyclists from using the safest and most direct route through the site. This route has been open to cyclists ever since the road was first built; it is an essential, well-used part of the city's cycling network and therefore the proposal to deter and/or divert cycles away from Cavendish Street is directly at odds with Manchester City Council's planning, sustainability and transport policies.

The applicant has also made misleading claims regarding the road's legal status and regarding pedestrian safety which I will outline below.

I am asking that the council refuse this application, and invite the developer to come back with a proposal that maintains direct cycle as well as pedestrian access along Cavendish Street, designed to modern standards set out in Greater Manchester's Streets For All design guide and in Department for Transport guidance note LTN 1/20. I am sure that the Highways team at MCC and the Active Travel team at TfGM will, if asked, be happy to comment on how such a route could be provided within the space available.

I am also asking that the council make a Section 106 agreement (s106) with the applicant to fund safety improvements for pedestrians and cyclists at the junction of Cavendish Street and Higher Cambridge Street – the applicant themselves discuss the shortcomings of the existing junction layout in Section 4.2.1 of the Transport Statement ("Cyclists have also been observed to queue on the footway to gain direct access to the Higher Cambridge Street/Cavendish Street junction (via a gap in the guard railings) rather than following the road markings which advise cyclists to dismount and use the controlled pedestrian crossings"). The improvements might take the form of a CYCLOPS junction. CYCLOPS is a homegrown Greater Manchester innovation now frequently used on Highways schemes across the country to deliver safe pedestrian and cycle movements without undue impact on traffic flows.

For prospective occupants and passers-by alike, in line with the S106 tests as set out in Paragraph 58 of the National Planning Policy Framework (NPPF) 2024, a contribution to junction safety improvements improvement would be 'necessary to make the development acceptable in planning terms' (by contributing to an appropriate movement strategy for the site), 'directly related to the development' (given its proximity, the pressure added to the junction by the proposed threefold increase in residents, and in light of the wholly inadequate mitigation route proposed by the applicant), and 'fairly and reasonably related in scale and kind to the development' (given the stated threefold increase in residents explained by the applicant, so directly adding more pressure to the junction).

1 Legal Status of Cavendish Street

This section of Cavendish Street, an adopted Highway, was subject to a stopping up order dated 14.06.1996. That order required that "the Developer shall provide a new highway which shall be a footpath/cycleway". MMU have since installed physical signage stating that Cavendish Street "has not been dedicated as a Highway" and have bolted down uncomfortable and restrictive speed bumps across the route in an apparent attempt to dissuade cyclists from exercising their legal rights over this space. Both measures may be unlawful, as my understanding is that cyclists do retain a legal Right of Way along Cavendish Street, unchanged from when the entire road was an adopted highway, and the speed bumps are inaccessible to some Disabled users.

2 Cycling routes and planning policy

The case for walking and cycling and specifically for maintaining and improving high quality cycling networks is clear at every level of modern planning policy, including:

NPPF 2024's "vision-led approach"
LTN 1/20
Places For Everyone Joint Development Plan Objectives 6, 7 and 10
Places for Everyone Joint Development Plan policies JP-Strat14, JP-C1, JP-C5 and JP-C6
GM Transport Strategy 2040 and the "Right Mix" targets
Greater Manchester Streets for All strategy and Streets for All design guide
Manchester City Council's Active Travel Strategy
Manchester City Council's commitment to be a Zero Carbon city by 2038
The policy position is absolutely clear – changes to the existing road and cycle networks should make cycling more convenient for people, not less convenient.

This specific stretch of Cavendish Street is a key part of the existing cycle network. It appears on TfGM's Bee Network map as a Beeway ("the routes that get people from A to B … representing the most direct routes between crossing points.") and connects to the Stretford Road Busy Beeway ("corridors or crossing points on busier roads that will require a higher

level of design intervention to improve cycling and walking.") It is also mapped on the TfGM Cycle Network.

The national standard for cycling infrastructure is DfT guidance note LTN 1/20. LTN 1/20 advises above all else that cycle routes and networks should be Safe, Direct, Comfortable, Attractive and Coherent. Introducing unnecessary diversions, junctions and bends into a well-used existing route undermines all of these core principles, resulting in a lower quality cycle network which will make it harder for the council to achieve its cycling objectives.

The applicant has offered various reasons why diverting cyclists is necessary but all of these reasons seem to be either existing problems, or problems designed into the scheme. The proposal is to demolish and redevelop the site – so considerations like limited space and the placement of entrances, shop frontages, planting and pedestrian areas are entirely within the applicant's scope to manage. Instead of starting with the problem "there is an existing busy cycle route across this site, how can I design to accommodate everyone's needs?", it seems the applicant has started with the conclusion "cyclists must be deterred" and instructed their consultants to post-rationalise that decision.

3 Misleading claims regarding safety

Page 22 of the Design & Access Statement refers to the "existing controversial link along Cavendish St., which is resulting in collisions of pedestrians, electric scooters, cyclists, etc."

However the map of recorded collisions, on page 18 of the Transport Statement submitted in the same planning application, shows no recorded collisions whatsoever on this link, only on the adjacent main roads.

It appears the applicant is attempting to restrict cycle access based on a "problem" for which they have no evidence.

Yours sincerely,

[redacted]

Sent from Outlook for Android

****
This email and any files transmitted with it are confidential and intended solely for the use of the individual or entity to whom they are addressed.
If you have received this email in error, please notify the sender, or [redacted] and then permanently delete the email, attachments and all copies.
The full text of the Council's email disclaimer is available at: www.manchester.gov.uk/emaildisclaimer.
Your personal data is very important to us. Please refer to our privacy notice at: www.manchester.gov.uk/privacy for further information.

This footnote also confirms that this email message has been swept for the presence of computer viruses.
****

Outlook

Fw: Comment on Planning Application 142888/FO/2025

From Planning <[redacted]
Date Mon 30/06/2025 08:52
To Lucy Harrison <[redacted]

Information, Delivery & Support Team
Planning, Building Control & Licensing
Growth & Development Directorate
Postal address: Manchester City Council, P O Box 532, Town Hall, Manchester M60 2LA
Location address: Level 6 Town Hall Extension, Manchester M2 5DB
Tel: 0161 234 4516

Please consider the environment before printing an e-mail.

From: [redacted]
Sent: 28 June 2025 14:05
To: Planning <[redacted]
Subject: Comment on Planning Application 142888/FO/2025

You don't often get email from [redacted] Learn why this is important

ALERT This message originated outside of the Manchester City Council network. **BE CAUTIOUS** before clicking any links or opening any attachments. Please remember your Cyber Training and report anything suspicious.

Dear Manchester Planning team,

I am writing to lodge an objection to planning application **142888/FO/2025** – Cambridge Halls Of Residence Cavendish Street Manchester M15 6TT.

My primary objection is that the proposals have been designed to deter cyclists from using the safest and most direct route through the site. This route has been open to cyclists ever since the road was first built; it is an essential, well-used part of the city's cycling network and therefore the proposal to deter and/or divert cycles away from Cavendish Street is directly at odds with Manchester City Council's planning, sustainability and transport policies.

The applicant has also made misleading claims regarding the road's legal status and regarding pedestrian safety which I will outline below.

I am asking that the council **refuse** this application, and invite the developer to come back with a proposal that maintains direct cycle as well as pedestrian access along Cavendish Street, designed to modern standards set out in Greater Manchester's Streets For All design guide and in Department for

Transport guidance note LTN 1/20. I am sure that the Highways team at MCC and the Active Travel team at TfGM will, if asked, be happy to comment on how such a route could be provided within the space available.

I am also asking that the council **make a Section 106 agreement (s106)** with the applicant to fund safety improvements for pedestrians and cyclists at the junction of Cavendish Street and Higher Cambridge Street – the applicant themselves discuss the shortcomings of the existing junction layout in Section 4.2.1 of the Transport Statement ("*Cyclists have also been observed to queue on the footway to gain direct access to the Higher Cambridge Street/Cavendish Street junction (via a gap in the guard railings) rather than following the road markings which advise cyclists to dismount and use the controlled pedestrian crossings*"). The improvements might take the form of a CYCLOPS junction. CYCLOPS is a homegrown Greater Manchester innovation now frequently used on Highways schemes across the country to deliver safe pedestrian and cycle movements without undue impact on traffic flows.

For prospective occupants and passers-by alike, in line with the S106 tests as set out in Paragraph 58 of the National Planning Policy Framework (NPPF) 2024, a contribution to junction safety improvements improvement would be 'necessary to make the development acceptable in planning terms' (by contributing to an appropriate movement strategy for the site), 'directly related to the development' (given its proximity, the pressure added to the junction by the proposed threefold increase in residents, and in light of the wholly inadequate mitigation route proposed by the applicant), and 'fairly and reasonably related in scale and kind to the development' (given the stated threefold increase in residents explained by the applicant, so directly adding more pressure to the junction).

1 Legal Status of Cavendish Street

This section of Cavendish Street, an adopted Highway, was subject to a stopping up order dated 14.06.1996. That order required that "the Developer shall provide a new highway which shall be a footpath/cycleway". MMU have since installed physical signage stating that Cavendish Street "has not been dedicated as a Highway" and have bolted down uncomfortable and restrictive speed bumps across the route in an apparent attempt to dissuade cyclists from exercising their legal rights over this space. Both measures may be unlawful, as my understanding is that cyclists do retain a legal Right of Way along Cavendish Street, unchanged from when the entire road was an adopted highway, and the speed bumps are inaccessible to some Disabled users.

2 Cycling routes and planning policy

The case for walking and cycling and specifically for maintaining and improving high quality cycling networks is clear at every level of modern planning policy, including:

- NPPF 2024's "vision-led approach"
- LTN 1/20
- Places For Everyone Joint Development Plan Objectives 6, 7 and 10

- Places for Everyone Joint Development Plan policies JP-Strat14, JP-C1, JP-C5 and JP-C6
- GM Transport Strategy 2040 and the "Right Mix" targets
- Greater Manchester Streets for All strategy and Streets for All design guide
- Manchester City Council's Active Travel Strategy
- Manchester City Council's commitment to be a Zero Carbon city by 2038

The policy position is absolutely clear – changes to the existing road and cycle networks should make cycling more convenient for people, not less convenient.

This specific stretch of Cavendish Street is a key part of the existing cycle network. It appears on TfGM's Bee Network map as a Beeway ("the routes that get people from A to B … representing the most direct routes between crossing points.") and connects to the Stretford Road Busy Beeway ("corridors or crossing points on busier roads that will require a higher level of design intervention to improve cycling and walking.") It is also mapped on the TfGM Cycle Network.

The national standard for cycling infrastructure is DfT guidance note LTN 1/20. LTN 1/20 advises above all else that cycle routes and networks should be Safe, Direct, Comfortable, Attractive and Coherent. Introducing unnecessary diversions, junctions and bends into a well-used existing route undermines all of these core principles, resulting in a lower quality cycle network which will make it harder for the council to achieve its cycling objectives.

The applicant has offered various reasons why diverting cyclists is necessary but all of these reasons seem to be either existing problems, or problems designed into the scheme. The proposal is to demolish and redevelop the site – so considerations like limited space and the placement of entrances, shop frontages, planting and pedestrian areas are entirely within the applicant's scope to manage. Instead of starting with the problem "there is an existing busy cycle route across this site, how can I design to accommodate everyone's needs?", it seems the applicant has started with the conclusion "cyclists must be deterred" and instructed their consultants to post-rationalise that decision.

3 Misleading claims regarding safety

Page 22 of the Design & Access Statement refers to the "existing controversial link along Cavendish St., which is resulting in collisions of pedestrians, electric scooters, cyclists, etc."

However the map of recorded collisions, on page 18 of the Transport Statement submitted in the same planning application, shows no recorded collisions whatsoever on this link, only on the adjacent main roads.

It appears the applicant is attempting to restrict cycle access based on a "problem" for which they have no evidence.

Yours sincerely,

[redacted]

****
This email and any files transmitted with it are confidential and intended solely for the use of the individual or entity to whom they are addressed.
If you have received this email in error, please notify the sender, or [redacted] and then permanently delete the email, attachments and all copies.
The full text of the Council's email disclaimer is available at: www.manchester.gov.uk/emaildisclaimer.
Your personal data is very important to us. Please refer to our privacy notice at: www.manchester.gov.uk/privacy for further information.

This footnote also confirms that this email message has been swept for the presence of computer viruses.
****

Outlook

Fw: Comment on Planning Application 142888/FO/2025

From Planning <[redacted]>
Date Mon 30/06/2025 08:51
To Lucy Harrison <[redacted]>

Information, Delivery & Support Team
Planning, Building Control & Licensing
Growth & Development Directorate
Postal address: Manchester City Council, P O Box 532, Town Hall, Manchester M60 2LA
Location address: Level 6 Town Hall Extension, Manchester M2 5DB
Tel: 0161 234 4516

Please consider the environment before printing an e-mail.

From: [redacted]
Sent: 28 June 2025 14:24
To: Planning <[redacted]>
Subject: Comment on Planning Application 142888/FO/2025

You don't often get email from [redacted] Learn why this is important

ALERT This message originated outside of the Manchester City Council network. **BE CAUTIOUS** before clicking any links or opening any attachments. Please remember your Cyber Training and report anything suspicious.

Dear Manchester Planning team,

I am writing to lodge an objection to planning application **142888/FO/2025 – Cambridge Halls Of Residence Cavendish Street Manchester M15 6TT**.

My primary objection is that the proposals have been designed to deter cyclists from using the safest and most direct route through the site. This route has been open to cyclists ever since the road was first built; it is an essential, well-used part of the city's cycling network and therefore the proposal to deter and/or divert cycles away from Cavendish Street is directly at odds with Manchester City Council's planning, sustainability and transport policies.

I live nearby and often use this pathway, avoiding the larger roads (the proposed diversion) and avoiding a dangerous right-hand turn into busy roads with bus and heavy traffic. The existing path is a clear desire line and has been for as long as I have lived in Manchester. I live near Hulme and often need to get onto Oxford Road for leisure purposes and this is the safest and most direct route for me to take. I have never seen any collisions on the existing path and would say that it feels like an area of low conflict with pedestrians and cycle users. The redeveloped public realm around the park allows me to give pedestrians plenty of space, and I appreciate the cycle-specific crossing lights and cycleways at the junction with Cavendish Road and Oxford Road. The redeveloped public realm was clearly designed with

shared use in mind, so it seems as though MMU are now trying to compensate for poor design and planning by now attempting to design-out cycle usage from this area by proposing an unrealistic diversion.

The applicant has also made misleading claims regarding the road's legal status and regarding pedestrian safety which I will outline below.

I am asking that the council refuse this application, and invite the developer to come back with a proposal that maintains direct cycle as well as pedestrian access along Cavendish Street, designed to modern standards set out in Greater Manchester's Streets For All design guide and in Department for Transport guidance note LTN 1/20. I am sure that the Highways team at MCC and the Active Travel team at TfGM will, if asked, be happy to comment on how such a route could be provided within the space available.

I am also asking that the council make a Section 106 agreement (s106) with the applicant to fund safety improvements for pedestrians and cyclists at the junction of Cavendish Street and Higher Cambridge Street – the applicant themselves discuss the shortcomings of the existing junction layout in Section 4.2.1 of the Transport Statement ("Cyclists have also been observed to queue on the footway to gain direct access to the Higher Cambridge Street/Cavendish Street junction (via a gap in the guard railings) rather than following the road markings which advise cyclists to dismount and use the controlled pedestrian crossings"). The improvements might take the form of a CYCLOPS junction. CYCLOPS is a homegrown Greater Manchester innovation now frequently used on Highways schemes across the country to deliver safe pedestrian and cycle movements without undue impact on traffic flows.

For prospective occupants and passers-by alike, in line with the S106 tests as set out in Paragraph 58 of the National Planning Policy Framework (NPPF) 2024, a contribution to junction safety improvements improvement would be 'necessary to make the development acceptable in planning terms' (by contributing to an appropriate movement strategy for the site), 'directly related to the development' (given its proximity, the pressure added to the junction by the proposed threefold increase in residents, and in light of the wholly inadequate mitigation route proposed by the applicant), and 'fairly and reasonably related in scale and kind to the development' (given the stated threefold increase in residents explained by the applicant, so directly adding more pressure to the junction).

1 Legal Status of Cavendish Street

This section of Cavendish Street, an adopted Highway, was subject to a stopping up order dated 14.06.1996. That order required that "the Developer shall provide a new highway which shall be a footpath/cycleway". MMU have since installed physical signage stating that Cavendish Street "has not been dedicated as a Highway" and have bolted down uncomfortable and restrictive speed bumps across the route in an apparent attempt to dissuade cyclists from exercising their legal rights over this space. Both measures may be unlawful, as my understanding is that cyclists do retain a legal Right of Way along Cavendish Street, unchanged from when the entire road was an adopted highway, and the speed bumps are inaccessible to some Disabled users.

2 Cycling routes and planning policy

The case for walking and cycling and specifically for maintaining and improving high quality cycling networks is clear at every level of modern planning policy, including:

- NPPF 2024's "vision-led approach"

- LTN 1/20
- Places For Everyone Joint Development Plan Objectives 6, 7 and 10
- Places for Everyone Joint Development Plan policies JP-Strat14, JP-C1, JP-C5 and JP-C6
- GM Transport Strategy 2040 and the "Right Mix" targets
- Greater Manchester Streets for All strategy and Streets for All design guide
- Manchester City Council's Active Travel Strategy
- Manchester City Council's commitment to be a Zero Carbon city by 2038

The policy position is absolutely clear – changes to the existing road and cycle networks should make cycling more convenient for people, not less convenient.

This specific stretch of Cavendish Street is a key part of the existing cycle network. It appears on TfGM's Bee Network map as a Beeway ("the routes that get people from A to B … representing the most direct routes between crossing points.") and connects to the Stretford Road Busy Beeway ("corridors or crossing points on busier roads that will require a higher level of design intervention to improve cycling and walking.") It is also mapped on the TfGM Cycle Network.

The national standard for cycling infrastructure is DfT guidance note LTN 1/20. LTN 1/20 advises above all else that cycle routes and networks should be Safe, Direct, Comfortable, Attractive and Coherent. Introducing unnecessary diversions, junctions and bends into a well-used existing route undermines all of these core principles, resulting in a lower quality cycle network which will make it harder for the council to achieve its cycling objectives.

The applicant has offered various reasons why diverting cyclists is necessary but all of these reasons seem to be either existing problems, or problems designed into the scheme. The proposal is to demolish and redevelop the site – so considerations like limited space and the placement of entrances, shop frontages, planting and pedestrian areas are entirely within the applicant's scope to manage. Instead of starting with the problem "there is an existing busy cycle route across this site, how can I design to accommodate everyone's needs?", it seems the applicant has started with the conclusion "cyclists must be deterred" and instructed their consultants to post-rationalise that decision.

3 Misleading claims regarding safety

Page 22 of the Design & Access Statement refers to the "existing controversial link along Cavendish St., which is resulting in collisions of pedestrians, electric scooters, cyclists, etc."

However the map of recorded collisions, on page 18 of the Transport Statement submitted in the same planning application, shows no recorded collisions whatsoever on this link, only on the adjacent main roads.

It appears the applicant is attempting to restrict cycle access based on a "problem" for which they have no evidence.

Yours sincerely,

[redacted]

[redacted]

****
This email and any files transmitted with it are confidential and intended solely for the use of the individual or entity to whom they are addressed.
If you have received this email in error, please notify the sender, or [redacted] and then permanently delete the email, attachments and all copies.
The full text of the Council's email disclaimer is available at: www.manchester.gov.uk/emaildisclaimer.
Your personal data is very important to us. Please refer to our privacy notice at: www.manchester.gov.uk/privacy for further information.

This footnote also confirms that this email message has been swept for the presence of computer viruses.
****

Outlook

Fw: Subject: Comment on Planning Application 142888/FO/2025

From Planning <[redacted]
Date Wed 16/07/2025 15:33
To Lucy Harrison <[redacted]

Information, Delivery & Support Team
Planning, Building Control & Licensing
Growth & Development Directorate
Postal address: Manchester City Council, P O Box 532, Town Hall, Manchester M60 2LA
Location address: Level 6 Town Hall Extension, Manchester M2 5DB
Tel: 0161 234 4516

Please consider the environment before printing an e-mail.

From: [redacted]
Sent: 15 July 2025 19:31
To: Planning <[redacted]
Subject: Subject: Comment on Planning Application 142888/FO/2025

You don't often get email from [redacted] Learn why this is important

ALERT This message originated outside of the Manchester City Council network. **BE CAUTIOUS** before clicking any links or opening any attachments. Please remember your Cyber Training and report anything suspicious.

Dear Manchester Planning team,

I am writing to lodge an objection to planning application **142888/FO/2025**– Cambridge Halls Of Residence Cavendish Street Manchester M15 6TT.

My primary objection is that the proposals have been designed to deter cyclists from using the safest and most direct route through the site. This route has been open to cyclists ever since the road was first built; it is an essential, well-used part of the city's cycling network and therefore the proposal to deter and/or divert cycles away from Cavendish Street is directly at odds with Manchester City Council's planning, sustainability and transport policies.

The applicant has also made misleading claims regarding the road's legal status and regarding pedestrian safety which I will outline below.

I am asking that the council **refuse** this application, and invite the developer to come back with a proposal that maintains direct cycle as well as pedestrian access along Cavendish Street, designed to modern standards set out in Greater Manchester's Streets For All design guide and in Department for Transport guidance note LTN 1/20. I am sure that the Highways team at MCC and the Active Travel team at TfGM will, if asked, be happy to comment on how such a route could be provided within the space available.

I am also asking that the council **make a Section 106 agreement (s106)** with the applicant to fund safety improvements for pedestrians and cyclists at the junction of Cavendish Street and Higher Cambridge Street – the applicant themselves discuss the shortcomings of the existing junction layout in Section 4.2.1 of the Transport Statement ("*Cyclists have also been observed to queue on the footway to gain direct access to the Higher Cambridge Street/Cavendish Street junction (via a gap in the guard railings) rather than following the road markings which advise cyclists to dismount and use the controlled pedestrian crossings*"). The improvements might take the form of a CYCLOPS junction. CYCLOPS is a homegrown Greater Manchester innovation now frequently used on Highways schemes across the country to deliver safe pedestrian and cycle movements without undue impact on traffic flows.

For prospective occupants and passers-by alike, in line with the S106 tests as set out in Paragraph 58 of the National Planning Policy Framework (NPPF) 2024, a contribution to junction safety improvements improvement would be 'necessary to make the development acceptable in planning terms' (by contributing to an appropriate movement strategy for the site), 'directly related to the development' (given its proximity, the pressure added to the junction by the proposed threefold increase in residents, and in light of the wholly inadequate mitigation route proposed by the applicant), and 'fairly and reasonably related in scale and kind to the development' (given the stated threefold increase in residents explained by the applicant, so directly adding more pressure to the junction).

1 Legal Status of Cavendish Street

This section of Cavendish Street, an adopted Highway, was subject to a stopping up order dated 14.06.1996. That order required that "the Developer shall provide a new highway which shall be a footpath/cycleway". MMU have since installed physical signage stating that Cavendish Street "has not been dedicated as a Highway" and have bolted down uncomfortable and restrictive speed bumps

across the route in an apparent attempt to dissuade cyclists from exercising their legal rights over this space. Both measures may be unlawful, as my understanding is that cyclists do retain a legal Right of Way along Cavendish Street, unchanged from when the entire road was an adopted highway, and the speed bumps are inaccessible to some Disabled users.

2 Cycling routes and planning policy

The case for walking and cycling and specifically for maintaining and improving high quality cycling networks is clear at every level of modern planning policy, including:

- NPPF 2024's "vision-led approach"
- LTN 1/20
- Places For Everyone Joint Development Plan Objectives 6, 7 and 10
- Places for Everyone Joint Development Plan policies JP-Strat14, JP-C1, JP-C5 and JP-C6
- GM Transport Strategy 2040 and the "Right Mix" targets
- Greater Manchester Streets for All strategy and Streets for All design guide
- Manchester City Council's Active Travel Strategy
- Manchester City Council's commitment to be a Zero Carbon city by 2038

The policy position is absolutely clear – changes to the existing road and cycle networks should make cycling more convenient for people, not less convenient.

This specific stretch of Cavendish Street is a key part of the existing cycle network. It appears on TfGM's Bee Network map as a Beeway ("the routes that get people from A to B … representing the most direct routes between crossing points.") and connects to the Stretford Road Busy Beeway ("corridors or crossing points on busier roads that will require a higher level of design intervention to improve cycling and walking.") It is also mapped on the TfGM Cycle Network.

The national standard for cycling infrastructure is DfT guidance note LTN 1/20. LTN 1/20 advises above all else that cycle routes and networks should be Safe, Direct, Comfortable, Attractive and Coherent. Introducing unnecessary diversions, junctions and bends into a well-used existing route undermines all of these core principles, resulting in a lower quality cycle network which will make it harder for the council to achieve its cycling objectives.

The applicant has offered various reasons why diverting cyclists is necessary but all of these reasons seem to be either existing problems, or problems designed into the scheme. The proposal is to demolish and redevelop the site – so considerations like limited space and the placement of entrances, shop frontages, planting and pedestrian areas are entirely within the applicant's scope to manage. Instead of starting with the problem "there is an existing busy cycle route across this site, how can I design to accommodate everyone's needs?", it seems the applicant has started with the conclusion "cyclists must be deterred" and instructed their consultants to post-rationalise that decision.

3 Misleading claims regarding safety

Page 22 of the Design & Access Statement refers to the "existing controversial link along Cavendish St., which is resulting in collisions of pedestrians, electric scooters, cyclists, etc."

However the map of recorded collisions, on page 18 of the Transport Statement submitted in the same planning application, shows no recorded collisions whatsoever on this link, only on the adjacent main roads.

It appears the applicant is attempting to restrict cycle access based on a "problem" for which they have no evidence.

Yours sincerely,

[redacted]

[redacted]

Sent from my iPhone

[redacted]

Sent from my iPhone

****
This email and any files transmitted with it are confidential and intended solely for the use of the individual or entity to whom they are addressed.
If you have received this email in error, please notify the sender, or [redacted] and then permanently delete the email, attachments and all copies.
The full text of the Council's email disclaimer is available at: www.manchester.gov.uk/emaildisclaimer.
Your personal data is very important to us. Please refer to our privacy notice at: www.manchester.gov.uk/privacy for further information.

This footnote also confirms that this email message has been swept for the presence of computer viruses.
****

Outlook

Fw: Comment on Planning Application 142888/FO/2025

From Planning <[redacted]>
Date Fri 04/07/2025 14:10
To Lucy Harrison <[redacted]>

Information, Delivery & Support Team
Planning, Building Control & Licensing
Growth & Development Directorate
Postal address: Manchester City Council, P O Box 532, Town Hall, Manchester M60 2LA
Location address: Level 6 Town Hall Extension, Manchester M2 5DB
Tel: 0161 234 4516

Please consider the environment before printing an e-mail.

From: [redacted]
Sent: 30 June 2025 13:14
To: Planning <[redacted]>
Subject: Comment on Planning Application 142888/FO/2025

You don't often get email from [redacted] Learn why this is important

ALERT This message originated outside of the Manchester City Council network. **BE CAUTIOUS** before clicking any links or opening any attachments. Please remember your Cyber Training and report anything suspicious.

Dear Manchester City Council Planning Team

I am writing to lodge an objection to planning application 142888/FO/2025 **– Cambridge Halls Of Residence Cavendish Street Manchester M15 6TT.**

My primary objection is that the proposals have been designed to deter cyclists from using the safest and most direct route through the site. This route has been open to cyclists ever since the road was first built; it is an essential, well-used part of the city's cycling network and therefore the proposal to deter and/or divert cycles away from Cavendish Street is directly at odds with Manchester City Council's planning, sustainability and transport policies.

Since I moved to Greater Manchester from London in 1977, I have been regularly riding my bike throughout central Manchester, including, for instance, cutting through on this exact route in order to go towards Old Trafford. I rode through the city centre this morning between Piccadilly rail station and Chapel Street, there and back. I must also declare my interest: I am a director of Manchester Bikes (200 Chapel Street, Salford, M3 6BY www.manchesterbikes.co.uk). Every time there is a negative approach to cycling like this, it makes our lives more difficult. We were established in 2014 to help get more people cycling, more often. We are trying very hard to get businesses, organisation and families to use cargo bikes. They need links like the one on Cavendish Street in order to feel safe.

The applicant has also made misleading claims regarding the road's legal status and regarding pedestrian safety which I will outline below.
I am asking that the council **refuse** this application, and invite the developer to come back with a proposal that maintains direct cycle as well as pedestrian access along Cavendish Street, designed to modern standards set out in Greater Manchester's Streets For All design guide and in Department for Transport guidance note LTN 1/20. I am sure that the Highways team at MCC and the Active Travel team at TfGM will, if asked, be happy to comment on how such a route could be provided within the space available.

I am also asking that the council **make a Section 106 agreement (s106)** with the applicant to fund safety improvements for pedestrians and cyclists at the junction of Cavendish Street and Higher Cambridge Street – the applicant themselves discuss the shortcomings of the existing junction layout in Section 4.2.1 of the Transport Statement ("*Cyclists have also been observed to queue on the footway to gain direct access to the Higher Cambridge Street/Cavendish Street junction (via a gap in the guard railings) rather than following the road markings which advise cyclists to dismount and use the controlled pedestrian crossings*"). The improvements might take the form of a CYCLOPS junction. CYCLOPS is a homegrown Greater Manchester innovation now frequently used on Highways schemes across the country to deliver safe pedestrian and cycle movements without undue impact on traffic flows.

For prospective occupants and passers-by alike, in line with the S106 tests as set out in Paragraph 58 of the National Planning Policy Framework (NPPF) 2024, a contribution to junction safety improvements improvement would be 'necessary to make the development acceptable in planning terms' (by contributing to an appropriate movement strategy for the site), 'directly related to the development' (given its proximity, the pressure added to the junction by the proposed threefold increase in residents, and in light of the wholly inadequate mitigation route proposed by the applicant), and 'fairly and reasonably related in scale and kind to the development' (given the stated threefold increase in residents explained by the applicant, so directly adding more pressure to the junction).

1 Legal Status of Cavendish Street

This section of Cavendish Street, an adopted Highway, was subject to a stopping up order dated 14.06.1996. That order required that "the Developer shall provide a new highway which shall be a footpath/cycleway". MMU have since installed physical signage stating that Cavendish Street "has not been dedicated as a Highway" and have bolted down uncomfortable and restrictive speed bumps across the route in an apparent attempt to dissuade cyclists from exercising their legal rights over this space. Both measures may be unlawful, as my understanding is that cyclists do retain a legal Right of Way along Cavendish Street, unchanged from when the entire road was an adopted highway, and the speed bumps are inaccessible to some Disabled users.

2 Cycling routes and planning policy

The case for walking and cycling and specifically for maintaining and improving high quality cycling networks is clear at every level of modern planning policy, including:

- NPPF 2024's "vision-led approach"
- LTN 1/20
- Places For Everyone Joint Development Plan Objectives 6, 7 and 10
- Places for Everyone Joint Development Plan policies JP-Strat14, JP-C1, JP-C5 and JP-C6
- GM Transport Strategy 2040 and the "Right Mix" targets
- Greater Manchester Streets for All strategy and Streets for All design guide
- Manchester City Council's Active Travel Strategy

- Manchester City Council's commitment to be a Zero Carbon city by 2038

The policy position is absolutely clear – changes to the existing road and cycle networks should make cycling more convenient for people, not less convenient.

This specific stretch of Cavendish Street is a key part of the existing cycle network. It appears on TfGM's Bee Network map as a Beeway ("the routes that get people from A to B … representing the most direct routes between crossing points.") and connects to the Stretford Road Busy Beeway ("corridors or crossing points on busier roads that will require a higher level of design intervention to improve cycling and walking.") It is also mapped on the TfGM Cycle Network.

The national standard for cycling infrastructure is DfT guidance note LTN 1/20. LTN 1/20 advises above all else that cycle routes and networks should be Safe, Direct, Comfortable, Attractive and Coherent. Introducing unnecessary diversions, junctions and bends into a well-used existing route undermines all of these core principles, resulting in a lower quality cycle network which will make it harder for the council to achieve its cycling objectives.

The applicant has offered various reasons why diverting cyclists is necessary but all of these reasons seem to be either existing problems, or problems designed into the scheme. The proposal is to demolish and redevelop the site – so considerations like limited space and the placement of entrances, shop frontages, planting and pedestrian areas are entirely within the applicant's scope to manage. Instead of starting with the problem "there is an existing busy cycle route across this site, how can I design to accommodate everyone's needs?", it seems the applicant has started with the conclusion "cyclists must be deterred" and instructed their consultants to post-rationalise that decision.

3 Misleading claims regarding safety

Page 22 of the Design & Access Statement refers to the "existing controversial link along Cavendish St., which is resulting in collisions of pedestrians, electric scooters, cyclists, etc."

However the map of recorded collisions, on page 18 of the Transport Statement submitted in the same planning application, shows no recorded collisions whatsoever on this link, only on the adjacent main roads.

It appears the applicant is attempting to restrict cycle access based on a "problem" for which they have no evidence.

Yours sincerely

[redacted]

****
This email and any files transmitted with it are confidential and intended solely for the use of the individual or entity to whom they are addressed.

If you have received this email in error, please notify the sender, or [redacted] and then permanently delete the email, attachments and all copies.
The full text of the Council's email disclaimer is available at: www.manchester.gov.uk/emaildisclaimer.
Your personal data is very important to us. Please refer to our privacy notice at: www.manchester.gov.uk/privacy for further information.

This footnote also confirms that this email message has been swept for the presence of computer viruses.
****

Outlook

Fw: 142888/FO/2025

From Planning <[redacted]
Date Fri 04/07/2025 14:09
To Lucy Harrison <[redacted]

Information, Delivery & Support Team
Planning, Building Control & Licensing
Growth & Development Directorate
Postal address: Manchester City Council, P O Box 532, Town Hall, Manchester M60 2LA
Location address: Level 6 Town Hall Extension, Manchester M2 5DB
Tel: 0161 234 4516

Please consider the environment before printing an e-mail.

From: [redacted]
Sent: 28 June 2025 14:19
To: Planning <[redacted]
Subject: 142888/FO/2025

You don't often get email from [redacted] Learn why this is important

ALERT This message originated outside of the Manchester City Council network. **BE CAUTIOUS** before clicking any links or opening any attachments. Please remember your Cyber Training and report anything suspicious.

Subject: Comment on Planning Application 142888/FO/2025

Dear Manchester Planning team,

I am writing to lodge an objection to planning application **142888/FO/2025** – Cambridge Halls Of Residence Cavendish Street Manchester M15 6TT.

My primary objection is that the proposals have been designed to deter cyclists from using the safest and most direct route through the site. This route has been open to cyclists ever since the road was first built; it is an essential, well-used part of the city's cycling network and therefore the proposal to deter and/or divert cycles away from Cavendish Street is directly at odds with Manchester City Council's planning, sustainability and transport policies.

In other countries where cycling has been integrated with other road users such as proposal would not have been made. Using the common British attitude of failing to cater for cycling is far from planning for the future.

[redacted]

[redacted]

[redacted]

[redacted]

****
This email and any files transmitted with it are confidential and intended solely for the use of the individual or entity to whom they are addressed.
If you have received this email in error, please notify the sender, or [redacted] and then permanently delete the email, attachments and all copies.
The full text of the Council's email disclaimer is available at: www.manchester.gov.uk/emaildisclaimer.
Your personal data is very important to us. Please refer to our privacy notice at: www.manchester.gov.uk/privacy for further information.

This footnote also confirms that this email message has been swept for the presence of computer viruses.
****

Outlook

Fw: Comment on Planning Application 142888/FO/2025

From Planning <[redacted]
Date Wed 16/07/2025 15:33
To Lucy Harrison <[redacted]

Information, Delivery & Support Team
Planning, Building Control & Licensing
Growth & Development Directorate
Postal address: Manchester City Council, P O Box 532, Town Hall, Manchester M60 2LA
Location address: Level 6 Town Hall Extension, Manchester M2 5DB
Tel: 0161 234 4516

Please consider the environment before printing an e-mail.

From: [redacted]
Sent: 15 July 2025 23:50
To: Planning <[redacted]
Subject: Comment on Planning Application 142888/FO/2025

[You don't often get email from [redacted] Learn why this is important at https://aka.ms/LearnAboutSenderIdentification]

ALERT This message originated outside of the Manchester City Council network. BE CAUTIOUS before clicking any links or opening any attachments. Please remember your Cyber Training and report anything suspicious.

Dear Manchester Planning team,

I am writing to lodge an objection to planning application 142888/FO/2025 – Cambridge Halls Of Residence Cavendish Street Manchester M15 6TT.

My primary objection is that the proposals have been designed to deter cyclists from using the safest and most direct route through the site. This route has been open to cyclists ever since the road was first built; it is an essential, well-used part of the city's cycling network and therefore the proposal to deter and/or divert cycles away from Cavendish Street is directly at odds with Manchester City Council's planning, sustainability and transport policies.

I use the route regularly, both as a cyclist and a pedestrian, to travel from Hulme to the University, picadilly station, and to businesses around Oxford road. I have used the route since since the construction of the current building and I have seen no evidence of danger or disturbance to residents or occupants.

The applicant has also made misleading claims regarding the road's legal status and regarding

pedestrian safety which I will outline below.

I am asking that the council refuse this application, and invite the developer to come back with a proposal that maintains direct cycle as well as pedestrian access along Cavendish Street, designed to modern standards set out in Greater Manchester's Streets For All design guide and in Department for Transport guidance note LTN 1/20. I am sure that the Highways team at MCC and the Active Travel team at TfGM will, if asked, be happy to comment on how such a route could be provided within the space available.

I am also asking that the council make a Section 106 agreement (s106) with the applicant to fund safety improvements for pedestrians and cyclists at the junction of Cavendish Street and Higher Cambridge Street – the applicant themselves discuss the shortcomings of the existing junction layout in Section 4.2.1 of the Transport Statement ("Cyclists have also been observed to queue on the footway to gain direct access to the Higher Cambridge Street/Cavendish Street junction (via a gap in the guard railings) rather than following the road markings which advise cyclists to dismount and use the controlled pedestrian crossings"). The improvements might take the form of a CYCLOPS junction. CYCLOPS is a homegrown Greater Manchester innovation now frequently used on Highways schemes across the country to deliver safe pedestrian and cycle movements without undue impact on traffic flows.

For prospective occupants and passers-by alike, in line with the S106 tests as set out in Paragraph 58 of the National Planning Policy Framework (NPPF) 2024, a contribution to junction safety improvements improvement would be 'necessary to make the development acceptable in planning terms' (by contributing to an appropriate movement strategy for the site), 'directly related to the development' (given its proximity, the pressure added to the junction by the proposed threefold increase in residents, and in light of the wholly inadequate mitigation route proposed by the applicant), and 'fairly and reasonably related in scale and kind to the development' (given the stated threefold increase in residents explained by the applicant, so directly adding more pressure to the junction).

1 Legal Status of Cavendish Street

This section of Cavendish Street, an adopted Highway, was subject to a stopping up order dated 14.06.1996. That order required that "the Developer shall provide a new highway which shall be a footpath/cycleway". MMU have since installed physical signage stating that Cavendish Street "has not been dedicated as a Highway" and have bolted down uncomfortable and restrictive speed bumps across the route in an apparent attempt to dissuade cyclists from exercising their legal rights over this space. Both measures may be unlawful, as my understanding is that cyclists do retain a legal Right of Way along Cavendish Street, unchanged from when the entire road was an adopted highway, and the speed bumps are inaccessible to some Disabled users.

2 Cycling routes and planning policy

The case for walking and cycling and specifically for maintaining and improving high quality cycling networks is clear at every level of modern planning policy, including:

NPPF 2024's "vision-led approach"
LTN 1/20
Places For Everyone Joint Development Plan Objectives 6, 7 and 10
Places for Everyone Joint Development Plan policies JP-Strat14, JP-C1, JP-C5 and JP-C6
GM Transport Strategy 2040 and the "Right Mix" targets
Greater Manchester Streets for All strategy and Streets for All design guide

Manchester City Council's Active Travel Strategy
Manchester City Council's commitment to be a Zero Carbon city by 2038
The policy position is absolutely clear – changes to the existing road and cycle networks should make cycling more convenient for people, not less convenient.

This specific stretch of Cavendish Street is a key part of the existing cycle network. It appears on TfGM's Bee Network map as a Beeway ("the routes that get people from A to B … representing the most direct routes between crossing points.") and connects to the Stretford Road Busy Beeway ("corridors or crossing points on busier roads that will require a higher level of design intervention to improve cycling and walking.") It is also mapped on the TfGM Cycle Network.

The national standard for cycling infrastructure is DfT guidance note LTN 1/20. LTN 1/20 advises above all else that cycle routes and networks should be Safe, Direct, Comfortable, Attractive and Coherent. Introducing unnecessary diversions, junctions and bends into a well-used existing route undermines all of these core principles, resulting in a lower quality cycle network which will make it harder for the council to achieve its cycling objectives.

The applicant has offered various reasons why diverting cyclists is necessary but all of these reasons seem to be either existing problems, or problems designed into the scheme. The proposal is to demolish and redevelop the site – so considerations like limited space and the placement of entrances, shop frontages, planting and pedestrian areas are entirely within the applicant's scope to manage. Instead of starting with the problem "there is an existing busy cycle route across this site, how can I design to accommodate everyone's needs?", it seems the applicant has started with the conclusion "cyclists must be deterred" and instructed their consultants to post-rationalise that decision.

3 Misleading claims regarding safety

Page 22 of the Design & Access Statement refers to the "existing controversial link along Cavendish St., which is resulting in collisions of pedestrians, electric scooters, cyclists, etc."

However the map of recorded collisions, on page 18 of the Transport Statement submitted in the same planning application, shows no recorded collisions whatsoever on this link, only on the adjacent main roads.

It appears the applicant is attempting to restrict cycle access based on a "problem" for which they have no evidence.

Yours sincerely,

[redacted]

****
This email and any files transmitted with it are confidential and intended solely for the use of the individual or entity to whom they are addressed. If you have received this email in error, please notify the sender, or [redacted] and then permanently delete the email, attachments and all copies.
The full text of the Council's email disclaimer is available at: www.manchester.gov.uk/emaildisclaimer.
Your personal data is very important to us. Please refer to our privacy notice at: www.manchester.gov.uk/privacy for further information.

This footnote also confirms that this email message has been swept for the presence of computer viruses.
****

Outlook

Fw: Subject: Comment on Planning Application 142888/FO/2025

From Planning <[redacted]
Date Mon 14/07/2025 14:05
To Lucy Harrison <[redacted]

Information, Delivery & Support Team
Planning, Building Control & Licensing
Growth & Development Directorate
Postal address: Manchester City Council, P O Box 532, Town Hall, Manchester M60 2LA
Location address: Level 6 Town Hall Extension, Manchester M2 5DB
Tel: 0161 234 4516

Please consider the environment before printing an e-mail.

From: [redacted]
Sent: 11 July 2025 20:02
To: Planning <[redacted]
Subject: Subject: Comment on Planning Application 142888/FO/2025

You don't often get email from [redacted] Learn why this is important

ALERT This message originated outside of the Manchester City Council network. **BE CAUTIOUS** before clicking any links or opening any attachments. Please remember your Cyber Training and report anything suspicious.

Dear Manchester Planning team,

I am writing to lodge an objection to planning application **142888/FO/2025** – Cambridge Halls Of Residence Cavendish Street Manchester M15 6TT.
My primary objection is that the proposals have been designed to deter cyclists from using the safest and most direct route through the site. This route has been open to cyclists ever since the road was first built; it is an essential, well-used part of the city's cycling network and therefore the proposal to deter and/or divert cycles away from Cavendish Street is directly at odds with Manchester City Council's planning, sustainability and transport policies.
I have used this route throughout my last four years as a student at MMU - hundreds of times - and fully intended to continue travelling this way while doing my Masters starting this coming Autumn. My journeys would be longer and less safe without it.
The applicant has also made misleading claims regarding the road's legal status and regarding pedestrian safety which I will outline below.
I am asking that the council **refuse** this application, and invite the developer to come back with a proposal that maintains direct cycle as well as pedestrian access along Cavendish Street, designed to modern standards set out in Greater Manchester's Streets For All design guide and in Department for Transport guidance note LTN 1/20. I am sure that the Highways team at MCC and the Active Travel team at TfGM will, if asked, be happy to comment on how such a route could be provided within the space available.
I am also asking that the council **make a Section 106 agreement (s106)** with the applicant to fund safety improvements for pedestrians and cyclists at the junction of Cavendish Street and Higher Cambridge Street – the applicant themselves discuss the shortcomings of the existing junction layout in Section 4.2.1 of the Transport Statement ("*Cyclists have also been observed to*

queue on the footway to gain direct access to the Higher Cambridge Street/Cavendish Street junction (via a gap in the guard railings) rather than following the road markings which advise cyclists to dismount and use the controlled pedestrian crossings"). The improvements might take the form of a CYCLOPS junction. CYCLOPS is a homegrown Greater Manchester innovation now frequently used on Highways schemes across the country to deliver safe pedestrian and cycle movements without undue impact on traffic flows.

For prospective occupants and passers-by alike, in line with the S106 tests as set out in Paragraph 58 of the National Planning Policy Framework (NPPF) 2024, a contribution to junction safety improvements improvement would be 'necessary to make the development acceptable in planning terms' (by contributing to an appropriate movement strategy for the site), 'directly related to the development' (given its proximity, the pressure added to the junction by the proposed threefold increase in residents, and in light of the wholly inadequate mitigation route proposed by the applicant), and 'fairly and reasonably related in scale and kind to the development' (given the stated threefold increase in residents explained by the applicant, so directly adding more pressure to the junction).

1 Legal Status of Cavendish Street

This section of Cavendish Street, an adopted Highway, was subject to a stopping up order dated 14.06.1996. That order required that "the Developer shall provide a new highway which shall be a footpath/cycleway". MMU have since installed physical signage stating that Cavendish Street "has not been dedicated as a Highway" and have bolted down uncomfortable and restrictive speed bumps across the route in an apparent attempt to dissuade cyclists from exercising their legal rights over this space. Both measures may be unlawful, as my understanding is that cyclists do retain a legal Right of Way along Cavendish Street, unchanged from when the entire road was an adopted highway, and the speed bumps are inaccessible to some Disabled users.

2 Cycling routes and planning policy

The case for walking and cycling and specifically for maintaining and improving high quality cycling networks is clear at every level of modern planning policy, including:

- NPPF 2024's "vision-led approach"
- LTN 1/20
- Places For Everyone Joint Development Plan Objectives 6, 7 and 10
- Places for Everyone Joint Development Plan policies JP-Strat14, JP-C1, JP-C5 and JP-C6
- GM Transport Strategy 2040 and the "Right Mix" targets
- Greater Manchester Streets for All strategy and Streets for All design guide
- Manchester City Council's Active Travel Strategy
- Manchester City Council's commitment to be a Zero Carbon city by 2038

The policy position is absolutely clear – changes to the existing road and cycle networks should make cycling more convenient for people, not less convenient.

This specific stretch of Cavendish Street is a key part of the existing cycle network. It appears on TfGM's Bee Network map as a Beeway ("the routes that get people from A to B … representing the most direct routes between crossing points.") and connects to the Stretford Road Busy Beeway ("corridors or crossing points on busier roads that will require a higher level of design intervention to improve cycling and walking.") It is also mapped on the TfGM Cycle Network.

The national standard for cycling infrastructure is DfT guidance note LTN 1/20. LTN 1/20 advises above all else that cycle routes and networks should be Safe, Direct, Comfortable, Attractive and Coherent. Introducing unnecessary diversions, junctions and bends into a well-used existing route undermines all of these core principles, resulting in a lower quality cycle network which will make it harder for the council to achieve its cycling objectives.

The applicant has offered various reasons why diverting cyclists is necessary but all of these reasons seem to be either existing problems, or problems designed into the scheme. The proposal is to demolish and redevelop the site – so considerations like limited space and the placement of entrances, shop frontages, planting and pedestrian areas are entirely within the applicant's scope to manage. Instead of starting with the problem "there is an existing busy cycle route across this site, how can I design to accommodate everyone's needs?", it seems the applicant has started with the conclusion "cyclists must be deterred" and instructed their consultants to post-rationalise that decision.

3 Misleading claims regarding safety

Page 22 of the Design & Access Statement refers to the "existing controversial link along Cavendish St., which is resulting in collisions of pedestrians, electric scooters, cyclists, etc." However the map of recorded collisions, on page 18 of the Transport Statement submitted in the same planning application, shows no recorded collisions whatsoever on this link, only on the adjacent main roads.

It appears the applicant is attempting to restrict cycle access based on a “problem” for which they have no evidence.
Yours sincerely,
[redacted]

****
This email and any files transmitted with it are confidential and intended solely for the use of the individual or entity to whom they are addressed. If you have received this email in error, please notify the sender, or [redacted] and then permanently delete the email, attachments and all copies.
The full text of the Council's email disclaimer is available at: www.manchester.gov.uk/emaildisclaimer.
Your personal data is very important to us. Please refer to our privacy notice at: www.manchester.gov.uk/privacy for further information.

This footnote also confirms that this email message has been swept for the presence of computer viruses.
****

Outlook

Fw: Comment on Planning Application 142888/FO/2025

From Planning <[redacted]
Date Wed 02/07/2025 14:52
To Lucy Harrison <[redacted]

Information, Delivery & Support Team
Planning, Building Control & Licensing
Growth & Development Directorate
Postal address: Manchester City Council, P O Box 532, Town Hall, Manchester M60 2LA
Location address: Level 6 Town Hall Extension, Manchester M2 5DB
Tel: 0161 234 4516

Please consider the environment before printing an e-mail.

From: [redacted] <[redacted]
Sent: 02 July 2025 14:51
To: Planning <[redacted]
Subject: Comment on Planning Application 142888/FO/2025

You don't often get email from [redacted] Learn why this is important

ALERT This message originated outside of the Manchester City Council network. **BE CAUTIOUS** before clicking any links or opening any attachments. Please remember your Cyber Training and report anything suspicious.

My primary objection is that the proposals have been designed to deter cyclists from using the safest and most direct route through the site. This route has been open to cyclists ever since the road was first built; it is an essential, well-used part of the city's cycling network and therefore the proposal to deter and/or divert cycles away from Cavendish Street is directly at odds with Manchester City Council's planning, sustainability and transport policies.

I am a south Manchester resident who cycles everyday. When going into the centre of Manchester I use the Chorlton Cycle way then down Stretford Road and then onto the Oxford road cycleway via Cavendish Street. This is the desire line, which links the Talbot Road and Chorlton cycleway to Oxford Road. The proposed diversion is counterintuitive, Indeed, when discussing this proposal with the planning consultants at a preplanning meeting at MMU. They admitted that if this area is closed to cyclists, people will still cycle through it. The result will be LESS SAFE. Without dedicated cycle infrastructure, there will be increased conflict with pedestrians. On that basis alone planning permission for closing Cavendish Street to cycles should be refused.

I am asking that the council **refuse** this application, and invite the developer to come back with a proposal that maintains direct cycle as well as pedestrian access along Cavendish Street, designed to modern standards set out in Greater Manchester's Streets For All design guide and in Department for Transport guidance note LTN 1/20. I am sure that the Highways team at MCC and the Active Travel team at TfGM will, if asked, be happy to comment on how such a route could be provided within the space available.

I am also asking that the council **make a Section 106 agreement (s106)** with the applicant to fund safety improvements for pedestrians and cyclists at the junction of Cavendish Street and Higher Cambridge Street – the applicant themselves discuss the shortcomings of the existing junction layout

in Section 4.2.1 of the Transport Statement ("*Cyclists have also been observed to queue on the footway to gain direct access to the Higher Cambridge Street/Cavendish Street junction (via a gap in the guard railings) rather than following the road markings which advise cyclists to dismount and use the controlled pedestrian crossings*"). The improvements might take the form of a CYCLOPS junction. CYCLOPS is a homegrown Greater Manchester innovation now frequently used on Highways schemes across the country to deliver safe pedestrian and cycle movements without undue impact on traffic flows.

For prospective occupants and passers-by alike, in line with the S106 tests as set out in Paragraph 58 of the National Planning Policy Framework (NPPF) 2024, a contribution to junction safety improvements improvement would be 'necessary to make the development acceptable in planning terms' (by contributing to an appropriate movement strategy for the site), 'directly related to the development' (given its proximity, the pressure added to the junction by the proposed threefold increase in residents, and in light of the wholly inadequate mitigation route proposed by the applicant), and 'fairly and reasonably related in scale and kind to the development' (given the stated threefold increase in residents explained by the applicant, so directly adding more pressure to the junction).

1 Legal Status of Cavendish Street

This section of Cavendish Street, an adopted Highway, was subject to a stopping up order dated 14.06.1996. That order required that "the Developer shall provide a new highway which shall be a footpath/cycleway". MMU have since installed physical signage stating that Cavendish Street "has not been dedicated as a Highway" and have bolted down uncomfortable and restrictive speed bumps across the route in an apparent attempt to dissuade cyclists from exercising their legal rights over this space. Both measures may be unlawful, as my understanding is that cyclists do retain a legal Right of Way along Cavendish Street, unchanged from when the entire road was an adopted highway, and the speed bumps are inaccessible to some Disabled users.

2 Cycling routes and planning policy

The case for walking and cycling and specifically for maintaining and improving high quality cycling networks is clear at every level of modern planning policy, including:

- NPPF 2024's "vision-led approach"
- LTN 1/20
- Places For Everyone Joint Development Plan Objectives 6, 7 and 10
- Places for Everyone Joint Development Plan policies JP-Strat14, JP-C1, JP-C5 and JP-C6
- GM Transport Strategy 2040 and the "Right Mix" targets
- Greater Manchester Streets for All strategy and Streets for All design guide
- Manchester City Council's Active Travel Strategy
- Manchester City Council's commitment to be a Zero Carbon city by 2038

The policy position is absolutely clear – changes to the existing road and cycle networks should make cycling more convenient for people, not less convenient.
This specific stretch of Cavendish Street is a key part of the existing cycle network. It appears on TfGM's Bee Network map as a Beeway ("the routes that get people from A to B … representing the most direct routes between crossing points.") and connects to the Stretford Road Busy Beeway ("corridors or crossing points on busier roads that will require a higher level of design intervention to improve cycling and walking.") It is also mapped on the TfGM Cycle Network.

The national standard for cycling infrastructure is DfT guidance note LTN 1/20. LTN 1/20 advises above all else that cycle routes and networks should be Safe, Direct, Comfortable, Attractive and Coherent. Introducing unnecessary diversions, junctions and bends into a well-used existing route undermines all of these core principles, resulting in a lower quality cycle network which will make it harder for the council to achieve its cycling objectives.

The applicant has offered various reasons why diverting cyclists is necessary but all of these reasons seem to be either existing problems, or problems designed into the scheme. The proposal is to demolish and redevelop the site – so considerations like limited space and the placement of entrances, shop frontages, planting and pedestrian areas are entirely within the applicant's scope to manage. Instead of starting with the problem "there is an existing busy cycle route across this site, how can I design to accommodate everyone's needs?", it seems the applicant has started with the conclusion "cyclists must be deterred" and instructed their consultants to post-rationalise that decision.

3 Misleading claims regarding safety

Page 22 of the Design & Access Statement refers to the “existing controversial link along Cavendish St., which is resulting in collisions of pedestrians, electric scooters, cyclists, etc.”
However the map of recorded collisions, on page 18 of the Transport Statement submitted in the same planning application, shows no recorded collisions whatsoever on this link, only on the adjacent main roads. It appears the applicant is attempting to restrict cycle access based on a “problem” for which they have no evidence.
I appreciate the need for increased accommodation and have no objection to that. However the removal of a vital cycling corridor should absolutely be refused.

I look forward to hearing your response with interest.

Yours faithfully,

[redacted]

****
This email and any files transmitted with it are confidential and intended solely for the use of the individual or entity to whom they are addressed.
If you have received this email in error, please notify the sender, or [redacted] and then permanently delete the email, attachments and all copies.
The full text of the Council's email disclaimer is available at: www.manchester.gov.uk/emaildisclaimer.
Your personal data is very important to us. Please refer to our privacy notice at: www.manchester.gov.uk/privacy for further information.

This footnote also confirms that this email message has been swept for the presence of computer viruses.
****

Outlook

Fw: Planning Application 142888/FO/2025

From Planning <[redacted]
Date Thu 10/07/2025 13:28
To Lucy Harrison <[redacted]

Information, Delivery & Support Team
Planning, Building Control & Licensing
Growth & Development Directorate
Postal address: Manchester City Council, P O Box 532, Town Hall, Manchester M60 2LA
Location address: Level 6 Town Hall Extension, Manchester M2 5DB
Tel: 0161 234 4516

Please consider the environment before printing an e-mail.

From: [redacted]
Sent: 10 July 2025 13:18
To: Planning <[redacted]
Subject: Planning Application 142888/FO/2025

You don't often get email from [redacted] Learn why this is important

ALERT This message originated outside of the Manchester City Council network. **BE CAUTIOUS** before clicking any links or opening any attachments. Please remember your Cyber Training and report anything suspicious.

Dear Manchester Planning team,

I am writing to lodge an objection to planning application **142888/FO/2025** – Cambridge Halls Of Residence Cavendish Street Manchester M15 6TT.

The plans block use of a very important, and importantly safe, cycling route. It is essential to retain a path for both pedestrians and cyclists in this busy part of the city.

For many years I lived nearby and used the route weekly, often more frequently. I remain a very regular visitor to Hulme and the MMU campus. This route is a vital community resource, changing its status alienates the community and puts lives at risk.

Manchester should be celebrated for its many advances in active travel, and closing this access would be a retrograde step

I also have serious concerns about the legality of closure given the status of Cavendish Street, in particular the stopping up order dated 14.06.1996. That order required that “the Developer shall provide a new highway which shall be a footpath/cycleway”.

I was heavily involved in opposing the 2023 Stopping Up Order and the level of community support was huge. This route matters to many people and it is not fair that MMU can extinguish access in this

way.

I understand WalkRide Manchester have provided detailed evidence regarding relevant planning policies and I urge you to consider their arguments, which are robust and fully evidenced

Please, reject the proposed closure of a safe cycling and walking route for the good of Manchester residents, visitors and students alike

Yours faithfully

[redacted]

[redacted]

[redacted]

****
This email and any files transmitted with it are confidential and intended solely for the use of the individual or entity to whom they are addressed.
If you have received this email in error, please notify the sender, or [redacted] and then permanently delete the email, attachments and all copies.
The full text of the Council's email disclaimer is available at: www.manchester.gov.uk/emaildisclaimer.
Your personal data is very important to us. Please refer to our privacy notice at: www.manchester.gov.uk/privacy for further information.

This footnote also confirms that this email message has been swept for the presence of computer viruses.
****

Outlook

Fw: Comment on Planning Application 142888/FO/2025

From Planning <[redacted]>
Date Mon 30/06/2025 10:35
To Lucy Harrison <[redacted]>

Information, Delivery & Support Team
Planning, Building Control & Licensing
Growth & Development Directorate
Postal address: Manchester City Council, P O Box 532, Town Hall, Manchester M60 2LA
Location address: Level 6 Town Hall Extension, Manchester M2 5DB
Tel: 0161 234 4516

Please consider the environment before printing an e-mail.

From: [redacted]
Sent: 30 June 2025 09:15
To: Planning <[redacted]>
Subject: Comment on Planning Application 142888/FO/2025

[You don't often get email from [redacted] Learn why this is important at https://aka.ms/LearnAboutSenderIdentification]

ALERT This message originated outside of the Manchester City Council network. BE CAUTIOUS before clicking any links or opening any attachments. Please remember your Cyber Training and report anything suspicious.

I object to these changes for Cavendish Street

Sent from my iPhone

****
This email and any files transmitted with it are confidential and intended solely for the use of the individual or entity to whom they are addressed.
If you have received this email in error, please notify the sender, or [redacted] and then permanently delete the email, attachments and all copies.
The full text of the Council's email disclaimer is available at: www.manchester.gov.uk/emaildisclaimer.
Your personal data is very important to us. Please refer to our privacy notice at: www.manchester.gov.uk/privacy for further information.

This footnote also confirms that this email message has been swept for the presence of computer viruses.
****

Outlook

Fw: Comment on Planning Application 142888/FO/2025

From Planning <[redacted]
Date Mon 30/06/2025 08:46
To Lucy Harrison <[redacted]

Information, Delivery & Support Team
Planning, Building Control & Licensing
Growth & Development Directorate
Postal address: Manchester City Council, P O Box 532, Town Hall, Manchester M60 2LA
Location address: Level 6 Town Hall Extension, Manchester M2 5DB
Tel: 0161 234 4516

Please consider the environment before printing an e-mail.

From: [redacted]
Sent: 30 June 2025 08:39
To: Planning <[redacted]
Subject: Comment on Planning Application 142888/FO/2025

You don't often get email from [redacted] Learn why this is important

ALERT This message originated outside of the Manchester City Council network. **BE CAUTIOUS** before clicking any links or opening any attachments. Please remember your Cyber Training and report anything suspicious.

Dear Manchester Planning team, I am writing to lodge an objection to planning application 142888/FO/2025 – Cambridge Halls Of Residence Cavendish Street Manchester M15 6TT. My primary objection is that the proposals have been designed to deter cyclists from using the safest and most direct route through the site. This route has been open to cyclists ever since the road was first built; it is an essential, well-used part of the city's cycling network and therefore the proposal to deter and/or divert cycles away from Cavendish Street is directly at odds with Manchester City Council's planning, sustainability and transport policies. The applicant has also made misleading claims regarding the road's legal status and regarding pedestrian safety which I will outline below. I am asking that the council refuse this application, and invite the developer to come back with a proposal that maintains direct cycle as well as pedestrian access along Cavendish Street, designed to modern standards set out in Greater Manchester's Streets For All design guide and in Department for Transport guidance note LTN 1/20. I am sure that the Highways team at MCC and the Active Travel team at TfGM will, if asked, be happy to comment on how such a route could be provided within the space available. I am also asking that the council make a Section 106 agreement (s106) with the applicant to fund safety improvements for pedestrians and cyclists at the junction of Cavendish Street and Higher Cambridge Street – the applicant themselves discuss the shortcomings of the existing

junction layout in Section 4.2.1 of the Transport Statement (“Cyclists have also been observed to queue on the footway to gain direct access to the Higher Cambridge Street/Cavendish Street junction (via a gap in the guard railings) rather than following the road markings which advise cyclists to dismount and use the controlled pedestrian crossings”). The improvements might take the form of a CYCLOPS junction. CYCLOPS is a homegrown Greater Manchester innovation now frequently used on Highways schemes across the country to deliver safe pedestrian and cycle movements without undue impact on traffic flows. For prospective occupants and passers-by alike, in line with the S106 tests as set out in Paragraph 58 of the National Planning Policy Framework (NPPF) 2024, a contribution to junction safety improvements improvement would be ‘necessary to make the development acceptable in planning terms’ (by contributing to an appropriate movement strategy for the site), ‘directly related to the development’ (given its proximity, the pressure added to the junction by the proposed threefold increase in residents, and in light of the wholly inadequate mitigation route proposed by the applicant), and ‘fairly and reasonably related in scale and kind to the development’ (given the stated threefold increase in residents explained by the applicant, so directly adding more pressure to the junction). 1 Legal Status of Cavendish Street This section of Cavendish Street, an adopted Highway, was subject to a stopping up order dated 14.06.1996. That order required that “the Developer shall provide a new highway which shall be a footpath/cycleway”. MMU have since installed physical signage stating that Cavendish Street “has not been dedicated as a Highway” and have bolted down uncomfortable and restrictive speed bumps across the route in an apparent attempt to dissuade cyclists from exercising their legal rights over this space. Both measures may be unlawful, as my understanding is that cyclists do retain a legal Right of Way along Cavendish Street, unchanged from when the entire road was an adopted highway, and the speed bumps are inaccessible to some Disabled users. 2 Cycling routes and planning policy The case for walking and cycling and specifically for maintaining and improving high quality cycling networks is clear at every level of modern planning policy, including: NPPF 2024’s “vision-led approach” LTN 1/20 Places For Everyone Joint Development Plan Objectives 6, 7 and 10 Places for Everyone Joint Development Plan policies JP-Strat14, JP-C1, JP-C5 and JP-C6 GM Transport Strategy 2040 and the “Right Mix” targets Greater Manchester Streets for All strategy and Streets for All design guide Manchester City Council’s Active Travel Strategy Manchester City Council’s commitment to be a Zero Carbon city by 2038 The policy position is absolutely clear – changes to the existing road and cycle networks should make cycling more convenient for people, not less convenient. This specific stretch of Cavendish Street is a key part of the existing cycle network. It appears on TfGM’s Bee Network map as a Beeway (“the routes that get people from A to B … representing the most direct routes between crossing points.”) and connects to the Stretford Road Busy Beeway (“corridors or crossing points on busier roads that will require a higher level of design intervention to improve cycling and walking.”) It is also mapped on the TfGM Cycle Network. The national standard for cycling infrastructure is DfT guidance note LTN 1/20. LTN 1/20 advises above all else that cycle routes and networks should be Safe, Direct, Comfortable, Attractive and Coherent. Introducing unnecessary diversions, junctions and bends into a well-used existing route undermines all of these core principles, resulting in a lower quality cycle network which will make it harder for the council to achieve its cycling objectives. The applicant has offered various reasons why diverting cyclists is necessary but all of these reasons seem to be either existing problems, or

problems designed into the scheme. The proposal is to demolish and redevelop the site – so considerations like limited space and the placement of entrances, shop frontages, planting and pedestrian areas are entirely within the applicant's scope to manage. Instead of starting with the problem "there is an existing busy cycle route across this site, how can I design to accommodate everyone's needs?", it seems the applicant has started with the conclusion "cyclists must be deterred" and instructed their consultants to post-rationalise that decision. 3 Misleading claims regarding safety Page 22 of the Design & Access Statement refers to the "existing controversial link along Cavendish St., which is resulting in collisions of pedestrians, electric scooters, cyclists, etc." However the map of recorded collisions, on page 18 of the Transport Statement submitted in the same planning application, shows no recorded collisions whatsoever on this link, only on the adjacent main roads. It appears the applicant is attempting to restrict cycle access based on a "problem" for which they have no evidence. Yours sincerely,

[redacted]

Sent from my iPhone

****
This email and any files transmitted with it are confidential and intended solely for the use of the individual or entity to whom they are addressed. If you have received this email in error, please notify the sender, or [redacted] and then permanently delete the email, attachments and all copies.
The full text of the Council's email disclaimer is available at: www.manchester.gov.uk/emaildisclaimer.
Your personal data is very important to us. Please refer to our privacy notice at: www.manchester.gov.uk/privacy for further information.

This footnote also confirms that this email message has been swept for the presence of computer viruses.
****

Outlook

Fw: Comment on Planning Application 142888/FO/2025

From Planning <[redacted]>
Date Wed 02/07/2025 08:51
To Lucy Harrison <[redacted]>

Information, Delivery & Support Team
Planning, Building Control & Licensing
Growth & Development Directorate
Postal address: Manchester City Council, P O Box 532, Town Hall, Manchester M60 2LA
Location address: Level 6 Town Hall Extension, Manchester M2 5DB
Tel: 0161 234 4516

Please consider the environment before printing an e-mail.

From: [redacted]
Sent: 01 July 2025 20:49
To: Planning <[redacted]>
Subject: Comment on Planning Application 142888/FO/2025

You don't often get email from [redacted] Learn why this is important

ALERT This message originated outside of the Manchester City Council network. **BE CAUTIOUS** before clicking any links or opening any attachments. Please remember your Cyber Training and report anything suspicious.

Dear Manchester Planning team,

I am writing to lodge an objection to planning application 142888/FO/2025 – Cambridge Halls Of Residence Cavendish Street Manchester M15 6TT.

My primary objection is that the proposals have been designed to deter cyclists from using the safest and most direct route through the site. This route has been open to cyclists ever since the road was first built; it is an essential, well-used part of the city's cycling network and therefore the proposal to deter and/or divert cycles away from Cavendish Street is directly at odds with Manchester City Council's planning, sustainability and transport policies.

The applicant has also made misleading claims regarding the road's legal status and regarding pedestrian safety which I will outline below.

I am asking that the council refuse this application, and invite the developer to come back with a proposal that maintains direct cycle as well as pedestrian access along Cavendish Street, designed to modern standards set out in Greater Manchester's Streets For All design guide and in Department for Transport guidance note LTN 1/20. I am sure that the Highways team at MCC and the Active Travel team at TfGM will, if asked, be happy to comment on how such a route could be provided within the space available.

I am also asking that the council make a Section 106 agreement (s106) with the applicant to fund safety improvements for pedestrians and cyclists at the junction of Cavendish Street and Higher Cambridge Street – the applicant themselves discuss the shortcomings of the existing junction layout in Section 4.2.1 of the Transport Statement ("Cyclists have also been observed to queue on the footway to gain direct access to the Higher Cambridge Street/Cavendish Street junction (via a gap in the guard railings) rather than following the road markings which advise cyclists to dismount and use the controlled pedestrian crossings"). The improvements might take the form of a CYCLOPS junction. CYCLOPS is a homegrown Greater Manchester innovation now frequently used on Highways schemes across the country to deliver safe pedestrian and cycle movements without undue impact on traffic flows.

For prospective occupants and passers-by alike, in line with the S106 tests as set out in Paragraph 58 of the National Planning Policy Framework (NPPF) 2024, a contribution to junction safety improvements improvement would be 'necessary to make the development acceptable in planning terms' (by contributing to an appropriate movement strategy for the site), 'directly related to the development' (given its proximity, the pressure added to the junction by the proposed threefold increase in residents, and in light of the wholly inadequate mitigation route proposed by the applicant), and 'fairly and reasonably related in scale and kind to the development' (given the stated threefold increase in residents explained by the applicant, so directly adding more pressure to the junction).

1 Legal Status of Cavendish Street

This section of Cavendish Street, an adopted Highway, was subject to a stopping up order dated 14.06.1996. That order required that "the Developer shall provide a new highway which shall be a footpath/cycleway". MMU have since installed physical signage stating that Cavendish Street "has not been dedicated as a Highway" and have bolted down uncomfortable and restrictive speed bumps across the route in an apparent attempt to dissuade cyclists from exercising their legal rights over this space. Both measures may be unlawful, as my understanding is that cyclists do retain a legal Right of Way along Cavendish Street, unchanged from when the entire road was an adopted highway, and the speed bumps are inaccessible to some Disabled users.

2 Cycling routes and planning policy

The case for walking and cycling and specifically for maintaining and improving high quality cycling networks is clear at every level of modern planning policy, including:

NPPF 2024's "vision-led approach"
LTN 1/20
Places For Everyone Joint Development Plan Objectives 6, 7 and 10
Places for Everyone Joint Development Plan policies JP-Strat14, JP-C1, JP-C5 and JP-C6
GM Transport Strategy 2040 and the "Right Mix" targets
Greater Manchester Streets for All strategy and Streets for All design guide
Manchester City Council's Active Travel Strategy
Manchester City Council's commitment to be a Zero Carbon city by 2038
The policy position is absolutely clear – changes to the existing road and cycle networks should make cycling more convenient for people, not less convenient.

This specific stretch of Cavendish Street is a key part of the existing cycle network. It appears on TfGM's Bee Network map as a Beeway ("the routes that get people from A to B … representing the most direct routes between crossing points.") and connects to the Stretford Road Busy Beeway

("corridors or crossing points on busier roads that will require a higher level of design intervention to improve cycling and walking.") It is also mapped on the TfGM Cycle Network.

The national standard for cycling infrastructure is DfT guidance note LTN 1/20. LTN 1/20 advises above all else that cycle routes and networks should be Safe, Direct, Comfortable, Attractive and Coherent. Introducing unnecessary diversions, junctions and bends into a well-used existing route undermines all of these core principles, resulting in a lower quality cycle network which will make it harder for the council to achieve its cycling objectives.

The applicant has offered various reasons why diverting cyclists is necessary but all of these reasons seem to be either existing problems, or problems designed into the scheme. The proposal is to demolish and redevelop the site – so considerations like limited space and the placement of entrances, shop frontages, planting and pedestrian areas are entirely within the applicant's scope to manage. Instead of starting with the problem "there is an existing busy cycle route across this site, how can I design to accommodate everyone's needs?", it seems the applicant has started with the conclusion "cyclists must be deterred" and instructed their consultants to post-rationalise that decision.

3 Misleading claims regarding safety

Page 22 of the Design & Access Statement refers to the "existing controversial link along Cavendish St., which is resulting in collisions of pedestrians, electric scooters, cyclists, etc."

However the map of recorded collisions, on page 18 of the Transport Statement submitted in the same planning application, shows no recorded collisions whatsoever on this link, only on the adjacent main roads.

It appears the applicant is attempting to restrict cycle access based on a "problem" for which they have no evidence.

Yours sincerely,

[redacted]

[redacted]

****
This email and any files transmitted with it are confidential and intended solely for the use of the individual or entity to whom they are addressed.
If you have received this email in error, please notify the sender, or [redacted] and then permanently delete the email, attachments and all copies.
The full text of the Council's email disclaimer is available at: www.manchester.gov.uk/emaildisclaimer.
Your personal data is very important to us. Please refer to our privacy notice at: www.manchester.gov.uk/privacy for further information.

This footnote also confirms that this email message has been swept for the presence of computer viruses.
****

Outlook

Fw: Comment on Planning Application 142888/FO/2025

From Planning <[redacted]>
Date Mon 14/07/2025 14:08
To Lucy Harrison <[redacted]>

Information, Delivery & Support Team
Planning, Building Control & Licensing
Growth & Development Directorate
Postal address: Manchester City Council, P O Box 532, Town Hall, Manchester M60 2LA
Location address: Level 6 Town Hall Extension, Manchester M2 5DB
Tel: 0161 234 4516

Please consider the environment before printing an e-mail.

From: [redacted]
Sent: 11 July 2025 09:27
To: Planning <[redacted]>
Subject: Comment on Planning Application 142888/FO/2025

You don't often get email from [redacted] Learn why this is important

ALERT This message originated outside of the Manchester City Council network. **BE CAUTIOUS** before clicking any links or opening any attachments. Please remember your Cyber Training and report anything suspicious.

Dear Manchester Planning team, I am writing to lodge an objection to planning application 142888/FO/2025 – Cambridge Halls Of Residence Cavendish Street Manchester M15 6TT. My primary objection is that the proposals have been designed to deter cyclists from using the safest and most direct route through the site. This route has been open to cyclists ever since the road was first built; it is an essential, well-used part of the city's cycling network and therefore the proposal to deter and/or divert cycles away from Cavendish Street is directly at odds with Manchester City Council's planning, sustainability and transport policies. The applicant has also made misleading claims regarding the road's legal status and regarding pedestrian safety which I will outline below. I am asking that the council refuse this application, and invite the developer to come back with a proposal that maintains direct cycle as well as pedestrian access along Cavendish Street, designed to modern standards set out in Greater Manchester's Streets For All design guide and in Department for Transport guidance note LTN 1/20. I am sure that the Highways team at MCC and the Active Travel team at TfGM will, if asked, be happy to comment on how such a route could be provided within the space available. I am also asking that the council make a Section 106

agreement (s106) with the applicant to fund safety improvements for pedestrians and cyclists at the junction of Cavendish Street and Higher Cambridge Street – the applicant themselves discuss the shortcomings of the existing junction layout in Section 4.2.1 of the Transport Statement ("Cyclists have also been observed to queue on the footway to gain direct access to the Higher Cambridge Street/Cavendish Street junction (via a gap in the guard railings) rather than following the road markings which advise cyclists to dismount and use the controlled pedestrian crossings"). The improvements might take the form of a CYCLOPS junction. CYCLOPS is a homegrown Greater Manchester innovation now frequently used on Highways schemes across the country to deliver safe pedestrian and cycle movements without undue impact on traffic flows. For prospective occupants and passers-by alike, in line with the S106 tests as set out in Paragraph 58 of the National Planning Policy Framework (NPPF) 2024, a contribution to junction safety improvements improvement would be 'necessary to make the development acceptable in planning terms' (by contributing to an appropriate movement strategy for the site), 'directly related to the development' (given its proximity, the pressure added to the junction by the proposed threefold increase in residents, and in light of the wholly inadequate mitigation route proposed by the applicant), and 'fairly and reasonably related in scale and kind to the development' (given the stated threefold increase in residents explained by the applicant, so directly adding more pressure to the junction). 1 Legal Status of Cavendish Street This section of Cavendish Street, an adopted Highway, was subject to a stopping up order dated 14.06.1996. That order required that "the Developer shall provide a new highway which shall be a footpath/cycleway". MMU have since installed physical signage stating that Cavendish Street "has not been dedicated as a Highway" and have bolted down uncomfortable and restrictive speed bumps across the route in an apparent attempt to dissuade cyclists from exercising their legal rights over this space. Both measures may be unlawful, as my understanding is that cyclists do retain a legal Right of Way along Cavendish Street, unchanged from when the entire road was an adopted highway, and the speed bumps are inaccessible to some Disabled users. 2 Cycling routes and planning policy The case for walking and cycling and specifically for maintaining and improving high quality cycling networks is clear at every level of modern planning policy, including: NPPF 2024's "vision-led approach" LTN 1/20 Places For Everyone Joint Development Plan Objectives 6, 7 and 10 Places for Everyone Joint Development Plan policies JP-Strat14, JP-C1, JP-C5 and JP-C6 GM Transport Strategy 2040 and the "Right Mix" targets Greater Manchester Streets for All strategy and Streets for All design guide Manchester City Council's Active Travel Strategy Manchester City Council's commitment to be a Zero Carbon city by 2038 The policy position is absolutely clear – changes to the existing road and cycle networks should make cycling more convenient for people, not less convenient. This specific stretch of Cavendish Street is a key part of the existing cycle network. It appears on TfGM's Bee Network map as a Beeway ("the routes that get people from A to B … representing the most direct routes between crossing points.") and connects to the Stretford Road Busy Beeway ("corridors or crossing points on busier

roads that will require a higher level of design intervention to improve cycling and walking.”) It is also mapped on the TfGM Cycle Network. The national standard for cycling infrastructure is DfT guidance note LTN 1/20. LTN 1/20 advises above all else that cycle routes and networks should be Safe, Direct, Comfortable, Attractive and Coherent. Introducing unnecessary diversions, junctions and bends into a well-used existing route undermines all of these core principles, resulting in a lower quality cycle network which will make it harder for the council to achieve its cycling objectives. The applicant has offered various reasons why diverting cyclists is necessary but all of these reasons seem to be either existing problems, or problems designed into the scheme. The proposal is to demolish and redevelop the site – so considerations like limited space and the placement of entrances, shop frontages, planting and pedestrian areas are entirely within the applicant’s scope to manage. Instead of starting with the problem “there is an existing busy cycle route across this site, how can I design to accommodate everyone’s needs?”, it seems the applicant has started with the conclusion “cyclists must be deterred” and instructed their consultants to post-rationalise that decision. 3 Misleading claims regarding safety Page 22 of the Design & Access Statement refers to the “existing controversial link along Cavendish St., which is resulting in collisions of pedestrians, electric scooters, cyclists, etc.” However the map of recorded collisions, on page 18 of the Transport Statement submitted in the same planning application, shows no recorded collisions whatsoever on this link, only on the adjacent main roads. It appears the applicant is attempting to restrict cycle access based on a “problem” for which they have no evidence. Yours sincerely, [redacted]

****
This email and any files transmitted with it are confidential and intended solely for the use of the individual or entity to whom they are addressed. If you have received this email in error, please notify the sender, or [redacted] and then permanently delete the email, attachments and all copies.
The full text of the Council's email disclaimer is available at: www.manchester.gov.uk/emaildisclaimer.
Your personal data is very important to us. Please refer to our privacy notice at: www.manchester.gov.uk/privacy for further information.

This footnote also confirms that this email message has been swept for the presence of computer viruses.
****

Outlook

Fw: Comment on Planning Application 142888/FO/2025

From Planning <[redacted]
Date Mon 14/07/2025 14:07
To Lucy Harrison <[redacted]

Information, Delivery & Support Team
Planning, Building Control & Licensing
Growth & Development Directorate
Postal address: Manchester City Council, P O Box 532, Town Hall, Manchester M60 2LA
Location address: Level 6 Town Hall Extension, Manchester M2 5DB
Tel: 0161 234 4516

Please consider the environment before printing an e-mail.

From: [redacted]
Sent: 11 July 2025 10:42
To: Planning <[redacted]
Subject: Comment on Planning Application 142888/FO/2025

You don't often get email from [redacted] Learn why this is important

ALERT This message originated outside of the Manchester City Council network. **BE CAUTIOUS** before clicking any links or opening any attachments. Please remember your Cyber Training and report anything suspicious.

I am writing to lodge an objection to planning application **142888/FO/2025** –

Cambridge Halls Of Residence Cavendish Street Manchester M15 6TT.

My primary objection is that the current halls, the last of the halls on campus to be accessible to students on lower incomes, will be replaced with higher cost halls, apparently with a focus on revenue generation for landlords rather than providing safe affordable accommodation for young people living away from their homes and families for the first time.

In addition, the proposals have been designed to deter cyclists from using the safest and most direct route through the site. This route has been open to cyclists ever since the road was first built; it is an essential, well-used part of the city's

cycling network and therefore the proposal to deter and/or divert cycles away from Cavendish Street is directly at odds with Manchester City Council's planning, sustainability and transport policies.

I have used this route on occasion to access Oxford Road corridor by bicycle from my home in Stretford. It feels safe and easy as it's away from traffic and heavy vehicles which can be a bit unpredictable around that area, especially with so many tall buildings and that sense of being 'enclosed' which can make cycling difficult.

In combination with the annexation of All Saint's Park and the proposed sell off of the gifted Ryebank Fields, it all adds up to a rather cynical succession of land grabs by MMU and developer partners, the pursuit of profit and capital being prioritised over the well being of residents and students alike.

I am asking that the council **refuse** this application.

If the Council are minded to approve in general, I ask they invite the developer to come back with a proposal that maintains direct cycle as well as pedestrian access along Cavendish Street, designed to modern standards set out in Greater Manchester's Streets For All design guide and in Department for Transport guidance note LTN 1/20.

I am also asking that the council **make a Section 106 agreement (s106)** with the applicant to fund safety improvements for pedestrians and cyclists at the junction of Cavendish Street and Higher Cambridge Street – the applicant themselves discuss the shortcomings of the existing junction layout in Section 4.2.1 of the Transport Statement ("*Cyclists have also been observed to queue on the footway to gain direct access to the Higher Cambridge Street/Cavendish Street junction (via a gap in the guard railings) rather than following the road markings which advise cyclists to dismount and use the controlled pedestrian crossings*").

[redacted]

[redacted]

[redacted]

[redacted]

****

This email and any files transmitted with it are confidential and intended solely for the use of the individual or entity to whom they are addressed. If you have received this email in error, please notify the sender, or [redacted] and then permanently delete the email, attachments and all copies.

The full text of the Council's email disclaimer is available at: www.manchester.gov.uk/emaildisclaimer.
Your personal data is very important to us. Please refer to our privacy notice at: www.manchester.gov.uk/privacy for further information.

This footnote also confirms that this email message has been swept for the presence of computer viruses.
****

Outlook

Fw: Comment on Planning Application 142888/FO/2025

From Planning <[redacted]>
Date Mon 14/07/2025 14:05
To Lucy Harrison <[redacted]>

Information, Delivery & Support Team
Planning, Building Control & Licensing
Growth & Development Directorate
Postal address: Manchester City Council, P O Box 532, Town Hall, Manchester M60 2LA
Location address: Level 6 Town Hall Extension, Manchester M2 5DB
Tel: 0161 234 4516

Please consider the environment before printing an e-mail.

From: [redacted]
Sent: 11 July 2025 20:01
To: Planning <[redacted]>
Subject: Comment on Planning Application 142888/FO/2025

You don't often get email from [redacted] Learn why this is important

ALERT This message originated outside of the Manchester City Council network. **BE CAUTIOUS** before clicking any links or opening any attachments. Please remember your Cyber Training and report anything suspicious.

Dear Manchester Planning team,

The below is mostly copied and pasted (my own text in bold), as I'm sure you can tell, but only because someone else has already done the research for me, so there's no reason for me to repeat all that work.

And I am disabled, so have limited executive functioning capacity to do it myself, plus my partner has recently had a major operation, so I have other things to do, but this is still important enough that I am taking the time to object to it. It doesn't give my opinion less weight than if I'd typed it all out myself (and the same applies to anyone else using a template email).

Poor though I am (our household income is in the lowest decile), I would willingly contribute financially to any legal challenge to this proposal. And that's part of the issue; drivers are consistently prioritised in society even though pedestrians and cyclists should be (for many reasons). Cycling needs to be more accessible to members of poorer households (many factors deter this, and this proposal is an example of some of those factors). So it's an equality issue too.

I am writing to lodge an objection to planning application 142888/FO/2025 – Cambridge Halls Of

Residence Cavendish Street Manchester M15 6TT.

My primary objection is that the proposals have been designed to deter cyclists from using the safest and most direct route through the site. This route has been open to cyclists ever since the road was first built; it is an essential, well-used part of the city's cycling network and therefore the proposal to deter and/or divert cycles away from Cavendish Street is directly at odds with Manchester City Council's planning, sustainability and transport policies.

I use this path several times a week (as a pedestrian), and I fully support its continued use as a cycle path. I have never seen anyone colliding there. My partner is a student at MMU and cycles through there daily in term time. He's never had an issue himself, or seen one. And even if there were collisions (which there's no evidence of), that would be a reason to take this opportunity to redesign it better, not send cyclists on a ridiculous wonky route instead! The university clearly just wants to gain full control over this land, which would be unlawful and unethical. They can't even spell bridle path on their signs (they've written "bridal path", which is a very different thing!), so it's not surprising they're getting other things wrong too.

The applicant has also made misleading claims regarding the road's legal status and regarding pedestrian safety which I will outline below.

I am asking that the council refuse this application, and invite the developer to come back with a proposal that maintains direct cycle as well as pedestrian access along Cavendish Street, designed to modern standards set out in Greater Manchester's Streets For All design guide and in Department for Transport guidance note LTN 1/20. I am sure that the Highways team at MCC and the Active Travel team at TfGM will, if asked, be happy to comment on how such a route could be provided within the space available.

I am also asking that the council make a Section 106 agreement (s106) with the applicant to fund safety improvements for pedestrians and cyclists at the junction of Cavendish Street and Higher Cambridge Street – the applicant themselves discuss the shortcomings of the existing junction layout in Section 4.2.1 of the Transport Statement ("Cyclists have also been observed to queue on the footway to gain direct access to the Higher Cambridge Street/Cavendish Street junction (via a gap in the guard railings) rather than following the road markings which advise cyclists to dismount and use the controlled pedestrian crossings"). The improvements might take the form of a CYCLOPS junction. CYCLOPS is a homegrown Greater Manchester innovation now frequently used on Highways schemes across the country to deliver safe pedestrian and cycle movements without undue impact on traffic flows.

For prospective occupants and passers-by alike, in line with the S106 tests as set out in Paragraph 58 of the National Planning Policy Framework (NPPF) 2024, a contribution to junction safety improvements improvement would be 'necessary to make the development acceptable in planning terms' (by contributing to an appropriate movement strategy for the site), 'directly related to the development' (given its proximity, the pressure added to the junction by the proposed threefold increase in residents, and in light of the wholly inadequate mitigation route proposed by the applicant), and 'fairly and reasonably related in scale and kind to the development' (given the stated threefold increase in residents explained by the applicant, so directly adding more pressure to the junction).

1 Legal Status of Cavendish Street

This section of Cavendish Street, an adopted Highway, was subject to a stopping up order dated 14.06.1996. That order required that "the Developer shall provide a new highway which shall be a

footpath/cycleway". MMU have since installed physical signage stating that Cavendish Street "has not been dedicated as a Highway" and have bolted down uncomfortable and restrictive speed bumps across the route in an apparent attempt to dissuade cyclists from exercising their legal rights over this space. Both measures may be unlawful, as my understanding is that cyclists do retain a legal Right of Way along Cavendish Street, unchanged from when the entire road was an adopted highway, and the speed bumps are inaccessible to some Disabled users.

2 Cycling routes and planning policy

The case for walking and cycling and specifically for maintaining and improving high quality cycling networks is clear at every level of modern planning policy, including:

NPPF 2024's "vision-led approach"
LTN 1/20
Places For Everyone Joint Development Plan Objectives 6, 7 and 10
Places for Everyone Joint Development Plan policies JP-Strat14, JP-C1, JP-C5 and JP-C6
GM Transport Strategy 2040 and the "Right Mix" targets
Greater Manchester Streets for All strategy and Streets for All design guide
Manchester City Council's Active Travel Strategy
Manchester City Council's commitment to be a Zero Carbon city by 2038

<u>The policy position is absolutely clear – changes to the existing road and cycle networks should make cycling more convenient for people, not less convenient.</u>

This specific stretch of Cavendish Street is a key part of the existing cycle network. It appears on TfGM's Bee Network map as a Beeway ("the routes that get people from A to B … representing the most direct routes between crossing points.") and connects to the Stretford Road Busy Beeway ("corridors or crossing points on busier roads that will require a higher level of design intervention to improve cycling and walking.") It is also mapped on the TfGM Cycle Network.

The national standard for cycling infrastructure is DfT guidance note LTN 1/20. LTN 1/20 advises above all else that cycle routes and networks should be Safe, Direct, Comfortable, Attractive and Coherent. Introducing unnecessary diversions, junctions and bends into a well-used existing route undermines all of these core principles, resulting in a lower quality cycle network which will make it harder for the council to achieve its cycling objectives.

The applicant has offered various reasons why diverting cyclists is necessary but all of these reasons seem to be either existing problems, or problems designed into the scheme. The proposal is to demolish and redevelop the site – so considerations like limited space and the placement of entrances, shop frontages, planting and pedestrian areas are entirely within the applicant's scope to manage. Instead of starting with the problem "there is an existing busy cycle route across this site, how can I design to accommodate everyone's needs?", it seems the applicant has started with the conclusion "cyclists must be deterred" and instructed their consultants to post-rationalise that decision.

3 Misleading claims regarding safety

Page 22 of the Design & Access Statement refers to the "existing controversial link along Cavendish St., which is resulting in collisions of pedestrians, electric scooters, cyclists, etc."

However the map of recorded collisions, on page 18 of the Transport Statement submitted in the same planning application, shows no recorded collisions whatsoever on this link, only on the

adjacent main roads.

It appears the applicant is attempting to restrict cycle access based on a “problem” for which they have no evidence.

Yours sincerely,

[redacted]

[redacted]

****
This email and any files transmitted with it are confidential and intended solely for the use of the individual or entity to whom they are addressed.
If you have received this email in error, please notify the sender, or [redacted] and then permanently delete the email, attachments and all copies.
The full text of the Council's email disclaimer is available at: www.manchester.gov.uk/emaildisclaimer.
Your personal data is very important to us. Please refer to our privacy notice at: www.manchester.gov.uk/privacy for further information.

This footnote also confirms that this email message has been swept for the presence of computer viruses.
****

Outlook

Fw: Objection to planning application 142888/FO/2025

From Planning <[redacted]>
Date Wed 16/07/2025 15:34
To Lucy Harrison <[redacted]>

Information, Delivery & Support Team
Planning, Building Control & Licensing
Growth & Development Directorate
Postal address: Manchester City Council, P O Box 532, Town Hall, Manchester M60 2LA
Location address: Level 6 Town Hall Extension, Manchester M2 5DB
Tel: 0161 234 4516

Please consider the environment before printing an e-mail.

From: [redacted]
Sent: 15 July 2025 01:21
To: Planning <[redacted]>
Subject: Objection to planning application 142888/FO/2025

You don't often get email from [redacted] Learn why this is important

ALERT This message originated outside of the Manchester City Council network. **BE CAUTIOUS** before clicking any links or opening any attachments. Please remember your Cyber Training and report anything suspicious.

Dear Manchester Planning team

I am writing to lodge an objection to planning application 142888/FO/2025 – Cambridge Halls Of Residence Cavendish Street Manchester M15 6TT.

My primary objection is that the proposals have been designed to deter cyclists from using the safest and most direct route through the site. This route has been open to cyclists ever since the road was first built; it is an essential, well-used part of the city's cycling network and therefore the proposal to deter and/or divert cycles away from Cavendish Street is directly at odds with Manchester City Council's planning, sustainability and transport policies.

The applicant has also made misleading claims regarding the road's legal status and regarding pedestrian safety which I will outline below.

I am asking that the council refuse this application, and invite the developer to come back with a proposal that maintains direct cycle as well as pedestrian access along Cavendish Street, designed to modern standards set out in Greater Manchester's Streets For All design guide and in Department for Transport guidance note LTN 1/20. I am sure that the Highways team at MCC and the Active Travel team at TfGM will, if asked, be happy to comment on how such a route could be provided within the space available.

I am also asking that the council make a Section 106 agreement (s106) with the applicant to fund safety improvements for pedestrians and cyclists at the junction of Cavendish Street and Higher Cambridge Street –

the applicant themselves discuss the shortcomings of the existing junction layout in Section 4.2.1 of the Transport Statement ("Cyclists have also been observed to queue on the footway to gain direct access to the Higher Cambridge Street/Cavendish Street junction (via a gap in the guard railings) rather than following the road markings which advise cyclists to dismount and use the controlled pedestrian crossings"). The improvements might take the form of a CYCLOPS junction. CYCLOPS is a homegrown Greater Manchester innovation now frequently used on Highways schemes across the country to deliver safe pedestrian and cycle movements without undue impact on traffic flows.

For prospective occupants and passers-by alike, in line with the S106 tests as set out in Paragraph 58 of the National Planning Policy Framework (NPPF) 2024, a contribution to junction safety improvements improvement would be 'necessary to make the development acceptable in planning terms' (by contributing to an appropriate movement strategy for the site), 'directly related to the development' (given its proximity, the pressure added to the junction by the proposed threefold increase in residents, and in light of the wholly inadequate mitigation route proposed by the applicant), and 'fairly and reasonably related in scale and kind to the development' (given the stated threefold increase in residents explained by the applicant, so directly adding more pressure to the junction).

1 Legal Status of Cavendish Street

This section of Cavendish Street, an adopted Highway, was subject to a stopping up order dated 14.06.1996. That order required that "the Developer shall provide a new highway which shall be a footpath/cycleway". MMU have since installed physical signage stating that Cavendish Street "has not been dedicated as a Highway" and have bolted down uncomfortable and restrictive speed bumps across the route in an apparent attempt to dissuade cyclists from exercising their legal rights over this space. Both measures may be unlawful, as my understanding is that cyclists do retain a legal Right of Way along Cavendish Street, unchanged from when the entire road was an adopted highway, and the speed bumps are inaccessible to some Disabled users.

2 Cycling routes and planning policy

The case for walking and cycling and specifically for maintaining and improving high quality cycling networks is clear at every level of modern planning policy, including:

NPPF 2024's "vision-led approach"
LTN 1/20
Places For Everyone Joint Development Plan Objectives 6, 7 and 10
Places for Everyone Joint Development Plan policies JP-Strat14, JP-C1, JP-C5 and JP-C6
GM Transport Strategy 2040 and the "Right Mix" targets
Greater Manchester Streets for All strategy and Streets for All design guide
Manchester City Council's Active Travel Strategy
Manchester City Council's commitment to be a Zero Carbon city by 2038
The policy position is absolutely clear – changes to the existing road and cycle networks should make cycling more convenient for people, not less convenient.

This specific stretch of Cavendish Street is a key part of the existing cycle network. It appears on TfGM's Bee Network map as a Beeway ("the routes that get people from A to B … representing the most direct routes between crossing points.") and connects to the Stretford Road Busy Beeway ("corridors or crossing points on busier roads that will require a higher level of design intervention to improve cycling and walking.") It is also mapped on the TfGM Cycle Network.

The national standard for cycling infrastructure is DfT guidance note LTN 1/20. LTN 1/20 advises above all else that cycle routes and networks should be Safe, Direct, Comfortable, Attractive and Coherent. Introducing unnecessary diversions, junctions and bends into a well-used existing route undermines all of these core principles, resulting in a lower quality cycle network which will make it harder for the council to achieve its cycling objectives.

The applicant has offered various reasons why diverting cyclists is necessary but all of these reasons seem to be either existing problems, or problems designed into the scheme. The proposal is to demolish and redevelop the site – so considerations like limited space and the placement of entrances, shop frontages,

planting and pedestrian areas are entirely within the applicant's scope to manage. Instead of starting with the problem "there is an existing busy cycle route across this site, how can I design to accommodate everyone's needs?", it seems the applicant has started with the conclusion "cyclists must be deterred" and instructed their consultants to post-rationalise that decision.

3 Misleading claims regarding safety

Page 22 of the Design & Access Statement refers to the "existing controversial link along Cavendish St., which is resulting in collisions of pedestrians, electric scooters, cyclists, etc."

However the map of recorded collisions, on page 18 of the Transport Statement submitted in the same planning application, shows no recorded collisions whatsoever on this link, only on the adjacent main roads.

It appears the applicant is attempting to restrict cycle access based on a "problem" for which they have no evidence.

Yours faithfully

[redacted]

[redacted]

****
This email and any files transmitted with it are confidential and intended solely for the use of the individual or entity to whom they are addressed.
If you have received this email in error, please notify the sender, or [redacted] and then permanently delete the email, attachments and all copies.
The full text of the Council's email disclaimer is available at: www.manchester.gov.uk/emaildisclaimer.
Your personal data is very important to us. Please refer to our privacy notice at: www.manchester.gov.uk/privacy for further information.

This footnote also confirms that this email message has been swept for the presence of computer viruses.
****

Outlook

Fw: Comment on Planning Application 142888/FO/2025

From Planning <[redacted]
Date Mon 14/07/2025 14:08
To Lucy Harrison <[redacted]

Information, Delivery & Support Team
Planning, Building Control & Licensing
Growth & Development Directorate
Postal address: Manchester City Council, P O Box 532, Town Hall, Manchester M60 2LA
Location address: Level 6 Town Hall Extension, Manchester M2 5DB
Tel: 0161 234 4516

Please consider the environment before printing an e-mail.

From: [redacted]
Sent: 11 July 2025 08:40
To: Planning <[redacted]
Subject: Comment on Planning Application 142888/FO/2025

You don't often get email from [redacted] Learn why this is important

ALERT This message originated outside of the Manchester City Council network. **BE CAUTIOUS** before clicking any links or opening any attachments. Please remember your Cyber Training and report anything suspicious.

Dear Manchester Planning team,

I am writing to lodge an objection to planning application **142888/FO/2025** – Cambridge Halls Of Residence Cavendish Street Manchester M15 6TT.

My primary objection is that the proposals have been designed to deter cyclists from using the safest and most direct route through the site. This route has been open to cyclists ever since the road was first built; it is an essential, well-used part of the city's cycling network and therefore the proposal to deter and/or divert cycles away from Cavendish Street is directly at odds with Manchester City Council's planning, sustainability and transport policies.

I use this route every day on my way into work in the city centre as it's quiet, safe and direct. The alternative is longer and on busy roads or narrow pedestrian paths.

The applicant has also made misleading claims regarding the road's legal status and regarding pedestrian safety which I will outline below.

I am asking that the council **refuse** this application, and invite the developer to come back with a proposal that maintains direct cycle as well as pedestrian access along Cavendish Street, designed to modern standards set out in Greater Manchester's Streets For All design guide and in Department for Transport guidance note LTN 1/20. I am sure that the Highways team at MCC and the Active Travel team at TfGM will, if asked, be happy to comment on how such a route could be provided within the space available.

I am also asking that the council **make a Section 106 agreement (s106)** with the applicant to fund safety improvements for pedestrians and cyclists at the junction of Cavendish Street and Higher Cambridge Street – the applicant themselves discuss the shortcomings of the existing junction layout in Section 4.2.1 of the Transport Statement ("*Cyclists have also been observed to queue on the footway to gain direct access to the Higher Cambridge Street/Cavendish Street junction (via a gap in the guard railings) rather than following the road markings which advise cyclists to dismount and use the controlled pedestrian crossings*"). The improvements might take the form of a CYCLOPS junction. CYCLOPS is a homegrown Greater Manchester innovation now frequently used on Highways schemes across the country to deliver safe pedestrian and cycle movements without undue impact on traffic flows.

For prospective occupants and passers-by alike, in line with the S106 tests as set out in Paragraph 58 of the National Planning Policy Framework (NPPF) 2024, a contribution to junction safety improvements improvement would be 'necessary to make the development acceptable in planning terms' (by contributing to an appropriate movement strategy for the site), 'directly related to the development' (given its proximity, the pressure added to the junction by the proposed threefold increase in residents, and in light of the wholly inadequate mitigation route proposed by the applicant), and 'fairly and reasonably related in scale and kind to the development' (given the stated threefold increase in residents explained by the applicant, so directly adding more pressure to the junction).

1 Legal Status of Cavendish Street

This section of Cavendish Street, an adopted Highway, was subject to a stopping up order dated 14.06.1996. That order required that "the Developer shall provide a new highway which shall be a footpath/cycleway". MMU have since installed physical signage stating that Cavendish Street "has not been dedicated as a Highway" and have bolted down uncomfortable and restrictive speed bumps

across the route in an apparent attempt to dissuade cyclists from exercising their legal rights over this space. Both measures may be unlawful, as my understanding is that cyclists do retain a legal Right of Way along Cavendish Street, unchanged from when the entire road was an adopted highway, and the speed bumps are inaccessible to some Disabled users.

2 Cycling routes and planning policy

The case for walking and cycling and specifically for maintaining and improving high quality cycling networks is clear at every level of modern planning policy, including:

- NPPF 2024's "vision-led approach"
- LTN 1/20
- Places For Everyone Joint Development Plan Objectives 6, 7 and 10
- Places for Everyone Joint Development Plan policies JP-Strat14, JP-C1, JP-C5 and JP-C6
- GM Transport Strategy 2040 and the "Right Mix" targets
- Greater Manchester Streets for All strategy and Streets for All design guide
- Manchester City Council's Active Travel Strategy
- Manchester City Council's commitment to be a Zero Carbon city by 2038

The policy position is absolutely clear – changes to the existing road and cycle networks should make cycling more convenient for people, not less convenient.

This specific stretch of Cavendish Street is a key part of the existing cycle network. It appears on TfGM's Bee Network map as a Beeway ("the routes that get people from A to B … representing the most direct routes between crossing points.") and connects to the Stretford Road Busy Beeway ("corridors or crossing points on busier roads that will require a higher level of design intervention to improve cycling and walking.") It is also mapped on the TfGM Cycle Network.

The national standard for cycling infrastructure is DfT guidance note LTN 1/20. LTN 1/20 advises above all else that cycle routes and networks should be Safe, Direct, Comfortable, Attractive and Coherent. Introducing unnecessary diversions, junctions and bends into a well-used existing route undermines all of these core principles, resulting in a lower quality cycle network which will make it harder for the council to achieve its cycling objectives.

The applicant has offered various reasons why diverting cyclists is necessary but all of these reasons seem to be either existing problems, or problems designed into the scheme. The proposal is to demolish and redevelop the site – so considerations like limited space and the placement of entrances, shop frontages, planting and pedestrian areas are entirely within the applicant's scope to manage. Instead of starting with the problem "there is an existing busy cycle route across this site, how can I design to accommodate everyone's needs?", it seems the applicant has started with the conclusion "cyclists must be deterred" and instructed their consultants to post-rationalise that decision.

3 Misleading claims regarding safety

Page 22 of the Design & Access Statement refers to the "existing controversial link along Cavendish St., which is resulting in collisions of pedestrians, electric scooters, cyclists, etc."

However the map of recorded collisions, on page 18 of the Transport Statement submitted in the same planning application, shows no recorded collisions whatsoever on this link, only on the adjacent main roads.

It appears the applicant is attempting to restrict cycle access based on a "problem" for which they have no evidence.

Yours sincerely,

[redacted]

[redacted]

[redacted]

****
This email and any files transmitted with it are confidential and intended solely for the use of the individual or entity to whom they are addressed.
If you have received this email in error, please notify the sender, or [redacted] and then permanently delete the email, attachments and all copies.
The full text of the Council's email disclaimer is available at: www.manchester.gov.uk/emaildisclaimer.
Your personal data is very important to us. Please refer to our privacy notice at: www.manchester.gov.uk/privacy for further information.

This footnote also confirms that this email message has been swept for the presence of computer viruses.
****

Outlook

Fw: Comment on Planning Application 142888/FO/2025

From Planning <[redacted]
Date Mon 30/06/2025 08:48
To Lucy Harrison <[redacted]

Information, Delivery & Support Team
Planning, Building Control & Licensing
Growth & Development Directorate
Postal address: Manchester City Council, P O Box 532, Town Hall, Manchester M60 2LA
Location address: Level 6 Town Hall Extension, Manchester M2 5DB
Tel: 0161 234 4516

Please consider the environment before printing an e-mail.

From: [redacted]
Sent: 28 June 2025 20:15
To: Planning <[redacted]
Subject: Comment on Planning Application 142888/FO/2025

You don't often get email from [redacted] Learn why this is important

ALERT This message originated outside of the Manchester City Council network. **BE CAUTIOUS** before clicking any links or opening any attachments. Please remember your Cyber Training and report anything suspicious.

Dear Manchester Planning team,

I am writing to lodge an objection to planning application **142888/FO/2025** – Cambridge Halls Of Residence Cavendish Street Manchester M15 6TT.

My primary objection is that the proposals have been designed to deter cyclists from using the safest and most direct route through the site. This route has been open to cyclists ever since the road was first built; it is an essential, well-used part of the city's cycling network and therefore the proposal to deter and/or divert cycles away from Cavendish Street is directly at odds with Manchester City Council's planning, sustainability and transport policies.

I use this route daily. Not to use this route on my way into town from my home in Chorlton would mean a dangerous right turn on a busy road. Not to use it would make my route a fair bit longer and deter me from cycling. One of the reasons I moved from Bury to S Manchester this March was because of the ease and safety of cycling into the city centre. I feel that removing safe routes like this – that take me into an area of my city that I love – is a betrayal of Manchester's net zero goals and is an error of MMU in its duty of care to people in the city – including its own students and alumni who live in S Manchester.

It would also reward a lie. The applicant has also made misleading claims regarding the road's legal status and regarding pedestrian safety which I will outline below.

I am asking that the council **refuse** this application, and invite the developer to come back with a proposal that maintains direct cycle as well as pedestrian access along Cavendish Street, designed to modern standards set out in Greater Manchester's Streets For All design guide and in Department for Transport guidance note LTN 1/20. I am sure that the Highways team at MCC and the Active Travel team at TfGM will, if asked, be happy to comment on how such a route could be provided within the space available.

I am also asking that the council **make a Section 106 agreement (s106)** with the applicant to fund safety improvements for pedestrians and cyclists at the junction of Cavendish Street and Higher Cambridge Street – the applicant themselves discuss the shortcomings of the existing junction layout in Section 4.2.1 of the Transport Statement ("*Cyclists have also been observed to queue on the footway to gain direct access to the Higher Cambridge Street/Cavendish Street junction (via a gap in the guard railings) rather than following the road markings which advise cyclists to dismount and use the controlled pedestrian crossings*"). The improvements might take the form of a CYCLOPS junction. CYCLOPS is a homegrown Greater Manchester innovation now frequently used on Highways schemes across the country to deliver safe pedestrian and cycle movements without undue impact on traffic flows.
For prospective occupants and passers-by alike, in line with the S106 tests as set out in Paragraph 58 of the National Planning Policy Framework (NPPF) 2024, a contribution to junction safety improvements improvement would be 'necessary to make the development acceptable in planning terms' (by contributing to an appropriate movement strategy for the site), 'directly related to the development' (given its proximity, the pressure added to the junction by the proposed threefold increase in residents, and in light of the wholly inadequate mitigation route proposed by the applicant), and 'fairly and reasonably related in scale and kind to the development' (given the stated threefold increase in residents explained by the applicant, so directly adding more pressure to the junction).

1 Legal Status of Cavendish Street

This section of Cavendish Street, an adopted Highway, was subject to a stopping up order dated 14.06.1996. That order required that "the Developer shall provide a new highway which shall be a footpath/cycleway". MMU have since installed physical signage stating that Cavendish Street "has not been dedicated as a Highway" and have bolted down uncomfortable and restrictive speed bumps across the route in an apparent attempt to dissuade cyclists from exercising their legal rights over this space. Both measures may be unlawful, as my understanding is that cyclists do retain a legal Right of Way along Cavendish Street, unchanged from when the entire road was an adopted highway, and the speed bumps are inaccessible to some Disabled users.

2 Cycling routes and planning policy

The case for walking and cycling and specifically for maintaining and improving high quality cycling networks is clear at every level of modern planning policy, including:

- NPPF 2024's "vision-led approach"
- LTN 1/20
- Places For Everyone Joint Development Plan Objectives 6, 7 and 10
- Places for Everyone Joint Development Plan policies JP-Strat14, JP-C1, JP-C5 and JP-C6
- GM Transport Strategy 2040 and the "Right Mix" targets
- Greater Manchester Streets for All strategy and Streets for All design guide
- Manchester City Council's Active Travel Strategy
- Manchester City Council's commitment to be a Zero Carbon city by 2038

The policy position is absolutely clear – changes to the existing road and cycle networks should make cycling more convenient for people, not less convenient.

This specific stretch of Cavendish Street is a key part of the existing cycle network. It appears on TfGM's Bee Network map as a Beeway ("the routes that get people from A to B … representing the most direct routes between crossing points.") and connects to the Stretford Road Busy Beeway ("corridors or crossing points on busier roads that will require a higher level of design intervention to improve cycling and walking.") It is also mapped on the TfGM Cycle Network.

The national standard for cycling infrastructure is DfT guidance note LTN 1/20. LTN 1/20 advises above all else that cycle routes and networks should be Safe, Direct, Comfortable, Attractive and Coherent. Introducing unnecessary diversions, junctions and bends into a well-used existing route undermines all of these core

principles, resulting in a lower quality cycle network which will make it harder for the council to achieve its cycling objectives.

The applicant has offered various reasons why diverting cyclists is necessary but all of these reasons seem to be either existing problems, or problems designed into the scheme. The proposal is to demolish and redevelop the site – so considerations like limited space and the placement of entrances, shop frontages, planting and pedestrian areas are entirely within the applicant's scope to manage. Instead of starting with the problem "there is an existing busy cycle route across this site, how can I design to accommodate everyone's needs?", it seems the applicant has started with the conclusion "cyclists must be deterred" and instructed their consultants to post-rationalise that decision.

3 Misleading claims regarding safety

Page 22 of the Design & Access Statement refers to the "existing controversial link along Cavendish St., which is resulting in collisions of pedestrians, electric scooters, cyclists, etc."

However the map of recorded collisions, on page 18 of the Transport Statement submitted in the same planning application, shows no recorded collisions whatsoever on this link, only on the adjacent main roads.

It appears the applicant is attempting to restrict cycle access based on a "problem" for which they have no evidence.

Thank you,

[redacted]

[redacted]

[redacted]

[redacted]

[redacted]

[redacted]

****

This email and any files transmitted with it are confidential and intended solely for the use of the individual or entity to whom they are addressed.
If you have received this email in error, please notify the sender, or [redacted] and then permanently delete the email, attachments and all copies.
The full text of the Council's email disclaimer is available at: www.manchester.gov.uk/emaildisclaimer.
Your personal data is very important to us. Please refer to our privacy notice at: www.manchester.gov.uk/privacy for further information.

This footnote also confirms that this email message has been swept for the presence of computer viruses.
****

Outlook

Fw: Comment on Planning Application 142888/FO/2025

From Planning <[redacted]
Date Wed 02/07/2025 08:51
To Lucy Harrison <[redacted]

Information, Delivery & Support Team
Planning, Building Control & Licensing
Growth & Development Directorate
Postal address: Manchester City Council, P O Box 532, Town Hall, Manchester M60 2LA
Location address: Level 6 Town Hall Extension, Manchester M2 5DB
Tel: 0161 234 4516

Please consider the environment before printing an e-mail.

From: [redacted]
Sent: 02 July 2025 08:02
To: Planning <[redacted]
Subject: Comment on Planning Application 142888/FO/2025

You don't often get email from [redacted] Learn why this is important

ALERT This message originated outside of the Manchester City Council network. **BE CAUTIOUS** before clicking any links or opening any attachments. Please remember your Cyber Training and report anything suspicious.

Dear Manchester Planning team,

I am writing to lodge an objection to planning application 142888/FO/2025 – Cambridge Halls Of Residence Cavendish Street Manchester M15 6TT.

My primary objection is that the proposals have been designed to deter cyclists from using the safest and most direct route through the site. This route has been open to cyclists ever since the road was first built; it is an essential, well-used part of the city's cycling network and therefore the proposal to deter and/or divert cycles away from Cavendish Street is directly at odds with Manchester City Council's planning, sustainability and transport policies.

This is a route that I use weekly to commute from my home to office at Circle Square.

The applicant has also made misleading claims regarding the road's legal status and regarding pedestrian safety which I will outline below.

I am asking that the council refuse this application, and invite the developer to come back with a proposal that maintains direct cycle as well as pedestrian access along Cavendish Street, designed to modern standards set out in Greater Manchester's Streets For All design guide and in Department for Transport guidance note LTN 1/20. I am sure that the Highways team at MCC and

the Active Travel team at TfGM will, if asked, be happy to comment on how such a route could be provided within the space available.

I am also asking that the council make a Section 106 agreement (s106) with the applicant to fund safety improvements for pedestrians and cyclists at the junction of Cavendish Street and Higher Cambridge Street – the applicant themselves discuss the shortcomings of the existing junction layout in Section 4.2.1 of the Transport Statement ("Cyclists have also been observed to queue on the footway to gain direct access to the Higher Cambridge Street/Cavendish Street junction (via a gap in the guard railings) rather than following the road markings which advise cyclists to dismount and use the controlled pedestrian crossings"). The improvements might take the form of a CYCLOPS junction. CYCLOPS is a homegrown Greater Manchester innovation now frequently used on Highways schemes across the country to deliver safe pedestrian and cycle movements without undue impact on traffic flows.

For prospective occupants and passers-by alike, in line with the S106 tests as set out in Paragraph 58 of the National Planning Policy Framework (NPPF) 2024, a contribution to junction safety improvements improvement would be 'necessary to make the development acceptable in planning terms' (by contributing to an appropriate movement strategy for the site), 'directly related to the development' (given its proximity, the pressure added to the junction by the proposed threefold increase in residents, and in light of the wholly inadequate mitigation route proposed by the applicant), and 'fairly and reasonably related in scale and kind to the development' (given the stated threefold increase in residents explained by the applicant, so directly adding more pressure to the junction).

1 Legal Status of Cavendish Street

This section of Cavendish Street, an adopted Highway, was subject to a stopping up order dated 14.06.1996. That order required that "the Developer shall provide a new highway which shall be a footpath/cycleway". MMU have since installed physical signage stating that Cavendish Street "has not been dedicated as a Highway" and have bolted down uncomfortable and restrictive speed bumps across the route in an apparent attempt to dissuade cyclists from exercising their legal rights over this space. Both measures may be unlawful, as my understanding is that cyclists do retain a legal Right of Way along Cavendish Street, unchanged from when the entire road was an adopted highway, and the speed bumps are inaccessible to some Disabled users.

2 Cycling routes and planning policy

The case for walking and cycling and specifically for maintaining and improving high quality cycling networks is clear at every level of modern planning policy, including:

NPPF 2024's "vision-led approach"
LTN 1/20
Places For Everyone Joint Development Plan Objectives 6, 7 and 10
Places for Everyone Joint Development Plan policies JP-Strat14, JP-C1, JP-C5 and JP-C6
GM Transport Strategy 2040 and the "Right Mix" targets
Greater Manchester Streets for All strategy and Streets for All design guide
Manchester City Council's Active Travel Strategy
Manchester City Council's commitment to be a Zero Carbon city by 2038
The policy position is absolutely clear – changes to the existing road and cycle networks should make cycling more convenient for people, not less convenient.

This specific stretch of Cavendish Street is a key part of the existing cycle network. It appears on

TfGM's Bee Network map as a Beeway ("the routes that get people from A to B … representing the most direct routes between crossing points.") and connects to the Stretford Road Busy Beeway ("corridors or crossing points on busier roads that will require a higher level of design intervention to improve cycling and walking.") It is also mapped on the TfGM Cycle Network.

The national standard for cycling infrastructure is DfT guidance note LTN 1/20. LTN 1/20 advises above all else that cycle routes and networks should be Safe, Direct, Comfortable, Attractive and Coherent. Introducing unnecessary diversions, junctions and bends into a well-used existing route undermines all of these core principles, resulting in a lower quality cycle network which will make it harder for the council to achieve its cycling objectives.

The applicant has offered various reasons why diverting cyclists is necessary but all of these reasons seem to be either existing problems, or problems designed into the scheme. The proposal is to demolish and redevelop the site – so considerations like limited space and the placement of entrances, shop frontages, planting and pedestrian areas are entirely within the applicant's scope to manage. Instead of starting with the problem "there is an existing busy cycle route across this site, how can I design to accommodate everyone's needs?", it seems the applicant has started with the conclusion "cyclists must be deterred" and instructed their consultants to post-rationalise that decision.

3 Misleading claims regarding safety

Page 22 of the Design & Access Statement refers to the "existing controversial link along Cavendish St., which is resulting in collisions of pedestrians, electric scooters, cyclists, etc."

However the map of recorded collisions, on page 18 of the Transport Statement submitted in the same planning application, shows no recorded collisions whatsoever on this link, only on the adjacent main roads.

It appears the applicant is attempting to restrict cycle access based on a "problem" for which they have no evidence.

Yours sincerely,

[redacted]

****
This email and any files transmitted with it are confidential and intended solely for the use of the individual or entity to whom they are addressed.
If you have received this email in error, please notify the sender, or [redacted] and then permanently delete the email, attachments and all copies.
The full text of the Council's email disclaimer is available at: www.manchester.gov.uk/emaildisclaimer.
Your personal data is very important to us. Please refer to our privacy notice at: www.manchester.gov.uk/privacy for further information.

This footnote also confirms that this email message has been swept for the presence of computer viruses.
****

Outlook

Fw: Objection Cavendish Street Planning Application

From Planning <[redacted]>
Date Mon 14/07/2025 14:04
To Lucy Harrison <[redacted]>

Information, Delivery & Support Team
Planning, Building Control & Licensing
Growth & Development Directorate
Postal address: Manchester City Council, P O Box 532, Town Hall, Manchester M60 2LA
Location address: Level 6 Town Hall Extension, Manchester M2 5DB
Tel: 0161 234 4516

Please consider the environment before printing an e-mail.

From: [redacted]
Sent: 12 July 2025 09:39
To: Planning <[redacted]>
Subject: Objection Cavendish Street Planning Application

You don't often get email from [redacted] Learn why this is important

ALERT This message originated outside of the Manchester City Council network. **BE CAUTIOUS** before clicking any links or opening any attachments. Please remember your Cyber Training and report anything suspicious.

Subject: Comment on Planning Application 142888/FO/2025
Dear Manchester Planning team,
I am writing to lodge an objection to planning application **142888/FO/2025** – Cambridge Halls Of Residence Cavendish Street Manchester M15 6TT.
My primary objection is that the proposals have been designed to deter cyclists from using the safest and most direct route through the site. This route has been open to cyclists ever since the road was first built; it is an essential, well-used part of the city's cycling network and therefore the proposal to deter and/or divert cycles away from Cavendish Street is directly at odds with Manchester City Council's planning, sustainability and transport policies.

The cycling route through Cavendish Street is the quickest and most convenient way for us to travel from Hulme into the City Centre, especially to Piccadilly Station. It's also the route we use regularly to reach the Aquatics Centre and Sugden Sports Centre. Beyond its practicality, Cavendish Street offers a safer, pedestrianised environment away from busy traffic and passes through All Saints Park — a green space that adds to our daily quality of life. Losing access to this route would be a significant loss, forcing us onto longer, more hazardous roads alongside cars, which would negatively impact both our safety and daily routines.

The applicant has also made misleading claims regarding the road's legal status and regarding pedestrian safety which I will outline below.
I am asking that the council **refuse** this application, and invite the developer to come back with a proposal that maintains direct cycle as well as pedestrian access along Cavendish Street, designed

to modern standards set out in Greater Manchester's Streets For All design guide and in Department for Transport guidance note LTN 1/20. I am sure that the Highways team at MCC and the Active Travel team at TfGM will, if asked, be happy to comment on how such a route could be provided within the space available.

I am also asking that the council **make a Section 106 agreement (s106)** with the applicant to fund safety improvements for pedestrians and cyclists at the junction of Cavendish Street and Higher Cambridge Street – the applicant themselves discuss the shortcomings of the existing junction layout in Section 4.2.1 of the Transport Statement ("*Cyclists have also been observed to queue on the footway to gain direct access to the Higher Cambridge Street/Cavendish Street junction (via a gap in the guard railings) rather than following the road markings which advise cyclists to dismount and use the controlled pedestrian crossings*"). The improvements might take the form of a CYCLOPS junction. CYCLOPS is a homegrown Greater Manchester innovation now frequently used on Highways schemes across the country to deliver safe pedestrian and cycle movements without undue impact on traffic flows.

For prospective occupants and passers-by alike, in line with the S106 tests as set out in Paragraph 58 of the National Planning Policy Framework (NPPF) 2024, a contribution to junction safety improvements improvement would be 'necessary to make the development acceptable in planning terms' (by contributing to an appropriate movement strategy for the site), 'directly related to the development' (given its proximity, the pressure added to the junction by the proposed threefold increase in residents, and in light of the wholly inadequate mitigation route proposed by the applicant), and 'fairly and reasonably related in scale and kind to the development' (given the stated threefold increase in residents explained by the applicant, so directly adding more pressure to the junction).

1 Legal Status of Cavendish Street

This section of Cavendish Street, an adopted Highway, was subject to a stopping up order dated 14.06.1996. That order required that "the Developer shall provide a new highway which shall be a footpath/cycleway". MMU have since installed physical signage stating that Cavendish Street "has not been dedicated as a Highway" and have bolted down uncomfortable and restrictive speed bumps across the route in an apparent attempt to dissuade cyclists from exercising their legal rights over this space. Both measures may be unlawful, as my understanding is that cyclists do retain a legal Right of Way along Cavendish Street, unchanged from when the entire road was an adopted highway, and the speed bumps are inaccessible to some Disabled users.

2 Cycling routes and planning policy

The case for walking and cycling and specifically for maintaining and improving high quality cycling networks is clear at every level of modern planning policy, including:

- NPPF 2024's "vision-led approach"
- LTN 1/20
- Places For Everyone Joint Development Plan Objectives 6, 7 and 10
- Places for Everyone Joint Development Plan policies JP-Strat14, JP-C1, JP-C5 and JP-C6
- GM Transport Strategy 2040 and the "Right Mix" targets
- Greater Manchester Streets for All strategy and Streets for All design guide
- Manchester City Council's Active Travel Strategy
- Manchester City Council's commitment to be a Zero Carbon city by 2038

The policy position is absolutely clear – changes to the existing road and cycle networks should make cycling more convenient for people, not less convenient.

This specific stretch of Cavendish Street is a key part of the existing cycle network. It appears on TfGM's Bee Network map as a Beeway ("the routes that get people from A to B … representing the most direct routes between crossing points.") and connects to the Stretford Road Busy Beeway ("corridors or crossing points on busier roads that will require a higher level of design intervention to improve cycling and walking.") It is also mapped on the TfGM Cycle Network.

The national standard for cycling infrastructure is DfT guidance note LTN 1/20. LTN 1/20 advises above all else that cycle routes and networks should be Safe, Direct, Comfortable, Attractive and Coherent. Introducing unnecessary diversions, junctions and bends into a well-used existing route undermines all of these core principles, resulting in a lower quality cycle network which will make it harder for the council to achieve its cycling objectives.

The applicant has offered various reasons why diverting cyclists is necessary but all of these reasons seem to be either existing problems, or problems designed into the scheme. The proposal is to demolish and redevelop the site – so considerations like limited space and the placement of

entrances, shop frontages, planting and pedestrian areas are entirely within the applicant's scope to manage. Instead of starting with the problem "there is an existing busy cycle route across this site, how can I design to accommodate everyone's needs?", it seems the applicant has started with the conclusion "cyclists must be deterred" and instructed their consultants to post-rationalise that decision.

3 Misleading claims regarding safety

Page 22 of the Design & Access Statement refers to the "existing controversial link along Cavendish St., which is resulting in collisions of pedestrians, electric scooters, cyclists, etc."

However the map of recorded collisions, on page 18 of the Transport Statement submitted in the same planning application, shows no recorded collisions whatsoever on this link, only on the adjacent main roads.

It appears the applicant is attempting to restrict cycle access based on a "problem" for which they have no evidence.

Yours sincerely,

[redacted]

[redacted]

****

This email and any files transmitted with it are confidential and intended solely for the use of the individual or entity to whom they are addressed. If you have received this email in error, please notify the sender, or [redacted] and then permanently delete the email, attachments and all copies.

The full text of the Council's email disclaimer is available at: www.manchester.gov.uk/emaildisclaimer.

Your personal data is very important to us. Please refer to our privacy notice at: www.manchester.gov.uk/privacy for further information.

This footnote also confirms that this email message has been swept for the presence of computer viruses.

****

Outlook

Fw: Comment on Planning Application 142888/FO/2025

From Planning <[redacted]
Date Mon 30/06/2025 08:52
To Lucy Harrison <[redacted]

Information, Delivery & Support Team
Planning, Building Control & Licensing
Growth & Development Directorate
Postal address: Manchester City Council, P O Box 532, Town Hall, Manchester M60 2LA
Location address: Level 6 Town Hall Extension, Manchester M2 5DB
Tel: 0161 234 4516

Please consider the environment before printing an e-mail.

From: [redacted]
Sent: 28 June 2025 13:57
To: Planning <[redacted]
Subject: Comment on Planning Application 142888/FO/2025

You don't often get email from [redacted] Learn why this is important

ALERT This message originated outside of the Manchester City Council network. **BE CAUTIOUS** before clicking any links or opening any attachments. Please remember your Cyber Training and report anything suspicious.

Dear Manchester Planning team,

I am writing to lodge an objection to planning application 142888/FO/2025 – Cambridge Halls Of Residence Cavendish Street Manchester M15 6TT.

My primary objection is that the proposals have been designed to deter cyclists from using the safest and most direct route through the site. This route has been open to cyclists ever since the road was first built; it is an essential, well-used part of the city's cycling network and therefore the proposal to deter and/or divert cycles away from Cavendish Street is directly at odds with Manchester City Council's planning, sustainability and transport policies.

I cycle as my main method of transport in Manchester and Cavendish Street provides me with a safe and convenient route across the city. Removing this route will force me to turn right onto a busy road, making my journey more difficult and dangerous than need be. Women are under-represented as cyclists and safer, traffic-free routes are crucial in enabling more women to feel able to access active modes of travel. I am an experienced cyclist but often find journeys by bike stressful due to the limited cycling infrastructure in most areas of the city.

The applicant has also made misleading claims regarding the road's legal status and regarding pedestrian safety which I will outline below.

I am asking that the council refuse this application, and invite the developer to come back with a proposal that maintains direct cycle as well as pedestrian access along Cavendish Street, designed to modern standards set out in Greater Manchester's Streets For All design guide and in Department for Transport guidance note LTN 1/20. I am sure that the Highways team at MCC and the Active Travel team at TfGM will, if asked, be happy to comment on how such a route could be provided within the space available.

I am also asking that the council make a Section 106 agreement (s106) with the applicant to fund safety improvements for pedestrians and cyclists at the junction of Cavendish Street and Higher Cambridge Street – the applicant themselves discuss the shortcomings of the existing junction layout in Section 4.2.1 of the Transport Statement ("Cyclists have also been observed to queue on the footway to gain direct access to the Higher Cambridge Street/Cavendish Street junction (via a gap in the guard railings) rather than following the road markings which advise cyclists to dismount and use the controlled pedestrian crossings"). The improvements might take the form of a CYCLOPS junction. CYCLOPS is a homegrown Greater Manchester innovation now frequently used on Highways schemes across the country to deliver safe pedestrian and cycle movements without undue impact on traffic flows.

For prospective occupants and passers-by alike, in line with the S106 tests as set out in Paragraph 58 of the National Planning Policy Framework (NPPF) 2024, a contribution to junction safety improvements improvement would be 'necessary to make the development acceptable in planning terms' (by contributing to an appropriate movement strategy for the site), 'directly related to the development' (given its proximity, the pressure added to the junction by the proposed threefold increase in residents, and in light of the wholly inadequate mitigation route proposed by the applicant), and 'fairly and reasonably related in scale and kind to the development' (given the stated threefold increase in residents explained by the applicant, so directly adding more pressure to the junction).

1 Legal Status of Cavendish Street

This section of Cavendish Street, an adopted Highway, was subject to a stopping up order dated 14.06.1996. That order required that "the Developer shall provide a new highway which shall be a footpath/cycleway". MMU have since installed physical signage stating that Cavendish Street "has not been dedicated as a Highway" and have bolted down uncomfortable and restrictive speed bumps across the route in an apparent attempt to dissuade cyclists from exercising their legal rights over this space. Both measures may be unlawful, as my understanding is that cyclists do retain a legal Right of Way along Cavendish Street, unchanged from when the entire road was an adopted highway, and the speed bumps are inaccessible to some Disabled users.

2 Cycling routes and planning policy

The case for walking and cycling and specifically for maintaining and improving high quality cycling networks is clear at every level of modern planning policy, including:

NPPF 2024's "vision-led approach"
LTN 1/20
Places For Everyone Joint Development Plan Objectives 6, 7 and 10
Places for Everyone Joint Development Plan policies JP-Strat14, JP-C1, JP-C5 and JP-C6

GM Transport Strategy 2040 and the "Right Mix" targets
Greater Manchester Streets for All strategy and Streets for All design guide
Manchester City Council's Active Travel Strategy
Manchester City Council's commitment to be a Zero Carbon city by 2038

The policy position is absolutely clear – changes to the existing road and cycle networks should make cycling more convenient for people, not less convenient.

This specific stretch of Cavendish Street is a key part of the existing cycle network. It appears on TfGM's Bee Network map as a Beeway ("the routes that get people from A to B … representing the most direct routes between crossing points.") and connects to the Stretford Road Busy Beeway ("corridors or crossing points on busier roads that will require a higher level of design intervention to improve cycling and walking.") It is also mapped on the TfGM Cycle Network.

The national standard for cycling infrastructure is DfT guidance note LTN 1/20. LTN 1/20 advises above all else that cycle routes and networks should be Safe, Direct, Comfortable, Attractive and Coherent. Introducing unnecessary diversions, junctions and bends into a well-used existing route undermines all of these core principles, resulting in a lower quality cycle network which will make it harder for the council to achieve its cycling objectives.

The applicant has offered various reasons why diverting cyclists is necessary but all of these reasons seem to be either existing problems, or problems designed into the scheme. The proposal is to demolish and redevelop the site – so considerations like limited space and the placement of entrances, shop frontages, planting and pedestrian areas are entirely within the applicant's scope to manage. Instead of starting with the problem "there is an existing busy cycle route across this site, how can I design to accommodate everyone's needs?", it seems the applicant has started with the conclusion "cyclists must be deterred" and instructed their consultants to post-rationalise that decision.

3 Misleading claims regarding safety

Page 22 of the Design & Access Statement refers to the "existing controversial link along Cavendish St., which is resulting in collisions of pedestrians, electric scooters, cyclists, etc."

However the map of recorded collisions, on page 18 of the Transport Statement submitted in the same planning application, shows no recorded collisions whatsoever on this link, only on the adjacent main roads.

It appears the applicant is attempting to restrict cycle access based on a "problem" for which they have no evidence.

Yours sincerely,

[redacted]

Yahoo Mail: Search, organise, conquer

****
This email and any files transmitted with it are confidential and intended solely for the use of the individual or entity to whom they are addressed.

If you have received this email in error, please notify the sender, or [redacted] and then permanently delete the email, attachments and all copies.
The full text of the Council's email disclaimer is available at: www.manchester.gov.uk/emaildisclaimer.
Your personal data is very important to us. Please refer to our privacy notice at: www.manchester.gov.uk/privacy for further information.

This footnote also confirms that this email message has been swept for the presence of computer viruses.
****

Outlook

Fw: Comment on Planning Application 142888/FO/2025

From Planning <[redacted]>
Date Fri 04/07/2025 14:09
To Lucy Harrison <[redacted]>

Information, Delivery & Support Team
Planning, Building Control & Licensing
Growth & Development Directorate
Postal address: Manchester City Council, P O Box 532, Town Hall, Manchester M60 2LA
Location address: Level 6 Town Hall Extension, Manchester M2 5DB
Tel: 0161 234 4516

Please consider the environment before printing an e-mail.

From: [redacted]
Sent: 28 June 2025 21:48
To: Planning <[redacted]>
Subject: Comment on Planning Application 142888/FO/2025

You don't often get email from [redacted] Learn why this is important

ALERT This message originated outside of the Manchester City Council network. **BE CAUTIOUS** before clicking any links or opening any attachments. Please remember your Cyber Training and report anything suspicious.

Dear Manchester Planning team,

I am writing to lodge an objection to planning application **142888/FO/2025** – Cambridge Halls Of Residence Cavendish Street Manchester M15 6TT.

My primary objection is that the proposals have been designed to deter cyclists from using the safest and most direct route through the site. This route has been open to cyclists ever since the road was first built; it is an essential, well-used part of the city's cycling network and therefore the proposal to deter and/or divert cycles away from Cavendish Street is directly at odds with Manchester City Council's planning, sustainability and transport policies.

The applicant has also made misleading claims regarding the road's legal status and regarding pedestrian safety which I will outline below.

I am asking that the council **refuse** this application, and invite the developer to come back with a proposal that maintains direct cycle as well as pedestrian access along Cavendish Street, designed to modern standards set out in Greater Manchester's Streets For All design guide and in Department for Transport guidance note LTN 1/20. I am sure that the Highways team at MCC and the Active Travel team at TfGM will, if asked, be happy to comment on how such a route could be provided within the space available.

I am also asking that the council **make a Section 106 agreement (s106)** with the applicant to fund safety improvements for pedestrians and cyclists at the junction of Cavendish Street and Higher Cambridge Street – the applicant themselves discuss the shortcomings of the existing junction layout in Section 4.2.1 of the Transport Statement ("*Cyclists have also been observed to queue on the footway to gain direct access to the Higher Cambridge Street/Cavendish Street junction (via a gap in the guard railings) rather than following the road markings which advise cyclists to dismount and use the controlled pedestrian crossings*"). The improvements might take the form of a CYCLOPS junction. CYCLOPS is a homegrown Greater Manchester innovation now frequently used on Highways schemes across the country to deliver safe pedestrian and cycle movements without undue impact on traffic flows.

For prospective occupants and passers-by alike, in line with the S106 tests as set out in Paragraph 58 of the National Planning Policy Framework (NPPF) 2024, a contribution to junction safety improvements improvement would be 'necessary to make the development acceptable in planning terms' (by contributing to an appropriate movement strategy for the site), 'directly related to the development' (given its proximity, the pressure added to the junction by the proposed threefold increase in residents, and in light of the wholly inadequate mitigation route proposed by the applicant), and 'fairly and reasonably related in scale and kind to the development' (given the stated threefold increase in residents explained by the applicant, so directly adding more pressure to the junction).

1 Legal Status of Cavendish Street

This section of Cavendish Street, an adopted Highway, was subject to a stopping up order dated 14.06.1996. That order required that "the Developer shall provide a new highway which shall be a footpath/cycleway". MMU have since installed physical signage stating that Cavendish Street "has not been dedicated as a Highway" and have bolted down uncomfortable and restrictive speed bumps across the route in an apparent attempt to dissuade cyclists from exercising their legal rights over this space. Both measures may be unlawful, as my understanding is that cyclists do retain a legal Right of Way along Cavendish Street, unchanged from when the entire road was an adopted highway, and the speed bumps are inaccessible to some Disabled users.

2 Cycling routes and planning policy

The case for walking and cycling and specifically for maintaining and improving high quality cycling networks is clear at every level of modern planning policy, including:

- NPPF 2024's "vision-led approach"
- LTN 1/20
- Places For Everyone Joint Development Plan Objectives 6, 7 and 10
- Places for Everyone Joint Development Plan policies JP-Strat14, JP-C1, JP-C5 and JP-C6
- GM Transport Strategy 2040 and the "Right Mix" targets
- Greater Manchester Streets for All strategy and Streets for All design guide
- Manchester City Council's Active Travel Strategy
- Manchester City Council's commitment to be a Zero Carbon city by 2038

The policy position is absolutely clear – changes to the existing road and cycle networks should make cycling more convenient for people, not less convenient.

This specific stretch of Cavendish Street is a key part of the existing cycle network. It appears on TfGM's Bee Network map as a Beeway ("the routes that get people from A to B … representing the most direct routes between crossing points.") and connects to the Stretford Road Busy Beeway ("corridors or crossing points on busier roads that will require a higher level of design intervention to improve cycling and walking.") It is also mapped on the TfGM Cycle Network.

The national standard for cycling infrastructure is DfT guidance note LTN 1/20. LTN 1/20 advises above all else that cycle routes and networks should be Safe, Direct, Comfortable, Attractive and Coherent. Introducing unnecessary diversions, junctions and bends into a well-used existing route undermines all of these core principles, resulting in a lower quality cycle network which will make it harder for the council to achieve its cycling objectives.

The applicant has offered various reasons why diverting cyclists is necessary but all of these reasons seem to be either existing problems, or problems designed into the scheme. The proposal is to demolish and redevelop the site – so considerations like limited space and the placement of entrances, shop frontages, planting and pedestrian areas are entirely within the applicant's scope to manage. Instead of starting with the problem "there is an existing busy cycle route across this site, how can I design to accommodate everyone's needs?", it seems the applicant has started with the conclusion "cyclists must be deterred" and instructed their consultants to post-rationalise that decision.

3 Misleading claims regarding safety

Page 22 of the Design & Access Statement refers to the "existing controversial link along Cavendish St., which is resulting in collisions of pedestrians, electric scooters, cyclists, etc."

However the map of recorded collisions, on page 18 of the Transport Statement submitted in the same planning application, shows no recorded collisions whatsoever on this link, only on the adjacent main roads.

It appears the applicant is attempting to restrict cycle access based on a "problem" for which they have no evidence.

Yours sincerely,

[redacted]

****
This email and any files transmitted with it are confidential and intended solely for the use of the individual or entity to whom they are addressed.
If you have received this email in error, please notify the sender, or [redacted] and then permanently delete the email, attachments and all copies.
The full text of the Council's email disclaimer is available at: www.manchester.gov.uk/emaildisclaimer.
Your personal data is very important to us. Please refer to our privacy notice at: www.manchester.gov.uk/privacy for further information.

This footnote also confirms that this email message has been swept for the presence of computer viruses.
****

Outlook

Fw: Comment on Planning Application 142888/FO/2025

From Planning <[redacted]
Date Mon 14/07/2025 14:07
To Lucy Harrison <[redacted]

Information, Delivery & Support Team
Planning, Building Control & Licensing
Growth & Development Directorate
Postal address: Manchester City Council, P O Box 532, Town Hall, Manchester M60 2LA
Location address: Level 6 Town Hall Extension, Manchester M2 5DB
Tel: 0161 234 4516

Please consider the environment before printing an e-mail.

From: [redacted]
Sent: 11 July 2025 09:36
To: Planning <[redacted]
Subject: Comment on Planning Application 142888/FO/2025

You don't often get email from [redacted] Learn why this is important

ALERT This message originated outside of the Manchester City Council network. **BE CAUTIOUS** before clicking any links or opening any attachments. Please remember your Cyber Training and report anything suspicious.

Dear Manchester Planning team,

I am writing to lodge an objection to planning application 142888/FO/2025 – Cambridge Halls Of Residence Cavendish Street Manchester M15 6TT.

My primary objection is that the proposals have been designed to deter cyclists from using the safest and most direct route through the site. This route has been open to cyclists ever since the road was first built; it is an essential, well-used part of the city's cycling network and therefore the proposal to deter and/or divert cycles away from Cavendish Street is directly at odds with Manchester City Council's planning, sustainability and transport policies.

The applicant has also made misleading claims regarding the road's legal status and regarding pedestrian safety which I will outline below.

I am asking that the council refuse this application, and invite the developer to come back with a proposal that maintains direct cycle as well as pedestrian access along Cavendish Street, designed to modern standards set out in Greater Manchester's Streets For All design guide and in Department for Transport guidance note LTN 1/20. I am sure that the Highways team at MCC and the Active Travel team at TfGM will, if asked, be happy to comment on how such a route could be provided within the space available.

I am also asking that the council make a Section 106 agreement (s106) with the applicant to fund safety improvements for pedestrians and cyclists at the junction of Cavendish Street and Higher Cambridge Street – the applicant themselves discuss the shortcomings of the existing junction layout in Section 4.2.1 of the Transport Statement ("Cyclists have also been observed to queue on the footway to gain direct access to the Higher Cambridge Street/Cavendish Street junction (via a gap in the guard railings) rather than following the road markings which advise cyclists to dismount and use the controlled pedestrian crossings"). The improvements might take the form of a CYCLOPS junction. CYCLOPS is a homegrown Greater Manchester innovation now frequently used on Highways schemes across the country to deliver safe pedestrian and cycle movements without undue impact on traffic flows.

For prospective occupants and passers-by alike, in line with the S106 tests as set out in Paragraph 58 of the National Planning Policy Framework (NPPF) 2024, a contribution to junction safety improvements improvement would be 'necessary to make the development acceptable in planning terms' (by contributing to an appropriate movement strategy for the site), 'directly related to the development' (given its proximity, the pressure added to the junction by the proposed threefold increase in residents, and in light of the wholly inadequate mitigation route proposed by the applicant), and 'fairly and reasonably related in scale and kind to the development' (given the stated threefold increase in residents explained by the applicant, so directly adding more pressure to the junction).

1 Legal Status of Cavendish Street

This section of Cavendish Street, an adopted Highway, was subject to a stopping up order dated 14.06.1996. That order required that "the Developer shall provide a new highway which shall be a footpath/cycleway". MMU have since installed physical signage stating that Cavendish Street "has not been dedicated as a Highway" and have bolted down uncomfortable and restrictive speed bumps across the route in an apparent attempt to dissuade cyclists from exercising their legal rights over this space. Both measures may be unlawful, as my understanding is that cyclists do retain a legal Right of Way along Cavendish Street, unchanged from when the entire road was an adopted highway, and the speed bumps are inaccessible to some Disabled users.

2 Cycling routes and planning policy

The case for walking and cycling and specifically for maintaining and improving high quality cycling networks is clear at every level of modern planning policy, including:

NPPF 2024's "vision-led approach"
LTN 1/20
Places For Everyone Joint Development Plan Objectives 6, 7 and 10
Places for Everyone Joint Development Plan policies JP-Strat14, JP-C1, JP-C5 and JP-C6
GM Transport Strategy 2040 and the "Right Mix" targets
Greater Manchester Streets for All strategy and Streets for All design guide
Manchester City Council's Active Travel Strategy
Manchester City Council's commitment to be a Zero Carbon city by 2038
The policy position is absolutely clear – changes to the existing road and cycle networks should make cycling more convenient for people, not less convenient.

This specific stretch of Cavendish Street is a key part of the existing cycle network. It appears on TfGM's Bee Network map as a Beeway ("the routes that get people from A to B … representing the most direct routes between crossing points.") and connects to the Stretford Road Busy Beeway

("corridors or crossing points on busier roads that will require a higher level of design intervention to improve cycling and walking.") It is also mapped on the TfGM Cycle Network.

The national standard for cycling infrastructure is DfT guidance note LTN 1/20. LTN 1/20 advises above all else that cycle routes and networks should be Safe, Direct, Comfortable, Attractive and Coherent. Introducing unnecessary diversions, junctions and bends into a well-used existing route undermines all of these core principles, resulting in a lower quality cycle network which will make it harder for the council to achieve its cycling objectives.

The applicant has offered various reasons why diverting cyclists is necessary but all of these reasons seem to be either existing problems, or problems designed into the scheme. The proposal is to demolish and redevelop the site – so considerations like limited space and the placement of entrances, shop frontages, planting and pedestrian areas are entirely within the applicant's scope to manage. Instead of starting with the problem "there is an existing busy cycle route across this site, how can I design to accommodate everyone's needs?", it seems the applicant has started with the conclusion "cyclists must be deterred" and instructed their consultants to post-rationalise that decision.

3 Misleading claims regarding safety

Page 22 of the Design & Access Statement refers to the "existing controversial link along Cavendish St., which is resulting in collisions of pedestrians, electric scooters, cyclists, etc."

However the map of recorded collisions, on page 18 of the Transport Statement submitted in the same planning application, shows no recorded collisions whatsoever on this link, only on the adjacent main roads.

It appears the applicant is attempting to restrict cycle access based on a "problem" for which they have no evidence.

Yours sincerely,

[redacted]

****
This email and any files transmitted with it are confidential and intended solely for the use of the individual or entity to whom they are addressed.
If you have received this email in error, please notify the sender, or [redacted] and then permanently delete the email, attachments and all copies.
The full text of the Council's email disclaimer is available at: www.manchester.gov.uk/emaildisclaimer.
Your personal data is very important to us. Please refer to our privacy notice at: www.manchester.gov.uk/privacy for further information.

This footnote also confirms that this email message has been swept for the presence of computer viruses.
****

Outlook

Fw: Comment on Planning Application 142888/FO/2025

From Planning <[redacted]>
Date Mon 07/07/2025 11:05
To Lucy Harrison <[redacted]>

Information, Delivery & Support Team
Planning, Building Control & Licensing
Growth & Development Directorate
Postal address: Manchester City Council, P O Box 532, Town Hall, Manchester M60 2LA
Location address: Level 6 Town Hall Extension, Manchester M2 5DB
Tel: 0161 234 4516

Please consider the environment before printing an e-mail.

From: [redacted]
Sent: 06 July 2025 15:14
To: Planning <[redacted]>
Subject: Comment on Planning Application 142888/FO/2025

You don't often get email from [redacted] Learn why this is important

ALERT This message originated outside of the Manchester City Council network. **BE CAUTIOUS** before clicking any links or opening any attachments. Please remember your Cyber Training and report anything suspicious.

Dear Manchester Planning team,

I am writing to lodge an objection to planning application 142888/FO/2025 – Cambridge Halls Of Residence Cavendish Street Manchester M15 6TT.

My primary objection is that the proposals have been designed to deter cyclists from using the safest and most direct route through the site. This route has been open to cyclists ever since the road was first built; it is an essential, well-used part of the city's cycling network and therefore the proposal to deter and/or divert cycles away from Cavendish Street is directly at odds with Manchester City Council's planning, sustainability and transport policies.

I should state here that I am a regular user of the Cavendish Street section of cycleway, using it as link from the Chorlton cycleway to get to Piccadilly Station in Manchester city centre several times a month (I live in Chorlton and use the new, excellent, cycleway to get to the CYCLOPS junction at Chorlton Road/Stretford Road, then cycle along Stretford Road to pick up Cavendish Street and beyond). I also use it in other capacities less frequently.
My route into the city centre is now very coherent (Chorlton to Victoria station being a prime example) but cycle routes across the city tend to be more problematic and the Cavendish Street cycleway is one of the few coherent links running across this part of Manchester in an area used by many cyclists, including me.

Whilst the current design of of the link is poor, this could easily be redesigned as part of the proposed planning application, rather than diminishing access.

The applicant has also made misleading claims regarding the road's legal status and regarding pedestrian safety which I will outline below.

I am asking that the council refuse this application, and invite the developer to come back with a proposal that maintains direct cycle as well as pedestrian access along Cavendish Street, designed to modern standards set out in Greater Manchester's Streets For All design guide and in Department for Transport guidance note LTN 1/20. I am sure that the Highways team at MCC and the Active Travel team at TfGM will, if asked, be happy to comment on how such a route could be provided within the space available.

I am also asking that the council make a Section 106 agreement (s106) with the applicant to fund safety improvements for pedestrians and cyclists at the junction of Cavendish Street and Higher Cambridge Street – the applicant themselves discuss the shortcomings of the existing junction layout in Section 4.2.1 of the Transport Statement ("Cyclists have also been observed to queue on the footway to gain direct access to the Higher Cambridge Street/Cavendish Street junction (via a gap in the guard railings) rather than following the road markings which advise cyclists to dismount and use the controlled pedestrian crossings"). The improvements might take the form of a CYCLOPS junction. CYCLOPS is a homegrown Greater Manchester innovation now frequently used on Highways schemes across the country to deliver safe pedestrian and cycle movements without undue impact on traffic flows.

For prospective occupants and passers-by alike, in line with the S106 tests as set out in Paragraph 58 of the National Planning Policy Framework (NPPF) 2024, a contribution to junction safety improvements improvement would be 'necessary to make the development acceptable in planning terms' (by contributing to an appropriate movement strategy for the site), 'directly related to the development' (given its proximity, the pressure added to the junction by the proposed threefold increase in residents, and in light of the wholly inadequate mitigation route proposed by the applicant), and 'fairly and reasonably related in scale and kind to the development' (given the stated threefold increase in residents explained by the applicant, so directly adding more pressure to the junction).

1 Legal Status of Cavendish Street

This section of Cavendish Street, an adopted Highway, was subject to a stopping up order dated 14.06.1996. That order required that "the Developer shall provide a new highway which shall be a footpath/cycleway". MMU have since installed physical signage stating that Cavendish Street "has not been dedicated as a Highway" and have bolted down uncomfortable and restrictive speed bumps across the route in an apparent attempt to dissuade cyclists from exercising their legal rights over this space. Both measures may be unlawful, as my understanding is that cyclists do retain a legal Right of Way along Cavendish Street, unchanged from when the entire road was an adopted highway, and the speed bumps are inaccessible to some Disabled users.are inaccessible to some Disabled users.

2 Cycling routes and planning policy

The case for walking and cycling and specifically for maintaining and improving high quality cycling networks is clear at every level of modern planning policy, including:

NPPF 2024's "vision-led approach"
LTN 1/20
Places For Everyone Joint Development Plan Objectives 6, 7 and 10

Places for Everyone Joint Development Plan policies JP-Strat14, JP-C1, JP-C5 and JP-C6
GM Transport Strategy 2040 and the "Right Mix" targets
Greater Manchester Streets for All strategy and Streets for All design guide
Manchester City Council's Active Travel Strategy
Manchester City Council's commitment to be a Zero Carbon city by 2038
The policy position is absolutely clear – changes to the existing road and cycle networks should make cycling more convenient for people, not less convenient.

This specific stretch of Cavendish Street is a key part of the existing cycle network. It appears on TfGM's Bee Network map as a Beeway ("the routes that get people from A to B … representing the most direct routes between crossing points.") and connects to the Stretford Road Busy Beeway ("corridors or crossing points on busier roads that will require a higher level of design intervention to improve cycling and walking.") It is also mapped on the TfGM Cycle Network.

The national standard for cycling infrastructure is DfT guidance note LTN 1/20. LTN 1/20 advises above all else that cycle routes and networks should be Safe, Direct, Comfortable, Attractive and Coherent. Introducing unnecessary diversions, junctions and bends into a well-used existing route undermines all of these core principles, resulting in a lower quality cycle network which will make it harder for the council to achieve its cycling objectives.

The applicant has offered various reasons why diverting cyclists is necessary but all of these reasons seem to be either existing problems, or problems designed into the scheme. The proposal is to demolish and redevelop the site – so considerations like limited space and the placement of entrances, shop frontages, planting and pedestrian areas are entirely within the applicant's scope to manage. Instead of starting with the problem "there is an existing busy cycle route across this site, how can I design to accommodate everyone's needs?", it seems the applicant has started with the conclusion "cyclists must be deterred" and instructed their consultants to post-rationalise that decision.

3 Misleading claims regarding safety

Page 22 of the Design & Access Statement refers to the "existing controversial link along Cavendish St., which is resulting in collisions of pedestrians, electric scooters, cyclists, etc."

However the map of recorded collisions, on page 18 of the Transport Statement submitted in the same planning application, shows no recorded collisions whatsoever on this link, only on the adjacent main roads.

It appears the applicant is attempting to restrict cycle access based on a "problem" for which they have no evidence.

Yours sincerely,

[redacted]

****
This email and any files transmitted with it are confidential and intended solely for the use of the individual or entity to whom they are addressed.
If you have received this email in error, please notify the sender, or [redacted] and then permanently delete the email, attachments and all copies.
The full text of the Council's email disclaimer is available at: www.manchester.gov.uk/emaildisclaimer.
Your personal data is very important to us. Please refer to our privacy notice at: www.manchester.gov.uk/privacy for further information.

This footnote also confirms that this email message has been swept for the presence of computer viruses.
****

Outlook

Fw: Comment on Planning Application 142888/FO/2025

From Planning <[redacted]>
Date Mon 14/07/2025 14:03
To Lucy Harrison <[redacted]>

Information, Delivery & Support Team
Planning, Building Control & Licensing
Growth & Development Directorate
Postal address: Manchester City Council, P O Box 532, Town Hall, Manchester M60 2LA
Location address: Level 6 Town Hall Extension, Manchester M2 5DB
Tel: 0161 234 4516

Please consider the environment before printing an e-mail.

From: [redacted]
Sent: 14 July 2025 11:07
To: Planning <[redacted]>
Subject: Comment on Planning Application 142888/FO/2025

You don't often get email from [redacted] Learn why this is important

ALERT This message originated outside of the Manchester City Council network. **BE CAUTIOUS** before clicking any links or opening any attachments. Please remember your Cyber Training and report anything suspicious.

Dear Manchester Planning team,

I am writing to lodge an objection to planning application 142888/FO/2025 – Cambridge Halls Of Residence Cavendish Street Manchester M15 6TT.

My primary objection is that the proposals have been designed to deter cyclists from using the safest and most direct route through the site. This route has been open to cyclists ever since the road was first built; it is an essential, well-used part of the city's cycling network and therefore the proposal to deter and/or divert cycles away from Cavendish Street is directly at odds with Manchester City Council's planning, sustainability and transport policies.

I use this route several times a week as a cyclist; the main benefit of the route is the direct and off-road line of travel from Stretford Road to Oxford Road and I do not believe any alternative routing would be as safe or as well-used by cyclists.

The applicant has also made misleading claims regarding the road's legal status and regarding pedestrian safety which I will outline below.

I am asking that the council refuse this application and invite the developer to come back with a proposal that maintains direct cycle as well as pedestrian access along Cavendish Street, designed to modern standards set out in Greater Manchester's Streets For All design guide and in Department for Transport guidance note LTN 1/20. I am sure that the Highways team at MCC and the Active Travel team at TfGM will, if asked, be happy to comment on how such a route could be provided within the space available.

I am also asking that the council make a Section 106 agreement (s106) with the applicant to fund safety improvements for pedestrians and cyclists at the junction of Cavendish Street and Higher

Cambridge Street – the applicant themselves discuss the shortcomings of the existing junction layout in Section 4.2.1 of the Transport Statement ("Cyclists have also been observed to queue on the footway to gain direct access to the Higher Cambridge Street/Cavendish Street junction (via a gap in the guard railings) rather than following the road markings which advise cyclists to dismount and use the controlled pedestrian crossings"). The improvements might take the form of a CYCLOPS junction. CYCLOPS is a homegrown Greater Manchester innovation now frequently used on Highways schemes across the country to deliver safe pedestrian and cycle movements without undue impact on traffic flows.

For prospective occupants and passers-by alike, in line with the S106 tests as set out in Paragraph 58 of the National Planning Policy Framework (NPPF) 2024, a contribution to junction safety improvements improvement would be 'necessary to make the development acceptable in planning terms' (by contributing to an appropriate movement strategy for the site), 'directly related to the development' (given its proximity, the pressure added to the junction by the proposed threefold increase in residents, and in light of the wholly inadequate mitigation route proposed by the applicant), and 'fairly and reasonably related in scale and kind to the development' (given the stated threefold increase in residents explained by the applicant, so directly adding more pressure to the junction).

1 Legal Status of Cavendish Street

This section of Cavendish Street, an adopted Highway, was subject to a stopping up order dated 14.06.1996. That order required that "the Developer shall provide a new highway which shall be a footpath/cycleway". MMU have since installed physical signage stating that Cavendish Street "has not been dedicated as a Highway" and have bolted down uncomfortable and restrictive speed bumps across the route in an apparent attempt to dissuade cyclists from exercising their legal rights over this space. Both measures may be unlawful, as my understanding is that cyclists do retain a legal Right of Way along Cavendish Street, unchanged from when the entire road was an adopted highway, and the speed bumps are inaccessible to some Disabled users.

2 Cycling routes and planning policy

The case for walking and cycling and specifically for maintaining and improving high quality cycling networks is clear at every level of modern planning policy, including:

NPPF 2024's "vision-led approach"

LTN 1/20

Places For Everyone Joint Development Plan Objectives 6, 7 and 10

Places for Everyone Joint Development Plan policies JP-Strat14, JP-C1, JP-C5 and JP-C6

GM Transport Strategy 2040 and the "Right Mix" targets

Greater Manchester Streets for All strategy and Streets for All design guide

Manchester City Council's Active Travel Strategy

Manchester City Council's commitment to be a Zero Carbon city by 2038

The policy position is absolutely clear – changes to the existing road and cycle networks should make cycling more convenient for people, not less convenient.

This specific stretch of Cavendish Street is a key part of the existing cycle network. It appears on TfGM's Bee Network map as a Beeway ("the routes that get people from A to B … representing the most direct routes between crossing points.") and connects to the Stretford Road Busy Beeway ("corridors or crossing points on busier roads that will require a higher level of design intervention to improve cycling and walking.") It is also mapped on the TfGM Cycle Network.

The national standard for cycling infrastructure is DfT guidance note LTN 1/20. LTN 1/20 advises above all else that cycle routes and networks should be Safe, Direct, Comfortable, Attractive and Coherent. Introducing unnecessary diversions, junctions and bends into a well-used existing route undermines all of these core principles, resulting in a lower quality cycle network which will make it harder for the council to achieve its cycling objectives.

The applicant has offered various reasons why diverting cyclists is necessary, but all of these reasons seem to be either existing problems, or problems designed into the scheme. The proposal is to demolish and redevelop the site – so considerations like limited space and the placement of entrances, shop frontages, planting and pedestrian areas are entirely within the applicant's scope to manage. Instead of starting with the problem "there is an existing busy cycle route across this site, how can I design to accommodate everyone's needs?", it seems the applicant has started with the

conclusion “cyclists must be deterred” and instructed their consultants to post-rationalise that decision.

3 Misleading claims regarding safety

Page 22 of the Design & Access Statement refers to the “existing controversial link along Cavendish St., which is resulting in collisions of pedestrians, electric scooters, cyclists, etc.”

However, the map of recorded collisions, on page 18 of the Transport Statement submitted in the same planning application, shows no recorded collisions whatsoever on this link, only on the adjacent main roads.

It appears the applicant is attempting to restrict cycle access based on a “problem” for which they have no evidence.

Yours sincerely,

[redacted]

[redacted]

[redacted]

****
This email and any files transmitted with it are confidential and intended solely for the use of the individual or entity to whom they are addressed.
If you have received this email in error, please notify the sender, or [redacted] and then permanently delete the email, attachments and all copies.
The full text of the Council's email disclaimer is available at: www.manchester.gov.uk/emaildisclaimer.
Your personal data is very important to us. Please refer to our privacy notice at: www.manchester.gov.uk/privacy for further information.

This footnote also confirms that this email message has been swept for the presence of computer viruses.
****

Outlook

Fw: Cavendish Street

From Planning <[redacted]
Date Mon 30/06/2025 08:48
To Lucy Harrison <[redacted]

Information, Delivery & Support Team
Planning, Building Control & Licensing
Growth & Development Directorate
Postal address: Manchester City Council, P O Box 532, Town Hall, Manchester M60 2LA
Location address: Level 6 Town Hall Extension, Manchester M2 5DB
Tel: 0161 234 4516

Please consider the environment before printing an e-mail.

From: [redacted]
Sent: 29 June 2025 09:36
To: Planning <[redacted]
Subject: Cavendish Street

You don't often get email from [redacted] Learn why this is important

ALERT This message originated outside of the Manchester City Council network. **BE CAUTIOUS** before clicking any links or opening any attachments. Please remember your Cyber Training and report anything suspicious.

Subject: Comment on Planning Application 142888/FO/2025
Dear Manchester Planning team,

I am writing to lodge an objection to planning application **142888/FO/2025** – Cambridge Halls Of Residence Cavendish Street Manchester M15 6TT.

My primary objection is that the proposals have been designed to deter cyclists from using the safest and most direct route through the site. This route has been open to cyclists ever since the road was first built; it is an essential, well-used part of the city's cycling network and therefore the proposal to deter and/or divert cycles away from Cavendish Street is directly at odds with Manchester City Council's planning, sustainability and transport policies.

I personally have never seen any kind of collision between cyclists and or pedestrians despite using this route hundreds of times! The actual risk to both pedestrians and cyclists is motorised vehicles on Chatham Street and Ormond Street not giving way to crossing traffic as mandated by signage and road markings.

The applicant has also made misleading claims regarding the road's legal status and regarding pedestrian safety which I will outline below.

I am asking that the council **refuse** this application, and invite the developer to come back with a proposal that maintains direct cycle as well as pedestrian access along Cavendish Street, designed to modern standards set out in Greater Manchester's Streets For All design guide and in Department for Transport guidance note LTN 1/20. I am sure that the Highways team at MCC and the Active Travel team at TfGM will, if asked, be happy to comment on how such a route could be provided within the space available.

I am also asking that the council **make a Section 106 agreement (s106)** with the applicant to fund safety improvements for pedestrians and cyclists at the junction of Cavendish Street and Higher Cambridge Street – the applicant themselves discuss the shortcomings of the existing junction layout in Section 4.2.1 of the Transport Statement ("*Cyclists have also been observed to queue on the footway to gain direct access to the Higher Cambridge Street/Cavendish Street junction (via a gap in the guard railings) rather than following the road markings which advise cyclists to dismount and use the controlled pedestrian crossings*"). The improvements might take the form of a CYCLOPS junction. CYCLOPS is a homegrown Greater Manchester innovation now frequently used on Highways schemes across the country to deliver safe pedestrian and cycle movements without undue impact on traffic flows.

For prospective occupants and passers-by alike, in line with the S106 tests as set out in Paragraph 58 of the National Planning Policy Framework (NPPF) 2024, a contribution to junction safety improvements improvement would be 'necessary to make the development acceptable in planning terms' (by contributing to an appropriate movement strategy for the site), 'directly related to the development' (given its proximity, the pressure added to the junction by the proposed threefold increase in residents, and in light of the wholly inadequate mitigation route proposed by the applicant), and 'fairly and reasonably related in scale and kind to the development' (given the stated threefold increase in residents explained by the applicant, so directly adding more pressure to the junction).

1 Legal Status of Cavendish Street

This section of Cavendish Street, an adopted Highway, was subject to a stopping up order dated 14.06.1996. That order required that "the Developer shall provide a new highway which shall be a footpath/cycleway". MMU have since installed physical signage stating that Cavendish Street "has not been dedicated as a Highway" and have bolted down uncomfortable and restrictive speed bumps across the route in an apparent attempt to dissuade cyclists from exercising their legal rights over this space. Both measures may be unlawful, as my understanding is that cyclists do retain a legal Right of Way along Cavendish Street, unchanged from when the entire road was an adopted highway, and the speed bumps are inaccessible to some Disabled users.

2 Cycling routes and planning policy

The case for walking and cycling and specifically for maintaining and improving high quality cycling networks is clear at every level of modern planning policy, including:

- NPPF 2024's "vision-led approach"
- LTN 1/20
- Places For Everyone Joint Development Plan Objectives 6, 7 and 10
- Places for Everyone Joint Development Plan policies JP-Strat14, JP-C1, JP-C5 and JP-C6
- GM Transport Strategy 2040 and the "Right Mix" targets
- Greater Manchester Streets for All strategy and Streets for All design guide
- Manchester City Council's Active Travel Strategy
- Manchester City Council's commitment to be a Zero Carbon city by 2038

The policy position is absolutely clear – changes to the existing road and cycle networks should make cycling more convenient for people, not less convenient.

This specific stretch of Cavendish Street is a key part of the existing cycle network. It appears on TfGM's Bee Network map as a Beeway ("the routes that get people from A to B … representing the most direct routes between crossing points.") and connects to the Stretford Road Busy Beeway ("corridors or crossing points on busier roads that will require a higher level of design intervention to improve cycling and walking.") It is also mapped on the TfGM Cycle Network.

The national standard for cycling infrastructure is DfT guidance note LTN 1/20. LTN 1/20 advises above all else that cycle routes and networks should be Safe, Direct, Comfortable, Attractive and Coherent. Introducing unnecessary diversions, junctions and bends into a well-used existing route undermines all of these core principles, resulting in a lower quality cycle network which will make it harder for the council to achieve its cycling objectives.

The applicant has offered various reasons why diverting cyclists is necessary but all of these reasons seem to be either existing problems, or problems designed into the scheme. The proposal is to demolish and redevelop the site – so considerations like limited space and the placement of entrances, shop frontages, planting and pedestrian areas are entirely within the applicant's scope to manage. Instead of starting with the problem "there is an existing busy cycle route across this site, how can I design to accommodate everyone's needs?", it seems the applicant has started with the conclusion "cyclists must be deterred" and instructed their consultants to post-rationalise that decision.

3 Misleading claims regarding safety

Page 22 of the Design & Access Statement refers to the "existing controversial link along Cavendish St., which is resulting in collisions of pedestrians, electric scooters, cyclists, etc."

However the map of recorded collisions, on page 18 of the Transport Statement submitted in the same planning application, shows no recorded collisions whatsoever on this link, only on the

adjacent main roads.

It appears the applicant is attempting to restrict cycle access based on a “problem” for which they have no evidence.

Yours sincerely,

[redacted]

****
This email and any files transmitted with it are confidential and intended solely for the use of the individual or entity to whom they are addressed. If you have received this email in error, please notify the sender, or [redacted] and then permanently delete the email, attachments and all copies.
The full text of the Council's email disclaimer is available at: www.manchester.gov.uk/emaildisclaimer.
Your personal data is very important to us. Please refer to our privacy notice at: www.manchester.gov.uk/privacy for further information.

This footnote also confirms that this email message has been swept for the presence of computer viruses.
****

Outlook

Fw: Comment on Planning Application 142888/FO/2025

From Planning <[redacted]
Date Mon 30/06/2025 10:35
To Lucy Harrison <[redacted]

Information, Delivery & Support Team
Planning, Building Control & Licensing
Growth & Development Directorate
Postal address: Manchester City Council, P O Box 532, Town Hall, Manchester M60 2LA
Location address: Level 6 Town Hall Extension, Manchester M2 5DB
Tel: 0161 234 4516

Please consider the environment before printing an e-mail.

From: [redacted]
Sent: 30 June 2025 09:23
To: Planning <[redacted]
Subject: Comment on Planning Application 142888/FO/2025

You don't often get email from [redacted] Learn why this is important

ALERT This message originated outside of the Manchester City Council network. **BE CAUTIOUS** before clicking any links or opening any attachments. Please remember your Cyber Training and report anything suspicious.

Dear Manchester Planning team,

I am writing to lodge an objection to planning application 142888/FO/2025 – Cambridge Halls Of Residence Cavendish Street Manchester M15 6TT.

My primary objection is that the proposals have been designed to deter cyclists from using the safest and most direct route through the site. This route has been open to cyclists ever since the road was first built; it is an essential, well-used part of the city's cycling network and therefore the proposal to deter and/or divert cycles away from Cavendish Street is directly at odds with Manchester City Council's planning, sustainability and transport policies.

The applicant has also made misleading claims regarding the road's legal status and regarding pedestrian safety which I will outline below.

I am asking that the council refuse this application, and invite the developer to come back with a proposal that maintains direct cycle as well as pedestrian access along Cavendish Street, designed to modern standards set out in Greater Manchester's Streets For All design guide and in Department for Transport guidance note LTN 1/20. I am sure that the Highways team at MCC and the Active Travel team at TfGM will, if asked, be happy to comment on how such a route could be provided within the space available.

I am also asking that the council make a Section 106 agreement (s106) with the applicant to fund safety improvements for pedestrians and cyclists at the junction of Cavendish Street and Higher Cambridge Street – the applicant themselves discuss the shortcomings of the existing junction layout in Section 4.2.1 of the Transport Statement ("Cyclists have also been observed to queue on the footway to gain direct access to the Higher Cambridge Street/Cavendish Street junction (via a gap in the guard railings) rather than following the road markings which advise cyclists to dismount and use the controlled pedestrian crossings"). The improvements might take the form of a CYCLOPS junction. CYCLOPS is a homegrown Greater Manchester innovation now frequently used on Highways schemes across the country to deliver safe pedestrian and cycle movements without undue impact on traffic flows.

For prospective occupants and passers-by alike, in line with the S106 tests as set out in Paragraph 58 of the National Planning Policy Framework (NPPF) 2024, a contribution to junction safety improvements improvement would be 'necessary to make the development acceptable in planning terms' (by contributing to an appropriate movement strategy for the site), 'directly related to the development' (given its proximity, the pressure added to the junction by the proposed threefold increase in residents, and in light of the wholly inadequate mitigation route proposed by the applicant), and 'fairly and reasonably related in scale and kind to the development' (given the stated threefold increase in residents explained by the applicant, so directly adding more pressure to the junction).

1 Legal Status of Cavendish Street

This section of Cavendish Street, an adopted Highway, was subject to a stopping up order dated 14.06.1996. That order required that "the Developer shall provide a new highway which shall be a footpath/cycleway". MMU have since installed physical signage stating that Cavendish Street "has not been dedicated as a Highway" and have bolted down uncomfortable and restrictive speed bumps across the route in an apparent attempt to dissuade cyclists from exercising their legal rights over this space. Both measures may be unlawful, as my understanding is that cyclists do retain a legal Right of Way along Cavendish Street, unchanged from when the entire road was an adopted highway, and the speed bumps are inaccessible to some Disabled users.

2 Cycling routes and planning policy

The case for walking and cycling and specifically for maintaining and improving high quality cycling networks is clear at every level of modern planning policy, including:

NPPF 2024's "vision-led approach"
LTN 1/20
Places For Everyone Joint Development Plan Objectives 6, 7 and 10
Places for Everyone Joint Development Plan policies JP-Strat14, JP-C1, JP-C5 and JP-C6
GM Transport Strategy 2040 and the "Right Mix" targets
Greater Manchester Streets for All strategy and Streets for All design guide
Manchester City Council's Active Travel Strategy
Manchester City Council's commitment to be a Zero Carbon city by 2038
The policy position is absolutely clear – changes to the existing road and cycle networks should make cycling more convenient for people, not less convenient.

This specific stretch of Cavendish Street is a key part of the existing cycle network. It appears on TfGM's Bee Network map as a Beeway ("the routes that get people from A to B … representing the most direct routes between crossing points.") and connects to the Stretford Road Busy Beeway

("corridors or crossing points on busier roads that will require a higher level of design intervention to improve cycling and walking.") It is also mapped on the TfGM Cycle Network.

The national standard for cycling infrastructure is DfT guidance note LTN 1/20. LTN 1/20 advises above all else that cycle routes and networks should be Safe, Direct, Comfortable, Attractive and Coherent. Introducing unnecessary diversions, junctions and bends into a well-used existing route undermines all of these core principles, resulting in a lower quality cycle network which will make it harder for the council to achieve its cycling objectives.

The applicant has offered various reasons why diverting cyclists is necessary but all of these reasons seem to be either existing problems, or problems designed into the scheme. The proposal is to demolish and redevelop the site – so considerations like limited space and the placement of entrances, shop frontages, planting and pedestrian areas are entirely within the applicant's scope to manage. Instead of starting with the problem "there is an existing busy cycle route across this site, how can I design to accommodate everyone's needs?", it seems the applicant has started with the conclusion "cyclists must be deterred" and instructed their consultants to post-rationalise that decision.

3 Misleading claims regarding safety

Page 22 of the Design & Access Statement refers to the "existing controversial link along Cavendish St., which is resulting in collisions of pedestrians, electric scooters, cyclists, etc."

However the map of recorded collisions, on page 18 of the Transport Statement submitted in the same planning application, shows no recorded collisions whatsoever on this link, only on the adjacent main roads.

It appears the applicant is attempting to restrict cycle access based on a "problem" for which they have no evidence.

Yours sincerely,

[redacted]

****
This email and any files transmitted with it are confidential and intended solely for the use of the individual or entity to whom they are addressed.
If you have received this email in error, please notify the sender, or [redacted] and then permanently delete the email, attachments and all copies.
The full text of the Council's email disclaimer is available at: www.manchester.gov.uk/emaildisclaimer.
Your personal data is very important to us. Please refer to our privacy notice at: www.manchester.gov.uk/privacy for further information.

This footnote also confirms that this email message has been swept for the presence of computer viruses.
****

Outlook

Fw: Comment on Planning Application 142888/FO/2025

From Planning <[redacted]
Date Mon 30/06/2025 08:51
To Lucy Harrison <[redacted]

Information, Delivery & Support Team
Planning, Building Control & Licensing
Growth & Development Directorate
Postal address: Manchester City Council, P O Box 532, Town Hall, Manchester M60 2LA
Location address: Level 6 Town Hall Extension, Manchester M2 5DB
Tel: 0161 234 4516

Please consider the environment before printing an e-mail.

From: [redacted]
Sent: 28 June 2025 14:37
To: Planning <[redacted]
Subject: Comment on Planning Application 142888/FO/2025

You don't often get email from [redacted] Learn why this is important

ALERT This message originated outside of the Manchester City Council network. **BE CAUTIOUS** before clicking any links or opening any attachments. Please remember your Cyber Training and report anything suspicious.

Dear Manchester Planning team,
I am writing to lodge an objection to planning application 142888/FO/2025 – Cambridge Halls Of Residence Cavendish Street Manchester M15 6TT.
My primary objection is that the proposals have been designed to deter cyclists from using the safest and most direct route through the site. This route has been open to cyclists ever since the road was first built; it is an essential, well-used part of the city's cycling network and therefore the proposal to deter and/or divert cycles away from Cavendish Street is directly at odds with Manchester City Council's planning, sustainability and transport policies.
Since the opening of the Chorlton Cycleway, I have cycled through Cavendish Street most weeks in order to get between my home in Chorlton variously to the University of Manchester, MMU, Central Library and Town Hall, Ardwick Green, Piccadilly Station and all points in between. The stretch along Stretford Rd onto Cavendish St often feels scary, and would benefit from better separation from traffic, but the direct route through Cavendish St to All Saints Park feels safe. I'm happy to slow down while cycling through a shared space, and catch my breath, before continuing on my journey whether that's along the Oxford Rd cycleway to the north and south, or along Grosvenor Street to the A6 and beyond. Better segregation on this stretch would be welcome of course, see below.
The applicant has also made misleading claims regarding the road's legal status and regarding pedestrian safety which I will outline below.

I am asking that the council refuse this application, and invite the developer to come back with a proposal that maintains direct cycle as well as pedestrian access along Cavendish Street, designed to modern standards set out in Greater Manchester's Streets For All design guide and in Department for Transport guidance note LTN 1/20. I am sure that the Highways team at MCC and the Active Travel team at TfGM will, if asked, be happy to comment on how such a route could be provided within the space available.

I am also asking that the council make a Section 106 agreement (s106) with the applicant to fund safety improvements for pedestrians and cyclists at the junction of Cavendish Street and Higher Cambridge Street – the applicant themselves discuss the shortcomings of the existing junction layout in Section 4.2.1 of the Transport Statement ("Cyclists have also been observed to queue on the footway to gain direct access to the Higher Cambridge Street/Cavendish Street junction (via a gap in the guard railings) rather than following the road markings which advise cyclists to dismount and use the controlled pedestrian crossings"). The improvements might take the form of a CYCLOPS junction. CYCLOPS is a homegrown Greater Manchester innovation now frequently used on Highways schemes across the country to deliver safe pedestrian and cycle movements without undue impact on traffic flows.

For prospective occupants and passers-by alike, in line with the S106 tests as set out in Paragraph 58 of the National Planning Policy Framework (NPPF) 2024, a contribution to junction safety improvements improvement would be 'necessary to make the development acceptable in planning terms' (by contributing to an appropriate movement strategy for the site), 'directly related to the development' (given its proximity, the pressure added to the junction by the proposed threefold increase in residents, and in light of the wholly inadequate mitigation route proposed by the applicant), and 'fairly and reasonably related in scale and kind to the development' (given the stated threefold increase in residents explained by the applicant, so directly adding more pressure to the junction).

1 Legal Status of Cavendish Street

This section of Cavendish Street, an adopted Highway, was subject to a stopping up order dated 14.06.1996. That order required that "the Developer shall provide a new highway which shall be a footpath/cycleway". MMU have since installed physical signage stating that Cavendish Street "has not been dedicated as a Highway" and have bolted down uncomfortable and restrictive speed bumps across the route in an apparent attempt to dissuade cyclists from exercising their legal rights over this space. Both measures may be unlawful, as my understanding is that cyclists do retain a legal Right of Way along Cavendish Street, unchanged from when the entire road was an adopted highway, and the speed bumps are inaccessible to some Disabled users.

2 Cycling routes and planning policy

The case for walking and cycling and specifically for maintaining and improving high quality cycling networks is clear at every level of modern planning policy, including:

- NPPF 2024's "vision-led approach"
- LTN 1/20
- Places For Everyone Joint Development Plan Objectives 6, 7 and 10
- Places for Everyone Joint Development Plan policies JP-Strat14, JP-C1, JP-C5 and JP-C6
- GM Transport Strategy 2040 and the "Right Mix" targets
- Greater Manchester Streets for All strategy and Streets for All design guide
- Manchester City Council's Active Travel Strategy
- Manchester City Council's commitment to be a Zero Carbon city by 2038

The policy position is absolutely clear – changes to the existing road and cycle networks should make cycling more convenient for people, not less convenient.

This specific stretch of Cavendish Street is a key part of the existing cycle network. It appears on TfGM's Bee Network map as a Beeway ("the routes that get people from A to B … representing the most direct routes between crossing points.") and connects to the Stretford Road Busy Beeway

("corridors or crossing points on busier roads that will require a higher level of design intervention to improve cycling and walking.") It is also mapped on the TfGM Cycle Network.
The national standard for cycling infrastructure is DfT guidance note LTN 1/20. LTN 1/20 advises above all else that cycle routes and networks should be Safe, Direct, Comfortable, Attractive and Coherent. Introducing unnecessary diversions, junctions and bends into a well-used existing route undermines all of these core principles, resulting in a lower quality cycle network which will make it harder for the council to achieve its cycling objectives.
The applicant has offered various reasons why diverting cyclists is necessary but all of these reasons seem to be either existing problems, or problems designed into the scheme. The proposal is to demolish and redevelop the site – so considerations like limited space and the placement of entrances, shop frontages, planting and pedestrian areas are entirely within the applicant's scope to manage. Instead of starting with the problem "there is an existing busy cycle route across this site, how can I design to accommodate everyone's needs?", it seems the applicant has started with the conclusion "cyclists must be deterred" and instructed their consultants to post-rationalise that decision.
3 Misleading claims regarding safety
Page 22 of the Design & Access Statement refers to the "existing controversial link along Cavendish St., which is resulting in collisions of pedestrians, electric scooters, cyclists, etc."
However the map of recorded collisions, on page 18 of the Transport Statement submitted in the same planning application, shows no recorded collisions whatsoever on this link, only on the adjacent main roads.
It appears the applicant is attempting to restrict cycle access based on a "problem" for which they have no evidence.
Yours sincerely,
[redacted]

****
This email and any files transmitted with it are confidential and intended solely for the use of the individual or entity to whom they are addressed.
If you have received this email in error, please notify the sender, or [redacted] and then permanently delete the email, attachments and all copies.
The full text of the Council's email disclaimer is available at: www.manchester.gov.uk/emaildisclaimer.
Your personal data is very important to us. Please refer to our privacy notice at: www.manchester.gov.uk/privacy for further information.

This footnote also confirms that this email message has been swept for the presence of computer viruses.
****

Outlook

Fw: Comment on Planning Application 142888/FO/2025

From Planning <[redacted]
Date Wed 02/07/2025 08:50
To Lucy Harrison <[redacted]

Information, Delivery & Support Team
Planning, Building Control & Licensing
Growth & Development Directorate
Postal address: Manchester City Council, P O Box 532, Town Hall, Manchester M60 2LA
Location address: Level 6 Town Hall Extension, Manchester M2 5DB
Tel: 0161 234 4516

Please consider the environment before printing an e-mail.

From: [redacted]
Sent: 01 July 2025 16:07
To: Planning <[redacted]
Subject: Comment on Planning Application 142888/FO/2025

You don't often get email from [redacted] Learn why this is important

ALERT This message originated outside of the Manchester City Council network. **BE CAUTIOUS** before clicking any links or opening any attachments. Please remember your Cyber Training and report anything suspicious.

Subject: Comment on Planning Application 142888/FO/2025

Dear Manchester Planning team,

I am writing to lodge an objection to planning application **142888/FO/2025** – Cambridge Halls Of Residence Cavendish Street Manchester M15 6TT.

My primary objection is that the proposals have been designed to deter cyclists from using the safest and most direct route through the site. This route has been open to cyclists ever since the road was first built; it is an essential, well-used part of the city's cycling network and therefore the proposal to deter and/or divert

cycles away from Cavendish Street is directly at odds with Manchester City Council's planning, sustainability and transport policies.

Whilst I don't live local to Cavendish St, I am a regular user of this route having used it for work commutes for many years. This proposed diversion will significantly impact safe cycling/wheeling through this area. The existing g mostly traffic free route needs to be kept in place!

The applicant has also made misleading claims regarding the road's legal status and regarding pedestrian safety which I will outline below.

I am asking that the council **refuse** this application, and invite the developer to come back with a proposal that maintains direct cycle as well as pedestrian access along Cavendish Street, designed to modern standards set out in Greater Manchester's Streets For All design guide and in Department for Transport guidance note LTN 1/20. I am sure that the Highways team at MCC and the Active Travel team at TfGM will, if asked, be happy to comment on how such a route could be provided within the space available.

I am also asking that the council **make a Section 106 agreement (s106)** with the applicant to fund safety improvements for pedestrians and cyclists at the junction of Cavendish Street and Higher Cambridge Street – the applicant themselves discuss the shortcomings of the existing junction layout in Section 4.2.1 of the Transport Statement ("*Cyclists have also been observed to queue on the footway to gain direct access to the Higher Cambridge Street/Cavendish Street junction (via a gap in the guard railings) rather than following the road markings which advise cyclists to dismount and use the controlled pedestrian crossings*"). The improvements might take the form of a CYCLOPS junction. CYCLOPS is a homegrown Greater Manchester innovation now frequently used on Highways schemes across the country to deliver safe pedestrian and cycle movements without undue impact on traffic flows.

For prospective occupants and passers-by alike, in line with the S106 tests as set out in Paragraph 58 of the National Planning Policy Framework (NPPF) 2024, a contribution to junction safety improvements improvement would be 'necessary to make the development acceptable in planning terms' (by contributing to an appropriate movement strategy for the site), 'directly related to the development' (given its proximity, the pressure added to the junction by the proposed threefold increase in residents, and in light of the wholly inadequate mitigation route proposed by the applicant), and 'fairly and reasonably related in scale and kind to the development' (given the stated threefold increase in residents explained by the applicant, so directly adding more pressure to the junction).

1 Legal Status of Cavendish Street

This section of Cavendish Street, an adopted Highway, was subject to a stopping up order dated 14.06.1996. That order required that "the Developer shall provide a new highway which shall be a footpath/cycleway". MMU have since installed physical signage stating that Cavendish Street "has not been dedicated as a Highway" and have bolted down uncomfortable and restrictive speed bumps across the route in an apparent attempt to dissuade cyclists from exercising their legal rights over this space. Both measures may be unlawful, as my understanding is that cyclists do retain a legal Right of Way along Cavendish Street, unchanged from when the entire road was an adopted highway, and the speed bumps are inaccessible to some Disabled users.

2 Cycling routes and planning policy

The case for walking and cycling and specifically for maintaining and improving high quality cycling networks is clear at every level of modern planning policy, including:

- NPPF 2024's "vision-led approach"
- LTN 1/20
- Places For Everyone Joint Development Plan Objectives 6, 7 and 10
- Places for Everyone Joint Development Plan policies JP-Strat14, JP-C1, JP-C5 and JP-C6
- GM Transport Strategy 2040 and the "Right Mix" targets
- Greater Manchester Streets for All strategy and Streets for All design guide
- Manchester City Council's Active Travel Strategy
- Manchester City Council's commitment to be a Zero Carbon city by 2038

The policy position is absolutely clear – changes to the existing road and cycle networks should make cycling more convenient for people, not less convenient.

This specific stretch of Cavendish Street is a key part of the existing cycle network. It appears on TfGM's Bee Network map as a Beeway ("the routes that get people from A to B … representing the most direct routes between crossing points.") and connects to the Stretford Road Busy Beeway ("corridors or crossing points on busier roads that will require a higher level of design intervention to improve cycling and walking.") It is also mapped on the TfGM Cycle Network.

The national standard for cycling infrastructure is DfT guidance note LTN 1/20. LTN 1/20 advises above all else that cycle routes and networks should be Safe, Direct, Comfortable, Attractive and Coherent. Introducing unnecessary diversions, junctions and bends into a well-used existing route undermines all of these core principles, resulting in a lower quality cycle network which will make it harder for the council to achieve its cycling objectives.

The applicant has offered various reasons why diverting cyclists is necessary but all of these reasons seem to be either existing problems, or problems designed into the scheme. The proposal is to demolish and redevelop the site – so considerations like limited space and the placement of entrances, shop frontages, planting and pedestrian areas are entirely within the applicant's scope to manage. Instead of starting with the problem "there is an existing busy cycle route across this site, how can I design to accommodate everyone's needs?", it seems the applicant has started with the conclusion "cyclists must be deterred" and instructed their consultants to post-rationalise that decision.

3 Misleading claims regarding safety

Page 22 of the Design & Access Statement refers to the "existing controversial link along Cavendish St., which is resulting in collisions of pedestrians, electric scooters, cyclists, etc."

However the map of recorded collisions, on page 18 of the Transport Statement submitted in the same planning application, shows no recorded collisions whatsoever on this link, only on the adjacent main roads.

It appears the applicant is attempting to restrict cycle access based on a "problem" for which they have no evidence.

Yours sincerely

[redacted]

[redacted]

[redacted]

[redacted]

[redacted]

Sent from my iPhone

****
This email and any files transmitted with it are confidential and intended solely for the use of the individual or entity to whom they are addressed.
If you have received this email in error, please notify the sender, or [redacted] and then permanently delete the email, attachments and all copies.
The full text of the Council's email disclaimer is available at: www.manchester.gov.uk/emaildisclaimer.
Your personal data is very important to us. Please refer to our privacy notice at: www.manchester.gov.uk/privacy for further information.

This footnote also confirms that this email message has been swept for the presence of computer viruses.
****

Outlook

Fw: Comment on Planning Application 142888/FO/2025

From Planning <[redacted]>
Date Mon 14/07/2025 14:05
To Lucy Harrison <[redacted]>

Information, Delivery & Support Team
Planning, Building Control & Licensing
Growth & Development Directorate
Postal address: Manchester City Council, P O Box 532, Town Hall, Manchester M60 2LA
Location address: Level 6 Town Hall Extension, Manchester M2 5DB
Tel: 0161 234 4516

Please consider the environment before printing an e-mail.

From: [redacted]
Sent: 11 July 2025 16:45
To: Planning <[redacted]>
Subject: Comment on Planning Application 142888/FO/2025

You don't often get email from [redacted] Learn why this is important

ALERT This message originated outside of the Manchester City Council network. **BE CAUTIOUS** before clicking any links or opening any attachments. Please remember your Cyber Training and report anything suspicious.

Dear Manchester Planning team,

I am writing to lodge an objection to planning application **142888/FO/2025** – Cambridge Halls Of Residence Cavendish Street Manchester M15 6TT.

My primary objection is that the proposals have been designed to deter cyclists from using the safest and most direct route through the site. This route has been open to cyclists ever since the road was first built; it is an essential, well-used part of the city's cycling network and therefore the proposal to deter and/or divert cycles away from Cavendish Street is directly at odds with Manchester City Council's planning, sustainability and transport policies.

The applicant has also made misleading claims regarding the road's legal status and regarding pedestrian safety which I will outline below.

I am asking that the council **refuse** this application, and invite the developer to come back with a proposal that maintains direct cycle as well as pedestrian

access along Cavendish Street, designed to modern standards set out in Greater Manchester's Streets For All design guide and in Department for Transport guidance note LTN 1/20. I am sure that the Highways team at MCC and the Active Travel team at TfGM will, if asked, be happy to comment on how such a route could be provided within the space available.

I am also asking that the council **make a Section 106 agreement (s106)** with the applicant to fund safety improvements for pedestrians and cyclists at the junction of Cavendish Street and Higher Cambridge Street – the applicant themselves discuss the shortcomings of the existing junction layout in Section 4.2.1 of the Transport Statement ("*Cyclists have also been observed to queue on the footway to gain direct access to the Higher Cambridge Street/Cavendish Street junction (via a gap in the guard railings) rather than following the road markings which advise cyclists to dismount and use the controlled pedestrian crossings*"). The improvements might take the form of a CYCLOPS junction. CYCLOPS is a homegrown Greater Manchester innovation now frequently used on Highways schemes across the country to deliver safe pedestrian and cycle movements without undue impact on traffic flows.

For prospective occupants and passers-by alike, in line with the S106 tests as set out in Paragraph 58 of the National Planning Policy Framework (NPPF) 2024, a contribution to junction safety improvements improvement would be 'necessary to make the development acceptable in planning terms' (by contributing to an appropriate movement strategy for the site), 'directly related to the development' (given its proximity, the pressure added to the junction by the proposed threefold increase in residents, and in light of the wholly inadequate mitigation route proposed by the applicant), and 'fairly and reasonably related in scale and kind to the development' (given the stated threefold increase in residents explained by the applicant, so directly adding more pressure to the junction).

1 Legal Status of Cavendish Street

This section of Cavendish Street, an adopted Highway, was subject to a stopping up order dated 14.06.1996. That order required that "the Developer shall provide a new highway which shall be a footpath/cycleway". MMU have since installed physical signage stating that Cavendish Street "has not been dedicated as a Highway" and have bolted down uncomfortable and restrictive speed bumps across the route in an apparent attempt to dissuade cyclists from exercising their legal rights over this space. Both measures may be unlawful, as my understanding is that cyclists do retain a legal Right of Way along Cavendish Street, unchanged from when the entire road was an adopted highway, and the speed bumps are inaccessible to some Disabled users.

2 Cycling routes and planning policy

The case for walking and cycling and specifically for maintaining and improving high quality cycling networks is clear at every level of modern planning policy, including:

- NPPF 2024's "vision-led approach"
- LTN 1/20
- Places For Everyone Joint Development Plan Objectives 6, 7 and 10
- Places for Everyone Joint Development Plan policies JP-Strat14, JP-C1, JP-C5 and JP-C6
- GM Transport Strategy 2040 and the "Right Mix" targets
- Greater Manchester Streets for All strategy and Streets for All design guide
- Manchester City Council's Active Travel Strategy
- Manchester City Council's commitment to be a Zero Carbon city by 2038

The policy position is absolutely clear – changes to the existing road and cycle networks should make cycling more convenient for people, not less convenient.

This specific stretch of Cavendish Street is a key part of the existing cycle network. It appears on TfGM's Bee Network map as a Beeway ("the routes that get people from A to B … representing the most direct routes between crossing points.") and connects to the Stretford Road Busy Beeway ("corridors or crossing points on busier roads that will require a higher level of design intervention to improve cycling and walking.") It is also mapped on the TfGM Cycle Network.

The national standard for cycling infrastructure is DfT guidance note LTN 1/20. LTN 1/20 advises above all else that cycle routes and networks should be Safe, Direct, Comfortable, Attractive and Coherent. Introducing unnecessary diversions, junctions and bends into a well-used existing route undermines all of these core principles, resulting in a lower quality cycle network which will make it harder for the council to achieve its cycling objectives.

The applicant has offered various reasons why diverting cyclists is necessary but all of these reasons seem to be either existing problems, or problems designed into the scheme. The proposal is to demolish and redevelop the site – so considerations like limited space and the placement of entrances, shop frontages, planting and pedestrian areas are entirely within the applicant's scope to manage. Instead of starting with the problem "there is an existing busy cycle route across this site, how can I design to accommodate everyone's needs?", it seems the

applicant has started with the conclusion “cyclists must be deterred” and instructed their consultants to post-rationalise that decision.

3 Misleading claims regarding safety

Page 22 of the Design & Access Statement refers to the “existing controversial link along Cavendish St., which is resulting in collisions of pedestrians, electric scooters, cyclists, etc.”

However, the map of recorded collisions, on page 18 of the Transport Statement submitted in the same planning application, shows no recorded collisions whatsoever on this link, only on the adjacent main roads.

It appears the applicant is attempting to restrict cycle access based on a “problem” for which they have no evidence.

Yours sincerely,

[redacted]

[redacted]

Sent from Outlook for iOS

****
This email and any files transmitted with it are confidential and intended solely for the use of the individual or entity to whom they are addressed.
If you have received this email in error, please notify the sender, or [redacted] and then permanently delete the email, attachments and all copies.
The full text of the Council's email disclaimer is available at: www.manchester.gov.uk/emaildisclaimer.
Your personal data is very important to us. Please refer to our privacy notice at: www.manchester.gov.uk/privacy for further information.

This footnote also confirms that this email message has been swept for the presence of computer viruses.
****

Outlook

Fw: Comment on Planning Application 142888/FO/2025

From Planning <[redacted]
Date Fri 04/07/2025 14:10
To Lucy Harrison <[redacted]

Information, Delivery & Support Team
Planning, Building Control & Licensing
Growth & Development Directorate
Postal address: Manchester City Council, P O Box 532, Town Hall, Manchester M60 2LA
Location address: Level 6 Town Hall Extension, Manchester M2 5DB
Tel: 0161 234 4516

Please consider the environment before printing an e-mail.

From: [redacted]
Sent: 01 July 2025 11:43
To: Planning <[redacted]
Subject: Comment on Planning Application 142888/FO/2025

You don't often get email from [redacted] Learn why this is important

ALERT This message originated outside of the Manchester City Council network. **BE CAUTIOUS** before clicking any links or opening any attachments. Please remember your Cyber Training and report anything suspicious.

Dear Manchester Planning team,

I am writing to lodge an objection to planning application **142888/FO/2025** – Cambridge Halls Of Residence Cavendish Street Manchester M15 6TT.

My primary objection is that the proposals have been designed to deter cyclists from using the safest and most direct route through the site. This route has been open to cyclists ever since the road was first built; it is an essential, well-used part of the city's cycling network and therefore the proposal to deter and/or divert cycles away from Cavendish Street is directly at odds with Manchester City Council's planning, sustainability and transport policies.

I regularly use this route to visit Whalley Range, Hulme and Moss Side. It is a great route that helps to link areas up. Without that I would be putting myself at risk of vehicular conflict.

The applicant has also made misleading claims regarding the road's legal status and regarding pedestrian safety which I will outline below.

I am asking that the council **refuse** this application, and invite the developer to come back with a proposal that maintains direct cycle as well as pedestrian access along Cavendish Street, designed to modern standards set out in Greater Manchester's Streets For All design guide and in Department for Transport guidance note LTN 1/20. I am sure that the Highways team at MCC and the Active Travel team at TfGM will, if asked, be happy to comment on how such a route could be provided within the space available.

I am also asking that the council **make a Section 106 agreement (s106)** with the applicant to fund safety improvements for pedestrians and cyclists at the junction of Cavendish Street and Higher Cambridge Street – the applicant themselves discuss the shortcomings of the existing junction layout in Section 4.2.1 of the Transport Statement ("*Cyclists have also been observed to queue on the footway to gain direct access to the Higher Cambridge Street/Cavendish Street junction (via a gap in the guard railings) rather than following the road markings which advise cyclists to dismount and use the controlled pedestrian crossings*"). The improvements might take the form of a CYCLOPS junction. CYCLOPS is a homegrown Greater Manchester innovation now frequently used on Highways schemes across the country to deliver safe pedestrian and cycle movements without undue impact on traffic flows.

For prospective occupants and passers-by alike, in line with the S106 tests as set out in Paragraph 58 of the National Planning Policy Framework (NPPF) 2024, a contribution to junction safety improvements improvement would be 'necessary to make the development acceptable in planning terms' (by contributing to an appropriate movement strategy for the site), 'directly related to the development' (given its proximity, the pressure added to the junction by the proposed threefold increase in residents, and in light of the wholly inadequate mitigation route proposed by the applicant), and 'fairly and reasonably related in scale and kind to the development' (given the stated threefold increase in residents explained by the applicant, so directly adding more pressure to the junction).

1 Legal Status of Cavendish Street

This section of Cavendish Street, an adopted Highway, was subject to a stopping up order dated 14.06.1996. That order required that "the Developer shall provide a new highway which shall be a footpath/cycleway". MMU have since installed physical signage stating that Cavendish Street "has not been dedicated as a Highway" and have bolted down uncomfortable and restrictive speed bumps

across the route in an apparent attempt to dissuade cyclists from exercising their legal rights over this space. Both measures may be unlawful, as my understanding is that cyclists do retain a legal Right of Way along Cavendish Street, unchanged from when the entire road was an adopted highway, and the speed bumps are inaccessible to some Disabled users.

2 Cycling routes and planning policy

The case for walking and cycling and specifically for maintaining and improving high quality cycling networks is clear at every level of modern planning policy, including:

- NPPF 2024's "vision-led approach"
- LTN 1/20
- Places For Everyone Joint Development Plan Objectives 6, 7 and 10
- Places for Everyone Joint Development Plan policies JP-Strat14, JP-C1, JP-C5 and JP-C6
- GM Transport Strategy 2040 and the "Right Mix" targets
- Greater Manchester Streets for All strategy and Streets for All design guide
- Manchester City Council's Active Travel Strategy
- Manchester City Council's commitment to be a Zero Carbon city by 2038

The policy position is absolutely clear – changes to the existing road and cycle networks should make cycling more convenient for people, not less convenient.

This specific stretch of Cavendish Street is a key part of the existing cycle network. It appears on TfGM's Bee Network map as a Beeway ("the routes that get people from A to B … representing the most direct routes between crossing points.") and connects to the Stretford Road Busy Beeway ("corridors or crossing points on busier roads that will require a higher level of design intervention to improve cycling and walking.") It is also mapped on the TfGM Cycle Network.

The national standard for cycling infrastructure is DfT guidance note LTN 1/20. LTN 1/20 advises above all else that cycle routes and networks should be Safe, Direct, Comfortable, Attractive and Coherent. Introducing unnecessary diversions, junctions and bends into a well-used existing route undermines all of these core principles, resulting in a lower quality cycle network which will make it harder for the council to achieve its cycling objectives.

The applicant has offered various reasons why diverting cyclists is necessary but all of these reasons seem to be either existing problems, or problems designed into the scheme. The proposal is to demolish and redevelop the site – so considerations like limited space and the placement of entrances, shop frontages, planting and pedestrian areas are entirely within the applicant's scope to manage. Instead of starting with the problem "there is an existing busy cycle route across this site, how can I design to accommodate everyone's needs?", it seems the applicant has started with the conclusion "cyclists must be deterred" and instructed their consultants to post-rationalise that decision.

3 Misleading claims regarding safety

Page 22 of the Design & Access Statement refers to the "existing controversial link along Cavendish St., which is resulting in collisions of pedestrians, electric scooters, cyclists, etc."

However the map of recorded collisions, on page 18 of the Transport Statement submitted in the same planning application, shows no recorded collisions whatsoever on this link, only on the adjacent main roads.

It appears the applicant is attempting to restrict cycle access based on a "problem" for which they have no evidence.

Yours sincerely,

[redacted]

****
This email and any files transmitted with it are confidential and intended solely for the use of the individual or entity to whom they are addressed.
If you have received this email in error, please notify the sender, or [redacted] and then permanently delete the email, attachments and all copies.
The full text of the Council's email disclaimer is available at: www.manchester.gov.uk/emaildisclaimer.
Your personal data is very important to us. Please refer to our privacy notice at: www.manchester.gov.uk/privacy for further information.

This footnote also confirms that this email message has been swept for the presence of computer viruses.
****

Outlook

Fw: Comment on Planning Application 142888/FO/2025

From Planning <[redacted]
Date Mon 14/07/2025 14:05
To Lucy Harrison <[redacted]

Information, Delivery & Support Team
Planning, Building Control & Licensing
Growth & Development Directorate
Postal address: Manchester City Council, P O Box 532, Town Hall, Manchester M60 2LA
Location address: Level 6 Town Hall Extension, Manchester M2 5DB
Tel: 0161 234 4516

Please consider the environment before printing an e-mail.

From: [redacted]
Sent: 11 July 2025 21:49
To: Planning <[redacted]
Subject: Comment on Planning Application 142888/FO/2025

You don't often get email from [redacted] Learn why this is important

ALERT This message originated outside of the Manchester City Council network. **BE CAUTIOUS** before clicking any links or opening any attachments. Please remember your Cyber Training and report anything suspicious.

Dear Manchester Planning team,
I am writing to lodge an objection to planning application **142888/FO/2025** – Cambridge Halls Of Residence Cavendish Street Manchester M15 6TT.
My primary objection is that the proposals will directly effect me as this is the main route I use when cycling into town from Chorlton. The route along Cavendish Street that will be blocked provides me with car free safe access from were Cavendish Street meets Higher Cambridge Street to a safe left turn onto Oxford Road. There are traffic lights at both the Oxford Road and Cambridge Street ends of Cavendish Street that make entering and exiting this car free streach of the road considerably safer. The proposed alternative route involves having to cross a busy Cambridge Street at a junction with no traffic lights that is considerably more dangours than the current option.

The plans submitted by MMU appear to have been designed to deter cyclists from using the safest and most direct route through the site. This route has been open to cyclists ever since the road was first built; it is an essential, well-used part of the city's cycling network and therefore the proposal to divert cycles away from Cavendish Street is directly at odds with Manchester City Council's planning, sustainability and transport policies.
The applicant has also made misleading claims regarding the road's legal status and regarding pedestrian safety which I will outline below.

I am asking that the council **refuse** this application, and invite the developer to come back with a proposal that maintains direct cycle as well as pedestrian access along Cavendish Street, designed to modern standards set out in Greater Manchester's Streets For All design guide and in Department for Transport guidance note LTN 1/20. I am sure that the Highways team at MCC and the Active Travel team at TfGM will, if asked, be happy to comment on how such a route could be provided within the space available.

I am also asking that the council **make a Section 106 agreement (s106)** with the applicant to fund safety improvements for pedestrians and cyclists at the junction of Cavendish Street and Higher Cambridge Street – the applicant themselves discuss the shortcomings of the existing junction layout in Section 4.2.1 of the Transport Statement ("*Cyclists have also been observed to queue on the footway to gain direct access to the Higher Cambridge Street/Cavendish Street junction (via a gap in the guard railings) rather than following the road markings which advise cyclists to dismount and use the controlled pedestrian crossings*"). The improvements might take the form of a CYCLOPS junction. CYCLOPS is a homegrown Greater Manchester innovation now frequently used on Highways schemes across the country to deliver safe pedestrian and cycle movements without undue impact on traffic flows.

For prospective occupants and passers-by alike, in line with the S106 tests as set out in Paragraph 58 of the National Planning Policy Framework (NPPF) 2024, a contribution to junction safety improvements improvement would be 'necessary to make the development acceptable in planning terms' (by contributing to an appropriate movement strategy for the site), 'directly related to the development' (given its proximity, the pressure added to the junction by the proposed threefold increase in residents, and in light of the wholly inadequate mitigation route proposed by the applicant), and 'fairly and reasonably related in scale and kind to the development' (given the stated threefold increase in residents explained by the applicant, so directly adding more pressure to the junction).

1 Legal Status of Cavendish Street

This section of Cavendish Street, an adopted Highway, was subject to a stopping up order dated 14.06.1996. That order required that "the Developer shall provide a new highway which shall be a footpath/cycleway". MMU have since installed physical signage stating that Cavendish Street "has not been dedicated as a Highway" and have bolted down uncomfortable and restrictive speed bumps across the route in an apparent attempt to dissuade cyclists from exercising their legal rights over this space. Both measures may be unlawful, as my understanding is that cyclists do retain a legal Right of Way along Cavendish Street, unchanged from when the entire road was an adopted highway, and the speed bumps are inaccessible to some Disabled users.

2 Cycling routes and planning policy

The case for walking and cycling and specifically for maintaining and improving high quality cycling networks is clear at every level of modern planning policy, including:

- NPPF 2024's "vision-led approach"
- LTN 1/20
- Places For Everyone Joint Development Plan Objectives 6, 7 and 10
- Places for Everyone Joint Development Plan policies JP-Strat14, JP-C1, JP-C5 and JP-C6
- GM Transport Strategy 2040 and the "Right Mix" targets
- Greater Manchester Streets for All strategy and Streets for All design guide
- Manchester City Council's Active Travel Strategy
- Manchester City Council's commitment to be a Zero Carbon city by 2038

The policy position is absolutely clear – changes to the existing road and cycle networks should make cycling more convenient for people, not less convenient.

This specific stretch of Cavendish Street is a key part of the existing cycle network. It appears on TfGM's Bee Network map as a Beeway ("the routes that get people from A to B … representing the most direct routes between crossing points.") and connects to the Stretford Road Busy Beeway

("corridors or crossing points on busier roads that will require a higher level of design intervention to improve cycling and walking.") It is also mapped on the TfGM Cycle Network.
The national standard for cycling infrastructure is DfT guidance note LTN 1/20. LTN 1/20 advises above all else that cycle routes and networks should be Safe, Direct, Comfortable, Attractive and Coherent. Introducing unnecessary diversions, junctions and bends into a well-used existing route undermines all of these core principles, resulting in a lower quality cycle network which will make it harder for the council to achieve its cycling objectives.
The applicant has offered various reasons why diverting cyclists is necessary but all of these reasons seem to be either existing problems, or problems designed into the scheme. The proposal is to demolish and redevelop the site – so considerations like limited space and the placement of entrances, shop frontages, planting and pedestrian areas are entirely within the applicant's scope to manage. Instead of starting with the problem "there is an existing busy cycle route across this site, how can I design to accommodate everyone's needs?", it seems the applicant has started with the conclusion "cyclists must be deterred" and instructed their consultants to post-rationalise that decision.
3 Misleading claims regarding safety
Page 22 of the Design & Access Statement refers to the "existing controversial link along Cavendish St., which is resulting in collisions of pedestrians, electric scooters, cyclists, etc."
However the map of recorded collisions, on page 18 of the Transport Statement submitted in the same planning application, shows no recorded collisions whatsoever on this link, only on the adjacent main roads.
It appears the applicant is attempting to restrict cycle access based on a "problem" for which they have no evidence.
Yours sincerely,
[redacted]

[redacted]

-
-

****
This email and any files transmitted with it are confidential and intended solely for the use of the individual or entity to whom they are addressed.
If you have received this email in error, please notify the sender, or [redacted] and then permanently delete the email, attachments and all copies.
The full text of the Council's email disclaimer is available at: www.manchester.gov.uk/emaildisclaimer.
Your personal data is very important to us. Please refer to our privacy notice at: www.manchester.gov.uk/privacy for further information.

This footnote also confirms that this email message has been swept for the presence of computer viruses.
****

Outlook

Fw: Comment on Planning Application 142888/FO/2025

From Planning <[redacted]>
Date Tue 01/07/2025 09:08
To Lucy Harrison <[redacted]>

Information, Delivery & Support Team
Planning, Building Control & Licensing
Growth & Development Directorate
Postal address: Manchester City Council, P O Box 532, Town Hall, Manchester M60 2LA
Location address: Level 6 Town Hall Extension, Manchester M2 5DB
Tel: 0161 234 4516

Please consider the environment before printing an e-mail.

From: [redacted]
Sent: 30 June 2025 22:30
To: Planning <[redacted]>
Subject: Comment on Planning Application 142888/FO/2025

You don't often get email from [redacted] Learn why this is important

ALERT This message originated outside of the Manchester City Council network. **BE CAUTIOUS** before clicking any links or opening any attachments. Please remember your Cyber Training and report anything suspicious.

Dear Manchester Planning team,

I am writing to lodge an objection to planning application 142888/FO/2025 – Cambridge Halls Of Residence Cavendish Street Manchester M15 6TT.

My primary objection is that the proposals have been designed to deter cyclists from using the safest and most direct route through the site. This route has been open to cyclists ever since the road was first built; it is an essential, well-used part of the city's cycling network and therefore the proposal to deter and/or divert cycles away from Cavendish Street is directly at odds with Manchester City Council's planning, sustainability and transport policies.

As an employee of the University of Manchester, I work and often shop on or near Oxford Road. The Cavendish Street cycle and pedestrian path is a safe, convenient, and pleasant route to access areas to the west of Oxford Road. The availability of this route makes Oxford Road a more appealing place to work and shop.

The applicant has also made misleading claims regarding the road's legal status and regarding pedestrian safety which I will outline below.

I am asking that the council refuse this application, and invite the developer to come back with a

proposal that maintains direct cycle as well as pedestrian access along Cavendish Street, designed to modern standards set out in Greater Manchester's Streets For All design guide and in Department for Transport guidance note LTN 1/20. I am sure that the Highways team at MCC and the Active Travel team at TfGM will, if asked, be happy to comment on how such a route could be provided within the space available.

I am also asking that the council make a Section 106 agreement (s106) with the applicant to fund safety improvements for pedestrians and cyclists at the junction of Cavendish Street and Higher Cambridge Street – the applicant themselves discuss the shortcomings of the existing junction layout in Section 4.2.1 of the Transport Statement ("Cyclists have also been observed to queue on the footway to gain direct access to the Higher Cambridge Street/Cavendish Street junction (via a gap in the guard railings) rather than following the road markings which advise cyclists to dismount and use the controlled pedestrian crossings"). The improvements might take the form of a CYCLOPS junction. CYCLOPS is a homegrown Greater Manchester innovation now frequently used on Highways schemes across the country to deliver safe pedestrian and cycle movements without undue impact on traffic flows.

For prospective occupants and passers-by alike, in line with the S106 tests as set out in Paragraph 58 of the National Planning Policy Framework (NPPF) 2024, a contribution to junction safety improvements improvement would be 'necessary to make the development acceptable in planning terms' (by contributing to an appropriate movement strategy for the site), 'directly related to the development' (given its proximity, the pressure added to the junction by the proposed threefold increase in residents, and in light of the wholly inadequate mitigation route proposed by the applicant), and 'fairly and reasonably related in scale and kind to the development' (given the stated threefold increase in residents explained by the applicant, so directly adding more pressure to the junction).

1 Legal Status of Cavendish Street

This section of Cavendish Street, an adopted Highway, was subject to a stopping up order dated 14.06.1996. That order required that "the Developer shall provide a new highway which shall be a footpath/cycleway". MMU have since installed physical signage stating that Cavendish Street "has not been dedicated as a Highway" and have bolted down uncomfortable and restrictive speed bumps across the route in an apparent attempt to dissuade cyclists from exercising their legal rights over this space. Both measures may be unlawful, as my understanding is that cyclists do retain a legal Right of Way along Cavendish Street, unchanged from when the entire road was an adopted highway, and the speed bumps are inaccessible to some Disabled users.

2 Cycling routes and planning policy

The case for walking and cycling and specifically for maintaining and improving high quality cycling networks is clear at every level of modern planning policy, including:

- NPPF 2024's "vision-led approach"
- LTN 1/20
- Places For Everyone Joint Development Plan Objectives 6, 7 and 10
- Places for Everyone Joint Development Plan policies JP-Strat14, JP-C1, JP-C5 and JP-C6
- GM Transport Strategy 2040 and the "Right Mix" targets
- Greater Manchester Streets for All strategy and Streets for All design guide
- Manchester City Council's Active Travel Strategy
- Manchester City Council's commitment to be a Zero Carbon city by 2038

The policy position is absolutely clear – changes to the existing road and cycle networks should make cycling more convenient for people, not less convenient.

This specific stretch of Cavendish Street is a key part of the existing cycle network. It appears on TfGM's Bee Network map as a Beeway ("the routes that get people from A to B … representing the most direct routes between crossing points.") and connects to the Stretford Road Busy Beeway ("corridors or crossing points on busier roads that will require a higher level of design intervention to improve cycling and walking.") It is also mapped on the TfGM Cycle Network.

The national standard for cycling infrastructure is DfT guidance note LTN 1/20. LTN 1/20 advises above all else that cycle routes and networks should be Safe, Direct, Comfortable, Attractive and Coherent. Introducing unnecessary diversions, junctions and bends into a well-used existing route undermines all of these core principles, resulting in a lower quality cycle network which will make it harder for the council to achieve its cycling objectives.

The applicant has offered various reasons why diverting cyclists is necessary but all of these reasons seem to be either existing problems, or problems designed into the scheme. The proposal is to demolish and redevelop the site – so considerations like limited space and the placement of entrances, shop frontages, planting and pedestrian areas are entirely within the applicant's scope to manage. Instead of starting with the problem "there is an existing busy cycle route across this site, how can I design to accommodate everyone's needs?", it seems the applicant has started with the conclusion "cyclists must be deterred" and instructed their consultants to post-rationalise that decision.

3 Misleading claims regarding safety

Page 22 of the Design & Access Statement refers to the "existing controversial link along Cavendish St., which is resulting in collisions of pedestrians, electric scooters, cyclists, etc."

However the map of recorded collisions, on page 18 of the Transport Statement submitted in the same planning application, shows no recorded collisions whatsoever on this link, only on the adjacent main roads.

It appears the applicant is attempting to restrict cycle access based on a "problem" for which they have no evidence.

Yours sincerely,

[redacted]

****
This email and any files transmitted with it are confidential and intended solely for the use of the individual or entity to whom they are addressed.
If you have received this email in error, please notify the sender, or [redacted] and then permanently delete the email, attachments and all copies.
The full text of the Council's email disclaimer is available at: www.manchester.gov.uk/emaildisclaimer.
Your personal data is very important to us. Please refer to our privacy notice at: www.manchester.gov.uk/privacy for further information.

This footnote also confirms that this email message has been swept for the presence of computer viruses.
****

Outlook

Fw: Complaint/Comments about Planning Application 142888/FO/2025

From Planning <[redacted]
Date Mon 14/07/2025 14:06
To Lucy Harrison <[redacted]

Information, Delivery & Support Team
Planning, Building Control & Licensing
Growth & Development Directorate
Postal address: Manchester City Council, P O Box 532, Town Hall, Manchester M60 2LA
Location address: Level 6 Town Hall Extension, Manchester M2 5DB
Tel: 0161 234 4516

Please consider the environment before printing an e-mail.

From: [redacted]
Sent: 11 July 2025 15:10
To: Planning <[redacted]
Subject: Complaint/Comments about Planning Application 142888/FO/2025

[You don't often get email from [redacted] Learn why this is important at https://aka.ms/LearnAboutSenderIdentification]

ALERT This message originated outside of the Manchester City Council network. BE CAUTIOUS before clicking any links or opening any attachments. Please remember your Cyber Training and report anything suspicious.

Dear Manchester City Council Planning Department

The validation of this planning application by Manchester City Council Planning Department should not have gone ahead because the applicant has given false information on page 7 of the planning application form, 1APP.

In the section headed 'Pedestrian and Vehicle Access, Roads and Rights of Way' the applicant has answered NO to the question:

Do the proposals require any diversions/extinguishments and/or creations of rights of way?

In 1996 the Secretary of State for Transport made an order as part of the planning permission 047472/FO/CITY 2 /95 that the developer (Manchester Metropolitan University) of

the 765 bed Cambridge Hall was to “provide a new highway which shall be a footpath/cycleway along the route shown by black dashes on the deposited plan.”

I am asking the Department of Transport in London for copy or scan of the plan numbered GO/TNW/ 5082/35/1/054(1) marked “Highway at All Saints, Manchester in the City of Manchester".

This clearly means that an extinguishment order is required before the 2025 planning application to build a larger, 2,302 room Cambridge Hall can proceed to the ‘consultation/comments/approval’ stage.

In addition to the false answer NO on the 1APP form, the Transport Statement referenced on the form makes a false claim on page 24, section 4.2.1 that the Highways Act 1980 section 31 notices affixed to the west walls of Cavendish Hall apply at Cambridge Hall. They do not. The 1996 Secretary of State for Transport order applies at the pedestrian/cycle route through Cambridge Hall.

In allowing the ‘validation’ of this planning application Manchester City Council Planning Department and the Highways Department are complicit with MMU’s false statements.

[redacted]

****
This email and any files transmitted with it are confidential and intended solely for the use of the individual or entity to whom they are addressed.
If you have received this email in error, please notify the sender, or [redacted] and then permanently delete the email, attachments and all copies.
The full text of the Council's email disclaimer is available at: www.manchester.gov.uk/emaildisclaimer.
Your personal data is very important to us. Please refer to our privacy notice at: www.manchester.gov.uk/privacy for further information.

This footnote also confirms that this email message has been swept for the presence of computer viruses.
****

Outlook

Fw: Comment on Planning Application 142888/FO/2025

From Planning <[redacted]
Date Mon 30/06/2025 08:48
To Lucy Harrison <[redacted]

Information, Delivery & Support Team
Planning, Building Control & Licensing
Growth & Development Directorate
Postal address: Manchester City Council, P O Box 532, Town Hall, Manchester M60 2LA
Location address: Level 6 Town Hall Extension, Manchester M2 5DB
Tel: 0161 234 4516

Please consider the environment before printing an e-mail.

From: [redacted]
Sent: 29 June 2025 08:28
To: Planning <[redacted]
Subject: Comment on Planning Application 142888/FO/2025

You don't often get email from [redacted] Learn why this is important

ALERT This message originated outside of the Manchester City Council network. **BE CAUTIOUS** before clicking any links or opening any attachments. Please remember your Cyber Training and report anything suspicious.

Dear Manchester Planning team,

I am writing to lodge an objection to planning application 142888/FO/2025 – Cambridge Halls Of Residence Cavendish Street Manchester M15 6TT.

My primary objection is that the proposals have been designed to deter cyclists from using the safest and most direct route through the site. This route has been open to cyclists ever since the road was first built; it is an essential, well-used part of the city's cycling network and therefore the proposal to deter and/or divert cycles away from Cavendish Street is directly at odds with Manchester City Council's planning, sustainability and transport policies.

I regularly cycle through this area and it is a key connection on my route. It is clear from the plans that applicant has not considered either why or how to "reroute" cyclists. They simply state that they will be rerouted through adjacent streets but propose no intervention to make this a safe or attractive alternative. They also propose no measures to block cyclists from the existing direct route meaning many cyclists will continue to use the direct route coming into increased conflict with pedestrians on restrained space that will exist post development.

The applicant has also made misleading claims regarding the road's legal status and regarding pedestrian safety which I will outline below.

I am asking that the council refuse this application, and invite the developer to come back with a proposal that maintains direct cycle as well as pedestrian access along Cavendish Street, designed to modern standards set out in Greater Manchester's Streets For All design guide and in Department for Transport guidance note LTN 1/20. I am sure that the Highways team at MCC and the Active Travel team at TfGM will, if asked, be happy to comment on how such a route could be provided within the space available.

I am also asking that the council make a Section 106 agreement (s106) with the applicant to fund safety improvements for pedestrians and cyclists at the junction of Cavendish Street and Higher Cambridge Street – the applicant themselves discuss the shortcomings of the existing junction layout in Section 4.2.1 of the Transport Statement ("Cyclists have also been observed to queue on the footway to gain direct access to the Higher Cambridge Street/Cavendish Street junction (via a gap in the guard railings) rather than following the road markings which advise cyclists to dismount and use the controlled pedestrian crossings"). The improvements might take the form of a CYCLOPS junction. CYCLOPS is a homegrown Greater Manchester innovation now frequently used on Highways schemes across the country to deliver safe pedestrian and cycle movements without undue impact on traffic flows.

For prospective occupants and passers-by alike, in line with the S106 tests as set out in Paragraph 58 of the National Planning Policy Framework (NPPF) 2024, a contribution to junction safety improvements improvement would be 'necessary to make the development acceptable in planning terms' (by contributing to an appropriate movement strategy for the site), 'directly related to the development' (given its proximity, the pressure added to the junction by the proposed threefold increase in residents, and in light of the wholly inadequate mitigation route proposed by the applicant), and 'fairly and reasonably related in scale and kind to the development' (given the stated threefold increase in residents explained by the applicant, so directly adding more pressure to the junction).

1 Legal Status of Cavendish Street

This section of Cavendish Street, an adopted Highway, was subject to a stopping up order dated 14.06.1996. That order required that "the Developer shall provide a new highway which shall be a footpath/cycleway". MMU have since installed physical signage stating that Cavendish Street "has not been dedicated as a Highway" and have bolted down uncomfortable and restrictive speed bumps across the route in an apparent attempt to dissuade cyclists from exercising their legal rights over this space. Both measures may be unlawful, as my understanding is that cyclists do retain a legal Right of Way along Cavendish Street, unchanged from when the entire road was an adopted highway, and the speed bumps are inaccessible to some Disabled users.

2 Cycling routes and planning policy

The case for walking and cycling and specifically for maintaining and improving high quality cycling networks is clear at every level of modern planning policy, including:

- NPPF 2024's "vision-led approach"
- LTN 1/20
- Places For Everyone Joint Development Plan Objectives 6, 7 and 10
- Places for Everyone Joint Development Plan policies JP-Strat14, JP-C1, JP-C5 and JP-C6
- GM Transport Strategy 2040 and the "Right Mix" targets
- Greater Manchester Streets for All strategy and Streets for All design guide
- Manchester City Council's Active Travel Strategy

The policy position is absolutely clear – changes to the existing road and cycle networks should make cycling more convenient for people, not less convenient.

This specific stretch of Cavendish Street is a key part of the existing cycle network. It appears on TfGM's Bee Network map as a Beeway ("the routes that get people from A to B … representing the most direct routes between crossing points.") and connects to the Stretford Road Busy Beeway ("corridors or crossing points on busier roads that will require a higher level of design intervention to improve cycling and walking.") It is also mapped on the TfGM Cycle Network.

The national standard for cycling infrastructure is DfT guidance note LTN 1/20. LTN 1/20 advises above all else that cycle routes and networks should be Safe, Direct, Comfortable, Attractive and Coherent. Introducing unnecessary diversions, junctions and bends into a well-used existing route undermines all of these core principles, resulting in a lower quality cycle network which will make it harder for the council to achieve its cycling objectives.

The applicant has offered various reasons why diverting cyclists is necessary but all of these reasons seem to be either existing problems, or problems designed into the scheme. The proposal is to demolish and redevelop the site – so considerations like limited space and the placement of entrances, shop frontages, planting and pedestrian areas are entirely within the applicant's scope to manage. Instead of starting with the problem "there is an existing busy cycle route across this site, how can I design to accommodate everyone's needs?", it seems the applicant has started with the conclusion "cyclists must be deterred" and instructed their consultants to post-rationalise that decision.

3 Misleading claims regarding safety

Page 22 of the Design & Access Statement refers to the "existing controversial link along Cavendish St., which is resulting in collisions of pedestrians, electric scooters, cyclists, etc."

However the map of recorded collisions, on page 18 of the Transport Statement submitted in the same planning application, shows no recorded collisions whatsoever on this link, only on the adjacent main roads.

It appears the applicant is attempting to restrict cycle access based on a "problem" for which they have no evidence.

Yours sincerely,

[redacted]

****
This email and any files transmitted with it are confidential and intended solely for the use of the individual or entity to whom they are addressed.
If you have received this email in error, please notify the sender, or [redacted] and then permanently delete the email, attachments and all copies.
The full text of the Council's email disclaimer is available at: www.manchester.gov.uk/emaildisclaimer.
Your personal data is very important to us. Please refer to our privacy notice at: www.manchester.gov.uk/privacy for further information.

This footnote also confirms that this email message has been swept for the presence of computer viruses.
****

Outlook

Fw: Comment on Planning Application 142888/FO/2025

From Planning <[redacted]
Date Mon 30/06/2025 08:49
To Lucy Harrison <[redacted]

Information, Delivery & Support Team
Planning, Building Control & Licensing
Growth & Development Directorate
Postal address: Manchester City Council, P O Box 532, Town Hall, Manchester M60 2LA
Location address: Level 6 Town Hall Extension, Manchester M2 5DB
Tel: 0161 234 4516

Please consider the environment before printing an e-mail.

From: [redacted]
Sent: 28 June 2025 17:50
To: Planning <[redacted]
Subject: Comment on Planning Application 142888/FO/2025

You don't often get email from [redacted] Learn why this is important

ALERT This message originated outside of the Manchester City Council network. **BE CAUTIOUS** before clicking any links or opening any attachments. Please remember your Cyber Training and report anything suspicious.

Dear Manchester Planning team,

I am writing to lodge an objection to planning application 142888/FO/2025 – Cambridge Halls Of Residence Cavendish Street Manchester M15 6TT.

My primary objection is that the proposals have been designed to deter cyclists from using the safest and most direct route through the site. This route has been open to cyclists ever since the road was first built; it is an essential, well-used part of the city's cycling network and therefore the proposal to deter and/or divert cycles away from Cavendish Street is directly at odds with Manchester City Council's planning, sustainability and transport policies.

The applicant has also made misleading claims regarding the road's legal status and regarding pedestrian safety which I will outline below.

I am asking that the council refuse this application, and invite the developer to come back with a proposal that maintains direct cycle as well as pedestrian access along Cavendish Street, designed to modern standards set out in Greater Manchester's Streets For All design guide and in Department for Transport guidance note LTN 1/20. I am sure that the Highways team at MCC and the Active Travel team at TfGM will, if asked, be happy to comment on how such a route could be provided within the space available.

I am also asking that the council make a Section 106 agreement (s106) with the applicant to fund safety improvements for pedestrians and cyclists at the junction of Cavendish Street and Higher Cambridge Street – the applicant themselves discuss the shortcomings of the existing junction layout in Section 4.2.1 of the Transport Statement ("Cyclists have also been observed to queue on the footway to gain direct access to the Higher Cambridge Street/Cavendish Street junction (via a gap in the guard railings) rather than following the road markings which advise cyclists to dismount and use the controlled pedestrian crossings"). The improvements might take the form of a CYCLOPS junction. CYCLOPS is a homegrown Greater Manchester innovation now frequently used on Highways schemes across the country to deliver safe pedestrian and cycle movements without undue impact on traffic flows.

For prospective occupants and passers-by alike, in line with the S106 tests as set out in Paragraph 58 of the National Planning Policy Framework (NPPF) 2024, a contribution to junction safety improvements improvement would be 'necessary to make the development acceptable in planning terms' (by contributing to an appropriate movement strategy for the site), 'directly related to the development' (given its proximity, the pressure added to the junction by the proposed threefold increase in residents, and in light of the wholly inadequate mitigation route proposed by the applicant), and 'fairly and reasonably related in scale and kind to the development' (given the stated threefold increase in residents explained by the applicant, so directly adding more pressure to the junction).

1 Legal Status of Cavendish Street

This section of Cavendish Street, an adopted Highway, was subject to a stopping up order dated 14.06.1996. That order required that "the Developer shall provide a new highway which shall be a footpath/cycleway". MMU have since installed physical signage stating that Cavendish Street "has not been dedicated as a Highway" and have bolted down uncomfortable and restrictive speed bumps across the route in an apparent attempt to dissuade cyclists from exercising their legal rights over this space. Both measures may be unlawful, as my understanding is that cyclists do retain a legal Right of Way along Cavendish Street, unchanged from when the entire road was an adopted highway, and the speed bumps are inaccessible to some Disabled users.

2 Cycling routes and planning policy

The case for walking and cycling and specifically for maintaining and improving high quality cycling networks is clear at every level of modern planning policy, including:

NPPF 2024's "vision-led approach"
LTN 1/20
Places For Everyone Joint Development Plan Objectives 6, 7 and 10
Places for Everyone Joint Development Plan policies JP-Strat14, JP-C1, JP-C5 and JP-C6
GM Transport Strategy 2040 and the "Right Mix" targets
Greater Manchester Streets for All strategy and Streets for All design guide
Manchester City Council's Active Travel Strategy
Manchester City Council's commitment to be a Zero Carbon city by 2038
The policy position is absolutely clear – changes to the existing road and cycle networks should make cycling more convenient for people, not less convenient.

This specific stretch of Cavendish Street is a key part of the existing cycle network. It appears on TfGM's Bee Network map as a Beeway ("the routes that get people from A to B … representing the most direct routes between crossing points.") and connects to the Stretford Road Busy Beeway ("corridors or crossing points on busier roads that will require a higher level of design intervention to improve cycling and walking.") It is also mapped on the TfGM Cycle Network.

The national standard for cycling infrastructure is DfT guidance note LTN 1/20. LTN 1/20 advises above all else that cycle routes and networks should be Safe, Direct, Comfortable, Attractive and Coherent. Introducing unnecessary diversions, junctions and bends into a well-used existing route undermines all of these core principles, resulting in a lower quality cycle network which will make it harder for the council to achieve its cycling objectives.

The applicant has offered various reasons why diverting cyclists is necessary but all of these reasons seem to be either existing problems, or problems designed into the scheme. The proposal is to demolish and redevelop the site – so considerations like limited space and the placement of entrances, shop frontages, planting and pedestrian areas are entirely within the applicant's scope to manage. Instead of starting with the problem "there is an existing busy cycle route across this site, how can I design to accommodate everyone's needs?", it seems the applicant has started with the conclusion "cyclists must be deterred" and instructed their consultants to post-rationalise that decision.

3 Misleading claims regarding safety

Page 22 of the Design & Access Statement refers to the "existing controversial link along Cavendish St., which is resulting in collisions of pedestrians, electric scooters, cyclists, etc."

However the map of recorded collisions, on page 18 of the Transport Statement submitted in the same planning application, shows no recorded collisions whatsoever on this link, only on the adjacent main roads.

It appears the applicant is attempting to restrict cycle access based on a "problem" for which they have no evidence.

Yours sincerely,

[redacted]

****
This email and any files transmitted with it are confidential and intended solely for the use of the individual or entity to whom they are addressed. If you have received this email in error, please notify the sender, or [redacted] and then permanently delete the email, attachments and all copies.
The full text of the Council's email disclaimer is available at: www.manchester.gov.uk/emaildisclaimer.
Your personal data is very important to us. Please refer to our privacy notice at: www.manchester.gov.uk/privacy for further information.

This footnote also confirms that this email message has been swept for the presence of computer viruses.
****

Outlook

Fw: Subject: Comment on Planning Application 142888/FO/2025

From Planning <[redacted]
Date Tue 01/07/2025 09:08
To Lucy Harrison <[redacted]

Information, Delivery & Support Team
Planning, Building Control & Licensing
Growth & Development Directorate
Postal address: Manchester City Council, P O Box 532, Town Hall, Manchester M60 2LA
Location address: Level 6 Town Hall Extension, Manchester M2 5DB
Tel: 0161 234 4516

Please consider the environment before printing an e-mail.

From: [redacted]
Sent: 30 June 2025 20:40
To: Planning <[redacted]
Subject: Subject: Comment on Planning Application 142888/FO/2025

You don't often get email from [redacted] Learn why this is important

ALERT This message originated outside of the Manchester City Council network. **BE CAUTIOUS** before clicking any links or opening any attachments. Please remember your Cyber Training and report anything suspicious.

Dear Manchester Planning team, I am writing to lodge an objection to planning application 142888/FO/2025 – Cambridge Halls Of Residence Cavendish Street Manchester M15 6TT. My primary objection is that the proposals have been designed to deter cyclists from using the safest and most direct route through the site. This route has been open to cyclists ever since the road was first built; it is an essential, well-used part of the city's cycling network and therefore the proposal to deter and/or divert cycles away from Cavendish Street is directly at odds with Manchester City Council's planning, sustainability and transport policies. The applicant has also made misleading claims regarding the road's legal status and regarding pedestrian safety which I will outline below. I am asking that the council refuse this application, and invite the developer to come back with a proposal that maintains direct cycle as well as pedestrian access along Cavendish Street, designed to modern standards set out in Greater Manchester's Streets For All design guide and in Department for Transport guidance note LTN 1/20. I am sure that the Highways team at MCC and the Active Travel team at TfGM will, if asked, be happy to comment on how such a route could be provided within the space available. I am also asking that the council make a Section 106

agreement (s106) with the applicant to fund safety improvements for pedestrians and cyclists at the junction of Cavendish Street and Higher Cambridge Street – the applicant themselves discuss the shortcomings of the existing junction layout in Section 4.2.1 of the Transport Statement ("Cyclists have also been observed to queue on the footway to gain direct access to the Higher Cambridge Street/Cavendish Street junction (via a gap in the guard railings) rather than following the road markings which advise cyclists to dismount and use the controlled pedestrian crossings"). The improvements might take the form of a CYCLOPS junction. CYCLOPS is a homegrown Greater Manchester innovation now frequently used on Highways schemes across the country to deliver safe pedestrian and cycle movements without undue impact on traffic flows. For prospective occupants and passers-by alike, in line with the S106 tests as set out in Paragraph 58 of the National Planning Policy Framework (NPPF) 2024, a contribution to junction safety improvements improvement would be 'necessary to make the development acceptable in planning terms' (by contributing to an appropriate movement strategy for the site), 'directly related to the development' (given its proximity, the pressure added to the junction by the proposed threefold increase in residents, and in light of the wholly inadequate mitigation route proposed by the applicant), and 'fairly and reasonably related in scale and kind to the development' (given the stated threefold increase in residents explained by the applicant, so directly adding more pressure to the junction). 1 Legal Status of Cavendish Street This section of Cavendish Street, an adopted Highway, was subject to a stopping up order dated 14.06.1996. That order required that "the Developer shall provide a new highway which shall be a footpath/cycleway". MMU have since installed physical signage stating that Cavendish Street "has not been dedicated as a Highway" and have bolted down uncomfortable and restrictive speed bumps across the route in an apparent attempt to dissuade cyclists from exercising their legal rights over this space. Both measures may be unlawful, as my understanding is that cyclists do retain a legal Right of Way along Cavendish Street, unchanged from when the entire road was an adopted highway, and the speed bumps are inaccessible to some Disabled users. 2 Cycling routes and planning policy The case for walking and cycling and specifically for maintaining and improving high quality cycling networks is clear at every level of modern planning policy, including: NPPF 2024's "vision-led approach" LTN 1/20 Places For Everyone Joint Development Plan Objectives 6, 7 and 10 Places for Everyone Joint Development Plan policies JP-Strat14, JP-C1, JP-C5 and JP-C6 GM Transport Strategy 2040 and the "Right Mix" targets Greater Manchester Streets for All strategy and Streets for All design guide Manchester City Council's Active Travel Strategy Manchester City Council's commitment to be a Zero Carbon city by 2038 The policy position is absolutely clear – changes to the existing road and cycle networks should make cycling more convenient for people, not less convenient. This specific stretch of Cavendish Street is a key part of the existing cycle network. It appears on TfGM's Bee Network map as a Beeway ("the routes that get people from A to B … representing the most direct routes between crossing points.") and connects to the Stretford Road Busy Beeway ("corridors or crossing points on busier

roads that will require a higher level of design intervention to improve cycling and walking.”) It is also mapped on the TfGM Cycle Network. The national standard for cycling infrastructure is DfT guidance note LTN 1/20. LTN 1/20 advises above all else that cycle routes and networks should be Safe, Direct, Comfortable, Attractive and Coherent. Introducing unnecessary diversions, junctions and bends into a well-used existing route undermines all of these core principles, resulting in a lower quality cycle network which will make it harder for the council to achieve its cycling objectives. The applicant has offered various reasons why diverting cyclists is necessary but all of these reasons seem to be either existing problems, or problems designed into the scheme. The proposal is to demolish and redevelop the site – so considerations like limited space and the placement of entrances, shop frontages, planting and pedestrian areas are entirely within the applicant’s scope to manage. Instead of starting with the problem “there is an existing busy cycle route across this site, how can I design to accommodate everyone’s needs?”, it seems the applicant has started with the conclusion “cyclists must be deterred” and instructed their consultants to post-rationalise that decision. 3 Misleading claims regarding safety Page 22 of the Design & Access Statement refers to the “existing controversial link along Cavendish St., which is resulting in collisions of pedestrians, electric scooters, cyclists, etc.” However the map of recorded collisions, on page 18 of the Transport Statement submitted in the same planning application, shows no recorded collisions whatsoever on this link, only on the adjacent main roads. It appears the applicant is attempting to restrict cycle access based on a “problem” for which they have no evidence. Yours sincerely,

[redacted]

--

[redacted]

****
This email and any files transmitted with it are confidential and intended solely for the use of the individual or entity to whom they are addressed. If you have received this email in error, please notify the sender, or [redacted] and then permanently delete the email, attachments and all copies.
The full text of the Council's email disclaimer is available at: www.manchester.gov.uk/emaildisclaimer.
Your personal data is very important to us. Please refer to our privacy notice at: www.manchester.gov.uk/privacy for further information.

This footnote also confirms that this email message has been swept for the presence of computer viruses.
****

Outlook

Fw: Comment on Planning Application 142888/FO/2025

From Planning <[redacted]>
Date Mon 14/07/2025 14:07
To Lucy Harrison <[redacted]>

Information, Delivery & Support Team
Planning, Building Control & Licensing
Growth & Development Directorate
Postal address: Manchester City Council, P O Box 532, Town Hall, Manchester M60 2LA
Location address: Level 6 Town Hall Extension, Manchester M2 5DB
Tel: 0161 234 4516

Please consider the environment before printing an e-mail.

From: [redacted]
Sent: 11 July 2025 09:42
To: Planning <[redacted]>
Subject: Comment on Planning Application 142888/FO/2025

You don't often get email from [redacted] Learn why this is important

ALERT This message originated outside of the Manchester City Council network. **BE CAUTIOUS** before clicking any links or opening any attachments. Please remember your Cyber Training and report anything suspicious.

Dear Manchester Planning team,

I am writing to lodge an objection to planning application 142888/FO/2025 – Cambridge Halls Of Residence Cavendish Street Manchester M15 6TT.

My primary objection is that the proposals have been designed to deter cyclists from using the safest and most direct route through the site. This route has been open to cyclists ever since the road was first built; it is an essential, well-used part of the city's cycling network and therefore the proposal to deter and/or divert cycles away from Cavendish Street is directly at odds with Manchester City Council's planning, sustainability and transport policies.

I live near Cavendish Street and I regularly use that link to access the southern part of Manchester including the University area.
I live in an area with plenty of student accommodations and I know I'm not the only one using Cavendish Street for the same journey.

The applicant has also made misleading claims regarding the road's legal status and regarding pedestrian safety which I will outline below.

I am asking that the council refuse this application, and invite the developer to come back with a proposal that maintains direct cycle as well as pedestrian access along Cavendish Street, designed to modern standards set out in Greater Manchester's Streets For All design guide and in Department for Transport guidance note LTN 1/20. I am sure that the Highways team at MCC and the Active Travel team at TfGM will, if asked, be happy to comment on how such a route could be provided within the space available.

I am also asking that the council make a Section 106 agreement (s106) with the applicant to fund safety improvements for pedestrians and cyclists at the junction of Cavendish Street and Higher Cambridge Street – the applicant themselves discuss the shortcomings of the existing junction layout in Section 4.2.1 of the Transport Statement ("Cyclists have also been observed to queue on the footway to gain direct access to the Higher Cambridge Street/Cavendish Street junction (via a gap in the guard railings) rather than following the road markings which advise cyclists to dismount and use the controlled pedestrian crossings"). The improvements might take the form of a CYCLOPS junction. CYCLOPS is a homegrown Greater Manchester innovation now frequently used on Highways schemes across the country to deliver safe pedestrian and cycle movements without undue impact on traffic flows.

For prospective occupants and passers-by alike, in line with the S106 tests as set out in Paragraph 58 of the National Planning Policy Framework (NPPF) 2024, a contribution to junction safety improvements improvement would be 'necessary to make the development acceptable in planning terms' (by contributing to an appropriate movement strategy for the site), 'directly related to the development' (given its proximity, the pressure added to the junction by the proposed threefold increase in residents, and in light of the wholly inadequate mitigation route proposed by the applicant), and 'fairly and reasonably related in scale and kind to the development' (given the stated threefold increase in residents explained by the applicant, so directly adding more pressure to the junction).

1 Legal Status of Cavendish Street

This section of Cavendish Street, an adopted Highway, was subject to a stopping up order dated 14.06.1996. That order required that "the Developer shall provide a new highway which shall be a footpath/cycleway". MMU have since installed physical signage stating that Cavendish Street "has not been dedicated as a Highway" and have bolted down uncomfortable and restrictive speed bumps across the route in an apparent attempt to dissuade cyclists from exercising their legal rights over this space. Both measures may be unlawful, as my understanding is that cyclists do retain a legal Right of Way along Cavendish Street, unchanged from when the entire road was an adopted highway, and the speed bumps are inaccessible to some Disabled users.

2 Cycling routes and planning policy

The case for walking and cycling and specifically for maintaining and improving high quality cycling networks is clear at every level of modern planning policy, including:

NPPF 2024's "vision-led approach"
LTN 1/20
Places For Everyone Joint Development Plan Objectives 6, 7 and 10
Places for Everyone Joint Development Plan policies JP-Strat14, JP-C1, JP-C5 and JP-C6
GM Transport Strategy 2040 and the "Right Mix" targets
Greater Manchester Streets for All strategy and Streets for All design guide
Manchester City Council's Active Travel Strategy
Manchester City Council's commitment to be a Zero Carbon city by 2038

The policy position is absolutely clear – changes to the existing road and cycle networks should make cycling more convenient for people, not less convenient.

This specific stretch of Cavendish Street is a key part of the existing cycle network. It appears on TfGM's Bee Network map as a Beeway ("the routes that get people from A to B … representing the most direct routes between crossing points.") and connects to the Stretford Road Busy Beeway ("corridors or crossing points on busier roads that will require a higher level of design intervention to improve cycling and walking.") It is also mapped on the TfGM Cycle Network.

The national standard for cycling infrastructure is DfT guidance note LTN 1/20. LTN 1/20 advises above all else that cycle routes and networks should be Safe, Direct, Comfortable, Attractive and Coherent. Introducing unnecessary diversions, junctions and bends into a well-used existing route undermines all of these core principles, resulting in a lower quality cycle network which will make it harder for the council to achieve its cycling objectives.

The applicant has offered various reasons why diverting cyclists is necessary but all of these reasons seem to be either existing problems, or problems designed into the scheme. The proposal is to demolish and redevelop the site – so considerations like limited space and the placement of entrances, shop frontages, planting and pedestrian areas are entirely within the applicant's scope to manage. Instead of starting with the problem "there is an existing busy cycle route across this site, how can I design to accommodate everyone's needs?", it seems the applicant has started with the conclusion "cyclists must be deterred" and instructed their consultants to post-rationalise that decision.

3 Misleading claims regarding safety

Page 22 of the Design & Access Statement refers to the "existing controversial link along Cavendish St., which is resulting in collisions of pedestrians, electric scooters, cyclists, etc."

However the map of recorded collisions, on page 18 of the Transport Statement submitted in the same planning application, shows no recorded collisions whatsoever on this link, only on the adjacent main roads.

It appears the applicant is attempting to restrict cycle access based on a "problem" for which they have no evidence.

Yours sincerely,

[redacted]

However the map of recorded collisions, on page 18 of the Transport Statement submitted in the same planning application, shows no recorded collisions whatsoever on this link, only on the adjacent main roads.

It appears the applicant is attempting to restrict cycle access based on a "problem" for which they have no evidence.

Yours sincerely,

[redacted]

[redacted]

****

This email and any files transmitted with it are confidential and intended solely for the use of the individual or entity to whom they are addressed.
If you have received this email in error, please notify the sender, or [redacted] and then permanently delete the email, attachments and all copies.
The full text of the Council's email disclaimer is available at: www.manchester.gov.uk/emaildisclaimer.
Your personal data is very important to us. Please refer to our privacy notice at: www.manchester.gov.uk/privacy for further information.

This footnote also confirms that this email message has been swept for the presence of computer viruses.

****

Outlook

Fw: Subject: Comment on Planning Application 142888/FO/2025

From Planning <[redacted]
Date Mon 30/06/2025 08:46
To Lucy Harrison <[redacted]

Information, Delivery & Support Team
Planning, Building Control & Licensing
Growth & Development Directorate
Postal address: Manchester City Council, P O Box 532, Town Hall, Manchester M60 2LA
Location address: Level 6 Town Hall Extension, Manchester M2 5DB
Tel: 0161 234 4516

Please consider the environment before printing an e-mail.

From: [redacted]
Sent: 30 June 2025 07:42
To: Planning <[redacted]
Subject: Subject: Comment on Planning Application 142888/FO/2025

You don't often get email from [redacted] Learn why this is important

ALERT This message originated outside of the Manchester City Council network. **BE CAUTIOUS** before clicking any links or opening any attachments. Please remember your Cyber Training and report anything suspicious.

Dear Manchester Planning team,
I am writing to lodge an objection to planning application **142888/FO/2025** – Cambridge Halls Of Residence Cavendish Street Manchester M15 6TT.
My primary objection is that the proposals have been designed to deter cyclists from using the safest and most direct route through the site. This route has been open to cyclists ever since the road was first built; it is an essential, well-used part of the city's cycling network and therefore the proposal to deter and/or divert cycles away from Cavendish Street is directly at odds with Manchester City Council's planning, sustainability and transport policies.
I have used this section of the road and it feels much safer and easier to cycle than the other nearby roads.
The applicant has also made misleading claims regarding the road's legal status and regarding pedestrian safety which I will outline below.
I am asking that the council **refuse** this application, and invite the developer to come back with a proposal that maintains direct cycle as well as pedestrian access along Cavendish Street, designed to modern standards set out in Greater Manchester's Streets For All design guide and in Department for Transport guidance note LTN 1/20. I am sure that the Highways team at MCC and the Active Travel team at TfGM will, if asked, be happy to comment on how such a route could be provided within the space available.
I am also asking that the council **make a Section 106 agreement (s106)** with the applicant to fund safety improvements for pedestrians and cyclists at the junction of Cavendish Street and Higher Cambridge Street – the applicant themselves discuss the shortcomings of the existing junction layout in Section 4.2.1 of the Transport Statement ("*Cyclists have also been observed to queue on the footway to gain direct access to the Higher Cambridge Street/Cavendish Street junction (via a gap in the guard railings) rather than following the road markings which advise cyclists to dismount and use*

the controlled pedestrian crossings”). The improvements might take the form of a CYCLOPS junction. CYCLOPS is a homegrown Greater Manchester innovation now frequently used on Highways schemes across the country to deliver safe pedestrian and cycle movements without undue impact on traffic flows.

For prospective occupants and passers-by alike, in line with the S106 tests as set out in Paragraph 58 of the National Planning Policy Framework (NPPF) 2024, a contribution to junction safety improvements improvement would be ‘necessary to make the development acceptable in planning terms’ (by contributing to an appropriate movement strategy for the site), ‘directly related to the development’ (given its proximity, the pressure added to the junction by the proposed threefold increase in residents, and in light of the wholly inadequate mitigation route proposed by the applicant), and ‘fairly and reasonably related in scale and kind to the development’ (given the stated threefold increase in residents explained by the applicant, so directly adding more pressure to the junction).

1 Legal Status of Cavendish Street

This section of Cavendish Street, an adopted Highway, was subject to a stopping up order dated 14.06.1996. That order required that “the Developer shall provide a new highway which shall be a footpath/cycleway”. MMU have since installed physical signage stating that Cavendish Street “has not been dedicated as a Highway” and have bolted down uncomfortable and restrictive speed bumps across the route in an apparent attempt to dissuade cyclists from exercising their legal rights over this space. Both measures may be unlawful, as my understanding is that cyclists do retain a legal Right of Way along Cavendish Street, unchanged from when the entire road was an adopted highway, and the speed bumps are inaccessible to some Disabled users.

2 Cycling routes and planning policy

The case for walking and cycling and specifically for maintaining and improving high quality cycling networks is clear at every level of modern planning policy, including:

- NPPF 2024’s “vision-led approach”
- LTN 1/20
- Places For Everyone Joint Development Plan Objectives 6, 7 and 10
- Places for Everyone Joint Development Plan policies JP-Strat14, JP-C1, JP-C5 and JP-C6
- GM Transport Strategy 2040 and the “Right Mix” targets
- Greater Manchester Streets for All strategy and Streets for All design guide
- Manchester City Council’s Active Travel Strategy
- Manchester City Council’s commitment to be a Zero Carbon city by 2038

The policy position is absolutely clear – changes to the existing road and cycle networks should make cycling more convenient for people, not less convenient.

This specific stretch of Cavendish Street is a key part of the existing cycle network. It appears on TfGM’s Bee Network map as a Beeway (“the routes that get people from A to B … representing the most direct routes between crossing points.”) and connects to the Stretford Road Busy Beeway (“corridors or crossing points on busier roads that will require a higher level of design intervention to improve cycling and walking.”) It is also mapped on the TfGM Cycle Network.

The national standard for cycling infrastructure is DfT guidance note LTN 1/20. LTN 1/20 advises above all else that cycle routes and networks should be Safe, Direct, Comfortable, Attractive and Coherent. Introducing unnecessary diversions, junctions and bends into a well-used existing route undermines all of these core principles, resulting in a lower quality cycle network which will make it harder for the council to achieve its cycling objectives.

The applicant has offered various reasons why diverting cyclists is necessary but all of these reasons seem to be either existing problems, or problems designed into the scheme. The proposal is to demolish and redevelop the site – so considerations like limited space and the placement of entrances, shop frontages, planting and pedestrian areas are entirely within the applicant’s scope to manage. Instead of starting with the problem “there is an existing busy cycle route across this site, how can I design to accommodate everyone’s needs?”, it seems the applicant has started with the conclusion “cyclists must be deterred” and instructed their consultants to post-rationalise that decision.

3 Misleading claims regarding safety

Page 22 of the Design & Access Statement refers to the “existing controversial link along Cavendish St., which is resulting in collisions of pedestrians, electric scooters, cyclists, etc.”

However the map of recorded collisions, on page 18 of the Transport Statement submitted in the same planning application, shows no recorded collisions whatsoever on this link, only on the adjacent main roads.

It appears the applicant is attempting to restrict cycle access based on a “problem” for which they have no evidence.

Yours sincerely,

[redacted]

****
This email and any files transmitted with it are confidential and intended solely for the use of the individual or entity to whom they are addressed.
If you have received this email in error, please notify the sender, or [redacted] and then permanently delete the email, attachments and all copies.
The full text of the Council's email disclaimer is available at: www.manchester.gov.uk/emaildisclaimer.
Your personal data is very important to us. Please refer to our privacy notice at: www.manchester.gov.uk/privacy for further information.

This footnote also confirms that this email message has been swept for the presence of computer viruses.
****

Outlook

Fw: Comment on Planning Application 142888/FO/2025

From Planning <[redacted]
Date Mon 30/06/2025 08:47
To Lucy Harrison <[redacted]

Information, Delivery & Support Team
Planning, Building Control & Licensing
Growth & Development Directorate
Postal address: Manchester City Council, P O Box 532, Town Hall, Manchester M60 2LA
Location address: Level 6 Town Hall Extension, Manchester M2 5DB
Tel: 0161 234 4516

Please consider the environment before printing an e-mail.

From: [redacted]
Sent: 29 June 2025 23:18
To: Planning <[redacted]
Subject: Comment on Planning Application 142888/FO/2025

You don't often get email from [redacted] Learn why this is important

ALERT This message originated outside of the Manchester City Council network. **BE CAUTIOUS** before clicking any links or opening any attachments. Please remember your Cyber Training and report anything suspicious.

Dear Manchester Planning team,
I am writing to lodge an objection to planning application **142888/FO/2025** – Cambridge Halls Of Residence Cavendish Street Manchester M15 6TT.
My primary objection is that the proposals have been designed to deter cyclists from using the safest and most direct route through the site. This route has been open to cyclists ever since the road was first built; it is an essential, well-used part of the city's cycling network and therefore the proposal to deter and/or divert cycles away from Cavendish Street is directly at odds with Manchester City Council's planning, sustainability and transport policies.
The applicant has also made misleading claims regarding the road's legal status and regarding pedestrian safety which I will outline below.
I am asking that the council **refuse** this application, and invite the developer to come back with a proposal that maintains direct cycle as well as pedestrian access along Cavendish Street, designed to modern standards set out in Greater Manchester's Streets For All design guide and in Department for Transport guidance note LTN 1/20. I am sure that the Highways team at MCC and the Active Travel team at TfGM will, if asked, be happy to comment on how such a route could be provided within the space available.
I am also asking that the council **make a Section 106 agreement (s106)** with the applicant to fund safety improvements for pedestrians and cyclists at the junction of Cavendish Street and Higher Cambridge Street – the applicant themselves discuss the shortcomings of the existing junction layout in Section 4.2.1 of the Transport Statement ("*Cyclists have also been observed to queue on the*

footway to gain direct access to the Higher Cambridge Street/Cavendish Street junction (via a gap in the guard railings) rather than following the road markings which advise cyclists to dismount and use the controlled pedestrian crossings"). The improvements might take the form of a CYCLOPS junction. CYCLOPS is a homegrown Greater Manchester innovation now frequently used on Highways schemes across the country to deliver safe pedestrian and cycle movements without undue impact on traffic flows.

For prospective occupants and passers-by alike, in line with the S106 tests as set out in Paragraph 58 of the National Planning Policy Framework (NPPF) 2024, a contribution to junction safety improvements improvement would be 'necessary to make the development acceptable in planning terms' (by contributing to an appropriate movement strategy for the site), 'directly related to the development' (given its proximity, the pressure added to the junction by the proposed threefold increase in residents, and in light of the wholly inadequate mitigation route proposed by the applicant), and 'fairly and reasonably related in scale and kind to the development' (given the stated threefold increase in residents explained by the applicant, so directly adding more pressure to the junction).

1 Legal Status of Cavendish Street

This section of Cavendish Street, an adopted Highway, was subject to a stopping up order dated 14.06.1996. That order required that "the Developer shall provide a new highway which shall be a footpath/cycleway". MMU have since installed physical signage stating that Cavendish Street "has not been dedicated as a Highway" and have bolted down uncomfortable and restrictive speed bumps across the route in an apparent attempt to dissuade cyclists from exercising their legal rights over this space. Both measures may be unlawful, as my understanding is that cyclists do retain a legal Right of Way along Cavendish Street, unchanged from when the entire road was an adopted highway, and the speed bumps are inaccessible to some Disabled users.

2 Cycling routes and planning policy

The case for walking and cycling and specifically for maintaining and improving high quality cycling networks is clear at every level of modern planning policy, including:

- NPPF 2024's "vision-led approach"
- LTN 1/20
- Places For Everyone Joint Development Plan Objectives 6, 7 and 10
- Places for Everyone Joint Development Plan policies JP-Strat14, JP-C1, JP-C5 and JP-C6
- GM Transport Strategy 2040 and the "Right Mix" targets
- Greater Manchester Streets for All strategy and Streets for All design guide
- Manchester City Council's Active Travel Strategy
- Manchester City Council's commitment to be a Zero Carbon city by 2038

The policy position is absolutely clear – changes to the existing road and cycle networks should make cycling more convenient for people, not less convenient.

This specific stretch of Cavendish Street is a key part of the existing cycle network. It appears on TfGM's Bee Network map as a Beeway ("the routes that get people from A to B … representing the most direct routes between crossing points.") and connects to the Stretford Road Busy Beeway ("corridors or crossing points on busier roads that will require a higher level of design intervention to improve cycling and walking.") It is also mapped on the TfGM Cycle Network.

The national standard for cycling infrastructure is DfT guidance note LTN 1/20. LTN 1/20 advises above all else that cycle routes and networks should be Safe, Direct, Comfortable, Attractive and Coherent. Introducing unnecessary diversions, junctions and bends into a well-used existing route undermines all of these core principles, resulting in a lower quality cycle network which will make it harder for the council to achieve its cycling objectives.

The applicant has offered various reasons why diverting cyclists is necessary but all of these reasons seem to be either existing problems, or problems designed into the scheme. The proposal is to demolish and redevelop the site – so considerations like limited space and the placement of

entrances, shop frontages, planting and pedestrian areas are entirely within the applicant's scope to manage. Instead of starting with the problem "there is an existing busy cycle route across this site, how can I design to accommodate everyone's needs?", it seems the applicant has started with the conclusion "cyclists must be deterred" and instructed their consultants to post-rationalise that decision.

3 Misleading claims regarding safety

Page 22 of the Design & Access Statement refers to the "existing controversial link along Cavendish St., which is resulting in collisions of pedestrians, electric scooters, cyclists, etc."

However the map of recorded collisions, on page 18 of the Transport Statement submitted in the same planning application, shows no recorded collisions whatsoever on this link, only on the adjacent main roads.

It appears the applicant is attempting to restrict cycle access based on a "problem" for which they have no evidence.

Yours sincerely,

[redacted]

****

This email and any files transmitted with it are confidential and intended solely for the use of the individual or entity to whom they are addressed. If you have received this email in error, please notify the sender, or [redacted] and then permanently delete the email, attachments and all copies.

The full text of the Council's email disclaimer is available at: www.manchester.gov.uk/emaildisclaimer.

Your personal data is very important to us. Please refer to our privacy notice at: www.manchester.gov.uk/privacy for further information.

This footnote also confirms that this email message has been swept for the presence of computer viruses.

****

Outlook

Fw: Comment on Planning Application 142888/FO/2025

From Planning <[redacted]
Date Mon 07/07/2025 11:01
To Lucy Harrison <[redacted]

Information, Delivery & Support Team
Planning, Building Control & Licensing
Growth & Development Directorate
Postal address: Manchester City Council, P O Box 532, Town Hall, Manchester M60 2LA
Location address: Level 6 Town Hall Extension, Manchester M2 5DB
Tel: 0161 234 4516

Please consider the environment before printing an e-mail.

From: [redacted]
Sent: 05 July 2025 16:06
To: Planning <[redacted]
Subject: Comment on Planning Application 142888/FO/2025

You don't often get email from [redacted] Learn why this is important

ALERT This message originated outside of the Manchester City Council network. **BE CAUTIOUS** before clicking any links or opening any attachments. Please remember your Cyber Training and report anything suspicious.

Dear Manchester Planning team,

I am writing to lodge an objection to planning application **142888/FO/2025** – Cambridge Halls Of Residence Cavendish Street Manchester M15 6TT.

My primary objection is that the proposals have been designed to deter cyclists from using the safest and most direct route through the site. This route has been open to cyclists ever since the road was first built; it is an essential, well-used part of the city's cycling network and therefore the proposal to deter and/or divert cycles away from Cavendish Street is directly at odds with Manchester City Council's planning, sustainability and transport policies.

[INSERT HERE OR DELETE THIS SECTION describe your own experience of using Cavendish Street, as a pedestrian, cyclist or other road user. Do you live or work nearby or use the route regularly?

What difference has this active travel route made to your life? How would you be impacted if it were removed?]

The applicant has also made misleading claims regarding the road's legal status and regarding pedestrian safety which I will outline below.

I am asking that the council **refuse** this application, and invite the developer to come back with a proposal that maintains direct cycle as well as pedestrian access along Cavendish Street, designed to modern standards set out in Greater Manchester's Streets For All design guide and in Department for Transport guidance note LTN 1/20. I am sure that the Highways team at MCC and the Active Travel team at TfGM will, if asked, be happy to comment on how such a route could be provided within the space available.

I am also asking that the council **make a Section 106 agreement (s106)** with the applicant to fund safety improvements for pedestrians and cyclists at the junction of Cavendish Street and Higher Cambridge Street – the applicant themselves discuss the shortcomings of the existing junction layout in Section 4.2.1 of the Transport Statement ("*Cyclists have also been observed to queue on the footway to gain direct access to the Higher Cambridge Street/Cavendish Street junction (via a gap in the guard railings) rather than following the road markings which advise cyclists to dismount and use the controlled pedestrian crossings*"). The improvements might take the form of a CYCLOPS junction. CYCLOPS is a homegrown Greater Manchester innovation now frequently used on Highways schemes across the country to deliver safe pedestrian and cycle movements without undue impact on traffic flows.

For prospective occupants and passers-by alike, in line with the S106 tests as set out in Paragraph 58 of the National Planning Policy Framework (NPPF) 2024, a contribution to junction safety improvements improvement would be 'necessary to make the development acceptable in planning terms' (by contributing to an appropriate movement strategy for the site), 'directly related to the development' (given its proximity, the pressure added to the junction by the proposed threefold increase in residents, and in light of the wholly inadequate mitigation route proposed by the applicant), and 'fairly and reasonably related in scale and kind to the development' (given the stated threefold increase in residents explained by the applicant, so directly adding more pressure to the junction).

1 Legal Status of Cavendish Street

This section of Cavendish Street, an adopted Highway, was subject to a stopping up order dated 14.06.1996. That order required that "the Developer shall provide a new highway which shall be a footpath/cycleway". MMU have since installed physical signage stating that Cavendish Street "has not been dedicated as a Highway" and have bolted down uncomfortable and restrictive speed bumps across the route in an apparent attempt to dissuade cyclists from exercising their legal rights over this space. Both measures may be unlawful, as my understanding is that cyclists do retain a legal Right of Way along Cavendish Street, unchanged from when the entire road was an adopted highway, and the speed bumps are inaccessible to some Disabled users.

2 Cycling routes and planning policy

The case for walking and cycling and specifically for maintaining and improving high quality cycling networks is clear at every level of modern planning policy, including:

- NPPF 2024's "vision-led approach"
- LTN 1/20
- Places For Everyone Joint Development Plan Objectives 6, 7 and 10
- Places for Everyone Joint Development Plan policies JP-Strat14, JP-C1, JP-C5 and JP-C6
- GM Transport Strategy 2040 and the "Right Mix" targets
- Greater Manchester Streets for All strategy and Streets for All design guide
- Manchester City Council's Active Travel Strategy
- Manchester City Council's commitment to be a Zero Carbon city by 2038

The policy position is absolutely clear – changes to the existing road and cycle networks should make cycling more convenient for people, not less convenient.

This specific stretch of Cavendish Street is a key part of the existing cycle network. It appears on TfGM's Bee Network map as a Beeway ("the routes that get people from A to B … representing the most direct routes between crossing points.") and connects to the Stretford Road Busy Beeway ("corridors or crossing points on busier roads that will require a higher level of design intervention to improve cycling and walking.") It is also mapped on the TfGM Cycle Network.

The national standard for cycling infrastructure is DfT guidance note LTN 1/20. LTN 1/20 advises above all else that cycle routes and networks should be Safe, Direct, Comfortable, Attractive and Coherent. Introducing unnecessary diversions, junctions and bends into a well-used existing route undermines all of these core principles, resulting in a lower quality cycle network which will make it harder for the council to achieve its cycling objectives.

The applicant has offered various reasons why diverting cyclists is necessary but all of these reasons seem to be either existing problems, or problems designed into the scheme. The proposal is to demolish and redevelop the site – so considerations like limited space and the placement of entrances, shop frontages, planting and pedestrian areas are entirely within the applicant's scope to manage. Instead of starting with the problem "there is an existing busy cycle route across this site, how can I design to accommodate everyone's needs?", it seems the applicant has started with the conclusion "cyclists must be deterred" and instructed their consultants to post-rationalise that decision.

3 Misleading claims regarding safety

Page 22 of the Design & Access Statement refers to the "existing controversial link along Cavendish St., which is resulting in collisions of pedestrians, electric scooters, cyclists, etc."

However the map of recorded collisions, on page 18 of the Transport Statement submitted in the same planning application, shows no recorded collisions whatsoever on this link, only on the adjacent main roads.

It appears the applicant is attempting to restrict cycle access based on a “problem” for which they have no evidence.

Yours sincerely,

[redacted]

[redacted]

****
This email and any files transmitted with it are confidential and intended solely for the use of the individual or entity to whom they are addressed.
If you have received this email in error, please notify the sender, or [redacted] and then permanently delete the email, attachments and all copies.
The full text of the Council's email disclaimer is available at: www.manchester.gov.uk/emaildisclaimer.
Your personal data is very important to us. Please refer to our privacy notice at: www.manchester.gov.uk/privacy for further information.

This footnote also confirms that this email message has been swept for the presence of computer viruses.
****

Outlook

Fw: Comment on Planning Application 142888/FO/2025

From Planning <[redacted]
Date Mon 30/06/2025 08:50
To Lucy Harrison <[redacted]

Information, Delivery & Support Team
Planning, Building Control & Licensing
Growth & Development Directorate
Postal address: Manchester City Council, P O Box 532, Town Hall, Manchester M60 2LA
Location address: Level 6 Town Hall Extension, Manchester M2 5DB
Tel: 0161 234 4516

Please consider the environment before printing an e-mail.

From: [redacted]
Sent: 28 June 2025 16:43
To: Planning <[redacted]
Subject: Comment on Planning Application 142888/FO/2025

[You don't often get email from [redacted] Learn why this is important at https://aka.ms/LearnAboutSenderIdentification]

ALERT This message originated outside of the Manchester City Council network. BE CAUTIOUS before clicking any links or opening any attachments. Please remember your Cyber Training and report anything suspicious.

Dear Manchester Planning team,

I am writing to lodge an objection to planning application 142888/FO/2025 – Cambridge Halls Of Residence Cavendish Street Manchester M15 6TT.

My primary objection is that the proposals have been designed to deter cyclists from using the safest and most direct route through the site. This route has been open to cyclists ever since the road was first built; it is an essential, well-used part of the city's cycling network and therefore the proposal to deter and/or divert cycles away from Cavendish Street is directly at odds with Manchester City Council's planning, sustainability and transport policies.

I cycle on Cavendish Street when I travel to and from the MMU area, principally to meet friends, and when I travel to and from Piccadilly rail station. If the route is diverted as proposed then it will place me in greater danger, particularly at the junction between the diverted route and Cambridge Street, and at the junction of Stretford Road and Cambridge Street. I think turning right from Stretford Road into Cambridge Street will be dangerous for me. It is already necessary to filter across a lane of traffic to access the right turn lane on Stretford Road, and there wouldn't be much space when turning

right. I fear being hit by a also turned right and not giving me sufficient space . A cyclops junction would greatly improve safety and should be funded by MMU.

The applicant has also made misleading claims regarding the road's legal status and regarding pedestrian safety which I will outline below.

I am asking that the council refuse this application, and invite the developer to come back with a proposal that maintains direct cycle as well as pedestrian access along Cavendish Street, designed to modern standards set out in Greater Manchester's Streets For All design guide and in Department for Transport guidance note LTN 1/20. I am sure that the Highways team at MCC and the Active Travel team at TfGM will, if asked, be happy to comment on how such a route could be provided within the space available.

I am also asking that the council make a Section 106 agreement (s106) with the applicant to fund safety improvements for pedestrians and cyclists at the junction of Cavendish Street and Higher Cambridge Street – the applicant themselves discuss the shortcomings of the existing junction layout in Section 4.2.1 of the Transport Statement ("Cyclists have also been observed to queue on the footway to gain direct access to the Higher Cambridge Street/Cavendish Street junction (via a gap in the guard railings) rather than following the road markings which advise cyclists to dismount and use the controlled pedestrian crossings"). The improvements might take the form of a CYCLOPS junction. CYCLOPS is a homegrown Greater Manchester innovation now frequently used on Highways schemes across the country to deliver safe pedestrian and cycle movements without undue impact on traffic flows.

For prospective occupants and passers-by alike, in line with the S106 tests as set out in Paragraph 58 of the National Planning Policy Framework (NPPF) 2024, a contribution to junction safety improvements improvement would be 'necessary to make the development acceptable in planning terms' (by contributing to an appropriate movement strategy for the site), 'directly related to the development' (given its proximity, the pressure added to the junction by the proposed threefold increase in residents, and in light of the wholly inadequate mitigation route proposed by the applicant), and 'fairly and reasonably related in scale and kind to the development' (given the stated threefold increase in residents explained by the applicant, so directly adding more pressure to the junction).

1 Legal Status of Cavendish Street

This section of Cavendish Street, an adopted Highway, was subject to a stopping up order dated 14.06.1996. That order required that "the Developer shall provide a new highway which shall be a footpath/cycleway". MMU have since installed physical signage stating that Cavendish Street "has not been dedicated as a Highway" and have bolted down uncomfortable and restrictive speed bumps across the route in an apparent attempt to dissuade cyclists from exercising their legal rights over this space. Both measures may be unlawful, as my understanding is that cyclists do retain a legal Right of Way along Cavendish Street, unchanged from when the entire road was an adopted highway, and the speed bumps are inaccessible to some Disabled users.

2 Cycling routes and planning policy

The case for walking and cycling and specifically for maintaining and improving high quality cycling networks is clear at every level of modern planning policy, including:

NPPF 2024's "vision-led approach"
LTN 1/20

Places For Everyone Joint Development Plan Objectives 6, 7 and 10
Places for Everyone Joint Development Plan policies JP-Strat14, JP-C1, JP-C5 and JP-C6
GM Transport Strategy 2040 and the "Right Mix" targets
Greater Manchester Streets for All strategy and Streets for All design guide
Manchester City Council's Active Travel Strategy
Manchester City Council's commitment to be a Zero Carbon city by 2038
The policy position is absolutely clear – changes to the existing road and cycle networks should make cycling more convenient for people, not less convenient.

This specific stretch of Cavendish Street is a key part of the existing cycle network. It appears on TfGM's Bee Network map as a Beeway ("the routes that get people from A to B … representing the most direct routes between crossing points.") and connects to the Stretford Road Busy Beeway ("corridors or crossing points on busier roads that will require a higher level of design intervention to improve cycling and walking.") It is also mapped on the TfGM Cycle Network.

The national standard for cycling infrastructure is DfT guidance note LTN 1/20. LTN 1/20 advises above all else that cycle routes and networks should be Safe, Direct, Comfortable, Attractive and Coherent. Introducing unnecessary diversions, junctions and bends into a well-used existing route undermines all of these core principles, resulting in a lower quality cycle network which will make it harder for the council to achieve its cycling objectives.

The applicant has offered various reasons why diverting cyclists is necessary but all of these reasons seem to be either existing problems, or problems designed into the scheme. The proposal is to demolish and redevelop the site – so considerations like limited space and the placement of entrances, shop frontages, planting and pedestrian areas are entirely within the applicant's scope to manage. Instead of starting with the problem "there is an existing busy cycle route across this site, how can I design to accommodate everyone's needs?", it seems the applicant has started with the conclusion "cyclists must be deterred" and instructed their consultants to post-rationalise that decision.

3 Misleading claims regarding safety

Page 22 of the Design & Access Statement refers to the "existing controversial link along Cavendish St., which is resulting in collisions of pedestrians, electric scooters, cyclists, etc."

However the map of recorded collisions, on page 18 of the Transport Statement submitted in the same planning application, shows no recorded collisions whatsoever on this link, only on the adjacent main roads.

It appears the applicant is attempting to restrict cycle access based on a "problem" for which they have no evidence.

Yours sincerely

[redacted]

****
This email and any files transmitted with it are confidential and intended solely for the use of the individual or entity to whom they are addressed. If you have received this email in error, please notify the sender, or [redacted] and then permanently delete the email, attachments and all copies.

The full text of the Council's email disclaimer is available at: www.manchester.gov.uk/emaildisclaimer.
Your personal data is very important to us. Please refer to our privacy notice at: www.manchester.gov.uk/privacy for further information.

This footnote also confirms that this email message has been swept for the presence of computer viruses.
****

Outlook

Fw: Comment on Planning Application 142888/FO/2025

From Planning <[redacted]
Date Tue 22/07/2025 09:26
To Lucy Harrison <[redacted]

Information, Delivery & Support Team
Planning, Building Control & Licensing
Growth & Development Directorate
Postal address: Manchester City Council, P O Box 532, Town Hall, Manchester M60 2LA
Location address: Level 6 Town Hall Extension, Manchester M2 5DB
Tel: 0161 234 4516

Please consider the environment before printing an e-mail.

From: [redacted]
Sent: 17 July 2025 13:01
To: Planning <[redacted]
Subject: Comment on Planning Application 142888/FO/2025

You don't often get email from [redacted] Learn why this is important

ALERT This message originated outside of the Manchester City Council network. **BE CAUTIOUS** before clicking any links or opening any attachments. Please remember your Cyber Training and report anything suspicious.

Dear Manchester Planning team,

I am writing to lodge an objection to planning application 142888/FO/2025 – Cambridge Halls Of Residence Cavendish Street Manchester M15 6TT.

My primary objection is that the proposals have been designed to deter cyclists from using the safest and most direct route through the site. This route has been open to cyclists ever since the road was first built; it is an essential, well-used part of the city's cycling network and therefore the proposal to deter and/or divert cycles away from Cavendish Street is directly at odds with Manchester City Council's planning, sustainability and transport policies.

I have lived in Hulme for over 20 years and have been using this route to cycle to Oxford Road at least twice a week, since I have been here. I have never experienced or seen any cyclists or pedestrians have any issues. I see Cavendish Street as a safe and convenient way to access Oxford Road from Hulme.

The applicant has also made misleading claims regarding the road's legal status and regarding pedestrian safety which I will outline below.

I am asking that the council refuse this application, and invite the developer to come back with a proposal that maintains direct cycle as well as pedestrian access along Cavendish Street, designed to

modern standards set out in Greater Manchester's Streets For All design guide and in Department for Transport guidance note LTN 1/20. I am sure that the Highways team at MCC and the Active Travel team at TfGM will, if asked, be happy to comment on how such a route could be provided within the space available.

I am also asking that the council make a Section 106 agreement (s106) with the applicant to fund safety improvements for pedestrians and cyclists at the junction of Cavendish Street and Higher Cambridge Street – the applicant themselves discuss the shortcomings of the existing junction layout in Section 4.2.1 of the Transport Statement ("Cyclists have also been observed to queue on the footway to gain direct access to the Higher Cambridge Street/Cavendish Street junction (via a gap in the guard railings) rather than following the road markings which advise cyclists to dismount and use the controlled pedestrian crossings"). The improvements might take the form of a CYCLOPS junction. CYCLOPS is a homegrown Greater Manchester innovation now frequently used on Highways schemes across the country to deliver safe pedestrian and cycle movements without undue impact on traffic flows.

For prospective occupants and passers-by alike, in line with the S106 tests as set out in Paragraph 58 of the National Planning Policy Framework (NPPF) 2024, a contribution to junction safety improvements improvement would be 'necessary to make the development acceptable in planning terms' (by contributing to an appropriate movement strategy for the site), 'directly related to the development' (given its proximity, the pressure added to the junction by the proposed threefold increase in residents, and in light of the wholly inadequate mitigation route proposed by the applicant), and 'fairly and reasonably related in scale and kind to the development' (given the stated threefold increase in residents explained by the applicant, so directly adding more pressure to the junction).

1 Legal Status of Cavendish Street

This section of Cavendish Street, an adopted Highway, was subject to a stopping up order dated 14.06.1996. That order required that "the Developer shall provide a new highway which shall be a footpath/cycleway". MMU have since installed physical signage stating that Cavendish Street "has not been dedicated as a Highway" and have bolted down uncomfortable and restrictive speed bumps across the route in an apparent attempt to dissuade cyclists from exercising their legal rights over this space. Both measures may be unlawful, as my understanding is that cyclists do retain a legal Right of Way along Cavendish Street, unchanged from when the entire road was an adopted highway, and the speed bumps are inaccessible to some Disabled users.

2 Cycling routes and planning policy

The case for walking and cycling and specifically for maintaining and improving high quality cycling networks is clear at every level of modern planning policy, including:

NPPF 2024's "vision-led approach"
LTN 1/20
Places For Everyone Joint Development Plan Objectives 6, 7 and 10
Places for Everyone Joint Development Plan policies JP-Strat14, JP-C1, JP-C5 and JP-C6
GM Transport Strategy 2040 and the "Right Mix" targets
Greater Manchester Streets for All strategy and Streets for All design guide
Manchester City Council's Active Travel Strategy
Manchester City Council's commitment to be a Zero Carbon city by 2038
The policy position is absolutely clear – changes to the existing road and cycle networks should make cycling more convenient for people, not less convenient.

This specific stretch of Cavendish Street is a key part of the existing cycle network. It appears on TfGM's Bee Network map as a Beeway ("the routes that get people from A to B … representing the most direct routes between crossing points.") and connects to the Stretford Road Busy Beeway ("corridors or crossing points on busier roads that will require a higher level of design intervention to improve cycling and walking.") It is also mapped on the TfGM Cycle Network.

The national standard for cycling infrastructure is DfT guidance note LTN 1/20. LTN 1/20 advises above all else that cycle routes and networks should be Safe, Direct, Comfortable, Attractive and Coherent. Introducing unnecessary diversions, junctions and bends into a well-used existing route undermines all of these core principles, resulting in a lower quality cycle network which will make it harder for the council to achieve its cycling objectives.

The applicant has offered various reasons why diverting cyclists is necessary but all of these reasons seem to be either existing problems, or problems designed into the scheme. The proposal is to demolish and redevelop the site – so considerations like limited space and the placement of entrances, shop frontages, planting and pedestrian areas are entirely within the applicant's scope to manage. Instead of starting with the problem "there is an existing busy cycle route across this site, how can I design to accommodate everyone's needs?", it seems the applicant has started with the conclusion "cyclists must be deterred" and instructed their consultants to post-rationalise that decision.

3 Misleading claims regarding safety

Page 22 of the Design & Access Statement refers to the "existing controversial link along Cavendish St., which is resulting in collisions of pedestrians, electric scooters, cyclists, etc."

However the map of recorded collisions, on page 18 of the Transport Statement submitted in the same planning application, shows no recorded collisions whatsoever on this link, only on the adjacent main roads.

It appears the applicant is attempting to restrict cycle access based on a "problem" for which they have no evidence.

Yours sincerely,

[redacted]

****
This email and any files transmitted with it are confidential and intended solely for the use of the individual or entity to whom they are addressed.
If you have received this email in error, please notify the sender, or [redacted] and then permanently delete the email, attachments and all copies.
The full text of the Council's email disclaimer is available at: www.manchester.gov.uk/emaildisclaimer.
Your personal data is very important to us. Please refer to our privacy notice at: www.manchester.gov.uk/privacy for further information.

This footnote also confirms that this email message has been swept for the presence of computer viruses.
****

Outlook

Fw: Comment on Planning Application 142888/FO/2025

From Planning <[redacted]
Date Thu 31/07/2025 14:19
To Lucy Harrison <[redacted]

Information, Delivery & Support Team
Planning, Building Control & Licensing
Growth & Development Directorate
Postal address: Manchester City Council, P O Box 532, Town Hall, Manchester M60 2LA
Location address: Level 6 Town Hall Extension, Manchester M2 5DB
Tel: 0161 234 4516

Please consider the environment before printing an e-mail.

From: [redacted]
Sent: 31 July 2025 13:57
To: Planning <[redacted]
Subject: Comment on Planning Application 142888/FO/2025

You don't often get email from [redacted] Learn why this is important

ALERT This message originated outside of the Manchester City Council network. **BE CAUTIOUS** before clicking any links or opening any attachments. Please remember your Cyber Training and report anything suspicious.

Dear Manchester Planning team,

I am writing to lodge an objection to planning application 142888/FO/2025 – Cambridge Halls Of Residence Cavendish Street Manchester M15 6TT.

My primary objection is that the proposals have been designed to deter cyclists from using the safest and most direct route through the site. This route has been open to cyclists ever since the road was first built; it is an essential, well-used part of the city's cycling network and therefore the proposal to deter and/or divert cycles away from Cavendish Street is directly at odds with Manchester City Council's planning, sustainability and transport policies.

The applicant has also made misleading claims regarding the road's legal status and regarding pedestrian safety which I will outline below.

I am asking that the council refuse this application, and invite the developer to come back with a proposal that maintains direct cycle as well as pedestrian access along Cavendish Street, designed to modern standards set out in Greater Manchester's Streets For All design guide and in Department for Transport guidance note LTN 1/20. I am sure that the Highways team at MCC and the Active Travel team at TfGM will, if asked, be happy to comment on how such a route could be provided within the space available.

I am also asking that the council make a Section 106 agreement (s106) with the applicant to fund safety improvements for pedestrians and cyclists at the junction of Cavendish Street and Higher Cambridge Street – the applicant themselves discuss the shortcomings of the existing junction layout in Section 4.2.1 of the Transport Statement ("Cyclists have also been observed to queue on the footway to gain direct access to the Higher Cambridge Street/Cavendish Street junction (via a gap in the guard railings) rather than following the road markings which advise cyclists to dismount and use the controlled pedestrian crossings"). The improvements might take the form of a CYCLOPS junction. CYCLOPS is a homegrown Greater Manchester innovation now frequently used on Highways schemes across the country to deliver safe pedestrian and cycle movements without undue impact on traffic flows.

For prospective occupants and passers-by alike, in line with the S106 tests as set out in Paragraph 58 of the National Planning Policy Framework (NPPF) 2024, a contribution to junction safety improvements improvement would be 'necessary to make the development acceptable in planning terms' (by contributing to an appropriate movement strategy for the site), 'directly related to the development' (given its proximity, the pressure added to the junction by the proposed threefold increase in residents, and in light of the wholly inadequate mitigation route proposed by the applicant), and 'fairly and reasonably related in scale and kind to the development' (given the stated threefold increase in residents explained by the applicant, so directly adding more pressure to the junction).

1 Legal Status of Cavendish Street

This section of Cavendish Street, an adopted Highway, was subject to a stopping up order dated 14.06.1996. That order required that "the Developer shall provide a new highway which shall be a footpath/cycleway". MMU have since installed physical signage stating that Cavendish Street "has not been dedicated as a Highway" and have bolted down uncomfortable and restrictive speed bumps across the route in an apparent attempt to dissuade cyclists from exercising their legal rights over this space. Both measures may be unlawful, as my understanding is that cyclists do retain a legal Right of Way along Cavendish Street, unchanged from when the entire road was an adopted highway, and the speed bumps are inaccessible to some Disabled users.

2 Cycling routes and planning policy

The case for walking and cycling and specifically for maintaining and improving high quality cycling networks is clear at every level of modern planning policy, including:

NPPF 2024's "vision-led approach"
LTN 1/20
Places For Everyone Joint Development Plan Objectives 6, 7 and 10
Places for Everyone Joint Development Plan policies JP-Strat14, JP-C1, JP-C5 and JP-C6
GM Transport Strategy 2040 and the "Right Mix" targets
Greater Manchester Streets for All strategy and Streets for All design guide
Manchester City Council's Active Travel Strategy
Manchester City Council's commitment to be a Zero Carbon city by 2038
The policy position is absolutely clear – changes to the existing road and cycle networks should make cycling more convenient for people, not less convenient.

This specific stretch of Cavendish Street is a key part of the existing cycle network. It appears on TfGM's Bee Network map as a Beeway ("the routes that get people from A to B … representing the most direct routes between crossing points.") and connects to the Stretford Road Busy Beeway

("corridors or crossing points on busier roads that will require a higher level of design intervention to improve cycling and walking.") It is also mapped on the TfGM Cycle Network.

The national standard for cycling infrastructure is DfT guidance note LTN 1/20. LTN 1/20 advises above all else that cycle routes and networks should be Safe, Direct, Comfortable, Attractive and Coherent. Introducing unnecessary diversions, junctions and bends into a well-used existing route undermines all of these core principles, resulting in a lower quality cycle network which will make it harder for the council to achieve its cycling objectives.

The applicant has offered various reasons why diverting cyclists is necessary but all of these reasons seem to be either existing problems, or problems designed into the scheme. The proposal is to demolish and redevelop the site – so considerations like limited space and the placement of entrances, shop frontages, planting and pedestrian areas are entirely within the applicant's scope to manage. Instead of starting with the problem "there is an existing busy cycle route across this site, how can I design to accommodate everyone's needs?", it seems the applicant has started with the conclusion "cyclists must be deterred" and instructed their consultants to post-rationalise that decision.

3 Misleading claims regarding safety

Page 22 of the Design & Access Statement refers to the "existing controversial link along Cavendish St., which is resulting in collisions of pedestrians, electric scooters, cyclists, etc."

However the map of recorded collisions, on page 18 of the Transport Statement submitted in the same planning application, shows no recorded collisions whatsoever on this link, only on the adjacent main roads.

It appears the applicant is attempting to restrict cycle access based on a "problem" for which they have no evidence.

Yours sincerely,

[redacted]

****
This email and any files transmitted with it are confidential and intended solely for the use of the individual or entity to whom they are addressed. If you have received this email in error, please notify the sender, or [redacted] and then permanently delete the email, attachments and all copies.
The full text of the Council's email disclaimer is available at: www.manchester.gov.uk/emaildisclaimer.
Your personal data is very important to us. Please refer to our privacy notice at: www.manchester.gov.uk/privacy for further information.

This footnote also confirms that this email message has been swept for the presence of computer viruses.
****

Outlook

Fw: Planning application 142888/FO/2025 – Cambridge Halls Of Residence Cavendish Street Manchester M15 6TT.

From Planning <[redacted]>
Date Tue 29/07/2025 09:25
To Lucy Harrison <[redacted]>

Information, Delivery & Support Team
Planning, Building Control & Licensing
Growth & Development Directorate
Postal address: Manchester City Council, P O Box 532, Town Hall, Manchester M60 2LA
Location address: Level 6 Town Hall Extension, Manchester M2 5DB
Tel: 0161 234 4516

Please consider the environment before printing an e-mail.

From: [redacted]
Sent: 28 July 2025 17:23
To: Planning <[redacted]>
Subject: Planning application 142888/FO/2025 – Cambridge Halls Of Residence Cavendish Street Manchester M15 6TT.

You don't often get email from [redacted] Learn why this is important

ALERT This message originated outside of the Manchester City Council network. **BE CAUTIOUS** before clicking any links or opening any attachments. Please remember your Cyber Training and report anything suspicious.

Dear Manchester Planning team,

I am writing to lodge an objection to planning application 142888/FO/2025 – Cambridge Halls Of Residence Cavendish Street Manchester M15 6TT.

My primary objection is that the proposals have been designed to deter cyclists from using the safest and most direct route through the site. This route has been open to cyclists ever since the road was first built; it is an essential, well-used part of the city's cycling network and therefore the proposal to deter and/or divert cycles away from Cavendish Street is directly at odds with Manchester City Council's planning, sustainability and transport policies.

The applicant has also made misleading claims regarding

the road's legal status and regarding pedestrian safety which I will outline below.

I am asking that the council refuse this application, and invite the developer to come back with a proposal that maintains direct cycle as well as pedestrian access along Cavendish Street, designed to modern standards set out in Greater Manchester's Streets For All design guide and in Department for Transport guidance note LTN 1/20. I am sure that the Highways team at MCC and the Active Travel team at TfGM will, if asked, be happy to comment on how such a route could be provided within the space available.

I am also asking that the council make a Section 106 agreement (s106) with the applicant to fund safety improvements for pedestrians and cyclists at the junction of Cavendish Street and Higher Cambridge Street – the applicant themselves discuss the shortcomings of the existing junction layout in Section 4.2.1 of the Transport Statement ("Cyclists have also been observed to queue on the footway to gain direct access to the Higher Cambridge Street/Cavendish Street junction (via a gap in the guard railings) rather than following the road markings which advise cyclists to dismount and use the controlled pedestrian crossings"). The improvements might take the form of a CYCLOPS junction. CYCLOPS is a homegrown Greater Manchester innovation now frequently used on Highways schemes across the country to deliver safe pedestrian and cycle movements without undue impact on traffic flows.Cyclops junctions work very well on the newly completed Chorlton cycleway and provide a safe alternative to right turns at potentially dangerous junctions.

For prospective occupants and passers-by alike, in line with the S106 tests as set out in Paragraph 58 of the National Planning Policy Framework (NPPF) 2024, a

contribution to junction safety improvements improvement would be ‘necessary to make the development acceptable in planning terms’ (by contributing to an appropriate movement strategy for the site), ‘directly related to the development’ (given its proximity, the pressure added to the junction by the proposed threefold increase in residents, and in light of the wholly inadequate mitigation route proposed by the applicant), and ‘fairly and reasonably related in scale and kind to the development’ (given the stated threefold increase in residents explained by the applicant, so directly adding more pressure to the junction).

1 Legal Status of Cavendish Street

This section of Cavendish Street, an adopted Highway, was subject to a stopping up order dated 14.06.1996. That order required that “the Developer shall provide a new highway which shall be a footpath/cycleway”. MMU have since installed physical signage stating that Cavendish Street “has not been dedicated as a Highway” and have bolted down uncomfortable and restrictive speed bumps across the route in an apparent attempt to dissuade cyclists from exercising their legal rights over this space. Both measures may be unlawful, as my understanding is that cyclists do retain a legal Right of Way along Cavendish Street, unchanged from when the entire road was an adopted highway, and the speed bumps are inaccessible to some Disabled users.

2 Cycling routes and planning policy

The case for walking and cycling and specifically for maintaining and improving high quality cycling networks is clear at every level of modern planning policy, including:

NPPF 2024's "vision-led approach"
LTN 1/20
Places For Everyone Joint Development Plan Objectives 6, 7 and 10
Places for Everyone Joint Development Plan policies JP-Strat14, JP-C1, JP-C5 and JP-C6
GM Transport Strategy 2040 and the "Right Mix" targets
Greater Manchester Streets for All strategy and Streets for All design guide
Manchester City Council's Active Travel Strategy
Manchester City Council's commitment to be a Zero Carbon city by 2038
The policy position is absolutely clear – changes to the existing road and cycle networks should make cycling more convenient for people, not less convenient.

This specific stretch of Cavendish Street is a key part of the existing cycle network. It appears on TfGM's Bee Network map as a Beeway ("the routes that get people from A to B … representing the most direct routes between crossing points.") and connects to the Stretford Road Busy Beeway ("corridors or crossing points on busier roads that will require a higher level of design intervention to improve cycling and walking.") It is also mapped on the TfGM Cycle Network.

The national standard for cycling infrastructure is DfT guidance note LTN 1/20. LTN 1/20 advises above all else that cycle routes and networks should be Safe, Direct, Comfortable, Attractive and Coherent. Introducing unnecessary diversions, junctions and bends into a well-used existing route undermines all of these core principles, resulting in a lower quality cycle network which will make it harder for the council to achieve its cycling objectives.

The applicant has offered various reasons why diverting cyclists is necessary but all of these reasons seem to be either existing problems, or problems designed into the scheme. The proposal is to demolish and redevelop the site – so considerations like limited space and the placement of entrances, shop frontages, planting and pedestrian areas are entirely within the applicant's scope to manage. Instead of starting with the problem "there is an existing busy cycle route across this site, how can I design to accommodate everyone's needs?", it seems the applicant has started with the conclusion "cyclists must be deterred" and instructed their consultants to post-rationalise that decision.

3 Misleading claims regarding safety

Page 22 of the Design & Access Statement refers to the "existing controversial link along Cavendish St., which is resulting in collisions of pedestrians, electric scooters, cyclists, etc."

However the map of recorded collisions, on page 18 of the Transport Statement submitted in the same planning application, shows no recorded collisions whatsoever on this link, only on the adjacent main roads.

It appears the applicant is attempting to restrict cycle access based on a "problem" for which they have no evidence.

Yours sincerely,

[redacted]

****
This email and any files transmitted with it are confidential and intended solely for the use of the individual or entity to whom they are addressed.
If you have received this email in error, please notify the sender, or [redacted] and then permanently delete the email, attachments and all copies.
The full text of the Council's email disclaimer is available at: www.manchester.gov.uk/emaildisclaimer.
Your personal data is very important to us. Please refer to our privacy notice at: www.manchester.gov.uk/privacy for further information.

This footnote also confirms that this email message has been swept for the presence of computer viruses.
****