**From:** Turner, Penny - E&E [mailto:Penny.Turner@Oxfordshire.gov.uk]
**Sent:** 10 November 2017 15:05
**To:** Narinder Jheeta
**Cc:** tim@infrastructcs.co.uk; Richard Cleary; Caroline Ford
**Subject:** RE: Condition 84 - pedestrian and cycle water crossings

Narinder,

Thank you for your email. Regarding the 2 footbridges, I’ve checked our correspondence records seeing if Martin Brain had recorded any input on these and could find nothing. We have drawing and reinforcement details but from conversations with Martin there was never an intention for Oxfordshire CC to adopt these bridges, they were to be maintained by A2D.

OCC requested details of the timber footbridges to assure ourselves that they were being built fit for purpose, as in the future it may be necessary for OCC to take on the responsibility for these.

I have also spoken to our Development Control section to ensure that nothing in the existing agreement had been amended, and it has been confirmed that there is no intention to adopt these bridges, so no technical approval is required by OCC. Development Control did mention in our conversation that as Cherwell District cover the area, the technical approval request could actually have come from them, not OCC, this does sound likely.

Please do not hesitate to contact me if you have any queries.

Regards

***Penny Turner IEng MICE MCMI***

Principal Engineer - Bridges

Highways & Transport,

Oxfordshire County Council,

County Hall,

New Road,

Oxford

OX1 1ND

Mobile: 07824 475805

Email: Penny.Turner@oxfordshire.gov.uk

**From:** Narinder Jheeta [mailto:NarinderJheeta@hill.co.uk]
**Sent:** 10 November 2017 13:16
**To:** Caroline Ford
**Cc:** Turner, Penny - E&E; tim@infrastructcs.co.uk; Richard Cleary
**Subject:** RE: Condition 84 - pedestrian and cycle water crossings

Caroline, good afternoon. I have this morning gone through and re-reviewed all the levels against the HYDER drawings you attached. My notes as follows.

        **Footbridge Crossing between Phase 2 Area 1 and Phase 1 NEAP (read in conjunction with attached *15-1859-02-4 (Rev AB4).pdf*)**

o   Our footbridge deck is around 40mm lower than HYDER levels on Phase 1 side and around 130mm lower on Phase 2 side.

o   The soffit of this bridge therefore starts at around 83.520 Phase 1 side and falls to around 83.200 on Phase 2 side.

o   By comparison, HYDER’s drawing notes a lower soffit level Phase 1 side, however we are lower than HYDER’s soffit level Phase 2 side by around 50mm. Predominantly though for the majority of the footbridge span, we’ve achieved a greater clearance over the watercourse than they managed.

o   I note the HYDER drawing states a 1:100 year plus Climate Change river level at 82.650; we are therefore also well clear of this and should have no detrimental effect on flood risk.

o   Looking at the approach paths, at design stage we surveyed a mid-path Spot Level Phase 1 side by NEAP of 84.234 (HYDER has this at around 84.300) which was already as built by Others (Phase 1 Contractor). You will see on our civil engineer’s levels drawing (reattached for easy reference) that the path we built in Phase 2 has a mid-path spot level of 83.545 (matching the HYDER drawing). The footbridge simply therefore bridges our matched level to the lower one constructed by others by way of a consistent and accessible 1:40 gradient – again visible on the attached plan.

        **Footbridge Crossing between Phase 2 Area 3 and Phase 2 Area 6 (read in conjunction with attached *15-1859-02-2 (Rev C8).pdf*)**

o   Our footbridge deck is around 230mm lower than HYDER levels on Area 3 side and around 90mm higher on Area 6 side.

o   The soffit of this bridge therefore starts at around 85.340 Area 6 side and falls to around 85.000 on Area 3 side.

o   By comparison, HYDER’s drawing notes a lower soffit level Area 6 side, however we are lower than HYDER’s soffit level Area 3 side by around 100mm. Predominantly though for the majority of footbridge span, we’ve achieved a greater clearance over the watercourse.

o   I note the HYDER drawing states a 1:100 year plus Climate Change river level at 83.490; again we are therefore also well clear of this and as the other footbridge should have no detrimental effect on flood risk.

o   The reasoning for the footbridges trajectory here differing from HYDER is merely a result of keeping the path approach to the bridge from all directions as accessible. You will see on HYDER’s plan that they had a series of steps adjacent to Area 6 plots 271 and 272 (as they had a level difference of over 1m), however we have managed a 1:80 sloping instead which gives far better usability as a result of the overall levels and gradients of the river corridor footways. I have also attached an annotated photo so it’s easier to see. I understand from having consulted our civil engineer (cc’d) that there was a strong desire from Cherwell DC at S96A stage to omit these steps and amend the levels to suit.

Accordingly, I hope you will agree that the slight difference in levels are acceptable in both cases - I would welcome your confirmation by reply.

In regards to the County seeking technical approval, coincidently this morning Penny Turner of OXFORDSHIRE CC was on site for a meeting on other matters. We took a few moments to look at the bridges as they have been installed and briefly discussed the point in your email. Penny kindly offered to check correspondence her end to determine the status quo on this; as both footbridges and the areas immediately surround them are understood as remaining in ownership of A2DOMINION – and not being taken on by the County. I have cc’d Penny in to advise with her findings.

Regards

**Narinder Jheeta**

**Technical Co-Ordinator**

**07710 304409**

**From:** Caroline Ford [mailto:Caroline.Ford@cherwellandsouthnorthants.gov.uk]
**Sent:** 09 November 2017 11:25
**To:** Narinder Jheeta <NarinderJheeta@hill.co.uk>
**Subject:** Condition 84 - pedestrian and cycle water crossings

Narinder,

As discussed, I have picked up a potential discrepancy with the levels that are shown on the two bridge drawings submitted for this condition submission and the levels for the bridges that were originally proposed (see attached levels plans) – the difference appears relatively small but the levels shown on your submitted drawings are slightly lower than as previously approved. Please can you check this and revert back with your view and I can determine what course of action to take – it might be that I need to contact OCC as the Lead Local Flood Authority to gain their view on the levels of the bridge in respect to flood risk. The County have also advised around the need for technical approval (in accordance with BD2/12) ‘Technical Approval of Highway Structures’ to ensure the safety of the public. Have the pedestrian and cycle water crossings had a technical approval? I can question the need for this further if not given that my understanding is that these sit outside of any area to be adopted.

I look forward to hearing from you.

Kind regards

Caroline

**Caroline Ford** BA. (Hons) MA MRTPI
Principal Planning Officer
Development Management
Cherwell District Council
Ext. 1823

Direct Dial: 01295 221823
mailto:caroline.ford@cherwellandsouthnorthants.gov.uk
[www.cherwell.gov.uk](http://www.cherwell.gov.uk/)