

Jacob Gemma

From: Sterritt Garry
Sent: 04 April 2019 09:08
To: Hawthorn Ian: H&F
Subject: RE: Hammersmith - Cat III checker comment on ped loading

Sorry, and what I should have been clearer about – I think we should use the target of getting works on site within 12 months.

From: Sterritt Garry
Sent: 04 April 2019 08:57
To: 'Hawthorn Ian: H&F'
Subject: RE: Hammersmith - Cat III checker comment on ped loading

Ian,

I understand your frustrations, I would love us to be further progressed than we are, it frustrates me as well.

As I've said before, it would not be sensible or prudent to embark on a £40m to £50m project without fully completing robust investigations, assessments and feasibility first. That must be done – and the advice we have received from LoBEG has always been sound. I was advised last week that feasibility will be complete by May (I'll check again today) and then concept/detailed design can commence (which we have committed to fund). This project has top level visibility/briefing in TfL and is being pushed hard. I think 12 months should be realistic to complete the design works.

We are happy to support you in defining and funding enhanced inspection regimes/monitoring during that period – regardless of the restrictions on the bridge in the interim, this needs to be done. I thought this was already happening as Duro has told me about potential monitoring and I've said we would fund it.

As you know, the government removed TfLs grant and it was that money that funded borough LIP programmes. We (TfL) are now paying for LIP funding out of fare paying and commercial revenue – that's a very difficult position for us.

We have put together a range of funding options that are being actively considered – and as I'm sure you will appreciate a frequent question is "why is TfL paying for a bridge that is not ours?". The changing funding position makes this a harder question to answer.

However, rest assured, in making the case we are highlighting the importance of the bridge to London and the value of investing in it. Is funding guaranteed? Unfortunately not; but we have the design money committed and that gives us time in parallel to work with everyone (you, City Hall, Gov't) to find the funding needed – and I'm confident that can be done given how important the bridge is.

Give me a call if you would like to discuss.

Regards,

Garry

From: Hawthorn Ian: H&F [mailto:██████████@lbhf.gov.uk]
Sent: 04 April 2019 08:04
To: Sterritt Garry
Subject: Re: Hammersmith - Cat III checker comment on ped loading

Quite simply you cannot guarantee any work on the bridge for a number of years. If it was short term we could live with it but this is not short term is it Garry. The question we will be asked is when will the works be happening and how long will the restrictions last what's the answer?

The way things are shaping up we are looking at least another couple of years of exploring the options and Misba is going on about LoBEG involvement being reintroduced again so we better make that 3 years then. Refurbishment is a long way off and there wouldn't be an issue if we had any confidence in finding a resolution to the options or that TfL would discover a sense of urgency to get the works done. I have not seen any evidence that TfL are willing to speed the process up. I have seen the emails from your commercial team.

Guarantee me that we will be working on the bridge in the next 12 months and I would support a single bus option but I know you can't.

Members may go with the single bus option but it will have a time limit. They will not put up with another two years of evaluated the design options with single bus restrictions in place. That is a tired answer we are giving out at the moment.

And if as I believe we are really talking about any major work happening for a number of years then we need to start protecting the bridge we have got now before it gets any worst.

The reason we have weekly inspection on the bridge was me insisting on them when TfL were pushing monthly. Otherwise the report would be much worst.

Are TfL prepared to fund me finding extra resource to undertake this enhanced inspections. There has been a constant battle with TfL for funding of staff to work on Hammersmith Bridge because you appear to not be able to make a decision without getting LoBEG approval and they always want to drive costs down. We need experts to work on the bridge not graduates.

No easy answer I'm afraid only difficult ones.

Regards

Ian

Get [Outlook for iOS](#)

From: Sterritt Garry <[REDACTED]@tfl.gov.uk>
Sent: Thursday, April 4, 2019 7:30 am
To: Hawthorn Ian: H&F
Subject: RE: Hammersmith - Cat III checker comment on ped loading

Ok, the current version of the Safety Case states that one bus is permissible on the grounds of an enhanced inspection regime and traffic enforcement (for buses and other vehicles). If you go to no buses it will be important to have an explanation as to why you felt the need to go further than the safety case recommendation – because ultimately the Safety Case may be FOI'd.

From: Hawthorn Ian: H&F [mailto:[REDACTED]@lbhf.gov.uk]
Sent: 04 April 2019 07:21
To: Sterritt Garry
Subject: Re: Hammersmith - Cat III checker comment on ped loading

I will force the issue on Monday so yes you will have a decision whether to move to single buses or a complete closure. It's a recommendation from me that doesn't mean it will be accepted.

Ian

Get [Outlook for iOS](#)

From: Sterritt Garry [REDACTED]@tfl.gov.uk>
Sent: Thursday, April 4, 2019 7:18 am
To: Hawthorn Ian: H&F
Subject: RE: Hammersmith - Cat III checker comment on ped loading

Thanks for the update...are you able to guarantee a decision by CoP Monday? If yes I'll try to see if I can defer the deputy Mayor briefing until then.

Going to no buses will be severe and we will face a lot of tough questions to explain why so lines will need to be fully developed. That said, the sooner we can have a firm decision the better.

From: Hawthorn Ian: H&F [mailto:[REDACTED]@lbhf.gov.uk]
Sent: 04 April 2019 07:13
To: Sterritt Garry
Subject: Re: Hammersmith - Cat III checker comment on ped loading

Good Morning Garry

I know that problem.

I am meeting Members and Strategic Director on Monday to discuss options. To be fair to TfL one option is to ban buses completely and enhance restrictions so that only light vehicles are using the bridge.

It is an option that I will be recommending with no end in sight of getting a design even agreed let alone any work being done. I don't believe we have the luxury of even going to a single bus option as we need to start protecting the bridge now with no refurbishment any where near being likely for some time.

So on Monday you will get a decision.

Regards

Ian

Get [Outlook for iOS](#)

From: Sterritt Garry <[REDACTED]@tfl.gov.uk>
Sent: Thursday, April 4, 2019 7:00 am
To: Hawthorn Ian: H&F
Subject: RE: Hammersmith - Cat III checker comment on ped loading

Ian,

It would help if I could type the message first before pressing send!

Given the message below, are you (H&F) content with the robustness of the Motts analysis, or might there be further findings from the Cat III check. Our (TfL) understanding is that your current plan, based on the Motts report, is to formally inform us to move to one bus at the end of April. The changes to bus services required to achieve this are considerable and there will be major impacts on customers; therefore it is vital that our decision making is robust.

If you think a further review of the Motts work is required we will be happy to support where we can.

Also, given the timeline, communications about bus service changes need to be going out ASAP – therefore do we know when the Cat III check will be finished – it would look bad if we go out with comms and then have to change the position. Rest assured, any comms will be agreed with yourselves before going out.

Regards,

Garry.

From: Sterritt Garry
Sent: 04 April 2019 06:49
To: Ian Hawthorn
Subject: FW: Hammersmith - Cat III checker comment on ped loading

From: Basic Duro (ST)
Sent: 02 April 2019 16:05
To: Sterritt Garry
Cc: English Richard
Subject: FW: Hammersmith - Cat III checker comment on ped loading

Hi Garry,

FYI, it appears that the Cat III checker found some mistake within Motts calculations, potentially resulting in additional works required (and costs) in order to achieve our preferred option (double decker buses loading). See the below

This will certainly prolong the currently slow programme of the project even further

Regards

Duro

From: Patro, Sivaji S [mailto:██████████@mottmac.com]
Sent: 02 April 2019 15:42
To: Alizadeh Anvar: H&F
Cc: Moodley Nicky: H&F; Ahmed Misba; Basic Duro (ST); Abbott, Tim C; Schmidt, John A; Rusev, Rusi A
Subject: Hammersmith - Cat III checker comment on ped loading

Anvar,

As discussed over phone today please note that following the comments made by the Cat III checker during the meeting on 22.Mar.2019 for results comparison (dated 14.Dec.2018), we have reviewed our pedestrian loading input and have found a typo in some of the inputs.

We have corrected these and are reviewing the effect of the increased loading. This is an early notification.

Please note that although not completed, our review indicates that due to the increase in loading, Sc.4B-2 (7.5T HA + 2x19.5T buses per lane) will not be achievable without strengthening to the chains in the vicinity of the tower saddles.

We will complete our review and provide further details once Cat III checker have completed their check and given their final comments.

Regards,

Sivaji

Sivaji Patro
Projects Director

D + [REDACTED]
F [REDACTED]
[REDACTED]@mottmac.com

T [REDACTED]
M + [REDACTED]



Mott MacDonald
Mott MacDonald House
8-10 Sydenham Road
Croydon CR0 2EE
United Kingdom

[Website](#) | [Twitter](#) | [LinkedIn](#) | [Facebook](#) | [YouTube](#)

Mott MacDonald Limited. Registered in England and Wales no. 1243967. Registered office: Mott MacDonald House, 8-10 Sydenham Road, Croydon CR0 2EE, United Kingdom

The information contained in this e-mail is intended only for the person or entity to which it is addressed and may contain confidential and/or privileged material. If you are not the intended recipient of this e-mail, the use of this information or any disclosure, copying or distribution is prohibited and may be unlawful. If you received this in error, please contact the sender and delete the material from any computer.

Click [here](#) to report this email as SPAM.

The contents of this e-mail and any attached files are confidential. If you have received this email in error, please notify us immediately at postmaster@tfl.gov.uk and remove it from your system. If received in error, please do not use, disseminate, forward, print or copy this email or its content. Transport for London excludes any warranty and any liability as to the quality or accuracy of the contents of this email and any attached files.

Transport for London is a statutory corporation whose principal office is at 55 Broadway, London, SW1H 0DB. Further information about Transport for London's subsidiary companies can be found on the following link: <http://www.tfl.gov.uk/corporate/about-tfl/>

Although TfL have scanned this email (including attachments) for viruses, recipients are advised to carry out their own virus check before opening any attachments, as TfL accepts no liability for any loss, or damage which may be caused by viruses.

Do it online at www.lbhf.gov.uk

Help us keep your council tax bill down and protect spending on vital public services - use our website to find

information, view your account, make payments, apply for services and report problems.

New - create an account - Want to manage your council tax, benefits claim or parking permits online? Create an account now at www.lbhf.gov.uk/myaccount

If you have received this email in error, please delete it and tell the sender as soon as possible. You should not disclose the contents to any other person or take copies.

All emails you send over the internet are not secure unless they have been encrypted. For further details, please see: www.getsafeonline.org/protecting-yourself

Do it online at www.lbhf.gov.uk

Help us keep your council tax bill down and protect spending on vital public services - use our website to find information, view your account, make payments, apply for services and report problems.

New - create an account - Want to manage your council tax, benefits claim or parking permits online? Create an account now at www.lbhf.gov.uk/myaccount

If you have received this email in error, please delete it and tell the sender as soon as possible. You should not disclose the contents to any other person or take copies.

All emails you send over the internet are not secure unless they have been encrypted. For further details, please see: www.getsafeonline.org/protecting-yourself

Do it online at www.lbhf.gov.uk

Help us keep your council tax bill down and protect spending on vital public services - use our website to find information, view your account, make payments, apply for services and report problems.

New - create an account - Want to manage your council tax, benefits claim or parking permits online? Create an account now at www.lbhf.gov.uk/myaccount

If you have received this email in error, please delete it and tell the sender as soon as possible. You should not disclose the contents to any other person or take copies.

All emails you send over the internet are not secure unless they have been encrypted. For further details, please see: www.getsafeonline.org/protecting-yourself
