[redacted]

18th October, 2025

Julie Roscoe
Director of Planning, Building Control & Licensing,
Planning,
Level 6,
Town hall Extension,
PO Box 532,
Manchester,
M60 2KLA.

Dear Julie Roscoe,

FAO Jennifer Atkinson.
Consultation response on re-notification on Planning application No. 143024/FO/2025 - Phased development of SISTER Plot C, Former UMIST Campus, Altrincham Street, Manchester.

Thank you for your consultation letter dated 25th September 2025 regarding the above.

There are some 167 documents on the City Council's online application file relating to this application and we have been unable to identify a document that readily identifies the changes that have taken place to the proposal. However, at a recent SISTER Community Panel meeting those present were advised by the representatives of SISTER that the revisions to the scheme were only to remove those parts of the original proposal that would have directly affected the recently listed Renold Building thus avoiding the need for an application for listed building consent and slowing the proposal/development process. Two points follow from this:

(1) If this advice from SISTER is **incorrect** we would be grateful if you or the proposers would identify the other items of change and direct us to the relevant application information. Once in receipt of this information we may choose to revise our previous comments/objections made in our latter dated 19th June 2025. Until such time as we submit any revised comments, our previous comments/objections remain in place and we request they continue to be taken into account.

(2) If, this advice from SISTER is **correct** we confirm that the comments/objections made in our previous letter dated 19th June 2025 remain in place and we request they be taken into account.

Whichever of (1) and (2) above is the case, we would also request that the following additional comments/objections be taken into account:

(a) The listing description for the Renold building specifically reiterates the importance of the association between the Renold Building and the Hollaway Wall. The ability to appreciate the wall in its full extent without the proposed alteration and encapsulation

within a new building takes on even greater relevance. In this regard we have also considered the additional justification on behalf of the proposers by Deloitte LLP (18th September 2025). We do not agree with this additional justification which appears to be a desperate attempt to justify an unjustifiable level of harm to this designated heritage asset. We maintain that the heritage significance of the wall and its setting should have been appropriately acknowledged by the proposers and their design approach from the outset in order to give the necessary great weight to conservation required by the NPPF. Such an acknowledgement would have avoided the current proposal that, if implemented, would cause very great harm to the heritage asset itself, its heritage significance and heritage significance of its setting.

(b) The listing of the Renold building should lead to a reconsideration of the impact of the proposal on its setting. In particular, the proposed treatment of the Bowling Green area should be re-thought with particular emphasis on retaining the 'butterfly steps' which are a very specific, characterful and contemporaneous built feature within this setting. This would not preclude an imaginative design approach for providing legible and convenient access for disabled people between the levels. There should be an increased emphasis on the proposed building having a design response - including through the use and type of elevation materials, finishes and fenestration design - that resonates with that of the Renold Building.

Yours sincerely,

[redacted]