Outlook

OBJECTION TO APPLICATION PLA-2026-001179, PP-15119271 – KFC, 83 PICCADILLY, MANCHESTER M1 2BZ

From [redacted]
Date Thu 2026-08-06 5:26 PM
To Lea Joseph [redacted] Planning [redacted]

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 Officer,

OBJECTION TO APPLICATION PLA-2026-001179, PP-15119271 – KFC, 83 PICCADILLY, MANCHESTER M1 2BZ

I wish to strongly object to the application seeking to vary Condition 3 and extend the permitted operating hours of KFC at 83 Piccadilly until 05:00 every day.

[redacted] and have direct experience of the impact that the existing operation already has on residential amenity. The premises are located directly beneath and adjacent to residential accommodation, and this relationship was an important consideration when the original planning permission was granted. The conditions attached to the original consent, including restrictions on opening hours, servicing, deliveries and noise control measures, were clearly intended to protect residents from unacceptable disturbance.

The existing operation already causes a number of issues for residents, including noise, odour and general disturbance. These impacts are not limited to the internal operation of the restaurant or extraction equipment. They also arise from customers gathering outside, delivery activity, conversations, vehicle movements, engines being left running, servicing activity and repeated door slamming.

In particular, the entrance door serving the premises creates a significant disturbance within the building. The door closes with considerable force, and the impact is transmitted through the structure of the building. From within my flat, I can clearly hear the door repeatedly slamming and, at times, the vibration is strong enough to cause items within my flat to move or rattle. This demonstrates that the disturbance is not simply external background noise but is being physically transmitted into the residential part of the building. Extending the operating hours would inevitably prolong this disturbance and further affect residents' ability to enjoy their homes.

Cooking odours are also a significant concern. I regularly experience smells from the premises entering my apartment, even when my windows are closed. This indicates that the issue is not simply caused by occasional smells entering through open windows, but that odours are affecting the residential accommodation itself. During warmer periods this becomes particularly difficult, as residents are effectively forced to choose between keeping windows closed in an attempt to reduce exposure to smells and noise, or opening them and experiencing even greater levels of

disturbance. Extending trading hours would significantly increase the length of time residents are exposed to cooking odours and would further affect their ability to enjoy and ventilate their homes.

I have concerns regarding the reliability of the submitted acoustic assessment and whether it accurately reflects the conditions experienced by residents. The assessment appears to place considerable reliance on the wider city-centre environment and background noise levels. However, many of the impacts experienced by residents do not originate from the main Piccadilly frontage. Noise from extraction equipment, deliveries, servicing arrangements and customer activity affects the quieter areas around Back Piccadilly and China Lane, where background noise levels are considerably lower.

The acoustic assessment also appears limited in its ability to capture the types of disturbance residents actually experience. The impact is not only from continuous noise levels but also from sudden and unpredictable events, such as doors slamming, people shouting, delivery activity, vehicle movements and unloading operations. These intermittent disturbances are capable of significantly affecting residents' quality of life and are not necessarily reflected by average noise measurements.

I am further concerned about the methodology used within the acoustic assessment. The noise survey was undertaken on a Sunday evening and was stated to represent the quietest period of a typical week. This does not provide a realistic representation of the conditions associated with a busy late-night takeaway operation. The assessment does not properly reflect periods when customer activity, delivery demand, pedestrian movement and interaction with Manchester's night-time economy are likely to be significantly greater.

The proposal also raises concerns regarding increased anti-social behaviour and public nuisance. A nationally recognised fast-food outlet operating until 05:00 would naturally become a destination for people leaving bars, clubs and other late-night venues. This could result in increased numbers of people congregating outside the premises, louder conversations, shouting, littering and general disturbance immediately beneath residential accommodation.

Residents have previous experience of the problems that can arise from late-night commercial activity in this immediate area. The former 24-hour Spar nearby regularly attracted groups gathering outside, shouting, nuisance behaviour and general disturbance. There is a clear risk that extending KFC's operating hours would create similar problems.

My experience over several years is that KFC has already been a poor neighbour. Residents have raised concerns regarding odour and nuisance associated with the premises, including cooking smells affecting residential apartments, yet there has been limited evidence of meaningful engagement or proactive action to resolve these issues.

Since living in the building, I have experienced these impacts directly. This objection is not based on speculation about what may happen in the future, but on the existing reality of living alongside the premises. The proposal would not introduce a new issue; it would extend the duration and increase the intensity of problems residents already experience.

There are also wider environmental concerns associated with the operation of the site. The area around the rear service entrance and bin storage area is frequently affected by grease and food-related residue, which is visible on the surrounding pavement and roadway. This creates an unpleasant environment for residents and raises concerns regarding cleanliness, maintenance and the wider impact of the operation on the local area.

Residents also experience disturbance from deliveries servicing the premises. Refrigerated delivery vehicles regularly attend the site and can remain stationary with engines and refrigeration units

running whilst unloading takes place. This creates a combination of noise, vibration and fumes which affects residents, particularly when windows are open. Extending the permitted trading hours is likely to increase servicing activity and the associated impacts over time.

It is also important to consider the assurances provided when the original permission was granted. During the original planning process, the applicant sought to reassure the Council that customer visits would be similar to those of a fast-casual restaurant, with limited dwell times, and that nuisance issues would be controlled. Commitments were also made regarding litter management, customers leaving quietly and measures to prevent public nuisance.

Those assurances were considered in the context of a business operating within restricted hours. The current proposal represents a significant change in the nature and intensity of the use. Extending operation until 05:00 would transform the premises into an effectively all-night takeaway operation, with a different pattern of customer behaviour, deliveries and servicing activity. The Council should therefore carefully reconsider whether the assumptions relied upon when the original permission was granted remain valid.

The original conditions relating to opening hours, deliveries, servicing and acoustic controls were imposed specifically to protect residential amenity. Those protections remain necessary. The applicant has not demonstrated that extending the operating hours can be achieved without causing additional harm to residents.

The applicant's statement concludes that there would be no material impact on residential amenity. As a resident who experiences the operation of the premises first-hand, this conclusion does not reflect the reality of living above the site. Technical assessments have a role to play, but they cannot replace the evidence of residents who experience the noise, odours, deliveries, servicing activity, vibration and disturbance associated with the premises on a daily basis.

The proposal would significantly reduce the periods of relief currently available to residents and would further undermine the residential environment that the original planning conditions were intended to protect.

For these reasons, I believe the proposed variation would result in unacceptable harm to residential amenity and would directly undermine the purpose of the safeguards originally imposed by Manchester City Council. I respectfully request that the application is refused.

Yours faithfully,

[redacted]

[redacted]