

22 February 2021

Wards: Drypool

<b>Sculcoates Bridge Feasibility Study</b>
--

**Report of the** Director of Regeneration

This item is not exempt  
Therefore exempt reasons are not applicable

**However, whilst this is not an exempt report, the attached Appendix is not for publication by virtue of paragraph 3 of Part 1 of Schedule 12 A of the Local Government Act 1972 as the report contains commercial information relating to the financial or business affairs of any particular person (including the authority holding that information) and the public interest in maintaining the exemption outweighs the public interest in disclosing the information, as the report contains commercial information relating to the bidding companies which it would not be in the public interest to disclose.**

This is a key decision. The matter is in the Forward Plan  
Forward Plan Reference Number : 0062/20

1. Purpose of the Report and Summary

- 1.1 This report outlines the findings of an independent feasibility study (and subsequent independent peer review) of the 146 year old, Grade II listed structure, Sculcoates Bridge, known locally due to its location, as Chapman Street Bridge. Based on those findings, the officer recommendation of the Council's bridge engineering team, is also indicated in this report and seeks a decision on which way to proceed.

To also seek authorisation for the Assistant Director – Streetscene for the delegated authorisation to proceed with the preferred option through design to commissioning.

Seek confirmation of the appropriate budget allocation.

## 2. Recommendations

- 2.1 That the preferred option F1 of appendix 1 is selected, whereby the bridge is fully refurbished and brought back into service with an enforced restricted weight limit and measures to physically restrict prohibited vehicles (by way of height restriction) to protect the bridge from overloading and thus, the life expectancy of the bridge.

Appropriate capital budget is allocated

The delegated authority is given to the Assistant Director – Streetscene to proceed to design and commission the complete works.

## 3. Reasons for Recommendations

- 3.1 It was noted by the Council's bridge engineers that the original feasibility report had not addressed some of the residual risks identified by the Bridges Team, therefore a peer review and detailed assessment of the potential costs was also commissioned to reduce, as much as is possible, the risk of unforeseen risk and costs. It is standard practice for contingency to be included in projects such as these, however it was felt that the consultant's preferred option had the potential to leave the Council vulnerable to incurring significantly increased, unplanned costs that were not budgeted for and would be covered by costly uncompetitive compensation events, or even result in the suspension of the scheme if the costs became untenable.

The peer review generally agreed with the officer assessment of the report and supported the validity of their concerns regarding the viability of the proposed options.

This preferred option also takes account of other associated issues that if left, would only mean revisiting the bridge again to undertake further works again in the near future.

This option negates the need for a replacement bridge and retains the listed building requirements and could therefore be justified under a spend to save business case.

## 4. Impact on other Executive Committees (including Area Committees)

- 4.1 All of the relevant Executive Committees and Area Committees will be consulted and advised of the impact as per the Corporate formal report process.

There is little to no significant impact on the traffic management as verified by traffic assessments.

## 5. Background

- 5.1 Sculcoates Bridge is a two span bridge comprising of a concrete slab fixed span and wrought iron swing span. The highway bridge was opened to users in 1874 and spans the River Hull on Chapman Street. Over its service life the bridge has had various repair/strengthening works carried out both structurally and operationally.

The most recent of these strengthening works being in the early 1980's. In 1999 an assessment of the structure resulted in the imposition of a 3t weight restriction on the bridge in the early 2000's.

In July 2019 the bridge was closed to all users for several weeks to carry out essential repairs to the timber footways. At the same time as the timber repair works were carried out a Principal Inspection of the structure was undertaken. The inspection recommended that further investigation work and a new assessment is carried out. The further investigation work and assessment showed the bridge condition to have deteriorated to a state that the bridge needed to be closed to all vehicles. The bridge was closed in April 2020 and this remains the current position to date.

## 6. Issues for Consideration

### 6.1 **Current Situation**

Following routine principal and planned inspections together with on-going reactive works, it became clear that the bridge was deteriorating more quickly than anticipated therefore, a study was commissioned to look at a range of options for the bridge.

#### **Other Considerations**

With structures of this kind, it is often difficult to ascertain other critical elements which can sometimes be unearthed as work commences therefore given the options available, further work was commissioned to give an improved ballpark of the cost estimates in order that the Council is close to understanding a final figure and timescales.

The outcome of that work is shown at Appendix 2.

Bridge works like this are extensive and require consultations and permissions linked to the listed status. It is anticipated that works will commence on site in the financial year 22/23 and be completed in the financial year 23/24.

#### **Traffic Movements and Safety**

River traffic has priority over the road traffic with the river feeding two major nearby industries namely oil.

As with any bridge structure, safety is paramount and will always take precedence over other issues. The bridge currently has restricted access to maintain safety. This will continue so long as on-going assessments deem it safe to do so or until the works are completed.

## 7. Options and Risk Assessment

7.1 The study has considered the feasibility of 6 main options for the future management of Sculcoates bridge, with variations of loading. Options include;

- A - Refurbish & re-open,
- B - Restrict and monitor,
- C - Close & conserve
- D - Relocate and replace
- E – Remove
- F- Extended Refurbishment

The options, their subsets and the associated officer risk assessment are detailed in Appendix 1

## 8. Consultation

8.1 Due to the varied options, consultation will be undertaken as the scheme develops but will include the Planning Authority, MMO, Historic England, local businesses & river users.

## 9. Comments of the Monitoring Officer (Director of Legal Services and Partnerships)

9.1 Sculcoates Bridge forms part of the city's highway network. The Council has a duty under S. 41 Highways Act 1980 to maintain the public highway as well as a duty to secure the expeditious movement of traffic on its network under S. 16 Traffic Management Act 2004. As a listed building, the bridge's architectural and historic character should also be preserved. Care also needs to be taken should any works, deterioration or other alteration impact negatively on river users or affect navigation. There is therefore a compelling case for preservation and refurbishment, although subject to constraints as to future use, which can be achieved through implementation of traffic regulation orders. It should be noted that the present closure may not lawfully continue indefinitely, as this is time-limited by virtue of S. 14 Road Traffic Regulation Act 1984.

## 10. Comments of the Section 151 Officer (Director of Finance and Transformation)

- 10.1 The Director of Finance & Transformation notes the outcome of this study into Sculcoates Bridge (aka Chapman Street bridge) & the options.

The draft capital programme to be presented to Council for approval in February contains £6.5m for this bridge in 2022/2023 only. Option F1 is just achievable within the financial constraints of the proposed budgets subject to no future overspends. (GS)

11. Comments of Assistant Director of HR & OD and compliance with the Equality Duty

- 11.1 There are no staffing issues arising from the recommended action, in terms of equality it is preferable to have the bridge operational to provide access across the river.

12. Comments of Overview and Scrutiny

- 12.1 This report was considered by the Infrastructure and Energy Overview and Scrutiny Commission at its meeting of Wednesday, 10 February, 2021. The Commission supported the recommendation at section 2 of the officer report. (Ref.6024)

13. Comments of the Portfolio Holder for Economic Investment, Regeneration, Planning Land and Property (Councillor Hale)

- 13.1 "I fully support the recommendations."

Mark Jones

Contact Officer: Peter Curry Telephone No.: 614860

Officer Interests: None

Background Documents: -

Appendix 1 – Options & Assessment

Appendix 2 – Costings and Timings

Technical References – Alan Woods, Mason Clark Reports

## Implications Matrix

**This section must be completed and you must ensure that you have fully considered all potential implications**

This matrix provides a simple check list for the things you need to have considered within your report

If there are no implications please state

I have informed and sought advice from HR, Legal, Finance, Overview and Scrutiny and the Climate Change Advisor and any other key stakeholders i.e. Portfolio Holder, relevant Ward Members etc prior to submitting this report for official comments	Yes
I have considered whether this report requests a decision that is outside the Budget and Policy Framework approved by Council	Yes
Value for money considerations have been accounted for within the report	Yes
The report is approved by the relevant Assistant Director	Yes
I have included any procurement/commercial issues/implications within the report	Yes
I have considered the potential media interest in this report and liaised with the Media Team to ensure that they are briefed to respond to media interest.	Yes
I have included any equalities and diversity implications within the report and where necessary I have completed an Equalities Impact Assessment and the outcomes are included within the report	No
Any Health and Safety implications are included within the report	Yes
Any human rights implications are included within the report	No
I have included any community safety implications and paid regard to Section 17 of the Crime and Disorder Act within the report	No
I have liaised with the Climate Change Advisor and any environmental and climate change issues/sustainability implications are included within the report	No
I have included information about how this report contributes to the City Plan/ Area priorities within the report	No
I have considered the impact on air quality, carried out an appropriate assessment and included any resulting actions or opportunities necessary to improve air quality in the report.	No