

Proposed redevelopment of the former Hotspur Press site, Manchester

Planning Statement Addendum

December 2025

Contents

1.	Introduction and background	1
2.	The need for scheme changes	7
3.	Change in planning and wider policy context	9
4.	Updated planning appraisal	11
5.	Consideration of the planning balance	22
Appendix 1: Schedule of documents for onward determination of planning application		
Appendix 2: Scheme benefits		
Appendix 3: Air Quality Technical Note		
Appendix 4: Schedule of architectural plans for approval		

1. Introduction and background

- 1.1 This Planning Statement Addendum relates to the proposed redevelopment of the former Hotspur Press site in Manchester City Centre. This is subject to a live planning application for the following (planning application reference 138805/FO/2023 relates):

Partial demolition of the former Hotspur Press Complex (Medlock Mill) and redevelopment of the site to provide Purpose Built Student Accommodation (Sui Generis Use Class) above ground floor commercial or community uses (Use Classes F(e), F2(a)(b) and E(b)), within a part 4/5-storey and part 35-storey (plus ground floor and roof parapet level), associated ancillary internal and external amenity space, public realm (including a new public square), hard and soft landscaping and associated highway works.

Recent history

- 1.2 The planning application was originally submitted by Manner (the applicant) in December 2023. It was considered by Manchester City Council's Planning Committee at its meeting of 30th May 2024. At the meeting, the Committee confirming that it was minded to approve the application in accordance with Officer recommendation subject to conditions, a Section 106 Agreement and removal of an objection to the proposal from the Environment Agency.
- 1.3 The Environment Agency subsequently removed its objection, on a matter relating to flood risk, in September 2024 following presentation of minor design changes to the scheme – these being the bricking up of lower ground floor windows adjacent to the River Medlock to prevent flood waters entering the site.
- 1.4 At this stage, the Section 106 Agreement has yet to be signed and so the application remains undetermined. In any case, the changes carried out to satisfy the Environment Agency would require the scheme to re-presented to the Planning Committee to determine that they do not change the Committee's resolution of 30th May 2024. The application has not yet been re-presented to the Planning Committee for this purpose.
- 1.5 On 31st May 2024, and subsequent to the Committee hearing, an application to add the former Hotspur Press complex to the List of Buildings of Special Architectural or Historic Interest (i.e. to be listed) was made by an anonymous individual or organisation. On 31st January 2025, some eight months after the application to list was made, the Secretary of State confirmed her decision that the building did not merit statutory listing.
- 1.6 Soon after this, the Secretary of State's decision was appealed (again by an anonymous individual/group) and so in effect returning the listing application

back to the Secretary of State to determine whether, in the light of any additional information submitted with the appeal, a different decision should be reached.

- 1.7 This process has resulted in significant delays to the project, with uncertainty as to whether the scheme could be delivered on account of the potential that the existing building would be subject to additional protection via its listing. This has meant that the development has not been fundable pending resolution of this matter.
- 1.8 Notwithstanding this, and in anticipation of the Secretary of State determining that her original decision not to list the building would stand, in May 2025 the applicant submitted a series of design amendments to the City Council as part of the undetermined planning application. These included an amended architectural approach to the tower component of the scheme and some limited changes to the massing of the development as well as an increase in the number of bedrooms.
- 1.9 The May 2025 submission was accompanied by a series of updated documents – where needed – including an Environmental Statement Update. It was intended that the application be progressed to determination on the basis of these revisions and the associated supporting documentation.
- 1.10 In June 2025, and prior to the Council’s determination of the updated application, a major fire broke out at the site which has destroyed the majority of the existing building with only parts of its façade still standing.
- 1.11 Immediately after the fire, and under direction from the City Council’s Building Control department, further parts of the façade were demolished as they were deemed to pose a health and safety risk. This is detailed within the Structural and Façade Retention Appraisal which forms part of this updated submission to the City Council.
- 1.12 It has not been possible to enter the site since the fire as the façade remains at risk of collapse.
- 1.13 On 12th September, the Secretary of State confirmed that she was not able to consider any further the appeal against her decision not to list the building on account of the condition of the building being materially different to that on which the evidence submitted by the listing applicant/appellant was based (i.e. owing to the fire). There is therefore no live application to list the building.
- 1.14 The above sets a new baseline for the onward progression of a scheme for the redevelopment of the former Hotspur Press site.

The revised scheme

- 1.15 Subsequent to the above, the applicant has engaged the existing project team to appraise the previous scheme design and understand to what extent this can still be progressed in the context of the site's altered baseline.
- 1.16 At the heart of the original proposal was the aspiration to regenerate the former Hotspur Press complex through a scheme which retained the essence of the existing iconic building whilst delivering a viable form of development which would secure its restoration, bring the site back into productive use and open up the site for all to use and enjoy.
- 1.17 This was to be achieved through retaining most of the existing façade of the mill complex and using this as a base and setting for a tower comprising residential accommodation, with a new large public square providing a tranquil space for the community to enjoy.
- 1.18 Notwithstanding the significant setback resulting from the recent fire, the applicant remains committed to delivering a scheme which is as close to the original vision as possible and, in being so, delivers the same benefits.
- 1.19 This is reflected in the revised scheme design which is now presented in response to the fire, working with the new baseline resulting from this.
- 1.20 To this end, the key change to the scheme is that the existing former mill facades can now not be retained and incorporated into the scheme. This follows a full appraisal of options for retaining the façade as presented in the Structural and Façade Retention Appraisal report.
- 1.21 The application therefore now proposes that the former mill façade is demolished and reconstructed in a replicated form. The steps taken in relation to the design of this part of the scheme will ensure that the reconstruction is as faithful as possible with the aim of the new build being indistinguishable from the scheme as originally proposed. A painstaking appraisal of the former mill building façade has been undertaken to ensure its detail is captured in the rebuild, with materials carefully selected for this purpose. This is considered further within the submitted Design and Access Statement.
- 1.22 Some further and largely immaterial aesthetic changes to the façade of the base structure are made to ensure the scheme complies with current building regulations with similarly immaterial changes made to the internal layout at ground floor and basement. These are detailed in Appendix 1 of the Design and Access Statement.
- 1.23 The tower component of the development is unchanged in its proportions and aesthetic. The number of bedrooms is unchanged as it the overall three

dimensional massing of the development. The size and location of the public square remains the same as does the site access and servicing arrangements.

- 1.24 For the purposes of the application, the reconstruction of the former mill façade will take place using entirely new material, with bespoke brick material being produced for this purpose. This is detailed within the Design and Access Statement.
- 1.25 Owing to the presence of asbestos on site, which the existing brickwork is expected to have been contaminated by as a result of the fire, and the expected heat damage to the brickwork, it is assumed that none of the existing bricks can be safely reused. For the purposes of the ongoing determination of the application, and particularly in considering the heritage related implications of the proposal in the planning balance, this should be the assumed position. The Heritage Statement which considers the revised proposals is presented on this basis.
- 1.26 Notwithstanding this, as part of the supplementary submission, a Heritage Strategy is provided which sets out the principles of some key moves the applicant will seek to make through the detailed design of the scheme to reveal and celebrate the significance of the former Hotspur Press, with a specific focus on the proposed public realm.
- 1.27 This may include, if possible, incorporating some materials or features retrieved from the existing building into the public realm. This will depend on further survey work as to the safe use of existing materials which isn't yet known due to access restrictions remaining in place. The requirement for a detailed strategy, pursuant to this objective, can be conditioned.
- 1.28 Reflecting the above, the revised description of development is as follows:

Demolition of the former Hotspur Press Complex (Medlock Mill) and redevelopment of the site to provide Purpose Built Student Accommodation (Sui Generis Use Class) above ground floor commercial or community uses (Use Classes F(e), F2(a)(b) and E(b)), within a part 4/5-storey and part 35-storey (plus ground floor and roof parapet level), associated ancillary internal and external amenity space, public realm (including a new public square), hard and soft landscaping and associated highway works.

- 1.29 A further key change is in relation to how the demolition of the building and clearance of the site now takes place compared to what was originally proposed. This is detailed further within the Environmental Statement (ES) Supplement (December 2025). The demolition process now takes account of the condition of the site and particularly the likely presence of asbestos, with measures required to contain this during site clearance. Previously this would have been carefully removed from site through internal 'strip out' works prior to demolition. This is

now not possible with removal of asbestos and demolition effectively happening as one.

Purpose of this document and scope of submission

- 1.30 This document presents a supplementary assessment of the proposed scheme in the context of the key changes proposed, including in relation to its planning policy compliance and the case for planning permission. Alongside the physical changes to the scheme itself, it considers any other material changes in circumstances (since May 2024) and their impact on this.
- 1.31 Its starting point is the Planning Committee Report of May 2024 which concluded, in the opinion of Officers, that the overall planning balance weighed in favour of granting planning permission for the scheme as presented at the time. This is a position with which the Planning Committee agreed, subject to the removal of an objection from the Environment Agency.
- 1.32 This statement therefore considers the scheme changes and other material changes in circumstances against the baseline of the May 2024 report and the scheme considered at that point.

Scope of submission

- 1.33 For the purposes of the onward determination of the application, it is necessary to provide updated and supplementary reports and plans to add to, update or supersede the equivalent existing insofar as the scheme, and wider material circumstances, have evolved since May 2024.
- 1.34 Selected documents which make up the existing application are affected, depending on whether and to what extent changes (to the scheme or in wider material circumstances) would mean the existing equivalent cannot be relied upon in its existing form. Full updates or addenda are therefore provided where needed. This relates to the following documents/topic areas:
- All architectural plans
 - Design and Access Statement
 - Viability Appraisal
 - Statement of Community Engagement
 - Energy Statement
 - Preliminary Ecological Appraisal
 - BNG Metric
 - Heritage Statement
 - Demolition Environmental Management Plan
 - Structural Assessment
 - Socio-economic regeneration
 - Environmental Statement, covering the following topics:

- Noise

- Townscape and Visual Impact
- Heritage
- Wind/microclimate
- Sunlight/Daylight
- Climate change
- Socio-economics and Human Health
- Flood Risk

1.35 Some documents are not affected and no update is provided such that the existing document/s continue to be relied upon for the purposes of the onward determination of the application. This relates to the following:

- Crime Impact
- Ground conditions/contamination
- Green & Blue Infrastructure
- TV reception
- Broadband connectivity
- Waste
- Archaeology
- Fire Strategy
- Landscape Plans
- Landscape Statement
- Student Management
- Indoor Air Quality
- Travel Planning

1.36 In a number of other cases, whilst no separate supplementary or replacement document is provided, the respective consultants have been engaged and requested to provide their commentary on the implications of the changes for their discipline and particular to verify that the conclusions of their original assessment work remain up to date and can continue to be relied upon for the purposes of the onward determination of the application. Where this is the case, any such commentary or verification is presented within the main body of this document under the relevant topic heading. The relates to the following topics:

- Air quality
- Glint and Glare
- Transport

1.37 To assist in understanding which documents remain 'live' following this supplementary submission, reference should be made to the schedule at Appendix 1.

2. The need for scheme changes

- 2.1 As a non-designated heritage asset, the former Hotspur Press complex of buildings do not benefit from statutory protection from demolition in the same manner as they would if listed. The policy framework against which a proposal for their demolition (in part or full) is therefore fundamentally different to that which would apply if the existing building was listed.
- 2.2 However, as a building of historic interest, a proposal for demolition will result in harm which must be characterised and appropriated weighted in the planning balance.
- 2.3 Against the context of the scheme as previously proposed, a key design driver of which was the opportunity it presented to retain and restore the existing Hotspur Press façade and regenerate a historic asset, it is important to present a clear rationale for the change in approach and why the wider benefits which the scheme will deliver cannot be achieved without this change.
- 2.4 As noted, the scheme has moved from one of substantial demolition of the existing building, with retention of a proportion of the building's façade, to one of full demolition.
- 2.5 Whilst the additional impacts resulting from the full demolition are substantially mitigated through the rebuild proposal, it is necessary to present, for context, the justification for this step.
- 2.6 To assist, the revised proposals are supported by a Structural and Façade Retention appraisal produced by Civic with inputs from Swantons; a specialist engineering firm which advises on building retention and demolition in respect of complex projects.
- 2.7 This reports presents a full assessment of the condition of the remaining components of the building and their structural integrity, including explaining the demolition works which took place in the immediate aftermath of the June 2025 fire.
- 2.8 This explains the extensive damage caused by the fire and the perilous state of what remains of the facades of the building, with most of internal structure being destroyed or collapsing in on itself. It is for this reason that it has not been possible for anyone to enter the site since the fire nor can entry take place until either the façade is demolished – and so no longer at risk of collapse – or else propped up with supporting structures.
- 2.9 As a means of honouring the original proposal, the applicant has considered options for achieving a structural solution for temporarily supporting the

remaining facades to enable the proposed development to be delivered with these in situ and thus ultimately incorporating these into the scheme.

- 2.10 As outlined in the Civic report there are a series of practical impediments to this as follows:
- The requirement for external propping up would require third party land, including highway land, resulting in road closures and potential disruption to accessing underground services, and privately owned land.
 - The expected presence of asbestos, released by the fire and likely to have contaminated the brick work, makes working with the façade in situ not possible on health and safety grounds
 - The structural integrity of the retained facades and their delicate state means that propping up itself, with the installation of attachments to the façade, is unlikely to be feasible
- 2.11 Ultimately, even if these issues were not insurmountable in theory, the practical effect of having to undertake a much more intricate clearance of the site and manage health and safety risks associated with personnel working in close proximity to retained materials, which are likely to be contaminated with asbestos as a result of the fire, and the resultant need for regular testing for such contaminants as personnel come into direct contact with more of the façade, is likely to add months to the programme for delivery and significant cost to the construction process associated with this risk area. This alone would render the development unviable.
- 2.12 As a result, whilst Manner has sought to explore options to continue with the existing design, with respect to façade retention, taking guidance from construction and structural experts, it has concluded that this is not feasible.
- 2.13 Notwithstanding this, Manner understand the heritage significance of this site and benefits of the scheme it had developed in securing the productive reuse and successful regeneration of the site whilst revealing and celebrating this significance. It is fully committed to maintaining this ethos within the amended scheme, whilst working within the constraint of doing so following the (necessary) full demolition of the remaining building.
- 2.14 This is achieved through its proposal to rebuild the existing facades in the form and style of the former mill complex, using appropriate materials and architectural detailing to achieve this and in doing so delivering a faithful reconstruction.

3. Change in planning and wider policy context

- 3.1 The development as proposed has been supported by the Council in the context of relevant planning policy and further a consideration of the stated development and regeneration goals developed by the City Council for the City Centre and the Oxford Road Corridor area.
- 3.2 This is expressed across a number of documents, including the development plan. In combination, these were deemed to support the conclusion that the proposed development would make an overall net positive contribution in respect of relevant planning considerations to the extent that planning permission should be approved.
- 3.3 Any changes in this policy context, considered alongside and independently of the scheme changes, has the potential to direct the decision maker towards a different outcome which, given the passage of time since the May 2024 resolution, it is necessary to consider.
- 3.4 Here we frame the key policy changes as relevant.

The development plan

- 3.5 The local component of the development plan remains unchanged, comprising, as relevant to this application, the Manchester Core Strategy (2012) and saved policies of the Unitary Development Plan (1995).
- 3.6 At the Greater Manchester level, Places for Everyone (PfE) was adopted in March 2024 and so was in place at the time of the application's presentation to the Planning Committee in May 2024. This is reflected in the recommendation which presents a consideration of PfE and its influence on the conclusion of development plan compliance.

Other material policy considerations

- 3.7 At the local level, the following documents, which are referenced within the committee report and which the scheme was considered to make a positive contribution towards or generally satisfy, remain unchanged and continue to be material considerations:
- Guide to Development in Manchester Supplementary Planning Document and Planning Guidance (2007)
 - Manchester Residential Quality Guidance (2017)
 - Manchester Housing Strategy 2022-2032
 - First Street SRF and Masterplan (2018)
 - Corridor Manchester Strategic Spatial Framework (2018)
 - Manchester City Centre Strategic Plan (2015 – 2018)

- 3.8 The Greater Manchester Strategy (Together we are Greater Manchester) was published by the Greater Manchester Combined Authority (GMCA) in 2025. This presents an update to the previous Greater Manchester Strategy covering the period 2016 to 2025.
- 3.9 As it relates to the proposal in question, the new strategy introduces limited changes of relevance. It outlines a focus on creating a thriving city region and creating the conditions for the conurbation's people and businesses to succeed to unlock a new form of economic growth. Building homes and providing employment opportunities is at the heart of this as outlined in the strategy.
- 3.10 At the national level, the National Planning Policy Framework (NPPF) was published in December 2024. This is not considered to introduce any changes which are materially relevant to the proposed development or which themselves require a reconsideration of any aspect of the scheme.
- 3.11 Of note, it maintains the focus on the regeneration of brownfield land, of making efficient and effective use of land, on given weight to economic benefit and on meeting the country's residential development needs.
- 3.12 The approach to considering impact on heritage assets and giving weight to harm is unchanged as is the approach to considering flood risk. Provisions in relation to transport, the sustainable location of development and the general consideration of environmental impacts across a number of disciplines (noise, air quality, ground conditions, sunlight/daylight, archaeology etc) are also unchanged.
- 3.13 Procedurally, the NPPF maintains the presumption in favour of sustainable development as previously expressed and continues to require applications that are in accordance with the development to be approved without delay.¹
- 3.14 There are no changes to the Planning Practice Guidance which would themselves warrant a reconsideration of any aspect of the scheme.
- 3.15 Notwithstanding the above, where application documents have been supplemented or replaced, any evolution of relevant policy has been considered in the relevant document to ensure this draws conclusions which are cognisant of up to date policy.

¹ NPPF paragraph 11c

4. Updated planning appraisal

- 4.1 Taking the above context into account, here we aim to assist the Council in its onward determination of the application by demonstrating that, in respect of each relevant topic, and having regard to the scheme changes and other changes in material circumstances, the proposal continues to represent an appropriate form of development.
- 4.2 Through this we demonstrate that any change in (adverse) impacts resulting from the development as now proposed remain within acceptable limits, that the scheme benefits remain materially unchanged and that the overall planning balance falls in favour of planning permission for the proposal, as revised, being granted.
- 4.3 As noted, this appraisal process is carried out against the baseline of the May 2024 Committee Report which recommended approval of the scheme at that point. It answers the question as to whether any aspect of the recommendation (including the appraisal presented within that recommendation) would be affected by the changes and how.
- 4.4 This assessment considers:
- Strategic positioning: the principle of development, regeneration contribution and scheme benefits
 - Design, environmental and technical considerations
 - The application of policy relating to Purpose Built Student Accommodation (PBSA)

Strategic positioning: the principle of development, regeneration contribution and socio-economic benefits

- 4.5 As noted, the policy context as framed within the May 2024 committee report remains materially unchanged, as does the expression of the Council's regeneration goals and priorities for the city centre and the Oxford Road Corridor which were (and continue) to be of material relevance.
- 4.6 To this end, and having regard to the materially similar form which the development takes, the strategic contribution which the scheme will make to the City Centre's ongoing regeneration and to realising the stated ambitions for the Oxford Road Corridor are unchanged.
- 4.7 These contributions have been and continue to be centred on the physical regeneration of a high profile site, the provision of a landmark building in the city centre and the provision of high quality student residential accommodation to support the continued success of Manchester as a higher education destination of choice.

- 4.8 Whilst a key strategic regeneration contribution of the scheme was the protection of much of the façade of the former Hotspur Press, and incorporation of these into the scheme, the step change to a façade reconstruction does not significantly water down that contribution. The scheme remains centred on a heritage-led regenerative approach with the commitment to a re-build of the facades doing justice to the ambition to reveal, celebrate and open up the former Hotspur Press site.
- 4.9 This beneficial aspect of the scheme may be deemed to be marginally lesser than the previous proposal but this is not itself sufficient to alter the conclusion that the scheme makes a significant regeneration contribution to which substantial material weight should be applied.
- 4.10 The Socio-economic Regeneration Statement Addendum submitted with the updated design illustrates that the scheme will achieve broadly the same numerically measurable benefits as that considered by the Planning Committee in May 2024. These benefits are presented graphically at Appendix 2.
- 4.11 Furthermore, and consistent with the scheme considered in May 2024, it continues to be the case that the scheme's overall benefits can only be realised through the development of the site for PBSA uses, as demonstrated within the Viability Assessment Addendum prepared by CBRE and submitted as part of the updated scheme. Alternative uses considered, including offices, hotel and residential uses would not provide a viable basis on which to deliver the regeneration of the site in the physical form proposed.

Technical, design and environmental considerations

- 4.12 The revised scheme, and the body of work submitted alongside, will be subject to full consultation, including the Council's taking advice from its advisors (statutory and non-statutory) covering a wide variety of topics. We address each topic in turn.

Traffic and transport

- 4.13 As the proposal does not propose any additional car parking, residential units or lettable floorspace and as there are no changes to the servicing strategy, then the characterisation of vehicular movements to and from the site will be unchanged.
- 4.14 The previous reporting provided as part of the planning application and its conclusions regarding policy compliance in relation to this matter and the position presented within the Committee Report of May 2024 in relation to this matter remain up to date.

Cycle parking

- 4.15 The only notable change from a traffic and transport point of view relates to long-stay cycle parking provision; the previous iterations of the scheme considered c.18% provision.
- 4.16 Due to various associated constraints at the development site and consideration of existing student residential developments where cycle parking is underutilised, the proposed long-stay cycle parking proposed for the revised scheme is a total of 45no. spaces (42no. standard spaces at the basement level and 3no. adaptive spaces at the ground floor (in line with LTN 1/20 requirements of 5% of total provision); this equates to a proportion of 7.4%.
- 4.17 It should be noted that the proposed provision of is in line with similar schemes which have previously been granted planning permission within Manchester. For example, the Student Castle accommodation on 1 Great Marlborough Street was approved with 1 space per 20 bedrooms (5%) (MCC planning reference 09192/FO/2009/C1).
- 4.18 The approach taken reflects a more developed understanding of how cycle parking is utilised within PBSA schemes and to what extent. It also reflects the sustainable location of the site, being within reasonable walking distance of both Manchester Met University and the University of Manchester main campuses – the known regular commuting destination of all residents within the development. It also reflects the availability of bike rental schemes (particularly via the Bee Network) in the locality which enables residents to access a bike for commuting or other reasons without the need to own one. This has significantly reduced the demand for bike ownership (and storage) amongst students.
- 4.19 As a result of these considerations, the reduction in cycle parking is deemed to be acceptable.

Glint and Glare

- 4.20 A Glint and Glare Assessment was submitted with the updated design in May 2025 to take account of the scheme changes and particularly the implications of the changes in materiality of the tower proposed at that point.
- 4.21 This demonstrates that the scheme will not give rise to any unacceptable impacts in respect of this topic. This was not considered in the May 2024 as no such assessment was originally submitted owing to the different materials strategy for the tower element of the scheme proposed at that point.
- 4.22 The massing of the development is unchanged compared to the May 2025 scheme as is the aesthetic design and materiality of the proposed tower element of the proposal. Accordingly, the May 2025 supplementary assessment and its conclusions remain up to date and, as noted within that report, no unacceptable impacts will result from the scheme.

Climate Change (ES topic)

- 4.23 See ES Supplement (December 2025), Circular Economy Statement Addendum (December 2025) and Energy Strategy (December 2025).
- 4.24 The May 2025 ES Supplement confirmed that the scheme changes proposed did not affect the overall conclusions of the ES in relation to this topic, that being that the residual effects will not be significant in EIA terms and so are within acceptable limits. This is reflected in the recommendation to Planning Committee of May 2024.
- 4.25 The ES Supplement (December 2025) presents tables containing the calculations of Upfront and Embodied Carbon Emissions reflective of the changes to the scheme, and particularly in relation to the extent of demolition.
- 4.26 Carbon and Embodied Carbon changes are deemed to be insignificant with increases of approximately 2% for Upfront Carbon and Embodied Carbon results. This is based on the assumed materiality of the façade, data selections within One Click LCA software, and the estimated quantities.
- 4.27 On the basis of the marginal increase in carbon emissions from the previously evaluated scheme, the conclusions of the previously submitted assessments are considered to remain valid and appropriate, with residual effects for both upfront and embodied carbon being not significant.
- 4.28 This reflects that whilst now proposing the full demolition of the existing building, the scheme as previously presented still proposed the demolition of most of the existing building/s on site. The retention of the façade, as a component of the building/s had a limited impact on the results therefore. This is reflected in the assessment presented which considers the scenario of full demolition.
- 4.29 Whilst the impacts in terms of carbon results are greater, the practical change is marginal. Further, this does not materially affect the other considerations in relation to this topic, including the operational performance of the development.
- 4.30 The Circular Economy Statement Addendum (December 2025) outlines that the principles of the original strategy remain relevant and up to date and continue to provide a suitable basis for delivering the scheme in a way which adequately mitigates its impacts in relation to this topic. It goes to identify a series of additional measures which may be taken to mitigate the impact of additional demolition and greater reliance on recycling/downcycling principles, in lieu of retention.
- 4.31 The Energy Strategy Report (December 2025) sets out the principles of a sustainable approach to the building's delivery and operation in the context of the scheme changes in order to satisfy key planning policies and requirements, including Core Strategy Policy EN8. The Energy Strategy Report demonstrates that this is achievable via the strategy presented.

- 4.32 As a result, whilst appropriate to note the marginal change in terms of the carbon effect of the development resulting from the full demolition of the facade, this does not change the overall conclusion as presented within the May 2024 Committee Report in respect of this topic which goes substantially beyond the question of demolition extent.

Townscape and visual impact (TVIA) (ES topic)

- 4.33 See ES Supplement (December 2025).
- 4.34 The TVIA implications of the scheme changes were considered in the May 2025 ES Supplement where it is demonstrated that the results of the original assessment are unaffected by the scheme changes as presented. An updated suite of verified views was presented for this purpose reflecting the change in massing and the architectural appearance of the tower.
- 4.35 Given the nature of the changes now proposed, against the May 2025 update, and being limited to the approach to the building's base (that of the former mill), the December 2025 ES Supplement concludes that all impacts are also predicted to be in line with the original assessment, as presented within the May 2024 Committee report.
- 4.36 The impacts of the scheme in relation to this topic are therefore as described in that report and are unchanged. Updated verified views are provided within the May 2025 ES Supplement on which this conclusion is based.

Wind/microclimate (ES Topic)

- 4.37 See ES Supplement (December 2025).
- 4.38 The wind/microclimate implications of the scheme changes were considered in the May 2025 ES update, where it is demonstrated that the overall conclusions of the original assessment are unaffected.
- 4.39 Given the nature of the further changes, and in not affecting the massing and volume the development, the scheme changes have no effect on the conclusions of the May 2025 ES Supplement and therefore also on the original which are reflected in the May 2024 Committee report. The impacts of the scheme in relation to this topic are therefore as presented in that report and are unchanged.

Sunlight/daylight (ES Topic)

- 4.40 See ES Supplement (December 2025).
- 4.41 The sunlight/daylight implications of the scheme changes were considered in the May 2025 ES Supplement, where it is demonstrated that the overall conclusions of the original assessment are unaffected. Detailed data was presented within the May 2025 ES Supplement to demonstrate this.

- 4.42 Given the nature of the scheme changes now proposed, and in not affecting the massing and volume of the development compare to the May 2025 proposal, the latest changes have no effect on the overall conclusions of the May 2025 ES Update and therefore also on the overall conclusions of the original ES, which are reflected in the May 2024 Committee report.
- 4.43 The information presented within the May 2025 ES Supplement remains up to date in respect of this topic.
- 4.44 This notes some minor changes to the impacts on specific windows resulting from the massing changes presented in the May 2025 revisions, compared to the original submission. These are not deemed to be significant to the extent that the overall conclusions presented in the May 2024 Committee Report would be affected.

Heritage (ES topic)

- 4.45 See Heritage Statement Update (December 2025) and ES Supplement December 2025).
- 4.46 The key material change in this regard is the switch from partial retention of the former mill building's facades to full demolition and reconstruction using new material.
- 4.47 Alongside the Heritage Statement a Heritage Strategy is submitted. This is an additional submission document which sets out the principles of how the former mill building will be reconstructed and the approach to this to ensure the strategic objective of reconstructing this as faithfully as possible is achieved. It also presents a strategy for enhancing the proposed public realm within the site to reveal and celebrate the history and historic significance of the site as an additionality to the baseline public realm scheme which remains unchanged.
- 4.48 The Heritage Statement concludes that, having regard to the amendments to the scheme and the change in context to the site, the proposed development will result in 'less than substantial' harm in heritage terms and that that harm will be at the lower end of the spectrum of such harm.
- 4.49 Whilst the heritage impacts of the development will be qualitatively different, the overall harm, as characterised and evidenced within the Heritage Statement, is the same as that presented within the original application and summarised in the May 2024 Planning Committee Report.
- 4.50 As noted above, the heritage related benefits of these scheme, as distinct from harm, are potentially marginally less as a result of the change in strategy. However, this is not considered to be significant enough in its own right to alter the conclusion that the scheme will realise significant regeneration benefits to which substantial material weight should be applied.

- 4.51 We consider the overall planning balance, including the application of paragraph 216 of NPPF², below.

Noise (ES topic)

- 4.52 See ES Supplement (2025).
- 4.53 Whilst the scope of demolition works is now marginally more extensive in including the full extent of the façade, the general method of demolition, equipment used and timeframe over which the works would be undertaken are unaffected.
- 4.54 On this basis, the conclusions of the May 2025 ES Supplement, and of the original ES, are unaffected by the further scheme changes in relation to this topic. The overall conclusions presented in the May 2024 Committee Report in relation to this topic remains up to date and reflective of the development's impact.

Flood risk and drainage (ES Topic)

- 4.55 See ES Supplement (December 2025) and Flood Risk Assessment (November 2025).
- 4.56 The updated material demonstrates that whilst partially located in Flood Zone 3, the development of the site satisfies the sequential and exception tests and presents a sufficient drainage strategy for the site.
- 4.57 The sequential and exception test results presented, and design measures deployed to demonstrate that the development will be safe for its lifetime taking account of the vulnerability of its users, without increasing flood risk elsewhere³, have previously been reviewed by the Environment Agency since the presentation of the application at Planning Committee in May 2024 with a positive consultation response confirming removal of their previous objection.
- 4.58 The Environment Agency will again be consulted but on account of their previous post May 2024 consultation response, and in retaining a commitment to the aforementioned design measures, it is assumed this organisation will be able to reiterate its position of no objection.

Ecology

- 4.59 See Preliminary Ecological Appraisal (December 2025) and BNG Metric (December 2025).
- 4.60 The updated appraisal concludes that the site has very limited ecological value.

² This directing that the acceptability of less than substantial harm to a non-designated heritage asset should be determined relative to the scheme's wider benefits

³ See NPPF paragraph 178b

- 4.61 It goes on to set out that the site has low potential for bat roost potential, post-fire, compared to a previous reporting of high potential. The bat roosts previously identified within the site are believed to have been destroyed by the fire.
- 4.62 The previously committed mitigation measures relating to bat habitat provision are to be maintained with conditions proposed to be imposed on any planning permission requiring the presentation of a licence issued by Natural England pursuant to Regulation 55 of the Conservation for Habitats and Species Regulations 2019 prior to the commencement of development on account of the historic known use of the site by bats. Such a condition was proposed as part of the May 2024 recommendation.
- 4.63 The BNG Metric confirms the development will result in a net biodiversity loss of 0.72 units owing to the development's proximity to the River Medlock. This will require the purchase of a biodiversity credit to achieve a net gain to mitigate this impact.

Scheme viability

- 4.64 Consistent with the Council's consideration of the scheme in May 2024, the updated viability evidence submitted with the application demonstrates that the regeneration of the site, incorporating the proposed faithful reconstruction of the former Hotspur Press façade, as a key objective of the scheme and significant regeneration benefit, can only be viably achieved through the use of the site for PBSA.
- 4.65 This demonstrates that other potentially feasible uses in such a location do not present viable forms of development whilst also delivering the bespoke heritage and regeneration benefits of this scheme. This reflects, in part, the significant abnormal costs which the scheme will need to bear in reconstructing the facades of the former mill complex.
- 4.66 The full package of positive regeneration outcomes will therefore only be realised through a PBSA-led development.

Air quality

- 4.67 See Technical Note Addendum provided at Appendix 3.
- 4.68 The assessment at Appendix 3 demonstrates that the changes to the scheme do not have a material effect on the air quality implications of the proposed development and that the conclusions of the pre-existing air quality assessment are up to date and fit for purpose, supplemented by the additional analysis.
- 4.69 To the extent that air quality is considered within the May 2024 Planning Committee Report, the overall conclusions too remain up to date and reflective of the impacts of the proposed development in its amended form.

Other topics

4.70 In terms of assessment of the scheme in respect of other environmental topics, we would note that there are no further changes to or consideration of the following existing reports submitted during the life of the application to date and, in some cases, subject to updates submitted prior and subsequent to the May 2024 Planning Committee. These reports continue to present appropriate assessments of the scheme and strategies to be delivered through the development in its evolved form:

- Crime Impact Statement
- Framework Travel Plan
- Phase 2 Geo-Environmental Investigation, Risk Assessment and Remediation Strategy
- Blue Green Infrastructure Strategy
- Waste Management Strategy
- Broadband Connectivity Assessment
- TV Reception Survey
- Student Management Strategy
- Fire Strategy Statement
- Landscape Drawings
- Landscape Statement
- Archaeological Desk-Based Assessment and Written Scheme of Investigation
- Environmental Standards Statement
- Indoor Air Quality Assessment

4.71 Reference should be made to Appendix 1 which identifies which reports/documents dealing with the above topics remain 'live' for the purposes of the onward determination of the application.

Policy relating to PBSA

4.72 Local policy relating to PBSA is unchanged, with this being presented in Policy H12 of the Core Strategy.

4.73 The May 2024 Committee Report presents a full appraisal of the scheme against the ten criteria in H12 and confirms compliance with these.

4.74 A number of the H12 criteria relate to matters which are concerned with the location of the site (which is unchanged) or where, drawing on the above appraisal, it is evident that the changes to the scheme would not give rise to any changes to the previous conclusion of compliance with the criteria. This includes in relation to:

- Criterion 1: Proximity to university campuses or public transport
- Criterion 2: Connectivity into zero carbon decentralised energy infrastructure

- Criterion 3: Compatibility with existing development and initiatives
- Criterion 4: Priority given to schemes delivering positive regeneration outcomes in their own right
- Criterion 5: Safety and security of users
- Criterion 6: Siting and design in relation to neighbouring uses
- Criterion 7: Contribution to the reuse of existing buildings (where appropriate)
- Criterion 8: Consideration should be given to waste management and disposal
- Criterion 9: Proof of deliverability

4.75 This leaves Criterion 10 relating to demonstration of need for the development or evidence of entering into an agreement with a higher education provider for the provision of the bedrooms.

4.76 As part of the original submission, the applicant presented evidence which demonstrated a need for additional PBSA beds. This included by reference to data presented by Knight Frank contained within a PBSA Demand Study (August 2023).

4.77 This analysis presented an explanation of why it is desirable to meet the evidenced need and the implications of not doing so. In this case, this relates specifically to the importance of the PBSA sector to the economic performance and growth of the city and the adverse impacts that an under provision has on residential communities and housing markets close to the universities through driving demand for HMOs and taking housing better suited to families and working households out of these markets.

4.78 At the time of the application's submission in 2023, the submitted Planning Statement noted that the Knight Frank report demonstrated that only 22% of full-time higher education students at the University of Manchester and Manchester Metropolitan University - the universities within the one-mile catchment of the site - have access to university or private sector purpose-built accommodation, while a further 17% are living at home with parents or guardians.

4.79 It went on to confirm that the remaining 61% of full-time students in Manchester are required to find accommodation within the private rented sector and would otherwise be unable to access university or private sector purpose-built accommodation. This reflects a low level of purpose built accommodation relative to the size of the city's student population.

4.80 The Knight Frank report demonstrates that there are more than 3 full-time students per PBSA room in the city. Further this outlines that since 2012, the number of full-time students in the city has increased by over 23,000 where as

the number of PBSA beds has increased by only 7,282 during this period (to 2023).

- 4.81 This points to clear evidence of a growing reliance on non-PBSA accommodation in the city by students and of an unmet need.
- 4.82 Whilst there is a pipeline of additional PBSA stock with planning permission or under constructed, estimated to total over 14,000 rooms (net of clearance), less than 6,000 additional bedrooms have been approved since the submission of the application in 2023. This is a material increase in supply but still leaves a significant residual need when the above metrics are considered and relative to the size of the student population of the city, being in excess of 90,000.
- 4.83 There therefore continues to be a demonstrable need for additional PBSA beds in the city which this scheme can help to fulfil. This remains a notable benefit of the scheme and further satisfies Criterion 10 of Policy H12.
- 4.84 The overall conclusions in relation to compliance with Policy H12 as presented in the May 2024 Committee Report are therefore unaffected.

5. Consideration of the planning balance

- 5.1 Taking the above into account, we can identify three areas where the scheme's effects (positive or adverse) have changed, compared to the scheme considered by the Planning Committee **in May 2024**, to any material degree:
- Marginally reduced heritage benefit resulting from the proposal to demolish and rebuild the existing façade
 - Marginally greater adverse effects relating to the carbon impacts of the development resulting from the more extensive demolition of the existing building
 - Marginally greater adverse effects in respect of daylight/sunlight owing to slight changes to the building's massing.
- 5.2 None of these changes affect the scheme's compliance with relevant policies which are concerned with these topic areas.
- 5.3 In respect of other considerations, presented as either a benefit or an adverse impact, the revisions proposed and wider changes in any material circumstances, do not change the effects of the development.
- 5.4 The above changes in impact are not significant when considered individually or cumulatively. They exist against the backdrop of the scheme's existing impacts (positive and adverse), already quantified and appraised within the May 2024 Planning Committee Report and which are materially unchanged.
- 5.5 Drawing on reference to the significant benefits which the development has been proven to deliver (and will still deliver), this updated assessment does not change the conclusion that these outweigh the scheme's adverse impacts.
- 5.6 Of note, and applying paragraph 216 of the NPPF, these adverse impacts include that of less than substantial harm to a historic asset (noted as being at the lower end of the range and unchanged in its magnitude) which, as previously, is deemed to be acceptable on account of the wider benefits of the scheme.
- 5.7 The planning balance thus continues to find in favour of the scheme.

Appendix 1: Schedule of documents for onward determination of planning application

Application document / topic	Superseded versions	Versions which are 'live' following December 2025 submission
Architectural plans	All previous	See separate schedule at Appendix 4
Landscape plans	Plan refs: 1391-011-P3 1391-013-P3 1391-211-P3 1391-213-P3 1391-401-P1 1391-402-P1 1391-500-P2	Plan refs: 1391-011-P4 1391-013-P4 1391-211-P4 1391-213-P4 1391-401-P2 1391-402-P2 1391-500-P3 As submitted in May 2025
Design and Access Statement	All previous Design and Access Statements Ventilation Design Addendum (April 2024)	Design and Access Statement (December 2025)*
PBSA demand	None	Relevant sections of the Planning Statement Addendum* PBSA Demand Study (September 2023)
Planning Statement	None	Planning Statement Addendum (December 2025)* Planning Statement and Environmental Statement Addendum (April 2024)

		Planning and Tall Building Statement (December 2023)
Flood Risk	Flood Risk Assessment (March 2025) Flood Risk Assessment (December 2023)	Flood Risk Assessment (December 2025)
Ground conditions	None	Phase 2 Geo-Environmental Investigation, Risk Assessment and Remediation Strategy (October 2023) Phase 1 Preliminary Risk Assessment (June 2018)
Environmental Impact Assessment	None	Environmental Statement Supplement (December 2025)* Environmental Statement Supplement (May 2025) Planning Statement and Environmental Statement Addendum (April 2024) Environmental Statement (December 2023)
Air Quality Assessment	None	Relevant section of Planning Statement (December 2025) including Appendix 3* Air Quality Assessment (March 2024)
Transport Statement	Transport Statement (December 2023)	Relevant section of Planning Statement Addendum (December 2025)* Transport Statement (April 2024)

Travel Plan	Interim Travel Plan (December 2023)	Interim Travel Plan (April 2024)
Archaeological Assessment	None	Archaeological Desk-based Assessment reference SA/2023/72 (undated)
BNG	Metric calculation (December 2023) BNG Report (December 2023)	Metric calculation (December 2025)*
Construction and demolition management	Interim Construction Management Plan (November 2023)	Construction Environmental Management Plan (December 2025)* Demolition Environmental Management Plan (December 2025)*
Ecology	Preliminary Ecological Appraisal (September 2023) Black Redstart Mitigation Report (October 2023)	Preliminary Ecological Appraisal (December 2025)* Bat Activity Report (September 2023)
Fire Strategy	Gateway One Fire Statement Hotspur Press (December 2023) Fire statement form (December 2023) Fire Strategy Statement (April 2024)	Fire Strategy Statement (March 2025)
Waste Management	Waste Management Strategy (December 2023)	Waste Management Strategy (March 2025)

	Waste Management Strategy (April 2024)	
Circular Economy	None	Circular Economy Statement Addendum (December 2025)* Stage 2 Circular Economy Report (November 2023)
Energy Statement	All previously submitted	Energy Statement Strategy (December 2025)*
Environmental Standards Statement	Environmental Standards Statement (December 2023)	Environmental Standards Statement (March 2025)
TV Reception Survey	None	Terrestrial Television Baseline Survey Report (October 2023)
Structural assessment and construction and façade retention methodology	Construction and façade retention methodology (September 2023) Structural Appraisal, Condition and Proposals Report (September 2023)	Structural and Façade Retention Appraisal (December 2025)*
Glint and Glare Assessment	None	Relevant sections of Planning Statement Addendum (December 2025)* Solar Glare Assessment (March 2025)
Trees	None	Arboricultural Advice Letter (October 2023)
Broadband Connectivity Survey	None	Broadband Connectivity Assessment (October 2023)
Heritage Statement	All previous	Heritage Statement (December 2025)*
Structural assessment	All previous	Structural and Façade Retention Appraisal (December 2025)*
Socio-economic Regeneration Statement	None	Socio-economic regeneration statement addendum (December 2025)* Socio-economic Regeneration Impact Statement (November 2023)

Statement of Community Engagement	None	Statement of Community Involvement Addendum (December 2025)* Statement of Community Involvement (November 2023)
Green and Blue Infrastructure	All previous	Green and Blue Infrastructure Statement (March 2025)
Landscape Statement	All previous	Landscape and Public Realm Design Statement (March 2025)
Student Management Plan	None	Student Management Plan for Hotspur Press (November 2023)
Viability appraisal	None	Viability appraisal addendum (December 2025)* Financial viability addendum (March 2025) Viability Assessment: alternative development (November 2023)
Crime Impact	Crime Impact Statement (December 2023)	Crime Impact Statement (March 2024)
Heritage Strategy	N/A	Heritage Strategy (December 2025)*
Indoor Air Quality Plan	None	Indoor Air Quality Plan (March 2024)

* denotes a document submitted as part of the revised scheme December 2025

Appendix 2: Scheme benefits

Appendix 3: Air Quality Technical Note

Appendix 4: Schedule of architectural plans for approval

Drawing Reference	Document Name / Date	Author	Updated Drawing Reference	Updated Document Name / Date
(--)000 P7	Proposed_LEVEL 00_Ground Floor Plan	Hodder and Partners	(--)000 P10	Proposed Level 00
(--)00M P7	Proposed_LEVEL 0M_ Mezzanine Plan	Hodder and Partners	(--)00M P8	Proposed Level - Mezzanine
(--)0LG P7	Proposed_LEVEL 0LG_Lower Ground Plan	Hodder and Partners	(--)0LG P9	Proposed Level -01
(--)002 P7	Proposed_LEVEL 01 & LEVEL 02 Plan	Hodder and Partners	(--)002 P8	Proposed Levels 01 & 02
(--)003 P7	Proposed_LEVEL 03 Plan_Clusters & Terrace	Hodder and Partners	(--)003 P9	Proposed Level 03 Plan
(--)004 P7	Proposed_LEVEL 04 Plan_Five Bed Clusters with Roof Access	Hodder and Partners	(--)004 P5	Proposed Level 04 Plan
(--)005 P7	Proposed_LEVEL 05, 09, 13, 17, 21, 25 Plan - Five Bed Clusters with Cleaners Store	Hodder and Partners	(--)005 P5	Proposed Level 05-33 (odd floors)
(--)006 P6	Proposed Level 06-08, 10-12, 14-16, 19, 20, 22-24, 26 Plan - Five Bed Clusters	Hodder and Partners	(--)006 P5	Proposed Level 06-32 (even floors)
(--)018 P6	Proposed_LEVEL 18 Plan_ Five-Bed Clusters - with Intermediate Plant	Hodder and Partners	NO LONGER INCLUDED	
(--)026 P6	Proposed Level 27, 28, 30-32, 34-36 Plan - Studios	Hodder and Partners	NO LONGER INCLUDED	
(--)029 P4	Proposed_LEVEL 29, 33 Plan - Studios with Cleaners Store	Hodder and Partners	NO LONGER INCLUDED	
		Hodder and Partners	(--)034 P2	Proposed Level 34
		Hodder and Partners	(--)035 P5	Proposed Level 35 - Plant
		Hodder and Partners	(--)036 P5	Proposed Level Roof
(--)037 P4	Proposed_LEVEL 37 Plan - Plant	Hodder and Partners	NO LONGER INCLUDED	
(--)037R P4	Proposed_LEVEL 37 Plan - Plant	Hodder and Partners	NO LONGER INCLUDED	
(--)201 P6	Proposed_South_Elevation	Hodder and Partners	(--)201 P9	South Elevation
(--)202 P7	Proposed_North_Elevation	Hodder and Partners	(--)202 P10	North Elevation
(--)203 P6	Proposed_West_Elevation	Hodder and Partners	(--)203 P10	West Elevation
(--)204 P7	Proposed_East_Elevation	Hodder and Partners	(--)204 P11	East Elevation
		Hodder and Partners	(--)210 P4	Podium – North and South Elevations
		Hodder and Partners	(--)211 P4	Podium – East and West Elevations
(--)301 P7	Proposed_South-North_Section	Hodder and Partners	(--)301 P3	Proposed South-North Section

(--)	302 P5	Proposed_North_South Section	Hodder and Partners	(--)	302 P3	Proposed North- South Section
(--)	303 P7	Proposed_West-East_Section	Hodder and Partners	(--)	303 P3	Proposed West-East Section
(--)	450 P45	Bay Studies - Tower Centre	Hodder and Partners	(--)	450 P6	Bay Studies - Tower Centre
(--)	451 P5	Bay Studies – Tower Level 04	Hodder and Partners	(--)	451 P6	Bay Studies – Tower Level 04
(--)	452 P5	Bay Studies - Tower Corner	Hodder and Partners	(--)	452 P6	Bay Studies - Tower Corner
(--)	454 P5	Bay Studies - Tower Crown Centre	Hodder and Partners	(--)	454 P6	Bay Studies - Tower Crown Centre
(--)	458 P5	Bay Studios – Town Crown Corner	Hodder and Partners	(--)	458 P6	Bay Studios – Town Crown Corner
			Hodder and Partners	(--)	460 P3	Bay Studies – Podium East Elevation
			Hodder and Partners	(--)	460 P2	Bay Studies – Podium South Elevation
			Hodder and Partners	(--)	462 P2	Bay Studies – Podium North Elevation
			Hodder and Partners	(--)	463 P1	Bay Studies – Palisade Wall
			Hodder and Partners	(--)	465 P1	Bay Studies – Palisade Wall Substation
(--)	800 P1	Existing Ground Floor Plan	Hodder and Partners			
(--)	800B P1	Existing Basement Floor Plan	Hodder and Partners			
(--)	800U P1	Existing Upper Ground Floor Plan	Hodder and Partners			
(--)	801 P1	Existing 1 st Floor Plan	Hodder and Partners			
(--)	802 P1	Existing 2 nd Floor Plan	Hodder and Partners			
(--)	803 P1	Existing 3 rd Floor Plan	Hodder and Partners			
(--)	821 P1	Existing Elevations	Hodder and Partners			
(--)	825 P1	Existing North Elevation	Hodder and Partners			
(--)	826 P1	Existing East Elevation	Hodder and Partners			
(--)	827 P1	Existing South Elevation	Hodder and Partners			
(--)	828 P1	Existing West Elevation	Hodder and Partners			
(--)	831 P1	Existing Sections	Hodder and Partners			
(--)	851 P1	Existing Site Location and Planning Boundary	Hodder and Partners			
(--)	852 P4	Site Location Plan and Planning Boundary	Hodder and Partners	(--)	852 P6	Site Location Plan and Planning Boundary
(--)	853 P1	1.1250 Site Plan	Hodder and Partners	(--)	853 P5	1.1250 Site Plan

(--)	854 P1	1.2500 Site Plan	Hodder and (--)	854 P5 Partners	1.2500 Site Plan
(--)	900 P5	Demolition Ground Floor Plan	Hodder and (--)	900 P4 Partners	Demolition Ground Floor Plan
(--)	900B	Demolition Basement Floor Plan	Hodder and (--)	900B P4 Partners	Demolition_Lower Ground Floor
(--)	900U	Demolition Upper Ground Floor Plan	Hodder and (--)	900U P4 Partners	NO LONGER INCLUDED
(--)	901 P3	Demolition 1 st Floor	Hodder and (--)	901 P4 Partners	Demolition_First Floor Plan
(--)	902 P3	Demolition 2 nd Floor	Hodder and (--)	902 P4 Partners	Demolition_Second Floor Plan
(--)	903 P4	Demolition 3 rd Floor	Hodder and (--)	903 P4 Partners	Demolition_Third Floor Plan
(--)	904 P3	Demolition 4 th Floor	Hodder and (--)	904 P4 Partners	Demolition_Roof Floor Plan
(--)	921 P3	Demolition Elevations	Hodder and (--)	921 P4 Partners	Demolition Elevations
(--)	925 P3	Demolition North Elevation	Hodder and (--)	925 P4 Partners	Demolition North Elevation
(--)	926 P3	Demolition East Elevation	Hodder and (--)	926 P4 Partners	Demolition East Elevation
(--)	927 P3	Demolition South Elevation	Hodder and (--)	927 P4 Partners	Demolition South Elevation
(--)	928 P3	Demolition West Elevation	Hodder and (--)	928 P4 Partners	Demolition West Elevation
			Hodder and Option 44	Partners	Schedule of Accommodation