

Planning
Manchester City Council
Floor 6
Town Hall Extension
PO Box 532
Town Hall
Manchester
M60 2LA

Our ref JYK/GRE01982.2

Your ref 137226/FO/2023

24 April 2026

BY EMAIL ONLY
Lucy.harrison@manchester.gov.uk

Dear Sirs / Madam,

Planning Application Reference: 137226/FO/2023 (“Application”)

Part of Plot C and Plot E, Great Jackson Street, Manchester (“Site”)

1 Introduction

- 1.1 We write on behalf of Great Jackson St Estates Limited (“**GJSEL**”), and further to GJSEL's previous objections to the Application (in particular, letters dated 4 August 2023, 21 June 2024, 1 August 2025 and 27 February 2026).
- 1.2 We do not seek to repeat the content of these earlier letters, but note that GJSEL's objections have neither been responded to nor addressed by Manchester City Council (“**Council**”). This failure is consistent with a pattern of behaviour evident since GJSEL first objected to the Application in August 2023. To date, we do not consider that the Council has properly taken GJSEL's objections into account when determining the Application.

2 Amended draft Section 106 agreement

- 2.1 A draft Section 106 Agreement was published on the Council's planning portal on or about 18 July 2025 (the “**Original Draft S106**”), and the Council has recently published a further draft Section 106 agreement (the “**Amended Draft S106**”).
- 2.2 It is not clear when the Council intends to either complete the Amended Draft S106 or determine the Application. However, we have been told by Lucy Harrison that the Application will not be determined within 7 days of 17 April 2026.
- 2.3 We have reviewed the Amended Draft S106 and we note it is in substantially the same form as the Original Draft S106. However, the Amended Draft S106 now includes the payment of the "Holcroft Moss Contribution" (in the sum of £64,602) and also sets a "Permitted Profit Level" of 12%, if the development is delivered as a build to rent scheme.

- 2.4 The Council has not properly explained how this additional financial contribution has been negotiated, in the context of Renaker's consistent argument that the development cannot viably support any planning obligations. The email exchange, included on the portal and dated 12 February 2026, does not provide further clarity. This raises significant questions over the reliability of the viability evidence, obtained by both Renaker and the Council, and also the potential for the development to support further planning obligations (in particular, affordable housing).
- 2.5 The addition of a "Permitted Profit Level" for a build to rent scheme raises the same concern set out in paragraph 2 of our letter of 27 February 2026. There is a continuing lack of transparency over: (i) who set the permitted profit levels; and (ii) what evidence base was used to support that decision.

3 Conclusion

- 3.1 The Amended Draft S106 raises new concerns over the approach the Council have taken to the Application. There remains a lack of a transparent evidence base to justify the proposed permitted profit levels referenced in the Amended Draft S106, a failure by the Council to meaningfully engage with the viability objections previously raised by GJSEL, a material inconsistency in Renaker's offer of the Holcroft Moss contribution, and a continued reliance by Renaker on outdated technical assessments.
- 3.2 These issues should be fully addressed, and Renaker should be required to obtain the necessary evidence to support the Application. The Application should then be taken back to members for re-consideration, before the Application is determined.
- 3.3 A failure to address these issues would leave any decision at clear risk of legal challenge. Please explain by return how the issues identified in this letter, and GJSEL's previous objections, will be addressed.

Please confirm receipt of this letter.

Yours faithfully,

