

Comments for Planning Application 142888/FO/2025

Application Summary

Application Number: 142888/FO/2025

Address: Cambridge Halls Of Residence Cavendish Street Manchester M15 6TT

Proposal: Demolition of existing halls of residence and erection of two buildings of 30 and 24 storeys above ground, plus basement and rooftop plant levels, comprising: purpose-built student accommodation with internal and external rooftop communal amenity space (Sui Generis); ground floor commercial and community uses (Flexible Use Classes E, F1(a) or F2(b)); hard and soft landscaping; and associated highway works.

Case Officer: Lucy Harrison

Customer Details

Name: Not Available

Address: Not Available

Comment Details

Commenter Type: Member of the Public

Stance: Customer objects to the Planning Application

Comment Reasons:

Comment: Removal of the through cycle route connecting Old Trafford, Hulme and other communities to the Oxford Road corridor is unnecessary and unacceptable. The developer cites conflict between pedestrians and cyclists and rather than design a safe solution they seek to remove cyclists entirely. They have claimed to make cycling safer by providing an alternative route. This isn't accurate as cyclists will be required to make multiple turns including a right turn without safe infrastructure. That results not only in a less convenient cycle route but also a less safe one. This scheme offers an opportunity to fix and improve a good route which is hampered by bad design. Maintaining the through route is crucial to keep supporting active travel and making cycling safe. Manchester city council's stated policy aims are to prioritise active travel. Forcing cyclists to take a diversion isn't prioritising cycling or active travel and will create a situation where some are tempted to cycle through regardless. This is design based on a false reality. Many won't take the diversion and so the conflict they claim to be fixing will actually be made worse by this unrealistic design. It's really important to design for safe movement of pedestrians and cyclists in spaces where they overlap and interact. Pretending that they can simple be removed is not realistic and doesn't design for real life. Ultimately putting pedestrians at risk as cyclists continue to try to use the well established direct and visible route. They should take the opportunity to use the TfGM Safer Streets for All guidance and design an improved through route which provides safety for both pedestrians and cyclists.

It should be rejected based on the failure to meet policies and stated aims of Manchester's development plan documents and active travel strategy.