

SMD/2025/0537 response

Because this is a Permission in Principle (PiP) application for up to 9 dwellings on the site between Rudyard Road and Hot Lane, it shows only the boundary of the land.

It does **NOT** include an illustrative layout plan.

That is the major **alarming** feature of this application – its vagueness and imprecision.

This suggests that if this application is successful the adjacent Green Belt area may be subjected to even further housing development.

However, it is hoped that the outcome of this PiP will be determined by the principles of The Staffordshire Moorlands Local Development Framework:

“All development in the rural areas ... will be assessed according to the extent to which it enhances the character, appearance and biodiversity of the countryside ... Appropriate development should **not** harm the rural character and environmental quality of the area ... by virtue of the scale, nature and level of activity involved and the type and amount of traffic generated or by other effects such as noise and pollution.”

This application is inappropriate.

- **It compromises the Security of the Green Belt**

“One of the purposes of the Green Belt is to assist in safeguarding the countryside from encroachment.”

With reference to the National Planning Policy Framework (2018, revised 2019) and as confirmed by the Staffordshire Moorlands Core Strategy Development Plan Document (2014) “strict control will be exercised over inappropriate development within the Green Belt The fundamental aim of Green Belt policy is to prevent urban sprawl by keeping land permanently open.”

According to Paragraph 145 of the Framework, the major exception is “limited infilling”. (Policy SS6C)

This proposed development is **NOT** infilling.

It is “encroachment.”

It is **NOT** unused land; is **NOT** waste land; has **NOT** been previously developed; and is in open countryside – all factors in the establishment of the Green Belt, as an extension of the safeguarding confirmed by the Green Belt policy.

The Framework statement on Housing Development states that its purpose is “to provide new housing that is affordable, desirable, well-designed and meets the needs of the residents of the moorlands.”

Since there is only an outline plan, how are these desiderata being measured?

What % of these 9 dwellings will be affordable? And to whom? How will they cater for younger couples wanting to get onto the housing ladder?

What will be the **needs** of these people? It is likely that they will be ageing as opposed to young families; how are their needs to be met? (See below: **Infrastructure Limitations**)

There is also quite a wide variety of property for sale on Biddulph Moor, including several unoccupied houses. This suggests that this development of new houses is **NOT** needed.

The proposed development would mean loss of distant views of landscapes reaching to Troughstones Hill and beyond.

It would also intrude onto the privacy of neighbouring properties, many of which are single-storey bungalows.

Aerial photographs from Google Earth indicate that there have already been considerable intrusions into the Green Belt at Parkes Farm involving changes of land use, including extension of the garden, the planting of hedging, and the use of hardcore (with consequent drainage problems) to make a long driveway across non-residential land and granting rear access to Hot Lane.

Has any aspect of these developments been approved by the SMDC planning authority?

- **It will lead to the Loss of Agricultural Land**

This is **NOT** unused or waste land.

Currently the land for suggested development is used for the grazing of sheep and occasionally milk-cattle.

Haymaking also takes place, twice yearly, for cattle-feed and silage.

As there are adjacent fields used for these purposes, if this PiP is allowed this will encourage further speculative housing developments, and the loss of even more agricultural land..

There will be even further encroachment on and erosion of the Green Belt.

- **It will increase the threat of Congestion, and lead to Road Safety Dangers**

Access to the site is **NOT** specified.

The two major roads detailed on the application (Hot Lane and Rudyard Road) are narrow country lanes with several bends and blind-spots.

Access to and from the proposed development site is dangerous.

a) Access via Hot Lane

passes by Biddulph Moor First School.

Hot Lane is used by parental parking of cars at school times.

This could cause hazardous congestion, as dropping off time would coincide with the time folk set out for work.

The nearer end of Hot Lane to the development land does **NOT** have any pavements. At the top end the lane narrows to become single-track with a passing space.

Hot Lane also feeds access to Biddulph Moor Village Hall which is occasionally very busy with traffic and consequent parking issues.

There is also an adjacent children's playing field.

Increased motorised traffic will be dangerous for children's safety.

According to Google Earth photos, a hardcore long driveway/access route from Parkes Farm to Hot Lane has been put in place. Does this contravene planning regulations?

b) Access via Rudyard Road

This road has only one pavement on the side of the road opposite the area defined by the proposed boundary.

At rush hour Rudyard Road can be heavily used.

At other times, large tractors, milk lorries, and heavy goods vehicles delivering building supplies use the road.

c) Access via Parklands

This is a cul-de-sac. During wet weather it is frequently running with water.

Because of inadequate sewerage system at the juncture of Parklands and Rudyard Road, flooding occurred to the ground floor of 32 Rudyard Road, which is directly opposite to the cul-de-sac.

This led to extensive internal work including the re-flooring and re-plastering of ground floor rooms.

- **It aggravates Transport Problems**

There is only a regular bus service from Biddulph Moor to Biddulph.

This runs hourly from 8.30 until 16.30. What price an evening's entertainment?

If the application was granted, there would be increased reliance on travelling by car.

This seems in direct contradiction to elements of the Staffordshire Moorlands Framework Policy.

- **It intensifies the Limitations of the Present Infrastructure**

While Biddulph Moor has a Post Office with general store facilities, a pharmacy, 2 public houses, a first school and a village hall it is generally lacking in a social and economic infrastructure.

There is no doctors' surgery – a real need for a predominantly ageing population.

There is no dentist.

There is little local employment opportunity.

There is limited economic competition. This results in increased car travel to nearby towns/markets.

Limited public transport availability means greater use of personal transport.

There is little activity such as Youth Clubs for adolescents and/or younger children. This increases car use in the evening.

The Staffordshire Moorlands policy is to “**only** permit new developments where the utility, transport and community infrastructure necessary to serve it is either available or will be made available by the time it is needed.”

What will be made available should this PiP succeed?

- **It threatens Biodiversity**

The development will lead to the removal of at least one boundary hedgerow (in part or in entirety) with consequent loss of nesting areas for birdlife, and food-scavenging areas for foxes and endangered hedgehogs.

Apart from the hibernation period, pipistrelles and bats are visibly active over the proposed development site – increased human activity will be detrimental.

Who knows, in this agricultural land perhaps there are ponds with newts!

This loss of bird and animal life will add to the loss already witnessed of lapwings, skylarks, pied wagtails, and hares.

- **Conclusion**

This planning proposal should **NOT** be allowed. I strongly object.

Yours Sincerely,

Roger Elkin

44 Rudyard Road

Biddulph Moor

Staffordshire Moorlands

ST8 7JN