

River Douglas Crossing - Questions and Answers

- Q1. Are there any CAD drawings available for the site?**
A1. A topographical survey of part of the East river bank and railway embankment, extending to the west river bank, is now included in Appendix E. A topographical survey of the West bank in pdf format is also included
- Q2. The ramps and the steps between riverbank footpaths and greenway/bridge are not clearly explained.**
A2. There are existing footpaths (Public Rights of Way) along each river bank. Appendix B, Section 2 specifies that these are to be linked with the greenway. Ramps will be provided outside the limits of the structure and will be dependent on final land take and greenway alignment at either end of the bridge. Ramps are not to be incorporated into the competition design. A step link between the greenway and the footpath on each riverbank is to be incorporated in the competition design.
- Q3. From the design brief, on the page 4 13.0 i) and iii), both are calling for an elevation. Does it mean we need to show two different elevations, even if a design has two identical mirrored elevations?**
A3. 13.0 i) requires an elevation superimposed on the supplied photograph. This photograph, taken from the South side of the bridge site, is now posted on the competition website for download. 13.0 iii) requires a 1:250 scale elevation, from the South, not superimposed on a photograph.
- Q4. What are the plan extents of the river channel at high tide and/or in flood conditions?**
A4. High tide levels are not known, however, Environment Agency flood data shows the farmland on the East side of the river flooded. It can be assumed that in flood conditions the river overtops the East flood bank at a level of approximately 7.0m.
- Q5. Is the river tidal?**
A5. The River Douglas is tidal at this point.
- Q6. What is the normal depth of the river channel at this point?**
A6. The depth of the river will vary significantly with the tide.
- Q7. To what extent has the Environment Agency been consulted? Have they agreed in principle to construction within the flood plain, and/or to the limits given in the competition brief?**
A7. The Environment Agency has been consulted.
- Q8. Is the river navigable at this point and if so, what are the typical vessels?**
A8. The river now forms part of the link between the Leeds and Liverpool canal and the Lancaster canal and is used by canal boats. The river is currently

navigable by masted vessels as far as the pipe bridge approximately 800m upstream of the bridge site. Construction of the bridge will reduce the length of the River Douglas navigable by masted vessels.

Q9. The brief says in Appendix B, page 1: ...Support points must not reduce the waterway area over a width of 75 m by more than 10%... Does this mean that the supports together can have a maximum width (perpendicular to the flow of the river) of 7.5 m.?

A9. The overall waterway area below 10.0m should not be reduced by more than 10% (see Appendix E for the cross section). In practice, a maximum width of 7.5m should be conservative.

Q10. What does AOD stand for? This acronym is used in Appendix B without explanation.

A10. Above Ordnance Datum

Q11. What are, or will be, the economic drivers and sources of funding for the bridge?

A11. The primary economic driver for the bridge and greenway project is the development and promotion of the Ribble Coast & Wetlands Regional Park as a local and regional environmental asset of international wildlife importance, which as a visitor destination will benefit Central Lancashire's economy. The River Douglas Bridge will facilitate access to Regional Park attractions. REMADE and Lancashire County Council will use the winning bridge design to progress the bridge/greenway scheme and obtain the necessary funding from public and private sources.

Q12. Is the bridge also to take into consideration the banks of the river for public access? Should we provide routes across the river but also along the river? Therefore, does the brief require the river banks and bridge abutments to connect?

A12. There are existing footpaths (Rights of Way) along each bank of the river. The Brief requires these to be linked to the Greenway by steps on both banks incorporated into the competition design (Appendix B, para 2).

Q13. Will there be any boat traffic, now or in the future, under the bridge? If yes, what is the clear allowance required under the bridge?

A13. The river is navigable by canal boats. The minimum required soffit level of the bridge is given in Appendix B, para 3 (i).

Q14. Are the footings and bridge abutments listed?

A14. No.

Q15. Physical Constraints / The Greenway - The brief indicates "a cycleway/bridleway with a minimum width of 4m". Does this mean the total width is to be min. 4m or is there a separate pedestrian lane to be added?

A15. The overall minimum width of the greenway, for all users combined, is to be 4m. There are no additional lanes to be catered for.

- Q16. Connection to path network: Is there any plan showing the future path network the bridge should connect into?**
- A16.** The existing footpath (Public Right of Way) network is shown in Appendix A. The Greenway is the only addition planned at this time. The greenway is expected to run along the route of the old railway line in the area of the bridge.
- Q17. Flood Levels: Could you indicate the maximum flood level to be considered for abutments and eventual foundations of intermediate supports?**
- A17.** The maximum flood level for should be taken as 7.0m AOD
- Q18. Services: Please clarify if there are any services to be integrated in the cross section of the bridge.**
- A18.** There are no services to accommodate on the bridge. There is an existing surface water drain, with a manhole in the West abutment, draining into the river.
- Q19. Lighting: Is there a lighting concept to be developed / would this item be included in the overall budget?**
- A19.** Lighting of the bridge may be considered at some time but is not to be included in the competition design.
- Q20. Drainage: Is it possible to drain directly from the bridge deck into the river?**
- A20.** Yes
- Q21. Documents: Is there any photograph available taken from ground level and showing the whole site?**
- A21.** There is a photograph of the site, from the South, included with the brief (elevation photograph.jpg)
- Q22. What is the current site ownership situation and does it bear any implications on the future development of the scheme?**
- A22.** All areas of the site are in private ownership and this may have implications on the future development of the scheme.
- Q23. Are there any access restrictions or easements that we would need to consider should we decide to build close to the existing river flood defence banks?**
- A23.** The integrity of the existing flood defences is to be maintained.
- Q24. Is there any information on the location of the existing railway bridge footings?**
- A24.** The remains of 2No, 1.25m diameter concrete filled iron pipes at 3.6m centres are visible approximately 8m in front of the west abutment. No other remains of the intermediate supports of the demolished railway bridge are visible. Photographs of the bridge are included in Appendix C
- Q25. Are there any restrictions on visiting the site?**
- A25.** Most of the site is in private ownership and is not open to the public. Whilst there are public Rights of Way along each river bank, these are linked to the highway network a considerable distance from the bridge site. There are also

no formal parking facilities anywhere near the site. A second escorted site visit is being arranged for 11th June: places can be booked via RIBA.

Q26. The brief refers to *maximizing habitat connectivity*. Can you expand on what this means?

A26. Routes for wildlife to travel under the greenway should be incorporated in the design. At abutment level, this could take the form of tunnels or pipes or providing approach span(s) to lift the greenway clear of the ground.

Q27. Is any further information available about the strength and condition of the existing abutments?

A27. All available information relating to the existing abutments is contained in Appendices C and G and Appendix D which will be available shortly.

Q28. I've noticed under the eligibility section it mentions the teams should be architect-led. Would it be acceptable for the team to be led by an engineer instead?

A28. Yes, this is acceptable provided that a registered architect forms part of the team.