MANCHESTER CITY COUNCIL

Planning

Growth & Development

Delegated officer report for planning application

Application no.	145172/LO/2026
Date registered valid:	20 February 2026
Proposal:	Listed Building Consent for removal of timber panels at fourth floor in association with asbestos removal.
Address:	Marlsbro House, 52 - 54 Newton Street, Manchester, M1 1ED
Ward(s):	Piccadilly Ward
Applicant:	Mr Barney Cook ACLO Assets MH Limited
Agent (if any):	Euan Kellie Euan Kellie Property Solutions
Case officer:	Angela Leckie Tel: 0161 234 4651 Email: angela.leckie@manchester.gov.uk
Recommendation:	Approve
Date of recommendation:	07-04-27

Application details

Type of application: Listed Building Consent

Development type: Listed building alteration

Date of site visit: 29 January 2026

Standard consultations:
Printed: 23 February 2026 Expired: 16 March 2026

Neighbour notifications
Printed: 23 February 2026 Expired: 16 March 2026

Site notice
Posted: 25 February 2026 Expired: 18 March 2026

Press advert
Published: 3 March 2026 Expired: 24 March 2026

Departure from Development Plan: No

Environmental Statement: Not required

Description of site/building

Listed building: Grade II

Conservation area: Stevenson Square Conservation Area 1987

Tree Preservation Order: Not applicable

Marlsbro House is a Grade II-listed building located in the Stevenson Square Conservation Area in the City of Manchester. It has elevations to Newton Street, Dale Street and Faraday Street. The building is rectangular in plan, set over seven floors including a basement and attics. The building is of red brick, timber and cast iron construction, faced in cement render and with windows dating from 1960. The building under went a major refurbishment around the time of the new windows and render being installed.

The building's primary heritage significance lies in its early industrial construction, including rare heavy-timber flooring, cast iron columns, original structural timbers, and the composite timber and iron roof structure, all of which are largely intact and of moderate to high significance.

In 2021 a soft strip and asbestos removal works were undertaken within the basement to 4th floor of the building to enable the building to be brought forward for refurbishment. Some works were agreed by exchange of correspondence and were not considered to affect the special qualities or character of the listed building and as such to require listed building consent but some works were granted listed building consent under application ref no's 131357/LO/2021 and 132546/LO/2021.

The application relates specifically to the 4th floor which features early 20th century timber panelling set within the eaves. Whilst the early 20th century timber panelling has some significance as an illustration of a later phase of the building's evolution, this is considered to be comparatively minor in context of the building's primary interest founded in its earlier mill fabric and is very much secondary to the principal roof structure (which the panelling in part obscures).

Description of area

The site lies within an area of the City Centre known as the Northern Quarter which contains a variety of uses including bars, restaurants, commercial, residential and hotel uses.

Description of development

During consideration of the above 2021 consents localised removal of the timber tongue and groove panelling at 4th floor was discussed. However this element of the asbestos removal was not progressed and was omitted from the method statement agreed with MCC which related to the staircase only.



4th floor



Panels below clerestorey windows



4th floor



Panels below clerestorey windows

The building has recently been sold to a new owner who wants to comprehensively refurbish and repurpose the building. From restricted visual inspections, the roof appears to be in a poor state of repair. Both the iron and the timber elements appear to be in poor condition as the result of exposure to damp conditions and water ingress through the roof, with little or no ongoing maintenance and repair. To enable the refurbishment to move forward it is necessary to carry out some structural investigation works in relation to the roof. In order to progress structural understanding of the behaviour of the roof and allow design of any remedial structural interventions and repairs, there is a need to develop a fuller understanding of the structural arrangement and requirements for any subsequent alterations to each structural bay and the extent of distortion and deterioration of the roof structure. This requires a clear and unobstructed view of each structural roof member, including their connections and junctions, across the whole footprint of the building's fourth floor and attic space.

Currently access is extremely limited due to a large proportion of the roof structure being concealed behind timber panelling with the presence of asbestos within the eaves voids, and within the timber panelling itself, preventing safe access. The removal of the panelling and the asbestos in the eaves is therefore proposed, in order to reveal the full roof structure in a safe manner. Given the levels of contamination found it is highly unlikely that it would be safe to reinstate any part of the panelling but this will be explored further as the works progress, should consent be granted.

Relevant Site History

131357/LO/2021- LISTED BUILDING CONSENT Soft strip of basement and third floors in advance of asbestos removal

132546/LO/2021- Listed Building Consent - Asbestos removal (internal works only)

Consultations & Notification Responses

Publicity - The application was advertised as affecting a listed building,. A site notice was displayed adjacent to the site. 2 representations have been received. One is a letter of support and the other raised questions about the application form and suggested that there were irregularities with the submission.

Issues

The Places for Everyone Plan – Joint Development Plan Document, for nine of the 10 boroughs which make up Greater Manchester adopted on 21st of March 2024:

- Policy JP-P2 – Heritage

The Manchester Core Strategy – Development Plan Document 2012-2027 ("the Core Strategy") was adopted by the City Council on the 11th of July 2012:

- Policy SP1 – Spatial Principles
- Policy CC9 – Design and Heritage
- Policy EN3 – Heritage
- Policy DM1 – Development Management

Saved Unitary Development Plan for Manchester – The following saved UDP Policies are of relevance to this application:

- Policy DC19 – Listed Buildings

National Planning Policy Framework (NPPF) -

-Chapter 16 – Conserving the Historic Environment

The government has published a consultation National Planning Policy Framework which is intended to improve housebuilding rates through a clearer, more predictable and faster policy basis for decision and plan making. Whilst this is a draft NPPF for consultation it is considered that the development proposals are in accordance with the general thrust of policy contained within it.

Other Legislative Requirements Planning (Listed Buildings and Conservation Areas) Act 1990

Section 16(2) of the Planning (Listed Buildings and Conservation Areas) Act 1990 (LBCA Act) states that in considering whether to grant Listed Building Consent for any works the Local Planning Authority shall have special regard to the desirability of preserving the building or its setting or any features of special architectural or historic interest which it possesses.

Impact on the Character and Fabric of the Listed Building

It is a fundamental requirement of the NPPF that planning proposals contribute to the achievement of "sustainable development" (NPPF Paragraph 8). In order to meet this key planning objective, in this instance the development should sustain and contribute to the stimulation of a thriving historic environment.

The building's primary heritage significance lies in its early industrial construction, including rare heavy-timber flooring, cast iron columns, original structural timbers, and the composite timber and iron roof structure, all of which are largely intact and of moderate to high significance. This would be unaffected by the works. The fourth-floor timber tongue-and-groove panels represent a later, early-20th-century intervention and are of comparatively low historic significance.

The proposals form part of asbestos removal works required to allow the long-term protection of the more historically significant structural timbers and floorboards and to inform future proposals for the adaptive reuse of the vacant building which will secure its conservation in the long-term. It is considered that the removal of the partitions would result in a low level of harm to the aesthetic value of the building through the removal of one of its layers of history.

Under current conditions and in terms of the investigative works identified above, retaining the panels would require confined space working, intrusive cleaning, and prolonged handling within a contaminated enclosure, all of which present greater risk to operatives than controlled removal. Their removal would be a critical first stage - securing the health and safety of this part of the building and thus would deliver a clear benefit in terms of ensuring safety.

Notwithstanding the contamination issues many of the simple timber tongue and groove panels have become distorted over the years as the roof has settled. Owing to the current condition of the panels, there is a risk that detailed and intrusive cleaning would adversely impact on integrity of the panels (leaving them perforated with numerous drill holes) which would have a poor visual appearance.

The removal would allow the carrying out in safe conditions of the detailed investigations to facilitate any required repair works to the roof and the identification of necessary structural interventions necessary to bring the building up to the required modern standards. Furthermore given that the panelling is not original its removal would reveal the original form and fabric of the buildings 4th floor which would enhance the significance of the listed building.

The harm from the proposed works is considered to be 'less than substantial'. Paragraph 215 of the NPPF requires that the impact of the development on the listed building should be evaluated against the mitigation that would be provided from the wider public benefits of the scheme.
The works will ultimately facilitate the economic, social and environmental benefits that would result from its reuse. Potentially some further mitigation would be secured through a condition which requires the reinstatement of some of the panels following the asbestos removal and completion of the roof investigations.

Whilst it is necessary to have special regard to the desirability of preserving the setting any affected Heritage Assets it is considered that the small instances of low physical harm resulting from the proposed works to the building are acceptable and that the impact on the special character and fabric of the building would be less than substantial, and is balanced by the legislative requirement to secure a viable future use for the heritage asset.

In the context of the NPPF and section 16 of the Act, it is considered that the scheme strikes the right balance between the impact of the changes on the significance of the building, and the public benefits and where there is harm, this would be less than substantial. It is considered for the reasons outlined above that the overall approach to the proposed works would, have an acceptable impact on the character and historic fabric of the listed building.

Given the necessity of the work to allow for safe working conditions for investigations and unltimately the future refurbishment of the building, it is considered that given the relative value of the panels, the works are on balance acceptable.

It is considered, therefore, that, notwithstanding the considerable weight that must be given to preserving the preserving the building or any features of special architectural or historic interest which it possesses by S16 of the Act, the harm caused would be less than substantial and would be outweighed by the public benefits of the scheme and meet the requirements set out in paragraphs 195, 200, 201, 203, 205, 206 and 208 of the NPPF and that in view of the above it is considered that the proposed development would on balance be consistent with the development would be consistent with sections 12 and 16 of the National Planning Policy Framework PfE policy JP-P2 SP1, DM1, EN3 and CC9 and of the Core Strategy and saved UDP policy 19.1.

Other Legislative Requirements

Equality Act 2010
Section 149 (Public Sector Equality Duty) of the Equality Act 2010 requires due regard to the need to: Eliminate unlawful discrimination, harassment and victimisation and other conduct prohibited by the Act and; Advance equality of opportunity between persons who share a protected characteristic and persons who do not share it. The Equality Duty does not impose a legal requirement to conduct an Equality Impact Assessment. Compliance with the Equality Duty involves consciously thinking about the aims of the Equality Duty as part of the process of decision-making.

Human Rights Act 1998 considerations
This application needs to be considered against the provisions of the Human Rights Act 1998. Under Article 6, the applicants (and those third parties, including local residents, who have made representations) have a right to a fair hearing and to this end the local planning authority must give full consideration to their comments.

Protocol 1 Article 1, and Article 8 where appropriate, confer(s) a right of respect for a person's home, other land and business assets. In taking account of all material considerations, including Council policy as set out in the Core Strategy and saved polices of the Unitary Development Plan, the Director of Planning, Building Control & Licensing has concluded that some rights conferred by these articles on the applicant(s)/objector(s)/resident(s) and other occupiers and owners of nearby land that might be affected may be interfered with but that that interference is in accordance with the law and justified by being in the public interest and on the basis of the planning merits of the development proposal. She believes that any restriction on these rights posed by the recommendation given is proportionate to the wider benefits of and that such a decision falls within the margin of discretion afforded to the Council under the Town and Country Planning Acts.

Recommendation:

Article 35 Declaration

Officers have worked with the applicant in a positive and pro-active manner to seek solutions to problems arising in relation to dealing with the planning application. This has included on going discussions about the form and design of the developments and pre application advice about the information required to be submitted to support the application.

Condition(s) to be attached to decision for approval

1) The development must be begun not later than the expiration of three years beginning with the date of this permission.

Reason - Required to be imposed pursuant to Section 18 of the Planning (Listed Buildings and Conservation Areas) Act 1990.

2) The development hereby approved shall be carried out in accordance with the following drawings and documents:

(a) Site plans AHA/MHM EX/097 and AHA/MHM/ EX/098;

(b) Dwgs Existing 4th Floor Plan (drawing no: AHA-MHM-EX-104) and Demolition 4th Floor Plan (drawing no: AHA-MHM-DM-104) Rev A;

(c) Heritage Impact Assessment prepared by Donald Insall Associates and Heritage Impact Assessment Appendices:
o Appendix I - Statutory List Description
o Appendix II - Planning Policy and Guidance
o Appendix III & IV - Asbestos Survey and Methodology

(d) PROPOSED ASBESTOS REMOVAL PLAN by Global Asbestos Solutions dated 09-03-25;

(e) Marlsbro House - Newton Street Manchester Protection Measures, Methods and Controls Statement by Global Asbestos Solutions dated 09-03-25; and

(f) EKPS RESPONSE TO COMMENTS 11-03-26

Reason - To ensure that the development is carried out in accordance with the approved plans. Pursuant to Core Strategy CC9, EN3 and DM1 saved Unitary Development Plan policy DC19.1

3) (a) A watching brief shall be in operation as set out within the EKPS RESPONSE TO COMMENTS 11-03-26 including a small trial section 'hold point' opened once the site has been fully set up and protection measures are in place, to allow the fixing arrangement to be confirmed before proceeding further. Details of the findings of the watching brief and the retention / restatement of any panels shall then be submitted and agreed in writing by the City Council as local planning authority within 3 months of the investigative works being completed.

(b) Any works to reinstate panels should be carried out within 6 months of the investigative works being completed.

Reason - In the interests of visual amenity, and because the proposed works affect a building which is included in the Statutory List of Buildings of Special Architectural or Historic Interest so careful attention to building work is required to protect the character and appearance of this building in accordance with DC Policy 19.1 of the Unitary Development Plan for the City of Manchester.

4) Prior to and during the works a full photographic record of the areas of removal shall be undertaken and shall be submitted to and approved in writing by the City Council as local planning authority.

Reason - To provide a record of any archaeological remains and of the listed building's appearance and condition before works commence, in accordance with saved policy DC20 of the Unitary Development Plan for the City of Manchester and policies SP1, EN3 and DM1 of the Core Strategy.

Appendix 1 – List of consultees & neighbours notified

Heritage & Urban Design

Ground Floor, Marlsbro House, 52 - 54 Newton Street, Manchester, M1 1ED
First Floor, Marlsbro House, 52 - 54 Newton Street, Manchester, M1 1ED
Flat 15, The Bradley, 23 - 25 Hilton Street, Manchester, M1 1EL
Flat 14, The Bradley, 23 - 25 Hilton Street, Manchester, M1 1EL
Flat 13, The Bradley, 23 - 25 Hilton Street, Manchester, M1 1EL
Flat 12, The Bradley, 23 - 25 Hilton Street, Manchester, M1 1EL
Flat 11, The Bradley, 23 - 25 Hilton Street, Manchester, M1 1EL
Flat 10, The Bradley, 23 - 25 Hilton Street, Manchester, M1 1EL
Flat 9, The Bradley, 23 - 25 Hilton Street, Manchester, M1 1EL
Flat 8, The Bradley, 23 - 25 Hilton Street, Manchester, M1 1EL
Flat 7, The Bradley, 23 - 25 Hilton Street, Manchester, M1 1EL
Flat 6, The Bradley, 23 - 25 Hilton Street, Manchester, M1 1EL
Flat 5, The Bradley, 23 - 25 Hilton Street, Manchester, M1 1EL
Flat 4, The Bradley, 23 - 25 Hilton Street, Manchester, M1 1EL
Flat 3, The Bradley, 23 - 25 Hilton Street, Manchester, M1 1EL
Flat 2, The Bradley, 23 - 25 Hilton Street, Manchester, M1 1EL
Flat 1, The Bradley, 23 - 25 Hilton Street, Manchester, M1 1EL
Unit 2, Newton House, 63 Newton Street, Manchester, M1 1ET
Unit 1, Newton House, 63 Newton Street, Manchester, M1 1ET
Basement, 50 Newton Street, Manchester, M1 2EA
Basement To Second Floor, 43 Port Street, Manchester, M1 2EQ
Basement And Ground Floor, 25 Hilton Street, Manchester, M1 1ET
55 Newton Street, Manchester, M1 1ET
Flat Above, 43 Port Street, Manchester, M1 2EQ
41 Hilton Street, Manchester, M1 2EE
Basement, Marlsbro House, 52 - 54 Newton Street, Manchester, M1 1ED
Third Floor, Marlsbro House, 52 - 54 Newton Street, Manchester, M1 1ED
Flat At, 41 Hilton Street, Manchester, M1 2EE
Second Floor, Marlsbro House, 52 - 54 Newton Street, Manchester, M1 1ED
43 Port Street, Manchester, M1 2EQ
Greater Manchester Police Museum, Newton Street, Manchester, M1 1ET
50 Newton Street, Manchester, M1 2EA
57 Newton Street, Manchester, M1 1ET
37 Port Street, Manchester, M1 2EQ
39 - 41 Port Street, Manchester, M1 2EQ
25 Hilton Street, Manchester, M1 1ET

Appendix 2 – Planning constraints

Article 4 Direction - City Centre PD Restriction - Class B1(c) To C3
Article 4 Direction - Removal Of PD Rights Change Of Use From Class C3 To Class C4
Article 4 Direction - City Centre PD Restriction - Class B1(a) To C3
Coal Authority - Development Low Risk - Name: DEVELOPMENT_LOW_RISK_AREA
Conservation Area - Stevenson Square Conservation Area 1987
Susceptible to Surf Water Flood (Less) -
Susceptible to Surf Water Flood (Less) -
Susceptible to Surf Water Flood (Middle) -
Susceptible to Surf Water Flood (Middle) -

Area Team Boundary - Name: CENTRAL