Department for Transport

Structures Fund template

This template is for local authorities proposing schemes for investment from the Structures Fund. Before completing the template, local authorities should read the Structures Fund guidance and associated documents. Alongside the template, local authorities must also complete the economic toolkit for the proposed scheme.

Part 1 – Details of the Structure Being Promoted

1.1 Scheme Information

This section captures the key information on the scheme that is being proposed to the Structures Fund.

a) Local highway authority (LHA) name: London Borough of Havering

b) Scheme / structure name and LHA bridges number: Upminster Road Bridge

c) Location (OS Grid Reference) of the scheme/structure (to identify location on map):

Easting: 555350

Northing: 186750

d) Name of Project Manager: Click or tap here to enter text.

e) Email address:

f) Phone number:

g) What type of eligible structure would your scheme address? (select all that apply)

☒	Bridges	☐	Cutting/embankment
☐	Fly-overs	☐	Tunnels
☐	Retaining walls	☐	Local highway repairs due to landslip
☐	Culverts	☐	Local highway repairs due to collapse
☐	Other structure type (please specify): Click or tap here to enter text.		

h) Provide an overview of the structure proposed for intervention and the nature of the problem. (Maximum 250 words)

This could include, for example, the age, construction type, feature carried and feature crossed of the relevant structure and if the structure has listed heritage status.

Upminster Road Bridge (B33) carries the A124 Upminster Road over the River Ingrebourne.The road is a single carriageway 5.9m wide with verges 0.96m wide on the south side and 0.81m wide on the north side. The structure is located on part of Havering's Strategic Road Network. It is a busy road carrying mixed traffic including several bus routes and HGVs and there is currently no weight restriction on the road over the bridge. The Bridge was built in 1892 with the present structure currently 134 years old. The structure is a brick and stone based structure. A crossing has existed at that location since at least 1375, but earlier

versions were wooden bridges that were rebuilt several times before the current brick-and-stone structure was constructed in 1892, and is believed to contain a time capsule.

The deck consists of steel troughing and 'I' edge girders simply supported on the brick abutments.There are currently two temporary props supporting the troughing deck at approximately the 1/3 span position. The abutments were suffering from water rundown and leakage from above. There is also some rust staining present at the top of abutments.

i) Provide an overview of the proposed intervention and how the works will address the problem.

This should set out the method of resolving the issue that is to be addressed.

An assessment carried out in 1994 concluded that the bridge was incapable of carrying any assessment live loading for the steel troughing deck and the limiting factor controlling the assessed capacity is identified as the flexural strength of the steel troughing at its mid-span position.

As a result of H & S 1994 assessment, temporary propping under the bridge was installed in 2011 to support troughing transversely at approximately its 1/3 span position. Although,this was believed to provide full live load capacity for the bridge in accordance with the assumptions made in the original assessment in 1994, since then the bridge has been deteriorating and all the superstructure elements need to be replaced.

Therefore, replacement of the bridge deck needs to be carried out before this bridge collapses. By replacing the deck including the bridge surface, this will extend the life expectancy of the structure by a further 50-60 years.

Delivering this scheme will support key structure fund objectives including "removing reliance on temporary measures" as it will negate the need to impose a 7.5t weight restriction on the structure at a future date and the propping that was put in place after the 1994 review will be able to be completely removed from the structure. Delivering this scheme will also ensure that this part of Havering's Strategic Road Network (SRN) remains open to all traffic rather then being restricted to private vehicles and vehicles weighing less than 7.5 tonnes. This therefore supports the key DfT Strategic Objective of "maintaining highway availability"

j) Is any part of the relevant structure owned by a third-party (e.g. the Canal and River Trust or Network Rail)?

This structure is owned and maintained by London Borough of Havering.

However, prior to the strengthening or replacement works , the Council may have to notify the Environment Agency of the work because of the River Ingrebourne that flows underneath it.

Given the sites proximity to Upminster Bridge Station and the Essex Thameside Railway Line, the Council would notify Transport for London and Network Rail about the works.

k) If the structure is on a diversion route for the SRN provide a clear description/commentary.

Whilst the structure itself is located on the SRN, it is not on a diversion route for the SRN.

1.2 Understanding the Condition of the Structure

Please set out the current condition of the structure in this section.

a) Provide evidence that the relevant structure is in need of repair either now or by the end of the 2029/30 financial year. (Maximum 250 words)

Provide details of the process used for determining whether this structure is in need of repair and the timescale in which the repair is needed..

Following a detailed assessment review carried out in 1994, propping was installed as an interim measure in 2011. Since then Superstructural Elements have been deteriorating considerably. Therefore, propping is not considered to be effective at this present time. As a result, LB Havering needs to implement permanent measures such as replacement of deck to strengthen this structure.Current Highways Structures Assessment (HA) loading is 7.5t carriageway loading capacity (Assessed capacity). This carriageway is currently used by HGV and Buses.Therefore, replacement is mandatory bringing HA loading to 40t.

The last Principal Inspection Report that was carried out took place in 2018. A copy of the last report including details such as BCI scores and propping history can be found attached with this application.

An intervention is required before 2029/30 because this is the estimated timeframe at which point a 7.5 tonne weight restriction would be required. In addition, the corridor that the bridge is located on is a busy bus route. The Council has plans over the next few years to improve bus journey times along this corridor to enable additional services to use the corridor as well as increase capacity on some bus routes.

b) Please indicate if the relevant structure is **currently** subject to traffic restriction as a result of its condition.

Reference should be made to closures, weight limits, width restriction, limits on use.

There is currently no weight or any other restriction in place at this location.

c) Please indicate if the relevant structure is **not currently** but **by the end of the 2029/2030 Financial Year is expected** to be subject to traffic restriction as a result of its condition.

Reference should be made to closures, weight limits, width restriction, limits on use that are anticipated.

The Council will need to install a 7.5 tonne weight restriction on the Bridge should the intervention not be delivered by the end of 2029/30. The proposal for a 7.5t restriction followed an assessment by consultants who have concluded that such a measure would be needed. All types of vehicles travel over the structure on a daily basis including buses and emergency vehicles many of which are over 7.5t. Prior to the 7.5t weight restriction being introduced, at that point Officers would need to commission a further structure assessment to make sure that the proposed weight restriction is the correct one and the specific date that it should be introduced. In addition to a weight restriction the propping that has been in place since 2011 will need to continue to be maintained.

d) If the answer to c) above is yes, then please estimate the likelihood of this occurring: (select box that applies):

☐ Low confidence in restriction occurring

☐ Medium confidence in restriction occurring

☒ High confidence in restriction occurring

e) Please indicate if the relevant structure is **currently** subject to other temporary measures to manage risk.

Reference should be made to measures such as propping, etc.

This structure is currently subject to other temporary measures including propping that is in place to manage risk. The temporary propping under the bridge was installed to support troughing transversely at approximately its 1/3 span position. Although,this was believed to provide full live load capacity for the bridge in accordance with the assumptions made in the original assessment in 1994, since then the bridge

has been deteriorating and all the superstructure elements need to be replaced. The propping was installed in 2011. The propping is inspected and maintained every two years, however propping at Upminster Bridge is not considered to be a permanent asset management solution and has only been undertaken as an interim risk management measure. A permanent solution is therefore urgently needed.

f) Please indicate if the relevant structure is **not currently** but **expected by the end of the 2029/2030 Financial Year** to be subject to temporary measures to manage risk.

Reference should be made to measures such as propping, etc. that is anticipated.

By the end of the 2029/2030 Financial Year, should this scheme not be delivered, it will become necessary to put in place a 7.5 tonne weight restriction on the structure. It will also become necessary to increase the frequency of Bridge Inspections and required maintenance at the site on an annual basis.

g) If the answer to f) above is yes, then estimate the likelihood of this occurring:

☐ Low confidence in temporary measures being required
☐ Medium confidence in temporary measures being required
☒ High confidence in temporary measures being required

h) If available and applicable, what is the current Bridge Condition Indicator score (average and critical) of the relevant structure?

BCI Crit: 55.48 – Bridge Condition Index Critical - From 2012 Principal Inspection Report (Jacobs) which is attached 50.32 – Bridge Condition Index Critical - From 2018 Principal Inspection Report (Jacobs) which is attached.

BCI Ave: 77.22 – Bridge Condition Index Average - From 2012 Principal Inspection Report (Jacobs) which is attached. 68.29 – Bridge Condition Index Average - From 2018 Principal Inspection Report (Jacobs) which is attached.

i) Which elements of the structure are negatively contributing to the BCI scores and how has this changed in the last 5 years.

Reference should be made to recent inspections and highlight the type and extent of the defects.

The critical and average BCI scores for the last two Princpal Inspections carried out in 2012 and 2018 shows that the BCI is decreasing. In all likelyhood the BCI critical and average levels are likely to now be even lower. Since the last Principal Inspection the BCI scores are substantially reducing from the values previously set out. The extent of deterioration includes whole primary deck elements and finishes Further details on the specific elements affected can be found in the attached Principal Inspection Report.

The table below show the detailed Inspection Report for Upminster Bridge including the Element Conditioning Index. As the table shows, there are a number of elements that are in a signifcantly poor condition.

No.	Element Description	Inspected On	Importance	Severity / Extent	ECI
Elements					
1	Primary Deck Element	10/07/2024	Very High	3C	3.10
2	Transverse beams	10/07/2024	Very High	2C	2.10
3	Secondary Deck Element	10/07/2024	Very High	2C	2.10
6	Parapet beam or cantilever	10/07/2024	Very High	1A	1.00
8	Foundations	10/07/2024	High	1A	1.00

9	Abutments (incl arch springing)	10/07/2024	High	2C	1.88
11	Pier/column	10/07/2024	Very High	1A	1.00
17	Waterproofing	10/07/2024	Medium**	3B	2.70
18	Movement/expansion joints	06/06/2022	High**	5C	5.00
19	Finishes: deck elements	10/07/2024	Medium**	5C	5.00
20	Finishes: substructure elements	10/07/2024	Medium	2C	1.67
21	Finishes: parapets/safety fences	10/07/2024	Medium	5B	5.00
23	Handrail/parapets/safety fences	10/07/2024	High**	2B	1.78
24	Carriageway surfacing	09/01/2004	Medium	2B	1.55
24	Carriageway surfacing	10/07/2024	Medium	1A	1.00
25	Footway/verge/footbridge surfacing	10/07/2024	Low	2C	1.23
26	Invert/river bed	10/07/2024	Medium	3C	2.82
31	Wing walls	10/07/2024	High	1A	1.00
32	Retaining walls	10/07/2024	Medium	2B	1.55
33	Embankments	10/07/2024	Low	2C	1.23
35	Approach rails/barriers/walls	10/07/2024	N/A	4C	

j) Submit, alongside this submission template, the most recent, dated copy of the structural inspection proforma or a report summarising this.

Part 2 – Understanding the Case for Investment

2.1 Strategic Case

This section of the template captures the wider need for the scheme and how it aligns to the objectives of the Structures Fund.

a) Provide a summary of how this scheme contributes to the Government's economic growth mission (Maximum 250 words)

Describe how the proposal will support economic growth (e.g. by creating jobs, attracting investment, improving productivity, or enabling new business activity) and set out the mechanisms through which these benefits will be delivered.

The structure is located on Havering's Strategic Road Network (SRN) and is part of a key corridor route connecting the District Centres of Upminster and Hornchurch to the Metropolitan centre of Romford. The strategic nature of the corridor the structure is located on means that it is also a key bus corridor being used by four routes in total, 248 (Romford – Cranham), 370 (Romford – Lakeside Bus Station) as well as two specific school "600" routes largely exclusively used by pupils travelling to and from local schools.

The current nature of the structure means there is a degree of unreliability which brings uncertainty to businesses who may need to navigate the structure for logistics purposes. Should a weight restriction have to be placed on this structure it could result in higher costs for local businesses if they have to re-route logistical journeys. Given the route is a key bus corridor it would also have a knock on impact on Transport for London through having to re-route buses and could also impact on patronage for Upminster Bridge station located close by.

Once the works are successfully completed, HGV and Buses will move unimpeded as the bridge will have maximum loading capacity. Business activity will increase as result of completion of the works bringing greater reliability to the network.

b) Explain how the scheme supports other Government policy objectives. (Maximum 250 words)

Provide a summary of the scheme's alignment to UK Government policy objectives as represented by the remaining missions.

Government policy objectives for strengthening bridges focuses on fixing historical infrastructure backlogs to support economic growth, public safety, and environmental resilience. By upgrading ageing structures, authorities aim to eliminate network bottlenecks, reduce community severance, and future-proof transport networks against extreme weather and the demands of modern freight. This scheme will improve infrastructure resilience on the network which in turn will support local economic growth. The scheme will also support the priority contained within the 2004 Traffic Management Act to " secure the expeditious movement of traffic on the authorities road network

c) Explain why this scheme is a local priority. (Maximum 250 words)

Provide a summary of the scheme's alignment to local priorities and policies.

This structure is located on a key part of Havering's Strategic Road Network. The A124 is a corridor that connects two of Havering's Major Centres of Upminster and Hornchurch with the Metropolitan Centre of Romford. Delivering key improvements to this structure will support broader transport policy priorities in the area including work currently being undertaken looking at improving bus journey times along the A124 Corridor which is being funded by Transport for London. Ensuring that this structure does not have to be closed in future supports Policy 23 of the Havering Local Plan which includes the objective of "tackling key congestion "hotspots"…. to improve motor vehicle traffic flow and improve air quality" and the adopted Local Implementation

Plan which includes the objective " To bring and maintain all infrastructure assets to good state of repair within Havering".

d) Summarise engagement with local stakeholders, any joint-owners, levels of support for the scheme and explain any controversial elements. (Maximum 250 words).

Summarise support from relevant stakeholders such as the Local MP, Elected Members relevant combined authorities, National Highways, Network Rail, neighbouring LHAs, or important utility providers.

Support is currently being sought from the MP for Hornchurch and Upminster and Transport for London. Securing collective support from Members of Parliament (MPs), local councillors, and Transport for London (TfL). This support will be communicated to the DfT in due course.

e) Provide a summary of the local approach to prioritisation of structural maintenance work. (Maximum 250 words)

Set out any weighting, scoring or other methodology which explains why this scheme has not been subject to work prior to this point.

Local authorities prioritise structural maintenance—like roads, bridges, and public buildings—using a risk-based asset management strategy. Instead of fixing the worst damage last-minute, councils score projects on safety risks, asset hierarchy (e.g., busy A-roads vs. quiet cul-de-sacs), whole-life cost, and preventative.

There has been limited Capital funding available for bridge strengthening and maintenance over the last decade or so, therefore schemes have been prioritised based on the level of funding that is available. There simply hasn't been sufficient funding available to deliver the required scheme at Upminster Bridge.

With regards to Transport for London's Bridge Strengthening funding programme, Havering has received only modest levels of funding over the last 10 to 15 years that has only ever allowed for minor strengthening works at structures, therefore TfL funding was never an option for this particular site.

f) Provide a summary of why this scheme has been selected for this application to the Structures Fund. (Maximum 250 words)

Provide a brief summary of the specific need for this structure is advanced to the Structures Fund.

This structure is located on the Strategic Road Network with several Bus routes and HGV's using this key corridor. There are no weight restrictions in place and currently only propping interim measures in place for more than 15 years. Although, this bridge has been maintained effectively, the bridge deteriorates and the Council needs to replace the deck or strengthening the bridge as soon as possible to prevent collapsing.

g) Summarise the impacts of not delivering this scheme (Maximum 250 words).

The response should consider the impact of not delivering the scheme, such as community severance, lengthy diversion routes or impacts on other infrastructure.

The consequences of not delivering the scheme in the near future will mean higher maintenance costs, and the closure the bridge for the maintenance works on a frequent basis. If the bridge has to be closed on a regular basis, this will result in a lengthy diversion route for vehicles which would impact particularly on buses and other emergency vehicles. Furthermore, there are a number of important community facilities in the area including nearby Upminster Bridge Station, and local shopping parades.

Delays for these essential services will not only have interruptions for the vehicle users but also for local residents and businesses and will impact on economic growth for the local area.

h) If applicable, explain how the scheme helps prevent the likelihood of community severance for all transport modes and the impact that this severance would have or already has. (Maximum 250 words)

Answers should explain the impact on connecting local people to facilities, services, employment, education and local communities. The response should also summarise the extent of diversions for communities, which modes are impacted and how. Applicants may wish to use the guidance in TAG A4-4 Social Impact Appraisal.

Implementing the permanent measures such as replacement of deck or strengthening measures will ensure this part of the SRN remains reliable for all road users. It forms part of a key corridor providing connectivity to nearby Upminster Station to the west as well as local shopping parades. Further along the A124 Corridor there are several schools with schools such as James Oglethorpe and Coopers Company & Coburn having many pupils travelling in from outside the borough elsewhere in Essex. Should the structure have to close for regular maintenance, a diversion route will impact on the ability of residents to get to work or do the school “drop off and “pick up” on time. The primary impacted modes of any diversion would be private vehicles, buses and HGV’s. Diversions would impact negatively on all user groups and would have a financial impact on local businesses with increased costs of deliveries.

As a result of implementing the scheme successfully, businesses will move to this area and employment for local people will be created, Educational establishments will use this area effectively and peacefully and families with children will be encouraged to move in this area for schooling.

i) Summarise the volumes of traffic by mode that are impacted as a result of any community severance (Maximum 250 words).

Explain the impacts on non-motorised and motorised traffic flow. Describe how diversions may differ by mode.

Should the structure require a 7.5 tonne weight restriction in the future, it will be necessary for vehicles at or above that limit to be diverted elsewhere on the network. It will not be necessary for vehicles or other road users that do not reach this tonnage limit to use a diversion route. Based on the DfT traffic count data that Havering has available for Upminster Road, over the course of a week just over 4,000 HGV’s or PSV’s would need to use a diversion route.

2.2 Economic Case

This section sets out the assessment for Value for Money of the project. Applications must use the provided economic toolkit, but if alternative methods have also been used to support the economic case, this section provides the opportunity for the results to be reported.

a) Set out the key sources for the economic benefits (e.g. journey-time savings, carbon, etc.) of the scheme. (Maximum 250 words)

Describe the main benefits the scheme is expected to deliver.

Upminster Bridge is located on a key corridor of Havering's Strategic Road Network. Four different bus routes use the bridge to travel east/west across the borough. In addition the wider A124 which stretches from Upminster to Hornchurch to Romford is used by multiple bus services. Improving this structure will reduce the need to close the road for urgent maintenance works which can force bus services to have to terminate early or be diverted. When this happens it has an operating impact on the bus route and can affect passenger revenues because if bus services become unreliable from a journey time perspective, fewer people will want to use them. In addition the structure is located close to a number of community facilities including a local Pub, local parade of shops and Upminster Bridge station. If the structure was to close in the future,this would have a significant impact on the trade for local shops in the area.

b) Summarise the estimate of the present value of costs and benefits (in 2023 present values, market prices) and the benefit cost ratio of the scheme from the economic toolkit.

Present Value Costs (PVC)	-£1,016,885
Present Value Benefits (PVB)	£272,872,841
Benefit to Cost Ratio (BCR)	-268.3

c) Explain assumptions used in the economic toolkit to estimate the present value scheme costs. (Maximum 250 words)

Describe the basis of the costs input to the economic toolkit and provide justification for the risk and optimism bias values that have been used.

The Optimism bias percentage of 66% has been used as this is the advise contained in the Treasury Green Book Table 1 for the level of optimism bias that should be applied to Non-standard

Civil Engineering schemes.The percentage of optimism bias has also been applied because the development of this scheme is at a very early stage with no concept or detailed design undertaken as yet. It is likely that this percentage figure will be able to be reduced over time once feasibility work and concept design has been undertaken next financial year.

d) Explain the sources of data and assumptions used to complete the Scheme Details section of the economic toolkit. (Maximum 250 words)

Provide details of the source of all data and associated assumptions (e.g. provenance, data checks, etc).

Traffic Count Data from the Department for Transport has been used from 2025. Details of route corridor and proposed diversion route length have been collected through the Council's GIS system Earthlight. Details of the estimated journey times have been obtain through Google Maps.

e) Describe significant non-monetised impacts of the scheme. (Maximum 250 words)

Consider any economic, environmental and social impacts that have not been monetised to fully describe the impacts of delivering the scheme.

If this scheme was to be delivered, it would have a positive economic Impact on the local shopping parade trade as well as on trade for The Windmill Public House. Ensuring that this section of the network remains open will give local businesses the reassurance they need to plan key areas of their business such as transport logistics for the years ahead if they know the structure isn't going to be closed for maintenance every year.

f) Where an alternative economic assessment has been undertaken to support a case for investment, please summarise the data used, the assumptions made and the results obtained (in 2023 present values, market prices). (Maximum 250 words)

Some schemes may have been subject to economic assessment to support previous cases for investment. Summarise the key details of these here, including details of the data, assumptions and results (e.g. present value of costs and benefits and benefit cost ratio).

Click or tap here to enter text.

Present Value Costs (PVC)	Click or tap here to enter text.
Present Value Benefits (PVB)	Click or tap here to enter text.
Benefit to Cost Ratio (BCR)	Click or tap here to enter text.

To enable the assessment of the economic case, please submit the supporting information listed below to StructuresFundTAB@dft.gov.uk

- Economic Toolkit
- Any supplementary reports which support the economic case

2.3 Commercial Case

This section captures information on the commercial viability and procurement strategy for the planning and delivery of the scheme being promoted.

a) Explain the LHA capacity and experience delivering comparable schemes. (Maximum 250 words)

Where capacity is challenging for local authorities, explain how any capacity gaps may be addressed to ensure delivery of the scheme.

There are resourcing challenges presently within the Highways Traffic and Parking Service at Havering. However, forward planning and putting the right amount of resources in place ahead of time, can overcome capacity gaps to ensure delivery of the scheme. In the past, Havering's Highways Traffic and Parking service have implemented similar schemes.Therefore, we have the capacity and experience to deliver this scheme successfully. The Council has a track record of delivering simlar projects in the borough which includes Lewis Road/Warrington Gardens, Launders Lane.

b) Explain the delivery plans and procurement strategy for the scheme. (Maximum 250 words).

This section should include explanation of the various stages of the scheme that are required for completion. This may include design, consents and construction processes.

Should this application be successful the Council will commission a external consultancy to undertake both concept and detailed design. Concept and detailed designs would be commissioned from early 2027/28 with the detailed design expected to be completed by March 2028. Given the size of the project, both in terms of the challenging engineering involved, cost and delivery timescales, the Council intends to appoint a specialist structural engineering contractor to deliver the project through an open competitive tender process. Since the value of the project is expected to be over significantly £500k the Council will first have to seek approval from the Council's Deputy Leader and Cabinet Member for Finance, Cabinet Member for Highways and Strategic Director of Place to undertake a competitive tender process. This governance process is carried out through sign off of a formal Key Executive Decision, and prior to its sign off will be discuss by the Council's Administration at Informal Cabinet. Once approval has been sought, the tender process will commence. Submitted Tenders will then be evaluated by a Panel before a recommendation to award being made through a further Key Executive Decision. The Open Tender process is expected to commence from April 2028 with a Contractor appointed to delvier the works by the end of July 2028. The appointed Contractor will be responsible for preparing suitable Traffic Management for the works which will have to be signed off by the Council's New Roads and Streetworks team.

c) Describe the delivery risks associated to the project delivery. This should include risks which may challenge the end date for the Structures Fund.

Explain what risks have been identified and how might these be mitigated.

One delivery risk is if multiple works are taking place in the wider corridor area at the same time. In order to minimise against this risk it will be necessary to undertake early engagement with utility companies to try and avoid multiple work sites in the area. Ahead of works taking place, Trial Holes will be conducted to identify nearby services and photographs will also be taken. This information will be provided to the utility companies. The main delivery risk will be capacity within the Highways Traffic and Parking team. However as stated earlier in the application, providing this work can be planned ahead of time, the Council can mitigate this risk as much as possible.

d) Explain whether liaison with any applicable third-party organisations present a particular risk to delivery and whether those organisations have agreed to support the scheme's delivery. (Maximum 250 words)

In this section set out if the scheme requires support from other organisations, and the nature of any engagement undertaken to date.

Third Party organisations such as statutory undertaker liaison will take place ahead of any works. Statutory undertakers will be met on site to discuss the scheme and to make sure there are no conflicts in works in the area. Havering's New Roads and Streetworks team will be the key point of contact for statutory undertakers ahead of any works taking place. Officers have quarterly Public Transport Operator Liaison Meetings (PTOLM). These meetings bring together Emergency Services, Bus Operators, and other public transport providers to discuss strategic and operational transport issues. The scheme will be discussed with them at PTOLM's ahead of any works taking place so there is an opportunity for them to raise any issues or concerns that they may have.

2.4 Financial Case

a) Provide estimated outturn costs (£million) for the scheme in the table below. The table should be completed with total costs, requested DfT investment, LHA contribution and third-party contributions. Only capital funding costs should be included in the table.

To note, the prospectus sets out that:

- schemes should be delivered by end-2029/30.
- schemes with early delivery (i.e. in 2026/27) may be prioritised.
- schemes should not be affordable from existing LA budgets.
- local contributions are required for proposed schemes.
- preference will be given to schemes with higher local contributions and/or those where there is a high percentage of local contribution.
- preference will also be given where the local contribution is:
    - not from other central government funding sources.
    - partially funded from other third-party sources.

	2026/27	2027/28	2028/29	2029/30	Total
Requested DfT investment	£	£100,000	£ 500000	£	£600,000
LA contribution	£	£	£20,000	£	£20,000
Other contribution	£	£	£30,000	£	£30,000
Total costs	£	£100000	£550000	£	£650,000

b) Outline how the LHA has sought to manage this scheme from existing budgets and why that has been unsuccessful.

Explain the local approach to managing the existing DfT contribution across its highway assets and what specific challenges have meant that this structure was not repaired earlier.

In recent years TfL's Bridge Strengthening funding programme has only been limited to small amounts of funding for strengthening works for Havering. There has not been any funding allocated to Havering for structural repairs from TfL for some time. This has in part been down to other structures across London being prioritised such as the Hammersmith Flyover works. The Council has a modest budget each year for structural maintenance which comes from the Highways Investment programme. The amount of funding that has been available has only allowed for temporary interim measures for structures because that is all the level of funding available allows for. A successful application through the DfT Structures Fund will enable more substantial and permanent improvements to be made as the Upminster Bridge site.

c) Describe the whole life costs anticipated without the proposed scheme. Explain how the proposed scheme mitigates costs from a whole life perspective. (Maximum 250 words)

Explain maintenance considerations for maintaining the structure and compare these to the scheme cost to demonstrate the financial benefit of delivering this scheme.

In terms of considerations for maintaining the structure should this application not be successful, Havering may have to spend £30k per annum to maintain this structure properly. This is because the propping that has been in place since 2011 will require more maintenance over a more frequent amount of time. In addition the inspections of the structure will likely have to increase in frequency from every two years to on an annual basis. Should further deterioration be detected, such inspections could take place every 6 months. Any urgent maintenance works that require the structure to be temporarily closed for a short period of time would also come out of this maintenance budget.

d) Summarise how the cost estimate for the scheme has been developed.

Set out the basis for the estimate. For example, is it based on an estimate from similar work, developed by a quantity surveyor or a contractor quotation. *Describe the inflation assumptions used and the rationale for these.*

Cost Estimate is based on an estimate from similar work carried out in the past. This estimate is developed by a framework Contractor quantity surveyor. When they made the estimate, they have also taken into account inflation assumptions and contingency in order to get this value.

The costs that have been provided are based on similar projects that have been delivered by other Local Authorities. The benchmarking that has been undertaken has come from details provided by LoBEG.

A 66% optimism bias rating has been used. This is based on the Treasury Green Book guidance for optimism bias for structures. The project is at a very early stage so it was considered prudent to use the 66% optimism bias figure as opposed to the 55% figure given in the DfT TAG Scheme Costs section on optimism bias. It is expected that this optimism bias value will be able to be reduced as the scheme is developed further.

e) Explain the financial risks that have been considered and factored into the estimate and what contingency is allowed for.

Explain the key risks and their impact on the cost and programme, including how these link to the overall contingency allowed for in the estimate.

Although Contingency and inflationary allowance have been taken into account, there may be an element of risk to the total figure. However, we made every effort to put reasonable inflationary assumptions and contingency in order to avoid over or underestimate the total value.

A 66% Optimism bias has been included in the cost estimates to cover for significant uncertainties.

f) Provide details of the local and other contributions, including the relevant funding sources and the certainty of whether these contributions are available. (Maximum 250 words)

Describe the various sources of funding and their availability.

Havering’s Highways Traffic and Parking team will submit a Bridge Stregthening application to TfL/LoBEG ahead of the 2028/29 financial year. The Council will apply for £30k for TfL’s Bridge Strengthening funding pot and utilise £20k from the Council’s Highways Investment Programme as match funding for this scheme.

TfL are supportive of match funding schemes so Officers are confident of being successful with a bridge strengthening bid should the DfT Structure Fund application be successful.

2.5 Management Case

Outlines how the project will be delivered and managed effectively.

a) Select the option which best describes the current stage of the project:

- ☒ No design, benchmarked against other schemes only
- ☐ Design concept only, no supplier yet engaged
- ☐ QS estimate / early supplier engagement, stable design

b) What is the anticipated start date for construction for the scheme?

1st August 2028

c) What is the anticipated end date for construction for the scheme?

30th November 2028

d) Summarise the approach to the management of the delivery of the scheme. This should be from the current point of development to completion.

This should include the management of resources, including the supply chain, to ensure delivery and an explanation of any evidence that provides certainty of delivery within the timescale.

Delivery of the project will be managed by the Highways Traffic and Parking department with a Senior Structure Engineer dedicated to Project Managing the scheme from conception through to delivery. A Prince 2 style Project Management team would be set up to oversee delivery of the project with the Highways Traffic and Parking Manager appointed as Senior Responsible Owner. Meetings would take place between the LBH Project team and the Contractor on a weekly basis to discuss scheme progress, assess the scheme delivery against agreed milestones and to try and resolve any issues. Any issues that are unresolved will be escalated to the SRO. At each progress meeting scheme deliverables will be assesed as well as the scheme expenditure against the agreed budget.

e) Explain the key delivery risks and challenges and how the local authority intends to address them. Answers should also explain any financial risks and how any cost overruns will be addressed by the local authority. (Maximum 250 words)

Explain how key financial risks are being managed and mitigated. Explain how other risks are being managed (e.g. are there any points of complexity or requirements regarding planning or land ownership?).

With large projects costs can sometimes come in higher than originally anticipated. This can sometimes happen once a Contractor is out on site delivering the project. To minimise this risk, in addition to the costs set out in the this application form, a 66% optimism bias has been added to the accompanying Structure Fund Economic Toolkit spreadsheet, to take account of any unexpected costs that arise during the scheme delivery. The LBH Project Manager will be meeting the Contractor on a weekly basis from inception meeting through the delivery and the budget will be a standard item on the agenda at each meeting. In the unlikely event that costs become higher then the healthy contingency that is covered with the optimism bias percentage, the Council will seek further match funding from Transport for London through their LoBEG Bridge Strengthening process.

f) Describe the key project controls that will be employed by the local authority to ensure that schemes are delivered on time and in budget. (Maximum 250 words)

Provide details of the methods that the authority uses to ensure timely delivery within budget.

Havering will ensure a suitable Contractor who has the necessary experience and track record at delivering this type of scheme on time and on budget is appointed, following a competitive tendering process. The LB Havering Project Manager will meet with the Contractor on a weekly basis to assess scheme progress and assess progress against agreed delivery milestones. A wider team based on PRINCE 2 project management principles will also be established to ensure any issues raised during delivery can get escalated and resolved quickly.

g) Set out if the scheme requires permission from other bodies, and how this permission can be obtained to ensure delivery.

Provide details of the permission required, the likely timescale for obtaining permission and any potential barriers to obtaining that permission.

No external permissions are expected, however the Council will need to liaise with TfL London Buses to ensure that buses can be re-routed during the course of the works. The Environment Agency will need to be consulted and involved during project delivery given the structure being worked on goes over the River Ingrebourne, however no approvals are required from the Environment Agency.

j) If applicable, explain how the scheme development has included consideration of climate adaptation and ensures the future resilience of the highway network (Maximum 250 words).

Describe how climate related risks (e.g., flooding, heat, extreme weather) have been assessed and incorporated into design measures to improve the long term resilience of the highway network. This may include evidence of risk assessments, adaptive design features, and how the scheme will maintain network performance under future climate conditions.

Climate related risks such as flooding,heat and extreme weather need to be assessed at an earlier stage using historical data and incorporated into design measures to improve the long term resilience of the structure. In order to carry this out, Havering may have to carry out risk assessments, introduce adaptive design features, and assess how the scheme will maintain network performance under future climate conditions. In terms of utilities, there are statutory organisations such as UKPN, water authorities and communication companies like Virgin Media that will need to be notified about the work, prior to the implementation.

h) Explain the considerations have been made or will be developed to account for the management of carbon for the development of the scheme.

This may include development of a carbon management plan dealing with whole life carbon (e.g. using low carbon construction measures to deliver the scheme or reducing emissions though reducing vehicle miles).

As part of the tender specfification for the project, the Council will ensure that tenders are only accepted where a contractor can demonstrate they are committed to environmental sustainability. During the construction phase, the Havering Structures Team along with the appointed Contractor will make every effort to use low carbon construction measures to deliver the scheme and reduce emissions. This will include the production of a Construction Phase Plan which will set out matters such as Traffic Management, sequencing of works, Method Statements and Environmental Controls. In addition, a Carbon Management Plan will be agreed with the Contractor dealing with whole life carbon. The Council will expect the contractors to use the latest technology both in construction vehicles and the works themselves to minimise carbon use.

i) What statutory undertakers affect the proposed scheme? Has any engagement been undertaken and how has this been accounted for within the delivery approach?

Set out the relevant statutory undertakers, the impacts they may have on the programme – including planning – and how this part of the programme will be managed. If applicable, describe how deterioration of the structure has or may impact utilities services and the extent of this disruption.

There are number of statutory undertakers that have assets in the area where the structure is located. Should the Council be successful with this funding application, these companies will be made aware of the future scheme and the proposed timetable. An initial meeting will be set up with relevant utility companies to discuss the scheme itself and the proposed programme of works so that any potential conflicts with works can be discussed at an early stage. If necessary work programmes can be revised to accommodate any conflicts in the area. The LBH appointed Project Manager will also arrange a site meeting with statutory undertakers to discuss the scheme on site, describe and explain how deterioration of the structure has or may impact utilities services and the extent of the works disruption. Officers will let the statutory undertakers know what is the best way forward to deal safely and effectively to implement the works. Officers will provide comprehensive information to them in order to do the works safely. Officers intend to undertake some trial holes to identify the location of utilities and carry out risk assessment and Method Statements to complete the works in line with the Health & Safety Act .

Part 3 – Governance and Declarations

3.1 Equality Analysis

a) Has analysis of the equality impacts of the scheme been undertaken by the LHA in line with the Public Sector Equality Duty? Select below:

☐ Yes

☒ No

b) Explain how the equality impacts of the scheme have been considered or will be considered. Identify the relevant affected groups with protected characteristics, and any planned measures to mitigate these impacts. (Maximum 250 words)

Implementing this scheme will ensure that Upminster Road continues to be a safe and reliable transport link for all road users. Delivery of the scheme will mitigiate the risk of having to impose a weight restriction on the structure which would have an impact for all road users and would impact on road user journey times. Delivering the Upminster Bridge scheme will ensure continued access to employment opportunities, healthcare facilities, education and community facilities for all local residents no matter their background. Maintaining the structure ensures accessibility for people with mobility impairements who may rely on private vehicles to travel. If this scheme is delivered it will avoid the need for a lengthy diversion route which may disproportionatly affect vulnerable road users who may have limited travel options.

3.2 Public Sector Transparency

When LHAs submit proposals for funding to DfT, as part of the Government's commitment to greater openness in the public sector under the Freedom of Information Act 2000 and the Environmental Information Regulations 2004, they must also publish a version excluding any commercially sensitive information on their own website within two working days of submitting the final proposal to DfT.

a) Please specify the weblink where this proposal will be published.

www.havering.gov.uk

This proposal will be published on the Parking, roads, transport and travel section of the LB Havering website here: Roads – London Borough of Havering . Havering intends to do a similar transparency report as has been the case for the Department for Tranport's Highways Maintenance programme. An example of the report undertaken and published on the Havering website can be found here Highways Maintenance Transparency Report.

3.3 Declarations

Senior Responsible Owner declaration

As Senior Responsible Owner for [Upminster Bridge], I hereby submit this request for approval to DfT on behalf of [London Borough of Havering] and confirm that I have the necessary authority to do so.

I confirm that [LB Havering] will have all the necessary statutory powers and other relevant consents in place to ensure the planned timescales in this proposal can be realised.

a) Name: Click or tap here to enter text.

b) Signed:

c) Date: Click or tap here to enter text.

d) Email: Click or tap here to enter text.

Section 151 Officer declaration

As Section 151 Officer for [LB Havering], I declare that the scheme cost estimates quoted in this proposal are accurate to the best of my knowledge and that [LB Havering]:

- has allocated sufficient budget to deliver this scheme on the basis of its proposed funding contribution.
- accepts responsibility for meeting any costs over and above the DfT contribution requested, including potential cost overruns and the underwriting of any funding contributions expected from third parties.
- accepts responsibility for meeting any ongoing revenue requirements in relation to the scheme.
- accepts that no further increase in DfT funding will be considered beyond the maximum contribution requested and that no DfT funding will be provided after 2029/30.
- confirms that the authority has the necessary governance and assurance arrangements in place and that all legal and other statutory obligations and consents will be adhered to.

e) Name: Click or tap here to enter text.

f) Signed:

g) Date: Click or tap here to enter text.

h) Email: Click or tap here to enter text.