

PYE GREEN COMMUNITY ESTATES' MEETING

Original Meeting held at Pye Green Community Centre, on 17 May 2025.

Update: 1st November 2025

Present at Original Meeting

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)

2. Anti-social Behaviour (ASB) – Bikes

Overview of Issues:

- 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)

UPDATE – AUG 2025: Nothing further to report

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.

RESOLVED: Land ownership was discovered and advised.

3. Anti-social Behaviour (ASB) - Youths

Overview of Issues:

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)

UPDATE – AUG 2025: Nothing further to report

4. Emergency Vehicle Access

Overview of Issues:

- 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

INITIAL 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."

UPDATE – AUG 2025/ RESOLUTION: SCC Community Highways Team's response about parking issues on the estates: "I can confirm that the sections of the estates which are currently adopted highway do not have any parking restrictions in place"

5. Managing Agents

Overview of Issues:

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

UPDATE – AUG 2025: A resident contacted GS about issues that they're having with their Managing Agent, Trustgreen

ACTION: GS received a TrustGreen SLA, in October, along with a selection of complaint emails to them.

GS to reach out to residents to obtain more sample SLAs / contracts and complaint details (to be dropped in at Hednesford Town Council – located in Pye Green Community Centre - or by email, at garry.samuels@hednesford-tc.gov.uk) to supply to JN.

6. Hedges on Limepit Lane

Overview of Issues:

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

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

UPDATE – AUG 2025: Highways cut back the verges on Limepit Lane, to aid visibility, on 3rd July 2025.

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.

UPDATE: CCDC confirmed with GS that they're not responsible for the grit bins and to try SCC. GS is waiting for a response from SCC before reaching out to developers

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

UPDATE – OCT 2025: Staffordshire County Councillor Paul Jones (PJ): "At present, Staffordshire County Council has implemented the "20 is Plenty" initiative primarily around schools, encouraging drivers to reduce their speed during peak school hours. However, a wider adoption of 20mph zones across residential areas, such as Adams Way, has not yet been formally adopted county-wide. The campaign is gaining

traction in other parts of Staffordshire, particularly in the Moorlands, and there is growing public support for broader implementation."

Additionally:

- A MOP raised speeding issues on Pye Green Road, most notably from Rosehill island down to the Hallum 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)

PREVIOUS 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."

UPDATE – OCT 2025: Staffordshire County Councillor Paul Jones (PJ): "Regarding enforcement, I understand there has been no response from Staffordshire Police only from the Staffordshire Safer Roads Partnership who state it is the County Council's responsibility. SCC state that, presently, there is only a small part of the estate adopted that is the responsibility of County Council. Enforcement of speed limits, including any future 20mph zones, (actual 24mph guidance 10% +2) would require police support and appropriate resources. I will continue to follow up with the relevant authorities to seek clarity on their position and potential involvement."

In the meantime, I would encourage residents to continue engaging with the campaign and to consider forming a local group if one does not already exist. The national "20's Plenty for Us" organisation offers resources and support for communities wishing to advocate for safer speed limits."

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) numerous points were raised, including:

- 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?

UPDATE – SEPT 2025: John Manning, Project Support Officer, Hednesford Town Council: “If we are taking about the same two roundabouts (I can’t find reference to any other proposed roundabouts), the attached summary of the overall Travel Assessment document in sections 5.5.10, 5.5.11 & 5.5.12 states improvements to the junction of Pye Green Road/ Broadhurst Green/ Brindley Road were secured as part of the original planning consent to create a double mini roundabout, which was agreed with SCC. However, due to concerns that the works required at the junction fall outside the Highway Boundary onto third party land or land which is not registered the idea of roundabouts was not taken forward. Instead, an alternative solution to change the priorities of the junction was suggested (see Appendix 1). I can’t confirm if any improvements were actually completed”

- 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?

UPDATE – SEPT 2025: Staffordshire County Council monitors the travel plan

- Developers started work on the footpaths last year then stopped, due to complaints from residents who don't actually live on the estates

UPDATE – SEPT 2025: John Manning, Project Support Officer, Hednesford Town Council: “Without more information I can’t take this forward. I’m not aware of any work starting on footpaths. The only outstanding footpath I’m aware of is now linked to planning application CH/25/0124 (yet to be approved). The path will go from Rosehill roundabout to the existing bus stop on Pye Green Road. When the footpath is completed, the final bus shelter allocated under the S106 monies will be installed”

- Hallum Way residents have been waiting for a gate onto the footpaths for 8 years.

UPDATE – SEPT 2025: John Manning, Project Support Officer, Hednesford Town Council: “Without more information, I can’t take this forward. I’m not aware of any gates requiring to be built”

10. Lack of Water Pressure

Overview of Issues:

- 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

RESOLVED: 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

RESOLVED: The developers are responsible for the bins

- 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

UPDATE – AUG 2025: ACTION: GS and Councillor Jeff Hill (JH) met with the Operations and the Cleansing Teams on 22 May and 17 July. Discussions and actions are ongoing, with the aim to keep the district tidy.

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

UPDATE – AUG 2025: Nothing further to report

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**

Appendix 1: Transport Assessment, Land West of Pye Green Road

Area I, Land West of Pye Green Road, Cannock
Transport Assessment



Table 10 – Pye Green Road/ Belt Road/ Limepit Lane – Junction Modelling Results

Arm	AM Peak (08:00-09:00)		PM Peak (17:00-18:00)	
	Deg Sat %	MMQ	Deg Sat %	MMQ
2019 Base				
Pye Green Road (N) Left Ahead Right	56.4%	5.4	58.5%	4.8
Belt Road Right Left Ahead	42.7%	3.8	35.5%	3.6
Pye Green Road (S) Ahead Right Left	40.9%	3.3	65.5%	6.0
Limepit Lane Left Ahead Right	58.4%	5.6	73.4%	9.6
2024 Base (Committed Development)				
Pye Green Road (N) Left Ahead Right	69.0%	7.8	69.8%	6.0
Belt Road Right Left Ahead	48.5%	4.9	42.3%	4.6
Pye Green Road (S) Ahead Right Left	44.0%	3.9	84.1%	11.4
Limepit Lane Left Ahead Right	65.8%	7.2	87.1%	13.7
2024 Base + Development (Area I)				
Pye Green Road (N) Left Ahead Right	71.4%	8.9	75.1%	6.7
Belt Road Right Left Ahead	51.4%	4.8	43.7%	4.8
Pye Green Road (S) Ahead Right Left	44.0%	4.3	86.9%	12.6
Limepit Lane Left Ahead Right	69.7%	7.2	89.5%	14.6
2024 Base + Development (Area I) + Sensitivity Test (Area E)				
Pye Green Road (N) Left Ahead Right	73.4%	9.6	76.0%	6.9
Belt Road Right Left Ahead	52.8%	4.9	44.9%	4.9
Pye Green Road (S) Ahead Right Left	44.1%	4.4	87.7%	13.3
Limepit Lane Left Ahead Right	71.6%	7.5	91.9%	15.9

5.5.8 It can be seen in **Table 10** that the junction operates within capacity during the peak periods in the 2019 base position. In the future year of 2024 the junction is predicted to operate within capacity.

5.5.9 With the addition of the development traffic the junction is predicted to continue to operate within capacity, albeit with increases in delay and queuing. With the addition of the committed development and Area E development traffic the junction will continue to operate within capacity with minimal increases in the degree of saturation and queuing.

Pye Green Road/ Broadhurst Green/ Brindley Road

5.5.10 The Pye Green Road/ Broadhurst Green/ Brindley Road junction is a four-arm priority junction arrangement with Brindley Road forming the northern arm, Broadhurst Green forming the eastern and western arm, and Pye Green Road forming the southern arm.

5.5.11 Improvements to the junction were secured as part of the planning consent for the Land



West of Pye Green Road site as the original TA prepared by PTB confirmed the junction was operating over capacity in the base year (which was 2011). The works involved changing the current staggered cross roads to provide a double mini roundabout, which was agreed with SCC. However, there are concerns that the works required at the junction, in particular the visibility splays, fall outside the Highway Boundary onto third party land or land which is not registered.

5.5.12 An alternative solution therefore seeks to change the priorities of the junction to reflect the demand more closely to match demand to capacity. The proposed scheme is shown on **DTA Drawing 19534-04**. The proposed junction has therefore been modelled in the Picady module of Junctions 9. The junction modelling results are summarised in **Table 11** below and the outputs are attached at **Appendix F**.

Table 11 – Pye Green Road/ Broadhurst Green/ Brindley Road – Junction Modelling Results

Arm	AM Peak (08:00-09:00)			PM Peak (17:00-18:00)		
	Queue	Delays (s)	RFC	Queue	Delays (s)	RFC
2019 Base						
Pye Green Road	1.0	17.47	0.49	0.9	18.61	0.46
Broadhurst Green	0.1	4.97	0.05	0.1	5.22	0.06
Brindley Road	0.4	12.40	0.27	0.5	14.18	0.35
Broadhurst Green (nw)	0.1	5.99	0.05	0.3	5.35	0.13
2024 Base						
Pye Green Road	1.2	19.33	0.53	0.8	17.28	0.46
Broadhurst Green	0.0	4.88	0.03	0.0	5.59	0.04
Brindley Road	0.4	12.75	0.29	0.6	14.65	0.38
Broadhurst Green (nw)	0.1	5.97	0.06	0.3	5.22	0.14
2024 Base + Development (Area I)						
Pye Green Road	1.2	19.55	0.54	0.9	17.42	0.46
Broadhurst Green	0.0	4.88	0.03	0.0	5.59	0.04
Brindley Road	0.4	12.76	0.29	0.6	14.75	0.38
Broadhurst Green (nw)	0.1	5.98	0.06	0.3	5.23	0.14
2024 Base + Development (Area I) + Sensitivity Test (Area E)						
Pye Green Road	1.2	19.75	0.55	0.9	17.53	0.46
Broadhurst Green	0.0	4.88	0.03	0.0	5.59	0.04
Brindley Road	0.4	12.82	0.29	0.6	14.94	0.39
Broadhurst Green (nw)	0.1	5.98	0.06	0.3	5.23	0.14

5.5.13 It can be seen in **Table 11** that the proposed junction operates within capacity during the peak periods in the 2019 base position. In the future year of 2024 the junction is predicted to operate within capacity.



5.5.14 With the addition of the development traffic the junction is predicted to continue to operate within capacity, albeit with increases in delay and queuing. With the addition of the committed development and Area E development traffic the junction will continue to operate within capacity with minimal increases in the degree of saturation and queuing.

Pye Green Road/ Rosehill/ Phase 2 & 3 Site Access

5.5.15 The existing three-arm roundabout is currently being upgraded to a larger 20m diameter four-arm roundabout to accommodate Phase 2 & 3. The junction has been modelled within Arcady with the improvements in place. The junction modelling outputs are attached at **Appendix F** and summarised in **Table 12** below.

Table 12 – Pye Green Road/ Rosehill/ Phase 2 & 3 Site Access – Junction Modelling Results

Arm	AM Peak (08:00-09:00)			PM Peak (17:00-18:00)		
	Queue	Delays (s)	RFC	Queue	Delays (s)	RFC
2024 Base						
Rosehill	0.3	4.01	0.23	0.4	4.23	0.28
Pye Green Road (s)	0.3	3.95	0.23	1.4	7.02	0.56
Site Access – Phase 2 & 3	0.2	4.19	0.15	0.0	4.21	0.04
Pye Green Road (n)	0.3	4.26	0.19	0.5	4.83	0.29
2024 Base + Development (Area I)						
Rosehill	0.3	4.02	0.23	0.4	4.29	0.29
Pye Green Road (s)	0.3	4.03	0.24	1.4	7.07	0.56
Site Access – Phase 2 & 3	0.2	4.23	0.15	0.0	4.22	0.04
Pye Green Road (n)	0.3	4.30	0.19	0.5	4.85	0.29
2024 Base + Development (Area I) + Sensitivity Test (Area E)						
Rosehill	0.3	4.10	0.24	0.5	4.38	0.30
Pye Green Road (s)	0.4	4.07	0.25	1.5	7.46	0.58
Site Access – Phase 2 & 3	0.2	4.42	0.18	0.0	4.30	0.06
Pye Green Road (n)	0.3	4.40	0.19	0.5	4.93	0.30

5.5.16 It can be seen in **Table 12** that the proposed junction is predicted to operate within capacity in the 2024 future year.

5.5.17 With the addition of the development traffic the junction is predicted to continue to operate within capacity, albeit with increases in delay and queuing. With the addition of the committed development and Area E development traffic the junction will continue to operate within capacity with minimal increases in the degree of saturation and queuing.

