



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: Tameside Metropolitan Borough Council

b) Scheme / structure name and LHA bridges number: Grove Road River Bridge, Grove Road, Stalybridge (structure code: 0193)

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

Easting: 397469

Northing: 399938

A site plan is attached as Appendix A.

d) Name of Project Manager: Daniel Hirst

e) Email address: Daniel.Hirst@tameside.gov.uk

f) Phone number: 0161 342 3950

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.

Grove Road river bridge comprises a two-span pre-stressed concrete tee beam deck with solid infill slab, simply supported on abutments and a central leaf pier. The c.1968 structure carries Grove Road over the River Tame near Stalybridge.

A series of intrusive investigations over many years, followed by a 2020 Structural Assessment, have resulted in a signed weight restriction of 18T since 2025. A VarioGuard barrier along the kerb line protects substandard structural elements below the southern footway, effectively restricting the carriageway to a single lane. The northern parapet is non-standard. The scour risk at the bridge is medium.

Prior to the 18T restriction being introduced, Grove Road provided the only highway route for heavy vehicles into the cluster of three Stalybridge electricity substations (Hartshead Grid, Heyrod and Stalybridge Grid Supply Point). These assets provide power to approximately 240,000 properties and the nearby Transpennine Route Upgrade (TRU) rail corridor, meaning they are Critical National Infrastructure. 44T access is critical to enable the substations to be serviced, maintained and upgraded. TMBC are aware that two 132kV transformer replacements are scheduled for the next three years, requiring the bridge to possess abnormal live load capacity.

Due to limited funding availability, TMBC has not yet been able to replace or strengthen Grove Road river bridge.

The 18T restriction means critical equipment required to maintain and operate the substations cannot currently be delivered. This leaves the sites susceptible to faults or failures that would be devastating to approximately 240,000 properties including local residents and businesses.

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 solution comprises the complete reconstruction of the superstructure, utilising simply supported pre-stressed concrete tee beams and a solid infill slab, designed in accordance with the relevant structural Eurocodes to support 44T loading. Use of simply supported beams and similar bridge articulation fixity will replicate the current dead, superimposed dead and live loading arrangements on the substructures.

Services will be accommodated in a service bay detail below the southern footway, with a Temporary Works structure deployed to suspend the cables across the river during demolition and reconstruction of the deck.

The soffit levels of the new beams will match those of the existing beams to preserve the headroom/freeboard clearance above the river.

The deck will be configured to provide a 5.5m carriageway, removing the existing width constraint and enabling two vehicles to pass. Containment level N2 parapets will be provided to both sides of the deck, appropriate to the location and use. A footway will be provided with the same width as is available on the current structure.

The solution allows the re-use of the existing substructures, thereby minimising the amount of new construction (reducing costs and carbon impacts). Some works are required to the wingwalls on the bridge approaches to accommodate the widening of the carriageway on the bridge itself.

The scheme will remove the current weight and width restrictions and so will return unrestricted HGV access to the locality, including the three Stalybridge energy substations.

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

TMBC has full ownership and responsibility for the bridge structure and all required land.

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

The structure is not on a designated Strategic Road Network diversion route.

Its strategic importance is, instead, of a different nature. The bridge provides the only suitable HGV access to critical electricity infrastructure serving approximately 240,000 properties across Tameside, Derbyshire and East Manchester, and providing power to the TRU rail corridor.

Although the route is lightly trafficked in terms of general traffic, pedestrians and cyclists, it is critically important to SP Electricity North West (ENW) and National Grid who require it to provide access by larger load vehicles such as oil tankers, HGVs, cranes, and emergency vehicles. The route is also required when larger, abnormal transformer loads are transported to site.

Alternative access to the substations from Wakefield Road is constrained by weight and height restrictions which would be harder to resolve, meaning a permanent solution on Grove Road is urgently required by all partners. A map is attached to show these other network constraints in the context of Grove Road river bridge.

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.

A Structural Assessment in 2020 determined an assessed capacity of 18T for carriageway-supporting elements, limited by bending in the pre-stressed concrete beams. Substandard structural elements beneath the southern footway are currently protected by a VarioGuard barrier along the kerb line. An 18T weight restriction Traffic Regulation Order (TRO) has since been introduced (Appendix F). The carriageway width is also restricted to a single vehicle lane in the centre of the bridge.

Notwithstanding the weight restriction, the 2025 General Inspection Report, the 2026 Asset Management Records and BCI scoring (BCI Crit = 50.32) demonstrate that the condition of the structure is also deteriorating further because of the absence/failure of a bridge deck waterproofing system.

SP ENW and National Grid Electricity Transmission (NGET) have advised that the 18T weight restriction significantly affects their operations at the substations and have requested an exemption to the TRO which cannot be granted. Since receiving the Assessment report and in response to stakeholder concerns, TMBC has been considering short- and long-term measures to address the weight restriction. This has included exploring funding opportunities to progress with either a temporary solution or a more permanent superstructure reconstruction project. Information has been sought from TfGM about the Transport for City Regions programme, but ongoing uncertainty led the Council to resort to securing a loan facility in early 2026 to enable the planning of critical maintenance schemes, including this project, to proceed.

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.

As above, Grove Road river bridge is currently subject to an 18T maximum gross vehicle weight restriction, introduced in 2025 because of the condition of the structure (TRO attached as Appendix F). This was brought forward following a Structural Assessment undertaken in 2020. The weight restriction represents a material limit on the usability of the structure, reducing its ability to perform its required highway access function.

In addition, a VarioGuard barrier has previously been installed along the south-western kerb line to protect substandard structural elements below the southern footway. This has restricted the effective carriageway width.

Alternative routes to the Stalybridge substations, from Wakefield Road, are not suitable. Spring Bank Lane railway bridge is subject to a 10T maximum gross weight restriction, while the western route along Printworks Road is constrained by height restrictions where the road passes beneath the railway.

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.

This question does not apply as the structure is already subject to restrictions as per 1.2b above. There are no changes to the existing weight restriction being planned.

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.

As per 1.2b above, there is a signed 18T weight restriction and a VarioGuard barrier. There are no other temporary measures including no physical works (such as propping).

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.

As per 1.2b above, there is a signed 18T weight restriction and a VarioGuard barrier. There are no other temporary measures including no physical works (such as propping).

TMBC has an obligation to provide vehicular access on Grove Road. This is particularly important to the region because of the three electricity substations which take access from Grove Road (for larger vehicles) as previously outlined.

This project seeks to construct a lasting solution which will enable the 18T weight restriction to be permanently removed.

However, until a permanent solution is designed and funded, TMBC may choose to act to restore heavy vehicle access over the river because of the need to restore access to the substation sites that contain Critical National Infrastructure. A possible approach would be to rent a temporary bridge to overspan the existing superstructure, in plan, with its end supports founded to the rear of the existing abutments. This would provide capacity for 44T vehicles and so remove any live loading from the 18T restricted superstructure below.

The working assumption is that TMBC may temporarily hire this infrastructure until a decision is made about the feasibility and affordability of implementing a permanent solution. There would come a time, after around two years, when TMBC may consider that purchasing the 'temporary' infrastructure is more efficient than continuing to incur monthly hire costs. Temporary bridges typically present a fatigue risk and will incur recurring operating costs so do not offer a desirable long-term outcome.

Restoring 44T capacity would be a suitable approach as this matches other structures across the borough, including the immediately adjacent canal 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: Section 1 (west span) = 65.32, Section 2 (east span) = 50.32

BCI Ave: Section 1 (west span) = 78.97, Section 2 (east span) = 71.84

Scores are taken from the TMBC asset management system (extract dated 9 July 2026) and are consistent with the most recent General Inspection undertaken in July 2025.

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.

Drawing from the 2020 Assessment Report, the July 2025 General Inspection, and July 2026 asset management records (all attached as Appendix B), the bridge's condition is understood to have deteriorated over the last five years. Longstanding defects associated with the absence/failure of the waterproofing system, including water ingress, damp staining, leachate deposits and calcite build-up, remain evident and have become the principal reasons for the BCI scoring. Safety concerns have also increased, with the 2025 General Inspection identifying that the north parapet is no longer considered adequate to contain an errant vehicle, whereas the 2019 Inspection noted the parapets were functioning as intended. The east span is now in poorer condition than the west span, and recent inspections have identified the need for waterproofing replacement, further investigation of concrete elements and upgrades to parapets and vehicle restraint systems.

Element	2019/20 Assessment Findings	2025/26 Findings	Extent / Severity	Change Over Last 5 Years
Waterproofing system	Waterproofing recorded as not present, with recommendation that a waterproofing system be installed. Water staining and leachate deposits were evident to abutments and pier	Waterproofing system recorded as failed, with widespread dampness and calcite deposits to the soffit. East span rated Condition 5E	High severity. Condition 5E on the east span, with extensive water ingress affecting multiple structural elements	Defect remains unresolved and has progressed into one of the principal drivers of the current BCI scores
Deck soffit / main beams	Leachate staining, stalactites and damp staining recorded throughout the soffit	Large areas of calcite deposits between beam joints and widespread dampness remain evident	Moderate to high severity. Defects evident across both spans	Continued deterioration associated with long-term water ingress
Piers and substructure	Active water staining and leachate deposits recorded on the pier	Dampness and algae growth present, with concrete investigations recommended. Bearing shelves exhibit extensive dampness and calcite deposits	Moderate severity. Moisture-related defects affecting pier and bearing shelf elements	Ongoing deterioration of substructure elements linked to persistent moisture ingress
Parapets and vehicle containment	Paint loss and bent rails recorded. Parapets were noted as functioning as intended	Damage remains to north and south parapets. The north parapet is now considered inadequate to contain an errant vehicle	High severity. Condition 4B/4C safety defect affecting vehicle containment	Safety performance has deteriorated, with a vehicle containment deficiency now identified
Finishes / protective coatings	Significant paint loss recorded to both parapets and parapet base plates	Breakdown of paint system recorded on both spans	Moderate severity. Condition 3E defects affecting both spans	Coating deterioration remains evident and requires renewal
Wing walls and embankments	Vegetation growth, a calcite-stained crack, hollow-sounding concrete and possible invasive species recorded	Vegetation overgrowth and moss growth continue to be recorded around the structure	Low to moderate severity. Localised deterioration and vegetation issues	Defects remain present, indicating limited improvement since 2019
Structural capacity	Assessment concluded the bridge was only suitable for	Bridge is currently operating under an 18T weight	High severity. Structural capacity	Weight restriction recommendation has been implemented,

Element	2019/20 Assessment Findings	2025/26 Findings	Extent / Severity	Change Over Last 5 Years
	an 18T load limit and recommended implementation of a restriction	restriction. Inspector notes reconstruction should be undertaken within the next five years	constraints require an operational weight restriction	reflecting the bridge's constrained structural capacity and ongoing deterioration concerns

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

Appendix B1 – 2020 Structural Assessment Report

Appendix B2 – July 2025 General Inspection

Appendix B3– 2026 Asset Management Extract

Appendix B4 – 2026 Scour Assessment

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.

Grove Road river bridge has been the only route available for HGVs to access three substations in Stalybridge which distribute electricity to approximately 240,000 properties and support electrified rail services on the TRU rail corridor. Unrestricted 24/7 access is essential to enable NGET to operate and maintain the substations, undertake planned works and respond to faults affecting the local electricity network. The 18T weight restriction introduced in 2025 is preventing essential access by 26T, 32T and 44T vehicles, oil tankers, cranes and other larger vehicles.

The Government's Powering Up Britain plan sets out the importance of energy security and the Plan for Change reflects the importance of prioritising clean power in support of the overarching ambitions for economic growth. Any power outages, which may occur if the substations cannot be maintained, would be devastating for Tameside and Greater Manchester residents, extremely harmful to the local and regional economy by impacting business continuity, and disruptive to Northern rail services. A more resilient highway network is required to safeguard the energy supply and reduce the risk of any disruption to energy supplies.

The scheme also aligns with the Modern Industrial Strategy which outlines a 10-year plan to increase business investment and grow high-productivity sectors. It highlights high industrial electricity costs as a barrier to growth and emphasises how electricity networks provide foundational infrastructure for business confidence and supply chain reliability.

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 scheme's policy alignment is strong in relation to providing safe and dependable journeys, infrastructure renewal, energy security, public safety and resilience.

The scheme supports wider Government policy objectives by restoring safe and dependable access to Critical National Infrastructure. 'Better Connected' sets out a vision for transport that is safe, reliable, affordable and accessible, underpinned by principles of People, Place and Partnership. The current 18T restriction on Grove Road river bridge means the route no longer provides dependable access for the heavy vehicles required to operate and maintain three substations, putting their operation and the local economy at risk.

The scheme also supports 'UK Infrastructure: A 10-Year Strategy' and aligns with the core purpose of the DfT's Structures Fund which is to help authorities renew essential transport assets. The Government has specifically identified that run-down bridges need investment to make them more resilient to modern transport demands. Replacement of the Grove Road bridge would contribute to "fixing the basics" by restoring a deteriorated structure to full and long-term functionality.

The proposal also supports the Government's clean energy and energy resilience objectives. The substations are Critical National Infrastructure and distribute electricity to approximately 240,000 properties across Tameside, Derbyshire and East Manchester. Maintaining unrestricted highway access would support safe network operation, fault-response and planned transformer replacement activity, helping to protect the integrity of electricity supply.

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 Grove Road scheme is a critical priority for TMBC officers and political leaders because of the essential access it provides. The structure had an 18T weight restriction introduced in 2025 but is the only route available for HGVs to access three Stalybridge substations which produce electricity for approximately 240,000 properties. SP ENW and NGET have advised that the weight restriction significantly affects their routine operations, maintenance plans, and fault-response as it prevents access by operational HGVs, oil tankers, cranes and abnormal larger transformer loads. They have sought legal advice and requested an exemption from the TRO.

Alternative routes to the Stalybridge substations, from Wakefield Road, are not suitable. Spring Bank Lane railway bridge is subject to a 10T maximum gross weight restriction, while the western route along Printworks Road is constrained by height restrictions where the road passes beneath the railway. It would be considerably more expensive for TMBC to develop upgrades for these routes compared to replacing Grove Road river bridge. It would also be prohibitively expensive and complicated to consider relocating the substations to a more accessible site.

TMBC maintenance priorities are set out in the Highway Asset Management Plan which states that effective maintenance is fundamental to the Council Plan, the local economy, growth and productivity. TMBC has been considering short- and long-term measures to address the Grove Road weight restriction, including exploring funding opportunities to progress with either a temporary solution or a more permanent superstructure reconstruction project.

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.

Engagement for this scheme is centred on major electricity infrastructure stakeholders, including SP ENW and NGET. SP ENW is the distribution network operator for the North West and distributes electricity from the three Stalybridge substations to approximately 240,000 properties in Tameside, Derbyshire and East Manchester. NGET owns and operates the three substations.

Both organisations have identified that Grove Road river bridge performs a critical operational access role. The current 18T restriction constrains the only feasible HGV route to the substations, affecting movements by 44T oil tankers, 26T and 32T HGV deliveries, cranes, emergency vehicles, fault-response activity and abnormal transformer replacement loads. National Grid has confirmed that unrestricted 24/7 HGV access is needed for routine maintenance, planned works and fault rectification.

The scheme is known to have strong stakeholder support because it will directly address the constraint that is presently impacting nationally-important electricity infrastructure. National Grid has indicated support for this Structures Fund application as a route to constructing a permanent, long-term solution and has offered to continue engaging constructively, including by providing information to strengthen this funding application.

We also anticipate the scheme will be supported by the company delivering the TRU programme.

There are no joint-ownership issues as TMBC has full ownership and responsibility for the structure. The main stakeholder sensitivity will be providing and maintaining reliable access while the project is developed and during its construction.

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.

TMBC prioritises structural maintenance through a risk-based asset management approach informed by inspections, engineering assessments, safety, network importance, functional consequence and available funding. These activities are carried out on a recurring basis across the portfolio of 375 bridges maintained by the Council.

Structures on key routes, such as bus routes and routes that provide critical access (where there are no alternative routes) are prioritised, as are structures assessed to require urgent strengthening or major maintenance works. Funding is a regular constraint on the amount of work that can be undertaken each financial year and not all desirable or recommended actions are affordable.

Short-term priorities are determined by consideration of the Council's statutory obligations, up to date condition data, benchmarking data, strategic objectives and customer expectations. The overall aim is to complete the right repairs at the right time in the lifecycle of all council assets.

Medium- and long-term measures are targeted at preventative works that can prolong the life of the existing network. There is a preference to deliver preventative treatments which cost considerably less than reactive maintenance that is needed once critical defects have developed.

The local approach to prioritising structural maintenance work is fully set out in the Council's Highway Asset Management Plan (Nov 2025) and supporting documents.

[Link to Highway Asset Management Plan, TMBC \(2025\)](#)

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 for the Structures Fund because it presents an unusual combination of urgent structural need, loss of highway functionality, critical infrastructure dependency and local affordability constraint.

The introduction of an 18T weight restriction on the bridge in 2025 has created an urgent issue for TMBC to address and typical annual grant funding is insufficient to enable TMBC to appropriately resolve the issue. It is crucial that action is taken as HGV access via Grove Road needs to be restored as soon as practicable to enable larger vehicles to access the three Stalybridge substations (as previously described). There will be a risk to energy security and economic growth until a solution is implemented.

The proposed scheme will address the issues, carries stakeholder support, and has a high prospect of being deliverable well in advance of the March 2030 Structures Fund deadline.

Whilst there remains considerable design stages to undertake, the Council has contracted WSP to progress these services and is providing local funding to kick-start the development process to give the project the

best possible chance of success. The Council will also have access to a new procurement framework to easily appoint a suitable contractor with relevant local experience.

Whilst the project will involve Environment Agency approvals, there is no interaction with Network Rail network which can add complexity and risk to bridge renewal projects.

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.

'Doing nothing' would mean that the network continues to operate in its current state. Grove Road is restricted to 18T vehicles meaning there is no permitted route for larger vehicles to access the three Stalybridge substations.

There is no prospect of the road being further restricted (e.g. restrictions on general traffic, pedestrians or cyclists). However, the existing restriction has a severe impact on local access as there are no lawful routes for larger vehicles to use to access the substation sites. SP ENW and NGET have advised that the 18T weight restriction significantly affects their operations and have requested an exemption from the TRO which cannot be granted on safety grounds. There is a risk that local and regional energy supplies, and transport systems that are powered by energy generated at the substations, could be disrupted should the sites not be able to be managed, maintained and updated as required.

TMBC therefore considers that 'doing nothing' is not a practical option and is required to implement a permanent solution as quickly as practicable that will sustain in the long-term and reduce risk and liabilities (as well as on-going maintenance costs) for the Council and partners.

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.

The need for the scheme is driven by the requirement to provide long-term HGV access across the River Tame at this location. Access for general traffic, pedestrians, cyclists and any other network users is not currently impacted, or expected to be placed at risk in coming years. Grove Road carries a low level of traffic flow and is only used for local access between Heyrod and Millbrook.

Severance impacts are therefore currently most felt by the operators of the Stalybridge substations, as larger vehicles are not able to access their sites. This is affecting movements by 44T oil tankers, 26T and 32T HGV deliveries, cranes, emergency vehicles, fault-response activity and abnormal transformer replacement loads. This is placing strain on the operation and management of the substations and could, in time, impact their ability to continue to operate safely. This places considerable risk for site operators, TMBC, and the public. This is a risk which TMBC wishes to reduce through the implementation of a replacement scheme which will remove the current weight restriction.

A further severance impact would be caused for people across the North of England should rail services be disrupted or cancelled due to outages in the power supply provided from the substations.

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.

As above, there are no concerns for most users and no foreseeable risk that pedestrians, cyclists or general traffic would be impacted if no action is taken. Grove Road is used for local access and carries a low traffic flow. Two-way traffic flows are understood to be fewer than 100 movements during the peak hours. Access for most traffic and non-motorised users is not expected to be impacted if no action is taken. Walking and cycling use is currently low and primarily related to leisure use.

The volume of HGV movements that require use of Grove Road is not known. It is not possible to collect data for this as the route now has an 18T restriction in place. However, prior to 2025, the route was not restricted and HGVs were able to use the route.

The only HGVs using the bridge were vehicles accessing the Stalybridge substation sites, as there are no through routes or alternative exit routes from the substations area. As previously described, routes to Wakefield Road are restricted by a weight restriction on Spring Bank Lane railway bridge and a height restriction along Printworks Road.

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.

This scheme is atypical of most highway maintenance projects as there is no alternative route if the scheme is not delivered. General traffic currently uses the structure and this is not planned to change. HGVs are the only restricted vehicles (because of an 18T weight restriction) and there are no alternative or diversionary routes for HGVs to take as other routes are also constrained.

It is therefore not straightforward to quantify the benefits of this scheme in terms of journey time savings, health benefits, carbon savings, modal share, safety or any other impacts assessed in typical transport scheme appraisal.

As previously set out, the benefit of the scheme is that it reinstates lawful access to Grove Road river bridge for vehicles carrying up to 44T. This is critically important to energy security and economic growth as Grove Road is the only highway route available for larger vehicles to access three substations.

Without the scheme, there is a considerable and growing risk that the operation and safety of the substations could be compromised. SP ENW and NGET have advised that the weight restriction significantly affects their operations and have requested an exemption to the TRO because of the adverse impacts. Over time, the operational impacts may worsen as it will not be possible to defer essential works. Workarounds currently being used, such as splitting loads into smaller components, will not always be practical (e.g. transformer parts which cannot be disassembled).

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):	Without-Scheme-£2,217,027 With-Scheme-£3,980,170
Present Value Benefits (PVB):	not calculated
Benefit to Cost Ratio (BCR):	not calculated

The workbooks are attached as Appendix C1 and C2. Details of the carbon assessment are included as Appendix D.

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 Without-Scheme approach has an estimated capital cost of £1.292 million and OMR costs of £925k across 60-years (2023 prices). This is based on a temporary overspan bridge being hired for two years and then purchased outright once a decision has been made this is the most appropriate long-term option.

The With-Scheme approach involves the use of a temporary overspan bridge prior to the permanent bridge replacement scheme being ready to install. This has a higher capital cost of £3.861 million but significantly lower on-going OMR costs which total £119k across 60-years (2023 prices).

Whilst the With-Scheme option will require short-term capital expenditure, it will provide a long-term, compliant replacement bridge that would carry significantly fewer future maintenance liabilities and risks for TMBC and partners, as well as place less strain on future maintenance budgets which are uncertain.

The scheme cost estimates referenced in the Financial Case (Appendix E) provide the basis for the data inputs to the economic tool in respect of the calculation of a PVC. Costs are inclusive of inflation but exclude risk. Optimism Bias is included at 55% on both capital and OMR costs. This aligns with TAG and reflects the early stage of the project and high-level estimation process (e.g. Stage 1).

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).

Scheme Details have been populated using information from TMBC bridge records and correspondence between NGET and TMBC.

Bridge condition, loading restrictions and asset information have been sourced from TMBC. The existing 18T weight restriction is reflected.

As previously described, the scheme will only impact HGVs and HGV traffic is currently not permitted to use the route. There is no monitoring of whether any larger vehicles are using the route in breach of the weight restriction. There are no approved exemptions to the TRO.

There are no alternative routes that HGVs are able to use instead of Grove Road, meaning there is therefore no practical way of inputting diversion route data and using the intended functionality of the tool to derive scheme benefits.

A 60-year appraisal period is applied, which is typical for this type of scheme appraisal. The tool has been used to calculate the differential in PVC between a Without-Scheme and a With-Scheme approach.

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.

As a traditional monetised appraisal of scheme benefits has not been practical, we ask that the scheme is assessed on the strength of its non-monetised impacts.

As previously described, the primary benefit of the scheme is the restored access that would be provided to the three Stalybridge substations and the energy security that this restored access will provide. Without the intervention, there is a considerable and growing risk that the sites could fail to operate safely or reliably. Any power outages, which could occur if the substations cannot be maintained, would be devastating for Tameside and Greater Manchester residents, extremely harmful to the local and regional economy, and disruptive to Northern rail services. Whilst not monetised, the economic impacts would be severe.

In respect of other potential scheme impacts commonly associated with transport scheme appraisal, there are no expected impacts in relation to social indicators such as accidents, security, physical activity, accessibility or personal affordability. Severance impacts have previously been described in respect of HGV access.

The scheme has the potential to impact the water environment given the proximity of the River Tame. Engagement with the Environment Agency will ensure the scheme creates no adverse impacts on the watercourse.

There may be adverse environmental impacts during construction, albeit the design will seek to minimise these through the re-use of the bridge substructure and through a responsible construction methodology. There are not a high density of sensitive receptors in the vicinity. There should be no long-term adverse environmental impacts.

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).

No alternative assessment has been undertaken for this scheme.

Present Value Costs (PVC): N/A

Present Value Benefits (PVB): N/A

Benefit to Cost Ratio (BCR): N/A

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.

TMBC is experienced in delivering its Highway Asset Management Plan, which includes routine bridge inspections and assessments as well as carrying out maintenance, strengthening and structural improvement works at various scales. TMBC regularly works with specialist consultants, contractors and third-party asset owners to deliver maintenance projects and draws on external expertise to supplement the knowledge of the Council team.

There have been no directly comparable schemes implemented in the borough during the last five years, as the Council has not had sufficient funding to take forward major bridge replacement projects, despite there being a need.

For this project, TMBC will bring its leadership, organisational experience and capability, governance and assurance processes to oversee delivery of the proposed scheme. However, it is recognised that the scope of the project will require additional and specialist design and construction expertise. Consultancy support from WSP has been procured to progress scheme development, as well as to provide technical assurance. WSP is an industry expert offering a wide array of relevant and recent experience across the North West and the UK. WSP will act as TMBC's trusted adviser on all aspects of the project's development.

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.

TMBC has already procured consultancy support from WSP to cover the design process. The scheme will progress through the remaining design, consent, procurement and construction stages in a structured sequence through to a start-on-site date in January 2028. TMBC will retain client-side responsibility for governance, approvals and delivery oversight. Once the new Tameside Highways Maintenance Framework (HMF) is established, there may be an opportunity to seek Early Contractor Involvement (ECI) to advise on constructability considerations through the design process and to inform how the scheme is brought to market. TMBC will also procure a temporary highway bridge to provide interim access until the main replacement project is ready for site.

Consents and approvals that are expected to be required include planning permission, watercourse-related consents, environmental approvals and utility-related agreements. TMBC will use in-house resource, supported by specialist consultancy input if required, to manage consent requirements and reduce delivery risk.

For construction, TMBC is currently awarding a new HMF. This should be operational from September 2026. This project will be tendered through Lot 5 (Bridges, Structures and Barriers). TMBC plans to appoint three suppliers to the Lot and will have the flexibility to award the contract by direct award or mini-competition. This decision will depend on the final scope, value and delivery requirements. The HMF

provides a clear route to market with recently appointed and value-checked contractors, that will affirm good value is being achieved and social value benefits.

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 proposed programme brings the project to completion in February 2029. This includes contingency around internal approvals and third-party engagement. There is therefore high confidence that this project is achievable within the Structures Fund period.

The initial design concept has sought to mitigate major potential risks. The proposal is to replace the superstructure and to re-use the existing substructures. This approach limits the scope of demolition and construction works, enabling the project to be undertaken relatively quickly. This is important as stakeholders will require any restrictions on highway access to be kept to the shortest possible duration. Further investigation will be required early in the design process to confirm the retention of the substructures.

The location of existing services has been established, and the proposed construction methodology includes temporary works to ensure that utilities are accommodated at every stage of the project.

The specification will ensure that the construction depth matches the existing structures, to retain the river flow area beneath.

TMBC has already engaged WSP to assess site constraints and develop design options in preparation for this submission, and its team is commissioned to support all aspects of the design process, as well as to provide independent Technical Approval Authority support to TMBC's in-house engineers.

Procurement will be through the new Tameside HMF which will ensure delivery will be undertaken by a contractor that is suitably qualified and experienced to undertake this type of project.

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.

NGET and SP ENW are fully supportive of a proposed intervention as they urgently seek the removal of the 18T weight restriction to enable access to their substation sites for larger vehicles. Consultation with these organisations is already taking place and the proposed solution will restore the required 44T access.

Specific plans will be implemented to ensure the extensive array of electricity cables that cross the existing bridge are accommodated during construction and within the replacement superstructure. The electricity infrastructure is planned to be temporarily suspended/supported across the river using temporary works which are commonplace for this type of scenario. Maintaining positive relationships will be critical to delivering a successful project.

Consultation has not yet started with the Environment Agency. However, the design team has started to consider its requirements, for example, by limiting the bulk of the reconstruction works to the superstructure, retaining the footprint of the pier and abutments in the bed and banks of the river, and matching the soffit levels to those of the existing bridge to maintain freeboard clearance above the river.

This approach provides the best opportunity to ensure existing flow and flood regimes are protected during the project. This collaborative approach should significantly de-risk the potential concerns of the Environment Agency.

The Canal & River Trust will also be engaged given the proximity of the scheme to the Huddersfield Canal and its status as a Site of Special Scientific Interest (SSSI).

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	£381,775	£2,089,799	£849,883	£77,429	£3,398,886
LA contribution – towards replacement scheme	£0	£200,000	£0	£0	£200,000
LA funded temporary structure	£217,000	£204,028	£158,869	£0	£579,896
Total costs	£598,775	£2,493,827	£1,008,752	£77,429	£4,178,782

Cost plan tables are included as Appendix E.

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.

TMBC manages highway maintenance through a risk-based asset management approach, directing available funding to the highest-priority needs across carriageways, footways, drainage, lighting, bridges, retaining walls and other structures. Investment decisions are informed by condition, safety, network importance, functional consequence and affordability.

Grove Road river bridge has been managed through this routine inspection, assessment and maintenance regime. Earlier deterioration was monitored and considered alongside competing highway asset priorities. The 2020 Structural Assessment and introduction of the 18T weight restriction materially changed the position. The restriction is a constraint on the only highway route that can provide HGV access to critical electricity infrastructure serving approximately 240,000 properties. Since receiving the Assessment, TMBC has been developing a funding strategy, considering both temporary arrangements and a long-term superstructure reconstruction, while exploring potential external funding opportunities (including the Transport for City Regions programme).

Existing highway capital budgets support a broad programme of essential asset management and cannot absorb a major bridge reconstruction of this scale. For context, TMBC is responsible for 375 structures and 2025/26 capital funding from DfT for structures maintenance was £525k. Due to uncertainty around funding, TMBC has recently been forced to secure a loan to fund planning work on critical maintenance

schemes to progress. Given financial pressures, external funding remains the preferred mechanism to deliver the long-term and permanent intervention at Grove Road.

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.

Wholesale replacement of the bridge superstructure enables the new elements to be designed to current standards with a 120-year design life. Future structure maintenance would therefore be limited to routine, predictable activities, including General Inspections every 2 years, Principal Inspections every 6 years, concrete repairs and expansion joint replacements. With new bearings and waterproofing installed with the scheme, it is anticipated that re-waterproofing and bearing replacement would most likely occur beyond the 60 year appraisal period. These activities have an estimated whole life cost of £0.673m (2026 prices) across the 60-year appraisal period (inclusive of inflation and risk at 55%).

Without the proposed scheme, it is assumed the current weight restriction would be mitigated by installing a temporary bridge overspanning the existing structure. This Without-Scheme option will also have maintenance requirements with both the temporary bridge and the deteriorating bridge beneath it requiring assessment and activity. The appraisal assumes an initial rental period for the temporary bridge, followed by outright purchase after 2 years and replacement with a similar structure at 20-year intervals (to manage fatigue and repainting risks). The Without-Scheme option has a considerably higher estimated whole life cost of £4.719m (2026 prices) across the 60-year appraisal period (inclusive of inflation and risk at 55%). TMBC is concerned that this level of on-going resource is unlikely to be easily affordable and would place considerable strain on the Council and its ability to fulfil other maintenance functions. From an on-going maintenance perspective, it is highly preferable to implement the With-Scheme option.

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 With-Scheme cost estimate has been prepared by a qualified quantity surveyor based upon the initial design concept prepared to inform this submission. The quantities of various elements of work needed (i.e. partial demolition, replacement pre-stressed concrete beams, reinforcement, in-situ concrete, waterproofing, concrete repairs, bearing replacement, etc.) have been defined and multiplied by standard unit rates taken from similar projects and industry-standard cost data.

Percentages for indirect costs have been added to account for costs such as design fees, contractor preliminaries, supervision fees, overheads and profit, utility works, and design contingency. Inflation has also been added using the BCIS All-in TPI for the construction period.

Risk is allowed for as 55% of base cost, reflecting the early design stage and for consistency with the optimism bias applied in the economic appraisal.

The Without-Scheme and With-Scheme cost estimates also include costs for the hire and/or purchase of temporary highway bridges to overspan the existing structure. These costs are drawn from a comparative scheme and industry knowledge. Hire costs are estimated to be £2,500 per week, with additional installation and removal costs at the start and end of the hire period.

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 design is at a formative stage and there remains a considerable amount of development work to undertake before project details are fully understood in a way that will allow financial project risks to be thoroughly understood. Therefore, a 55% risk and uncertainty allocation is included (as well as a 10% design contingency included in the base cost). This considerably increases the overall estimate and provides an upper bound for the likely cost of the project which acts as a ceiling cost estimate that the project can be scoped to meet.

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.

TMBC will provide a local contribution of **£200k** towards the capital scheme, funded from its capital grant to support this project as a critical highway maintenance priority. This local contribution is secured, subject to the Council's normal internal approvals and confirmation of the final funding package. The scale of this local funding commitment is considerable given TMBC's capital funding from DfT for bridges and structures maintenance in 2025/26 was £525k.

The Council is seeking **£3.399m** from the Department for Transport Structures Fund to meet the remaining capital cost of delivering the permanent intervention. This reflects the scale of the works, the strategic importance of restoring 44T access, and the fact that the scheme cannot be accommodated within existing local highway budgets without displacing other essential asset management priorities.

The local contribution to the permanent intervention is therefore 5.6%.

In addition, TMBC proposes to cover the costs of hiring a temporary structure during 2026/27 and 2027/28, at an estimated cost of **£526k** (including installation and removal). This will be removed once the permanent solution is ready to be constructed during 2028/29. This extends the local contribution to 18.7% of the overall capital works value of £4.178m.

No third-party financial contributions are expected to be available to deliver the project.

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?

28 January 2028

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

16 February 2029

A programme is included in Appendix E.

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 scheme is still at an early stage. It will progress through the remaining design, consent, procurement and construction stages in a structured sequence with TMBC holding client-side responsibility for governance, approvals and delivery oversight.

WSP has already been commissioned to progress design development, and TMBC plans to retain WSP's services throughout the project. They will supplement TMBC's in-house engineers, who are resource-constrained. WSP is also scoping to provide independent Technical Approval Authority support, through a separate resource, to support design assurance. TMBC will lead engagement activities with NGET and other key stakeholders, including statutory bodies. Required consents and approvals will be identified and secured as the design develops. TMBC and WSP are meeting regularly to discuss technical progress, review risks and support collaborative delivery.

Once a design is completed, TMBC will procure the works through Lot 5 of the Tameside HMF, which is currently being established. The framework will be active from September 2026 and will provide a ready-made route to market. It is expected that up to three contractors will be shortlisted to Lot 5, and all suppliers will be suitably qualified and experienced to undertake this type of work. The construction phase will be managed through an NEC4 contract, likely to be Option A. TMBC will retain ownership of the project throughout, though may appoint external resources to act on behalf of the Council in management or supervision roles should in-house resources be constrained. An existing professional services framework provides a procurement route for any additional services.

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?).

Funding certainty is the largest risk. TMBC must act urgently because of the bridge's role in providing access to critical electricity infrastructure. There has been regular engagement with SP ENW and NGET over the issues that the current structure is causing. Maintaining positive relationships will be critical to delivering a successful project.

The proposed solution and delivery methodology is designed to minimise complexity. Retaining the existing substructure significantly reduces risks associated with ground conditions, structural condition, flooding, and seasonally restricted works within the watercourse. National flood risk mapping identifies a low flood risk at the site, further mitigated by scheduling demolition during summer.

Existing services running through the bridge will be safeguarded by temporary works to suspend them across the river while the superstructure is replaced.

Engagement will need to agree mitigation plans that ensure the substations are able to operate safely during any periods when access may need to be restricted due to traffic management or demolition works. Contingency arrangements could include critical materials being brought to site before any periods of disruption. NGET's access requirements will be a key risk to understand as the design and construction methodology is developed.

Procurement through the Tameside HMF assures that a suitably qualified and experienced contractor will be appointed. An NEC4 contract will provide an appropriate risk profile.

TMBC understands the terms of the Structures Fund and is committed to underwriting any cost overruns that may occur. A loan is the most likely funding strategy for any overruns.

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 project will be delivered under an NEC4 contract (likely Option A), incorporating robust management and governance controls to maintain programme certainty, cost control and quality throughout. These will include:

- **Stakeholder Engagement:** Ongoing liaison with SP Electricity North West, NGET and the Environment Agency, supported by proactive community engagement and communications, will ensure effective interface management and stakeholder awareness.
- **Cost Control:** Financial performance will be monitored through monthly valuations, forecasting and cost-value reconciliation. The NEC Early Warning process will identify emerging risks and their potential impacts on project costs.
- **Programme Management:** The designer and contractor will provide a baseline programme, including critical activities and milestones. Progress will be reviewed weekly to monitor performance, identify delays and manage any erosion of programme contingency.
- **Risk Management:** Risk workshops involving key stakeholders will be undertaken throughout pre-construction and construction to identify, assess and mitigate project risks collaboratively.
- **Design and Construction Assurance:** The scheme will be procured against a technically assured detailed design, with key assumptions validated during development to minimise scope changes and associated cost increases. The contractor will enact a Quality Management System to ensure a quality-assured delivery process.

- **Change Control:** NEC Early Warning and Compensation Event procedures will provide a structured approach to managing change, with regular reviews to identify mitigation measures and maintain programme and budget objectives.
- **Governance and Reporting:** Weekly project meetings will track performance against defined KPIs. Clear decision-making responsibilities will be established from the outset, supported by a dedicated Project Manager and full-time site supervisor.

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 scheme is expected to require a limited number of third-party permissions and approvals, which will be confirmed as design development progresses. These are expected to include permissions from the Environment Agency to work across the River Tame, planning-related approvals, ecological approvals or licences (if protected species are identified), utility-related agreements with SP ENW and NGET, and local highway approvals, including a Temporary TRO to manage any restrictions to Grove Road during construction. Permissions will be managed by TMBC and WSP throughout the detailed design and pre-construction stages. Early engagement with SP ENW and NGET is already taking place, reflecting the presence of electricity assets on the bridge and the need to maintain network connectivity during the works.

Formal engagement with the Environment Agency will commence shortly. The planned approach of retaining the existing substructures, maintaining existing soffit levels and limiting works within the watercourse, is designed to meet their requirements as well as reduce complexity.

Any permissions and consents present a potential programme risk. The programme includes contingency to allow third-party processes to be followed and to give sufficient time for thorough engagement and collaboration on the permissions identified above. Appropriate mitigation will also be prescribed within contractor method statements and construction phase plans.

Based on current information, there are no permissions or consents that are assessed to be unachievable within the project timescales set out in this submission.

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 adaptation has been integrated into the work completed to date and will continue to be a key consideration as both the design and a construction methodology are developed. An earlier screening of climate hazards using UKCP18 projections identified a range of medium to high risks under both current and future conditions, including higher river flows, intense storm events, extreme temperatures and increased rainfall. These are addressed through established standards, including Eurocode Actions on Structures (including NA to BS EN 1991-1-4:2005 and NA to BS EN 1991-1-5:2003).

The Grove Road river bridge is particularly vulnerable to water ingress and moisture-related deterioration, which could worsen with increased rainfall intensity and higher river flows. This risk will be addressed

through the replacement of waterproofing to improve resistance to rainfall, water ingress and moisture-related deterioration. The full reconstruction of the superstructure will improve structural integrity. The structure is also vulnerable to flooding from higher river flows, and the new structure will preserve headroom clearance above the river. Engagement with the Environment Agency will confirm that any new structure is sufficiently future-proofed for climate resilience.

The bridge provides the only suitable HGV access route to three electricity substations serving approximately 240,000 properties. As the only HGV access route, the road network currently offers no resilience. This has escalated risks for SP ENW and NGET. Delivering a permanent solution is critical to TMBC from the perspectives of both transport and energy sector resilience.

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 scheme proposes the reconstruction of the Grove Road river bridge over the River Tame. To support the delivery of the Tameside Climate Strategy and its ambition for carbon neutrality across the borough by 2038, a PAS 2080:2023-compliant Carbon Management Plan (CMP) will be developed to embed carbon management throughout the scheme lifecycle.

The design will include the full reconstruction of the bridge superstructure using pre-stressed concrete tee beams and a solid infill slab. The team plan to re-use the existing substructures (such as the footprint of the pier and abutments in the bed and banks of the river), thereby minimising the level of new construction. This approach is expected to reduce lifecycle emissions by avoiding the embodied carbon associated with repeated maintenance and avoiding impact on carbon-sequestering vegetation where possible. Other measures such as new waterproofing, concrete repairs and bearing replacements will result in fewer future maintenance activities which will also outturn lower future embodied carbon.

The CMP will be developed alongside the design process, informing an early review of potential construction methods, material quantities, and programme sequencing - with the aim of reducing embodied carbon. An infrastructure assessment has estimated whole life carbon emissions at 206 tCO₂e, with asphalt and ready-mix concrete identified as the largest contributors. An ambitious evidence-based carbon reduction target will be set within the CMP with clear roles and responsibilities established across the scheme lifecycle.

The proactive approach will ensure carbon emissions are minimised and the wider environmental impacts during delivery are appropriately considered, in line with the expectations placed on suppliers and contractors through STAR procurement's Responsible Procurement Strategy (which TMBC participates in). A stakeholder carbon workshop will identify further emissions reduction opportunities across design, materials and procurement processes. The PAS 2080:2023 Carbon Reduction Hierarchy will be applied, prioritising measures that avoid carbon before considering lower carbon materials and efficient construction.

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.

All statutory undertakers in the vicinity of the scheme have been identified and asset plans obtained. The bridge superstructure currently accommodates a significant number of electricity cable routes serving the nearby substations. Engagement with SP ENW and NGET will continue throughout design development. Both organisations support an intervention that restores operational and maintenance access for 44T HGVs across the bridge. The delivery strategy recognises the need to maintain all cable routes across the river throughout demolition and reconstruction of the superstructure. The construction methodology will be planned accordingly. Utility works are expected to be incorporated into the main contractor's programme, consistent with previous TMBC projects. The programme includes provision for temporary works to facilitate the suspension of the cable routes across the river.

Engagement with the Environment Agency will begin shortly to confirm permit requirements and incorporate these into the delivery programme. As the proposals are limited to replacement of the superstructure, while retaining existing deck soffit levels and substructures, impacts on the river are expected to be minimal and the associated consenting risk is considered low. The scheme will be developed to ensure compliance with any environmental permit requirements and mitigation measures will be incorporated as appropriate.

The requirement for any Protected Species Licences has yet to be determined and will be confirmed through further ecological assessment. The work will also require a Temporary TRO to facilitate traffic management and a temporary closure of the bridge during reconstruction.

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)

An Equality Impact Assessment (EqIA) has been undertaken for the scheme in line with the Public Sector Equality Duty (Appendix G). The EqIA considers both temporary construction impacts and longer-term operational effects across protected characteristics, including age, disability, pregnancy and maternity, race, religion or belief, sex, gender reassignment and sexual orientation. It concludes that significant adverse equality impacts are not expected once the scheme is operational, with long-term effects likely to be neutral to positive if inclusive design measures are incorporated.

Temporary minor adverse impacts could arise during construction if Grove Road is temporarily closed or restricted, particularly for disabled people, older people, people travelling with pushchairs, pedestrians, cyclists and people without access to a car. Potential impacts include longer or less accessible temporary routes, changes to walking and wheeling access, construction traffic, noise, and inaccessible communications. Use of the bridge by these groups is understood to be relatively limited but this will be reviewed as traffic management proposals are developed. Community engagement will be essential. Mitigation may include confirming accessible temporary routes where practicable, assessing diversion routes for gradients, surfacing, lighting, crossings and personal safety, and providing clear advanced communications through letters, site notices, web updates and alternative formats on request.

The detailed design will ensure that permanent access is retained for all network users through a permanent solution. Footway widths will be protected and new surfacing, dropped kerbs/tactile paving, lighting, and parapets will also provide better conditions.

The EqIA will be updated at key project milestones.

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.tameside.gov.uk/engineers/bridge-structures-and-retaining-walls>

3.3 Declarations

Senior Responsible Owner declaration

As Senior Responsible Owner for [Grove Road Bridge, Grove Road, Stalybridge], I hereby submit this request for approval to DfT on behalf of [Tameside MBC] and confirm that I have the necessary authority to do so.

I confirm that [Tameside MBC] 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: Emma Varnam

b) Signed: 

c) Date: 03/08/2026

d) Email: emma.varnam@tameside.gov.uk

Section 151 Officer declaration

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

- 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: Zoe Evans

f) Signed: 

g) Date: 03.08.2026

h) Email: zoe.evans@tameside.gov.uk