

Delegated Officer Report

Summary of application details

Application reference: 145601/FO/2026

Application type: Full planning permission

Proposal: Installation of louvres.

Site address: 102 - 104 Market Street
Manchester
M1 1PB

Ward(s): Deansgate

Date application valid: 02 April 2026

Applicant name:

Agent (if any): Miss Anisha Ahmed

Case officer: Lea Joseph

Recommendation: **Refuse**

Date of recommendation: **28.05.2026**

Description of site, building and/or area



Image of application site at present and image of application site without hoarding.

The application site refers to the ground floor of a white stone building in the Italian palazzo style. The site has a high-quality historic appearance, seen in the rustication, window ornamentation and symmetrical bays. The building is four storeys' with basement and was previously used as offices.

The ground floor fronts Fountain Street and Market Street and has previously been occupied by Class E retail uses.

The upper storeys have been approved for a change of use to residential housing as of January 2025.

The historic appearance, massing and style of building enhances that of the Upper King Street Conservation Area as the palazzo architectural style is present at the adjacent Primark Building (Non-Designed Heritage Asset) and the nearby Rylands Building (Grade II).

The site lies at the intersection of the Central Business District and the Retail Core of Manchester. There is a strong mix of historic uses, and new office buildings that form the Central Business District. Market Street intersects with Fountain Street, and constitutes the core of Manchester's Retail Area, seeing high levels of footfall. The non-designated former Lewis's Buildings is adjacent to the site.

Description of development

Full planning permission is sought for the installation of louvres at Fountain Street.



Relevant planning history

- **141487/P3MAP/2024** | Prior Approval for change of use of commercial floorspace to 9x self-contained units with associated cycle and refuse storage. Decision issued 6 January 2025.
- **141210/AOH/2024** | Temporary display of externally illuminated advertisement hoarding for a period of 33 weeks. Approved December 2024

Consultation, notification and publicity responses

Consultations

Environmental Health – Advised they are unable to provide final comments due to lack of information. On the basis of what was submitted, recommended a condition for maintenance and cleaning strategy, stated that fumes and odour impact mitigation is unlikely to be suitable for cooking beyond electric heating of pans, electric noodle/water baths, Bain maries and steam-based warming equipment. Noted that in order to form a view on noise, distance between existing windows and the proposed louvre are required, as well as details about if windows are openable.

Highway Services – No objections. Works will be within the site boundary and would not affect the adopted highway. Requesting informative regarding scaffolding and temporary traffic management should application be approved.

Notifications and publicity

A site notice was posted, and a press advert was published, no representations have been received.

Relevant policies

Places for Everyone Joint Development Plan

JP-P1 Sustainable Places

JP-P2 Heritage

Manchester Core Strategy

SP1 Spatial Principles

DM1 Development Management

EN3 Heritage

Saved UDP Policies

DC10 Food and Drink Uses

DC18 Conservation Areas

DC26 Development and Noise

Other Material Considerations:

National Planning Policy Framework (2024)

Chapter 12 Achieving well designed places

Chapter 16 Conserving and enhancing the historic environment

Shopfront and Signage Design Guide (2024)

Planning (Listed Building and Conservation Areas) Act 1990

Draft National Planning Policy Framework (NPPF) (2025)

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 not in accordance with the general thrust of policy contained within it. As set out in the printed report adverse impacts have been identified through consideration of the application proposals.

Assessment

Principle of development

The development would facilitate the occupation of a character building within a highly trafficked area of the City Centre. The proposal to activate ground floor frontages, creating visually stimulating shopfronts is welcomed.

However, in this instance the development has potential to harm amenity due to noise and odour concerns, and the application has failed to clearly demonstrate that there would not be undue harm to amenity by virtue of odour and noise. The development is therefore unacceptable in principle for the reasons discussed below.

Visual Amenity and Impact on the Historic Environment

Policy DM1 requires consideration of appearance, materials, scale, siting and details in all development proposals. Chapter 12 of the National Planning Policy Framework requires that

when assessing design quality Local Planning Authorities consider 'will function well and add to the overall quality of the area', 'are visually attractive' and 'are sympathetic to local character and history, including the surrounding built environment and landscape setting'

The proposal would see the removal of a pane of glazing to allow for the installation of 1no. louvre on Fountain Street.

It is acknowledged that positive discussions were taking place to implement amendments to the appearance this scheme but however, scaled and annotated drawings were not produced in time for the decision. In the absence of these the most complete submission, drawing WAS-MKT ST-02 has been assessed in this report.

The louvre would be made of aluminium, with no decorative screen proposed. The existing shopfront cladding and overall proportions would be retained.

The application site is a historic building with a high-quality visually interesting appearance; the site contributes to the appreciation and understanding of the Upper King Street Conservation Area. Further the 16th century Shakespeare public house and former Lewis's Building (now Primark) are within the site's setting.

The Shopfront and Signage Design Guide section 6.1 states that design, location and appearance of new equipment should not adversely impact the street scene or the appearance of the shopfront. Further in Section 6.2.6 the Guide requires that decorative grills are employed when large prominent louvres are proposed. Decorative grills screen unsightly features and can contribute both aesthetic coherence and visual interest to a shopfront.

The proposal does not include louvre screens, resulting in a large, highly obtrusive, dark, utilitarian appearance. The louvre would not contribute to the overall quality or character of the area. This would negatively contrast with the ornate stone façade of the application site, the Lewis's building and the traditional historic Tudor appearance of the adjacent public house. In this regard the proposed louvre fails to meet the requirements of the Shopfront and Signage Design Guide, Chapter 12 of the National Planning Policy Framework, policy DM1, EN3 and DC18.

Policies EN3 and JP-P2 details the importance of conserving the historic environment. Unique historic features that represent Manchester's history and evolution should be preserved through careful design choices. The proposed louvre is considered to have a poorly sited, obtrusive addition to the street scape that fails to respond to the existing character of the area and the application site.

In totality, the development's appearance is out of character with application site and failing to conserve the appearance of the Conservation Area, the development is therefore detrimental to visual amenity and contrary to the provisions of policies DM1, SP1, EN3, DC18, JP-P2, the NPPF and the Shopfront and Signage Design Guide.

The National Planning Policy Framework Chapter 16 sets out a framework for evaluating heritage assets. In line with paragraph 208 of the National Planning Policy Framework, the proposed development must be assessed for potential harm to the significance of the Grade II Listed

Asset.

The development would result in the installation of louvres to allow for a new occupant to trade in the presently vacant site. The level of development proposed is considered minor and would result in a low level less than substantial harm to the significance of the NDHA and the Upper King Street Conservation Area.

The proposals would result in a low level of a less than substantial harm to the asset and in accordance with section 215 of the NPPF, the harm must be weighed against the proposal's public benefits.

It is acknowledged that the louvre would help support the occupation of part of a historic building in a prominent area of the City Centre. However, this benefit is limited and could be realised in a less harmful way than is the case with the louvres proposed in this application. Thus, public benefits fail to convincingly outweigh the harm to the significance of the Conservation Area and NDHA caused by the proposal.

The scale, siting, and details of the proposed louvres relate poorly to the significance of the Conservation Area and Non-Designated Heritage Asset. On this basis, the proposal is not considered to meet the statutory tests as required by Section 16(2) of the Planning (Listed Building and Conservation Areas) Act 1990 and Chapter 16 of the National Planning Policy Framework.

Residential Amenity – Odour and Noise

The application would result in the installation of extraction intake equipment on a what has been consented as a mixed-use building, with flats to be installed between the first and fourth floors, flats would consist of studio's, one bedroom and two bedrooms.

Windows would face on to Market Street and Fountain Street.



Proposed First Floor



Proposed Third Floor

In light of the Prior Approval consent that was granted, the application was assessed by the City Council as Local Planning Authority on the basis that the permission will be implemented and the units occupied. 34no. residential windows were observed above the proposed location of the 1no. extraction louvre on Market Street.

Policy SP1 states that new development should positively contribute to its locality, including the health, safety and wellbeing of residents. Policy DM1 requires consideration of amenity impacts including air quality, noise, and odour. Policy DC26 requires careful consideration of the noise impact of new developments. DC26.4 states that when a new proposal may result in an unacceptable level of noise the onus is on the applicant to produce an assessment and outline proposed mitigation measures.

The Acoustic Assessment submitted as part of the application does not identify the upper floors of the application site as a potential noise sensitive receptor (NSR). The nearest NSR identified in the report is the adjacent residential flat on the first floor of Shakespeare public house at 16 Fountain Street located 23m from the proposed extraction louvre's location. Exact distance between upper floor windows of the site and the proposed extraction and intake equipment have not been provided. The assessment concludes that with the inclusion of mitigation treatments to the 1no. extraction louvre would effectively mitigate noise disturbance, but this conclusion cannot be generalised to the proposed flats with windows as close as 1m away from the extraction louvre.

Without a complete acoustic assessment, it is not possible to properly assess the noise impact of the proposed louvres from external noise, internal noise transfer and vibration. The development is therefore contrary to the provisions of policies SP1, DM1 and DC26.

Policies DM1 and DC10.1 require consideration of the amenity impacts of food and drink uses. It is acknowledged that a change of use application is not relevant in this instance, however, as this is the first food and beverage use to come forward at the site and there are sensitive residential properties planned above the site, further consideration is required.

The submitted odour statement identifies the odour sources on the site as 'light duty electric cooking' including boiling, reheating and simmering.

Environmental Health have advised that the information submitted, would not be effectively mitigated by the measures proposed in the report. As such the proposal has not effectively demonstrated how amenity impacts would be mitigated, particularly the upper floor residential uses permitted under the Prior Approval and whose windows have a direct relationship with the vent.

In addition, it is not considered reasonable or enforceable via condition to restrict the type of cooking processes that take place in the building.

As undue harm to residential amenity has not been adequately demonstrated, the proposal would be contrary to policies DM1, SP1, DC10, DC26.

Conclusion

The proposed louvre arrangement would be positioned in close proximity to multiple residential windows. The noise and fumes and odour reports submitted have failed to include the residential uses in the upper floor of the building. The supporting information submitted as part of this application fails to satisfactorily demonstrate that the amenity of the nearest resident properties amenity would not result in unduly harmful impacts. The appearance of the louvres fails to consider the site's context and would detract from the visual amenity of the application site, streetscape and conservation area. On this basis the development would be contrary to Core Strategy policies DM1, EN3 and SP1, and Saved Unitary Development Plan policies DC10, DC18 and DC26, Places for Everyone policy JP-P2, the NPPF and the Shopfront and Signage Design Guide.

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 policies 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: Refuse

Reason(s) for refusal

- 1) Insufficient information has been submitted with the application in order to demonstrate that the noise, fumes and odours from the proposed louvre would not have an unduly harmful impact on surrounding residential amenity particularly on the proposed upper floor residential apartments. The proposal is therefore contrary to the provisions of policies SP1 and DM1 of the Manchester Core Strategy (2012) and saved policies DC10 and DC26 of the Unitary Development Plan for the City of Manchester (1995).
- 2) The proposed louvre by virtue of its siting, scale, appearance would form an unattractive and incongruous feature to the building. The design fails to positively respond to the existing context resulting in an unduly harmful impact on local visual amenity, the character of the street scene and the setting of the conservation area and nearby non-designated heritage asset. The proposal would result in less than substantial harm and the required public benefits do not exist to outweigh that harm. The proposal is therefore contrary to the provisions of policy JP-P2 of the Places for Everyone Joint Development Plan (2024), policies SP1, EN3 and DM1 of the Manchester Core Strategy (2012), saved policy DC18 of the Unitary Development Plan for the City of Manchester (1995) and the NPPF.