

[REDACTED]

Sent: 29 January 2026 10:37

To: Planning (SMDC)

Subject: SMD/2025/0537

[REDACTED]

Good morning,

I would like to strongly object to SMD/2025/0537 outline application for planning permission as the site in question is clearly located on officially designated Green Belt land. When considering development on Green Belt land we must remember the original purposes of the Green Belt policy: to prevent urban sprawl by encouraging housing to be directed towards urban and brownfield sites near existing infrastructure and the amenities and services we need - the proposed development fundamentally undermines this.

Whilst there is no statutory definition of a material consideration, I would argue that the below are material considerations for this site.

1. The site is located on Green Belt land and would cause significant harm to the open character of the area.
2. Biddulph Moor has very little infrastructure, very few amenities, and extremely poor public transport links making people dependent on their cars.
3. This site is bordered by an unclassified narrow country lane to one side (Hot Lane) making this unsuitable for access to the site, and a 'C' road to the other side (Rudyard Road) which regularly has cars parked on the side of the road opposite this site which would make entry to and egress from the site dangerous resulting in an impact to highway safety and directly contradicting several point in paragraph 115 of the framework.
4. I don't believe the development could be classed as 'sustainable' as per paragraph 110 of the framework, the planning statement says that Rudyard Road is only lightly trafficked, this is simply untrue and shows a distinct lack of awareness of key issues around the site.
5. An impact on biodiversity through the loss of habitat for wildlife by the removal of hedgerows and trees bordering the site.
6. There would be a loss of privacy for neighbouring properties which would be overlooked by the development.
7. There is no supporting information to show that existing infrastructure such as public sewers would be able to cope, these have likely not been upgraded for decades.

The planning statement states that there is no relevant planning history for the site, I would argue that this is simply untrue. Whilst I appreciate there has been no application for dwellings per se, there has been several applications for what are arguably far less intrusive and less intensive developments of an agricultural nature all of which have been refused (SMD/2005/0764, SMD/2000/0554, SMD/2001/0855) citing that the development would:

- 'harm the appearance of the Special Landscape Area and the open character of the Green Belt'
- 'be detrimental to the countryside amenity enjoyed by the residents and users of Rudyard Road'

In addition to this the planning history shows that at appeal (APP/B3438/A/06/2006993) the Planning Inspectorate dismissed the appeal citing:

- 'could severely undermine the fundamental aim of Green Belt policy'

I do not believe the site can be realistically classified as 'grey belt', I would argue that this site strongly contributes to 143 (a), (c) and (d), as can be found in the Staffordshire Moorlands Green Belt Review (2015).

Referring directly to the previous applications these have included the entirety of the site edged in blue, in my considered opinion it would appear that the applicant is trying to push through the development edged in red specifically to avoid the classification of 'major development' with the site being 0.01 hectares under the definition and 1 house under the definition, however it is my belief that they will make subsequent applications for the land edged in blue on the same basis as this application should this application be permitted, this would simply be an end around national planning policy and should be regarded as underhanded and damaging to the confidence of the public in the planning system.

Once we've built on the Green Belt there is no way to reverse it, so these decisions must be taken with the natural environment in mind.

Kind Regards,

Simon Willoughby.