

Comments for Planning Application 143025/LO/2025

Application Summary

Application Number: 143025/LO/2025

Address: Sister Plot C Former Umist Campus Altrincham Street Manchester M1 7JA

Proposal: Listed building consent for alterations to Sculptural Wall (Hollaway Wall), to encapsulate the wall within new office building (C2 Building), as part of mixed-use development proposals comprising offices use (Class E) and flexible commercial and community uses (Class E, F2 and/or Sui Generis- drinking establishment).

Case Officer: Jennifer Atkinson

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: I wish to OBJECT to Listed Building Consent Application 143025/LO/2025 for alterations to the Sculptural Wall (Hollaway Wall), a Grade II listed structure.

The proposed alterations would cause substantial harm to the special architectural and historic interest of this Grade II listed structure. The alterations would result in the effective loss of a large section of the structure (around 30%) which undermines the wall's original purpose as a single piece of large scale, functional, public art. The structure is regarded by Historic England as a rare example of 1960s public art which incorporates a functional purpose, as a sound buffer. Removing and relocating sections of the wall and incorporating other sections into the interior space of a new building will negate this purpose and the important historical context in which the structure was built, namely the 1950s and 60s concept of separating people from the noise and visual and physical intrusion of vehicular traffic, will be lost. In addition to the harm caused to the structure itself, the proposed alterations will limit public access to a structure designed first and foremost as a piece of functional public art. Whilst plans are for the encased sections to be within a 'publicly accessible space', the wall will be on private property where public access could be withdrawn at any time, this severely undermines Anthony Hollaway's vision for structures which combine public art with form and function. With no indication of what exactly the interior space incorporating the wall will be used for, it is unclear how the public will access the piece and whether this will be possible without the expectation to make a purchase (e.g. if the space were to be used for commercial purposes such as hospitality).

The proposed changes are irreversible and fundamentally alter the character of an important listed

asset. As the post war period continues to be of increasing interest to architectural and social historians, structures like the Holloway Wall will provide crucial insights into the social context of the period and the changes in thinking around architecture and the built environment driven forward by rapid advancements in materials and techniques.

The proposal fails to comply with NPPF paragraphs 201-202 regarding substantial harm to heritage assets and these severe alterations are not required for the developer to achieve the desired goals of the scheme. The proposed development will cause undue harm to a Grade II listed structure. The developer does not appear to have considered any alternatives to retain the structure in its current, unaltered state. As a private, commercial development, the proposal does not represent substantial public benefit and as such does not justify the level of damage to a significant heritage asset.

As the importance of the post war period in architecture and design continues to become more apparent, I hope planning authorities won't look back and regret the loss of a striking and imposing Brutalist structure such as the Anthony Holloway wall.