

### **3 Questions raised by Carillion-Telent**

**Question 1** Depth of Surface Course in reinstatements within extended trim-lines:

Cores that are being taken in trimmed back areas around our reinstatements are failing for lack of surface course depth where the utility has reinstated on top of the existing HA binder course.

#### **Answer 1:**

Where the existing binder course has not been damaged, the Undertaker may limit trim back to the surface course – Section S6.5.2.3(2) refers. The thickness of the new surface course in the trimmed back area will therefore be dictated by the thickness of the original surface course. The core should not be failed for insufficient thickness where the original surface course does not meet the required thickness as set out in Table A2.1. In such cases, the Undertaker should make all reasonable efforts to alert the Highway Authority before completing the reinstatement, and provide a comment on EToN at registration.

For carriageways, these trimmed back areas are coloured light grey in Figures S6.1 (both examples) and S6.2. The same principle applies in footways but the trimmed back reinstatement areas in Figure S8.1 have not been differentiated.

**Question 2** Depth of Bound Layers in reinstatements within extended trim-lines:

Cores fail for overall depth after being taken in the trimmed back area around our reinstatement, in these cases the trim back is full depth down to the existing HA backfill material, are we required to dig out the HA sub base material to a depth suitable for the SROH ?

#### **Answer 2:**

##### **(i) Flexible Footways:**

As per the principle set out in the answer to Question 1, the thickness of the reinstated bound courses in the trimmed back area is dictated by the depth of the original bound courses.

The Working Party recommends that the depth of the reinstated bound layers should be as required under the Specification for the type of footway being reinstated. To achieve this, it will be necessary to locally excavate or trim the existing sub-base. The reduced thickness of sub-base may affect its load-carrying capacity which could inhibit compaction of the bound layers, and may contribute to the difficulty in the Undertaker meeting the air voids requirements in the trimmed back area. As part of the current review for a 4th Edition of the Specification, the Working Party will review the wording for footways in Section S8.3.7(4).

**HAUC (UK) SROH Working Party response dated 31<sup>st</sup> May 2016**

---

(ii) Flexible Carriageways – Scenario 1:

As per the principle set out in the answer to Question 1, the overall thickness of the reinstated bound course(s) in the trimmed back area is dictated by the overall thickness of the original bound course(s). Where the trimmed back operation extends over existing carriageway construction that includes several bituminous layers (generally three or more bound courses – surface course, binder course and one or more layers making up the base), provided at least one remains intact, only the over-lying layers that are damaged in the trim back operation are required to be replaced.

This scenario will be reviewed as part of the 4<sup>th</sup> Edition, including improved use of Noticing Systems to record site details.

(iii) Flexible Carriageways – Scenario 2:

The wording for carriageways in Section S6.5.2.3(3) is not sufficiently clear where trimming back causes all existing bound courses to be removed down to the top of the existing sub-base. As such, the principle for Footways (in this Question 2, above) applies.

The Working Party recommends that the depth of the reinstated bound layers should be as required under the specification for the road category being reinstated. To achieve this, it will be necessary to locally excavate or trim the existing sub-base. The reduced thickness of sub-base may affect its load-carrying capacity which could inhibit compaction of the bound layers and may contribute to the difficulty in the Undertaker meeting the air voids requirements in the trimmed back

**Question 3**    **Bound Layers in reinstatements within extended trim-lines failing Air Voids:**

**Cores fail for air voids where the core has been taken in the trim back area around a utility reinstatement, are we required to dig out the existing HA backfill and replace it in compacted layers?**

**Answer 3:**

This answer is based on the assumption that only bound courses have been provided in the trimmed back areas. The Working Party recommends that additional core(s) may be taken in the reinstatement that is not part of the trimmed back area to establish overall air void compliance of the reinstatement, for comparison. If the bound courses in the trimmed back areas fail the air voids requirements, then where remedial work is undertaken it should be limited to the bound courses in the trimmed back areas. The Highway Authority and Undertaker should agree whether the integrity of the existing granular materials is contributing to the inability of the Undertaker to meet the air voids requirements in the trimmed back area.