

**Minutes of a meeting of the Transport Working Group held at Longdon-Upon-Tern Village Hall on Wednesday 20<sup>TH</sup> August 2025 at 7pm.**

**Present** Cllr Sue Hodgskin from Rodington Parish Council. Seven residents.

**Apologies**

Apologies had been received from three Longdon-Upon-Tern residents.

**Minutes of last meeting**

The minutes of the last meeting had been circulated. The item on the SIDS needed to be amended to read that the current 40mph area approaching Millers Row should be 30mph.

**Matters Arising**

None

**SIDs**

SIDs data sheets for the last four months were circulated.

There was a discussion about the value of the data being collected and it was agreed that it was indicative of levels of traffic going through Longdon-Upon-Tern. This could be useful especially given the prospect of new residential development in the area.

The data had been collected for almost a year (from December 2024) which meant year on year comparison could take place from early 2026.

**Action**

SIDS data to be downloaded monthly. HF would start looking at the data with a view to identifying any trends over the last twelve months.

**Report on council's response to the Transporter Survey**

There had been a meeting with a planning officer from T&W on 22<sup>nd</sup> May 2025. He had taken away the data collected and the live stream footage. A written reply had been received on 5<sup>th</sup> June 2025 which said the figures in the routing map were 'indicative' and 'intended to be an average' and a 'worst case scenario' and there was nothing in the S106 agreement that limited the number of permitted vehicles. The Parish Council had written back to T&W pointing out that the data in the routing map read 40 vehicles whereas in the planning report it was suggested the number could be as high as 90. 40 vehicles a day had been assessed as increasing daily traffic volume (6000) by 1.5% which was (according to the planning report) acceptable. However, a figure of 90 would increase traffic volume by 3% - was this an acceptable increase? The question was asked about the origin of the data in the planning report – according to T&W's reply, it had come from Greenhous who had carried out the assessment. It was now clear that the S106 agreement only referred to the route transporters were allowed to take and the hours of operation. There was nothing with regard to numbers that the council were prepared to enforce.

The feeling of the meeting was that residents' groups who had raised concerns at the time had been misled but unfortunately there was little that could be done at this stage. However, the S106 agreement was legally binding in regard to the hours of operation (06.00 – 20.00 Monday – Saturday and 10.00am to 16.00 Sunday and Bank Holidays with no deliveries to be made before 6.00am and after 8.00pm). The question was asked whether there was an argument for monitoring the transporter traffic outside the permitted hours to see if breaches were occurring. The meeting felt this could be useful.

## **Action**

SH to contact MC (who had streamed data during the survey) and see if he would be able to help.

## **Longdon-Upon-Tern Bridge**

Following the last meeting, Heritage England had been contacted who advised that T&W were responsible for maintenance (HE could only advise). A Freedom of Information Request had been sent asking about the load capacity on the bridge, what recommendations for remedial work had been made and how many had been carried out, how many queries had been raised about the bridge over the last ten years, and the acceptable frequency of maximum load vehicles passing through. A reply had been received advising that assessments were carried out in 2009 and 2016 and the load capacity assessment was 40/44 tonnes. Parapet repairs were scheduled for 2025/2026. T&W could not provide an answer to the question about the number of queries raised. This was because the data was not in a 'reportable format' and would need to be extracted manually. The estimated cost of this allowed T&W to exempt themselves from replying. The Parish Council had responded by asking for a copy of all survey reports carried out by T&W (as presumably these were in a 'reportable format'). T&W had responded – the attached document was 64 pages. However, although reports were attached, there were pages missing (2015 started at 8 out of 18, then 9-13 out of 18. 2018 started at 7 out of 30. 2023 was complete). Names of council officers had been redacted which the meeting felt was reasonable, but the omissions raised the question what was being concealed?

There had recently been another incident on the bridge where the yellow direction bollard on the High Erccall side had been knocked down. It had been reported to T&W who had been out and put up a temporary sign.

## **Action**

RPC to write to T&W asking about the missing pages from the survey reports. DONE

RPC to write to Greenhous, Simmonds and Palletline asking the weight of their heaviest vehicle.

Copies of T&W's reports to be emailed to VS & SW.

RPC to write to T&W and ask for more information about outstanding repairs (including the new incident!).

## **Rural Bus Services**

SH had attended a zoom meeting of the group. Representatives of the bus companies advised their priorities were routes serving schools and any service had to be economically viable. There were plans to look at Rural Bus provision.

## **Action**

SH to attend future meetings.

## **Any Other Business**

i). Bloor Homes – The developer had plans for 1500 homes on land at Shawbirch. The TWG were concerned about the potential for increased traffic through Longdon-Upon Tern and the parish generally. The feeling of the meeting was that it was important to keep in touch with the application process and make sure residents' concerns were voiced. The developer had tried to get a transport study left out of the Environmental Impact Assessment, but this had been refused by T&W. The developer was preparing to submit an outline planning application. The meeting agreed that it was important to take part in any consultation exercises/attend meetings. It could be an opportunity to push for traffic calming measures through the area.

### **Action**

Suggest that RPC liaise with Wrockwardine Council about the development (SH to speak to RPC clerk)  
Track progress – <https://bloorhomesbrattongreen.com> to comment and receive updates (no planning application yet lodged).

The report about the Environmental Impact Assessment can be seen on T&W's planning portal  
Ref:EIA/2025/0001

### ii). Accident in Longdon Upon Tern – 25.6.2025

There had been an accident on the bend just past the church in Longdon-Upon-Tern early in the morning. A car had left the road and ended upside down in the horse field, destroying the Openreach distribution box. Thankfully, the horses were not injured, however, some residents were left without internet services for a week while repairs were carried out. This had caused considerable difficulty and financial loss for those who worked from home. The police were reported to be investigating the accident, and it had been added to the TWG incident file. It was suggested that a double white line on that section of the B5063 would discourage vehicles from overtaking on the bend and T&W should be approached to request this.

### **Action**

RPC to write and ask T&W to introduce double white lines on the hill.  
SH – to check with police if there is to be any prosecution.

iii). Post Box – there was concern on several grounds about the decision of Royal Mail not to replace the post box in Longdon-Upon-Tern. The meeting felt that it was a road safety issue with the only existing box by Red House Farm Barns. Motorists were parking in what was already a difficult junction to access the post box. Moreover, the aperture in the box was too small to accommodate most 21<sup>st</sup> century mail. It was also difficult for residents at the Tern Lane end of the village to access. It was agreed that it would not be enough to simply put in another request for a box. A case needed to be made to Royal Mail which demonstrated the strength of local feeling

### **Action**

SH to discuss with RPC clerk the possibility of adding something to the Village Voice.

iv). Tern Lane – Concern was expressed at the amount of traffic using Tern Lane. The lane had not been designed to carry such heavy loads, and considerable damage was being caused to the surface.

### **Action**

Problems with road surfaces could be reported to T&W through their website and typing Potholes into the search bar. There was also an email address – [highways@telford.gov.uk](mailto:highways@telford.gov.uk)

### **Date of Next Meeting**

Wednesday 21<sup>st</sup> January 2026 at 7pm at Longdon-Upon-Tern Village Hall.

The meeting closed at 8.30pm.