

HAUC (UK) SROH Working Party response dated 31st May 2016

Questions

It is my understanding that as per S10.2.3 2) all bituminous materials must be compacted and comply with the S10.1.

Restriction for core extraction in air voids section, S10.2.3 4) “with no part of any core being within 100 mm of any surface apparatus within the reinstatement.”

Under Notes for guidance this is explained as NG10.2.3 5) “When taking cores near surface apparatus, Section S10.2.3(4) requires a minimum clearance of 100mm to avoid damaging the apparatus or structure it is bedded on. However it is possible that some surface apparatus may have wider than normal flanges and there may be instances where a greater clearance is required to avoid damage. If doubt exists, liaison with the owner of the apparatus should be undertaken in advance.”

Within the adopted highway there are a number of surface apparatuses where the undertaker has consistently changed their working practice to reduce the size of the excavation so there is no part greater than 200mm from the apparatus. Stopping us from fitting a 100mm core more than 100mm from the apparatus.

As highways authority we are concerned that the undertaker could not compact the material in the correct material lifts. The undertaker is claiming it can't be tested as per the above comment in S10.2.3 4) and minimum trimback from S11.5.1.3 don't apply as it is not a carriageway.

Example:

The works: Installation of a water meter, the surface apparatus is an Atlas Box.

Solution: I would like to core within the trimback. This would be a full 100mm core but would be within the 100mm of the surface apparatus. There is absolutely no risk of damage to the apparatus as the core will be beyond the apparatus and its supports.

As above, if we as the authority extract a core within 100mm of a surface apparatus and cause no damage to the apparatus and we send the core for air void testing and it fails to table S10.1. Are we correct to issue a defect for air voids using this result as valid failure?

Working Party Response:

The review by the HAUC (UK) SROH Working Party (the “SROH WP”) leading up to the current SROH 3rd Edition (England) deliberated in some detail the merits of coring, and adverse implications of not coring reinstatements close to an Undertaker’s Apparatus. The agreed position is set out in the SROH 3rd Edition (England), as reproduced in the Question.

In respect of the engineering underpinning this position, the SROH WP therefore considers a core taken within the 100mm zone, whose results showed a failure to meet the normal Air

Blackburn with Darwent Council - Exemption from Coring [less than 200mm]
[submitted to Highways-side of HAUC (UK) SROH Working Party, 13th November 2015]

HAUC (UK) SROH Working Party response dated 31st May 2016

Voids limits, would not be a non-compliance with the SROH 3rd Edition (England). However, there is potentially a point of law to consider in relation to the question. At this juncture, the SROH WP has not referred for legal opinion.

Supplementary Points (provided for information only):

All Editions of the SROH since 1992 have been consistent in not prescribing a minimum width for any reinstatement, whether close to, or remote from an Undertaker's Apparatus.

The SROH WP is presently considering whether a minimum width of reinstatement should be stated in the proposed SROH 4th Edition. This might support the Questioner's position. The SROH WP has called for evidence to demonstrate that this is a sufficiently widespread area of concern, ahead of advancing its deliberations on this matter.