



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 Newham
- b) Scheme / structure name and LHA bridges number: Groves Bridge over Waterworks River Structural Refurbishment works/ Groves Bridge (24/B/LA/37)
- c) Location (OS Grid Reference) of the scheme/structure (to identify location on map):
- Easting: 538241
- Northings: 183465
- d) Name of Project Manager:
- 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.

Groves Bridge carries the A118 Stratford High Street over the Waterworks River within the Borough Principal Road Network (BPRN). The route also forms part of a bus corridor serving eight busy bus routes, the Cycle Superhighway, and a key gateway linking Stratford Town Centre, Westfield Shopping Centre and Queen

Elizabeth Olympic Park. Constructed in 1930, the structure is a two-span reinforced concrete bridge. Service bays are located beneath both footways, with two bays on each side. The bridge crosses the tidal Waterworks River and is not a listed heritage asset.

Recent Principal Inspection (19 December 2023) and Structural Assessment reports have identified significant deterioration requiring intervention. Water ingress through failed bridge expansion joints and deteriorated deck waterproofing has caused extensive concrete spalling to beams and the deck soffit. The last renewal of the expansion joints and waterproofing was undertaken in 1994. Please refer to **Appendices 1-4** for further details

Additional water penetration through joints in the precast concrete footway slabs above the service bays has resulted in further deterioration of the supporting concrete beams and soffit slab. Replacement of the precast slabs with an in-situ reinforced concrete slab and new waterproofing system is required to prevent continued ingress.

Cracking has also been identified in several primary concrete beams, the deck slab and both abutments, requiring urgent repair. Furthermore, a number of bridge bearings are severely corroded and require repair or replacement. The last major concrete repairs and bearing renewal were completed in 1985.

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.

The proposed intervention comprises a targeted structural refurbishment of Groves Bridge to address deterioration identified through recent Principal Inspections and the subsequent Structural Assessment (**Appendices 1–4**), ensuring the structure remains safe and serviceable.

The works include structural concrete repairs to deteriorated beams, deck slabs, abutments and columns affected by cracking, spalling and reinforcement corrosion resulting from prolonged water ingress. These repairs will restore structural performance and prevent further deterioration.

The existing bridge expansion joints and deck waterproofing system, which have reached the end of their service life, will be replaced to eliminate a primary source of water ingress and provide long-term protection to the reinforced concrete structure.

Bridge bearings will be refurbished through cleaning, greasing and protective coatings where feasible, with severely corroded bearings replaced. This will restore their ability to accommodate structural movement and safely transfer loads.

All precast concrete footway slabs above the service bays will be replaced with in-situ reinforced concrete slabs incorporating an integrated waterproofing and surfacing system. Waterproofing to the service bays will provide an additional barrier against moisture ingress and protect the supporting beams and soffit slab.

Collectively, these works will address the underlying causes of deterioration, reduce future maintenance requirements, extend the operational life of the bridge and maintain its full load-carrying capacity and strategic transport function.

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

The whole structure is owned and maintained by London Borough of Newham.

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

If there is a problem at A12 Blackwall Tunnel Northern Approach at Bow Roundabout, traffic can be diverted to via this structure to reach A406 and other routes.

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..

The Groves Bridge Principal Inspection Report 2023 (**Appendix 1**) identified significant deterioration across the structure, demonstrating that major repairs are required. The inspection confirmed that defects recorded during the 2018 Principal Inspection had continued to deteriorate.

Concrete spalling was identified on the primary beams beneath both the footways and carriageway, together with moderate to severe delamination and cracking of the reinforced concrete deck. Failed expansion joint sealants on both the east and west sides of the bridge have resulted in water ingress, with widespread dampness, leachate staining to the soffit and water seepage from the deck surface. These defects indicate failure of the waterproofing system, continued deterioration of the reinforced concrete elements and corrosion of the bridge bearings.

The 2023 Principal Inspection recommended that a full structural assessment be undertaken as a priority. This was subsequently completed through the Groves Bridge Assessment Report (Level 1) (**Appendix 2**), supported by the Approval in Principle Report (**Appendix 3**) and Inspection for Assessment Report (**Appendix 4**), confirming the need for the proposed refurbishment works

- 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.

The structure is not currently subject to any traffic restrictions as a result of its condition. There are no closures, weight restrictions, width restrictions, or limits on use presently in force.

A further structural assessment of the bridge is required to confirm its current load-carrying capacity in light of the deterioration identified during subsequent inspections, including the 2023 Principal Inspection. The outcome of this assessment will determine whether future weight restrictions are necessary to maintain the safe operation of the structure.

- 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.

If the proposed structural refurbishment works are not undertaken, it is anticipated that the bridge will be subject to traffic restrictions before the end of the 2029/30 financial year as a result of its deteriorating condition.

Based on the current condition and the age related deterioration of the structure, it is likely that a future structural assessment would require the introduction of traffic management measures to maintain safe operation of the bridge. These measures could include the implementation of a weight restriction of approximately 7.5 tonnes, restrictions on abnormal load movements, and the exclusion of larger vehicles such as buses and heavy goods vehicles. Traffic restrictions may also require the reduction of the carriageway to a single running lane in each direction to limit loading on the structure.

Such restrictions would significantly affect the operation of the route, reduce network resilience, and impact local connectivity. The proposed refurbishment works are therefore required to preserve the bridge's structural integrity and avoid the need for future traffic restrictions before the end of the 2029/30 financial year.

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.

No temporary measures are currently in place to manage risk on the structure.

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.

The structure is not currently subject to any temporary measures on the bridge.

If the deterioration of the structure continues without intervention, it is anticipated that temporary traffic management measures will be required on the carriageway before the end of the 2029/30 financial year. These are likely to include weight restrictions to reduce loading on the bridge.

In a worst-case scenario, continued deterioration could result in the structure becoming unsafe for use, leading to partial or full closure of the bridge.

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: **28.08 BCI**

Ave: **73.87**

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.

Recent Principal Inspections has identified defects affecting a number of the bridge's primary structural elements, which are contributing to the deterioration in the Bridge Condition Indicator (BCI) score. The most significant issues include deterioration of reinforced concrete beams, slabs and abutments, cracking and spalling of concrete, corrosion associated with reinforcement and bearings, deterioration of expansion joints, defects to waterproofing, and deterioration of footway slabs and drainage components. These defects have the potential to accelerate structural deterioration if left untreated.

The condition of the structure has deteriorated over the last five years, as reflected in the BCI Critical score. In 2020, the BCI Critical score was 55.48. Subsequent inspections have recorded a year-on-year decline, with the current BCI Critical score reducing to 28.08. This reduction reflects the increasing extent and severity of defects across the bridge and highlights the need for intervention to prevent further deterioration and increased maintenance liabilities.

The proposed refurbishment works have been developed to address the principal defects identified through the inspection regime and will restore the condition and performance of the bridge, extend its service life and improve its long-term resilience.

- 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 Groves Bridge refurbishment directly supports the Government's economic growth mission by maintaining a critical transport corridor connecting Tower Hamlets and Newham via the A118, providing essential access to Stratford's business, residential, and regeneration areas.

The bridge supports high volumes of buses, Heavy Goods Vehicles (HGVs), cyclists, pedestrians, and general traffic and is vital to the movement of people, goods, and services across East London. The scheme will improve the resilience and lifespan of this strategically important asset, supporting the Government's objectives to improve connectivity, reduce congestion, and enhance productivity.

The route is a key gateway into Stratford and the Lower Lea Valley, supporting access to employment centres, retail, housing developments, and major regeneration projects in the surrounding Queen Elizabeth Olympic Park. It also provides critical HGV access servicing construction activity, businesses, and local supply chains, while supporting sustainable transport through bus services, pedestrian routes, and the CS2 Cycle Superhighway.

Without intervention, further deterioration could result in weight restrictions or long-term diversions. This would negatively impact the Government's growth mission by increasing congestion, journey times, and transport costs, while disrupting freight and public transport reliability. HGV diversions would place additional pressure on surrounding roads, affecting businesses, commuters, and local communities, while reduced accessibility could undermine investment confidence and regeneration activity within Stratford and surrounding growth areas.

The scheme therefore delivers long-term economic value by protecting network reliability, supporting sustainable transport, and enabling continued growth across Stratford and surrounding areas.

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.

The Groves Bridge refurbishment supports the Government's wider policy objectives beyond growth by contributing to cleaner energy, healthier and safer streets, and breaking down barriers to opportunity, while also delivering against key priorities within the Local Outcomes Framework.

Cleaner energy – Refurbishment prevents future weight restrictions, lane closures or full closure that would divert HGVs, buses and other traffic onto longer routes, reducing additional vehicle miles, congestion and associated emissions. This supports improved air quality in Newham and contributes to the Local Outcomes Framework priority of Environmental Sustainability by reducing transport-related emissions and improving resilience to climate change. Renewal of waterproofing, expansion joints and drainage also protects this critical transport asset against increasing tidal and extreme weather risks, supporting the Framework's priority of Transport Infrastructure by maintaining a safe, reliable and resilient network.

Healthier and safer streets – The bridge carries bus services, pedestrian routes and the CS2 Cycle Superhighway. Maintaining safe operation protects access to sustainable transport, encourages active travel and prevents severance of walking and cycling connections. Refurbishment also removes existing safety risks from deteriorating concrete, supporting the Local Outcomes Framework priority of Health and Wellbeing through safer, more accessible travel.

Breaking down barriers – As a key connection between Newham and Tower Hamlets, the bridge provides access to employment at Stratford Centre, Westfield and Queen Elizabeth Olympic Park, together with education and essential services. Maintaining unrestricted access prevents community severance and supports inclusive economic participation, aligning with the Local Outcomes Framework priority of Economic Prosperity and Regeneration by sustaining access to jobs, businesses and opportunities.

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.

Groves Bridge is a local priority as a main road link between Newham and Tower Hamlets, carrying the A118 across the Waterworks River and connecting Stratford to the Bow Flyover, the A12 and east London's wider road network. It carries buses, lorries, cyclists and pedestrians daily and gives direct access to Stratford town centre, Westfield and Queen Elizabeth Olympic Park.

It supports the Council's priorities. Newham has declared the whole borough an Air Quality Management Area, and its Air Quality Action Plan 2025–2030 aims to cut traffic emissions and protect health in a borough with among the highest rates of childhood asthma and air-pollution deaths in London. The Council declared a climate emergency in 2019 and, after serious flooding in 2021, has prioritised resilience to extreme weather, directly relevant to a tidal-river bridge whose faults stem from water getting in. It also fits the Newham Local Plan, now being updated, and the Mayor of London's Transport Strategy.

If the bridge is not repaired, a 7.5-tonne weight limit becomes unavoidable. This would stop buses, lorries, abnormal loads and emergency vehicles from crossing, forcing them onto residential streets never built for heavy traffic. Bus routes would be diverted or cut, hitting the residents who most depend on them; deliveries to Stratford's shops and construction sites would slow; and emergency response times would lengthen. The diverted traffic would pile noise, vibration and pollution onto the very streets the Council is fighting to protect and a full closure would sever the connection entirely.

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.

The bridge is owned and maintained solely by the London Borough of Newham (LBN), with no joint owners or third-party structural interests. This provides clear accountability for decision-making and delivery, removing the risks associated with shared ownership arrangements.

The scheme is essential maintenance of an important council-owned transport asset and aligns with LBN priorities for maintaining a safe, resilient and reliable highway network. Engagement has focused on key stakeholders affected by the works and will continue throughout delivery.

Canal & River Trust (CRT), as the navigation authority for the Waterworks River beneath the bridge, is being engaged regarding construction methodology, safe working arrangements, navigation requirements and necessary permits.

Transport for London (TfL) engagement is being progressed through the Transport Management Assessment Notification (TMAN) process to assess impacts on the strategic road network, bus services and cycle infrastructure, and agree appropriate traffic management measures.

LBN's Network Management Team has also been involved, with a Temporary Traffic Regulation Order (TTRO) progressed and issued to enable the temporary restrictions required during construction.

Ward Councillors and relevant local representatives will be kept informed throughout delivery.

LBN has received combined letter from TfL and LoBEG to endorse out scheme, a copy of the letter is attached as **Appendix 12**.

The scheme is not considered controversial in principle. The main sensitivities relate to temporary traffic restrictions and working above a navigable waterway, which will be managed through established approval processes, stakeholder liaison and communication arrangements. No objections or significant concerns have been identified to date.

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.

Newham prioritises structural maintenance using BCI scores held in BridgeStation, within the objective, riskbased framework developed by LoBEG and TfL. Structures are ranked by condition, with the lowest-scoring, highest-risk assets prioritised for intervention to make best use of limited funding.

On this basis, Groves Bridge is clearly a priority: its BCI crit of 28.08 falls within the "very poor" category, reflecting serious deterioration of critical load-bearing elements.

The scheme has not been delivered before now because of funding constraints, not a lack of recognised need. The Council has been unable to secure external funding for several reasons:

- The Principal External Source – TfL's Bridge Assessment and Strengthening Programme, administered by LoBEG is allocated through an annual, competitive bidding round across all 33 London boroughs. It is heavily oversubscribed and directed primarily at assessment and strengthening, rather than the condition-led refurbishment this structure requires.
- TfL funding available to boroughs has been significantly constrained in recent years, reducing the scope for major structures investment through the LIP.
- The scheme's cost (around £2.912 million) far exceeds any annual allocation the Council could realistically obtain, and there is no associated development to attract third-party contributions.

The Council's own revenue budgets cover only reactive maintenance, not planned works of this scale. As a result, the condition and BCI crit score have continued to decline year on year.

The Structures Fund is intended to address a structure in urgent, evidenced need that is unaffordable from existing local and regional budgets.

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 scheme has been selected because Groves Bridge is the structure in Newham with the most urgent, evidenced need that the Council cannot fund itself – placing it squarely within the purpose of the Structures Fund.

It is the Council's highest-priority structure by condition. Its BCI crit score of 28 ("very poor") reflects serious deterioration of critical, load-bearing elements, confirmed by recent inspection and a structural assessment. Please refer to **Appendices 1-4** for further detail.

The defects are structural rather than cosmetic: spalled and cracked concrete to primary beams, deck slab and abutments, corroded bearings, and water ingress through expansion joints and waterproofing last renewed in 1994 (with bearings and concrete repairs last carried out in 1985).

The repair of these critical elements requires substantial capital investment (around £2.912 million) that is beyond the Council's own resources and the structures funding available to it – exactly the unaffordable, high-cost need the fund is designed to meet.

Without investment, the Council faces a weight restriction and ultimately closure of a strategically important corridor the disruption the fund exists to prevent. The scheme can be delivered early within the fund's timescale, with works programmed from 2027/28 and 2028/2029, and is supported by a local contribution. Please refer to **Appendix 8 – Design and Construction Programme**.

Selecting Groves Bridge targets funding where the need is greatest and the evidence strongest, and where the cost of inaction is highest.

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.

If the scheme is not delivered, the central impact would be growing community severance the physical separation of communities that depend on this crossing of the Waterworks River.

A 7.5-tonne weight restriction would first sever public transport links: with buses unable to cross, busdependent residents would lose direct connections to jobs, education, healthcare and Stratford's town centre, facing longer walks to alternative stops and unreliable interchanges. If the bridge then closed, severance would become total, affecting every mode.

Severance falls hardest on those without cars older people, disabled residents, students and low-income households – who make up a large share of this deprived part of the borough. For pedestrians and cyclists in particular, the loss of a direct route is rarely offset by a diversion: with few alternative crossings nearby, the detour to the next bridge is long enough to effectively cut people off from destinations they previously reached on foot, by bike or by bus.

The everyday consequences are real: harder access to employment and training, to schools, to GP and hospital appointments, to shops, and to social and family networks on the other side of the river. Local highstreet trade would also suffer as footfall is severed.

Beyond severance, lengthy vehicle diversions would increase congestion and emissions in residential streets, accelerate wear on roads not built for heavy traffic, remove a recognised A12 Blackwall Tunnel diversion route, and threaten utilities carried in the bridge.

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.

Delivering the scheme directly prevents community severance: keeping Groves Bridge open and fully serviceable maintains the A118 crossing of the Waterworks River for all modes pedestrians, cyclists, buses, general traffic and freight. Severance arises only under the do nothing scenario a weight restriction, then potential closure.

Assessed against TAG A4-4, the severance impact would be significant. The bridge is the direct link between communities and the facilities they rely on: schools, GP and medical services, Stratford town centre, Westfield, the Stratford transport interchange and Queen Elizabeth Olympic Park.

The extent of diversion is significant in both east and west bound. The diversion has increased the journey time from about 1 km and 3 minutes to 4.2 km and 11 minutes, and adding congestion through the Olympic Park.

Modes are affected differently. HGVs and abnormal loads have the fewest alternative routes; bus passengers on routes 25, 108, 276, 425, D8, N8, N25 and N205 lose a direct connection; and pedestrians and cyclists on the CS2 route face the loss of footway and cycle access, with the nearest walking and cycling crossing through the Olympic Park.

Diversion will have a direct impact to the traffic restrictions imposed during matchdays and events at the London Stadium.

These impacts fall disproportionately on residents without cars older people, disabled residents, students and low-income households in one of the borough's more deprived areas. Under TAG A4-4 this represents a moderate to severe severance effect, which the scheme avoids by keeping the crossing open to everyone.

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.

The affected section of the A118 carries 21,377 vehicles per day (2025): 18,358 cars, 1,609 light goods vehicles (LGVs), 690 heavy goods vehicles (HGVs) and 720 buses and coaches (PSVs). These volumes indicate the scale of traffic that community severance would affect.

Under the modelled restriction, the diversion applies to goods vehicles and buses LGVs, HGVs and PSVs while cars continue to use the route. This displaces around 3,019 vehicles per day onto the diversion for 274 days of the year. The impact on these motorised modes is substantial: the normal trip across the affected section of roughly 1 km, taking around 3 minutes, becomes a 6 km diversion of about 15 minutes six times the distance and five times the journey time for every affected vehicle.

The diversion routes via Warton Road, Montfichet Road, Westfield Avenue and Waterden Road onto the A12 and back to the A118 at Bow Flyover, adding distance, journey time and congestion through the Queen Elizabeth Olympic Park.

Diversions differ by mode. Cars and LGVs would reroute to the nearest crossing with longer journeys. HGVs and abnormal loads are more constrained, with fewer suitable routes and longer detours onto strategic roads. Bus services would be diverted or curtailed, breaking direct passenger connections, while LGV deliveries to local businesses face added cost and delay.

Non-motorised users' pedestrians and CS2 cyclists would face the loss of footway and cycle access, with dismount or diversion arrangements during works and a long detour relative to short local trips. During delivery, by contrast, traffic is maintained through lane closures or contraflow, so the scheme itself avoids severance.

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.

The principal economic benefit of the scheme is the avoidance of additional journey time, distance and vehicle operating costs that would arise if a weight restriction were introduced on Groves Bridge.

Groves Bridge currently carries approximately 21,377 vehicles per day, including 1,609 light goods vehicles, 690 heavy goods vehicles, and 720 buses and coaches. From 2027, a weight restriction could require around 3,019 commercial vehicles and buses each day to divert via alternative routes through the Olympic Park area.

The diversion routes would increase journey lengths by an average of 4.2 km and journey times by approximately 11 minutes per trip. Refurbishing the bridge would therefore avoid these additional travel impacts, generating significant economic benefits through journey-time savings for businesses, public transport operators and other road users. The scheme would also reduce vehicle operating costs, including fuel consumption, vehicle wear and maintenance costs associated with longer journeys.

A further economic benefit is the reduction of congestion on local roads that would otherwise experience increased traffic from diverted vehicles. Lower congestion would improve network reliability, reduce delays for all road users and support the efficient movement of goods and services.

The scheme would also deliver environmental benefits by reducing unnecessary vehicle mileage, resulting in lower carbon emissions and improved local air quality. These benefits contribute to wider social and economic outcomes, including improved health and environmental conditions for local communities.

These benefits would begin when the refurbished bridge reopens in 2028/29 and continue throughout its anticipated 60 year design life.

- 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)	-19,684,388
Present Value Benefits (PVB)	1,364,645,372
Benefit to Cost Ratio (BCR)	- 69.3

- 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 Present Value of Costs (PVC) has been estimated using an initial capital cost of £2.912 million, based on current design information, benchmark costs from comparable bridge refurbishment schemes and prevailing market conditions. A Local Authority contribution has been assumed, reducing the overall external funding requirement.

Capital costs have been forecast to the anticipated construction year using an annual inflation rate of 2.8%, consistent with long-term Building Cost Information Service (BCIS) forecasts.

Operation, maintenance and renewal (OMR) costs have been assessed for both the without-scheme and with-scheme scenarios. The without-scheme case assumes annual OMR costs of £30,000, reflecting the increasing maintenance requirements associated with the deteriorating structure. Following refurbishment, the with-scheme OMR requirement is estimated at £5,000 per annum, reflecting reduced intervention requirements following renewal of waterproofing, expansion joints and drainage systems, improving durability and extending asset life. Both OMR profiles have been inflated by 2.8% per annum over the 60-year appraisal period.

The OMR assumptions have been reviewed against DfT TAG Unit A5.3 (Rail Appraisal) as a comparable benchmark for long term asset maintenance and renewal costs. A 21% OMR allowance has been considered as a reference point, with scheme-specific costs adopted to reflect Groves Bridge conditions and risks.

A 20% capital risk allowance has been included based on the scheme risk register, covering project specific uncertainties such as design development and unforeseen structural conditions. This is separate from the 32% optimism bias allowance applied in accordance with DfT TAG Unit A2.1, reflecting wider uncertainty at this stage of scheme development.

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).

The Scheme Details section of the economic toolkit has been informed by traffic survey data, bridge asset information, diversion route assessments and scheme-specific assumptions appropriate to the current stage of scheme development.

Traffic data was obtained from an Automatic Traffic Count (ATC) survey undertaken by Citisense in 2025 and was considered representative of existing traffic conditions. The bridge, which dates from the 1930s, is approaching the end of its intended service life. Based on available bridge condition information and projected asset deterioration, it has been assumed that a 7.5-tonne weight restriction will be introduced in 2027 and that, without intervention, the bridge may require closure to motorised traffic from 2032.

Diversion routes were identified using the surrounding highway network. Westbound traffic is assumed to divert via Warton Road, Montfichet Road, Westfield Avenue, Waterden Road and the A12, while eastbound traffic diverts via the A118, Marshgate Lane, Siding Street, Pool Street, Montfichet Road and Warton Road. Google Maps was used to determine diversion distances and journey times. The appraisal applies a flat average of the eastbound and westbound diversion routes, resulting in an average diversion distance of 4.2 km and an average journey time of 11 minutes. The diversion is expected to increase travel distances, journey times and congestion within the Olympic Park area.

A high-level infrastructure carbon assessment estimated embodied infrastructure carbon emissions of approximately 1,423 tCO₂e. The assessment is based on feasibility stage assumptions, with the methodology and calculations provided in **Appendix 11A – Infrastructure Carbon Emissions Assessment** and **Appendix 11B - Local Transport Infrastructure Carbon Benchmarking Tool**.

The carbon assessment will be refined during the detailed design stage.

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.

The scheme would deliver several significant non-monetised impacts that are not fully reflected in the monetised appraisal. In accordance with DfT TAG Units A3 and A4.1, these have been assessed qualitatively based on their significance, duration and the population affected.

Accessibility and Severance (Large Beneficial) – Refurbishment of Groves Bridge would maintain a key transport link between Newham and Tower Hamlets, preventing community severance and preserving access to employment, education, healthcare, Stratford town centre, Westfield and Queen Elizabeth Olympic Park.

The bridge also supports bus services, pedestrians and the CS2 Cycle Superhighway. Benefits would be greatest for older people, disabled people, lower-income households and residents without access to a car, who rely most on sustainable transport.

Air Quality and Greenhouse Gases (Moderate Beneficial) – Preventing future weight restrictions or closure would avoid diversionary routes of up to 5 km and 12 minutes for LGVs, HGVs and buses, reducing fuel consumption, congestion, engine idling and associated emissions of carbon dioxide, nitrogen oxides and particulate matter. This would support local air quality and reduce exposure to transport-related pollution.

Transport Reliability, Resilience and Safety (Large Beneficial) – The scheme would maintain the reliability of bus, freight and local highway movements while removing the risk of concrete spalling. Renewal of waterproofing, expansion joints and drainage would improve resilience to water ingress and extreme weather, extending the service life of this strategically important transport asset.

Temporary construction impacts, including noise, lane restrictions and traffic disruption, would be Slight Adverse, short term and mitigated through phased construction and traffic management

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). N/A

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.

The London Borough of Newham (LBN) has the technical expertise, in-house design capability and project delivery experience required to successfully deliver the Groves Bridge refurbishment.

A strong example of comparable delivery capability is LBN's recent refurbishment of the Silvertown Way Viaduct in the Royal Docks, delivered through the Council's Highway Framework Contractor, Kenson Highways. This project involves significant structural repairs and renewal works to an existing bridge asset, requiring management of complex construction activities, traffic impacts, stakeholder coordination and maintaining safe access throughout delivery.

LBN's experienced Highways and Structures team provides technical oversight and project management capability throughout the project lifecycle. The team has demonstrated experience in structural investigations, developing engineering solutions, managing procurement, overseeing contractors, controlling programme and costs, and ensuring quality and safety standards are achieved.

The Groves Bridge refurbishment will be delivered through LBN's established governance arrangements, with clear accountability across client leadership, project management, technical assurance, commercial management, design coordination and construction delivery. The proposed project organisation structure, including named roles, responsibilities and relevant experience of key personnel, is provided in **Appendix 7 – LBN Project Organisation Chart**.

LBN will continue to use established processes for managing contractors, stakeholders, utilities and transport partners to minimise disruption and ensure effective delivery. The governance arrangements provide the necessary capacity, expertise and controls to successfully deliver the scheme within programme, budget and quality requirements.

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.

The delivery plan for Groves Bridge refurbishment consists of four key stages: design development, approvals and consents, construction and completion/handover. The detailed design and construction programme, from funding award through to completion, is provided in **Appendix 8 – Design and Construction Programme**.

The Council will lead the scheme through its highways and structures team, with detailed design undertaken through the Council's Highway Professional Service Contract. Kenson Highways has been engaged through the Council's existing framework to provide contractor input during design development, supporting constructability reviews, repair methodologies, temporary works considerations, access requirements and construction planning.

Prior to construction, the Council will secure the necessary approvals and permissions, including coordination with the Canal & River Trust for works affecting the Waterworks River, TfL approvals through the TMAN process and agreement of temporary traffic restrictions through the Council's Network Management team.

Construction will be delivered through the Council's existing Highways Framework Contract with Kenson Highways under NEC4 contractual arrangements. This provides an established procurement route, agreed contract mechanisms and continuity between design development and construction delivery, reducing procurement and delivery risk.

The Council will manage delivery through defined roles and responsibilities (**Appendix 7 – LBN Project Organisation Chart**) and will oversee Kenson Highways' supply chain management arrangements through the NEC4 contract and established contract management processes (**Appendix 9 – Groves Bridge Refurbishment Specialist Supply Chain Schedule**). This will ensure appropriate management of specialist subcontractors, quality, safety and programme requirements.

Throughout delivery, the Council will monitor programme, cost, quality, safety and risk to ensure the works are completed within the approved budget and programme.

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.

The main delivery risks associated with the Groves Bridge refurbishment relate to uncertainty associated with refurbishing an existing structure, programme coordination, cost control and managing third-party interfaces.

A key risk is that additional defects may be identified once elements of the structure, including concrete, footway slabs, bearings and waterproofing systems, are exposed. This could increase the scope, cost and duration of the works, creating potential pressure on the available Structures Fund allocation. LBN will mitigate this through early surveys and investigations, detailed cost planning, and early engagement with Kenson Highways through the Council's established Highway Framework arrangements to confirm methodology, buildability and construction risks.

The availability of specialist resources, materials and subcontractors is also recognised as a delivery risk. Kenson Highways has established specialist supply chain arrangements covering key bridge refurbishment activities, including concrete repairs, bearing replacement, temporary works, waterproofing, expansion joints and marine support. Further details are provided in **Appendix 9 – Groves Bridge Refurbishment Specialist Supply Chain Schedule**.

Third-party requirements, including approvals from Transport for London, Canal & River Trust, utilities providers and LBN's Network Management Team, may also affect programme delivery. These risks will be managed through early engagement, coordination of approvals and proactive management of any utility conflicts or access constraints.

All identified risks, including cost, programme and delivery risks, will be managed through a live quantified risk register, NEC4 early warning processes, regular programme reviews and assigned mitigation ownership. Further details are provided in **Appendix 10 – Quantified Risk Register**

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.

The main third-party organisations affecting delivery are Transport for London and the Canal & River Trust.

The Council and the Principal Contractor, Kenson Highways, have already engaged with the Canal & River Trust. Design information has been submitted and discussions are ongoing regarding the proposed construction methodology, access arrangements, temporary works and any permits required for working over the Waterworks River. Early engagement will help ensure that the Trust's requirements are incorporated into the design and programme before construction begins.

Engagement with TfL is also progressing, the Council has started the TMAN application process to obtain approval for the proposed traffic-management arrangements and any effects on bus services, cycle movements and the wider road network. Further technical and programme information is required from Kenson Highways before the application can be completed and approval obtained.

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	£0.00	£916,000	£1,739,000	£0.00	£2,655,000
LA contribution	£0.00	£257,000	£0.00	£0.00	£257,000
Other contribution	£0.00	£0.00	£0.00	£0.00	£0.00
Total costs	£0.00	£1,173,000	£1,739,000	£0.00	£2,912,000

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.

The Council manages its available highway funding across the full range of assets for which it is responsible, including roads, footways and highway structures. For bridges, inspection findings and BCI scores held in BridgeStation are used to identify structures requiring the earliest intervention.

Groves Bridge has remained within the Council's maintenance programme, but available budgets have only supported essential inspections, monitoring and reactive repairs to manage immediate risks. These budgets have not been sufficient to fund the major structural refurbishment now required. The bridge's BCI critical score of 28.08, classified as "very poor", reflects deterioration to critical elements, including concrete beams, the deck, abutments, bearings, waterproofing, expansion joints and footway slabs.

The estimated £2.912 million cost cannot be met from the Council's normal annual highway allocations without delaying other safety critical and essential works across the network. Access to external funding has also been limited because available LoBEG funding is competitively allocated and must address competing priorities across London.

The Council has nevertheless committed £257,000 of local funding in 2027/28. The requested £2.655 million DfT contribution is therefore required to deliver the full refurbishment rather than continue relying on shortterm repairs while the structure deteriorates further.

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.

A whole life cost assessment has been undertaken to consider the long-term financial implications of maintaining Groves Bridge and the benefits of delivering the proposed scheme. The whole life cost information, including structure data, Gross Replacement Cost (GRC) and Depreciated Replacement Cost (DRC) values, is provided in **Appendix 6 – Groves Bridge Whole Life Cost Assessment**.

Without the proposed scheme, the Council would need to continue funding inspections, monitoring, temporary repairs and traffic management measures to maintain the bridge in a safe operational condition. Continued deterioration associated with failed waterproofing, expansion joints and water ingress could lead to increasing maintenance requirements affecting the concrete beams, deck, abutments, bearings and footway slabs.

Reactive maintenance measures, such as localised concrete repairs, joint sealing, drainage clearance, protective treatments and replacement of damaged footway slabs, would address immediate defects but would not resolve the underlying causes of deterioration. This approach also increases the risk of more extensive repairs or emergency intervention being required in the future.

The proposed £2.912m scheme addresses these issues by renewing key structural elements, including waterproofing, expansion joints, drainage and footway slabs, alongside necessary concrete and bearing repairs. This extends the service life of the structure and reduces the reliance on short-term reactive maintenance.

The whole life cost assessment identifies the bridge's Gross Replacement Cost as approximately £21.7m, demonstrating the significant value of protecting the existing asset through targeted intervention. Delivering the scheme now provides a proportionate investment that reduces future maintenance risk and supports the long-term operation of the bridge.

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.

The estimated scheme cost is £2.912 million and has been developed by Kenson Highways, the Council's framework contractor, based on the identified scope of refurbishment works required for Groves Bridge. The estimate has been prepared using agreed framework contract rates where applicable, supported by contractor experience and current market knowledge of similar bridge refurbishment activities. Where agreed framework rates are not available, lump sum allowances have been applied based on the anticipated scope of works and will be reviewed and refined during procurement as further cost certainty is achieved.

The estimate has been developed from the required refurbishment activities, including concrete repairs, renewal of bridge bearings, replacement of footway slabs, waterproofing, expansion joints and drainage improvements. Allowances have also been included for design development, specialist surveys, temporary works, traffic management, supervision, contract management and third-party approvals, including coordination with TfL and the Canal & River Trust.

The scheme cost is phased across the design and construction stages. In 2027/28, £1,173,000 is required for structural assessment, detailed design, specialist surveys, temporary works planning, approvals and initial construction activities. This comprises £916,000 of DfT funding and a £257,000 Council contribution. In 2028/29, £1,739,000 of DfT funding will be allocated for the remaining construction works.

Inflation has been considered within the estimate to reflect anticipated changes in construction costs between the estimate base date and delivery period. The estimate will be updated as the design develops and procurement progresses.

The detailed cost are provided in **Appendix 5 - Groves Bridge Structural Refurbishment Works Budget Estimate**

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.

The main financial risk identified is that further defects may be discovered following detailed structural assessments, intrusive surveys and inspection of concealed elements, particularly the concrete components

and bridge bearings. This could increase repair quantities, temporary works requirements, construction duration and associated costs.

The estimate prepared by Kenson Highways includes a 20% contingency allowance to reflect the current level of uncertainty associated with the condition of the existing structure and the complexity of the proposed refurbishment works. The contingency provides an allowance for risks including unforeseen structural deterioration, additional repair requirements, temporary works, access constraints, changes to traffic management arrangements, specialist material requirements and third-party approval delays.

A Quantified Risk Register (**Appendix 10 – Quantified Risk Register**) has been developed to identify key cost risks, assumptions and potential impacts. The risk register provides a breakdown of how the contingency allowance within the estimate could be allocated against identified risks and will be used to monitor and manage cost exposure throughout delivery.

The £1,173,000 allocation in 2027/28 will fund detailed assessments, design development, specialist surveys and stakeholder engagement, reducing uncertainty around the bridge condition, repair quantities and construction methodology.

Early contractor involvement with Kenson Highways will support the review of buildability, access arrangements and temporary works requirements, helping to identify and mitigate cost and programme risks before construction. Any emerging cost pressures will be managed through the Council's change control procedures and NEC4 contract management arrangements, with additional works subject to assessment, approval and appropriate governance.

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.

The total estimated scheme cost is £2.912 million. The Council is requesting £2.655 million from the Department for Transport and will provide a local contribution of £257,000 from Council contributions

The £257,000 local contribution has been identified within the Council's planned maintenance funding and is considered available to support delivery of the scheme, subject to the Council's normal financial approval and budget-control processes.

The Council has requested funding for this scheme through LoBEG/TfL and there is no budget for structural refurbishment works.

No third-party contribution has currently been included in the funding plan because no other source of funding has been confirmed as available.

The scheme has therefore been developed based on the requested DfT investment and the Council's confirmed local contribution only. This provides a clear and deliverable funding position without relying on uncertain external contributions.

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?

The anticipated construction start date is January 2028

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

The anticipated construction end date is October 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.

The Council will allocate resources to manage this scheme. The Council frameworks contractor will deliver the scheme utilising the supply chain contractors and other subcontractors.

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?).

The scheme is considered to have manageable delivery risks. The bridge is wholly owned and maintained by the Council; therefore, no land acquisition, planning agreements or joint-owner approvals are anticipated. The key delivery challenge is confirming the full extent of deterioration and repair requirements before construction, particularly for concealed elements such as concrete components and bridge bearings. A structured project management approach will be implemented throughout design and construction. The delivery team structure, governance arrangements and roles and responsibilities are set out in Appendix 7 – LBN Project Organisation Chart. Early contractor involvement with Kenson Highways and specialist subcontractors will support buildability reviews, repair methodology development, access planning and construction sequencing. Supply chain management arrangements, including coordination, communication and performance monitoring processes, are provided in Appendix 9 – Groves Bridge Refurbishment Specialist Supply Chain Schedule. Key risks and mitigation measures include:•

Unforeseen structural deterioration: managed through detailed surveys, intrusive investigations and refinement of repair quantities. • Additional temporary works or access requirements: managed through early contractor input and construction planning. • Traffic management impacts: managed through early development of traffic management proposals and stakeholder engagement • Third-party approvals and interfaces: managed through early coordination with organisations including TfL and the Canal & River Trust. • Cost escalation or additional works: managed through the contractor's 20% contingency allowance, the Quantified Risk Register (Appendix 10) and Council change control procedures. Any emerging cost pressures will be assessed through NEC4 contract management arrangements and subject to appropriate approval and governance.

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.

The Council will use separate programme and financial controls to monitor delivery from design through to completion. Regular programme meetings will be held between the Council's structural engineers, specialist consultants and Kenson Highways. These meetings will review progress against the agreed programme, including surveys, design submissions, third-party approvals, specialist material lead times, construction

activities and handover. Delayed activities will be assigned corrective actions, responsible persons and revised target dates. Separate financial meetings will review actual expenditure, committed costs, forecasts and the remaining contingency against the approved £2.912 million budget. Kenson Highways will provide updated cost information so that potential overspends can be identified and addressed before further expenditure is committed. The NEC4 early-warning process and a live risk register will be used to record issues that could affect cost, programme, quality or safety. Each risk will have an agreed owner, mitigation action and target date, with higher-risk items reviewed regularly. The works will be delivered in accordance with the Council-approved design drawings, specifications and quality requirements. Any proposed deviation from the approved design, scope, materials or construction method will require the Council's written approval. The associated cost and programme effects must also be assessed and agreed before the change is instructed.

- 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.

The Council owns and maintains Groves Bridge; therefore, no separate landowner consent or joint-owner approval is required. The main external approvals required are from Transport for London (TfL) and the Canal & River Trust (CRT). TfL approval will be required for traffic management arrangements. The process is expected to include a Scheme Notification (approximately 4 weeks) followed by a Works Notification (TMAN) submission (approximately 4 weeks). These approvals will be progressed during the preconstruction stage to ensure they are secured before works commence. A licence or agreement from CRT will be required for works affecting the Waterworks River and associated access arrangements. Early engagement will be undertaken to confirm requirements, with an anticipated approval period of approximately 6 weeks. Potential barriers include changes requested by approving bodies, additional access or working requirements, and delays associated with third-party reviews. These risks will be managed through early engagement, coordination meetings and involvement of Kenson Highways during design development to confirm construction methods, temporary works and access arrangements. The Council will also liaise with the London Borough of Tower Hamlets (LBTH) and the London Borough of Hackney (LBH) regarding diversion impacts, and notify relevant stakeholders including bus operators, cyclists and other affected road users. Utility risk is considered low; however, the scheme will be reviewed through LBN utility coordination processes and quarterly utilities meetings to identify conflicts and coordinate any planned utility works. The approval activities and timescales are incorporated within Appendix 8 – Design and Construction Programme, which sets out key milestones from funding award through to completion of construction.

- 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.

Not Applicable

- 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).

The proposed bridge refurbishment has been developed with consideration of carbon management and climate change adaptation throughout the lifecycle of the scheme. A proportionate Whole Life Carbon

Assessment (WLCA) will be undertaken during detailed design to identify opportunities to reduce embodied and operational carbon emissions and inform design development. The scheme adopts a low-carbon approach by retaining the existing bridge structure wherever practicable, avoiding the significant embodied carbon associated with demolition and full replacement. Opportunities will be explored to use recycled and responsibly sourced materials, optimise material quantities, minimise construction waste and prioritise suppliers with strong environmental credentials where feasible. Local sourcing will also be considered to reduce construction-related emissions and costs; for example, the use of concrete from nearby batching facilities such as Bow Batching Plant could reduce haulage distances, vehicle movements and associated carbon emissions. The appointed contractor will prepare a Construction Carbon Management Plan, incorporating measures such as efficient construction programming, minimising plant idling, use of low emission equipment where appropriate, and monitoring of construction-related carbon emissions. Climate change adaptation has also been considered through the assessment of future risks to the asset. The bridge crosses the tidal Waterworks River and existing deterioration is primarily associated with water ingress through failed expansion joints, waterproofing and drainage. Refurbishment will improve resilience by renewing these elements, reducing vulnerability to increased rainfall intensity, flooding and tidal exposure, while extending the operational life of the structure. By combining carbon reduction measures with climate adaptation, the scheme supports a resilient, lower-carbon and cost-effective transport network.

- 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.

During detailed design stage, utility information and surveys were carried out and no affected utility services have been identified at this stage. The Council will present the scheme at its quarterly stakeholder meeting with utility providers so that any relevant services, planned works or access requirements can be identified early. This may also provide opportunities to coordinate works where appropriate if necessary.

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)

Neutral impact should the funding be given to undertake the works highlighted in the bid submission. Should the funding not be provided the Council will undertake an EQiA in line with its own policies prior to making any decisions on adjusting weight restrictions or traffic management in light of bridge deterioration.

The London Borough of Newham and its contractors Kenson Highways can demonstrate evidence working with various disabled groups during construction works to improve site layout, traffic management, and signage to ensure any works are considerate of all needs. The theoretical workshops took place at the Council's offices and practical workshops and reviews on site at its Stratford project.

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.

<https://www.newham.gov.uk/transport-streetsw>

3.3 Declarations

Senior Responsible Owner declaration

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

I confirm that [London Borough of Newham] 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:

b) Signed:

c) Date: 31/07/2026

d) Email:

Section 151 Officer declaration

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

- ☐ 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:

f) Signed:



g) Date: 03/08/2026

h) Email: