



7th August 2025

Plot C, ID Manchester – Group Value, Heritage Note

Group value is identified within the 'Principles of Selection for Listed Buildings' (DCMS Guidance document, last updated Jan, 2025). This document sets out the statutory criteria and general principles applied by the Secretary of State when deciding whether a building is of special architectural or historic interest and should therefore be added to the list of buildings compiled under the terms of the Planning (Listed Buildings and Conservation Areas) Act 1990.

However, group value is a supplementary attribute of significance rather than founding criteria (which is defined in the NPPF (Annex 2 – Glossary) as architectural, historic, artistic and archaeological) and should not be given greater weight than these established pillars of significance (for heritage policy).

The guidance states that, *"when making a listing decision, the Secretary of State may also take into account 'Group value', which is defined as: 'the extent to which the exterior of the building contributes to the architectural or historic interest of any group of buildings of which it forms part, generally known as group value. The Secretary of State will take this into account particularly where buildings comprise an important architectural or historic unity or a fine example of planning (e.g. squares, terraces or model villages) or where there is a historical functional relationship between the buildings. Sometimes group value will be achieved through a co-location of diverse buildings of different types and dates'.*

It's important to note that the group of former university buildings that surround the Renold building (the Barnes Wallis, Butterfly steps, Staff Meeting House, and Morton Laboratory) have not been considered to yield Group Value to any extent that would a) warrant listing, or b) mention in the Renold listing description – this confirms that the NDHAs are not considered to contribute to the architectural or historic interest of the Renold to a significant extent (N.B. the NDHAs are still within the setting of the Renold building are subject to relevant policies within the NPPF).

It will be evident that the group value derived from the Renold and Hollaway Wall falls into the latter category defined within the Principles of Selection guidance, i.e.: *'achieved through a co-location of diverse buildings of different types and dates'*. The official list entry for the Renold Building has identified *"the Renold Building and Antony Hollaway's listed Sculptural Wall (NHLE number 1400857) have group value as integral components of UMIST's post-war campus"*.

As highlighted within the list description, the two structures share group value through their historical associations as components of the post-war UMIST Campus. This is however, the only definable link between the two structures, which are otherwise read and understood as completely separate components. The Hollaway Wall (1968) was erected six years after the Renold building was completed (1962) and was designed by Fairhurst & Sons and Anthony Holloway, with the Renold building having

been designed over 6 years before, by Cruickshank & Seward. Whilst both practices worked in unison on the UMIST masterplan, the Holloway Wall did not feature at any point during the masterplan development stages, with archival evidence demonstrating the structure was latterly introduced to the east side of the existing Moffat Building as a functional retaining wall with dual interest as an artistic sculpture.

Neither structure can be seen in conjunction with each other and have always been visually segregated by existing campus buildings, notably the Barnes Wallis / Wright Robinson Tower and the Moffat Building. As a consequence, they each make a neutral contribution to the others setting and do not retain any additional 'group value' through other key attributes of heritage significance, including architectural interest, aesthetic interest or archaeological interest; with the limited interest as a 'group' derived from wider historical associations with the UMIST Campus.

Whilst both listed structures have a shared group value as being "*integral components of UMIST's post-war campus*", they are separate structures with individual significance criteria and consequently, need to be assessed as individual designated heritage assets in their own right; it should also be noted that the Holloway Wall is not listed for its Group Value.

To attribute significant weight to 'group value' would dilute the individual significance of each asset in their own right, as such, the heritage statement assesses the impact of the proposals for each listed building separately, and identifies the overall effect of the proposals for the Holloway Wall to have a neutral effect (i.e. no harm) to the significance of the Renold Building and will not change its group value.

On this basis, the attribution of group value between the Renold Building and the Holloway wall does not alter the current assessment of the potential heritage impact as a result of the Plot C proposals.

Further to the above, it is recognised there is an opportunity to enhance the physical and historical group value between the Renold Building and the Holloway Wall through the Planning Application for Plot C, which will seek to provide enhanced permeability and community access across the former UMIST site. The 'Manchester Room' proposed within the new atrium space of Plot C2 will also provide a space for interpretation and public engagement with the history of the site, with inherent focus being on buildings of national interest such as the Renold and the Holloway Wall.