**Cannock Chase District Council**

**Planning Committee**

**2nd July 2025**

**CH/25/0016 - 243 Hill Street, Hednesford**

* Following compilation of the report for the Committee agenda, Officer’s recommendation has been altered to the following:

*Resolution to grant planning consent, subject to the completion of a 21-day notice being served upon the landowner, in accordance with the Town and Country Planning (Development Management Procedure) (England) Order 2015: Notice Under Article 13 of Application for Planning Permission.*

The applicant has confirmed that notice was served upon the landowner on 13th June 2025 and so this will be complete on 4th July 2025.

* A small error was noted at paragraph 4.4.3 of the Officer’s report; only the first-floor side windows will be obscure glazed, serving bedroom 1 at the western elevation and an en-suite at the eastern elevation. The ground floor side facing windows will not be obscured and will serve a utility room and the lounge area.

**CH/25/0037 - 258 Walsall Road, Cannock, Staffordshire, WS11 0JL**

* Following compilation of the report for the Committee agenda, an objection has been received. It should be noted however, that the objection references the proposal as a HMO. There is a separate planning application for a retrospective HMO by a different applicant currently under consideration by the Council (reference CH/25/0178). Officers have contacted the objector to clarify this, however, have not received a response. Whilst it is highly likely that the objector has commented on the incorrect application, for clarity, their objection is as follows:

*As a resident of Bridgtown, I have serious concerns about the impact such a development would have on the safety, wellbeing, and overall character of our village. Bridgtown is a small, close-knit and up-and-coming community that values its cohesion, public safety, and shared amenities—particularly its local park, which is heavily used by families and children.*

*My main concerns include:*

*1. Safeguarding of Residents and Children*

*The proposed facility is in close proximity to residential homes, public areas, and the local school. The potential safeguarding risks, particularly for children, cannot be ignored. A sudden and large influx of adult residents with unknown backgrounds into such a sensitive area raises legitimate safety concerns.*

*2. Impact on Community Cohesion and Public Resources*

*Bridgtown is not equipped to handle the strain this proposal may place on local services and infrastructure. We lack the necessary resources and support frameworks to responsibly accommodate individuals in this capacity, particularly under a House in Multiple Occupation (HMO) model.*

*3. Local Opposition and Community Wellbeing*

*There is a strong and growing feeling among residents that this change is being forced upon a village that neither wants nor needs this facility. This decision appears to have been made without adequate consultation or consideration of local views. The development risks bringing unrest, discontent, and a loss of public trust in local governance.*

*While we understand the broader challenges facing local authorities and government, imposing such a facility in a quiet village like Bridgtown is not a fair or responsible solution. It is vital that decisions of this nature are made with genuine local engagement, proper safeguarding plans, and respect for the community’s character and future.*

*I urge you to reconsider this proposal and explore more appropriate locations with suitable infrastructure, safeguarding measures, and public support.*