

[REDACTED]

From: [REDACTED]
Sent: 12 February 2026 11:31
To: Planning Comments (SMDC)
Subject: Comment Received from Public Access

[REDACTED]

Application Reference No. : SMD/2025/0537 Site Address: LAND BETWEEN RUDYARD ROAD AND HOT LANE Rudyard Road Biddulph Moor Staffordshire Comments by: Catherine Yardley

From:
Two Jays
Stoney Lane
Biddulph Moor
Biddulph Moor
Staffordshire
ST8 7FQ

Phone: [REDACTED]

Email: [REDACTED]

Submission: Objection

Comments: I strongly OBJECT to the outline planning permission application.

The applicant contends that the land should be treated as Grey Belt as designated by the National Planning Policy Framework. Having read this, I can see no basis for grey belt designation, a designation which, I believe, holds no weight in planning law or national policy. The land is designated Green Belt and there are no exceptional circumstances to change its designation. Building on his land would -

1. harm green belt openness
2. encroach into countryside
3. do harm to the character of the landscape
4. and would impact on an already fragile infrastructure in regards to flooding and traffic.

The application fails to make any case for giving planning permission in principle and there appears only to be a profit motive which should not outweigh the erosion of the green belt.

if you look at Biddulph Moor Village, even though it has been vastly expanded over the past 50 years, there is still a natural 'stopping point' on each approach road that holds back housing development and gives way to more open land and stone cottages (in the main). This preserves the rurality and distinct nature of Biddulph Moor. This site is one such natural break and should not be lost. Planning permission in principle on this land would, in my opinion, set a precedent and lead to a breakdown of that natural boundary. Development outside of this boundary has been only renovation or rebuilding - it is not the case here. This is a clear replacement of green belt.

Even though Biddulph Moor is a high point, topographically, there is still much flooding. Natural springs appear in the area and the clear lack of drain maintenance has led to flooding higher up Rudyard Road. The land borders a natural watercourse which is often swift running and deep.

Rudyard Road itself is often busy with traffic speeding and paying little heed to emerging traffic from side roads - I have had several near misses in this respect. A road emerging onto Rudyard Road is clearly not desirable. Similarly, the narrow nature of Hot Lane does not lend itself to more traffic.

The high hedges erected behind the land in question to shield the owners property and the helicopter landing area from that land, along with the proximity to more open countryside means there is an abundance of wildlife. There are bats, rabbits, sightings of a hare, a multitude of birds. When local residents are working to promote the local wildlife population - eg the development of a community orchard - it seems wrong to reduce the available land for wildlife for a non essential reason.

I understood that any housing development would be kept to infill (which this isn't) under the establishment of the local plan a few years ago. is this now abandoned?

For these reasons, I object to the application.

Catherine Yardley

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.staffs Moorlands.gov.uk/YourData>
