



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: Southampton City Council
- b) Scheme / structure name and LHA bridges number: Northam Bridge – A3014 and 1346
- c) Location (OS Grid Reference) of the scheme/structure (to identify location on map):
- Easting: 443229
- Northing: 112930
- d) Name of Project Manager: Joshua Uzzell
- e) Email address: josh.uzzell@southampton.gov.uk
- f) Phone number: 07710203943
- 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.

Built in 1953/54, it was the first major post-tensioned concrete road bridge constructed in the UK and carries approximately 32,000 vehicles daily (SCC 2025 counts).

The bridge comprises five continuous spans totalling 148m, supported by four in-water piers. Its pioneering construction used longitudinal prestressed beams and transverse post-tensioning over

the diaphragms without original waterproofing, a combination that presents durability challenges today.

The recent inspection (2026) and load assessment (2015) have identified the following:

- The 2015 Post-Tensioned Special Inspection found critical defects in the transverse post-tensioning over the piers, with some ducts 100% ungrouted.
- The 2015 assessment rated the bridge at 40t HA for the carriageway and dead load only for the parapet edge beams, with no sensitivity analysis for progressive tendon loss, meaning the true residual capacity may be lower.
- Water seepage at the deck soffit prompted remedial waterproofing in 2015, but seepage remains unresolved and continues to threaten the post-tensioning system.
- Underwater inspections in 2019 identified a high risk of localised scour at multiple pier foundations.
- The 2026 Principal Inspection (attached) recorded significant spalling and hollow sounding concrete throughout the longitudinal flexure members. Hollow sounding was noted to the bottom section of all primary beams, and anchorages within the precast beams showed severe section loss from corrosion. Water seepage was observed over the piers where the transverse post-tensioning present.

The bridge carries no HB or SV/SOV rating. Any abnormal load must divert via the M27, adding distance, delay and network stress.

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 Council is proposing a renewal scheme comprising structural intervention to the superstructure and scour protection to the foundations. Following completion of the 2026 Principal Inspection, a detailed structural assessment is now being commissioned, incorporating sensitivity analysis on the progressive loss of transverse post-tensioning capacity and the extent of section loss to the precast beams. On the basis of the Principal Inspection findings like extensive spalling, hollow-sounding concrete throughout the longitudinal flexural members, and severe corrosion-related section loss to anchorages within the precast beams with full superstructure replacement is now anticipated to be the preferred intervention, with comprehensive strengthening considered unlikely to be a viable option given the extent of deterioration. The forthcoming structural assessment will confirm this position before the option is finalised at the design stage, ensuring the decision is made on the basis of robust evidence.

Whichever option is confirmed, the scheme will be designed to achieve a full abnormal load rating, including HB or SOV capacity across the full width of the structure. This will establish Northam River Bridge as the only abnormal load crossing of the River Itchen within Southampton's city boundary, closing a long-standing gap in the strategic network.

Scour protection works will be delivered alongside the structural intervention, addressing the high risk of localised scour at the pier foundations identified during the 2019 underwater inspections. These works will improve the long-term resilience of the structure against the increasing frequency of high-flow events associated with a changing climate.

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

No

k) If the structure is on a diversion route for the SRN provide a clear description/commentary. No. However, A3024 is part of the Major Road Network (MRN) between M27 Junction 8 and Southampton City Centre.

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 2009 PTSI identified grout voids in the transverse post-tensioning and confirmed the deck was built without waterproofing. The 2015 PTSI found more extensive grout loss, with some transverse post-tensioning ducts over the piers 100% ungrouted. The 2015 load assessment, which included no sensitivity analysis for progressive tendon loss, rated the bridge at 40T HA on the carriageway and dead load only on the parapet edge beams a rating now considered to overstate residual capacity. The 2019 underwater inspection identified a high risk of localised scour at multiple pier foundations, which remains unresolved. The 2026 Principal Inspection (attached and submitted alongside this application) found significant new deterioration such as delamination and spalling to the longitudinal beams in spans 5 and 6, hollow-sounding concrete to the bottom 200mm of most beams, severe section loss to prestressing strands, and water seepage through the transverse diaphragms over the piers, confirming and extending defects first flagged in 2009/2015. This evidence underpins the bridge's current BCI Critical score of 38.52 and BCI Average of 79.81, driven principally by the primary longitudinal deck elements and internal diaphragms. These scores reflect a marked decline over the last 15 years, as the 2026 PI is the first inspection to fully capture the extent of water ingress and post-tensioning loss identified since 2009. The bridge currently carries no HB or SV/SOV rating.

- 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 bridge currently has a capacity of 40T ALL over the carriageway and dead load only to the verges. It should be noted that the 2015 assessment did not include a sensitivity analysis on the loss of the transverse post-tensioning system.

At present, only a low number of HGVs use the bridge, however that is anticipated to increase within the next few years with other work planned to upgrade other assets along this corridor. Once the current structural assessment is complete, it is expected that no HGVs will be permitted on the bridge given the rating likely to be obtained once the condition of the structure is taken into account. Further restrictions on cars and LGVs are also anticipated if the concrete deterioration continues at its current rate, with a full closure of the bridge to traffic assumed to be reached by 2027. Also, the currently the bridge has no restriction over the pedestrian loading, however the edge beams are rated dead loading only. Therefore, based on the ongoing assessment, no pedestrian loading will be allowed.

- 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.

Yes. It is expected that based on the current level of concrete and reinforcement deterioration, the structural assessment cannot take the condition factor as 1, which means there are significant chances of curtailment to the capacity of the bridge from the current rating. Due to the absence of deck slab, it is anticipated that the width of the bridge would be restricted to 7m along the centre line with single lane to each direction to enable the transverse distribution of the load. A weight restriction of 7.5T or 3T would be imposed to the carriageway to allow only buses to travel in 2026 and further complete close down is anticipated by the end of 2027, if the concrete is allowed to deteriorate at this rate. This assumption is based on the upcoming load assessment and engineering judgement based on the latest principal inspection.

- 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, There is no propping. However, the edge beams are protected away from the wheel loading using bollards.

- 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.

Yes

- 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: 38.52

BCI Ave: 79.81

- 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.

Primary deck elements and internal diaphragms.

- 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.

Main of five bridges across the River Itchen, carrying 32,000 vehicles including 14 buses/hr, forming the principal route into Southampton city centre and the Port of Southampton (3rd busiest in UK and premier cruise port – employing 15,000+ jobs across UK). Safeguarding access to the Port ensures that £2bn of economic activities is retained for UK economy.

- Supports delivery of 12,000 homes within 5km helping to meet Government's 1.5m homes target including homes locally in Itchen Riverside Renaissance area and regeneration around St Mary's Stadium
- Any restriction or closure would sever this route entirely, with no comparable alternative available within Southampton.
- Provides a route for future MRT from Bitterne and Hedge End into Southampton and retains a cycle (SCN3) and pedestrian routes.

Reliable and unrestricted access to the Port supports continued economic productivity for Southampton and Solent sub-region. If the bridge deteriorates to the point of weight restriction or closure, the consequences would be immediate and significant freight movements would be disrupted, bus operations disrupted, journey times and vehicle operating costs would increase, and supply chains that depend on predictable port access would be placed under serious pressure.

Restoring a full abnormal load rating would unlock economic activity that is currently impossible providing a viable route for construction plant, energy infrastructure and large-scale freight movements supporting new investment, development and major infrastructure delivery. Repairing the bridge to ensure that root causes of the issues would ensure that the bridge remains operational for people needing to use it and safeguarding growth in Southampton.

- 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.

Further to the economic growth mission, the renewal of Northam River Bridge supports three additional government missions.

On clean energy, the Port of Southampton is a nationally significant hub for renewable energy supply chains. It is the primary staging and export point for wind turbine blades manufactured at the Vestas facility on the Isle of Wight, the UK's only dedicated onshore wind turbine blade factory and handles offshore wind cargo as part of a growing energy portfolio. Distribution of these components across the UK involves road movements, some requiring abnormal load capability. With no abnormal load crossing of the River Itchen in Southampton, this movement is currently constrained. Restoring an abnormal load rating would address this gap and strengthen Southampton's role in the energy transition.

On safer streets, a bridge that continues to deteriorate without intervention will require traffic management measures including lane restrictions, weight limits or temporary closures. Each of these transfers traffic onto less suitable roads, increases the risk of accidents between vehicles, pedestrians and cyclists, and degrades road safety across the wider network. Timely renewal prevents this and maintains the safe operation of a busy urban corridor used by thousands of people every day.

On breaking down barriers to opportunity, Northam River Bridge is the primary crossing connecting Southampton's eastern communities to the city centre, employment, education and public services. Parts of Southampton face significant economic challenges, and the A3024 is a lifeline for residents who depend on it for access to work and opportunity. Protecting this connection is directly consistent with the government's ambition to ensure infrastructure serves everyone.

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.

Southampton LTP4 Policy C2 sets out investment in main Road and Rail corridors to ensure they are resilient and reliable to support economic growth- A3024 is the main corridor to eastern Southampton. Policy C4 sets out approach for a Resilient Highway Network. LTP is supported by BSIP – A3024 is main bus corridor and future MRT and LCWIP – part of SCN3 to Bitterne. TfSE Strategic Investment Plan (SIP) identifies that asset resilience is a key policy approach needed to maintain the South East and UK's competitiveness as Southampton is home to one UK's main international trade gateways. SCC's Transport Asset Management Plan (TAMP)'s framework prioritises investment based on condition, network criticality, safety risk, economic impact and community need. Scoring for Northam River Bridge is high across all criteria and identified as highest priority structure requiring investment. The TAMP sets out that ensuring continued reliable access to the Port is one of the five principal challenges facing Southampton's transport network. It also recognises that structures with a high consequence of failure, such as bridges on principal roads are identified and assessed as critical assets that need higher degree of attention and investment than routine maintenance. TAMP's prioritisation methodology combines assessments with value management (including road type, traffic, economic impact and community priority). The TAMP acknowledges that structures lifecycle plan is incomplete and that the ~£450,000 annual structures maintenance budget is insufficient for a full-scale renewals programme.

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.

SCC is the sole owner and maintainer of Northam River Bridge. There are no third-party ownership interests, shared maintenance responsibilities or land ownership complications associated with the structure or the proposed scheme. This means SCC has full ability to progress the scheme without dependency on external parties, simplifying procurement process.

However, delivery depend on few parties. Statutory and technical stakeholders include the Environment Agency, given in-water works to the River Itchen, and the relevant utility companies with services carried on the bridge. Strategic stakeholders include National Highways (A3024 forms part of the MRN), Network Rail, local bus operators, emergency services, Southampton FC and Ward Members for the eastern wards.

Engagement with these groups is being programmed rather than left informal: initial contact is planned once the structural assessment concludes later this year, with the purpose of confirming design constraints, coordinating consents and agreeing target dates ahead of detailed design. A high-level delivery programme is,

- Surveys and structural assessment (underway).
- Options study and feasibility (early 2027).
- Design development (late 2027)
- ECI /Construction (2028/29–2029/30).
- Completion and handover (2029/30).

No controversial elements have been identified. The renewal of a deteriorating principal road bridge is expected to command broad public and stakeholder support.

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.

The reason the bridge has not undergone a major capital intervention until now is due to how it has been investigated and assessed over time. The first PTSI in 2009 identified grout voids and confirmed the bridge had been constructed without waterproofing, allowing water to seep through the deck. In response, the Council delivered a waterproofing scheme. During these works, improved access enabled a further PTSI, which identified more extensive grout loss and defects within the transverse post-tensioning system.

A structural assessment was undertaken around the same period using a basic methodology. However, this assessment did not account for the loss of prestressing and concluded the bridge had a 40-tonne carriageway capacity, which was adopted as the standard rating. As no significant cracking or structural distress was observed, the bridge remained in service and was managed through routine inspections.

Subsequent engineering reviews have shown that the 2015 assessment did not fully reflect the PTSI findings and that the bridge's residual capacity is likely lower than the 40-tonne rating once the deterioration of the post-tensioning system is considered. This updated understanding, combined with ongoing water ingress, the scour risk identified in 2019, and the absence of an abnormal load assessment, has demonstrated that a major capital intervention is now necessary.

The 2026 Principal Inspection further confirmed the deteriorating condition by identifying extensive delamination, complete loss of prestressing cables and reinforcing bars in the longitudinal members, and hollow sounding along the soffit of every longitudinal beam, indicating significant deterioration requiring urgent intervention.

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.

Northam River Bridge has been selected for this application because of 3 main reasons.

The first is the scale and complexity of the required intervention. The renewal of a 70-year-old post-tensioned concrete bridge, with active post-tensioning deterioration, unresolved water ingress and high risk of scour to piers, represents a scheme of a scale and technical complexity that is

beyond Council's routine structures maintenance budget. The Council's annual structures maintenance allocation across its entire stock is circa £450,000. A scheme of this nature, whether full superstructure replacement or comprehensive strengthening, will require an investment of much higher in value.

The second is the abnormal load network gap that only this structure can close. Northam River Bridge is the only crossing of the River Itchen on the A3024 corridor and the only structure in the city with the potential to provide an abnormal load crossing of the river. No other scheme in Southampton's stock offers this combination of strategic network benefit alongside urgent structural need.

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

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

The consequences of not delivering this scheme are interconnected.

The immediate consequence is the continued and accelerating deterioration of the structure. Without intervention, unresolved water ingress will continue to compromise the transverse post-tensioning system, progressive tendon loss will reduce the bridge's structural capacity below its already sub-standard rating, and the scour risk at the pier foundations will remain unresolved. This deterioration will lead to weight restriction, emergency propping or full closure of the bridge. Given there is no comparable alternative crossing of the River Itchen on this corridor, any restriction would cause severe and sustained disruption to approximately 32,000 vehicle movements per day, with immediate consequences for freight, port access, public transport and the communities that depend on this route.

The second consequence is the continuation of the abnormal load gap in Southampton's network. Every year without an abnormal load crossing of the River Itchen is another year in which clean energy distribution, large-scale construction and major freight movements are constrained in how they move across the city. This is not a temporary inconvenience but a structural limitation on Southampton's capacity to grow, develop and attract investment.

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.

Northam River Bridge is the primary connection between Southampton's eastern residential communities and employment, education, healthcare and public services on the western bank of the River Itchen. The communities directly served include Bitterne Manor, Bitterne, Sholing and Thornhill, representing around 26% of Southampton's population. Bitterne is among the more economically challenged areas of the city, and many residents rely on public transport and active travel for daily journeys. The A3024 corridor carries approximately 18 bus services per hour, making it one of Southampton's busiest public transport routes.

Any restriction or closure of the bridge would significantly impact these communities by disrupting their most direct connection to essential services and opportunities. For residents without private vehicles, or those affected by weight restrictions, there is no equivalent alternative. The Itchen Toll Bridge adds distance, cost and time to journeys, while other crossings such as Cobden Bridge are already congested and unable to accommodate the existing demand.

The Bluestar 18 bus service, connecting Thornhill with key destinations including Royal South Hants Hospital, Solent University, St Mary's Stadium, Southampton City Centre, Southampton Central and

University Hospital Southampton, would be severely affected. A diversion via Cobden Bridge would increase journey times by approximately 30%, disproportionately impacting users who have limited alternative travel options.

The eastern communities already face connectivity challenges due to limited River Itchen crossings. Loss of Northam River Bridge would further increase inequality, while alternative active travel routes would add 3–6 km to journeys, making walking and cycling less practical and reducing accessibility to essential services.

- 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.

Northam River Bridge is a multi-modal corridor carrying 31,910 vehicles per day (2025 SCC Counts) representing a significant proportion of all cross-Itchen vehicle movements within Southampton.

- The vehicle mode split is 94% cars & LGVs, 1.6% motorcycles, 0.6% HGVs, 1.3% bus, 1% cycles, the person mode split is 70.8% cars & LGVs, 27.5% bus, 1.6% motor and pedal cycles. There is very low HGV traffic >1% linked restrictions at Northam Rail Bridge.

- Carries 14 buses/hr on services that move 4.1M people/year (2025)

- Part of Southampton Cycle Network (SCN) 3 connecting from Bitterne and West End to City Centre – sees 242 cycles/day (2025). The impact of the closure of the bridge would be extremely significant as traffic would need to reroute onto already congested alternative – Cobden and Itchen Toll Bridges. These routes would not be able to accommodate this level of traffic causing additional delays and congestion. Traffic may also reroute to M27 if congestion on local roads affecting the Strategic Road Network and wider strategic journeys being made on it. Impact for would be to divert either via Itchen Bridge or Cobden Bridge – these would add time to services increase operator costs and potentially reducing frequencies. HGVs would not be able to use Cobden or Itchen Bridges and would need to divert 15km via the M27. Active travel would be significantly impacted with diversions 3.7km north and 6.2km south – disbenefiting 45,000 people including Bitterne Manor School pupils.

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 economic benefits of this scheme arise from five principal sources, representing the value lost if intervention does not proceed.

The current AADT is 31,910 (SCC counts), comprising 94% cars, 0.61% HGVs, 1.2% buses and 2.2% LGVs. Of the HGVs, 79% are rigid and 21% articulated. Converted to PCUs, traffic demand

is approximately 1,145 PCU/hr. Using TAG Unit 5-4 congestion banding for an urban primary A-road within the FORGE 'Other Urban' classification, the alternative route via Cobden Bridge and Thomas Lewis Way operates at a volume-to-capacity ratio exceeding 1.

The first benefit is journey time savings by avoiding the 5.6 km diversion via Cobden Bridge and Thomas Lewis Way, an urban single carriageway already carrying over 20,000 AADT. Bus journey time savings also arise by avoiding additional mileage and operating costs for the 16 buses per hour using the corridor; the high-frequency Bluestar 18 service alone would require three additional vehicles to maintain operation. The scheme delivers £28 million in journey time benefits and £94 million in decongestion benefits.

The second benefit is carbon reduction from avoiding longer diversion routes, quantified using current Green Book carbon values.

The third is whole-life cost savings by intervening before deterioration accelerates, avoiding emergency repairs and substantially higher reconstruction costs.

The fourth is creating Southampton's first abnormal load crossing of the River Itchen, removing a long-standing network constraint, supporting future investment and economic growth.

- 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)	30,516,480
Present Value Benefits (PVB)	139,794,758
Benefit to Cost Ratio (BCR)	4.6

- 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.

With Scheme – An initial capital investment of £30 Million to be spend for replacement before 2030. Then further on there is no requirement for routine maintenance on a newly built bridge except the inspections (PI & GI). The cost is both captured with inflation of 3.5%. A re-waterproofing and expansion joint replacement scheme is also assumed. After 45 years into service, it is assumed that bridge would require routine maintenance along with principal inspections.

The assumption that any strengthening would be possible is disregarded based on the extensive concrete defects observed from 2026 Principal Inspection.

Under the built up of the 30 million, initial 500k would be spend on the studies and optioneering, followed a detailed design allocation of 15% of 30M. Further spend is recorded over 2 years with 2028/29 being the major cost.

Of the three diversion options, the Itchen Toll Bridge is excluded as drivers are unlikely to prefer a tolled route. It is assumed that 50% of cars use Cobden Bridge, with the remainder using the M27. A weighted diversion length is therefore applied.

The route length without diversion is 3 km as there are railway track on both sides and estimated time of 7 minutes.

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

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

Traffic data for AADT has come from a SCC Permanent Traffic Counter located at the southern end of Northam River Bridge as is for the whole of 2025. Maps show the location of Northam River Bridge within eastern Southampton showing the other river crossings north (Cobden Bridge) and south (Itchen Bridge) as well as the M27. Closer location maps show the bridge in context with Northam estate, Northam Rail Bridge, St Mary's Stadium and local residential areas. The diversion route is calculated between the Centurion Industrial Estate Junction north of the bridge and Union Road/Princes Road junction south of the bridge to provide an indication of the level of diversion for someone travelling between these two points to replicate a trip towards Southampton City Centre. There are 3 options for the diversion:

1. Via Itchen Toll Bridge 1.7km south – however, certain HGVs cannot use it (height & width restrictions) but buses and general traffic can at a charge;
2. Via Cobden Bridge 1.2km north – however, has a weight restriction except buses so certain HGVs cannot use
3. Via M27 8km north – adds c17km to route and is only viable route for HGVs Distance has been calculated using SCC GIS and journey times have been calculated using Google Maps.

HGV use of the bridge is currently very low, and the toolkit assumes HGVs will be prohibited following completion of the load assessment, consistent with the structural evidence set out in 1.2(b): a high-confidence restriction is expected in 2026, with further restrictions to cars and LGVs, and full closure, anticipated by 2027 if deterioration continues at its current rate.

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.

Other non-monetised impacts include

Whole life cost saving from intervening now rather than deferring. Early intervention avoids accelerating deterioration costs, emergency reactive expenditure and the significantly higher reconstruction costs associated with structural failure. Expected to spend circa £73 million by the end of 2095 without the scheme, with 5 million strengthening in 2028/29 and a full replacement in 2044/45 with inflation 54 Million.

Non-monetised impacts in line with TAG & AST include,

- Ability to have abnormal load crossing of the River Itchen to support movements of large-scale construction plant, energy infrastructure components and oversized freight across the city, unlocking investment and economic activity that the current network cannot support.
- Would enable long-term ambition for Mass Rapid Transit (MRT) to be realised
- Land values could be retained with access – value could be negatively impacted from reduction in connectivity to the City Centre and Port Environmental.

- Air quality and noise impacts – avoiding disbenefits from rerouting over 32,000 vehicles only to other routes that have lower levels of air and noise pollution currently. This would be avoided if all traffic could remain on A3024 and avoid potential noise insulation claims.
- Avoided greenhouse emissions from rerouted traffic .
- Health impacts – could be slightly beneficial benefits from cycles rerouting to longer routes in terms of physical fitness and well-being however this would be undermined by longer route that would reduce the attractiveness of cycling.

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

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

Click or tap here to enter text.

Present Value Costs (PVC)

Click or tap here to enter text.

Present Value Benefits (PVB)

Click or tap here to enter text.

Benefit to Cost Ratio (BCR)

Click or tap here to enter text.

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

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

2.3 Commercial Case

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

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

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

The Southampton Highway Partnership has strong experience delivering complex infrastructure schemes and is well placed to lead the Northam River Bridge renewal. The project is envisioned to be owned by the Highways and Traffic Management Service within the Transport & Planning Directorate of Southampton City Council, led by Joshua Uzzell, Service Manager for Highways and Traffic Management. The SHP has a £10M+ annual highways asset maintenance programme, over £17million infrastructure project and other highways projects. It is likely that some of this funding will be required to get dedicated resource to manage this project.

Asset management and maintenance are delivered through the SHP with Balfour Beatty Living Places (BBLP). Established in 2010 and renewed in 2025 for a further five years to 2030, the SHP covers the anticipated delivery period for Northam River Bridge and provides an established delivery framework.

Recent examples of major schemes delivered through the partnership include:

- Bridges to Prosperity (2013–14): £12M investment in Northam, Itchen and Central Bridges.
- A33/A35 Millbrook Roundabout (2017): £8M investment addressing structural and surfacing issues at a key Port gateway.
- M271/A35 Redbridge Roundabout (2019–20): RIS1 capacity upgrade and resurfacing scheme delivered with National Highways.
- Itchen Bridge (2025): Waterproofing, drainage, parapet and footway works delivered while maintaining operation.

The SHP also supports delivery of major capital transport programmes, including the £57M Transforming Cities programme (2020–25) and the annual Integrated Transport Programme. SCC is additionally leading the Outline Business Case with Network Rail for the adjacent A3024 Northam Rail Bridge enhancement and replacement project, valued at over £150M, requiring complex railway interface management.

For Northam River Bridge we will use established programme management processes, specialist support and the SHP's local network knowledge to deliver the renewal effectively.

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 scheme will be delivered across five stages: investigation and options development, planning and development, detailed design, procurement, and construction.

The 2026 Principal Inspection has now been completed and identified significantly more extensive deterioration than previously understood. This will be followed by a detailed structural assessment of the bridge, including sensitivity analysis on the progressive loss of transverse post-tensioning capacity that was not accounted for in the 2015 assessment, and the extent of section loss to the concrete precast beams. On the basis of the Principal Inspection findings, full superstructure replacement is anticipated to be the preferred intervention; the forthcoming structural assessment will confirm whether comprehensive strengthening remains a viable alternative before the option is finalised alongside the scour protection works.

Once the preferred option is confirmed, detailed design will commence alongside the planning and permissions process. Detailed design will be progressed to support contractor procurement, including ground investigation, utilities surveys and traffic management design. The target completion date is 31 March 2030, with construction initiation in the 2027/28 financial year. The scheme is expected to be delivered through a design and build or construction management route. Balfour Beatty Living Places will support SCC in managing the scheme, drawing on its parent company's experience in comparable bridge renewal projects. AtkinsRéalis which is part of the framework design services contract has been assigned to support the structural assessment and will also be engaged to undertake optioneering and develop the detailed design.

- 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 Council has identified the inspection programme, cost and delivery risks associated with the Northam River Bridge scheme and developed proportionate mitigation measures. These risks reflect the current stage of development and will continue to be refined as the structural assessment, option selection and detailed design progress. A formal risk register will be maintained throughout the project, reviewed at each governance stage, and updated to reflect new information from investigations, design development and stakeholder engagement.

The Principal Inspection has now been completed and identified significantly more severe deterioration than previously understood, indicating that full bridge replacement is now the likely preferred intervention, subject to confirmation by the forthcoming structural assessment. The principal risk is therefore managing the cost, programme and delivery implications of a replacement scheme, which will be mitigated through detailed structural assessment, option development, robust cost planning and phased programme management.

A second key risk is traffic management during construction. The bridge carries approximately 32,000 vehicles per day on a four-lane principal route with no comparable diversion. Construction will require lane or full closures, creating disruption to road users, public transport, freight movements and the Council's reputation. Mitigation includes a phased construction methodology, a comprehensive traffic management strategy and proactive public communication.

A further significant risk is the diversion or protection of utilities carried by the bridge, which will be managed through early stakeholder engagement, surveys and utility coordination during design.

- 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.

Northam River Bridge is owned and maintained solely by Southampton City Council, with no third-party ownership of the structure or adjacent land. Therefore, the scheme is not exposed to the typical third-party delivery risks that often arise where multiple owners or interests are involved in a structure. However, scheme requires liaison with multiple external organisations as part of planning permissions like EA etc.

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	500,000	5,000,000	20,000,000	4,500,000	30,000,000
LA contribution	0	0	0	0	0
Other contribution	0	0	0	0	0
Total costs	500,000	5,000,000	20,000,000	4,500,000	30,000,000

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.

Southampton City Council's annual budget for managing its entire highway structures stock is currently below £450,000, which must cover the whole structures portfolio owned by the Council. The Council has tried to manage Northam River Bridge from within this budget for many years. The 2015 Post-Tensioned Special Inspection and the waterproofing scheme that followed were both funded by the Council from its own resources. However, these works constituted only reactive maintenance and minor intervention. A 70-year-old bridge with no waterproofing and a deteriorating prestressed concrete requires major structural intervention. These renewals are far beyond what the Council can afford from its own budget. Even if the full structures budget were redirected to this single bridge for several years, the scheme would still not be affordable, and every other structure in the city would be left without basic maintenance funding. This scheme therefore requires additional support from the government.

Due to the condition of the overall highway network and assets, it is difficult to allocate more of the annual highway maintenance budget to structures. As it would mean increased deterioration of other assets like carriageways and footway which are in desperate need for funding and repair.

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.

Without the proposed renewal scheme, the whole-life cost of Northam River Bridge will increase significantly across three key areas, all of which the proposed scheme directly mitigates. The first is the continued cost of reactive maintenance and emergency interventions. Without renewal, the Council will be required to continue using limited structures budgets on temporary measures, including attempts to manage water ingress, ongoing monitoring of the post-tensioning system, and reactive repairs as defects emerge. These activities do not address the underlying structural issues and provide diminishing value as the bridge continues to deteriorate. The second, and most significant, cost is the eventual emergency replacement of the bridge following structural failure or closure. Delivering a replacement under emergency conditions would be substantially more expensive than a planned scheme due to programme acceleration, increased direct and indirect costs, emergency traffic management, and reduced opportunity to optimise the design through detailed investigation. The third cost relates to temporary propping or similar stabilisation measures. Installing and maintaining temporary supports over an operational dual carriageway

and tidal river would be technically complex and expensive, requiring specialist design, installation, traffic management, and ongoing inspection, while providing only a short-term solution. WLC modelling indicates expenditure of approximately £73 million over 70 years if renewal is not undertaken. This includes strengthening in 2028 (£5.4 million), monitoring and reactive maintenance to 2044 (£1.12 million), and full replacement in 2044 (£54 million). Based on the completed Principal Inspection, full replacement is now considered the appropriate long-term solution due to the severity and extent of the defects identified.

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 estimate is developed based on the assumption that a renewal scheme comprising of superstructure replacement and scour mitigation measure are required. Based on the the recent PI which showed extensive spalling and structure concrete defects, a strengthening option was disregarded. The estimate built was from a generic assumption which included in the year 1, there are requirements for inspection, investigation and assessment followed by the development of the optioneering report. The year 2, planning permission and detailed design of the scheme will be undertaken and I have assumed a 15% of the total fees for planning and detailed design. Year 3, have accounted for the actual work which is the replacement of the superstructure. I have assumed that the sub-structure will be adequate for the new construction and the replacement of the superstructure will be using precast beams which is bought in and erected using cranes. The year 4 will be project close with completion of the construction including resurfacing and handing back to the council. Also, Year 4 has accounted for the scour mitigation works.

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 most significant financial risk relates to scope at this stage. The Principal Inspection and the detailed capacity assessment that follows will identify the need for a more extensive intervention than currently anticipated, particularly if the loss of post-tensioning capacity has progressed further than the 2015 assessment indicated. Also, construction cost inflation over a multi-year programme remains a meaningful exposure. Ground and site conditions at the pier foundations are not yet fully known, and in-water working in the tidal River Itchen will introduce constraints that can affect both cost and programme. Extended design, procurement or consenting periods could also push elements of the scheme into later financial years and expose the cost plan to further inflationary pressure. The Council will manage these financial risks through structured cost control during design and delivery, including regular cost reviews at each governance stage, early contractor involvement to test pricing assumptions, and active management of the contingency drawdown against emerging risks throughout the project lifecycle will also be considered. The financial risk is captured through accounting for contingency which is currently 20% of the overall budget.

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.

Given SCC's current financial position, the scale of recent expenditure on major infrastructure schemes, and the number of existing funding commitments already in place, it would be unreasonable to expect the Council to make a further financial contribution to this fund and project. As the DfT has itself recognised through the announcement of this fund, local authorities are facing

significant financial pressures and are often unable to meet the cost of repairing and maintaining major infrastructure assets, including highway structures.

SCC has already committed substantial resources to essential projects. This includes £5.7million on a recent scheme to repair and extend the life of the Itchen Bridge. The Council must supplement DfT highway maintenance funding by nearly £7million annually because the funding received is insufficient to maintain the highway network. SCC is expected to provide 15% match funding for the Rail Bridge project, currently estimated £25.7million.

Alongside these commitments, SCC is supporting a range of other infrastructure projects across the city, including the Outdoor Sports Centre, which requires investment of around £10.7million.

Taken together, these examples of existing commitments demonstrate that SCC has already allocated its available funding to essential major projects. As a result, the Council is not in a position to provide additional financial support for this project without creating further pressure on already stretched budgets.

It is also well understood by the DfT that local authorities are not always able to contribute funding to infrastructure projects because of their already stretched financial circumstances. Reflected in other funding, like LEVI, where capital and revenue grant funding are provided so local authorities are not required to invest their own funds 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?

01/08/2027

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

31/03/2030

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 Southampton Highway Partnership, lead by SCC, will manage the delivery of the Northam River Bridge renewal scheme. Technical Expertise will be procured through external consultants with proven experience in major bridge renewal schemes, particularly in post-tensioned concrete structures. The Balfour Beatty will be supporting the client (council) through the Balfour Beatty

Living Places with SHP contract. It is likely internal resources will need to be procured to have the dedicated project management needed to meet project timelines.

- 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 key delivery risks for this scheme have been set out in detail in the previous sections, covering programme, cost and delivery risks across scope, ground conditions, traffic management, in-water working, statutory consents. The financial risks have been addressed through a 20% contingency allowance built into this high-level cost estimate. This will be drawn down in a controlled way against emerging risks as the scheme progresses. A formal risk register will be maintained throughout the project lifecycle and reviewed at each governance gate by the project board. Risk ownership is clearly assigned. Any cost overruns that exceed the contingency allowance will be addressed in the first instance through value engineering and design review to bring the scheme back within budget.

- 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.

Programme will be controlled through a master schedule with critical path activities, dependencies and milestones clearly identified. Float in the programme will be managed actively rather than allowed to be absorbed silently. Cost will be controlled through a baseline cost plan. The cost plan will be tracked against committed and forecast spend on a monthly basis, with variances reported. Quality will be controlled through a defined design assurance process, with independent technical review at key design stages and Approval In Principle and Technical Approval submissions to the appropriate authorities. Risk will be controlled through the live risk register and reviewed at regular intervals. Project Controls and Planner will be procured into the project upon the agreement of the Structures Fund. Current structural assessment programme will define a clear intervention strategy and type of work to be undertaken. This will then decide on the wider programme and cost schedule.

- 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.

At this stage, no clear visibility of the planning permission is available. Based on the optioneering, the requirements will be defined.

- 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.

Northam River Bridge represents a single point of failure on the A3024, with no comparable diversion route available. Renewal of the structure safeguards network resilience by securing this critical link against the

risk of closure. The scheme also addresses the scour vulnerability identified in the 2019 inspection and enhances the structure's resilience against future climate-related stresses. Furthermore, Northam River Bridge has been identified as the only unrestricted crossing point over the River Itchen capable of accommodating emergency service vehicles, including fire engines. Cobden Bridge is subject to a weight restriction, limiting access to cars and light goods vehicles (LGVs) only, while Itchen Bridge is subject to width and height restrictions. Consequently, Northam River Bridge is the sole crossing providing unrestricted access for emergency service vehicles like a Fire Engine with a gross weight of 17 to 18 T

- 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).

Carbon management will be embedded throughout the scheme's development in line with PAS 2080 principles, ensuring whole life carbon is systematically assessed, reduced, and reported at each design stage. A whole life carbon assessment (WLCA) will be undertaken covering both embodied carbon (materials, construction processes) and operational carbon (in-use emissions), enabling a low-carbon baseline to be established early and tracked through to delivery. Opportunities to minimise embodied carbon will be prioritised through material selection (e.g. low-carbon concrete mixes, recycled aggregates, sustainably sourced timber), design optimisation to reduce material quantities, and specification of construction methods with lower plant and transport emissions. On the operational side, the scheme is expected to deliver a net reduction in carbon through modal shift away from private vehicle use, reducing vehicle miles travelled and associated emissions across the wider network. This would enabled by delivering a long-term ambition for Mass Rapid Transit (MRT). While a formal carbon assessment has not yet been undertaken at this stage, the approach will build on lessons learned from the Northam Rail Project, where a structured carbon management strategy delivered measurable reductions in whole life emissions. We are confident this scheme offers strong potential to achieve similarly positive outcomes, and a dedicated carbon management plan will be developed as the design progresses to ensure carbon reduction targets are met or exceeded

- 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.

The bridge currently carries two services. There are two medium-pressure water mains running across it, supplying water from Southampton city centre through to the Bitterne side of the river and if it had to be shut off in an emergency, a large number of people on that side of the city would lose their water. Alongside this, Neos Networks also has cables crossing the bridge, so any damage or deterioration to the structure risks disrupting their network service.

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)

The Northam Rail Bridge project has completed an indepth equality analysis. As this bridge is along the same road and less than half a mile from Northam River Bridge. The equality impacts and mitigation are the same for this proposed project.

The scheme impacts a wide range of groups, including children and young people, older people, disabled people, pregnant people and parents with young children, women, minoritised ethnic communities, religious groups, LGBTQ+ people, care leavers, people on low incomes, local residents, bus users, pedestrians, cyclists and drivers. Key impacts relate to access, safety, air quality, noise, journey reliability, severance, community connectivity and accessibility of consultation.

Mitigation measures include improved and segregated walking and cycling facilities, safer crossings, upgraded bus stops, better surfacing, dropped kerbs, raised kerbs, tactiles and wayfinding. Bus journey reliability will be supported through bus priority measures, helping those without access to a car. The bridge replacement will maintain long-term connectivity and avoid significant diversion impacts. Parklets on Old Northam Road will include seating and rest points.. Engagement will include community, religious and disability groups, with consultation materials available in alternative formats, plain English and, where needed, other languages. Noise, air quality, journey times and wider impacts will be monitored through the monitoring and evaluation programme, with ongoing work with Bluestar and Hampshire Police to address safety and operational issues.

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://transport.southampton.gov.uk/transport-funding-bids/>

3.3 Declarations

Senior Responsible Owner declaration

As Senior Responsible Owner for [Northam River Bridge], I hereby submit this request for approval to DfT on behalf of [Southampton City Council] and confirm that I have the necessary authority to do so.

I confirm that [Southampton City Council] 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: Pete Boustred
- b) Signed: 
- c) Date: 31.07.26
- d) Email: pete.boustred@southampton.gov.uk

Section 151 Officer declaration

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

- 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: Mel Creighton
- f) Signed: 
- g) Date: 31/7/26
- h) Email: mel.creighton@southampton.gov.uk