

Guzman, Kenny De

From: Cornelius Barton [REDACTED]
Sent: 18 June 2012 14:42
To: steveakehurst@btconnect.com
Subject: Re: FW: Proposed 38 Agreement - Phase 2 of Felpham Road, including the Viaduct Structure.

Dear Steve

I have spoken to John Mills and he is happy to approve the borehole WSI. John tells me that the WSI document needs to be submitted to Paul Stack at Arun District Council as part of an application to discharge condition 42 of application no. FP/92/04 in respect of the viaduct. The borehole WSI is the last of the archaeological documents required for this discharge.

Yours Sincerely

Cornelius

On Mon, Jun 18, 2012 at 10:44 AM, Steve Akehurst <[REDACTED]> wrote:

Cornelius

Matthew Williams is on leave at present could you please look into the matter regarding the borehole testing and if John Mills has informed the planners that all is ok mate to get it signed off ?

Steve

From: Steve Akehurst [REDACTED]
Sent: 18 June 2012 10:20
To: 'Simon Greig'; 'Gerald Ford'; 'Chin, Choon W'; 'Drewett, John'; 'Paul Berrill'; 'Aluco Ecology'; 'Matthew Williams'
Cc: 'Dunne, James (Southampton)'
Subject: FW: Proposed 38 Agreement - Phase 2 of Felpham Road, including the Viaduct Structure.
Importance: High

Gentlemen

Now that you all have had some time to digest WSCC responses regarding the attached email and attachments , could you please respond to me today with your proposed re submission dates to WSCC on your relevant scope of works. I have hoped that you will all agree that this Friday midday is acceptable.

On Archaeology this relates to a planning condition on Lidsey Rife Boreholes . Can we confirm that this matter is well underway ?

Regards

[REDACTED]

Steve Akehurst | Major Projects Technical Manager | BDW Southampton (a trading name of BDW Trading Ltd)

[REDACTED]

The sender of this e-mail is a member of the Barratt Developments group of companies, the ultimate parent of which is Barratt Developments PLC (company number 00604574).

Barratt Developments PLC is registered in England and Wales with its registered office at Barratt House, Cartwright Way, Forest Business Park, Bardon Hill, Coalville, Leicestershire, LE67 1UF, together with its principal subsidiaries BDW Trading Limited (03018173), KingsOak Homes Limited (01993976), David Wilson Homes Limited (00830271) and Wilson Bowden Developments Limited (00948402). BDW East Scotland Limited (SC027535), also a principal subsidiary, is registered in Scotland and has its registered office at Blairton House Old Aberdeen Road, Balmedie, Aberdeenshire, AB23 8SH.

This e-mail message is intended only for use by the named addressee and may contain privileged and/or confidential information. If you are not the named addressee you should not disseminate, copy or take any action in reliance on it. This communication is subject to contract and not intended to create legal relations between the sender and the recipient. Please view our 'Email Addendum v1' at <http://www.barrattcommercialsupport.co.uk> for further details.

From: [REDACTED]
Sent: 14 June 2012 15:41
To: Chin, Choon W
Cc: Steve Akehurst; Gerald Ford; [REDACTED] Guile, Stephen
Subject: Fw: Proposed 38 Agreement - Phase 2 of Felpham Road, including the Viaduct Structure.

Dear Choon Wah,

Thank you for your letters dated 14th, 20th and 24th February 2012 enclosing the detailed design of Phase 2 of the Felpham Relief Road, including the embankment, viaduct, maintenance access road and associated structures.

I apologise for not responding before now, but this has not been possible because of other Site 6 commitments / priorities and the length of time needed to check the design of works of such significant nature. However, the submitted information has now been reviewed and I would like to make the following comments:-

Additional Documentation Required

1. A copy of the Environment Agency Consent to the surface water drainage strategy for Phase 2 of the Relief Road, (if different to the documentation submitted in connection with the A29 Roundabout).
2. A drainage statement explaining the relationship between the MJA attenuation pond design and the Atkins highway drainage design, in order it can be checked the designs are compatible. Additionally, please confirm the Atkins drainage design takes into account the impermeable area draining into Attenuation Pond K increased through the Technical Approval process for the new A29 Roundabout and therefore less relief road surface water can drain into the pond.
3. Evidence the Swale and Attenuation Pond G designed by WSP at the eastern end of the road has the capacity to drain the shared use cycleway and the carriageway in this location.
4. Confirmation all pre-commencement of work Planning Conditions relating to the Relief Road (FP/220/07) and the Viaduct Structure (AL/113/09) have been discharged by Arun District Council.
5. A swept path diagram that demonstrates the agricultural access to the south of Footpath 153 Crossing is accessible from all directions. Has the size of the design vehicle been agreed with the landowner? Can this vehicle wait clear of the shared use cycleway and carriageway on each side of the road to open the gate?
6. Is there a reason why the location of the above agricultural access is different to that shown on the drawings submitted at the Reserve Matters Planning Application stage i.e. why has the access moved from the western side of the footpath crossing to the eastern side? Is the landowner happy with this change?
7. The location and type of boundary fencing to be used along the entire route of the relief road needs to be shown on the relevant drawings. On the northern side of the road I would suggest the fence is set back 1 metres from the toe of the embankment and an appropriate position is found on the southern side. At present far too much land is being offered for adoption which has no highway purpose. The surplus land can be transferred back to the relevant landowners, unless it is being retained for some other reason.
8. In connection with Comment 7, please confirm each of the affected landowners has agreed to the location and type of boundary fence to be used.
9. A copy of Drawing Number 5084455-RLS-BNR-CBR-03010, which I understand shows the design of the retaining structure(s) adjacent to the maintenance access road.

Amey Comments

1. Our Consultant, Amey has checked the detailed design of the works, including the embankment, the road, the viaduct, the maintenance access road and other structures. Comments relating to the design of the embankment were issued in my email dated 20th April 2012. The road design comments are listed in the below email from Mr Guile of Amey and the viaduct and other structure comments are listed in the attached schedule. Please review the situation and provide an appropriate response to each of these comments.

Section 38 Agreement Drawings

I have assumed the General Layout Plans (dwg.nos. 4102 to 4105) are going to be used to form the basis of the legal agreement. Consequently, the following alterations are required in order the details on these drawings are in the correct format for inclusion in the legal agreement:-

1. Add "Section 38 Agreement" to the Drawing Titles and General Key and add "New" prior to "Verge / Embankment" and "Drainage" in the General Key or change the word "New" to "Adoptable" in each case for consistency.
2. The adoptable highway drainage system, including the road gullies, gully connections, carrier drains, catchpits and headwalls etc need to be shown in solid blue colouring on the drawings and the key. Is part of the adoptable highway drainage system missing from the northern side of the road on the plans?
3. The adoptable culverts and headwalls need to be shown in solid blue colouring, together with a suitable reference in the key.
4. The following features need to be shown and identified on each of the agreement plans:-
 - Viaduct Structure.
 - Attenuation Ponds, including identification lettering.
 - Flood Relief Culverts.
 - Non Flood Relief Culverts.
 - Lidsey Rife Bridge / Culvert.
 - Headwalls.
 - Existing Route of Footpaths 152 and 153.
 - Proposed Diversion Route of Footpath 152.
 - Existing Watercourse / Ditch Lines (schematically).
 - Petrol Interceptors.
 - Hybrobrakes.
 - Safety Fencing.
4. A list of the drawing numbers of the plans to be used to construct the road, viaduct, maintenance access road and other structures etc.
5. Remove the colouring that extends beyond the drawing "Cut Lines" so that the colouring on one drawing does not overlap with the colouring on the next drawing - the land can only be offered for adoption once.
6. Adjust the red "Proposed Highway Boundary" line to coincide with the boundary fencing that needs to be introduced to the various drawings (see comments under first heading) and indicate who is going to be responsible for the future maintenance of each type of fence. Please note the ditches must not be incorporated within the red line because they are not suitable for adoption.
7. The area either side of the viaduct maintenance access should be coloured appropriately on the agreement plan, as the land in this location needs to be adopted up to the boundary fencelines.
8. Remove the notation advising there is to be a "Proposed Cycle and Pedestrian Track" on the southern side of the Footpath 153 crossing, as this is not going to be the case. The proposed cycleway on the northern side of the road to be constructed by the County Council in the future is going to tie-in with the cycleway running along the southern side of the relief road. This comments applies to all of the drawings.
9. Has the safety fencing been shown in the correct location at either end of the viaduct structure, as it looks as though the fencing is going to encroach within the shared use cycleway.

AIP for Viaduct Structure

1. I look forward to receiving a copy of the Viaduct AIP Document signed by Network Rail, as requested in my letter dated 3rd May 2011.

Form B Documentation for Viaduct and Other Structures

1. The signed Form B for the Viaduct Structure, Lidsey Rife Bridge and the other culverts along the Maintenance Access Road have been requested and will be signed by WSCC and returned for your records / signature by Network Rail (viaduct structure only) once received.

Highway Drainage

1. MJA Highway Pond Construction Detail Plan (dwg.no.4276-71) -

- Add identification lettering to the attenuation pond.
- How is the attenuation pond going to be accessed - there is no gate?
- The ditch into the outfall watercourse needs to be dimensioned - this information is not available at present.
- Evidence is required the Class 1 Bypass Interceptor has been suitably sized to drain the impermeable area.

2. MJA Highway Pond Construction Plan (dwg.no.4276:72) -

- Add identification lettering to the attenuation
- How is the attenuation pond going to be accessed - there is no gate?
- One of the outfall drainage pipes has no headwall or invert level details - these need to be introduced to the plan.
- Invert level details are missing generally from this plan and need to be introduced.
- Evidence is required the Class 1 Bypass Interceptor has been suitably sized to drain the impermeable area.

Construction

1. Is there a reason why BN kerbs (K1), rather than HB2 kerbs are being used to define the carriageway edge?

2. I understand your Client has requested the harden margin on the northern side of the relief road be changed to a more conventional grass verge margin. If this is the case, please clarify the following:-

- Has the removal of the harden margin changed the type of kerb to be used to define the carriageway edge along this side of the road?
- Am I correct in assuming a 1 metre wide rollover verge is to be provided behind the 1 metre wide verge to tie in with the side slope of the embankment? I think this is shown on the general arrangement type drawings. If this is the case, please add dimension lines to the Typical Section B on Drawing Number CBR-04-04039/B02 and adjust the design cross sections to suit as well, if necessary, so there is no confusion in this respect in the future.
- Additionally, please confirm a 1 metre wide roll over verge is being provided behind the shared use cycleway on the opposite side of the road?
- On a more general point, can I suggest dimension lines are introduced to all of the typical sections on drawing number 4039/B02, so there is no confusion in this respect in the future.

2. Is there a reason why BN Kerbs (Detail 4), rather than CS2 channels blocks are being used to define the carriageway edge where the swale is present at the eastern end of the road? Phase 1 of the Relief Road has been designed with the latter, so Phase 2 needs to be designed in a consistent way, unless there is a technical reason for the change.

3. Has any consideration been given to incorporating a geotextile membrane within the pavement of the maintenance access road to stop the granular material being washed away over time during period of flooding?

4. Additionally, why are timber edgings being proposed along the sides of the maintenance access road as these will rot over time due to the presence of the flood water?

5. Change the surface course of the shared use cycleway to AC 6 dense surf 100 / 150, as this is the preferred material of the County Council. Please indicate on the relevant drawings and specification the material must be machine laid.

6. Show on the relevant drawings the noise bund attenuation fencing details at the eastern end of the road.

Street Lighting / Electrical Apparatus

1. The viaduct lighting column spacing, plinth and duct details etc have not been checked at this stage because the Street Lighting Arrangement Technical Note needs to be revised in accordance with the comments made

in your email dated 31st May 2012 - otherwise the situation will be confusing to my Street Lighting Team and a decision over the acceptability of the proposal will not be able to be made.

2. I understand MJA are designing the street lighting for Phase 2 of the Relief Road. In this respect, confirmation of the following is required:-

- The lighting columns are going to be passively safe and be to the same Specification as the A29 Roundabout lighting, including the westbound approach to the A29 Roundabout and the eastbound approach to the Stanover Lane Roundabout?
- SEC will be checking and approving the lighting design.
- SEC will be providing a passively safe Specification for the illuminated refuge island bollards, beacon and illuminated traffic signs.
- The agreed lighting, illuminated bollard, beacon and traffic signs details are to be shown on the Atkins drawings for completeness and to ensure there is no conflict with other highway signs / furniture etc.
- The agreed lighting column positions will be shown on the Atkins drawings in order the illumination requirements for the traffic signs can be designed and checked. At present some of the details in the signs schedule are incorrect in this respect, presumably due to the absence of the lighting details. These components need to be considered and designed together.

Advance Direction Signs

1. The location of the advance direction signs at each end of the road need to be shown on the drawings, together with relevant sign face, post and foundations details. MJA have been given the sign face details by WSCC, but the aspects, including location need to be designed by Atkins.
2. The direction signs installed in connection with the new A29 Roundabout are interim and need to be replaced in conjunction with the relief road works. The replacement sign details, including the post and foundation design need to be shown on the Atkins drawings for completeness.

Traffic Signs and Carriageway Markings

1. The centreline carriageway markings at the western end of the relief road are not consistent with the markings agreed with MJA in connection with the A29 Roundabout works. Please revise the design and the Lining and Signing Technical Advice Note accordingly.
2. The Lining and Signing Technical Advice Note states that road studs are not proposed for Phase 2 of the Relief Road. In our view they should be used, as recommended in paragraph 6.1 of Chapter 5 of the Traffic Signs Manual:

"Retroreflective road studs are frequently used to supplement longitudinal road markings.....They are used in addition to reflectorised lines where traffic flows are high, particularly on roads without street lighting. They remain effective in wet weather and also in areas prone to fog, when the efficiency of reflective markings is reduced"

3. The Technical Advice Note also suggests Diagram 617/618.1 signing is going to be used at the beginning of the viaduct maintenance access road. A TRO is required if these signs are used, so that any noncompliance issues are enforceable by the Sussex Police. This comment applies to the signs at the opposite end of the route as well. Further, advice over the appropriateness of the use of these signs and the resultant TRO will follow in due course.

4. Drawing Number 4034/B02 - another 50 mph repeater sign is required, to be sited back-to-back with S-01.

5. Drawing number 4035/B02 - another 50 mph repeater sign is required, to be sited back-to-back with S-02 and another clearway repeater sign is required, to be sited back-to-back with S-03.

6. Drawing number 4036/B02 - another 50 mph repeater sign is required, to be sited back-to-back with S-09

7. Drawing number 5064455-RLS-BNR-CBR-04037/B02

- The 50 mph speed limit repeater signs S-20 & S-21 do not need to be illuminated

- I would suggest extending the diag 1004.1 hazard warning line eastwards to the location of the warning sign S-22, as recommended by paragraph 4.25 of Chapter 5 of the Traffic Signs Manual:

"the marking can with benefit be extended to start at the location of the accompanying warning sign"

9. At the western end of the road the location of the speed limit terminal signs may need to be changed in connection with the reduction in the speed limit along the A29 - further advice in this respect will follow in due course.

10. The speed limit terminal signs at the eastern end of the road can be removed from the drawings as these signs are situated immediately adjacent to the Stanover Lane Roundabout and fall within the limits of the WSP road design.

Shared Use Cycleway

1. It has been agreed with your Client that the cycleway being built in connection with the A29 Roundabout would not be signed, lined or have corduroy paving laid until the Phase 2 Relief Road cycleway is built - otherwise the A29 cycleway will not lead anywhere. These details either need to be shown on the Atkins drawings or alternatively the plan numbers of the MJA drawings showing these works should be shown on the Atkins plans, again, for completeness.

Landscaping

1. Comments relating to the proposed landscaping design beneath and adjacent to the viaduct structure are being issued to Arun District Council in connection with the discharge of planning conditions. I have, however, attached a copy of the comments for consideration at this stage.

Existing Footpath 152

1. What is the current position with the Temporary Diversion Order for Footpath 152?
2. What is the current position with the Permanent Diversion Order for Footpath 152? Please show the diversion route on the relevant agreement plan?

Existing Footpath 153 Crossing of the Relief Road

1. Existing Footpath 153 is going to be converted to a shared use cycleway following construction of the relief road and will form part of the Barnham to Bognor Regis Cycleway. Your Client is not being asked to undertake this work because the majority of the alterations will be on third party land, however, the central refuge island has to be designed to accommodate the future cycleway (planning condition). Please remove the cycleway sign / line etc details from the drawings, as these will be installed by the County Council in conjunction with the future cycleway conversion works - the dropped kerbs / tactile paving details etc should remain though, as cater for the pedestrians using the footway.

Safety Audit / Designers Response

1. The latest Stage 2 Safety Audit needs to be reviewed for acceptability by our internal Safety Auditor as the authors of the report were not from the County Councils' Accepted List of Auditors. Before I arrange this the following issues need to be addressed:-
 - The Safety Auditors need to be told about the two Departures from Standard and the report needs to be revised to reflect this situation. I am particularly concerned about Problem 2.5 of the Previous Stage 1 Safety Audit (May 2008), as the report states the Design Team advised the Safety Auditors the full overtaking sight distance of 195 metres is available over the viaduct structure, when 490 metres is required to meet the standard in this respect. This situation needs to be resolved.
 - The Designers Response Report (January 2012) is not acceptable because the document has not been signed and Problem 2.5 of the Previous Stage 1 Safety Audit and Problems 2.3 and 2.4 of the Previous

Stage 2 Safety Audit (October 2009) and Problems 3.3 and 3.4 of the Current Stage 2 Safety Audit (December 2011) do not have a Designers Response.

- In connection with the solution to Problem 2.1 of the Previous Stage 1 Safety Audit, please submit evidence that demonstrates the smaller 76mm diameter posts are able to support the traffic signs or alternatively design these as passive posts and foundations.
- A Safety Audit Exception Report is going to be required because Recommendation of Problem 3.2 of the Stage 2 Safety Audit (December 2012) is not being addressed. The document will be prepared and issued to our Senior Management for acceptance once the revised Safety Audit / Designers Response is submitted.

Departure from Standard

1. Approval to the two Departures from Standard will be sought from my Senior Management once the comments in this email have been addressed, as a number relate to the design of the Departures from Standard themselves.

Please review the situation in accordance with these comments and submit 3 copies of each of the revised drawings / documents for further consideration, together with an appropriate response to each of the comments made.

If any clarification of these comments is required, please do not hesitate to contact me.

I look forward to matters proceeding accordingly.

Kind regards harvey.

Harvey Rogers | Principal Engineer (S38/278 Agreements), Implementation Team, Strategic Planning, Communities and Infrastructure,
West Sussex County Council
Location: Second Floor Northleigh, County Hall, Chichester, West Sussex, PO19 1RG

Think sustainably. Do you have to print? Can you double side? Do you need colour?
----- Forwarded by Harvey Rogers/SU/WSCC on 31/05/2012 13:52 -----

"Guile, Stephen" <Stephen.Guile2@amev.co.uk>

To "Harvey Rogers (harvey.rogers@westsussex.gov.uk)"
<harvey.rogers@westsussex.gov.uk>

01/05/2012 16:38

cc "Nicholson, John" <John.Nicholson2@amev.co.uk>

Subject: TRIM: 300412 - 507130 BRNRR Felpham DD - submission dated 10th April 2012

Harvey

With reference to your letter dated 10th April 2012 regarding the latest submission for the Viaduct Section of the Felpham Relief Road please find my comments below.

Wilson Bailey GI Report – No Comment

Atkins – Geotechnical Design Report – No Comment

MJA Pavement design calculations – Please supply a legible copy.

Stage 2 Road Safety Audit - No comment

Highway Ponds H, J & k –

- 4276:71 and 72 - There is no indication as to which pond is H and which is J. Please advise.
- Pond J exceeds the allowable 5l/s flow for the 100yr + 30%. Please advise.
- Pond K has an allowable discharge of 2l/s. However, all the hydrobrakes on the drawings discharge at 5l/s. Please advise.
- The Hydrobrake featured at the end of the booklet does not match any of those required for the project. Please advise.

Technical Note - HRRRAP – The design report is satisfactory.

Highway Specification

- Page S5 – There is no specification for capping layer in section 6, only general fill.

Technical Note - Departures from Standards – This not a full report in line with the DMRB. Has this level of detail been agreed with WSCC as they have to sign of Departures.

Technical Note – General Design Clarification – No comments.

Technical Note – Drainage Design – Design satisfactory

Drawings

- 5084455-RLS_BNR-CBR-03001 & 2 – There are no details for culverts 3, 11, 12 & 13 with the access road over the top
- 5084455-RLS_BNR-CBR-03001 & 2 – Please advise what protection is to be provided for vehicles at the culvert crossings.
- 5084455-RLS_BNR-CBR-03001, 2, 3 & 4 – Drawing 5084455-RLS_BNR-CBR-03010 quoted in the General Key has not been provided. Please advise.
- 5084455-RLS_BNR-CBR-04002 – Safety fence does not tie into the parapet on the south side of the road. Please revise.
- 5084455-RLS_BNR-CBR-04019 – Transition offsets do not match terminal offsets, on both sides of the road.
- 5084455-RLS_BNR-CBR-04020 – Transition offsets do not match terminal offsets on the south side of the road
- 5084455-RLS_BNR-CBR-04024 – Is there continuity between the drainage ditch shown on this drawing as ‘designed by others’ and the design for the Felpham end of the road. Please advise.
- There are no gradients shown on verge behind the footpaths on the cross-sections. Please advise.
- The culverts are not shown on the long sections. We have no indication as to their proximity to the

formation/ base of capping layer. Please include the culverts, and with their invert and soffit levels, on the long sections.

There are no issues with any of the other drawings.

This concludes the assessment of the Submission. There is nothing that should impede the approval process we just need some clarification.

If you have any comments or queries please contact me on my mobile or on 01403229974 at County Hall North.

Regards

Stephen Guile

Senior Engineer - Consulting

Amey

South East Hub| Explorer II | Fleming Way | Crawley | West Sussex| RH10 9GT

Amey |Service is our passion. People, our strength

Amey: 2010 Winner and 2011 Finalist of the NCE/ACE Consultants of the Year - Major Firm award

COMPANY PARTICULARS: For particulars of companies within the Amey Group, please visit <http://www.amey.co.uk/Home/Companyparticulars/tabid/182/Default.aspx>. Amey plc, Registered Office: The Sherard Building, Edmund Halley Road, Oxford OX4 4DQ, Registered in England: 4736639

CONFIDENTIALITY NOTICE: This email message and accompanying data are for the sole use of the intended recipient(s) and may contain information that is confidential. If you are not the intended recipient, you are notified that any use, dissemination, distribution or copying of this message or data is prohibited. If you received this email message in error, please notify us immediately and erase all copies of this message and attachments.

Please note that Amey monitors incoming and outgoing mail for compliance with its Email Policy. This includes scanning emails for computer viruses.

—
This e-mail and any attachments are confidential and intended solely for the persons addressed. If it has come to you in error please reply to advise us but you should not read it, copy it, show it to anyone else nor make any other

use of its content. West Sussex County Council takes steps to ensure e-mails and attachments are virus-free but you should carry out your own checks before opening any attachment.

—
L - P : Archaeology
[REDACTED]

L - P : Archaeology is the trading name of L - P : Heritage LLP Registered in England and Wales
OC366545

Registered office address: Amelia House, Crescent Road, Worthing, BN11 1QR

