



Joint Secretaries
Guy Townsend
Fibernet
Rosalind House,
Jays Close
Viables,
Basingstoke RG22 4BS
Tel: 01256 858580
Fax: 01256 858601
E-mail: gtownsend@fibernet.co.uk

Barry Lucas
Principal Technical Officer
Islington Council
Fourth Floor, Laycock Wing
222 Upper Street, London, N1 1YA
Tel: 0207 527 2582
Fax: 0207 527 2194
E-Mail: barry.lucas@islington.gov.uk

Quarterly Meeting

**Held at TfL offices at Eccleston Place, London
on the 29th July 2005.**

Attendees:

Peter Loft	Thames Water, Chairman,
Steve Barriff	Corporation of London, Joint Chairman
Guy Townsend	Fibernet, Joint Secretary
Barry Lucas	L B Islington, (North & East London), Joint Secretary
Louise Nagle	London Borough of Hammersmith and Fulham, (West London)
Jim McTiernan	Metropolitan Police
Dave Lambert	London Borough of Bromley, (South London)
Eddy Owen	3 Valleys Water
Bob Bayley	Transport for London
Nigel Bennett	National Grid Transco
Roger Khanna	London Borough of Hammersmith and Fulham, (LoTAG)
Peter Dixon	London Borough of Croydon, (South London)
Keith O'Brien	Thus
Ron Weaver	Telewest
Barry Rainger	BT
Mark Barber	EDF

Apologies:

Tony Pegrum	Royal Borough of Kensington & Chelsea, (West London)
Julie Ulliott	National Grid Transco
Mark Ostheimer	NTL
Jim Blewett	Transport for London
Steve Leeks	EDF Energy

Item

2 Minutes from previous meeting

Minutes of the previous meeting held on the 21st April 2005 were read for accuracy and agreed.

Amendments;

Page 1.

Nigel Bennett represents National Grid Transco and not Nation Grid Transco as printed.

Page 3.

Barry Rainger replaces Andy Swift on LJUG, not Barry Grainger as printed.

Action

3 National and Regional HAUC matters

Steve Barriff reported:

High Speed Roads.

Highways Agency has set up a group to examine temporary traffic management on lower speed roads. There was concern that the HSE would adopt recommendations for TTM on 50 mph roads for all roads with speed restrictions below that.

Compliance Testing.

Final draft of the C.S.S's report is due to be presented to HAUC (UK). It was suggested that a coring programme for England and Wales be set up with the results being presented to the Secretary for State, similar to the RAUC system. There was some discussion about the sample size, RAUC currently taking a 2% sample whereas NSWHG wanted a 5% sample.

Temporary ATS.

NJUG are reported to have submitted their legal opinion on the use of temporary ATS to DfT and have requested a decision on the appropriateness of the NSWHG approved form when used for two-way traffic working.

Codes of Practice.

Coordination.

BB reported that the consultation had now been completed. The DfT had taken note of some issues and were due to report to the Minister by the end of July 2005.

Reinstatement.

DL said that the working party were still awaiting the simplified CoP. There were plans for a meeting of the working party in November 2005. The Specification will be refreshed but not rewritten.

Training.

The paper by the Working Party was not well received by HAUC (UK).

They asked that some ideas be re-examined.

[It was acknowledged, by London HAUC, that a skills gap had developed in the industry but this was no excuse for either HA's or Utility contractors failing to ensure that they employed suitably qualified staff. It was also agreed by London HAUC that a nationally recognised qualification in Streetworks Administration was long overdue].

PL/SB

Inspections.

Discussions have been held in respect of representation on the working party. It was unknown if any agreement had been reached.

Diversions Works.

This had stalled at HAUC (UK). HA's are unwilling to pay for estimates from utility companies.

4 Traffic Management Act 2004.

BB reported that the responses to the consultation had been discussed and some compromises offered, however the DfT had not yet made any decision. Once this had been made, and it was not expected until September 2005, the working parties would have to reconvene.

5 Transport for London

BB reported that work is progressing, albeit slowly, on LondonWorks and the central registers. He said that problems had arisen due to the stalling of other regulatory documents. The likely implementation date is July 2006.

LN reports that LOTAG were in the process of preparing a 'Good Practice' document for filming on the highway.

6 Metropolitan Police Issues

Emergency closures.

JMcT said that utility companies had asked for a single contact point for emergency closures. He reported that the internal communication system of the Metropolitan Police was currently in a state of flux and that such calls should be referred to the MetroComm number at the LTCC. All

JMcT informed the meeting that he was being transferred to the Policy Unit of the Traffic Division and that his place at future London HAUC meetings would be taken by Neil Davies (TD Drummond Crescent). ND

BB asked whether the Metropolitan Police were asking for gang details in Westminster and Camden as part of their response to ongoing terrorists threats. JMcT agreed to check. JMcT

RK expressed concern about leachates from the burn-off of acetone devices. He asked for advice from the water companies. EO/PL

7 London HAUC Emergency Plan

LN said that there appeared to be no guidance for Traffic Managers or utility companies on what actions should be taken in the wake of incidents such as those on 7th July. She suggested that a small working party be established to prepare such guidance. LN/SB
/PL/KO'B

It was also suggested that London HAUC seek to clarify the Road Traffic Act in relation to Commissioner's Powers.

8 London HAUC website

BR reported that the site had now been built and now waited populating. BB said that items for inclusion should be sent to Dagmara Kawecki at TfL. All

9 Improvement Notices

GT reported that he had received copies of a number of improvement notices and asked what he should be doing to progress them.

PL replied that a protocol had been established some years previously. It was agreed that it should be re-circulated and updated where required.

LN said that a dispute had arisen over improvement notices issued by Hammersmith & Fulham. Utility companies are insisting that these notices can only be issued on the 30% random samples whereas H&F issue improvement notices on all inspections with the 30% cited by the utilities is for financial provisions only.

BR replied stating that the 30% sample was used for improvement notices so that performance monitoring could be carried out. He added that improvements were being made although the notice was not formally recognised.

*RK to
supply
Sec
with
copy*

LSWHG

10 Highway Authority Resurfacing

KO'B raised the subject of highway authority resurfacing works and the covering over of utility covers. He said that this was a regular item at borough co-ordination meetings but there had been no improvement in the situation. He said that often utilities were not notified of works and some of the on-site supervision was not as good as it could be. The highways side replied to this by citing the poor response from utilities when asked to adjust the level of their covers.

The utility side requested that Highway Authorities keep better records of major works.

BTL raised the question of resin or plastic covers used in the carriageway. He asked whether they were fit for purpose after being subjected to the temperatures involved in carriageway resurfacing.

RK brought to the attention of the meeting the forthcoming Roads 2000 Seminar at the Novotel Hammersmith.

All

11 Matters Arising from previous minutes not on agenda

The CLP London Considerate Contractor scheme appears to have lost a little impetus on the departure of Eleanor Purser from the project.

The Westminster scheme is currently progressing and the introduction of a TfL scheme is likely.

It was requested that the current Traffic Manager list be circulated.

Members were urged to register for the SEHAUC event at Sandown Park.

All

NB reported that National Grid Transco will be renamed National Grid from October.

Southern Gas Networks should now be attending South London area quarterly co-ordination meetings.

12 **Any Other Business**

PD asked whether there was a policy of first time reinstatement in conservation areas. He said that special materials were disappearing from work sites and not reappearing.

The utility side confirmed that they endeavoured, where practicable, to carry out first time reinstatement for just that reason.

PD reported that a South London borough wanted to bring a s74 dispute to London HAUC for conciliation. SB suggested that a written request stating the background should be the first step.

RK advised the meeting that local elections would be held in May 2006. He said that one of the matters being raised would be smarter/cleaner borough. He asked that all works be properly barriered off to prevent open excavations becoming litter bins.

EO reported that he'd tried to contact TfL after an incident and had called the given emergency number for three hours before getting a response. He asked for an out-of-hours contact number for each highway authority.

BB

BB reported that NJUG had suggested resurrecting the all regions HAUC.

PL informed the meeting that William Talbot of Camden Council had suddenly been taken ill. The meeting wished him a speedy recovery.

13 **Date of next meeting**

28th October 2005, commencing at 10.00

Report to HAUC(UK) from joint chairs of the Specification Working Party

The Review of the Specification for the Reinstatement of Openings in the Highway (SROH)

1) **Summary:** This report looks at the need to update the SROH and recommends that a refresh of the Specification is undertaken to ensure that it reflects the current best practices and technical standards.

2)**Introduction:** (i) A report on the status of the 2nd edition of SROH was taken to HAUC(uk) on 20-04-2005 and a scoping study was requested to assess the extent of any review of the specification. The specification has been adopted in England and Scotland but the 1st edition is currently used in Wales and a Hybrid version in NI. The second edition for NI substantially adopts the 2nd Edition, and is presently with Brussels, ahead of implementation in NI this year.

3) Scoping study of the SROH

(i) It is inevitable that this specification is fixed in time because it is statutory and enacted by regulation and therefore becomes out of date as soon as new standards and practices are adopted. The harmonisation of European Standards has accelerated this process and whilst these changes are mainly around using consistent terminology the existing specification needs to be updated. Currently the HAUC website is used to advise users of any new standards or issues that affect users of the standard. The web advice is however not mandatory in the context of the specification document.

(ii) Feedback from users, as presented at the April HAUC(UK) meeting and at the national conference has shown that the layout and content is readily navigated and understood. However there was concern about the complexity of the document, cross referencing and large number of options and there is a strong call for simplification especially for site use. Tabulation of the material options is an example of the kind of simplification that may be considered. Clarity on the purpose and status of 'Notes for Guidance' within the SROH is also required.

A Handbook on the SROH is due to published shortly and this will help site staff and operatives and overcome some criticisms of the SROH. This was also discussed at the April HAUC (UK) meeting, at which it was noted that the work to produce the handbook was substantially completed by the Working Party and TRL within 9 months of the 2nd Edition coming into force.

(iii) Since its publication a number of ambiguities, errors and technical omissions have come to light and whilst these have been dealt with through the website ideally they need to be corrected in an updated version. The number and impact of these changes is relatively small overall.

(iv) Technical standards, advice and new initiatives have progressed since its publication and these need to be reflected in any updated version.

Examples of these include the:

- New DfT design standard HD28/04 for skid resistance criteria,
- Advice on the use of SMA and over-banding.

(v) There are opportunities to promote within a revised specification the increased use and development of Sustainable materials, SMR's and SMF's

(vi) There is a need to consider the external approval of reinstatement materials by BBA/HAPAS

(vii) Compliance testing: there is an opportunity to develop the outcomes of the CSS project on compliance testing with the Specification.

(4) **Conclusions:** Users of the Specification are familiar with its format and there is not a strong case to completely reshape or totally revise the document at this time. Updating and correcting the Specification would however be beneficial together with opportunities to include and develop initiatives such as sustainable working and compliance testing.

Currently the 2nd Edition of the Specification is not used consistently across the countries of the UK and an update will give an opportunity for a full UK take up. It is hoped this will be assisted by the fact that the membership of the Working Party has representation across all 4 domestic countries.

The updating of any technical document is complex and it is important that full records are kept of changes and the reasons for the changes. There will be a need for support in this area and it is recommended that the DfT will assist here.

Specialist input will also be required for any review and it is proposed that this is sought through HAUC (UK) or the DfT as necessary.

(5) **Recommendations:**

- (i) It is recommended that the Specification Working Group refresh the existing SROH to reflect the issues raised in this scoping study and that this is commenced in July 2005 with an aim for completion of the Draft for consultation by July 2006.
- (ii) That editorial and technical support is provided through the DfT and HAUC (UK) as appropriate.

Kevin Fuller

Alan Rainford

Joint Chairs of HAUC Specification Working Party.