

MINUTES OF PYE GREEN COMMUNITY ESTATES MEETING

Saturday 17th May 2025 – 12 midday

Meeting held at Pye Green Community Centre, Bradbury Lane, Hednesford, WS12 4EP

Present:

Cllr Mandy Dunnett (MD)

Cllr Fred Prestwood (FP)

Cllr Garry Samuels (GS)

Josh Newbury MP (JN)

Andrew Brett, Principal Flood Risk South Team Leader at Staffs County Council (AB)

Members of the Public:

There were 6 members of the public present

1. Apologies:

Cllr Paul Jones (PJ)

2. Anti-social Behaviour (ASB) – Bikes

- Off road motorbikes were using the bottom side of Huntington Belt and now coming to the top
- There's also dangerous, silent and fast e-bikes. A gang of 6-8 youths regularly ride through to the Chase on footpaths
- Although the 101 call-response is patchy, the personal response is bad.
- PCSO Emma Beady advised that they were aware of the ASB, along with the concern about 101 responses, whereby bikers would have left the area by the time the police turn up
- GS referred members to a quote from Oliver Greatbatch, Community Safety & Partnerships Manager at Cannock Chase Council (see Appendix 1)

A MOP suggested that St Chad's Ditch, at the end of Cooke Way, could be protected, in which case bike-use could be prohibited


ACTION: GS to investigate the protected status of St Chad's Ditch

Update from CCDC regarding St Chad's Ditch:

The plan below shows the CCDC boundary. All land to right(east) is in CCDC area. All land to left (west) is South Staffs



Chads Ditch is to the north of Chads Gate, as below. It is to the NW corner of the Suitable Alternative Natural Greenspace - SANGS - area (Barratt Homes Development).



Chad's Ditch has a bridleway running along it which also meets the east-west bridleway at Chads Gate.

Chad's Ditch is on land owned or managed by the Forestry Authority, although SCC Right of Way team would also have some involvement. The Huntington Belt is also the same but in SSDC area.

If bikes are accessing the SANGS area, i.e. the open space to north and west of the new housing area, then that is a matter for Barrett Homes to sort, as landowner.

3.Anti-social Behaviour (ASB) - Youths

MOP advised that ASB on the Limes is increasing by the day:

- Swearing and shouting very loudly, which is intimidating
- Youths tearing up trees and smashing signage, in addition to the increasing number of off-road motorbikes/e-bikes (see above)

4.Emergency Vehicle Access

- While focus was on concerns about emergency vehicle access around Bilberry (Tompkinson Heights, Suthard Way, etc.) the same could be said for much of the estates, with the number of cars parked on either side of the narrow roads
- A suggestion was made to move the fencing back
- The focus of how – and where – to deal with these matters was dependent on whether particular roads were adopted or not
- AB showed some MOPs a map showing which roads within the estates had been adopted – some more surprising than others

ACTIONS:

- **GS and AB to try and produce a (Interactive Meta PDF) map to enable residents to see if their roads are adopted or not.**

UPDATE: This is available via Staffs CC:

(<https://www.staffordshire.gov.uk/Highways/highwayscontrol/Land-Charges/Land-charges-mapping-portal.aspx>)

- **Determine next steps (SCC, developers?) depending on who was responsible for the roads**

UPDATE: SCC Community Highways Team's response about parking issues on the estates:

"As it was only adopted last year, I have not had sight of the S38 agreement as yet. I will ask our road adoptions team regards any restrictions for parking on the estate but I wouldn't expect there to be any from a highway's perspective."

"Typically, you would not see parking restrictions such as double yellow lines or single yellow lines on an estate as this restricts residents and their visitors, unless of course there is a school within the same vicinity then you will see parking restrictions."

5.Managing Agents

MOP, based in Hallum Way, complained about management fees being paid to Pinnacle:

- They didn't look after the play area
- Residents have to pay them £200 for an up-to-date info booklet **when they sell their properties**
- They weren't following a maintenance schedule, and workmanship was questionable. What is Pinnacle actually contracted to manage?
- MOP asked if there was a different management company for the Limes estate

Additionally:

- Another MOP advised that his Managing Agent was ok. He wasn't sure who they were, but knew that they'd just put the annual fee up. JN advised that, as Managing Agents were unregulated, they could charge what they want
- Another MOP, based on Tompkinson Heights advised that he wasn't paying a fee. JN suggested that the developers had probably not completed all works on that estate yet

JN advised that he would look into this issue but would need a sample of agents' contracts and Service Level Agreements to determine if there was any uniformity / disparity to them

ACTION: Residents to send a sample of SLAs and contracts to Garry Samuels, either at Hednesford Town Council or by email (garry.samuels@hednesford-tc.gov.uk)

6. Hedges on Limepit Lane

- They were obstructing drivers' views when pulling out of Cooke Way
- AB advised that the hedges had to be maintained by the residents

UPDATE: Community Highways Team have confirmed that Staffs CC only maintain the verge and not the hedge line in front of 3-11 Cooke Way

7. Lack of Grit Bins on the Deer' Rise Estate

- MOP advised that many emergency workers live on the Deer's Rise estate and wouldn't be able to get to work if there was snow, due to the lack of grit bins.
- AB advised that not all roads were adopted, so grit bin requests wouldn't be the same throughout
- GS advised that, at a recent Hednesford Town Council (HTC) meeting, he had raised, about getting grit bins. JN said that the developers should be the ones to install the grit bins.

ACTIONS:

- **As with above, GS and AB (via the interactive map) determine which roads are adopted or not, and where grit bins are / could be / should be placed...and who is responsible for them**

8. Road Safety / Speeding

- The road into Fallows/Deer's Rises is dangerous, and Adams Way is the same, as it sweeps left. With narrow roads and cars parked on both sides, drivers can't see what is coming
- A Hallum Way MOP said that her road was bad, with parking on both sides, and asked whether Pinnacle (see above) should be looking at parking management
- MOPs suggested traffic-calming measures, one-way traffic, and petitions

- MOP advised that Hednesford Town Council had agreed to participate in a **"20 is plenty campaign"** a few years ago

Additionally:

- A MOP raised speeding issues on Pye Green Road, most notably from Rosehill island down to the Hallam Road dip
- Another MOP said that, because of the short distance from the "top of the hill" to the Hallam Road lights, any speeders ran the risk of an accident
- GS advised that County had conducted several speed tests and had concluded that, on average, there weren't any speeding concerns (in contrast to a MOP's Speed Watch data)

ACTIONS:

- **GS to check with HTC Chief Officer (or MOP to provide GS with info) about the "20 is plenty" campaign**
- **Request further speed monitoring from County / perform additional Speed Watch sessions**
- **Determine any additional next steps (SCC, developers?) depending on who was responsible for the roads**

UPDATE: SCC Community Highways Team's response about speed issues by Adams Way:

"Highways have only adopted up to 26 Adams Way, Hednesford so far. I have searched our electronic records and no enquiries have been made with regards to speeding on the highway section of Adams Way."

"Please be aware that Adams Way will typically be a standard 30mph road as per all other estate roads, unless a developer has applied for a separate traffic regulation order to install 20mph zones."

9. New Development / Infrastructure / S106s

Residents don't want new development on the north of the estates:

- There's only 1 entrance into the estate so it will increase through-traffic
- Pye Green Road is already busy
- With 47 new properties planned, schools are already full, and 40 children were turned away from Poppyfields
- JN described the challenges of getting infrastructure embedded into the development in Wimblebury
- Objections had been submitted, as part of the Planning Application process

With regards to S106s (and to accompany HTC's Section 106 Update given to MOPs – appendix 2) numerous points were raised:

- There were 3 roundabouts on plans for Pye Green Road. The only one that has been installed is Rose Hill. When are the other 2 coming?
- Paths are not in place. If you are walking to school from Deer's Rise, residents have to cross Pye Green Road and then cross 2 junctions before having to cross the road again, making it dangerous for parents/children. GS advised that this was mentioned in the Update document
- Who monitors the travel plan for the area?

- Developers started work on the footpaths last year then stopped, due to complaints from residents who don't actually live on the estates
- Hallum Way residents have been waiting for a gate onto the footpaths for 8 years.

ACTION: GS to take these queries back to HTC, as part of their investigations

10. Lack of Water Pressure

- A MOP from Deer's Rise advised ongoing concerns with the lack of water pressure at his house on most mornings (*"If it is bad now, what's it going to be like when another development is built?"*)
- Another MOP from Hallum Way, raised an issue with drains
- AB advised that he would do a brief talk on water-related issues

ACTION: AB to raise these concerns with colleagues

UPDATE: AB's response, following a conversation with South Staffordshire Water Authority regarding the recent concerns about inconsistent water pressure:

"I've learned that individual residential issues, as opposed to highway leaks, require direct reporting from affected residents.

"Unfortunately, I'm unable to report these instances on behalf of everyone. Therefore, it is crucial that each resident experiencing low or fluctuating water pressure contacts South Staffordshire Water directly. "The more individual reports they receive, the higher the urgency assigned to this issue, and the quicker we can hope for a resolution.

"Please call the designated telephone number and provide your details to ensure your experience is logged and contributes to a comprehensive understanding of the problem."

**Water Pressure concerns
South Staffs Water
0800 389 10 11**

11. Litter Issues

- A MOP raised the issue of litter around the takeaways and the Co-Op, along with the shops taking more responsibility in that litter
- The MOP also raised the issue of having more (thorough) litter picks
- A MOP suggested looking at which bins are used more and those not used could perhaps be moved to an area where it would be more needed, suggesting that there were 3 bins on Simmonds Drive that nobody was emptying. JN advised that consultation would be needed for moving bins

ACTION: AB and GS to determine, via road adoption, whose is responsible for the bin

- GS advised that he was due to meet Steve Clarke (Cleansing Supervisor at CCDC) on 22 May to discuss bins, lack of bins, litter, and litter-picking

- JN discussed bin technology, including; solar-powered bins, bins that alert when full, QR codes that can be stuck on bins so people can scan the code if they see the bin is full to alert it needs emptying, and installation of temporary bins used to trial areas to see if they would be used
- A MOP advised that, on the Limes estate, children are coming from different areas to use play areas and are making a mess, leaving litter. The MOP also suggested educating secondary school children, to keep areas clean and take pride

ACTION: GS to report back (following his meeting with Steve Clarke) on any Pye Green-related discussions

12. Council Tax Banding

- A MOP advised that there were Council Tax banding issues on Bilberry Chase, suggesting that the same house types on the estate should be under the same council tax bands
- JN advised that this was not always the case
- The MOP also advised that the Council are leaving it to residents to apply for change rather than changing the estate as a whole

13. “Eyesore” Balancing Ponds / Flood Risk Presentation

- Multiple MOPs have branded the balancing ponds as an eyesore
- AB delivered a short presentation on flooding, mitigating the risk of flood, and the need for – and maintenance of - balancing ponds
- MOP advised that, when he bought his property, the brochure showed a scenic pond with ducks on it. AB advised that the balancing pond would never look like that need

ACTIONS:

- **AB to develop a basic guide to balancing ponds**
- **AB to advise about maintenance plans for the balancing ponds**

The Council absolutely recognise the impact which ASB, linked to e- bikes and motorbikes, can have on our communities.

This is why, as a Community Safety Partnership, we took the step to include this prohibited activity across the entirety of the district within our new Public Spaces Protection Order – (www.cannockchasedc.gov.uk/council/your-community/cannock-chase-community-partnership/public-spaces-protection-orders)


This gives police additional powers, alongside existing legislation, to help tackle this behaviour.

The Police encourage that all issues of ASB are reported - either on 101, or online at: www.staffordshire.police.uk/ro/report/asb/asb-v3/report-antisocial-behaviour/.

Local Policing Team Commander, Tim Norbury, further reassures that police are aware of the issues and has tasked his teams to the areas to proactively seek out those who are offending. Where apprehended, positive action will be taken.

Parents of young people have been spoken to regarding the use of e-bikes and motorbikes, and information has also been shared with the Road Crime Team, who will be utilising anti-speeding measures in the coming weeks. This has been successful in South Staffordshire, who have also experienced similar incidents.

Oliver Greatbatch
Community Safety & Partnerships Manager
Cannock Chase Council




Community Event- Section 106 Update

17th May 2025

What is Section106

- Refers to Section 106 of the Town and Country Planning Act 1990 (as amended)
- Section 106 (s106) agreements are **legal agreements between a planning authority and a developer, or undertakings offered unilaterally by a developer, that ensure that certain extra works related to a development are undertaken.** They are a mechanism which make a development proposal acceptable in planning terms, that would not otherwise be acceptable.




Hednesford Town Council

Section 106 Activities

Completed Action

- **Completed Action from CH/19/421**
 - The Bus Shelter (opposite Fieldhouse Road) has been installed






Closed Action

- **S106 Funding - Land to West of Pye Green Road - CH/14/0184**
- **Closed Action**
 - **Electrical Sub-Station**
 - CCDC confirmed the following -
 - *The substation was not built in accordance with the plans however, it is not in breach of the Section 106 agreement. Substations can be built under permitted development which does not therefore require a planning application. This was the view of the developer after we approached them over a potential breach.*
 - *Legal advised that it was not expedient to pursue enforcement action in the circumstances. The structure has since been transferred to the utility provider.*
 - *The enforcement file has been closed as we are not able to take action.*
 - *PD rights are set at a national level within the General Permitted Development Order.'*

Closed Action (continued)

Permitted development rights for substations


- *Permitted development rights are a national grant of planning permission which allow certain building works and changes of use to be carried out without having to make a planning application. To enable the efficient rollout of certain assets such as substations and underground cables, the Town and Country Planning (General Permitted Development) (England) Order 2015 includes a permitted development right (Part 15, Class B) which allows for development in England by statutory undertakers in relation to the generation, transmission, distribution or supply of electricity without having to make a planning application. The right is subject to limitations and conditions, including that the installation or replacement of electrical substations cannot exceed 29m³ in size.*




Outstanding Actions

- **S106 Funding - Land to West of Pye Green Road - CH/19/421 & CH/19/422**
- **Outstanding Actions**
 - **Secure cycle facility**
 - £7,500 is being held by CCDC
 - We are working with CCDC to obtain design and costing options. These will be submitted to Hednesford Town Council for review and approval
 - The S106 agreement defines the location as the Anglesey Street Car Park (close to platform access) or other suitable location as agreed with CCDC
 - **Bus Shelter (opposite Tudor Road)**
 - The following planning condition is appended to CH/25/0124 via CH/19/422 and refers to the completion of a footpath. When the footpath is in place, the shelter will be built
 - *Prior to first occupation of any dwelling the footway extension as broadly indicated on submitted Drg. No.19534-09 Rev. A shall be completed. Reason To comply with the objectives of paragraph 111 of the National Planning Policy Framework*
 - HTC will continue to monitor the development to ensure delivery

Outstanding Actions - Drg. No. 19534-09





Outstanding Actions

- **Suitable Accessible Natural Greens Space (SANGS)**
- **Allotments**
- A Decision Notice, dated **17th February 2025**, has been issued in relation to planning application reference CH/19/304

The decision notice confirms the following in relation to the allotments -

- The development to which this permission relates **must have begun** not later than the expiration of **one year** beginning with the date on which this permission is granted
- The hard landscaping works hereby permitted inclusive of the paths, play areas and allotments, shall be completed within 7 months of the commencement of the development. Thus, the **latest completion** date is **17th September 2026**
- The approved soft landscaping works (Shrub, hedge & tree planting) shall be implemented within the **first planting season** following commencement of the development. Seeding and scarification works are to commence within the **first appropriate season** and continue on a **seasonal basis** until the **desired habitat state** of the grass land is **achieved**

Allotment Plan

Hednesford Town Council (May 2025)



NOTES

This drawing is the property of FPCR Environment and Design Ltd and is issued on the condition it is not reproduced, retained or disclosed to any unauthorised person, either wholly or in part without written consent of FPCR Environment and Design Ltd.
Ordinance Survey base mapping - supplied by client.



- Site Boundary
- Land consented under permission CH210426
- Proposed Allotment Plots
Plots separated by 5m surfaced access track
- Plots in rows separated by 5m surfaced access track
- Proposed Amenity Grassland
- Proposed Water Point
Water supply to be provided by the client. Water supply to be provided by the client. Water supply to be provided by the client.
- Compost Area
- Proposed Road and Parking
Access to be provided by the client. Access to be provided by the client.
- Proposed Vehicular Access Gate
Access to be provided by the client. Access to be provided by the client.
- Proposed Boundary Fence and Native Hedgerow
Fencing to be provided by the client. Fencing to be provided by the client. Fencing to be provided by the client.

Plots

Plot	Area (sqm)	Area (sqft)	Area (acres)
1	100	1196	0.0023
2	100	1196	0.0023
3	100	1196	0.0023
4	100	1196	0.0023
5	100	1196	0.0023
6	100	1196	0.0023
7	100	1196	0.0023
8	100	1196	0.0023
9	100	1196	0.0023
10	100	1196	0.0023
11	100	1196	0.0023
12	100	1196	0.0023
13	100	1196	0.0023
14	100	1196	0.0023
15	100	1196	0.0023
16	100	1196	0.0023
17	100	1196	0.0023
18	100	1196	0.0023
19	100	1196	0.0023
20	100	1196	0.0023
21	100	1196	0.0023
22	100	1196	0.0023
23	100	1196	0.0023
24	100	1196	0.0023
25	100	1196	0.0023
26	100	1196	0.0023
27	100	1196	0.0023
28	100	1196	0.0023
29	100	1196	0.0023
30	100	1196	0.0023
31	100	1196	0.0023
32	100	1196	0.0023
33	100	1196	0.0023
34	100	1196	0.0023
35	100	1196	0.0023
36	100	1196	0.0023
37	100	1196	0.0023
38	100	1196	0.0023
39	100	1196	0.0023
40	100	1196	0.0023
41	100	1196	0.0023
42	100	1196	0.0023
43	100	1196	0.0023
44	100	1196	0.0023
45	100	1196	0.0023
46	100	1196	0.0023
47	100	1196	0.0023
48	100	1196	0.0023
49	100	1196	0.0023
50	100	1196	0.0023
51	100	1196	0.0023
52	100	1196	0.0023
53	100	1196	0.0023
54	100	1196	0.0023
55	100	1196	0.0023
56	100	1196	0.0023
57	100	1196	0.0023
58	100	1196	0.0023
59	100	1196	0.0023
60	100	1196	0.0023
61	100	1196	0.0023
62	100	1196	0.0023
63	100	1196	0.0023
64	100	1196	0.0023
65	100	1196	0.0023
66	100	1196	0.0023
67	100	1196	0.0023
68	100	1196	0.0023
69	100	1196	0.0023
70	100	1196	0.0023
71	100	1196	0.0023
72	100	1196	0.0023
73	100	1196	0.0023
74	100	1196	0.0023
75	100	1196	0.0023
76	100	1196	0.0023
77	100	1196	0.0023
78	100	1196	0.0023
79	100	1196	0.0023
80	100	1196	0.0023
81	100	1196	0.0023
82	100	1196	0.0023
83	100	1196	0.0023
84	100	1196	0.0023
85	100	1196	0.0023
86	100	1196	0.0023
87	100	1196	0.0023
88	100	1196	0.0023
89	100	1196	0.0023
90	100	1196	0.0023
91	100	1196	0.0023
92	100	1196	0.0023
93	100	1196	0.0023
94	100	1196	0.0023
95	100	1196	0.0023
96	100	1196	0.0023
97	100	1196	0.0023
98	100	1196	0.0023
99	100	1196	0.0023
100	100	1196	0.0023

fpcr

client: Barratts West Midlands
project: Limepit Lane Pye Green
drawing title: Proposed Allotments

scale: 1:500 @ A3
drawing number: 6857-L-40
revision: 1
revision date: 22 February 2024

scale: 1:500 @ A3
drawing number: 6857-L-40
revision: 1
revision date: 22 February 2024

scale: 1:500 @ A3
drawing number: 6857-L-40
revision: 1
revision date: 22 February 2024

scale: 1:500 @ A3
drawing number: 6857-L-40
revision: 1
revision date: 22 February 2024

scale: 1:500 @ A3
drawing number: 6857-L-40
revision: 1
revision date: 22 February 2024

scale: 1:500 @ A3
drawing number: 6857-L-40
revision: 1
revision date: 22 February 2024



Outstanding Actions

- **Bus Stop on Green Heath Road**
- Awaiting a response from CCDC to Cllr Samuels questions -
 - Why have bus markings been painted on Green Heath Road. If no bus service is planned, remove the markings
 - CH/06/0205 varied by CH/17/389 requires £40k to be paid to CCDC for either a Bus Voucher Scheme or a Subsidised Bus Service. Which option has been taken.



Potential Corporate Improvements

- **What needs to be done**
 - Improve the control over of the spending of S106 funding
- **How could this be achieved**
 - Assign accountability via a Corporate S106 Group, ensure a senior named person is accountable for managing the end-to-end process
 - Create a S106 Monitoring Role
 - Part-time (in addition to other activities)
 - Create and maintain a database of S106 agreements related actions
 - Monitor all developments and key trigger points
 - Reports to Corporate S106 Group