

**Phil Hamshaw**

---

**From:** Carling, Terry <[REDACTED]>  
**Sent:** 09 June 2021 14:51  
**To:** Phil Hamshaw  
**Cc:** Harwood, Paul  
**Subject:** RVR departure 102131\_0 - Rework clarification [Filed 09 Jun 2021 18:31]

Hi Phil

Further clarification of the points raised in this morning's meeting:

Point 17. It should be noted that SSDs for the southbound approach to the level crossing should be measured from the ICD at the exit of the roundabout in accordance with CD116 clause 3.50 NOTE. Any see-through across the roundabout central island should not be considered as providing visibility to the crossing as road users approaching the roundabout will be focussed on negotiating the roundabout itself.

Point 23. The SRA predominantly provides a risk comparison of the implementation of mitigation measures assuming the crossing is already in place. There is a request for a comparison between a do-nothing scenario and the introduction of the level crossing as it is common in highway projects to provide a risk comparison between the existing situation and the provision of the new junction. The driver for the provision of a new junction can be to improve the safety of the carriageway. It is clear that the majority of the risks of a do-nothing situation will be lower than the do something in this case. However, having spoken to my colleagues, and the fact that this appears to be a special situation, it was decided that this was not required in this case.

Point 24. The Departures Manual clause 5.4 requires a comparison between the non-compliant option and a compliant option. The compliant option would be an option that removes the need for the departure at this location. In this case the compliant option would be the grade separated options and the non-compliant option would be the level crossing. A risk comparison with regard to construction, operation and future maintenance of the options is required, and all populations must be considered.

Point 29. Regarding the BCR for the project, part of the proposal uses the cost comparison between the level crossing and a grade separated option as the basis of the BCR. However, another part of the submission uses the local economic benefits against the costs of both an at-grade and grade separated options. Highway design options take into account local economic benefits in BCR calculations. In this case, when factoring in local economic benefits, both options provide a BCR which would be acceptable and provide value for money. Clarification should be provided as to which BCR is proposed to be the driver behind the choice of an at-grade or grade separated crossing.

Regards

Terry

**Terry Carling, Senior Technical Advisor, Safer Roads Design,  
Safety, Engineering & Standards**

[REDACTED]  
[REDACTED]  
[REDACTED]

Web: [www.highwaysengland.co.uk](http://www.highwaysengland.co.uk)

This email may contain information which is confidential and is intended only for use of the recipient/s named above. If you are not an intended recipient, you are hereby notified that any copying, distribution, disclosure, reliance upon or other use of the contents of this email is strictly prohibited. If you have received this email in error, please notify the sender and destroy it.

**Highways England Company Limited** | [REDACTED]  
[REDACTED]  
[REDACTED]

[REDACTED]  
[REDACTED]

Consider the environment. Please don't print this e-mail unless you really need to.