TECHNICAL NOTE

Job Name:	10-12 Whitworth Street West, Manchester
Job No:	330910278
Note No:	TN03
Date:	20th October 2026
Prepared By:	Nathan Caines: Graduate Transport Planner
Checked By:	Jack Fawdington: Principal Transport Planner
Approved By:	Brian Laird: Technical Director – Transport Planning
Subject:	**Erection of a 39-storey purpose-built student accommodation building (Sui Generis)** **10-12 Whitworth Street West, Manchester, M1 5WY** **Planning Application Reference: PLA-2026-000485** **Transport Technical Note: Response to TfGM and MCC Highways Comments**

1. Introduction

1.1. This Technical Note [TN] has been prepared in response to comments received from Transport for Greater Manchester [TfGM] (dated 1st October 2026) and Manchester City Council [MCC] (dated 8th October 2026), regarding the proposed purpose-built student accommodation development at 10-12 Whitworth Street West.

1.2. The proposed development would provide 818 student bedspaces and would operate on a car-free basis. The planning application was supported by a Transport Statement [TS], Framework Travel Plan, Residential Management Strategy, Initial Construction Management Plan, Stage 1 Road Safety Audit and associated drawings. A previous TN, dated 14 September 2026, responded to comments from MCC Highways and TfGM.

2. Cycle Parking and Supporting Facilities

2.1. TfGM and MCC seek increased secure private cycle parking and supporting facilities, monitoring and provision for future expansion. MCC has previously identified a preferred provision equivalent to 25% of bedspaces, which it has suggested could comprise a combination of private cycle storage, Fusion pool bicycles and access to public cycle hire.

2.2. Stantec remains confident that the submitted evidence provides a sound basis for retaining 139 secure internal cycle spaces, equivalent to approximately 17% of bedspaces. No adopted policy establishing a specific 25% requirement for PBSA has been identified or cited in support of the requested increase. A preferred percentage does not demonstrate that the proposed provision is insufficient.

2.3. The committee reports for the Charles Street and iQ Weston PBSA schemes, scheduled for consideration on 22 October 2026, identify cycle parking provision equivalent to approximately 6% of bedspaces as acceptable to officers. Whilst each scheme must be considered on its merits, these examples support an evidence-led assessment rather than a fixed 25% requirement. The proposed 17% provision at Whitworth Street West is substantially higher.

2.4. The first-principles assessment uses recorded cycle-parking demand at 12 occupied PBSA developments, reported in Velocity Transport Planning's August 2026 Healthy Streets Transport Assessment for Units 10 and 12 Forest Trading Estate, London. **Table 1** applies the reported demand rates to the proposed 818 bedspaces, allowing direct comparison with the proposed provision.

Table 1: Comparator Cycle Demand and Proposed Provision

Evidence	Percentage of Bedspaces	Equivalent for 818 Beds
Four Fusion developments: average demand	2.2%	18 cycles
Eight Unite developments: average demand	2.9%	24 cycles
Combined dataset: reported average demand	2.56%	21 cycles
Highest recorded comparator demand	6.9%	56 cycles
Proposed secure cycle parking provision	17%	139 spaces
MCC's preferred provision	25%	205 spaces

Source: Velocity Transport Planning, August 2026

2.5. The proposed 139 spaces provide approximately 118 spaces above the reported average demand and 83 above the highest recorded comparator demand. Provision is approximately 2.5 times the highest recorded comparator demand, leaving substantial headroom for cycling to increase beyond the observed levels. Retaining the proposed provision would allow more effective use of ground-floor space for facilities benefiting the student population, whilst maintaining cycle parking capacity substantially above the demand indicated by the comparator evidence.

2.6. This supports a vision-led approach to the car-free development by providing capacity well above anticipated use, directly alongside existing cycle infrastructure. Stantec considers the site to be in a sustainable location, with walking, cycling and public transport providing readily available alternatives to private car travel for residents. Ten Fusion pool bicycles would additionally enable residents without their own bicycle to cycle, while eight visitor spaces would serve short-stay demand. The pool bicycles would be available for shared use, allowing individual bicycles to serve multiple residents over time and supporting cycling without requiring each user to own and store a bicycle.

2.7. Residents would also have access to nearby Starling Bikes hire stations, operated by Beryl, including 12 docking spaces outside the Hacienda building on Whitworth Street West and 11 outside Fusion Deansgate South. These public facilities provide a further opportunity to cycle without owning a bicycle. Consistent with MCC's suggested approach, the 139 secure private spaces should therefore be considered alongside the ten Fusion pool bicycles and nearby public cycle hire when assessing the overall cycle offer. Public docking spaces are shared facilities and are not included in the 139-space provision. Cycle parking is also provided at nearby Deansgate railway station (six cycle parking spaces) and Manchester Oxford Road (secure cycle hub with 18 spaces), supporting residents making journeys that combine cycling and rail travel, subject to availability.

2.8. The revised six-site TRICS assessment forecasts 47 daily two-way cycle trips. Cycle trips and cycle-parking accumulation are different measures, so the comparator occupancy data provide the direct basis for the parking assessment. No additional dataset beyond the submitted comparator surveys, TRICS and 2011 Census benchmark has been identified that is demonstrably more representative of the prospective residents and their travel patterns.

2.9. The submitted TS also identifies accepted Manchester PBSA provision ranging from approximately 8% to 29%, including approximately 17% at nearby Fusion Deansgate South. Occupancy monitoring through the Full Travel Plan would identify any sustained pressure on storage and inform whether additional provision is required. An unconditional requirement for additional private cycle spaces is not justified by the evidence of demand and the substantial capacity already proposed.

3. Integration with the Whitworth Street Corridor

3.1. TfGM and MCC seek further clarification of route legibility, directness, safety and integration with the Whitworth Street corridor.

3.2. Dedicated cycle facilities run along Whitworth Street West immediately outside the front door of the development. The internal cycle store is reached by a short connection via Cameron Street, with its entrance on the western side of the building. This provides a direct relationship between the development and the existing corridor.

3.3. Stantec does not agree that further off-site connections or wayfinding works are necessary merely because the cycle-store entrance is on Cameron Street. TfGM and MCC should identify any specific gap, conflict or unclear part of the route that requires treatment, together with the development-related need for that treatment.

3.4. Residents will live within the building and receive an induction and welcome pack on arrival, identifying the cycle-store entrance and nearby cycle routes, including connections to university destinations. The Travel Plan will reinforce this guidance and explain connections to the wider network.

3.5. Four Sheffield stands, accommodating eight visitor cycles, will be clearly visible from the site frontage near the north-western corner. MCC has accepted their location in principle. Given the adjoining cycle facilities, short route to the internal store and resident information, the proposed arrangements provide clear access and wayfinding. Highway details and frontage works will be coordinated through Section 278 works.

4. Public Transport Distribution and Capacity

4.1. TfGM challenges the assumptions used to distribute public transport demand and seeks evidence of available service and station capacity, particularly at Deansgate.

4.2. The assessment uses student-accommodation TRICS surveys to forecast demand and 2011 Census journey-to-work data as a local benchmark for splitting the combined bus/Metrolink category. The Census datasets are not student-specific, and the equal rail split between Deansgate and Oxford Road is an assessment assumption. These limitations are recognised; no demonstrably more representative dataset has been identified for the future residents.

4.3. The resident demographic and proximity to Manchester Metropolitan University and the University of Manchester support walking, cycling and bus use for routine education journeys. Rail and Metrolink would also serve longer-distance journeys. The submitted sensitivity test assigns all forecast rail trips to Deansgate, producing a maximum of 30 departing passengers in the morning peak hour and 24 arriving passengers in the evening peak hour.

4.4. The recently consented Glenbrook scheme adjacent at 2-4 Whitworth Street West provides a relevant comparison. The scheme Transport Statement assesses 364 Build-To-Rent [BTR] apartments and identifies the highest GMAL accessibility rating of 8 and highlights the proximity of Deansgate rail station and Deansgate-Castlefield Metrolink stop. It does not present a detailed public transport capacity assessment. Whilst the resident profiles and travel patterns would differ, both developments would use the same nearby services and stations.

4.5. The submitted forecasts identify the additional demand associated with the proposed development. Stantec considers the assessment proportionate. Having regard to the neighbouring consent, the need for further capacity work should be supported by a clear explanation of the particular constraint and its relationship to this scheme. Further clarification from TfGM on the concerns at Deansgate and the implications of planned works at Oxford Road would help establish whether any additional assessment or mitigation is required.

4.6. Stantec acknowledges that the X50 no longer serves the Whitworth Street West stop. Services 255, 256 and free bus 1 remain available within a short walk of the site, providing connections to Piccadilly Gardens, Partington, Flixton and Spinningfields. TfGM's published information confirms that free bus 1 runs along Whitworth Street West every ten minutes between 07:00 and 19:00 on weekdays. This supplements the TS bus information; the earlier combined service totals are not relied upon here as evidence of current available capacity.

5. Travel Plan

5.1. TfGM seeks mode-share targets, monitoring, sustainable travel measures, remedial actions and a response to additional cycle-parking demand.

5.2. MCC has previously requested that preparation, submission, implementation and monitoring of the Full Travel Plan be secured by condition. Stantec maintains that this remains an appropriate mechanism and that a further standalone Full Travel Plan is not required before determination.

5.3. The condition can secure agreed mode-share targets, a defined monitoring regime, measures and incentives promoting active travel and public transport, and remedial action where targets are not achieved. Resident induction and welcome information will form part of the measures promoting cycling.

5.4. Cycle-store occupancy monitoring will identify any sustained excess demand and inform an appropriate response. Any additional private cycle-parking requirement should reflect demonstrated demand and a feasible storage arrangement. An unconditional commitment to additional spaces is not considered justified where the initial provision already substantially exceeds the comparator demand.

6. Loading and Servicing Arrangement

6.1. TfGM and MCC seek a consistent minimum retained footway width and clarification of effects on the bus lane, cycle provision and pedestrian safety.

6.2. A minimum unobstructed footway width of 2m will be retained behind the loading bay when it is occupied. This supersedes the approximately 1.66m figure in paragraphs 10.5 and 12.7 of the September TN and reconciles those references with the 2m dimension shown on the appended landscape drawing. The 2m minimum is the basis of the proposed arrangement.

6.3. MCC has accepted the loading-bay principle and delivery of the highway works through Section 278, subject to detailed design and the relevant approvals. MCC's scoping correspondence, appended to the TS, supports a frontage loading bay and allows its geometry to be refined at detailed design stage. Stantec does not agree that the principle should be reopened; the detailed arrangement should build on that agreement while resolving specific outstanding operational or safety matters.

6.4. Refuse vehicles would approach eastbound before crossing the westbound bus lane to enter the bay. The revised swept-path assessment demonstrates accommodation of the 11.5m vehicle. MCC's email of 5 March 2026 confirms no objection to relocating the cycle-lane start, subject to a 1:10 taper and the solid cycle line commencing beyond the loading bay. These treatments, kerb details and servicing controls will be coordinated through Section 278. TfGM should identify any particular conflict requiring further treatment.

6.5. Paragraph 7.2.4 of the submitted TS records MCC's agreement in principle that private waste-collection vehicles serving the site can be whitelisted to pass westbound through the bus gate. This supports the principle of servicing access, while the applicable vehicle authorisation and operational arrangements will be confirmed with MCC before implementation.

7. Student Move-In and Move-Out Strategy

7.1. MCC and TfGM accept that the Student Move-In/Move-Out Strategy can be secured through a planning condition. This approach is agreed, including the operational matters identified in TfGM's response.

8. Summary and Conclusion

8.1. The proposed 139 secure internal cycle spaces provide substantial headroom above observed comparator demand, supported by pool bicycles, visitor parking and direct access to the adjoining cycle corridor. Increased cycle-parking quantity or additional off-site corridor works are not justified by the evidence currently presented.

8.2. The retained unobstructed footway width is confirmed as a minimum of 2m. The Full Travel Plan and Student Move-In and Move-Out Strategy can be secured by condition, with the agreed loading-bay principle and detailed highway arrangements progressed through Section 278.