

Planning

Growth & Development

Delegated officer report for planning application

Application no. 145061/FO/2026
Date registered valid: 12 February 2026
Proposal: Erection of 1.8m high fencing for a temporary period of five years.
Address: Land At Sledmere Close And Alan Turing Way, Manchester, M11 3BU
Ward(s): Ancoats & Beswick Ward

Applicant: Kelly Baldwin, One Manchester Limited
Agent (if any): Miss Megan Beattie, Stantec UK Ltd
Case officer: Jack Naven
Tel: 0161 219 2095
Email: jack.naven@manchester.gov.uk

Recommendation: Approve
Date of recommendation: 07 April 2026

Application Details

Type of application: Full Application Consent

Development type: Minor Other

Date of site visit: 13 March 2026

Standard consultations:

Printed: 12 February 2026 Expired: 5 March 2026

Neighbour notifications

Printed: 12 February 2026 Expired: 5 March 2026

Site notice

No site notice has been produced

Press advert

No press advert had been published

Departure from Development Plan: No

Environmental Statement: Not required

Description of Site/Area

Listed building: Not applicable

Conservation area: Not applicable

Tree Preservation Order: Not applicable

The application site is located within the Grey Mare Lane estate and is identified as a development plot within the Grey Mare Lane Regeneration Masterplan. The applicant refers to the site as 'Plot J' of this masterplan.

The site is located in East Manchester, to the south of the Etihad Campus.

The east of the site is bounded by Alan Turing Way, a major arterial route that runs through to Etihad Campus. East Manchester Leisure Centre is located to the south of the site.

To the north of the site is Sledmere Close, a residential street. A row of houses is situated to the west of the site with a plot of green land to the south.

The plot currently is a vacant plot of land, with no buildings on it. There is a low retaining wall facing on to Alan Turing Way.

The wider surrounding uses are varied and mixed, including leisure centres, schools and educational institutions, football stadiums and training facilities, and residential. The immediate surrounding uses around Sledmere Close are primarily residential in nature.

This site is not within a conservation area and is not within the setting of listed buildings.

Description of Development

The proposal seeks Planning Permission for the erection of 1.8m high fencing for a temporary period of five years.

The site would feature a gate on its eastern boundary fronting onto Alan Turing Way.

Related Applications

There are 4 other applications submitted in tandem with this application for similar schemes across nearby sites all relating to Grey Mere Lane developments.

145060/FO/2026 - Erection of 2m high fencing for a temporary period of five years at Grey Mare Lane, M11 3BR.

Withdrawn April 2026.

145059/FO/2026 - Erection of 1.8m high fencing for a temporary period of five years at Sledmere Close, M11 3BU.

Approved April 2026.

145058/FO/2026 - Erection of 1.8m high fencing for a temporary period of five years at Newcombe Close, M11 3TF.

Approved April 2026.

145057/FO/2026 - Erection of 1.8m high fencing for a temporary period of five years at Rouse Close, M11 3AS.

Approved April 2026.

Consultations & Notification Responses

Publicity - Neighbour notification letters were sent to surrounding properties. A site notice and local press advert were also produced. One objection was received, regarding concerns that the proposal would obstruct public rights of way and access to residents' gardens. One neutral comment was received regarding what the plans for this land will be once this temporary consent expires.

Highway Services - Have no objections. Requested that informatives be attached to the decision notice outlining requirements to agree any licensing, hoarding / scaffolding and any temporary pedestrian and traffic management to be agreed with Highway Services.

Design for Security Team (Greater Manchester Police) - Responded to the consultation request and had no comments.

Policy

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

- JP-Strat5 – Inner Area
- JP-C5 - Streets for All
- JP-P1 - Sustainable Places
- JP-H1 – Scale, Distribution and Phasing of New Housing Development
- JP-H2 – Affordability of New Housing
- JP-H3 – Type, Size and Design of New Housing
- JP-H4 – Density of New Housing

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

- SP1 - Spatial Principles
- EC5 - East Manchester
- C4 - East Manchester District Centres - Eastlands, Gorton, Newton Heath and Openshaw
- CC5 – Transport
- H1 – Overall Housing Provision
- H4 – East Manchester
- H8 – Affordable Housing
- H10 – Housing for People with Additional Support Needs
- T1 - Sustainable Transport
- EN1 - Design Principles and Strategic Character Areas
- DM1 - Development Management

Saved Unitary Development Plan

- DC22 – Footpath Protection

National Planning Policy Framework (NPPF) (2024)

- Chapter 9 - Promoting Sustainable Transport
- Chapter 12 - Achieving well-designed places

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 in accordance with the general thrust of policy contained within it. As set out in the printed report no adverse impacts have been identified through consideration of the application proposals that would outweigh a positive decision in this instance.

Issues

Principle of Development

The proposal would secure, for a temporary period of time, a development plot within the Grey Mare Lane Masterplan, contributing towards the regeneration of East Manchester in line with PfE policy JP-Strat5, JP-P1, JP-H1, JP-H2, JP-H3, JP-H4; as well as Core Strategy policy SP1, EC5, C4, H1, H4, H8, H10, T1, EN1, EN4, EN8, and EN9.

On this basis, the principle of the development is considered to be acceptable for a temporary period of time.

Visual Amenity

The proposed fencing would be a green Paladin fence design that would allow some visibility into the site and be appropriate in scale. It is not considered to form an overbearing opaque or obtrusive feature within the residential setting, on a temporary basis.

If permission were sought for a permanent boundary treatment on this site, then a higher quality design and materiality would be required. Given that the fencing would be for a temporary period of 5 years from the date of the permission and any visual impact would therefore not represent any permanent harm or change to the visual amenity of the surrounding residential street scene, the proposed temporary fencing is considered to be of a sufficient quality in order to not have an unacceptable visual impact on the street scene for this temporary period of time. The proposed development would therefore comply with PfE Joint Development Plan policy JP-P1; policies SP1 and DM1 of the Core Strategy, and Section 12 the NPPF in this respect.

Conditions have been attached to ensure that the temporary period of time is complied with, that the temporary works will be discontinued, and that the site will be appropriately remediated.

There is a low retaining wall facing on to Alan Turing Way. The applicant has stated that this wall will be retained and the fencing will be sited behind the wall. The Local Planning Authority requested a cross section be provided in order to show this, but this could not be provided during the determination period.

A standing compliance condition has therefore been added to the application to ensure that this wall will be retained and that the fencing will be sited behind this. The applicant was supportive of this condition.

Highway Impacts

MCC's Highways Services have reviewed the application and requested that a visibility splay be submitted to ensure that the fencing would not compromise highway safety for either vehicles or pedestrians, particularly in relation to the vehicle access point on Alan Turing Way.

Visibility splays were submitted by the applicant during the determination period of this application which showed that a 2.4m x 43m SSD visibility splay can be achieved at the site access, which is appropriate for Alan Turing Way (30mph speed limit). This ensures vehicles can stop 2.4m from the edge of kerb and see vehicles and cyclists approaching from the south on Alan Turing Way. The proposed arrangement reflects the existing situation, as the access point and crossover are already established and will continue to be utilised in the same manner.

As such, the proposals do not introduce a new access or materially alter the existing vehicle access arrangement.

Regarding pedestrian visibility, the green paladin fencing proposed provides permeability that allows visibility through the structure, enabling drivers exiting the site to observe pedestrians approaching along the footway.

The footway along Alan Turing Way measures approximately 5m in width, providing substantial space for pedestrian movement. In practice, pedestrians are likely to walk centrally within the footway rather than directly adjacent to the site boundary fencing, which further reduces any potential interaction between pedestrians and vehicles exiting the site.

Given the visual permeability of the proposed fencing and the generous width of the adjacent footway, it is considered that the proposal accords with this guidance and will not materially negatively impact upon pedestrian visibility or safety.

The gated access will open inward. A compliance condition has been added to ensure that this is complied with.

In view of this, the proposal is acceptable with regards to PfE Policies JP-C5 and JP-P1, Core Strategy Policies T1 and DM1 and saved UDP Policy DC22 and the National Planning Policy Framework as they relate to negative effects of vehicle traffic.

Public Right of Way

The fencing would be a more durable product to more effectively secure the site. Greater Manchester Police's Design for Security Team have reviewed the application and have raised no objection to the proposal. In view of the above, the proposal is considered acceptable with respect to PfE Joint Development Plan Policy JP-P1; Policies SP1 and DM1 of the Core Strategy, and Section 12 the NPPF in this respect.

The fencing will surround and close off a vacant plot of land and will not impede access to surrounding residential properties, nor impact upon any public right of way.

As such, the proposal is considered acceptable with respect to PfE Joint Development Plan Policy JP-P1; Policies SP1 and DM1 of the Core Strategy, and Section 12 the NPPF in this respect.

Residential Amenity

Given the height and permeability of the fencing, the distance of the proposed fence from neighbouring properties' gardens and habitable room windows, it is not considered that the proposed fencing would result in any significant overbearing or overshadowing impacts on neighbours. In view of the above, the proposal is considered acceptable with respect to PfE Joint Development Plan Policy JP-P1; Policies SP1 and DM1 of the Core Strategy, and Section 12 the NPPF in this respect.

Crime and Antisocial Behaviour

The fencing would be a more durable product to more effectively secure the site. Greater Manchester Police's Design for Security Team have reviewed the application and have raised no objection to the proposal. In view of the above, the proposal is considered acceptable with respect to PfE Joint Development Plan Policy JP-P1; Policies SP1 and DM1 of the Core Strategy, and Section 12 the NPPF in this respect.

Conclusion

Given the above, it is considered that the proposal would have acceptable visual, highways, crime and antisocial behaviours impacts. It would also not have an unacceptable impact on residential amenity or restrict any right of way or primary means of access to residential properties.

Therefore, the proposal is considered to be consistent with the relevant policies set out above and is approved with conditions attached.

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: Approve

Article 35 Declaration

Officers have worked with the applicant/agent in a positive and proactive manner based on seeking solutions to problems arising in relation to dealing with the application. All such issues have been resolved due to the discussions within the original determination period, with appropriately attached conditions where required.

Condition(s) to be attached to decision for approval

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

Reason - Required to be imposed pursuant to Section 91 of the Town and Country Planning Act 1990.

2) The permission hereby granted is for a limited period only. The development for which permission is hereby granted is required to be discontinued and remove no later than one week from the expiration of the temporary period (which shall be five years from the implementation of the planning permission)

Reason - The use hereby approved is of a temporary nature only and pursuant to Core Strategy Policies SP1 and DM1 and saved Unitary Development Plan policy DC26.

3) Within two weeks prior to the expiration of the temporary period, a scheme to restore the land shall be submitted to and be approved in writing by the City Council as Local Planning Authority. The scheme shall be implemented within one month of the use ceasing and thereafter retained and maintained in accordance with this scheme.

Reason - To ensure that the land is reinstated to an appropriate standard in the interest of visual amenity and to restore the recreational value of the site pursuant to policies SP1, EN9, EN10 and DM1 of the Manchester Core Strategy (2012).

4) The development hereby approved shall be carried out in accordance with the following drawings and documents, received by the City Council as the Local Planning Authority on 29 January 2026:

- Location Plan GMLNE-BUT-XX-XX-DR-A-01235-P03
- Proposed Fence Elevation and Section GMLNE-BUT-XX-XX-DR-A-01261-P01

Received by the City Council as the Local Planning Authority on 16 March 2026:

- Proposed Visibility Splays 35664-STAN-XX-XX-DR-1001-P02

And received by the City Council as the Local Planning Authority on 18 March 2026:

- Proposed Fencing Plan GMLNE-BUT-XX-XX-DR-A-01255-P03

Reason - To ensure that the development is carried out in accordance with the approved plans and pursuant to Places for Everyone policies JP-Strat5, JP-C5, JP-P1, JP-H1, JP-H2, JP-H3 and JP-H4; policies SP1, EC5, C4, H1, H4, H8, H10, T1, EN1, EN4, EN8, EN9 and DM1 of the Adopted Core Strategy for the City of Manchester; Saved Unitary Development Plan policy DC22; and Section 12 of the NPPF.

5) The existing low retaining wall on the elevation adjacent to Alan Turing Way shall be retained throughout the lifetime of this temporary consent. The fencing shall not be sited on top of the wall, but shall instead be sited behind the low wall, on the side opposite to Alan Turing Way.

Reason - In order to ensure a satisfactory appearance in the interests of visual amenity in accordance with policies SP1 and DM1 of the Core Strategy and the requirements of the National Planning Policy Framework.

6) The proposed vehicular access gates shall be inward opening as shown on drawing 'Proposed Visibility Splays 35664-STAN-XX-XX-DR-1001-P02 ' received by the City Council as the Local Planning Authority on 16 March 2026 and 'Proposed Fencing Plan GMLNE-BUT-XX-XX-DR-A-01255-P03 ' received by the City Council as the Local Planning Authority on 18 March 2026.

Reason: To ensure that the fencing will not compromise highway safety for either vehicles or pedestrians in accordance with PfE policies JP-C5 and JP-P1, Core Strategy policies T1 and DM1, saved UDP policy DC22 and the National Planning Policy Framework as they relate to negative effects of vehicle traffic.

7) The proposed fencing hereby approved shall be a green paladin fencing as specified on approved drawing 'Proposed Fence Elevation and Section GMLNE-BUT-XX-XX-DR-A-01261-P01' received by the City Council as the Local Planning Authority on 29 January 2026.

Reason - In order to ensure a satisfactory appearance in the interests of visual amenity in accordance with PfE Joint Development Plan policy JP-P1; policies SP1 and DM1 of the Core Strategy, and Section 12 the NPPF.

Informatives

1) At the request of MCC's Highway Services department, the applicant should contact Manchester City Council's Event and Traffic Management Team as soon as possible via Email: highwaynetworkmanagement@manchester.gov.uk to discuss the following matters:

- Pedestrian and traffic management plans
- Coordination with neighbouring works to prevent clashes
- Utility plans
- Impacts on vehicular and pedestrian movement
- Whether any temporary road or footway closures or diversions will be required to facilitate the development

2) The applicant is required to liaise with MCC's Highways Licensing Team to discuss and agree requirements relating to licensing, hoardings/scaffolding, and skips: Email: highwaylicences@manchester.gov.uk

Appendix 1 – List of consultees & neighbours notified

Highway Services
Greater Manchester Police

15 Claybrook Walk, Manchester, M11 3BL
16 Sledmere Close, Manchester, M11 3BT
8 Prentice Walk, Manchester, M11 3BW
6 Prentice Walk, Manchester, M11 3BW
4 Prentice Walk, Manchester, M11 3BW
2 Prentice Walk, Manchester, M11 3BW
13 Claybrook Walk, Manchester, M11 3BL

Appendix 2 – Planning constraints

Article 4 Direction - Removal Of PD Rights Change Of Use From Class C3 To Class C4
Coal Authority - Development High Risk - Name: DEVELOPMENT_HIGH_RISK_AREA
Coal Authority - Development Low Risk - Name: DEVELOPMENT_LOW_RISK_AREA
Coal Authority - Surface Coal Resources - Name: Coal bearing strata at surface
Susceptible to Surf Water Flood (Less) -
Susceptible to Surf Water Flood (Less) -
Susceptible to Surf Water Flood (Middle) -
Susceptible to Surf Water Flood (More) -
Area Team Boundary - Name: CENTRAL