

Planning Statement Addendum

Site of Stocktons Furniture, 140 Great Ancoats
Street

September 2026

Contents

1.	Introduction	2
2.	Relentless Developments	4
3.	The updated scheme	6
4.	Stakeholder engagement	11
5.	Relationship with the Oxygen Building	12
6.	Supplementary planning application material	13
7.	Planning appraisal	16
8.	Conclusion	24
Appendix 1: NPPF 2026 – Technical Note relating to Climate Change and Environmental Standards		
Appendix 2: NPPF 2026 – Technical Note relating to Noise and Vibration		
Appendix 3: NPPF 2026 – Technical Note relating to Built Heritage		

Andrew Bickerdike



Client

Stocktons

Our reference

CLIM3002

September 2026

1. Introduction

- 1.1 This Planning Statement Addendum has been provided by Turley on behalf of Liquid Business Manchester and Relentless Developments. It relates to a planning application which seeks full planning permission for the development of the former Stocktons Furniture site at 140 Great Ancoats Street for a mix of residential and commercial uses and the provision of associated public realm.
- 1.2 The current planning application was submitted in March 2025 and remains undetermined by Manchester City Council (planning application reference 142535/FO/2025).
- 1.3 This Planning Statement Addendum supplements the Planning and Tall Building Statement submitted as part of the planning application in March 2025 and should be read alongside the original statement.
- 1.4 It is provided to Manchester the City Council, as Local Planning Authority, to assist its determination of the application in the context of a series of changes which are made to the scheme and reflected in an updated suite of architectural and landscape plans and updated supporting reports and assessments submitted alongside. It also considers changes to national planning policy, as a material consideration in the application's determination, following the publication of the National Planning Policy Framework (NPPF) on 17th August 2026.
- 1.5 This Addendum acts as a signposting document to explain the basis of the changes as proposed and outline the implications for the development's overall compliance with relevant planning policy and the case in favour of planning permission being granted.

Application determination to date

- 1.6 At its meeting of 15th January, the City Council's Planning Committee confirmed that it was minded to refuse the application as proposed at that point with the following reasons given and summarised in the meeting minutes:
 - Conflict with the East Village Central Strategic Regeneration Framework (SRF) on account of the height of Block A
 - Uncertainty as the development's viability on account of the conclusions of the submitted Financial Viability Appraisal (FVA)
 - The effects of the development on receipt of daylight and sunlight into the adjacent Oxygen residential building
- 1.7 It is noted that the Officer Report of January 2026 set out a full recommendation for approval of the application, including in the context of a consideration of the above three matters. Officers have not yet advised the Planning Committee as to whether there would be any policy-based justification for refusal of the application linked to the above matters, noting the professional advice presented within the aforementioned report in relation to these matters.

- 1.8 The resolution of the Planning Committee is noted and the applicant fully understands the position taken. In response, the applicant has carried out a reappraisal of the scheme in order to identify steps which may be taken to address these points and so enabling the development to progress.
- 1.9 To that end, provided alongside this Planning Statement Addendum is a suite of updated architectural and landscape plans and associated materials which represent an update to the planning application as considered to date and which reflect and assess, as a collective, a series of changes made to the scheme.

2. Relentless Developments

- 2.1 Since the Planning Committee meeting of January 2026, the applicant has entered into a Joint Venture with Relentless Developments (Relentless) to deliver the development.
- 2.2 Relentless Developments is a Manchester-based property developer with a proven track record in delivering complex, high-quality developments across the North West. Co-founded in 2015 by Gary Neville and Anthony Kilbride, the business combines extensive expertise in land acquisition, planning, development management and project delivery, supported by an experienced in-house team and a wider network of project management, planning and cost consultancy specialists. Collectively, the team has delivered schemes across multiple sectors and has extensive experience in bringing challenging urban regeneration projects from concept through planning and into successful delivery.
- 2.3 Relentless has demonstrated its ability to deliver significant developments through landmark projects such as St Michael's, one of Manchester's most prominent mixed-use regeneration schemes. Phase 1 was successfully completed in 2025, delivering 205,000 sq ft of Grade A office accommodation and achieving full pre-letting prior to completion, whilst being delivered on programme and within budget. The development has received multiple industry awards and attracted a strong occupier and investor profile. Building on this success, Relentless is now delivering St Michael's Phase 2, a major mixed-use development comprising a hotel, branded residences, office accommodation and public amenity spaces, backed by a £240 million debt facility and scheduled for completion in 2027.
- 2.4 In addition to completed and live developments, Relentless is actively progressing a number of strategic city-centre regeneration projects, including the Kendals project on Deansgate, where it has been appointed by Investec to lead development management of a major mixed-phase commercial scheme, together with the St Mary's Parsonage developments, which will deliver high-quality hospitality, residential and commercial uses. These projects demonstrate Relentless' ability to structure partnerships, secure investment, navigate complex planning requirements and deliver transformative developments that create lasting economic and social value.
- 2.5 Relentless bring the local experience and expertise in order to deliver the development in full over the next five years. This additional certainty is of critical importance given the profile and prominence of the site as a strategic component of an area set to undergo significant change over the next five to ten years, including through the development of the wider East Village Central site and the Government's Digital Campus on the opposite side of Great Ancoats Street.
- 2.6 Relentless is fully committed to the development and is in active discussion with funders to deliver the proposal from 2027.
- 2.7 Drawing on its experience and expertise, Relentless has carried out a fuller review of the proposals as presented. This has not only focused on the feedback provided by the Committee but has sought to enhance the scheme more generally, achieve a better quality development which is attractive to the market and which gives more back to

the city. This has been a process carried out over the last 6 months informed by consultation with the City Council and key stakeholders to arrive at a scheme which optimises the regeneration benefits the development will realise whilst operating within the context of the existing SRF for the site.

3. The updated scheme

- 3.1 The key changes to the scheme which respond to the feedback from the Planning Committee are detailed below.

Scheme viability and inclusion of affordable housing

- 3.2 A Financial Viability Appraisal (FVA) Addendum is submitted with the amended proposals. This captures and reflects changes to the cost base of the scheme resulting from the design amendments proposed, which are summarised below. It also reflects the outcome of an appraisal of the scheme, and inputs to the FVA, by Relentless, drawing on their experience as an active local developer, with specific reference to operational costs which inform the overall development value and a reduced construction cost in relation to Building A in light of its reduced size. The FVA therefore now benefits from this 'at the coalface' input in relation to the delivery and operation of build to rent residential schemes.
- 3.3 Given the significant size of the scheme, limited per unit operational cost savings (in percentage terms), which Relentless consider it appropriate to assume, have a significant compounded effect on the overall scheme value and therefore on the development profit after cost which forms the basis of the FVA.
- 3.4 Reflecting this, the updated FVA demonstrates that the scheme achieves a profit of 5.15% on cost (for a build to rent residential scheme as proposed) and thus showing a reasonable level of viability when measured in today's terms. This improved position is also influenced by reduced build costs associated with a reduction in the scale of development at Building A.
- 3.5 It should be noted that the FVA is carried out at a point in time and informed by inputs measured in today's terms. However the proposed development represents a long term investment by institutional funders. The asset is expected to be held for a number of years and over a timeframe during which the market will inevitably evolve.
- 3.6 Investment decisions in relation to proposed long term ownership will therefore be taken on the basis of longer term projections and investor attitude to risk. This contrasts the consideration of viability in the planning process which has a narrow focus and can only be based on a here and now value.
- 3.7 In the context of the level of profit which the FVA reports, Relentless has actively engaged the funding market and, as an experienced developer, is content that the development represents an attractive opportunity to the funding market and is therefore deliverable.

Provision of affordable homes at the Manchester Living Rent

- 3.8 Whilst the profit shown in the FVA is at a level below that needed for the Local Authority to be able to stipulate that the scheme must provide affordable housing, in accordance with local policy, Relentless understands the level of affordable housing need in the city and the City Council's desire to achieve a greater diversity in the city centre's residential offer in this regard.

- 3.9 To that end, and noting the lens through which the investment market will assess the opportunity as outlined above, Relentless is content that the proposal is able to provide some affordable housing, pursuant to Policy H8 of the Core Strategy, with 50 such homes therefore proposed to be allocated within the scheme on this basis.
- 3.10 These homes will be provided at a rental level which reflects the **Manchester Living Rent**¹. The Manchester Living Rent is an amount of rent that is set at or below the Local Housing Allowance level. It has been devised, by the City Council, as a benchmark for what is genuinely deemed to be affordable to those in need and reflects a view that what the Government deem to be an 'affordable rent' (namely 80% of market value) is simply not affordable to many in the context of the market conditions in city centre Manchester.
- 3.11 The affordable homes will be provided as part of one of the two blocks of development or spread across the two. They will provided to the same specification as market homes and be distributed in a 'pepper pointed' manner. Residents of the affordable homes will have access to the same facilities and amenities as other residents.
- 3.12 As the development is being institutionally funded, requiring it to be held in single ownership, it is not possible to transfer ownership of the affordable units to a Registered Provider to be allocated to those on locally held on housing waiting lists. In the circumstances, the allocation of the units to eligible households will be administered by the site owner, in accordance with rules and criteria which will be set out within a Section 106 Agreement and so agreed with the Local Authority. This will stipulate the rent levels, eligibility of individuals / households and how the homes should be allocated according to need. It will also require these homes to remain as affordable, on the basis of the Manchester Living Rent, or an equivalent benchmark which the City Council may use, in perpetuity.
- 3.13 Discussions are ongoing with the City Council as to the criteria for allocation which will be set out in the Section 106 Agreement.
- 3.14 This represents a significant additional benefit of the scheme, delivering affordable homes for those in need including key workers in the city centre.

An improved design and aesthetic

- 3.15 As part of the applicant's reappraisal of the scheme, the opportunity has been taken to revisit a number of aspects of the design.
- 3.16 This has included reducing the height of Block A (to 45 storeys) to bring this in line with the 2023 East Village Central SRF.
- 3.17 The development's general arrangement remains as previously proposed comprising two blocks fronting Great Ancoats Street with a significant area of shared public realm between (occupying c55% of the site), reflective of the SRF. The scheme and its key parameters are fully compliant with the 2023 SRF in this regard.

¹ [The Manchester Living Rent | Manchester City Council](#)

- 3.18 The submitted Design and Access Statement describes the layout rationale. This has been driven by the need to make effective and efficient use of the site, achieve development across two buildings (reflective of the SRF), positively engage Great Ancoats Street as a key route through the north eastern part of the expanding City Centre and achieve a substantial area of useable public realm for wider community benefit.
- 3.19 The general arrangement of the site has also been required to respond to the constraint presented by Shooters Brook and its diversion through the central part of the site which dictates that the two buildings need to be situated at the northern and southern extremities of the site. A proposal for the diversion of Shooters Brook is submitted as part of the application.
- 3.20 As part of the changes, an enhancement to the external aesthetic of both buildings has been proposed. This achieves a more balanced arrangement of the development blocks within Building A and a façade approach which is more appropriate to its context.

Detailed design changes

- 3.21 The submitted Design and Access Statement describes the scheme changes in full but in summary these are as follows:

Uses

- Residential (Use Class C3) reduced from 758 to 723 units;
- Flexible office accommodation, (Use Class Eg(i)) increased from 4,165 sq m to 4,385 sq m (GEA), including ancillary uses in basement levels)
- Café space (Use Class Ea and b) increased from 119 sq m to 136 sq m GEA.

Dwelling mix:

August 2026 scheme:

- 33% Studio and 1-bed
- 65% 2-bed
- 2% 3-bed

March 2025 scheme:

- 35% Studio and 1-bed
- 64% Studio and 1-bed
- 1% 3-bed

Building A design and parameters

- 3.22 There have been changes to the height of Building A, with an overall height reduction of 5 storeys (from 49 storeys plus roof (+201.910m AOD) to 44 storeys plus roof (+187.460m AOD)).
- 3.23 The residential accommodation split has been amended to 13% studio; 20% 1 bed; 65% 2 bed; and 2% 3 bed apartments.

- 3.24 The number of 'stacking blocks' proposed as part of the 2025 Scheme have reduced from 4 to 3. The cantilevers have also been reduced with the removal of the extrusions from the façade. The colour palette has changed to anodised aluminium elements within a unitised system from grey to warm light and mid-bronze tone, and soffits adjusted to match.
- 3.25 The Building A overall basement depth has been reduced by 2.625m. The basement now comprises two levels. The layout of the upper level is unchanged apart from a minor reconfiguration of the cycle storage layout (provision remains as previously proposed, albeit other storage areas have been omitted).
- 3.26 The layout of the lower level has been adjusted to reduce the height of the storage tanks, so that they can be accommodated in a lower floor-floor height. In addition, the building footprint has been slightly repositioned to the west, with foundations encroaching approximately 150mm further into the culvert zone.

Building B design and parameters

- 3.27 Amendments to the architectural expression and building parameters include a revision to the external materiality, with pre-cast concrete replaced by brick (one brick type – warm buff tone) and change to metalwork colour palette to mid bronze.
- 3.28 Within Building B, the residential floor-to-floor heights have been increased from 2,950mm to 3,000mm. The office component has been reduced in height, resulting in an overall decrease of approximately 580mm for the office element. These changes have resulted in a net increase of 310mm in the overall building height to 129.520m AOD but remaining at 24 storeys.
- 3.29 In Building B, the residential accommodation split has slightly been amended and is now 18% studio; 16% 1 bed; and 67% 2 bed apartments. The outdoor terraces in Building B have also expanded, with the parapets extended to the edge of the floor.
- 3.30 Building B has been slightly repositioned, shifting approximately 500mm to the west and south.

Parking provision, circulation space and public realm

- 3.31 The development continues to provide 100% cycle parking, albeit cycle parking numbers have reduced in absolute terms owing to the reduction in the number of residential dwellings.
- 3.32 Limited amendments are made to the public realm and landscaping strategy for the site, including the provision of a Building Maintenance Unit landing zone for Building A and a reduction in total tree planting from 41 trees to 39 trees to accommodate this. No additional trees are lost.
- 3.33 The inclusion of a taxi drop off/pick up facility was raised during recent stakeholder engagement. The service road which runs to the rear of the site can adequately and safely operate as such without any amendments to the scheme. The applicant would be happy to accept a condition requiring that this space is able to be used for this specific purpose without restriction.

- 3.34 There has been no change to the motorized vehicle parking, access or servicing strategy for the development.

4. Stakeholder engagement

- 4.1 The changes to the scheme and above commitments have been informed by a process of engagement with key stakeholders. This has included two meetings with Cllr Sam Wheeler (Piccadilly Ward Member), one meeting with Cllr Jon-Connor Lyons (Piccadilly Ward Member), one meeting with Cllr Gavin White (Executive Member for Housing and Regeneration), one meeting with representatives of Oxygen building and numerous meetings with Planning Officers from the City Council.
- 4.2 Through these meetings options for addressing the above issues raised by the Planning Committee have been discussed as well as the affordable housing commitment. This has been a positive process of engagement providing a platform for the submission of the updated proposals.
- 4.3 Of note, these meetings have highlighted that meeting the need for affordable homes in the city is a priority for local ward members, to which the applicant is pleased to be able to respond positively. Further, the request for the inclusion of a taxi parking drop off/pick up facility within the scheme was made by Cllr Jon-Connor Lyons. Such provision is adequately accommodated in the updated scheme as summarised above.

5. Relationship with the Oxygen Building

- 5.1 A group of individuals representing residents within the nearby Oxygen residential building located on the opposite side of Store Street to the application site have made previous representations in relation to the development's impacts on sunlight/daylight received by those residential dwellings within the Oxygen building which face the development site. A further meeting was held with this group on 6th July to discuss the proposals and scheme changes.
- 5.2 Whilst noting the position taken by the resident group, it is not feasible to materially change the scheme to reduce the impact of the development further in this regard.
- 5.3 In essence, Block A, fixed in its location due to the constraint of the culverted Shooters Brook running through the site, would need to be reduced in scale very significantly before the effect on those dwellings most impacted would begin to be materially reduced. This is not considered to be appropriate or viable in the context of a need to make efficient and effective use of a site which occupies a highly sustainable and prominent city centre location, would put the scheme at odds with the SRF and would significantly dilute the scheme's wider regeneration benefits.
- 5.4 It is recognised that a balance needs to be struck and it is important to establish that the impacts that the development will have are within acceptable limits when considered in their context. Work has been undertaken to benchmark the level of daylight/sunlight which residential properties within Oxygen will have access to, following the development, against other city centre locations where the application of different standards and expectations (compared to a suburban location by comparison) is supported by the relevant guidance in relation to this subject. This exercise has demonstrated that the level of sunlight and daylight which affected properties will receive following the development is typical of other locations in the city centre.
- 5.5 As outlined, there are a range of competing objectives which must be met when delivering viable regeneration-led proposals in the city centre. The need for a balanced approach is important. The applicant has evidenced that, insofar as maintenance of an acceptable level of daylight and sunlight to existing residential properties is one such objective, this is achieved by the development with reference to the benchmark of what is commonplace across Manchester City Centre – a successful residential location in which people choose to live in order to access the benefits this brings.
- 5.6 For the avoidance of doubt, in overall terms the revised scheme's impacts in relation sunlight, daylight and overshadowing are broadly the same as the existing proposal and are deemed to be within acceptable limits for the circumstances of this site as reported in the Environmental Statement Update. This conclusion is one which Officers have agreed within as set out in the Officer Report of January 2026.

6. Supplementary planning application material

6.1 Reflecting the above changes to the scheme, the majority of architectural and landscape plans have been updated and are submitted for approval. The following plans are unaffected and remain 'in play' with all other plans superseded by the suite of plans provided as part of this supplementary submission:

- Site Location Plan 10359-SHP-Z0-A-B5D9-G100-XP-XX-001 Rev P01
- Existing Site Roof Plan 10359-SHP-Z0-A-B5D9-G100-XP-RF-001 Rev P01
- Proposed - Demolition Plan 10359-SHP-Z0-A-B5D9-JC20-XP-00-001 Rev P01
- Site Wide Phasing Plan 10359-SHP-Z0-A-B5D9-G100-PL-00-002 Rev P02
- Elevation Existing - North East Site Elevation - Great Ancoats Street 10359-SHP-Z0-A-B5D9-G100-XE-NE-001 Rev P01
- Elevation Existing - North West Site Elevation - Ducie Street 10359-SHP-Z0-A-B5D9-G100-XE-NW-001 Rev P01
- Elevation Existing - South East Site Elevation - Store Street 10359-SHP-Z0-A-B5D9-G100-XE-SE-001 Rev P01

6.2 Alongside the submitted plans, a number of other documents are provided to replace or supplement the existing equivalent in respect of key topic areas so that the Council's further assessment of the scheme can take place on the basis of accurate and up to date information as to the scheme's impacts.

6.3 These comprise:

- Planning Statement Addendum (this report)
- Design and Access Statement Update*
- Financial Viability Appraisal Addendum
- Health Impact Assessment Addendum
- Economic Benefits Statement Addendum
- Fire Statement Update*
- Heritage Statement Addendum
- Energy Statement Update*
- Overheating Assessment Update*
- Environmental Standards Statement Update*
- Air Quality Assessment Addendum

- Bat Survey Update*
- Shooters Brook Diversion proposal Update*
- Preliminary Ecological Assessment Addendum
- Landscape Statement Update (Stage 2 report)*
- Transport Statement Addendum
- Environmental Statement Update addressing each topic, including:
 - TVIA
 - Wind
 - Sunlight / daylight
 - Noise and Vibration
 - Climate Change
 - Solar Glare
 - Socio-economics and Human Health

*denotes a document which supersedes, in full, the existing equivalent/s referred to in draft Condition 2 of the Officer Report of January 2026. All other documents listed above re supplementary to the existing equivalent which therefore remain part of the planning application.

6.4 All other documents not referred to above and which are listed in Condition 2 of the Officer Report remain up to date in their current form for the purposes of the onward determination of the application.

NPPF 2026

6.5 A number of the above supplementary and updated documents was concluded prior to the publication of NPPF on 17th August 2026. Of these documents, and where needed, the following fully reflect and capture the changes to national planning policy as of 17th August in respect of the assessment presented and conclusions drawn:

- Transport Statement Addendum
- Flood Risk Assessment Update
- Drainage Strategy Update
- Shooters Brook Diversion proposal Update
- Overheating Assessment Update
- Design and Access Statement Update
- Financial Viability Appraisal Addendum

- Energy Statement Update
- Fire Statement Update

6.6 By contrast, in relation to the following documents/topic areas, the implications of the updates to NPPF for the assessment work and the conclusions presented are dealt with exclusively in this Planning Statement Addendum (Section 7):

- Air Quality
- Heritage
- Environmental Standards Statement
- Archaeology
- Ecology
- Ground conditions
- Health Impact Assessment
- Economic Benefits Statement
- Environmental Statement topics:
 - TVIA
 - Wind
 - Sunlight / daylight
 - Noise and Vibration
 - Climate Change
 - Solar Glare
 - Socio-economics and Human Health
- Strategic policy compliance

7. Planning appraisal

- 7.1 The development plan context to the application remains the Manchester Core Strategy (2012) and Places for Everyone (2024), supplemented by Piccadilly HS2 SRF (2018). There have been no updates to locally adopted policy documents or strategies which supplement the development plan since the submission of the application in 2025 or its consideration by the Planning Committee in January 2026.
- 7.2 The scheme is fully appraised against such policies within the Officer's report to the Planning Committee of January 2026 with compliance evidenced. This noted the scheme's direct and wider regeneration benefit and positive contribution to the growth and success of the city centre as a strategic priority for the city.
- 7.3 As noted, the scheme has since been amended to reflect fully the 2023 East Village Central SRF, which is supplementary to the HS2 Piccadilly SRF, on account of feedback on this matter from the Planning Committee. This is achieved via a reduction in the height of Building A to 45 storeys. The development retains the principle of a tall building in this location underpinned by the same strategic design rationale, consistent with the SRF. Notwithstanding this, the scheme remains principally the same in its overall form, general scale and design approach, with its positive regenerative effects therefore being unaffected in this regard.
- 7.4 The measurable benefits which the scheme will deliver are materially unaffected, albeit changes to the baseline and scheme amendments do marginally alter the quantifiable economic outcomes which are captured in the Economic Benefits Statement Addendum.
- 7.5 As noted, the scheme will deliver the same general form of development, broadly the same number of residential homes and the same amount of commercial floorspace with the changes to the measurable beneficial effects of the development being immaterial in the context of a scheme of this size and significance. These benefits remain significant to which appropriate weight should be applied.
- 7.6 The extent, form and location of public realm to serve the development and the wider community is unchanged. It will continue to secure the provision of two striking landmark buildings, with Building A representing an elegant tall building which marks the key junction of Great Ancoats Street and Store Street as before.
- 7.7 The suite of updated technical documents demonstrate that the amended scheme does not result in any additional adverse impacts compared to the previous. They also demonstrate that the changes do not affect the conclusion of existing reports and assessments, namely that the impacts of the development are within acceptable limits.
- 7.8 As noted, the conclusions of the reports and documents which have not been updated remain unaffected and should continue to be relied upon. The commentary on these aspects of the scheme within the Officer report of January 2026 is therefore up to date as to the acceptability of the proposals in respect of these areas of concern.

- 7.9 Notwithstanding the above, the proposal as presented will deliver additional benefit compared to the scheme considered to date via the provision of affordable homes as an integral and committed part of the scheme.

Implications of changes to NPPF

- 7.10 NPPF was published on 17th August 2026 and replaces the previous version dated December 2024.

Strategic alignment with NPPF

- 7.11 The new NPPF does not materially change the national strategic policy context in relation to developments of this type and scale and the scheme's locational and site circumstances. To that end, NPPF maintains an emphasis on prioritising brownfield regeneration, boosting the supply of housing, supporting economic and jobs growth and making efficient and effective use of sustainably located sites. These principles were embedded in NPPF 2024 and remain a focus of national planning policy through the new NPPF.
- 7.12 Considered at a strategic level, the new NPPF does not alter the conclusions of the original Planning Statement as to the scheme's acceptability in principle and its alignment with key aims and objectives expressed through NPPF. Policies HO7, E2, TR3 and L1 particularly are particularly noted in this regard, reflecting a general reiteration of provisions in the previous NPPF.
- 7.13 The new NPPF does not therefore introduce any provisions would indicate that the principle of the development is not acceptable or which would imply the benefits of the development in terms of job creation, housing (and affordable housing) provision and the catalytic regeneration role and effect of the development are any less significant, meaningful or relevant as material considerations which informed the Officer recommendation for approval in January 2026.
- 7.14 At a more granular level, NPPF introduces some policy changes in relation to key topics which are relevant to this application. Outwith the strategic position outlined above, it is therefore necessary to consider these policy changes and their implications for the scheme's overall policy compliance. This exercise is undertaken on a topic-by-topic basis.

Transport

- 7.15 See Transport Statement Addendum.
- 7.16 The revisions to the scheme and implications of policy changes brought about by NPPF are considered in the above document. This evidences and concludes that the development, in its amended form, is aligned with relevant provisions in NPPF 2026 with relevant standards continuing to be achieved. The update to NPPF and changes to the scheme would not therefore change the overall conclusion outlined in the original reporting in relation to this topic, the Planning Statement and Tall Building Statement and Officer report of January 2026 as to the scheme's acceptability and policy compliance in respect of this topic area.

Flood risk and drainage

- 7.17 See Flood Risk Assessment Update and Drainage Strategy Update.
- 7.18 The revisions to the scheme and implications of policy changes brought about by NPPF are considered in the above documents. These evidence and conclude that the development, in its amended form, is aligned with relevant provisions in NPPF 2026 with relevant standards continuing to be achieved. The update to NPPF and changes to the scheme would not therefore change the overall conclusion outlined in the original reporting in relation to this topic, the Planning and Tall Building Statement and Officer report of January 2026 as to the scheme's acceptability and policy compliance in respect of this topic area.

Energy, climate change and Sustainability

- 7.19 See technical note relating to Climate and Environmental Standards at **Appendix 1**, the Energy Statement Update and Environmental Statement Supplement.
- 7.20 Read alongside the Energy Statement Update and the Environmental Statement , Supplement, the effects of the revisions to the scheme and implications of policy changes brought about by NPPF are considered at Appendix 1. These documents evidence and conclude that the development, in its amended form, is aligned with relevant provisions in NPPF 2026 with relevant standards continuing to be achieved. The update to NPPF and changes to the scheme would not therefore change the overall conclusion outlined in the original reporting in respect of this topic area, the Planning and Tall Building Statement and Officer report of January 2026 as to the scheme's acceptability and policy compliance in respect of this topic area.

Air Quality

- 7.21 NPPF 2024 set out the requirement to prevent new and existing development from contributing to, or being put at risk from, unacceptable levels of air pollution (paragraph 187). It also states that development should be appropriate for its location taking into account the likely effects (including cumulative effects) of pollution on health, living conditions and the natural environment, as well as the potential sensitivity of the site or the wider area to impacts that could arise from the development (paragraph 198) and that planning decisions should sustain and contribute towards compliance with relevant limit values or national objectives for air pollutants, taking into account the presence of AQMAs and Clean Air Zones (CAZ)s (paragraph 199).
- 7.22 NPPF 2026 is broadly the same. Policy P3 sets out that development proposals should be appropriate for their location, taking into account the likely effects (including cumulative effects) of pollution on health, living conditions and the natural environment and that in assessing the potential effects of pollution, consideration should be given to the potential sensitivity of the site, and its intended occupiers and users, as well as that of the environment and population in the surrounding area (including where certain groups could be particularly vulnerable to its effects, such as children and older people).
- 7.23 Policy P3 goes onto set out that development should not give rise to, or contribute to, an unacceptable level of air pollution on or beyond the site and that development should sustain and contribute to compliance with relevant limit values or national

objectives and targets for air pollutants including PM2.5 and that development proposals should take account of Air Quality Management Areas and be consistent with the objectives of relevant Air Quality Action Plans, Clean Air Plans and Local Air Quality Strategies.

- 7.24 NPPF 2026 does not set out any more onerous or stringent requirements in relation to a consideration of this topic with the key principles in NPPF 2024 carried over into the updated NPPF. The original reporting in relation to this topic, and the submitted Air Quality Assessment Addendum, demonstrate that the scheme will not give rise to significant adverse air quality impacts considered in the context of NPPF 2024. The same conclusion can be drawn in the context of NPPF 2026 having regard to the updated policy requirements and expectations in relation to this topic.
- 7.25 The update to NPPF and changes to the scheme would not therefore change the overall conclusion outlined in the original and supplementary reporting in relation to this topic, the Planning and Tall Building Statement and Officer report of January 2026 as to the scheme's acceptability and policy compliance in respect of this topic area.

Sunlight/daylight

- 7.26 See Environmental Statement Supplement.
- 7.27 NPPF continues to place a strong emphasis on making effective use of land. Policy S4 supports development within settlements unless its benefits would be substantially outweighed by any adverse effects whilst Policy L2 gives substantial weight to the benefits of making better use of vacant and underutilised land and buildings. Further Policy L3 expects residential and mixed-use development within settlements to contribute to an increase in density, unless there is a clear justification that this would be inappropriate or not possible. It also confirms that existing character should not prevent development from making the most of an area's potential.
- 7.28 In relation specifically to daylight and sunlight, Policy P3 requires development to provide healthy living conditions for occupiers, including adequate access to light, and not to result in unacceptable daylight and sunlight conditions for neighbouring residents and occupiers. It notes that adverse effects should be avoided where possible or otherwise mitigated to an acceptable degree.
- 7.29 These principles are carried forward from NPPF 2024 and do not mark a material change in policy or standards notwithstanding an amended expression.
- 7.30 Whilst the revised NPPF no longer contains the previous express wording requiring a flexible approach to daylight and sunlight policies and guidance (see NPPF 2024 paragraph 130) it continues to require a balance between making effective use of land and maintaining acceptable living conditions which reflect this principle in practice.
- 7.31 The NPPF does not prescribe compliance with particular numerical daylight and sunlight targets, consistent with NPPF 2024. The acceptability of the retained conditions should therefore continue to be considered in the context of the site, including the existing and emerging pattern of development, the sensitivity of the affected properties and the overall level of amenity retained.

7.32 This policy context is materially unchanged from that expressed in NPPF 2024 therefore. It does not present any more onerous standards or expectations or change the way that this topic and impacts in this area should be considered in the planning balance.

7.33 For this reason, changes to NPPF do not affect the methodology or conclusions of the daylight and sunlight assessment presented within the original Environmental Statement and the Environmental Statement Supplemental. The characterisation of the development's impacts in respect of this topic is unaffected. This is to be weighed in the planning balance.

Townscape and Visual Impact (TVIA)

7.34 See Environmental Statement Supplement.

7.35 Guidance on two policies which govern the design process, and which are relevant to this topic, have changed compared to NPPF 2024. These are policies DP3 Key principles for well-designed places and DP4 The design process. However, neither policies materially change the guidance in previous version of the NPPF nor the standards to be applied, approach to considering this area of harm or adverse weight to be given to harm in the planning balance.

7.36 As result, changes to the NPPF do not affect the methodology or conclusions of the TVIA presented within the original Environmental Statement and the Environmental Statement Supplement. The characterisation of the development's impacts in respect of this topic is unaffected. This is to be weighed in the planning balance.

Noise and vibration

7.37 See Environmental Statement Supplement and Technical Note at Appendix 2.

7.38 Read alongside the Environmental Statement Supplement, the effect of the revisions to the scheme and implications of policy changes brought about by NPPF are considered at Appendix 2. These evidence and conclude that the development, in its amended form, is aligned with relevant provisions in NPPF 2026 with relevant standards continuing to be achieved. The update to NPPF and changes to the scheme would not therefore change the overall conclusion outlined in the original reporting in relation to this topic, the Planning and Tall Building Statement and Officer report of January 2026 as to the scheme's acceptability and policy compliance in respect of this topic area.

Socio-economic impacts and Health Impact

7.39 See Health Impact Assessment Addendum, Economic Benefits Statement Addendum and Environmental Statement Supplement.

7.40 The revisions to the scheme are considered in the above documents. These evidence and conclude that the development in its amended form do not change the overall conclusions of the original reporting notwithstanding some limited changes to outputs in terms of measure metrics in relation to the indicators considered.

7.41 With respect to NPPF, as with the previous December 2024 iteration, the 2026 NPPF continues to provide a framework for a planning system centred around sustainable development, as the overarching '*purpose of the planning system*', and outlines the

expectation that future development will contribute positively towards meeting economic and social objectives, as follows:

- **An economic objective** – to help build a strong, responsive and competitive economy, by ensuring that sufficient land of the right types is available in the right places and at the right time to support growth, innovation and improved productivity; and by identifying and coordinating the provision of infrastructure.
- **A social objective** - to support strong, vibrant and healthy communities, by ensuring that a sufficient number and range of homes can be provided to meet the needs of present and future generations; and by fostering well-designed, beautiful and safe places, with accessible community facilities, public service infrastructure and open spaces that reflect current and future needs and support communities' health, social and cultural well-being.

7.42 Chapter 16 ('Promoting healthy communities') of the August 2026 NPPF continues to *"promote the creation of healthy and inclusive places and support the provision of appropriate public services"*, aligning in principle with the December 2024 NPPF's Chapter 8 ('Promoting Healthy and Safe Communities').

7.43 Given this alignment, the amendments to the NPPF do not change the overall conclusion outlined in the original reporting in relation to this topic area, the Planning and Tall Building Statement and Officer report of January 2026 and updated reporting referred to above as to the scheme's acceptability, policy compliance and overall positive contributions in respect of this topic area.

Wind/Microclimate

7.44 As with the 2024 version, the 2026 NPPF does not contain any policies which directly address the topic of wind microclimate.

7.45 Design provisions, which are relevant to a consideration of this topic, were previously set out at paragraph 135 of the December 2024 NPPF and now sit within Chapter 14 (Achieving well-designed places), whose objective is to promote high quality, healthy, inclusive and sustainable places, and within Policy DP3 (Key principles for well-designed places).

7.46 Of the principles set out in Policy DP3, paragraph 2(a) requires development to support communities which will function well over the lifetime of the development, and paragraph 2(f) requires spaces which are safe, secure, inclusive and accessible for all ages and abilities. These correspond closely to the provisions previously relied upon, and the change is therefore one of structure and wording rather than of substance.

7.47 The NPPF does not prescribe numerical wind comfort criteria and did not previously do so. The requirement, directed by the update to NPPF, remains that development should function well over its lifetime and provide external spaces which are safe and accessible for their intended users, and this in turn requires that the wind environment within and around the site is suitable for its intended uses.

7.48 The assessment methodology, the comfort and safety criteria applied and the conclusions reached in the original reporting in relation to this topic, and presented

within the Planning and Tall Building Statement and Officer Report of January 2026 are therefore unaffected by changes to national planning policy.

Heritage

- 7.49 See Built Heritage technical note at Appendix 3, Heritage Statement Addendum and Environmental Statement Supplement.
- 7.50 The effect of the revisions to the scheme and implications of policy changes brought about by NPPF are considered across the above documents.
- 7.51 Of note, the NPPF continues to require the acceptability of any harm to a non-designated heritage asset to be considered in the context of the scheme's wider public benefit (NPPF Policy HE7(2) and (2)). Whilst this contrasts with the previous wording, which presented this as requiring a 'planning judgement' (NPPF 2024 paragraph 216), the practical application of the test is essentially unchanged noting that a planning judgement is, in effect, an assessment of harm weighted against benefit. This is clarified in the new NPPF but in practical terms the test is broadly unchanged.
- 7.52 Notwithstanding this, in terms of the application of this test, the original Planning and Tall Building Statement addressed paragraph 216 of NPPF 2024 in the manner directed by NPPF 2026, in acknowledging that the harm resulting from the loss of a non-designated heritage asset and giving this adverse weight to be appropriately balanced against the scheme's benefits.
- 7.53 The Planning and Tall Building Statement evidences that the harm to the non-designated heritage asset (noted as significant), and the overall adverse impacts of the development in respect of built heritage, is outweighed by the scheme's benefits. The appraisal approach deployed in this regard reflects the direction provided in the new NPPF.
- 7.54 In the case of the new NPPF, and having regard to the changes to the scheme, the overall harm to the non-designated heritage asset is unchanged, albeit now expressed as 'substantial' (harm to the asset) reflecting the terminology in Policy HE7(3), as explained across the Heritage Statement Addendum, the Environmental Statement Supplement and the technical note at Appendix 3. This change in terminology does not change the magnitude or scale of harm in absolute or relative terms which remains the same.
- 7.55 The wider benefits of the scheme are materially unchanged. Whilst the scale of development is marginally reduced, the overall regeneration benefit of the scheme is unaffected reflecting that the scheme retains the same general form and character. The revised scheme brings added benefit, not present in the previous scheme, resulting from the provision of affordable homes.
- 7.56 As such, applying the planning balance test in Policy HE7 of the new NPPF to the revised scheme, the outcome remains that the benefits of the development outweigh the harm to the non-designated heritage asset. This is consistent with the conclusion presented in the original Planning and Tall Building Statement and reflected in the Officer report of January 2026.

Other topics

7.57 Documents relating to the following topic areas present assessments which do not engage a consideration of NPPF, there have been no changes to NPPF in relation to that topic area or the changes are negligible and so of no material significance. As such, the changes to NPPF do not affect these assessments, the basis on which they are carried out and their conclusions which can be relied up for the purposes of the onward determination of the application:

- Ground conditions (Phase 1 Geo-Environmental Assessment)
- Ecology (Preliminary Ecological Appraisal, Preliminary Ecological Appraisal Addendum, Bat Survey Update)
- Archaeology (Archaeological Desk-Based Assessment)
- Architectural and landscape design (Design and Access Statement Update, Landscape Design Statement Update and Green & Blue Infrastructure Statement)
- Fire safety (Fire Statement Update)
- TV Reception (Terrestrial Television Baseline Survey Report)
- Broadband Connectivity (Broadband Connectivity Assessment)
- Air safety (Technical Aerodrome Safeguarding Assessment)
- Solar Glare (Environmental Statement and Environmental Statement Supplement)
- Culvert diversion (Shooters Brook Diversion proposal Update)
- Overheating (Overheating Assessment Building A Update and Overheating Assessment Building B Update)
- Crime Impact (Crime Impact Statement)
- Trees (Arboricultural Impact Assessment and Arboricultural Method Statement)

8. Conclusion

- 8.1 The revised scheme as submitted has been able to respond directly and robustly to two of the three issues of concern raised by the Planning Committee in reaching its 'minded to refuse' decision of 15th January 2026. This is achieved through evidence of an improved viability position, achieved via efficiency focused design changes and informed by additional evidence in relation to operational costs, and, against this context, the provision of genuinely affordable homes within the scheme, as well as a reduction in the height of Building A to align with the 2023 East Village Central SRF. An improved aesthetic to both buildings is also proposed which responds more positively to its context.
- 8.2 As outlined in the Officer Report of January 2026, the daylight / sunlight impacts of the scheme, which are unaffected by the changes to the proposed development, are within acceptable limits for a city centre location and when considered in the context of the scheme's wider regeneration benefits. This area of impact does not provide a justified reason for the application's refusal having regard to prevailing policy. The scheme's impacts, and therefore this conclusion, are unchanged.
- 8.3 Notwithstanding this, the applicant has been able to present a series of positive enhancements to the scheme, which include a more elegant and contextually appropriate façade aesthetic and appearance to both blocks alongside affordable homes and a fully SRF compliant massing approach in direct response to feedback from the Planning Committee.
- 8.4 These moves optimise and increase the positive regeneration benefits of this strategic scheme and its contribution to the ongoing transformation of this important part of the city centre. These changes reinforce the conclusion of the 2025 Planning and Tall Building Statement, and the Officer report of January 2026, that the development accords with the development plan.
- 8.5 Changes to national planning policy brought about by the revised NPPF published on 17th August 2026 have been considered by the wider consultant team. Supplementary analysis of the changes in policy context is therefore considered and presented within this report and associated materials submitted with the updated proposal.
- 8.6 Collectively this analysis concludes that in respect all relevant topic areas, changes to NPPF do not affect the overall conclusions of previous reporting in relation to the scheme's impacts (positive and adverse) and the weighting of these outcomes in the planning balance.
- 8.7 Accordingly, this analysis concludes that, in respect of all topics, the new NPPF does not give rise to any additional tension with national planning policy nor change the extent to which the development makes a positive contribution to the achievement of the Government's objectives and priorities articulated through national planning policy.
- 8.8 A consideration of the scheme against the updated NPPF, as a material consideration, does not support a decision being made contrary to the direction provided by the

development plan which, as summarised above, is that the development should be approved.

**Appendix 1: NPPF 2026 – Technical Note relating
to Climate Change and
Environmental Standards**

Briefing

Stocktons Sustainability NPPF Update

August 2026

Introduction

1. This briefing note has been prepared to consider the effect of the revised National Planning Policy Framework (NPPF), updated in August 2026.
2. The purpose of this note is to:
 - Summarise the changes to national planning policy relevant to sustainability, energy and climate change; and
 - Assess whether those changes materially affect the conclusions of the Environmental Standards Statement (including Energy and Carbon Statement) and its findings regarding compliance with national planning policy.

Summary of Changes to National Planning Policy

3. The revised NPPF retains the overarching objective of achieving sustainable development and continues to require the planning system to support the transition to a low carbon future.
4. In relation to sustainability, energy and climate change, the principal amendments strengthen the policy emphasis on climate change mitigation and adaptation. Policies CC2 and CC3, which relate to decision-making on individual development proposals, are the most directly relevant policies to the proposed development, and set out a series of criteria against which compliance can be demonstrated.
5. **CC2: Mitigation of climate change.** In order to contribute to climate change mitigation and the transition to net zero, development proposals should, where relevant to the proposal:
 - a) Accord with policies TR3 and TR4 so that sustainable patterns of movement are prioritised, opportunities are taken to improve walking, wheeling, cycling and public transport, and infrastructure is provided to support the transition to zero-emission vehicles;
 - b) Support good access to facilities in order to limit the need to travel, whether through the development's location, through development densities which improve catchment populations for local services, or by incorporating community facilities and premises to support local employment opportunities;
 - c) Use design approaches which conserve energy and other resources in accordance with policy DP3(2)(b);
 - d) Take advantage of opportunities to reuse existing structures and materials, including by reusing non-contaminated excavated soil and hardcore within the site;

- e) Take advantage of opportunities to draw low carbon energy from decentralised networks (such as district heat networks), where these are available, and to co-locate energy and heat generators and users, especially to take advantage of suppliers of surplus heat and energy;
 - f) Contribute to the creation or restoration of habitats which can act as carbon stores, such as through woodland planting and peatland restoration, while avoiding harm to habitats which can act as important carbon stores, including peatland and salt marsh; and
 - g) Not involve the extraction of fossil fuels unless it is in accordance with policy M5.
6. **CC3: Adaptation to climate change.** Development proposals should take into account the current and potential impacts of climate change over the lifetime of the scheme, and in order to minimise vulnerability to these impacts should, where relevant to the proposal:
- a) Be located where the risk of flooding is minimised, or can be managed and the development made safe without increasing risk elsewhere, in accordance with policies F4, F5, F6, F7 and F8;
 - b) Comply with policy F9 where development would be located in an area vulnerable to coastal change, as specified in that policy;
 - c) Incorporate sustainable drainage systems to manage surface water flow rates and reduce volumes of runoff in accordance with policy F8;
 - d) Use design approaches which minimise risks from overheating in accordance with policy DP3(2)(b), and include green infrastructure and suitable tree planting in accordance with policies DP3(2)(c) and N3; and
 - e) Incorporate proportionate measures to mitigate against wildfires, where opportunities to do so exist and wildfires pose a particular risk (for example as a result of the combined effect of topography, prevailing wind direction and being located within or adjacent to heavily vegetated areas). Such measures should be designed to limit fuel loads for fires, and to create defendable spaces, such as by avoiding timber panel fences and incorporating firebreaks into development layouts and planting schemes.
7. Whilst the revised NPPF strengthens the emphasis placed on climate change and net zero objectives, the amendments do not represent a fundamental shift in the policy direction of national planning policy relating to sustainability, energy and climate change. The material effect of the changes is likely to be limited where development proposals are already supported by robust sustainability, energy and climate resilience strategies.

Review of the Proposed Development Against the Updated NPPF

8. The Environmental Standards Statement (including Energy and Carbon Statement) submitted as part of the application demonstrates a comprehensive approach to sustainability, energy efficiency, carbon reduction and climate resilience. The statement has been reviewed in the context of the updated NPPF and it is considered that the Proposed Development continues to accord with the relevant national planning policy objectives.

9. The revised national policy emphasis on climate mitigation and adaptation is reflected throughout the scheme strategy and assessment. In particular, the ESS demonstrates:

Climate Change Mitigation

- Significant reductions in operational carbon emissions beyond Part L 2021 requirements;
- An all-electric and fossil fuel free energy strategy;
- Incorporation of highly efficient air source heat pump technology;
- Provision of onsite renewable energy generation through roof-mounted solar photovoltaic panels;
- Consideration of embodied carbon and whole life carbon impacts through a Whole Life Cycle Assessment;
- Development in a highly accessible city centre location that promotes sustainable travel, and a sustainable Travel Plan that aims to reduce reliance on private car travel.

Climate Change Adaptation

- Assessment and mitigation of overheating risk through compliance with Part O and CIBSE TM59 methodologies;
 - Incorporation of sustainable drainage systems and wider flood resilience measures. The proposed drainage strategy has been designed to account for increased rainfall intensities as a result of climate change;
 - Water efficiency measures to reduce potable water consumption;
 - Biodiversity enhancement and green infrastructure provision to enhance climate resilience.
10. The development is targeting a BREEAM 'Very Good' rating for the office element of the development, which will help to ensure high levels of sustainability performance.
11. The development therefore continues to align with the overarching objectives of sustainable development set out within the Framework, and no further changes are needed.

Appendix 2: NPPF 2026 – Technical Note relating to Noise and Vibration



Note

Title	Noise Updates within National Planning Policy Framework		
Project	Stockton's, Manchester		
Reference	2835.NT.6.0	Author(s)	BH
Date	21 August 2026	Reviewer	FD

NPPF Updates

1. A planning application has been submitted to Manchester City Council (MCC) under reference 142535/FO/2025 which includes two new buildings providing residential, commercial and amenity spaces. The site address is 140 Great Ancoats Street, M4 6DU.
2. An Environmental Statement (ES) was submitted alongside the planning application, including a chapter on noise. A noise survey and an assessment of noise break-in are set out in Appendix 14.1 of the ES, which considers noise from the local road network and plant items on neighbouring buildings. Several notes have also been submitted relating to various noise matters following submission.
3. The National Planning Policy Framework (NPPF) was updated on 17th August 2026. The relevant national decision-making policies with regards to noise are now contained within P3 and P4 of Chapter 17 (Pollution, public protection and security); these are:
 - P3: Living conditions and pollution; and
 - P4: Impact of development on existing activities [Agent of Change].
4. The wording of these policies is either the same as the previous iteration of the NPPF or otherwise sets out the same policy aim. For instance, P3 incorporates noise policy with other non-noise pollution aspects so the precise wording has changed, but the policy intent remains unchanged.
5. Additional information is also provided within P4, but again these changes are not applicable to this scheme, and the policy aim remains as it was within the previous NPPF iteration.
6. As the changes in relation to noise are not material, the proposed scheme complies with the new NPPF (dated August 2026). All noise-related documents submitted to date can therefore still be relied upon.



Appendix 3: NPPF 2026 – Technical Note relating to Built Heritage

Heritage Statement Addendum – 2026 NPPF

Stocktons, 140 Great Ancoats Street, Manchester

20/08/2026

The following Heritage Statement Addendum has been prepared by Levrant (Heritage Architecture Ltd).

The revised National Planning Policy Framework (NPPF) was published by the Government on Monday the 17th of August 2026. ‘Conserving and enhancing the historic environment’ now constitutes Chapter 20 of this document, and the policies regarding the built environment have been re-organised from the previous iteration of paragraphs, into ten central policies. Policies HE1, HE2, and HE3 are Plan-making policies, and policies HE4, HE5, HE6, HE7, HE8, HE9, and HE10 are Decision-making policies.

The Heritage Statement submitted alongside the original Planning Application (142535/FO/2025) utilised the policies contained in the 2024 version of the NPPF. The purpose of the following addendum note is to consider whether the revised NPPF results in any material change to the conclusions outlined in the original report.

The policies which are of relevance to the Stockton’s Planning Application include:

- HE4: Securing the conservation of heritage assets;
- HE5: Assessing effects on heritage assets;
- HE6: Proposals affecting designated heritage assets;
- HE7: Decisions on non-designated heritage assets; and
- HE10: Loss or removal of heritage assets.

Under Policy HE4(2), “any harm to, or loss of, the significance of a designated heritage asset (including from development within its setting) should have a clear and convincing justification”.

Policy HE5(1) requires development proposals affecting heritage assets to be accompanied by an assessment of the significance of the assets affected, and of the effects of the proposal on their significance. This policy reiterates the requirement for proportionality when assessing potential effects on significance. HE5(2) explicitly categorises the potential resultant effects of development proposals on the significance and setting of heritage assets as:

- Positive effects;
- No effects;
- Harm;
- Substantial harm, which is defined as where “the development proposal would seriously affect a key element of the asset’s significance”; or
- Total loss of significance.

HE5(3) notes that it is the “effect on a heritage asset’s significance rather than the scale of the development which should be considered” when assessing development proposals.

The concept of ‘less than substantial harm’ to designated heritage assets previously identified under Paragraph 215 of the NPPF (2024) has been removed. Consequently, the effects of development proposals on the significance and setting of designated heritage assets are now required to be assessed under Policy HE5 and HE6.

Previously, non-designated heritage assets were assessed under Paragraph 216 of the NPPF (2024) which stated that *“in weighing applications that directly or indirectly affect non-designated heritage assets, a balanced judgement will be required having regard to the scale of any harm or loss and the significance of the heritage asset”*.

The revised NPPF (2026) assesses non-designated heritage assets under Policy HE7, whereby it states that positive effects will be supported (1); a development proposal which would result in harm to significance should be weighed against the benefits of the proposal and a balanced judgement made having regard to the scale of any harm or loss and the significance of the asset (2); and where a development proposal would cause substantial harm to, or the total loss of significance, it should only be supported where the harm or loss is outweighed by the benefits of the proposal, having regard to the scale of the harm and the significance of the asset (3).

The loss or removal of heritage assets is assessed within Policy HE10, whereby, whether designated or not, development which would result in the loss of the whole or part of a heritage asset “should not be approved without all reasonable steps being taken to ensure that the new development will proceed after the loss has occurred” (1), and

that the applicant should “record and advance understanding of the significance of the asset to be lost in a manner proportionate to its importance and the potential impact upon it”.

Effects of the 2026 NPPF upon the Assessment of the Proposed Development

The amendments to the Proposed Development would not result in any change to the impact conclusions outlined within the original Heritage Statement submitted in March 2025. However, these effects are required to be re-assessed in accordance with the revised terminology and relevant policies established under the revised NPPF, with principal focus on the revised principles for assessing ‘effects’ on heritage assets (HE5).

The Heritage Statement outlined that the formation of warehouses, designed in 1899 by P. Sidney Stott, were identified by the Local Planning Authority (LPA) as a non-designated heritage asset. When assessed against the recognised criteria for local listing, the existing buildings were considered to possess an overall **medium-low** degree of local significance.

The report highlighted the proposals would result in the demolition of a significant proportion of the non-designated heritage asset’s historic fabric, with the exception of the girder warehouse. The loss of the office block, which was identified as the most significant component part of the non-designated heritage asset was judged to result in a **moderate adverse (high)** effect overall. Notwithstanding this, the retention of the girder warehouse would preserve an element of the asset’s historic value, and accordingly, the proposals would not be considered to result in the total loss of the non-designated heritage asset’s significance.

This effect is required to be re-assessed against Policy HE5. The identified moderate adverse effect as a result of the loss of the most significant components of the asset is considered to “seriously affect a key element of the asset’s significance”. Therefore, when assessed against Policy HE5(2c), the development proposal is considered to result in “substantial harm” to the significance of the non-designated heritage asset.

This conclusion arises from the revised terminology and assessment framework introduced by the 2026 NPPF, rather than any change in the nature or extent of the effects identified within the Heritage Statement. The conclusion of a **moderate adverse effect** on the significance of the non-designated heritage assets remains unchanged.

In accordance with Policy HE7(3), development proposals that would result in substantial harm to the significance of a non-designated heritage asset should only be supported “where the harm or loss is outweighed by the benefits of the proposal, having regard to the scale of the harm or loss and the significance of the non-designated heritage asset”. The public benefits arising from the Proposed Development are set out within the accompanying Planning Statement.

Finally, the loss of the constituent elements of the non-designated heritage asset is also required to be assessed against Policy HE10. In this regard, the development should not be approved without reasonable steps to ensure the development will proceed following the loss. Further, it is recommended that a Historic Building Record should be conducted prior to the demolition of the building to ensure the significance of the asset is recorded and deposited within the Greater Manchester Historic Environment Record (GMHER).

The scoping assessment further identified the application site was located in the wider setting of 21 listed buildings, the Stevenson Square Conservation Area, and the Ancoats Conservation Area. The Proposed Development was judged to result in 9 instances of **minor adverse** impact, 7 instances of **negligible adverse** impact, and 7 instances of **neutral impact** to the settings of the identified heritage assets. The identified effects upon the setting of heritage assets were previously categorised as resulting in “less than substantial harm” under Paragraph 215 of the 2024 NPPF.

Accordingly, when reviewed against Policy HE5, the degree of harm to the setting of the identified heritage assets as a result of the Proposed Development is considered to constitute “harm” under HE5(2c), ranging from **minor to negligible adverse effects** (please refer to Table 5, Section 7.6 of the Heritage Statement for a summary of impact).

Policy HE6(3) requires any identified harm to a heritage asset to be treated as a matter of considerable importance and weight, and where a development proposal would harm the significance of a designated heritage asset, the proposal should be weighed against any public benefits arising as a result of the proposal.

The public benefits arising from the Proposed Development are set out in detail within the accompanying Planning Statement. Those benefits should be taken into account when undertaking the balancing exercises required under Policy HE7 in relation to the harm identified in relation to the non-designated heritage asset and under Policy HE6 in relation to the identified effect upon the settings of designated heritage assets.

Turley Office
Manchester

T 0161 233 7676

Turley