

Ms J Renshaw-Livesey
Development Management
Manchester City Council
Planning Department
PO Box 532
Town Hall
Manchester
M60 2LA

6 October 2025
EP ref: 24-498

Dear Ms Renshaw-Livesey

Re: Planning application for an extension and associated works - Monsall Mill, Monsall Road, Manchester, M40 8NQ

We are instructed by our client, Revegate Ltd, to progress a planning application for a change of use and extension at Monsall Mill, Monsall Road, Manchester, M40 8NQ.

Site and surrounding area

The site forms part of the Monsall Mill complex in the Monsall area of Manchester. The main building is a former mill that is now occupied by a wide range of businesses. The site comprises hardstanding that is used for ad-hoc storage, together with a building, and it is known as forming part of Unit 6.

Vehicular access is via Monsall Road and there is an internal access road that leads to Unit 6. Parking at the wider Monsall Mill complex takes place on an uncontrolled basis with no formal parking management strategy in place.

Planning permission was granted in the past on a temporary basis for the use of Unit 6 as a place of worship (LPA ref: 107779/FO/2015/N1). Planning permission was subsequently refused to make this use permanent (LPA ref: 117182/FO/2017); the only reason for refusal related to noise impacts as a result of the specific use proposed and all other matters, including principle and highways/parking, were found to be acceptable by the Council.

A planning application was lodged in 2024 for the change of use of Unit 6 to Class E(g) with associated three-storey extension (LPA ref: 134760/FO/2022). This application was refused by the Council in April 2024 on the basis of the following:

- Absence of information in relation to highways impacts.
- Absence of information in relation to justification for the proposed scheme in terms of its design, hours of use and anticipated number of staff.

All other matters were found to be acceptable by the Council, including the principle of development, residential amenity and noise impacts.

Planning policy context

The development plan comprises the Manchester Core Strategy, adopted in 2012, Saved Policies of the Manchester Unitary Development Plan (UDP) and the Greater Manchester Places for Everyone (PfE), adopted in 2024.

The Guide to Development in Manchester Supplementary Planning Document (SPD), adopted in 2007, provides guidance on development proposals.

Planning considerations

We address the reasons for refusal for 134760/FO/2022 below. All other matters, including the principle of development, residential amenity and noise impacts, were found to be acceptable by the Council and this new application is a re-submission of the same scheme with additional information as set out below.

Highways

We summarise the position as follows:

- The site is highly accessible by non-car modes of transport and is well located in relation to large residential catchment areas and local facilities to which trips can be made on foot and cycle.
- No safety issues have been recorded on the surrounding highway network based on the most recently available 5 year accident record.
- Reduced parking demand generated by the proposed use, in comparison with the previous place of worship, which was found to be acceptable by the Council in highways safety/parking terms and will have a beneficial impact and reduce the potential for on-road.
- In the unlikely event that on road parking does occur, there is no reason to believe that the parking would result in the local highway network operating any less safely than it currently does.
- This increase in traffic will be imperceptible and will not have a material impact on the operation or safety of the local highway network.
- The proposed scheme would generate minimal car parking requirements for Class Eg(ii) and Eg(iii) uses and there is capacity within the grounds of the mill to accommodate such demand.

The previous reason for refusal for 134760/FO/2022 in relation to Core Strategy Policies T1, SP1 and DM1 has been fully addressed.

Other matters

The application was also refused based on the basis of absence of information in relation to hours of use and anticipated number of staff/employees. The application is speculative insofar as there being no named end-operator at this stage and the hours of use and anticipated employment numbers cannot be confirmed at this stage.

It is not unusual for a planning application to be submitted on a speculative basis, and the proposed scheme creates the conditions for businesses to invest, expand and adapt in accordance paragraph 85 of the Framework. The Framework is highly supportive of such schemes that help build a strong, competitive economy and this

weighs heavily in favour of the grant of planning permission (paras. 85 to 87). The proposal seeks to make best use of under-utilised land in an effective and efficient manner.

The submitted application should be assessed on the basis of the building being used for Class E(g)(ii) and/or Class E(g)(iii) purposes. It is not necessary for a tenant to be known for an informed assessment to be carried out; even if a tenant was known at this stage, there would be nothing to stop a different tenant from occupying the premises in the future within the parameters of the same use class. Any restriction within the E Use Class can be controlled via suitably worded planning condition. In terms of hours of use, we are happy to discuss this with officers and it can also be subject to a suitably worded planning condition.

The previous planning application was not refused on the basis of alleged harm to character and appearance as a result of the proposed design concept. If there was any such concern by the LPA, it would have been refused on such grounds. We summarise visual impacts as a result of the proposal below:

- The existing site is characterised by a complex of industrial buildings or a range of sizes and layouts. It has an industrial and urbanised character and appearance.
- The application site itself is well enclosed visually by the existing belt of trees to the road frontage.
- The size of the proposed extension is subservient and secondary in relation to the overall built form of the host building.
- The fenestration and external materials of the extension would be to match the existing building.

The previous reason for refusal for 134760/FO/2022 in relation to Core Strategy Policies EN1 and DM1 and Saved UDP Policy DC26 has been fully addressed.

The Council's concerns for the previous planning application 134760/FO/2022 have been fully addressed and planning permission should therefore be granted without delay in accordance with paragraph 11 of the Framework. Should you require any further information, please do not hesitate to contact us.

Yours sincerely
Emery Planning


Gareth Salthouse BA (Hons), Mplan, MRTPI
Director

01625 442 787
