

[REDACTED]

Sent: 12 January 2026 19:01

Subject: Comment Received from Public Access

[REDACTED]

Application Reference No. : SMD/2025/0523 Site Address: 1 Parklands Biddulph Moor Staffordshire ST8 7JL Stoke-On-Trent Comments by: Ewan Munro

From:

41 Rudyard Road
Biddulph Moor
Biddulph Moor
Stoke on Trent
Staffordshire
ST8 7JD

[REDACTED]

Submission: Objection
Comments:

I am writing to formally object to the planning application referenced above, relating to the proposed development at 1 Parklands Biddulph Moor ST8 7JL

I wish to register my objection on the following planning application

1. Impact on residents

Parklands is a Cul de sac area of Biddulph moor where the considerable majority of the residents are senior/retirees, with the property being used as a care facility for children it would result in an unacceptable level of noise, increase in traffic and disturbance to the existing resident

2. Traffic, parking, and highway safety

(1) The development would increase traffic movement and place additional pressure on already limited parking, the property currently has parking spaces for 2 vehicles at best with no room to turn on the drive so vehicles would have to reverse on or reverse off the property and there being only one point at the property that has dropped curbs with shift changes, staffing and visitors this would also potentially result in cars parking on the pavement restricting pedestrian access along the pavement, parkland only has a pavement on one side of the Cul de sac and this could cause a significant reduction in clear vision/sight of traffic movement.

(2) Parklands has poor street lighting, making vehicle movement at night higher risk and with open fields and farmland adjacent with no lighting this would potentially make for hazardous situations should a child become unsupervised.

(3) With the considerable majority of residents being senior/retirees/complex health issues, ambulance access, parking and maneuverability for emergency treatment should be paramount for consideration

(4) With regards to parking at the property in the application form page 6 Vehicle parking does the site have any existing vehicle/cycle parking spaces or will the proposed development add/remove any parking spaces, the applicant as stated there is currently EXISTING parking space for 4 vehicles

3. Location

(1) Biddulph Moor is a quiet rural location which is prone to power outages on frequent occasions, poor public transport links, no amenities or facilities immediately accessible for children without being transported off the moor, the only park is best suited to younger children, there is the MUGA (multi use games area) on the far side of the playing field which could be used by older children but would still require supervision as it is in a secluded areas and is also used by Biddulph moor 1st school, with the nearest gym facility being in Biddulph itself

(2) The property itself is located approximately 45m from Rudyard Road which has a continual speeding issue both up and down the road with vehicles regularly parking on the pavement massively reducing visibility when crossing the road on foot and exiting Parklands by vehicle

(3) Parklands also has a brook running its full length within 10m of the property, which when asked in the planning application form page 6 Assessment of flood risk, is your proposal within 20m of a water course (e.g river stream or beck) the applicant has answered no when it clearly is

4. The property

The property itself based on a professional opinion and having been in the property numerous times (assisting the previous owner) is not suitable to operate as a care facility based on.

(1) The property has an EPC(energy performance certificate) rating of F which under the current MEES regulation means the property cannot be rented

- (2). No self-closers and lack of intumescent strips fitted to the internal doors (fire risk)
- (3) The property also has no adequate means of fire escape on the first floor should the worst happen)
- (4) Has a fire risk/risk assessment/ofsted inspection been carried out on the property
- (5) No form of adequate secondary back up heating at the property or hot water provision
- (6). The apparent lack of building regs sign offs/certificates for works carried out to drainage and sewer works
- (7). No line of site from the road to the LPG bulk tanks for filling or emergency access (building regs/HSE)
- (8). Minimum separation distance of 3m from bulk tanks to habitable room/building, boundary and fence has not been met due to the garage conversion and associated works (building regs/HSE)
- (9). LPG pipework from bulk tank to property not having minimum clearance from other services (water and electricity) in a shared trench and insufficient protection (building regs/HSE)
- (10). No suitable or secure outside space for children to utilise
- (11) The suitability of the flat roof extension (which was an early addition to the property classed as a summer room) as a lounge area which is largely glazed and has no cooling facility in the summer other than opening windows and doors and as such would need significant heating to maintain 21deg in the winter months
- (12) The suitability and condition of the flat roof to the proposed lounge area and flat dormer roof (which leaks) which both appear to have had no repair or replacement work carried out to them
- (13) The age of the windows is questionable as to whether they meet current safety standards for this type of facility

(14) Given the age and build style of the property the presence of textured coating to the walls and ceilings and the proposed change of use has an asbestos survey been carried out at the property

(15) Have the damp and mould issues in the property, lounge, bathroom, bedroom, kitchen and flat roof been address and dealt with properly.

(16) As the property would be considered to be a ‘specialised property’ and the application is too change the property from C3 residential dwelling to C2 care facility have appropriate fire detection and alarm systems (e.g., interlinked smoke and heat alarms designed to BS 5839 standards) been installed

5. The clients and children

(1) The application for change of use to this property to a care facility for 3 children plus staff by Egret Care Ltd is considerably smaller @115m² than other care facilities they have for example the facility at 1 Woodland Ave Cheddleton ST13 7BY for 3 children plus staff being 245m² with secured outside space and adequate off road parking, is this proposed facility big enough to meet the needs

(2) Challenged children require space and appropriate access to quiet zones, decreasing the domino effect of behavioural incidents occurring and escalating, is access to 1 small communal area, their bedroom and minimal unsecured/safe outside in their best interest or adding to emotional and physical frustrations. The lack of space can make this difficult for both staff and residence to deliver enhanced care when required. This property/location seems to lean more towards segregation and containment rather than inclusion and enhancement

(3) With the proposed required additional parking this would block the only sight line window in the communal area that looks out onto the Cul de sac and surrounding area, other communal area windows look out onto the side of the garage and fence panels that screen the LPG bulk tanks

(4) The risk of absconding, there is higher percentage statistically in challenged children, do the local police have the capacity and equipment should an incident occur given the location to vast surrounding farm land and open fields

(5) The Roaches school is 3.5 miles away catering for up to 58 pupils with combined on site and off site accommodation for challenged children with moderate to server issues, is Staffordshire moorland not becoming saturated with challenged children care facilities

(6) Ofsted are less favourable of this kind of system where private landlords acquire small rural properties with Cul de sacs being the least position as its not cost effective or meeting children's care needs to enhance their potential, there was a 65% increase in 2024-25 where the northwest's share of these homes rose to 26%

For these reasons, I respectfully request that the application be refused. I ask that my comments be taken fully into account when the application is determined.

Do you really need to print out this Email? Be green - keep it on the screen.

This email is intended for the addressee(s) only and may contain sensitive, privileged or confidential information that could be protectively marked. If you are not the addressee please do not use the information in any way. If you have received this email in error please notify the sender immediately and delete it from your system. Thank you.

The Council may be required to disclose this email or any responses to it under the Freedom of Information Act 2000. The way in which we handle personal information is set out in our privacy notice and is available at <https://www.staffsmoorlands.gov.uk/YourData>
