

[REDACTED]

From:

Sent:

[REDACTED]
21 April 2026 09:39

To:

Cc:

Subject:

[REDACTED]
[REDACTED]
Re: 9309-PTSI -Provision of Tech Approval- M4 23A-24 51Bishton Llanmartin-CS470
A4 & A6_P02

All,

For completeness:-

- CS 470 measures: The recommendation presented in the CS 470 A6, northbound lane closure of Waltwood Road and live monitoring is accepted. Option to implement a weight restriction was discussed but discounted, as there is no alternative access route for heavy vehicles, meaning such a restriction could be disregarded. A “give way to oncoming traffic” arrangement could be considered if the lane closure becomes too disruptive.
- Also, at present, it is unclear how the CS 470 interim measures would be removed; this is partly because they are addressing the likelihood of further impacts rather than any inherent structural inadequacy. The assessment, PTSI, and concrete testing will help to improve our current understanding of the structure; however, it appears that, even where the updated assessment concludes that the structure is adequate, this alone may not, in itself, remove the need for measures to prevent further impacts. Therefore, a review of the options proposed by CAPITA should be initiated as soon as practicable to help inform the long-term strategy once all relevant information is available.

Actions:-

1. TAA to provide comments on the AiP.
2. WSP to proceed with the assessment once the AiP is agreed with the TAA.
3. In relation to appointing a Category 3 checker, SWTRA will separately instruct WSP to prepare a document for tender for a mini-competition.

Regards,

[REDACTED]

[REDACTED]

[REDACTED]

[REDACTED]

[REDACTED]

Croesewir gohebiaeth yn y Gymraeg a byddwn yn ymdrin â gohebiaeth Gymraeg a Saesneg i'r un safonau ac amserlenni.
We welcome correspondence in Welsh and will deal with Welsh and English correspondence to the same standards and timescales.

Mae'r e-bost ac unrhyw ffeiliau sy'n cael eu trosglwyddo gyda'r e-bost yn gyfrinachol ac at ddefnydd yr unigolyn eu'r endid y cyfeirir yr e-bost ato yn unig. Os ydych wedi derbyn yr e-bost ar gam, rhowch wybod i'r sawl a'i hanfonodd ar unwaith. Nodwch hefyd nad oes unrhyw sicrwydd y bydd yr e-bost hwn neu unrhyw ymgysylltiad yn rhydd o firws neu id yw wedi cael ei ryng-gipio neu ei ddiwygio.

This e-mail and any files are transmitted with it are confidential and intended solely for the use of the individual or entity to whom they are addressed. If you have received this e-mail in error, please notify the sender immediately. Please note also that there is no guarantee that this e-mail or any attachment is virus free or has not been intercepted or amended.

From: [REDACTED]
Sent: 20 April 2026 2:44 PM
To: [REDACTED]
Cc: [REDACTED]
Subject: RE: 9309-PTSI -Provision of Tech Approval- M4 23A-24 51Bishton Llanmartin-CS470 A4 & A6_P02

Hi [REDACTED]

Thank you for the meeting earlier.

I just wanted to mention that regarding the PTSI results consideration during the structural assessment, the AIP states the following:

3.8. Proposed arrangements for inspection for assessment

This assessment will be based on the findings from the 2025 Arcadis Principal Inspection (ref 30286543-ARC-SBR-M4-TR-CB-00004). The full inspection report is attached in Appendix E.

A post-tensioned special inspection and concrete testing programme is being planned at the time of writing of this AIP, any outcomes relevant to the assessment will be included in an AIP addendum following completion.

Looking forward to receiving your comments to the AIP.

Many thanks,

[REDACTED]

[REDACTED]

[REDACTED]

[REDACTED]

[REDACTED]

From: [REDACTED]
Sent: 15 April 2026 17:23
To: [REDACTED]
Cc: [REDACTED]
Subject: RE: 9309-PTSI -Provision of Tech Approval- M4 23A-24 51Bishton Llanmartin-CS470 A4 & A6_P02

Hi [REDACTED],

I am available tomorrow afternoon and all day Friday to discuss.

I can understand why you have challenged the proposed load mitigation measures, as you note the CS470 proposal does not classify the structure as an Immediate Risk Structure; it explicitly records that no distress was observed in the 2025/26 PI and that the 2010 assessment certified capacity based on the then-damaged condition.

The reference to a potential collapse scenario is not intended to suggest an immediate collapse risk in the structure's current condition. Rather, it describes a credible, event-triggered failure pathway should a future vehicle strike occur in an already damaged zone and subsequently propagate into the web or tendon region. In such a scenario, hidden post-tensioning elements could be affected, and the redistribution behaviour would be uncertain. This interpretation reflects an assessment of the risks posed by the structure in its current condition, rather than any newly identified defect or deterioration mechanism.

In that context, I believe the proposed interim measures are proportionate short-term risk controls aimed at reducing live load demand and improving strike detection/response while the updated assessment and PTSI are progressed.

I would welcome further discussion, particularly in relation to the separate but related point with regards to the proposed assessment methodology.

Regards

[REDACTED]

From: [REDACTED]
Sent: 14 April 2026 17:03

To:

Cc:

Subject: Re: 9309-PTSI -Provision of Tech Approval- M4 23A-24 51Bishton Llanmartin-CS470 A4 & A6_P02

All,

I have spoken to you individually (except with [REDACTED]). I suggest a discussion at the earliest opportunity so that everyone is aligned. Basis for discussion below:

1. **Current position:** The proposed lane closure appears to be driven by the potential for future impact damage and uncertainty in prestress behaviour, rather than evidence of current structural inadequacy. The 2025 inspection records no signs of structural distress, and the 2010 assessment remains the baseline for adequacy under existing loads.
2. **Technical interpretation and assessment approach:** There are two schools of thought on how the bottom flange is considered. The document presents two views: one where the bottom flange is not structurally critical, and another where it forms part of the prestress system and may influence structural behaviour if damaged.

The current assessment approach, based on a grillage model with reduced section properties, reflects the former; however, the risk narrative reflects the latter, giving the impression that the assessment assumptions and failure mechanisms are not fully aligned.

Based on the submitted AIP and the 2010 assessment, the structure is idealised using a grillage model, with defects accounted for through reductions in section properties within the assessment calculations. No modification to the global model is described to reflect the identified defects. Given this, and the discussion on prestress behaviour, it is not clear how any changes in structural behaviour associated with the defects are being captured.

If the bottom flange is capable of influencing prestress behaviour (view 2), then the current approach may need to be supplemented with targeted investigation and, where necessary, refined local modelling.

Note: This was raised by TAA in the CS451 comments sheet and addressed by WSP on 25-Feb 2026. But no were found in the AIP

3. **Data gap (PTSI):** A PTSI is planned this financial year (2026-27). The outcome of the PTSI is likely to influence the understanding of structural behaviour and should be a key input to confirming both the assessment and any long-term mitigation.
4. **Risk and proportionality:** The structure is noted as not meeting the criteria for an Immediate Risk Structure, yet a collapse scenario is referenced to justify intervention.

The proposed interim measures appears to be a precautionary response to uncertainty rather than to any demonstrated deficiency. In particular, it is not immediately clear what new information arising from the 2025 PI report, shared last December, would justify this level of mitigation compared to the technical note issued beforehand, where no interim measures were proposed.

In other words, there does not appear to be any clear assessment output or quantitative evidence demonstrating that either the available capacity or the current structural risk has changed to a degree that would warrant intervention, the position instead seeming to rest largely on qualitative interpretation of the Dec-2025 PI findings.

I appreciate that other measures were considered within the CS 470 document; however, it is not clear whether options such as a "Give Way to oncoming vehicles" or lane reduction arrangements were considered and discounted.

I can make myself available this week to discuss.

Regards,

[REDACTED]

[REDACTED]

[REDACTED]

[REDACTED]

[REDACTED]

Croesewir gohebiaeth yn y Gymraeg a byddwn yn ymdrin â gohebiaeth Gymraeg a Saesneg i'r un safonau ac amserlenni.
We welcome correspondence in Welsh and will deal with Welsh and English correspondence to the same standards and timescales.

Mae'r e-bost ac unrhyw ffeiliau sy'n cael eu trosglwyddo gyda'r e-bost yn gyfrinachol ac at ddefnydd yr unigolyn eu'r endid y cyfeirir yr e-bost ato yn unig. Os ydych wedi derbyn yr e-bost ar gam, rhowch wybod i'r sawl a'i hanfonodd ar unwaith. Nodwch hefyd nad oes unrhyw sicrwydd y bydd yr e-bost hwn neu unrhyw ymgysylltiad yn rhydd o firws neu id yw wedi cael ei ryng-gipio neu ei ddiwygio.

This e-mail and any files are transmitted with it are confidential and intended solely for the use of the individual or entity to whom they are addressed. If you have received this e-mail in error, please notify the sender immediately. Please note also that there is no guarantee that this e-mail or any attachment is virus free or has not been intercepted or amended.

From: [REDACTED]

Sent: 05 March 2026 9:58 AM

To: [REDACTED]

Cc: [REDACTED]

Subject: RE: 9309-PTSI -Provision of Tech Approval- M4 23A-24 51Bishton Llanmartin-CS470 A4 & A6_P02

Dear [REDACTED]

Thank you for your follow up comments. We have updated the CS470 App. A4 & A6 document for Bishton Llanmartin Overbridge to address your comments and uploaded to the TEDDMS folder (file name: *M4 23A-24 51 Bishton-Llanmartin CS470 App.A4,A6_P03.pdf*): [M4 23A-24 51 Bishton Llanmartin Overbridge](#). The comment sheet is also uploaded into the same folder.

Many thanks,

[REDACTED]

[REDACTED]

[REDACTED]

[REDACTED]

From: [REDACTED]
Sent: 03 March 2026 11:59
To: [REDACTED]
Cc: [REDACTED]
Subject: RE: 9309-PTSI -Provision of Tech Approval- M4 23A-24 51Bishton Llanmartin-CS470 A4 & A6_P02

Dear [REDACTED]

Sorry I may have hit send prematurely on the below, upon final check of the revised CS470 there were a couple of things:

- Annex A – Roads 277 not contained within document
- Can it be made clearer that the recommended monitoring option M2 also includes the reactive monitoring as described in M1?
 - For example, A4.6.2. paragraph 1. Last sentence notes that “it is recommended that regular (trimonthly) inspection visits are still undertaken to monitor for newly developed signs of distress” which is ambiguous as to whether it includes the full scope of M1 (i.e. pointcloud survey etc).
 - Similar comment for A4.7.2, A6.2.2 and A6.2.4.
 - It is only the risk assessment that confirms that the live monitoring is in addition to visual inspection **and** point cloud survey.

Regards

[REDACTED]

From: [REDACTED]
Sent: 03 March 2026 11:41

[REDACTED]

From: [REDACTED]
Sent: 20 January 2026 12:36
To: [REDACTED]
Cc: [REDACTED]
Subject: RE: 9107-UK0029359.0533-BSHTON LLANMARTIN STR. REVIEW & TECH MEMO-24/SW/CHI/020 - CS470 A4 and A6 Issue

Hi [REDACTED]

Further to below, please see comments on document attached.

It may be worthwhile discussing comment 2?

Regards

[REDACTED]

From: [REDACTED]
Sent: 16 January 2026 14:28
To: [REDACTED]
Cc: [REDACTED]
Subject: RE: 9107-UK0029359.0533-BSHTON LLANMARTIN STR. REVIEW & TECH MEMO-24/SW/CHI/020 - CS470 A4 and A6 Issue

Hi [REDACTED],

Not a problem. We're writing that now and we'll send it back to you as a separate PDF for now so you can review in parallel with the P01 submission and will formally include in a Rev P02 with any other comments incorporated.

Regards,
[REDACTED]

[REDACTED]

[REDACTED]

[REDACTED]

[REDACTED]

From: [REDACTED]

Sent: 16 January 2026 13:22

To: [REDACTED]

Cc: E [REDACTED]

Subject: RE: 9107-UK0029359.0533-BSHTON LLANMARTIN STR. REVIEW & TECH MEMO-24/SW/CHI/020 - CS470 A4 and A6 Issue

Hi [REDACTED]

Thanks for this. I am reviewing and will respond with formal comments shortly. One thing that is missing from the document is a risk assessment indicating the current risk of failure without interim measures and how it is reduced with the proposed interim measures implemented. Given the urgency I thought it best to communicate this ahead of any further comments.

Regards

[REDACTED]

From: [REDACTED]

Sent: 16 January 2026 11:46

To: [REDACTED]

Cc: E [REDACTED]

Subject: 9107-UK0029359.0533-BSHTON LLANMARTIN STR. REVIEW & TECH MEMO-24/SW/CHI/020 - CS470 A4 and A6 Issue

Good morning,

Please find attached the CS470 A4 and A6 for Bishton Llanmartin Overbridge, following the recent receipt of the 2025 PI on the structure for your review and endorsement. Please note we have made allowance in Section A.6.3.2 for Newport City Council to co-sign the CS470 given the impact on their local network if you agree with our recommended option. We have agreed with SWTRA that we will issue you the report prior to their signature.

If you have any comments or would like to discuss anything on a call please let us know.

Kind regards,

[REDACTED]

[REDACTED]
[REDACTED]
[REDACTED]

[REDACTED]
[REDACTED]
[REDACTED]
[REDACTED]
[REDACTED]
[REDACTED]
[REDACTED]

[REDACTED]

NOTICE: This communication and any attachments ("this message") may contain information which is privileged, confidential, proprietary or otherwise subject to restricted disclosure under applicable law. This message is for the sole use of the intended recipient(s). Any unauthorized use, disclosure, viewing, copying, alteration, dissemination or distribution of, or reliance on, this message is strictly prohibited. If you have received this message in error, or you are not an authorized or intended recipient, please notify the sender immediately by replying to this message, delete this message and all copies from your e-mail system and destroy any printed copies.

-LAEmHhHzdJzBITWfa4Hgs7pbKI

Electronic mail messages entering and leaving Arup business systems are scanned for viruses and acceptability of content.

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

This message has been scanned for malware by Forcepoint. www.forcepoint.com