Plot C, Sister

Environmental Statement Addendum

September 2025

Figures & Appendices

Heritage

Figure 6.1: Heritage Asset Map – Listed Buildings (Updated)

Appendix 6.1: Heritage Statement (Updated – dated September 2025)

1. Introduction

1.1. This Environmental Statement Addendum has been prepared in respect of three applications, submitted to Manchester City Council ('MCC'), comprising: one application for full planning permission; and two applications for listed building consent concerning the redevelopment of part of 'Sister,' a Strategic Regeneration Area known as Plot C in Manchester City Centre. As such, the proposals form a key component of realising Sister's ambitions to transform the former University of Manchester Institute of Science and Technology (UMIST) campus into a 4 million sq. ft. globally competitive innovation district, including 2 million sq. ft. of commercial and retail space, and over 1,500 homes.

1.2. Plot C falls under within Zone C of the ID Manchester Strategic Regeneration Framework (2023) ('the SRF') and will be hereby referred to solely as Plot C. ID Manchester has since been rebranded as 'Sister' and shall be referred to as such throughout this Statement.

1.3. This Addendum supplements, and should be read in conjunction with, the Environmental Statement (the ES) prepared by Deloitte dated May 2025 submitted with the below planning applications. The sections of this Addendum have been numbered to correspond with the chapters of the ES. Where relevant, it is noted in each section who has authored.

1.4. The Environmental Impact Assessment (EIA) was carried out in accordance with the Town and Country Planning (Environmental Impact Assessment) Regulations 2017 (as amended) ('the EIA Regulations') and best practice guidance.

1.5. The Applicants are ID Manchester Ltd and University of Manchester ('the Applicants'). ID Manchester Ltd is a joint venture ('JV') between Bruntwood SciTech Ltd and the University of Manchester formed to deliver Sister.

1.6. The three applications were submitted to Manchester City Council (MCC) in May 2025.

1.7. An application with reference 143024/FO/2025 for:

1.8. *"Phased development comprising: Phase A - demolition of existing buildings and structures, erection of a basement (C1 Building and C2 Building) and a podium across lower ground and upper ground floors comprising flexible commercial space (Class E and/or Sui Generis drinking establishment), erection of a building (C1 Building) to form offices (Class E), landscaping works, highways, access, servicing, infrastructure and other associated works; Phase B: erection of a podium across lower ground and upper ground floors and a new building (C2 Building) to form offices (Class E) and flexible commercial and community uses (Class E, F2 and/ or Sui Generis drinking establishment), alterations to the existing Sculptural Wall (Hollaway Wall), relocation of existing art work, landscaping works, highways, access, servicing, infrastructure and other associated works; Phase C - change of use and associated works to railway Viaduct arches to form flexible commercial units (Class E, and/ or Sui Generis - drinking establishment) including highways, access and servicing arrangements, and other associated works."*

1.9. An application with reference 143025/LO/2025 for:

1.10. *"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)."*

An application with reference 143060/LO/2025 for:

1.11. *"Listed Building Consent for alterations to Manchester South Junction and Altrincham Railway Viaduct to facilitate the change of use to form flexible commercial units (Class E, and/ or Sui Generis - drinking establishment)."*

1.12. Please note that for the remainder of this statement 'the Site' and 'Proposed Development' refers to each of the three concurrent applications.

1.13. This Addendum is submitted following the formal listing of the Renold Building (located immediately west of the Site) as a Grade II listed asset (on 31 July 2025).

This Addendum provides further information relevant to the following chapters of the ES:

- Heritage (Chapter 6)

- Alternatives and Design Evolution
- Summary of Residual Effects (Chapter 16).

1.14. Paragraphs 1.20 - 1.26 of the ES set out and define the phases and scenarios tested. These broadly align with the EIA Screening Scoping Report / Request (submitted to MCC on 20 February 2025 – Appendix 2.1) and the Formal Scoping Opinion (received 7 April 2025 – Appendix 2.2).

1.15. Please refer to Appendix 2.4 (of the ES) which provides a Summary of EIA Scoping Opinion comments, responses and updates; this includes identifying where scenarios to be assessed have been amended since the EIA Screening and Scoping stage (in comparison to those assessed as part of this EIA, including supporting rationale).

1.16. Paragraphs 2.33 – 2.34 of the ES provide details in relation to the Committed Developments that have been considered as part of the cumulative assessment and Appendix 2.3 to the ES provides a table of the Committed Developments. Paragraph 2.33 notes that a search of MCC's planning applications database and knowledge of the area has identified a number of committed developments for which cumulative effects are considered more likely. A full list is contained at Appendix 2.3 and was provided to the Local Planning Authority. The Committed Developments include schemes that have been submitted to the Local Planning Authority but had not yet been determined. Applications in the pre-application stage are not considered as reasonably foreseeable.

The Site

1.17. The Site is bound by Vimto Park and the rear of buildings fronting onto Granby Row to the north, London Road to the east, Jackson's Mill and the Maths and Social Sciences (MSS) Tower to the south, and the Grade II Listed Renold Building to the west.

1.18. The Site is partially located within the Whitworth Street Conservation Area, with the north aspect of the Plot C boundary (Viaduct) forming the Conservation Area boundary. The Site therefore forms part of the designated area.

1.19. The Site is located within the Piccadilly Ward in Manchester City Centre, including significant levels of current or planned private sector investment near to the site at Mayfield and London Road Fire Station for example.

1.20. Please refer to Chapter 4 of this Environment Statement for further details on the Site Context.

Scheme Amendments

1.21. Following Historic England's listing of Renold Building the proposed landscaping in Sister Square has been revised Please refer to Design and Access Statement addendum (section 4), Planning and Tall Building Statement Addendum, and Chapter 3 of this Environmental Statement addendum for further details).

1.22. In addition, it should also be noted that since the submission of the applications in May 2025 a number of façade changes have been progressed in response to comments received by planning officers (in relation to the façade and associated materiality). Please refer to Design and Access Statement Addendum (section 3) and Planning and Tall Building Statement Addendum for further details.

1.23. Further updates to the ES have been screened out and technical notes pertaining to the relevant technical chapters confirming this are submitted:

- Wind – in the context of façade and landscaping changes.
- TVIA – in the context of façade and landscaping changes.
- Solar glare – in the context of facade changes.

3. Alternatives and Design Evolution

3.1. The Proposed Development has been detailed within Chapter 5 of the PTBS and the submitted Design and Access Statement, which also sets out the iterative design process undertaken pre-submission to develop the proposals.

3.2. Since the submission of the applications, a Design and Access Statement Addendum and Planning Statement addendum have been submitted, which sets out the continued iterative design process undertaken over the past 3 – 4 months to develop the submitted proposals.

Alternative Designs

3.3. Under the above heading, paragraphs 3.9 -3.19 of the submitted Environmental Statement Volume 1 set out the alternative design for the Proposed Development.

3.4. Since the submission the design team has engaged closely with MCC, and has had a further meeting with Historic England throughout this period to ensure the optimum development proposal for the Site. As such, the design team, continuously led by Allies and Morrison, has continued to consider a multitude of different development options, and has undertaken detailed analysis to design an appropriate response to the Site's context. This has been informed by expert townscape, heritage, and microclimate advice and assessments.

3.5. Following the submission of the applications, stakeholder comments have been received and the Renold Building (partially located within the Site) has been listed by Historic England. In response a number of design changes have been made to the previously submitted scheme. These are summarised as follows:

- Refinement to façade details including the integration of ventilation requirements, passive shading elements, articulation of opening and pre-cast finished through further optioneering and engagement with MCC planning officers.
- Refinement to viaduct arches signage following comments received by MCC planning officers' post-submission.
- Revisions to landscaping and public realm design within Sister Square, to retain the Renold podium (including the existing terrace walls, steps and in-built planters).

3.6. Following the submission of the applications, Historic England and C20 Society comments have been received, which are focused on the Hollaway Wall. In response to comments received from C20 Society, additional detailed analysis has been undertaken and submitted around the full enclosure of the Hollaway Wall within the proposed building footprint. This builds upon the Hollaway Wall considerations outlined in the submitted Design and Access Statement. For further details on this additional analysis please refer to the Design and Access Statement Addendum submitted concurrently.

3.7. For further details on the design development please refer to Design and Access Statement Addendum prepared by Allies and Morrison and SLA, submitted concurrently with this Addendum.

6. Built Heritage

Introduction

6.1. Chapter 6 of the ES assessed the impact of the Proposed Development upon Built Heritage and was prepared by Heritage Architecture. This addendum reflects a change to the Built Heritage baseline following the listing of the Renold Building at Grade II and subsequent design changes to the Proposed Development.

6.2. The Heritage Statement, which accompanies the Chapter has been updated and is included in Appendix 6.2 Heritage Statement (Updated – September 2025).

Baseline Conditions

6.3. The Grade II listed Renold Building sits partially within the boundary of the Site and was previously assessed as a non-designated heritage asset.

6.4. The UMIST Cube sculpture, which sits on the north-east corner of the terrace of the Grade II listed Renold Building is not referenced within the listing of the Renold Building. It was not originally intended to be located on the terrace of the Renold Building and its status as a non-designated heritage asset has not changed.

6.5. Heritage Architecture have re-assessed the significance/ sensitivity of the Renold Building as a designated heritage asset and the potential indirect impacts of the Proposed Development on it.

6.6. As a result of its listing, the significance and sensitivity of the Grade II listed Renold Building, as a designated heritage asset is now **medium.**

6.7. The Proposed Development no longer includes the removal of the UMIST Cube which is fixed to the terrace of the Grade II listed Renold Building terrace.

6.8. The landscaping proposals of the Proposed Development have been amended to ensure that they will not directly affect the listed fabric of the terrace, steps, and planters to the north, east and south sides of the Grade II listed Renold Building. Consequently, it is considered that Listed Building Consent is not required due to the fact that the proposals will not directly affect the listed building's special historic character or architectural interest. Further to this, detailed methodologies outlining how the listed fabric will be protected during construction can be provided to ensure the listed fabric is not affected.

6.9. The comprehensive list description for the Grade II listed Renold Building includes reference to the Group Value the building has with the Grade II listed Hollaway Wall, which is located to the east side of the Site. The reference to Group Value relates to the association both listed structures have with the historic development of the former UMIST campus rather than a direct visual relationship, which is, as existing, not present/ understood. Consequently, this has not affected the assessment.

Identification and Evaluation of Likely Significant Effects

6.10. Heritage Architecture have re-assessed the in-direct impacts of the Proposed Development on the Grade II listed Renold Building which are outline below:

6.11 **Construction Phase**

Scenario 2 (Baseline + Phase A + Phase C): Scenario 2 is considered to give rise to a **moderate adverse** impact on the Renold Building (Grade II) and a **negligible-to-minor adverse** impact on the UMIST Cube (NDHA) during the construction phase (permanent, indirect effect) deriving principally from the demolition works of the NDHAs within the Site which are within its setting.

6.12. **Scenario 5 (Baseline + Phase A + Phase B + Phase C):** Scenario 5 is considered to give rise to a **moderate adverse** impact on the Renold Building (Grade II) and a **negligible-to-minor adverse** impact on the UMIST Cube (NDHA) during the construction phase (permanent, indirect effect) deriving principally from the demolition of the NDHAs within the Site which are within its setting.

6.13. **Scenario 8 (Baseline + Phase C):** Scenario 8 is considered to give rise to a **minor adverse** impact on the Renold Building (Grade II) and a **negligible adverse** impact on the UMIST Cube (NDHA)during the construction phase (temporary, indirect effect) due to the works being within the building's setting.

Operational Phase

6.14. **Scenario 2 (Baseline + Phase A + Phase C):** Scenario 2 will give rise to a **moderate adverse** impact on the Renold Building (Grade II) and a **negligible adverse** impact on the UMIST Cube (NDHA) (permanent, indirect) in recognition of the changes to the original setting of the building which contributed to the building's significance.

6.15. **Scenario 5 (Baseline + Phase A + Phase B + Phase C):** Scenario 5 will give rise to a **moderate adverse** impact on the Renold Building (Grade II) and a **negligible adverse** impact on the UMIST Cube (NDHA) (permanent, indirect) in recognition of the changes to the original setting of the building which contributed to the building's significance.

6.16. **Scenario 8 (Baseline + Phase C)**: The delivery of this scenario in isolation would give rise to a **minor beneficial** impact on the Renold Building (Grade II) and a **negligible beneficial** impact on the UMIST Cube (NDHA) (permanent, indirect) due to the localised enhancement to the building and art piece's setting.

Cumulative Effects

6.17. It is not considered this will result in any material change to the proposed situation and will incur no further / greater impact.

Residual Effects

Table 6.4 (Addendum) Residual Effects

Receptor	Sensitivity / significance value	Scale of Impact	Mitigation Measure	Post Mitigation Residual Effect – Significance and Duration (Temporary/Permanent)
Demolition and Construction Phase				
Renold Building (setting)	Medium	Moderate adverse	Ensure that CEMP is adhered to	Moderate adverse (temporary)
UMIST Cube	Low	Low adverse	Ensure that CEMP is adhered to	Minor adverse (temporary)
Operational Phase				
Renold Building	Medium	Moderate adverse	Embedded design quality	Moderate adverse (permanent)
UMIST Cube	Low	Negligible-to-Minor adverse	Embedded design quality	Negligible adverse (permanent)

	Figure:	6.1 (Updated)		
	Title:	Heritage Asset Map – Listed Buildings (Updated)		
	Project:	Plot C – ID Manchester		
	Date:	12.09.25	Scale:	Not to Scale

18. Summary of Residual Effects

18.1. Chapter 18 of the ES has been prepared by Deloitte and includes a summary of Residual Effects derived from the preceding technical chapter.

Heritage

Table 18.2 Summary of Residual Effects (Heritage – Addendum)

Receptor	Sensitivity / significance value	Scale of Impact	Mitigation Measure	Post Mitigation Residual Effect – Significance and Duration (Temporary/Permanent)
Demolition and Construction Phase				
Renold Building (setting)	Medium	Moderate adverse	Ensure that CEMP is adhered to	Moderate adverse (temporary)
UMIST Cube	Low	Low adverse	Ensure that CEMP is adhered to	Minor adverse (temporary)
Operational Phase				
Renold Building	Medium	Moderate adverse	Embedded design quality	Moderate adverse (permanent)
UMIST Cube	Low	Negligible-to-Minor adverse	Embedded design quality	Negligible adverse (permanent)

Planning Conditions or Obligations

18.2. Where inherent mitigation is included in the design of the Proposed Development, and as such will be included as part of the Proposed Development, it is anticipated that suitably worded planning conditions requiring the Proposed Development to be constructed in accordance with the approved plans or details would be appropriate.

18.3. A suitably worded planning condition could be appropriate to secure the submission of a Construction Management Plan(s) for the construction phase of the Proposed Development in line with Chapters 2, 5, 6, 7, 8, 12, 14, 16 and 17 of the ES.

18.4. It has been anticipated that suitably worded planning conditions or obligations may be required where necessary in relation to the following measures:

- Chapter 6 (Built Heritage) – Detailed method statements to works affecting the listed assets on or adjacent to the Site to ensure that works are carried out in an appropriate manner that protects the asset's significance. The detailed method statements include the demolition and construction phase whereby the listed assets will need to be protected.

- A management plan to manage ongoing protection/ cleaning works to ensure the fabric and character of the Hollaway Wall is preserved.

- Chapter 7 (TVIA) - Development to be delivered in-line with approved plans. Planning conditions requiring details of building and public realm materials to be submitted and approved by the LPA prior to works commencing.

- Chapter 8 (Air Quality) – Implementation of a Dust Management Plan (see table 8.13 within Appendix 8.2).
- Chapter 10 (Wind) Table 10.6 – Validation of wind mitigation measures through further wind testing once detailed design of public realm and building details, including balustrades to the balconies on Building C2, developed to demonstrate acceptable wind environment delivered throughout the development.
- Chapter 11 (Solar Glare) Table 11.7 - Glazing VLR Specification for western elevations of C1 and C2
- Chapter 13 (Socio Economic) – Paragraph 13.65 Local Labour Agreement
- Chapter 14 (Traffic and Transport) – Paragraph 14.12 Travel Plan
- Chapter 16 (Noise and Vibration) – Paragraph 16.179 Glazing Specification
- Chapter 16 (Noise and Vibration) – Paragraph 16.200 Implementation of noise and vibration monitoring.
- Chapter 16 (Noise and Vibration) – Paragraph 16.202 A Noise Management Plan for each event.
- Chapter 16 (Noise and Vibration) – Alongside the CEMP, to use Best Practicable Means (BPM).
- Chapter 17 (Ground Conditions) – Paragraph 17.9 Piling Works Risk Assessment (PWRA).
- Chapter 17 (Ground Conditions) – Table 17.4 Submission of a Remediation Strategy.
- Chapter 17 (Ground Conditions) – Table 17.4 Submission of a Contractor's Construction Phase Health
- and Safety Plan.
- Chapter 17 (Ground Conditions) – Table 17.4 Submission of a UXO Risk Management Plan.

18.5. Mitigation identified in Chapter 12 (Human Health) are identified above.

18.6. Finally, it is anticipated that a suitably worded planning condition or obligation may be appropriate to regulate the phasing of the Proposed Development where necessary.

Deloitte.

This report has been prepared for ID Manchester Ltd and University of Manchester and on the understanding that it will be made publicly available. All copyright and other proprietary rights in the report remain the property of Deloitte LLP, Allies and Morrison, SLA, Civic, G-Tech, BWB, Buro Happold, Greater Manchester Police, Pager Power, ID Manchester Limited, Stephen Levrant Heritage Architecture , Tyler Granger, Bruntwood Sc-Tech, Lowri Morris, 1st Line Defence and any rights not expressly granted in these terms or in the Contract are reserved.

No party other than ID Manchester Ltd and University of Manchester is entitled to rely on the report for any purpose whatsoever and thus Deloitte and the consultants accept no liability to any other party who is shown or gains access to this document.

The information contained within this report is provided to assist ID Manchester Ltd and University of Manchester with this Planning Application. The report makes use of a range of third party data sources. Whilst every reasonable care has been taken in compiling this report, Deloitte LLP and the Consultants cannot guarantee its accuracy.

Deloitte LLP is a limited liability partnership registered in England and Wales with registered number OC303675 and its registered office at 2 New Street Square, London EC4A 3BZ, United Kingdom.

Deloitte LLP is the United Kingdom affiliate of Deloitte NWE LLP, a member firm of Deloitte Touche Tohmatsu Limited, a UK private company limited by guarantee ("DTTL"). DTTL and each of its member firms are legally separate and independent entities. DTTL and Deloitte NWE LLP do not provide services to clients. Please see www.deloitte.com/about to learn more about our global network of member firms.

© 2025 Deloitte LLP. All rights reserved.