



Alan Wood & Partners

Date 27th March 2026

Combined Road Safety Audit Stage 1 & 2 Designer Responses Report

M181 Southern Junction – Phase 2
B1450 Spur and East Roundabout for
North Lincolnshire Council

Project Number: 53335

Doc. Reference: SER-AWP-ZZ-XX-RP-C-3005_P01

Engineer /
Manage /
Deliver /

www.alanwood.co.uk

Road Safety Audit Stage 3 Designer Responses Report

Project: M181 Southern Junction – Phase 2 B1450 Spur and East Roundabout
Prepared for: North Lincolnshire Council
Project Number: 53335
Doc. Reference: SER-AWP-ZZ-XX-RP-C-3005_PO1

Quality

Issuing Office

Omega 2
 Monks Cross Drive
 York

t: 01904 611594
 e: eng@alanwood.co.uk
 www.alanwood.co.uk

Prepared by



Jad El-Khawaja
 MSc, Beng (Hons)

Principal Engineer

Approved by



Ben Hawkins
 CEng MICE, Meng (Hons)

Associate

Revision History

Revision	Suitability	Date	Description	Prepared by	Approved by
PO1	S4	27/03/26	First Issue	JEK	BMH

Distribution

Revision	Date	Company	Name
PO1	27/03/26	North Lincolnshire Council	Brindley Axe

This document has been prepared by Alan Wood Partnership Limited (“Alan Wood & Partners”) for sole use of our client (the “Client”) in accordance with generally accepted consultancy principles, the budget for fees and the terms of reference agreed between Alan Wood & Partners and the Client. Any information provided by third parties and referred to herein has not been checked or verified by Alan Wood & Partners, unless otherwise expressly stated in the document. No third party may rely upon this document without the prior and express written agreement of Alan Wood & Partners.

For the avoidance of doubt, the parties confirm that these conditions of engagement shall not and the parties do not intend that these conditions of engagement shall confer on any party any rights to enforce any term of this Agreement pursuant of the Contracts (Rights of third Parties) Act 1999.

The Appointment of Alan Wood & Partners shall be governed by and construed in all respects in accordance with the laws of England & Wales and each party submits to the exclusive jurisdiction of the Courts of England & Wales.



Contents

1.0	Introduction	4
2.0	Key Personnel	5
3.0	Road Safety Audit Decision Log	6
4.0	Design Organisation and Overseeing Organisation Statements	8

TABLE C1 – PROJECT DETAILS

Report Title:	Combined Road Safety Audit Stage 1 & 2 Designer Responses Report
Date:	27/03/2026
Document Reference and Revision:	SER-AWP-ZZ-XX-RP-C-3005 P01
Prepared by:	Alan Wood & Partners
On behalf of:	North Lincolnshire Council

TABLE C2 – AUTHORISATION SHEET

Project:	M181 Southern Junction – Phase 2 B1450 Spur and East Roundabout
Report Title:	Combined Road Safety Audit Stages 1 & 2 Designer Responses Report
Prepared by:	
Name:	Jad El-Khawaja
Position:	Principal Engineer
Signed:	
Organisation:	Alan Wood & Partners
Date:	27/03/2026
Approved by:	
Name:	Ben Hawkins
Position:	Associate
Signed:	
Organisation:	Alan Wood & Partners
Date:	27/03/2026

1.0 Introduction

This report provides responses from Design Organisation Alan Wood & Partners (AWP) and the Overseeing Organisation North Lincolnshire Council (NLC) to the Combined Stage 1 & 2 Road Safety Audit identified by Local Transport Projects (LTP) in document *M181 Southern Junction – Phase 2 B1450 Spur and Eastern Burringham Road Roundabout, Scunthorpe Combined Stage 1 & 2 Road Safety Audit* dated March 2026 and the agreed RSA actions for each. The RSA was done according to *SER-AWP-ZZ-XX-RP-C-3005_P01 – Combined Road Safety Audit Stages 1 & 2 Brief M181 Southern Junction – Phase 2 B1450 Spur and East Roundabout for North Lincolnshire Council* dated March 2026.

The design organisation responses have been provided by Jad El-Khawaja, a Principal Engineer with over 12 years' experience in highways design.

2.0 Key Personnel

- Overseeing Organisation** - North Lincolnshire Council (NLC)
- RSA Team** - Andy Mayo (LTP – Team Leader), Tony Kirby (LTP)
- Design Organisation** - Alan Wood & Partners

3.0 Road Safety Audit Decision Log

RSA problem	RSA recommendation	Design Organisation response	Overseeing Organisation response	Agreed RSA action
<p>Problem 2.1 Location: Burringham Road Bridge – eastbound approach Summary: Forward visibility restriction increasing risk of shunt or failure to give way collisions</p> <p>The 120m forward visibility line to the roundabout (red line below) is shown to pass over the verge/embankment area. If anything is placed within this area or if vegetation grows too high, it could result in the forward visibility to the roundabout being restricted, increasing the risk of shunt or failure to give way collisions approaching the roundabout. It is noted that this area is proposed to be landscaped with a mixture of amenity and open grassland during the temporary phase.</p>	<p>It is recommended that the area highlighted is maintained sufficiently so that forward visibility to the roundabout is not compromised, throughout the Temporary Phase.</p>	<p>Accept the RSA problem and recommendation Note to be added to drawing identifying visibility splay area to be maintained clear of obstructions and vegetation in perpetuity during the temporary phase to provide suitable forward visibility.</p>	<p>Agree with Design Organisation response.</p>	<p>Note to be added to drawing identifying visibility splay area to be maintained clear of obstructions and vegetation in perpetuity during the temporary phase.</p>

RSA problem	RSA recommendation	Design Organisation response	Overseeing Organisation response	Agreed RSA action
<p>Problem 2.2 Location: Burringham Road eastern arm Summary: Risk of falls into drainage ditch by active travel users</p> <p>There is a section of shared footway/cycletrack which does not appear to have any fencing proposed at the rear of it. There is a drainage ditch in this area which appears to be otherwise fully fenced from the footway/cycletrack. There is a risk that pedestrians or cyclists could enter the drainage ditch over this section and sustain injury as a result.</p>	<p>It is recommended that the post and rail fencing is extended to cover the full length of the ditch.</p>	<p>Accept the RSA problem, but suggest alternative solution The ditch has now been removed from the design and the current proposed fencing is in place to provide suitable protection from the embankment.</p>	<p>Agree with Design Organisation response.</p>	<p>No further action.</p>

RSA problem	RSA recommendation	Design Organisation response	Overseeing Organisation response	Agreed RSA action
<p>Problem 2.3 Location: Maintenance/farm access Summary: Risk of stones/gravel being deposited on the highway</p> <p>Unbound granular pavement material is proposed in relatively close proximity to the carriageway. There is potential for this to be dragged out onto the highway by farm or maintenance vehicles using the access, forming a loss of control hazard particularly for two-wheeled vehicles.</p>	<p>It is recommended that a bound material is provided in place of the unbound granular material for an extended distance back from the highway (suggested minimum of 15 metres).</p>	<p>Reject the RSA problem and recommendation</p> <p>The access in question caters to maintenance vehicles and the field access only and will therefor be utilised very infrequently.</p> <p>The change in surfacing is set back over 9m from the carriageway edge and asphalt is provided from the fence line which is in line with typical practice for direct accesses for fields etc.</p>	<p>Agree with Design Organisation response.</p>	<p>No further action</p>

RSA problem	RSA recommendation	Design Organisation response	Overseeing Organisation response	Agreed RSA action
<p>Problem 2.4 Location: Eastern Burringham Road arm Summary: Risk of falls by cyclists due to full-height kerb</p> <p>No dropped kerbs are show on the northern side of Burringham Road during the temporary layout, to enable cyclists to safely cross the road in order to access the cycle slip onto Burringham Road (heading westwards over the bridge). This could result in cyclists falling and sustaining injury as they attempted to negotiate a full-height kerb.</p>	<p>It is recommended that dropped kerbs are provided where shown, noting that the temporary layout could be in place for a considerable period of time prior to the permanent layout being completed.</p>	<p>Accept the RSA problem and recommendation Dropped kerbs to be added at the crossing locations.</p>	<p>Agree with Design Organisation response.</p>	<p>Dropped kerbs and tactiles to be added at all crossing locations.</p>

RSA problem	RSA recommendation	Design Organisation response	Overseeing Organisation response	Agreed RSA action
<p>Problem 2.5 Location: Western Burringham Road arm Summary: Risk of cyclists losing control due to full height kerb</p> <p>No dropped kerbs are shown to enable cyclists to transition onto Burringham Road (west), noting that the temporary phase could be in place for a considerable period of time prior to the permanent works bring implemented. This could result in cyclists falling as they attempt to negotiate a full height kerb.</p>	<p>It is recommended that dropped (flush) kerbs are provided to enable cyclists to merge onto Burringham Road western arm during the temporary phase (see also Problem 2.6 below).</p>	<p>Accept the RSA problem and recommendation Dropped kerbs to be added to allow for cycle access onto Burringham Road.</p>	<p>Agree with Design Organisation response.</p>	<p>Dropped kerbs to be added.</p>

RSA problem	RSA recommendation	Design Organisation response	Overseeing Organisation response	Agreed RSA action
<p>Problem 2.6 Location: Cycle slip onto Burringham Road (west) Summary: Risk of cyclists being struck by motor vehicles as they emerge onto Burringham Road (west)</p> <p>In the Temporary Layout, given that it may be in place for a considerable period of time, cyclists may wish to cross from the north and use the footway facilities to then access the Burringham Road carriageway to continue their journey westwards across the bridge. In this situation there would be a requirement for cyclists to merge out onto Burringham Road after using the off-road facilities. There is a risk that they may not be aware of the requirement to give way and could be struck by a vehicle turning left off the roundabout onto Burringham Road and injured.</p>	<p>It is recommended that give way markings are added for westbound cyclists, (see also Problem 2.5 above).</p>	<p>Accept the RSA problem and recommendation Cyclist give way markings to be provided at the dropped kerb location to provide safer access onto Burringham Road.</p>	<p>Agree with Design Organisation response.</p>	<p>Cyclist give way markings to be provided at the dropped kerb location.</p>

RSA problem	RSA recommendation	Design Organisation response	Overseeing Organisation response	Agreed RSA action
<p>Problem 2.7 Location: Section of road between M181 terminal roundabout and the new roundabout Summary: Potential for pedestrians to attempt to cross motorway</p> <p>Pedestrians may attempt to walk on the verges on the section between the new roundabout and the M181 terminal roundabout, then attempt to cross the motorway roundabout itself, particularly once the development to the west of the M181 is constructed but also potentially in the interim period. They may be struck by fast moving heavy traffic, sustaining potentially fatal injury.</p>	<p>It is recommended that the section of highway between the M181 roundabout and the new roundabout is subject to a 'No Pedestrians' TRO and signed as such, and anti-pedestrian paving provided within the verge areas at the western end of the link road to discourage pedestrians. A system of directional signing should also be implemented between the proposed development site and the active travel route along Burringham Road westwards over the bridge as part of the permanent layout. (See also Problem relating to signing of motorway regulations).</p>	<p>Accept the RSA problem, but suggest an alternative solution</p> <p>It is proposed to provide signs to Dia. 951 and 625.1 on the northern and southern verges of the northwestern arm to prohibit pedestrian and cyclists accessing the M181 motorway, which will need to be covered by TROs. This is considered adequate provision and it is not proposed to provide anti-pedestrian paving, particularly as this would only deter less mobile pedestrians.</p> <p>It is proposed to provide wayfinding / cycle direction signs towards Burringham.</p>	<p>Agree with Design Organisation response.</p>	<p>Provide signs to Dia. 951 and 625.1 on the northern and southern verges of the northwestern arm. Also provide wayfinding / cycle direction signs towards Burringham.</p>

RSA problem	RSA recommendation	Design Organisation response	Overseeing Organisation response	Agreed RSA action
<p>Problem 2.8 Location: Proposed section of road between M181 terminal roundabout and the new roundabout Summary: Risk of cyclists crossing motorway conflicting with heavy traffic</p> <p>Cyclists may attempt to ride on the section of carriageway between the new roundabout and the M181 terminal roundabout, and also potentially on the motorway itself, particularly once the development to the west of the M181 is constructed but also potentially in the interim period. This would be a very challenging environment for cyclists, with heavy and fast-moving traffic in three lanes, potentially resulting in cyclists conflicting with motor vehicles and sustaining fatal injury. Although it is noted that a “No Cycling” sign is proposed for westbound cyclists entering the new link road, cyclists could still find themselves cycling on the motorway if they ignore or miss the sign.</p>	<p>It is recommended that a system of directional signing is implemented between the proposed development site and the active travel route along Burringham Road westwards over the bridge to indicate the route west to Burringham. (See also Problem 2.12 below relating to signing of motorway regulations).</p>	<p>Accept the RSA problem and recommendation It is proposed to provide wayfinding / cycle direction signs towards Burringham.</p>	<p>Agree with Design Organisation response.</p>	<p>Provide wayfinding / cycle direction signs towards Burringham.</p>

RSA problem	RSA recommendation	Design Organisation response	Overseeing Organisation response	Agreed RSA action
<p>Problem 2.9 Location: New link road, westbound approach to M181 terminal roundabout Summary: Risk of lane change conflicts due to confusing lane marking arrangements</p> <p>The temporary road marking layout drawing shows advanced lane markings in two lanes as ahead and right. This could cause driver confusion, as there will be no straight-ahead movement available during the temporary layout, only left or right. This could lead to lane changing and side swipe collisions and injury to vehicle occupants. Also, the lanes then split to three, with left, ahead and right lane markings shown. The roundabout circulatory is shown with two ahead arrows in the first two lanes, and a right lane marking in the outside lane. Again, this could lead to driver confusion as a driver in the central lane could decide to turn left or right, leading to other drivers having to brake to avoid them, and shunt or side-swipe collisions.</p>	<p>It is recommended that the lane markings are amended so that no lanes on the westbound approach are marked as 'straight-ahead' and that the overall lane designation is amended to accord with the predicted trip patterns upon opening as shown in the 2026 Transport Assessment Addendum. The lane allocations on both the link road and the M181 terminal roundabout should then be reviewed at regular intervals prior to subsequent phases of development being completed, to ensure they are still relevant for the evolving traffic patterns.</p>	<p>Accept the RSA problem, but suggest an alternative solution</p> <p>As mentioned in DMRB straight ahead arrows should be used in place of right turn arrows to avoid driver confusion upon entering a roundabout. A departure has been compiled for the use of the right turn arrow in the right lane as this will be for right turn manoeuvres only. However, the middle lane can go either left or right in the temporary layout and left, right or straight ahead in the permanent. Therefore, it is felt that the straight-ahead arrow is suitable.</p> <p>As such the only change proposed to be implemented will be to the confirmatory arrow on the circulatory itself from straight ahead to right for the temporary phase.</p>	<p>Agree with Design Organisation response.</p>	<p>Change confirmatory arrow on circulatory from straight ahead to right.</p>

RSA problem	RSA recommendation	Design Organisation response	Overseeing Organisation response	Agreed RSA action
<p>Problem 2.10 Location: Cycle/pedestrian crossing point at southern leg of roundabout Summary: Risk of post and rail fencing being struck by passing vehicles</p> <p>Post and rail fencing is shown to extend right up to the kerbline. This could be struck by a passing vehicle resulting in injury to vehicle occupants.</p>	<p>It is recommended that the post and rail fencing is set back a suitable distance from the edge of carriageway to ensure it isn't struck by passing vehicles, (see also Problem 3.4 below).</p>	<p>Accept the RSA problem and recommendation Design to be amended to provide suitable offset of fencing end from carriageway.</p>	<p>Agree with Design Organisation response.</p>	<p>Update design to provide suitable offset between edge of carriageway and end of fencing.</p>

RSA problem	RSA recommendation	Design Organisation response	Overseeing Organisation response	Agreed RSA action
<p>Problem 2.11 Location: Footway/cycle track routes Summary: Risk of cyclists riding on busy roundabout due to absence of appropriate signing for active travel users</p> <p>No shared use signing is shown for the cycletrack/footway on the northern side of Burringham Road, or the route around the southern leg of the roundabout for the temporary arrangement. This could lead to cyclists riding on the carriageway coming into conflict with heavy traffic on the roundabout, or conflict between cyclists and pedestrians using the paths due to neither user group being aware of the potential presence of the other group. Also, cyclists (temporary layout) or cyclists and pedestrians (permanent layout) may be unaware of the dedicated cycling/walking route west towards Burringham and attempt to negotiate the M181 terminal roundabout, in conflict with motor vehicles.</p>	<p>It is recommended that appropriate signing is provided for all shared paths and that route signing for cyclists (temporary scheme) and cyclists and pedestrians (permanent scheme) is provided from the residential development to the north and east, to direct them to the Burringham Road (west) active travel route (see also Problem 2.12 below).</p>	<p>Accept the RSA problem and recommendation It is proposed to provide shared use/ cycle signage throughout the temporary and permanent phases as required, including wayfinding / cycle direction signs towards Burringham.</p>	<p>Agree with Design Organisation response.</p>	<p>Provide shared use/ cycle signage throughout the temporary and permanent phases as required, including wayfinding / cycle direction signs towards Burringham.</p>

RSA problem	RSA recommendation	Design Organisation response	Overseeing Organisation response	Agreed RSA action
<p>Problem 2.12 Location: Junction with M181 Summary: Signing of regulations indicating end of motorway status</p> <p>The new link road will join the M181 motorway at the existing roundabout. Drivers may not be aware of the point at which motorway regulations start/finish and may therefore drive in a manner which is not appropriate for the environment, increasing the risk of collisions of all types. Cyclists or other vehicles which are not permitted on motorways (e.g. mopeds, mobility scooters etc.) may also enter the M181 in contravention of regulations, increasing the risk of collision with faster moving motor vehicles</p>	<p>It is recommended that appropriate signing is provided to indicate the start/end of the motorway designation in both directions, (see also Problem 2.11 above).</p>	<p>Reject the RSA problem and recommendation The M181 roundabout has been deregulated from a motorway, with existing motorway regulation signs provided on the northern and southern exits of the M181 roundabout. Therefore, this is a non-issue and no change is proposed.</p>	<p>Agree with Design Organisation response.</p>	<p>No further action.</p>

RSA problem	RSA recommendation	Design Organisation response	Overseeing Organisation response	Agreed RSA action
<p>Problem 3.1 Location: Permanent scheme – proposed closure of Burringham Road Summary: Risk of loss of control or lane changing collisions at road closure point</p> <p>For the permanent scheme, the proposed closure of the Burringham Road (west) leg across the bridge to motor vehicles may result in drivers attempting to turn left, and hitting the kerb/losing control, as there are no upright features proposed across the closure other than a kerb. This could be a particular issue in the initial months following the closure.</p>	<p>It is recommended that suitable upright features (e.g. bollards, fencing or landscaping) are added across the closure area to make it obvious to drivers that Burringham Road (west) leg is closed to traffic, and “New Road Layout Ahead” signs provided on the Burringham Road westbound approach to the new roundabout for the initial period following opening.</p>	<p>Accept the RSA problem and recommendation The location identified is a maintenance access and hence needs to be accessible by vehicular traffic. A 25mm upstand kerb has been proposed to provide additional delineation.</p> <p>It is noted that the other traffic may try to gain access to Burringham Road. However, as such, additional ‘authorised vehicles only’ signage and removable bollards or fencing with a lockable gate to be provided to prevent unauthorised access.</p>	<p>Agree with Design Organisation response.</p>	<p>Additional ‘authorised vehicles only’ signage and removable bollards or fencing with a lockable gate to be provided.</p>

RSA problem	RSA recommendation	Design Organisation response	Overseeing Organisation response	Agreed RSA action
<p>Problem 3.2 Location: Permanent scheme – proposed closure of Burringham Road Summary: Risk of reversing or U-turn collisions due to driver confusion</p> <p>Drivers travelling from the Carr Dyke Road/ Burringham Road crossroads, east towards the point of the proposed closure, may be unaware that it is a no through road. They may attempt to reverse or make a U-turn at inappropriate locations, risking collision with other road users not expecting these manoeuvres, with injury to vehicle occupants.</p>	<p>It is recommended that a suitable temporary sign is added for eastbound Burringham Road drivers at the Carr Dyke Road junction, indicating the amended arrangements. A “No Through Road” sign should also be added at this location.</p>	<p>Reject the RSA problem and recommendation In advance of the permanent phase (i.e. until the western roundabout is implemented), Burringham Road will remain open to vehicles, after which it will be closed to all vehicles except maintenance vehicles. Therefore, this is a non-issue and no change is proposed.</p>	<p>Agree with Design Organisation response.</p>	<p>No further action.</p>

RSA problem	RSA recommendation	Design Organisation response	Overseeing Organisation response	Agreed RSA action
<p>Problem 3.3 Location: Permanent scheme – proposed closure of Burringham Road Summary: Risk of reversing or U-turn collisions due to driver confusion</p> <p>The eastern extent of proposed vehicular access along Burringham Road from the west is not clear from the information provided. A large vehicle may proceed to the end of the carriageway and be unable to turn due to the constrained space available. They may attempt to reverse and come into conflict with other vehicles or active travel users.</p>	<p>It is recommended that vehicular access is restricted at a suitable point west on Burringham Road and bollards/barriers/signing provided at the point of closure, together with a suitable turning head. Note: the requirements of the residential properties and field accesses will need to be considered. .</p>	<p>Reject the RSA problem and recommendation In advance of the permanent phase (i.e. until the western roundabout is implemented), Burringham Road will remain open to vehicles, after which it will be closed to all vehicles except maintenance vehicles. Therefore, this is a non-issue and no change is proposed.</p>	<p>Agree with Design Organisation response.</p>	<p>No further action.</p>

RSA problem	RSA recommendation	Design Organisation response	Overseeing Organisation response	Agreed RSA action
<p>Problem 3.4 Location: Cycle/pedestrian crossing point at southern leg of roundabout Summary: Risk of post and rail fencing being struck by vehicles, or restricting visibility of crossing active travel users</p> <p>Post and rail fencing is shown to extent right up to the kerbline. This could be struck by a passing vehicle resulting in injury to vehicle occupants. Also, the fence may partially restrict the visibility of cyclists or pedestrians waiting to cross from west to east for northbound drivers and could result in them being struck by motor vehicles when attempting to cross. The eastern extent of proposed vehicular access along Burringham Road from the west is not clear from the information provided. A large vehicle may proceed to the end of the carriageway and be unable to turn due to the constrained space available. They may attempt to reverse and come into conflict with other vehicles or active travel users.</p>	<p>It is recommended that the post and rail fencing is set back a suitable distance from the edge of carriageway to ensure it isn't struck by passing vehicles and so that it won't restrict the forward visibility of the pedestrian/cycle crossing point, including when grass grows up around the posts in future, (see also Problem 2.10 above).</p>	<p>Accept the RSA problem and recommendation Design to be amended to provide suitable offset of fencing end from carriageway.</p>	<p>Agree with Design Organisation response.</p>	<p>Update design to provide suitable offset between edge of carriageway and end of fencing</p>

4.0 Design Organisation and Overseeing Organisation Statements

4.1 On behalf of the design organisation I certify that:

- 1) the RSA actions identified in response to the road safety audit problems in this road safety audit have been discussed and agreed with the Overseeing Organisation

Name: Ben Hawkins, MEng (Hons), CEng, MICE
Position: Associate
Organisation: Alan Wood & Partners (on behalf of North Lincolnshire Council)

Signed:
Date:

4.2 On behalf of the Overseeing Organisation I certify that:

- 1) the RSA actions identified in response to the road safety audit problems in this road safety audit have been discussed and agreed with the design organisation; and
- 2) the agreed RSA actions will be progressed.

Name:
Position:
Organisation:

Signed:
Date:

Services

To support and compliment our core services Alan Wood & Partners have invested in and developed a range of additional services.

Civil Engineering

Drainage Design
 Earthworks Modelling /
 Cut and Fill Assessments
 External Works and
 Hardstanding Design
 Flood Defence Assessment and Design
 Flood Risk Assessments (FRAs)
 Highways Design
 Retaining Wall and Foundation Design
 Sustainable Drainage Solutions (SuDS)
 Traffic and Transport Assessment
 Utilities Design
 Watercourse Modelling

Structural Engineering

Blast Design
 Bridge Assessment and Design
 Demolition Assessments and Advice
 Parametric Modelling
 Reinforced Concrete Design
 Retaining Wall and Foundation Design
 Structural Assessments
 Structural Masonry Design
 Structural Steelwork Design
 Structural Timber Design
 Temporary Works Design

Building Consultancy

Architectural Design
 Asset Management
 and Lifecycle Surveys
 BREEM
 Backlog Maintenance Management
 Building and Structural Surveys
 Defect Diagnostics
 Party Wall Surveyor
 Planning and Building
 Regulation Applications
 Principal Designer
 RAAC Inspections, Assessments
 and Remedial Design
 Schedule of Condition and Dilapidations
 Spatial Planning and Feasibility Studies
 Topographical and Measured Surveys

Project Management

Contract Administration
 Cost Planning and Control
 Design and Programme Management
 Project Briefing and Development
 Risk Analysis and Management
 Site Supervision
 and Quality Management
 Supply Chain Engagement

Geotechnical and Geoenvironmental Engineering

Contaminated Land,
 Risk Assessments and Remediation
 Desktop Studies
 Earthworks Specifications
 and Site Supervision
 Geotechnical Engineering Design
 Materials Management
 Mining Investigations
 and Risk Assessments
 Site Investigations and Materials Testing
 Slope Stability Assessment
 and Embankment Design

Specialist Services

Building Information Modelling (BIM)
 Conservation and Heritage
 Expert Witness and Dispute Services
 Maritime Civil Engineering
 Modern Methods of Construction (MMC)





www.alanwood.co.uk

- / Civil Engineering
- / Structural Engineering
- / Building Consultancy
- / Geotechnical and Geoenvironmental Engineering
- / Project Management
- / Specialist Services

Locations:

- Hull
- Leeds
- Lincoln
- Scarborough
- Sheffield
- Stockton-on-Tees
- York