



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: Wandsworth Council
- b) Scheme / structure name and LHA bridges number: St Johns Hill Bridge – Identifier: 08
- c) Location (OS Grid Reference) of the scheme/structure (to identify location on map):

Easting: 527107

Northing: 175318

- d) [Redacted]
- e) [Redacted]
- f) [Redacted]

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.

St John's Hill Bridge is a six span structure carrying St John's Hill (A3036) over nine railway lines on the southwestern approach to Clapham Junction Station. The westernmost span was constructed in 1884 and the bridge was subsequently widened and extended through to the 1960s resulting in its present arrangement.

The reinforced concrete deck of span 3 has deteriorated severely due to long term water leakage, resulting in extensive concrete spalling that has exposed the reinforcement and led to significant corrosion. Patch repairs have been applied to the soffit over time, but these offer only short term benefit and, given the access constraints imposed by the railway, do not provide a viable long lasting solution.

A 2018 assessment found the span 3 carriageway beams to be overstressed under normal 40-tonne traffic load. Carriageway beam strengthening works were carried out in 2021, but because access was limited to the top of the deck the continuing deterioration of the soffit could not be addressed. Significant overstress was also identified in the span 3 footways which continue to present a structural risk.

Spans 1 and 2 comprise wrought iron plate girders with an ageing, deteriorated paint system and areas of corrosion. The southern parapet to these spans incorporates a timber infill, which has a limited service life and is not suitable for a bridge crossing a railway.

All six spans have an ageing and failed deck waterproofing system. As a result, water is able to penetrate through the deck and leak onto the superstructure beams, contributing to the durability problems described above.

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 reinforced concrete deck of span 3 has deteriorated severely due to long term water leakage. Assessment work has also identified areas of overstress which continue to present a structural risk. To maintain the safe operation of both the highway and the railway, replacement of span 3 is being proposed. The new span will consist of steel girders with a reinforced concrete deck, designed to provide a 120-year service life.

For spans 1 and 2 it is proposed to carry out repairs to areas of corrosion damage and apply a new protective paint system. It is proposed to replace southern timber infilled parapet with a modern metal parapet, providing a safer, more durable, and compliant solution. The full bridge deck will be re waterproofed and re surfaced to enhance the long term durability of all six spans. These works will also resolve the long-standing issue of recurring defects in the road surfacing. To enable these works, the utilities currently located within the footways will need to be temporarily diverted onto a separate utility bridge positioned alongside the existing structure. Once construction activities are complete, the utilities will be reinstated in their original positions beneath the footways. Through these measures, the bridge is expected to be restored to full load capacity ensuring it continues to serve as a vital route for active travel, public transport, and general vehicular movement that supports a thriving town centre.

The planned works are based on the best information available at this stage. WBC is undertaking a series of inspections, investigations, and assessments to confirm the full extent of required interventions. Potential additional works and associated uncertainties are outlined in the project risk register in Appendix 7 of the supporting information.

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.

It is not.

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..

Spans 1 and 2 comprise wrought iron plate girders with an ageing, deteriorated paint system and areas of corrosion. This condition has been known from general and principal inspection records dating back to 1991 and verified most recently during an inspection in June 2026. The girders do not have significant spare capacity and if the corrosion is left to continue it will impact on the load rating of the bridge.

The reinforced concrete deck of span 3 has deteriorated severely due to long term water leakage. Inspection records show that patch repairs have been repeatedly applied to the bridge soffit and typically last 10 to 20 years evidencing that patch repairs do not provide a viable long lasting solution.

A 2018 assessment found significant overstress of the span 3 footway beams. The recommendation to introduce bollards on the north footway was implemented. However, the finding of overstress under just pedestrian loading has not been addressed and continues to present a structural risk.

Span 3 carriageway beam strengthening works were carried out in 2021, but because access was limited to the top of the deck the continuing deterioration of the soffit could not be addressed. Inspection work from June 2026 found the beams to be in worse condition than assumed for the 2021 strengthening design. [REDACTED]

The June 2026 inspection identified water leakage across the full deck indicating failure of the deck waterproofing system.

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

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

The structure currently operates without load restrictions, though the assessment evidence from 2019, indicates that restrictions could be justified now.

- 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, as in response to 1.2b, the structure currently operates without load restrictions, though the assessment evidence from 2019, indicates that restrictions could be justified at present.

Span 3's north footway beams are heavily overstressed under pedestrian loading. While bollards help reduce the risk of errant vehicle loading, the condition still warrants mitigation [REDACTED]

Span 3s south footway beams are also overstressed [REDACTED].

The beam at the southern edge of span 3's carriageway is overstressed under a 40 tonne assessment load [REDACTED]

If the bridge were re assessed in light of recent inspection findings showing further deterioration, the level of overstress in these elements would likely be higher, providing additional justification for the restrictions outlined above. [REDACTED]

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.

The installation of bollards on the northern footway to mitigate the risk of errant vehicle loading is only a temporary measure and does not deal with vehicle impact, they only act as a deterrent, not a protective measure. Therefore, the northern footway continues to be at risk.

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.

Temporary measures would largely consist of concrete repairs that can be carried out within shorter NR possessions due to the busyness of the NR lines and very high cost of longer possessions. The constraints on duration available would therefore limit the practicality of achieving long-lasting repairs that also enhance the structural capacity and will therefore aim to only slow down the rate of corrosion in the reinforcement and address removal of loose, delaminated and spalling concrete. Based on historic concrete repairs they have not lasted more than around 10 years, whilst the reinforcement continues to corrode. As detailed in the responses to parts b & c, there is already currently overstress and therefore additional temporary measures would be expected by the end of 2029/2030 financial year. This is anticipated to initially include more thorough intrusive investigations and Special Inspection to identify extent and severity of the corrosion and concrete contamination (e.g. from carbonation and chlorides) and removing loose concrete from the beams and the concrete pier crosshead that was identified in the recent (2026) Principal Inspection (PI). This would potentially be followed by installing retention netting or similar on the soffit of the beams to catch any falling concrete as an added safety measure, then installing crack monitoring and load monitoring (e.g. strain gauges or load cells) by beginning 2027, subject to available NR possessions, to provide information for an updated bridge assessment. This will inform what load restrictions and lane closures need to be implemented. As detailed in the responses to 1.2b) & c), the previous assessment already showed overstress in some of the beams and therefore monitoring is essential in managing and informing necessary load restrictions. During the period from now until the end of 2029/2030 financial year, there will need to

be more frequent inspections (every 3 to 6 months, depending on rate of deterioration and what monitoring informs), to check for physical change in condition such as further corrosion, amount of fallen concrete and continued loss of iron thickness. These will all increase costs for both the investigations and railway possessions. [REDACTED]

[REDACTED] temporary barriers installed beside the north footway to further mitigate risk of errant vehicles coming onto the footway. Within the same timeframe, [REDACTED] are possible due to continued deterioration to the carriageway beams in Span 3, that was picked up in the 2026 PI.

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?

[REDACTED] [REDACTED]

[REDACTED] [REDACTED]

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

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

The latest BCI's were generated from the 2016 General Inspection. [REDACTED]

[REDACTED] However, this result is not considered fully informed because this inspection was not done under a railway possession and consequently the inspectors did not go under the bridge.

The most recent BCI where the inspectors did inspect the underside of the bridge was the 2010 Principal Inspection. [REDACTED]

The following summaries the 2010 Principal Inspection findings, which is considered the most informed record on file:

Spans 1 and 2 (ironwork)

Paint loss and corrosion of the beams. All beams displaying isolated areas of general minor corrosion. A small number of beams showing significant corrosion. Missing rivets. Debris on unused portion of deck.

Span 3 (Reinforced Concrete)

Heavy spalling, cracking and exposed reinforcement to beams under the footway. Staining and stalactite formation.

Spalling, cracking and exposed reinforcement to beams under the carriageway.

Spans 4 and 5 (Prestressed Beams)

Water leakage, staining and stalactite formation to soffit and cross beams.

Concrete spalling and exposed shear links to cross beam.

Masonry Substructures (Abutments and Pier B)

Damaged and missing brickwork, cracks, mortar loss, vegetation growth.

Safety elements

Damage to brickwork parapets. Rotten timber parapet on south side of spans 1 and 2.

Damage to surfacing: Potholes in carriageway. Loose paving slabs in the footway.

Changes in the last 5 years

Generally, the condition has worsened since this inspection result. This is expected as long-term repairs have not been carried out and only limited areas of the deck have been re-waterproofed. Crucially, it has not been possible to re-waterproof the footways owing the presence of utilities. On span 3 it is leakage from the footways which is driving the deterioration of the deck beams.

The 2010 inspection notes spalling and exposed reinforcement both south footway and carriageway beams of span 3. A 2018 Inspection for Assessment records the carriageway beams to be in good condition as a result of concrete repairs to the soffit. However, the recent inspection work in June and July of 2026 have found the carriageway beams repairs to be failing and once again exposing the reinforcement.

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

Part 2 – Understanding the Case for Investment

2.1 Strategic Case

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

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

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

The St John's Hill bridge provides the key connection to Clapham Junction from the west, carrying nine bus routes and providing the principal access for private hire vehicles and cars from much of the borough to the station. Disruption to the bridge risks causing extended journey times for thousands of residents, impacting access to employment within the town centre and to the rest of London. Many of these jobs are in high value, high productivity sectors. Bus services connect some of the borough's most deprived communities in the west of the borough to employment opportunity. Significant disruption to the structure would therefore have both economic productivity and equity impacts. The bridge also connects two parts of Clapham Junction town centre – St John's Hill to the town centre core and St John's Road, Lavender Hill and Northcote Road. Clapham Junction is designated a major town centre and the GLA is proposing to upgrade to a Metropolitan Centre on the basis of its high footfall and extent of its hospitality and nighttime economies. It provides one of the borough's most important concentrations of retail and hospitality jobs. The Junction Business Improvement District brings together businesses across the town centre to promote further growth. Clapham Junction is at the heart of the 'Growth Corridor' identified in the borough's Growth Plan, linking with Wandsworth Town to the west and Nine Elms to the east. Resilient and high performing transport connectivity along this corridor is crucial to enabling it to reach its growth potential.

- 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 supports a range of UK Government policy objectives beyond economic growth by maintaining the safety, resilience and accessibility of a strategically important transport interchange that connects London to the South. The proposed scheme will mitigate risks to the users of the road and rail and prevent disruption to the transport network. The scheme aligns strongly with the Government's Safer Streets mission by addressing known structural deficiencies and reducing risks to all bridge users, including pedestrians, cyclists, bus passengers and motorists. By undertaking preventative intervention, the scheme improves public safety and reduces the likelihood of incidents arising from continued deterioration. The project also supports the mission to Build an NHS Fit for the Future by maintaining reliable access for emergency services, healthcare staff and patients. Preserving unrestricted use of the bridge helps avoid delays that could affect emergency response times and access to healthcare facilities. In addition, the scheme contributes to the mission of Breaking Down Barriers to Opportunity by ensuring continued access to employment, education, public services and local amenities. Maintaining pedestrian and public transport connectivity is particularly important for those without access to private vehicles. Finally, the scheme supports de-carbonisation/net-zero objectives by protecting routes used by pedestrians and bus services, particularly supporting TfL's transition to heavier, all electric fleets and avoiding congestion and diversionary traffic that would increase vehicle

emissions. Overall, the scheme delivers important safety, social, health and environmental benefits while improving the long-term resilience of the transport network.

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

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

The structure is located in the heart of Clapham Junction. Forecast restrictions would risk impacting access to 'Europe's busiest train station'. This is critical transport infrastructure that requires access for all modal users at all time. St Johns Hill provides access to the local businesses who rely heavily on freight logistics, active footfall and the bus routes connecting east to west. To support local businesses and communities it is essential this route is maintained in full. The current issues with water ingress, is adding to existing revenue pressures through continuous patch repairs on the carriageway surface of the bridge. Recent evidence shows spalling concrete falling from the beams of the super structure onto the railway lines below. In the interests of the LHA, Network Rail and local users, the project is considered a local and London priority. Ambitions to work closely with Network Rail to provide 'step-free' access to all major train stations in the borough, have progressed well in recent years. Clapham Junction has 'step-free' access but it is only available via one entrance, which is the Brighton Yard entrance, adjacent to St Johns Hill Bridge. Any severance to this access has major impacts on more vulnerable users. Engagement has started with the Clapham Junction Business Improvement District (BID) who support this major infrastructure improvement to support the growth of the town centre and to support the Clapham Junction Masterplan, not only through reliable access but to facilitate construction in future years as well.

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.

Being a road-over-rail bridge and the proximity to the busiest train station in Europe (by train movements), Clapham Junction, Network Rail is the primary stakeholder. Detailed discussions have taken place, and are ongoing, around track possession requirements. Crossing 9 lines here means track possessions are complicated and costly. An opportunity exists to co-ordinate this proposal with planned Network Rail works within the delivery window set by the fund. A letter of support and approval in principal to the project and collaboration from Network Rail can be found in Appendix 2 of the supporting information. The MP for Battersea, Leader of Wandsworth Council and Cabinet Member for Transport are in support of the proposals. The Chairman of the Junction Business Improvement District also recognises the importance of this scheme and the potential impacts of not undertaking the works. We have also started early engagement with TfL Buses who are also very supportive of the project, particularly with an adjacent bus stand. All parties fully appreciate the strategic importance of this structure as part of the local transport network. Letters/emails confirming this are available in Appendix 2 of the supporting information. There are various utilities that cross the bridge, these will need to be temporarily diverted during the proposed works. Costs and programme have considered this requirement. Formal C3 and C4 engagement will take place as and when required.

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.

Wandsworth and Richmond Councils operate a shared structures maintenance service, enabling resources, expertise and best practice to be shared across both boroughs. Structural assets are managed using a risk-based prioritisation process in accordance with London Bridges Engineering Group (LoBEG) guidance, allowing limited funding to be targeted at the highest-risk structures. Routine Principal and General Inspections are undertaken at prescribed intervals, supplemented by special inspections where required, to identify defects requiring monitoring, testing or repair. Since 2014, Wandsworth has invested significantly in its bridge assets, initially focusing on its critical Thames crossings. Putney Bridge underwent waterproofing and deck repair works in 2014 at a cost of [REDACTED]. More recently, Wandsworth Bridge received a comprehensive [REDACTED] refurbishment between 2020 and 2024, including steelwork repainting, waterproofing, expansion joint replacement and bearing renewals. Attention turned to St John's Hill Bridge following an assessment in 2018 that identified structural concerns. Given limited budgets and the high cost of obtaining Network Rail possessions, works were restricted to those that could be undertaken from the bridge deck. Strengthening of carriageway beams was completed in 2021; however, deterioration of the bridge soffit could not be addressed due to access constraints. Significant overstress was also identified in the Span 3 footways, but the utility diversions required to facilitate strengthening or waterproofing works proved prohibitively expensive. Recent inspection works undertaken in June and July 2026 have indicated that the Span 3 beams are in a worse condition than assumed during the 2021 strengthening design. Principal Inspections of all bridge spans have now been completed, although the final inspection report is not expected until mid-August 2026.

- 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.

The condition of the structure is of [REDACTED]. Restrictions in such a sensitive location, with such key transport interchanges and a vibrant town centre, with day and night time economies. St Johns Hill forms part of the Growth Corridor connecting Wandsworth to Nine Elms via Clapham Junction Town Centre. It is a complex project, with access required to the railway lines under possessions/blockades, which has proved cost prohibitive from LHA budgets. The structures life has gone past the piece meal maintenance approach. What has always been cost prohibitive in the past due to the extremely high, pre-set costs of railway possessions/blockades, could be delivered through the opportunity cost that has presented itself through planned Network Rail projects. Wandsworth have been in close consultation with Network Rail regarding the scheme. They have outlined delivery opportunities and have to date facilitated the access requirements to inspect this fragile infrastructure. They accept it is in their best interests to collaborate and coordinate with Wandsworth. Subject to funding, this project is deliverable within the demanding programme window and potentially, as efficiently as one could plan, with the potential to reduce possession costs by 50% if not by 66%. This project meets the criteria of the funding, it is an eligible structure with restrictions currently under risk management, the works need doing now and we have the opportunity to deliver before 2030. In Appendix 2 of the supporting information is more detail from Network Rail on the planned projects in 2028 and the engagement to date.

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

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

If the proposed works are not delivered, the condition of St John's Hill Bridge will continue to deteriorate, particularly in span 3 where severe water-related concrete damage and overstressed beams already present a structural risk. Ongoing corrosion in spans 1 and 2 will further reduce their limited spare capacity. Failure of the deck waterproofing will accelerate deterioration across all spans. Without intervention, traffic and footway restrictions are increasingly likely by 2029/30.

Clapham Junction is the busiest railway interchange in the UK. This transport interchange is serviced by 1300 daily bus movements via St John's Hill and 2000 daily trains passing through the station. Any loss of connectivity caused by traffic restrictions or falling debris onto the railway would have significant consequences, disrupting access to jobs and services not only in the immediate area but across London and the wider south east.

The risk of community severance is significant. St John's Hill is a main artery through Clapham Junction town centre and provides access to two of the station's principal entrances, including the only step free route at Brighton Yard.

St John's Hill forms part of the growth corridor connecting Wandsworth Town Centre, via Clapham Junction town centre to the emerging town centre in Nine Elms Battersea. Impacting transport connections and freight movements along this corridor would have a significant detrimental impact on the local economy and harm the growth ambitions of already suffering town centres.

Delaying repairs will also lead to escalating maintenance needs, higher future capital costs, and a growing risk of unplanned closures of this critical route.

- 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 scheme would play a critical role in preventing community severance by maintaining the operational capacity and connectivity provided by St John's Hill Bridge. The bridge is a strategically important crossing over the extensive railway infrastructure surrounding Clapham Junction Station, providing links between residential areas, employment centres, retail facilities, schools, healthcare services and public transport interchange facilities on either side of the railway corridor.

Without intervention, any reduction in bridge capacity [REDACTED] could create significant barriers to movement for all transport modes. Pedestrians and cyclists would face longer and less convenient journeys to reach alternative crossing points, potentially discouraging active travel and reducing access to key destinations. Severance impacts would be particularly acute for disabled people, older residents, parents with children, and other users who may have limited mobility or reduced ability to undertake longer diversions.

The bridge is also an important route for buses and general traffic. Reduced capacity could increase congestion on nearby roads, leading to longer journey times, reduced network resilience and increased pressure on alternative routes. This could adversely affect access to local businesses, community facilities and emergency services.

Maintaining the bridge's functionality would help preserve access to Clapham Junction Station, one of the UK's busiest rail interchanges, ensuring that residents, workers and visitors can continue to access regional and national transport connections efficiently. By safeguarding this key transport link, the scheme would support social inclusion, maintain access to economic opportunities and essential services, and prevent the fragmentation of communities on either side of the railway corridor.

Overall, the scheme would avoid substantial severance impacts and help preserve connectivity for pedestrians, cyclists, public transport users and motorists, supporting a cohesive and accessible local transport network.

- 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.

Using the ATC data collated in June 2026, there are on average 15,982 motorised vehicle movements across the bridge daily. This includes 11,806 private car movements, 2,537 LGV and over 1000 HGV movements on average daily. Importantly due to this critical transport interchange, according to bus frequencies, the bridge carries 1300 bus movements a day. Community severance could be significantly impacted by the potential restrictions on the bridge. [REDACTED]

[REDACTED] impacts on the pedestrian comfort in a location that provides access to Clapham Junction Station from the west but also to the only 'step-free' access at the station, which is critical for more vulnerable users. [REDACTED]

Subject to further load assessment however, should a further restriction be imposed, [REDACTED] This will have even greater consequence on the local area [REDACTED] This would impact all [REDACTED] traffic movements even further, diverting them away from the town centre, adding congestion to local routes, further severing the communities either side of the bridge.

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 objectives of the scheme are to remove the requirement for a piecemeal approach to the maintenance. Maximising the opportunity cost of coordinated work with Network Rail, whilst safeguarding the capacity of the structure and it's criticality in a town centre location, on the doorstep of Europe's busiest train station (Clapham Junction). This growth corridor as designated by the GLA connects Wandsworth Town Centre to the emerging town centre at Nine Elms, via

Clapham Junction, the boroughs largest town centre. To avoid introducing the severance between the west and east of the Borough would have catastrophic impacts on journey times, connectivity, the local residential and business communities whilst negatively impacting our net zero carbon targets. Evidence of these objectives are outlined in the Economic Toolkit. The travel time savings over the life cycle of the project based on 8400 vehicles per day [REDACTED] [REDACTED] Vehicle operating cost, based on reduced journey distances of 450m instead of a 4.38km diversion, suggest benefits of [REDACTED] and accident cost benefits of [REDACTED] by avoiding accidents on unsuitable, longer diversion routes. The model evidences that the total Present Value Benefits for the project is [REDACTED]

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.

[REDACTED]	[REDACTED]
[REDACTED]	[REDACTED]
[REDACTED]	[REDACTED]

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.

A budget cost estimate has been developed using the information currently available, including General Arrangement drawings issued "For Information" (noted as approximate and subject to further development), a 2018 structural assessment report, and a preliminary scope of works. The estimate has been prepared by the Quantity Surveying team and informed by early supplier engagement. However, several surveys and key confirmations are still required before the scope and costs can be finalised.

The submission is considered to be at Outline Business Case (OBC) stage. While TAG Unit A1.2 Table 7 recommends a standard optimism bias allowance of 32% for Fixed Links (bridges and tunnels), a reduced optimism bias of 20% has been applied. This reflects a risk-based assessment supported by the maturity of the design concept and early market engagement, which provide greater cost certainty than would typically be available at OBC stage.

The reduced optimism bias is also supported by a preliminary quantitative risk register that captures major scheme-specific uncertainties, including design development, Network Rail access requirements, existing asset condition, and potential contamination risks.

Whole-life maintenance assumptions include repairs to Span 3 concrete beams every 10 years, repairs to footway beams in Spans 4-6 every 15 years, and repeated patch painting until full repainting is undertaken. The painting strategy assumes ST3 surface preparation with a 25-year coating life, requiring two repainting cycles and around 55 weekend possessions. Additional maintenance includes annual road surfacing patch repairs and full bridge resurfacing every 10 years. Future renewals include replacement of Span 3 in 2037 and footway beams in Spans 4 and 5 in 2087, when they reach their 120-year design life.

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

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

The sources of data used to complete the Scheme details, is based on ATC data collated in June 2026. The integrity of the traffic volume data can be misleading when traffic is queuing over them or travelling slowly in opposite directions, which is a limitation of the technology. Previous count data was not eligible as it pre-dated 2023. The data does provide a relatively accurate picture of the flows on St Johns Hill. Some assumptions have had to be applied to the data, in that bus frequencies are higher than the recorded PSV value. this can be as a result of PSV movements being confused with long wheel base LGV's and light HGV's. Relying on accurate bus frequency data, we have adjusted the HGV and LGV numbers to reflect this. As advised by our design consultants, subject to further assessment, the most probable outcome for additional outcomes would be a reduction in carriageway capacity to a single lane. Traffic signal operation would not be possible without major network impacts, due to the proximity of existing signalised junctions.

[REDACTED]. Data used to generate 'The Scheme' is from the most recent PI in 2010, GI in 2016 and the inspection for assessment and load assessment in 2018. Assumptions have been made on some of the conditions, due to the lack of access to spans 4,5&6 since 2010.

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.

A scheme to protect St John's Hill Bridge from capacity restrictions [REDACTED] would deliver significant non-monetised benefits by maintaining connectivity, supporting the local environment, and safeguarding access to key transport infrastructure.

The principal benefit would be avoiding severance. The bridge is a vital crossing over the railway corridor at Clapham Junction, connecting residential areas, businesses, and community facilities. Any reduction in capacity [REDACTED] would increase journey times for pedestrians, cyclists, buses, and general traffic, forcing users onto less convenient routes and reducing accessibility. Maintaining the bridge would therefore preserve connectivity, social cohesion, and access to essential services, particularly for those reliant on active travel and public transport.

The scheme would also protect the quality of the local townscape. As a prominent structure and gateway into Clapham Junction, the bridge contributes to the character and appearance of the area. Preserving its functionality and condition would help maintain positive perceptions of the town centre and surrounding neighbourhoods.

In addition, safeguarding the bridge would support existing and future regeneration plans. Reliable transport infrastructure is critical to attracting investment, supporting local businesses, and enabling development. Maintaining this strategic crossing would help ensure that growth opportunities are not constrained by reduced connectivity.

The scheme would also protect access to Clapham Junction Station, one of the UK's busiest railway stations. Retaining bridge capacity would support efficient passenger movement, maintain accessibility, and preserve the station's role as a key transport hub. This is particularly important given the planned redevelopment of the station and surrounding area, where any significant impact on the road network could adversely affect construction logistics and jeopardise the successful delivery of future regeneration initiatives.

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).

Not available – Used the Economic Toolkit for the economic assessment.

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.

Wandsworth have an experienced project team at Wandsworth Council who, in recent years, have built strong partnership working relationships with Network Rail. With project management, project officers, engineers and site supervisors, Wandsworth are confident we have the resource to deliver a successful project, within the programme timelines. We have access to design consultants through various frameworks to ensure the professional level of design required to progress such complex works. Wandsworth has already appointed Tony Gee & Partners to undertake the structural assessment and inspection works, with the permanent works design to be commissioned as funding becomes available. Tony Gee brings significant experience of bridge construction, refurbishment and replacement within rail environments. Relevant projects include the [REDACTED] A404(M) bridge replacement over four Great Western Railway lines; repair works to the Canterbury Viaduct iron railway underbridge; and the [REDACTED] Greek Street bridge replacement, involving demolition and reconstruction of a road-over-rail bridge within a 21-day blockade. Their involvement provides confidence in managing complex rail interfaces, possessions and construction phasing. With regard to delivery, we would work closely with our term contractor FM Conway and their supply chain, to ensure the competence and quality assurance, whilst ensuring best value. FM Conway will provide end-to-end project delivery, managing the scheme from development through to completion. Working collaboratively with Wandsworth Council, Network Rail, designers and the supply chain, FM Conway will support detailed design development, approvals, construction planning, possession booking, stakeholder engagement and programme management. An experienced project team will oversee delivery, including Contractor's Engineering Manager [REDACTED] who brings more than 20 years of Network Rail project experience. Organisational Chart in Appendix 5 of the supporting information.

- 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 project will commence with review of the Principal Inspection (PI) reports due in August 2026, followed by analysis of findings and recommendations. Further trackside access will be required to complete inspections for assessment and testing. Wandsworth Council intends to utilise existing budgets to progress these activities during 2026/27 ahead of funding receipt. The assessment outcomes will inform both the permanent and temporary works designs. Given the constrained access to the railway and the sensitivity of the location, design development will be programmed to align with available possessions and access opportunities. All design activities are scheduled for completion by March 2028. The preferred procurement strategy is to utilise the Council's existing term contractor, FM Conway, which has extensive experience delivering projects in both highway and rail environments. Subject to internal procurement approvals, the Council will seek to adopt an Early Contractor Involvement (ECI) approach to maximise efficiency, optimise buildability and reduce programme risk. Engagement with Network Rail is already underway, and Approval in Principle has been secured to coordinate the works alongside adjacent Network Rail schemes. This integrated approach offers significant cost efficiencies and greater certainty around possession planning. The consents process has commenced and will continue throughout project development to maximise opportunities for access and minimise programme constraints. Highway approvals will be managed internally, ensuring effective stakeholder engagement and consideration of network impacts. While highway consents typically require 3 to 6 months, early engagement is planned to mitigate delays. Overall, the proposed delivery strategy provides the most streamlined and efficient route to construction. It minimises procurement risk, accelerates design and approvals, and supports delivery within the timescales of the Structures Fund programme.

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

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

A project of this nature, working over railway lines into Clapham Junction Station and on a main arterial A road come with a number of programme risks. To present the currently identified risks, we have produced a project risk register, in Appendix 7 of the supporting information. Drawing out the top risks to delivery:

Risk 1 - Network Rail Possessions. With the delivery programme planned for 2028 and 2029, we are unable to obtain the required consents from Network Rail at this time. We have approval in principle from NR to coordinate works with their planned renewal and refurbishment works. There is a risk they pull their project from the programme, which could double the forecast value of the possessions in accordance with Schedule 4 calculations. Cost share model for impacts on the railway. Cost could fluctuate from [REDACTED] subject to collaboration. This risk will continue to be mitigated through ongoing dialogue with NR through the programme. We expect the probability of this risk to be medium, which is why 50% of possession costs are included in the capital cost and 50% including in risk contingency.

Risk 2 – Utility Diversions – Required to replace span 3 and to waterproof trough deck in footways. Third party involvement always presents programme and cost risk. Mitigation through early engagement, strategic planning and advance enabling works, prior to the possessions, to avoid impacting those critical programme elements. C3/C4 enquiries to be requested 18 months prior to works being required. Risk contingency includes [REDACTED] to manage the risk of escalation of costs from initial estimates. Probability is medium.

Risk 3 – The structural condition is worse than currently known. The risk could result in scope creep from that outlined in the ‘scheme proposals’ subject to receipt of PI and subsequent inspections, testing and assessment. Mitigation includes early review of PI’s in August, further access to soffit for inspections and testing to facilitate design and inclusion of assumed worse case replacement of beams on spans 4,5 & 6 in QRA. Probability is medium.

Risk management approach will include regular risk workshops, maintaining the risk register, escalation through project governance, change control processes and the drawdown of the 55% proposed risk contingency.

- 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.

As the structure spans 9no. Railway lines into Clapham Junction Station, Network Rail are the principal stakeholder and partner to ensure successful delivery. We have engaged with NR recently to organise the access for a PI which was arranged over 2 separate access dates for the BML and VTB lines out of CJ Station. We have also been having detailed conversations over the opportunity to coordinate the proposed works with their planned replacement and refurbishment project of Latchmere structures VTB and FLL, programmed for CP7 Y5 2028/29. At present they are planning to undertake the works under a blockade in December 2028 with a contingency blockade planned for December 2029. We have submitted a full technical report to Network Rail with a view to getting our project on their programme and early agreement to extend the blockade to cover St Johns Hill Bridge. NR have provided a letter of support of the project, which is included as an appendix. In addition to this, the other key stakeholders identified are TfL London Buses and the Junction Business Improvement District. Having had early engagement with both stakeholders, we have received letters of support from the Junction BID and TfL have recognised the impact on buses through any potential restrictions. The Leader of Wandsworth Council has also provided a letter of support for this critical infrastructure project. All communications received are in Appendix 2 of the supporting information.

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.

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.

Wandsworth have been actively maintaining the structure following 2018 inspection for assessment. 2021 works undertaken were limited to measures from above, as rail possessions were cost prohibitive. Unable to waterproof footways due to utility diversion costs and overstressed beams below. Span 3 carriageway deck strengthening - reinforced concrete slab. Kerbs and bollards were installed to protect one footway and reduce the risk of accidental loading on the other. Obtaining the required funding to arrange a possession of the railway at such a sensitive location has proved to be cost prohibitive but we have now identified an opportunity to coordinate with Network Rail's planned possession in 2028. Thames river crossings were prioritised since 2014 with major refurbishments of Putney Bridge and Wandsworth Bridge, to avoid our Thames crossings from requiring significant restrictions.

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.

The whole life cost of maintaining the structure without the proposed scheme is substantial, primarily due to the need for repeated Network Rail possessions to access and repair the soffit. The proposed scheme delivers a programme-led solution with key interventions designed to provide a minimum 60-year design life, including a replacement Span 3 and a 60-year protective paint system. Without the scheme, ongoing water ingress will continue to accelerate deterioration, requiring significant reactive maintenance throughout the asset life. Anticipated interventions include repairs to Span 3 concrete beams every 10 years, repairs to footway beams in Spans 4-6 every 15 years, and repeated patch painting until full repainting is completed. The paint strategy assumes ST3 surface preparation and a 25-year life expectancy, requiring two repainting cycles and approximately 55 weekend shifts. Additional maintenance would include annual road surfacing patch repairs and full bridge resurfacing every 10 years. These activities would result in substantial road user delay costs, bus replacement costs, traffic management expenses, and Network Rail possession charges associated with concrete and painting works. Major future renewals would also be required, including replacement of Span 3 in 2037 and replacement of the footway beams

in Spans 4 and 5 in 2087 as they reach the end of their 120-year design lives. The estimated whole life cost without the scheme is [REDACTED] with the scheme. This demonstrates that reactive, piecemeal maintenance is both inefficient and costly, particularly where rail possessions can account for up to 50% of capital costs. Early intervention is forecast to deliver savings of approximately [REDACTED] over a 60-year period.

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.

Background and basis: The concept design for Span 3 assumes replacing it with a new bridge deck. This is based on the very poor condition of at least 2 of the southern beams (subject to carriageway and footway loading) that have suffered extensive corrosion and reinforcement loss. The concrete repairs previously undertaken to the intermediate beams under the carriageway of Span 3 have already failed within 8-10 years (confirmed by interim Principal Inspection results) and the condition of the reinforcement is unknown. Whilst strengthened from above in 2021, the unknown condition of the beams under the carriageway may mean despite the previous strengthening, the current capacity of the beams may be inadequate for 40t live load. The previous assessed capacity of 2 of the north footway beams showed 40% overstress which is also a concern and if the footways are not waterproofed, these beams will only suffer reduction in capacity resulting in a width-restricted footway and possibly eventual full closure. This could lead to traffic lanes being closed or narrowed to accommodate the high footfall outside a very busy railway station. The extensive corrosion and difficulty / very high costs in securing railway possessions of practicable lengths to undertake extensive and as durable as possible repairs as possible to the concrete beams has led to the decision that replacement is the most practical solution that will reduce ongoing maintenance costs that will eventually still lead to lane / footway closures. For Spans 1 and 2, although assessed in 2018 as having 40t capacity, the ongoing corrosion has reduced its capacity. Some ironwork repair and complete repainting is therefore necessary. The derivation has been based on the following:

Methodology: ECI pricing

Basis:

Construction estimate based on ECI quantity surveyors

Design fees estimate provided by designers based on taking forward concept.

Supervision at 10% of construction.

Traffic management based on FMC TM quote

Possession costs – Estimates provided by Network Rail using DfT and ORR pre-set costs.

Utility costs – Estimates based on C2 information. C3/C4 estimates not obtained yet.

Risk Allowance is 55%. This reflects the complexity of the works, the risks of working over the railway and the possession costs if NR pull their project after we secure funding. Inflation indexed to base price in 2026.

Inflation – Indexed to base price using COPI.

Confidence Level: Base Price – 20% The submission is treated as Outline Business Case (OBC) stage, for which TAG Unit A1.2 Table 7 recommends a standard optimism bias uplift of 32% for Fixed Links (Bridges and Tunnels). A 20% optimism bias has been applied instead, reflecting a risk-based judgement supported by the design concept maturity and early supplier engagement, which reduce estimating uncertainty beyond a typical desk-based OBC estimate.

Base construction costs and NR Possession costs are in Appendix 4 of the supporting information.

- 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.

Financial Risks include cost estimating an incomplete design. Design development, will seek to design out risks but due to the constraints of working over the railway, the design is programme driven. Procurement risks can be mitigated through utilising existing term and framework contracts to allow efficient procurement of competent organisations with the relevant experience to undertake works of this nature. We have produced a QRA which is included in the supplementary information. The largest risk to the project financially is the possession costs with Network Rail. To facilitate the proposed programme, the possession costs have been estimated by NR to be [REDACTED]. Working closely with NR and using their 'cost share' model for possessions, we expect to mitigate this risk by at least 50% and have included 50% of the value in the capital ask. However, this relies on NR delivering their project, which is out of our control. If they pull the project from their programme after we secure funding then we are at risk of absorbing the entire possession cost. As a result, we have had to include the remaining 50% possession costs within our risk contingency. The impact of this risk is severe but we assess that the probability is low. Utility costs are based on C2 information and estimates from previous experience. Until we reach C3/C4 we will not know the full cost, so carry risk associated to this. We consider the impact as medium and probability as medium. The other top risk is that we have made assumptions regarding the condition of the bridge until such time as we receive the latest inspection information. There is a risk of scope creep, for which we have made appropriate provision within our contingency. This could include works to the soffit of spans 4,5&6. Worse case, the footway beams would need to be replaced and on this basis, we have included costs to replace 2no. footway beams across these spans. The impact is high but the probability is low. The contingency for the project is calculated through a QRA and equates to approximately 55% of the project cost. This is considered appropriate for a project of this nature at outline business case stage. We expect to be able to manage the risk contingency and after mitigation anticipate to have a residual risk exposure closer to [REDACTED] from the current [REDACTED] contingency. This is directly related to possession costs.

- 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.

Wandsworth have [REDACTED] which has been allocated to the project. There will be opportunities for the project to bid annually for capital contributions and we will continue to seek contributions from LoBEG in future years, following their confirmation of endorsement of the project but no funding allocation this year. LoBEG letter of endorsed schemes included in Appendix 2 of the supporting information.

2.5 Management Case

Outlines how the project will be delivered and managed effectively.

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

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

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

The anticipated start date for construction of the scheme is October 2028. This is enabling works to divert utilities in preparation for the possession over Christmas 2028. The preconstruction activities will commence on 1st April 2027 subject to funding. This provides 18 months to achieve the following key milestones: Procurement – May 2027, Track Possessions to complete inspections, testing and assessments – July 2027, Planning Permission (Permitted Development) – December 2027, Network Rail Asset Protection Agreement – April 2028, Design Permanent works – March 2028, Design Temporary Works – June 2028, Highways Consents TTRO's – June 2028, Utility consultations – August 2028.

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

The anticipated end date for construction of the scheme is January 2030. This assumes a second possession requirement for Christmas 2029 to complete any remaining iron repair and protection works. The key construction milestones are: Replace Rivets in Spans 1 & 2 in advance of Christmas Blockade under engineering hours - November 2028, Utility diversion and enabling works - December 2028, Replace Span 3 and complete as much metal work on spans 1&2 under Track possession – 25th December - 1st January 2028, Waterproofing, resurfacing and utilities re-install – May 2029, Spans 1 & 2 metal repairs and protection under track possession – 25th December 2029 - 1st January 2030. Contract completion 16th January 2030. Full programme in Appendix 6 of the supporting information.

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.

Wandsworth Council has extensive experience delivering major structural infrastructure projects, including the refurbishment of Wandsworth Bridge and the transformation of the Falcon Road Bridge underpass. Through these schemes the project team has developed strong working relationships with Network Rail's engineering and asset protection teams, evidenced by recent support for principal inspection access and ongoing collaboration to align programmes, reduce risk and maximise efficiencies for both road and rail users. The scheme is classified by the Council as a Major Project and is governed through established arrangements, including scrutiny by a Project Board chaired by the Director of Service and attended by the Cabinet Member for Transport. Regular progress reporting, risk management and change control processes will ensure effective project oversight throughout delivery. Wandsworth has already appointed Tony Gee & Partners to undertake the structural assessment and inspection works, with the permanent works design to be

commissioned as funding becomes available. Tony Gee brings significant experience of bridge construction, refurbishment and replacement within rail environments. Relevant projects include the £10m A404(M) bridge replacement over four Great Western Railway lines; repair works to the Canterbury Viaduct iron railway underbridge; and the £26m Greek Street bridge replacement, involving demolition and reconstruction of a road-over-rail bridge within a 21-day blockade. Their involvement provides confidence in managing complex rail interfaces, possessions and construction phasing. The project will be overseen by [REDACTED], Project Director, a Chartered Engineer with over 20 years' experience delivering bridge and viaduct infrastructure, including railway bridge schemes at Didcot and Wokingham. Day-to-day design management will be led by [REDACTED], a Chartered Engineer with more than 15 years' experience in both road and rail bridge projects. The team will be supported by specialist rail advisors, including [REDACTED], who led the successful Greek Street bridge scheme, and [REDACTED], who has extensive expertise in bridge refurbishment and replacement within railway environments. FM Conway will provide end-to-end project delivery, managing the scheme from development through to completion. Working collaboratively with Wandsworth Council, Network Rail, designers and the supply chain, FM Conway will support detailed design development, approvals, construction planning, possession booking, stakeholder engagement and programme management. An experienced project team will oversee delivery, including Contractor's Engineering Manager [REDACTED], who brings more than 20 years of Network Rail project experience. FM Conway has a proven track record of successfully delivering complex structural works within operational railway environments, providing expertise in possession planning, engineering assurance, stakeholder management and safe construction practices. Specialist subcontractors will be appointed to undertake key elements of the works. Econ Group will deliver demolition activities and has extensive experience completing bridge and infrastructure demolitions within constrained rail possessions. CC Infrastructure Services will undertake structural preparation and protective coating works, drawing on its Network Rail experience and ICATS-accredited workforce to provide high-quality corrosion protection and asset preservation solutions. Robust project controls covering programme management, commercial reporting, quality assurance, engineering verification, environmental performance, health and safety, and risk management will be applied throughout delivery. This integrated approach, supported by highly experienced rail specialists and established governance arrangements, provides confidence that the St John's Hill scheme can be delivered safely, efficiently and with minimal disruption to rail passengers, road users and the local community.

- 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 St John's Hill Bridge scheme presents a number of delivery challenges due to the bridge's location above the operational railway approaches to Clapham Junction Station and on a key arterial A-road. To manage risks, the project team has developed a quantitative risk register and will maintain a robust risk management process throughout delivery, including regular risk workshops, formal governance reviews, change control procedures, and managed drawdown of the proposed 55% risk contingency. Principal risk is Network Rail (NR) possessions. Approval in Principle has been secured to coordinate the bridge works with NR's planned renewal programme,

required possessions cannot be confirmed for the 2028-29 delivery period. Should NR's programme change, possession costs could increase and range from [REDACTED]. This risk is being mitigated through ongoing engagement and joint planning with NR. Reflecting its medium probability, 50% of anticipated possession costs have been included in the base estimate, with the remaining 50% held within contingency. A second key risk is utility diversions, required for the Span 3 replacement and footway waterproofing works. Third-party utility providers can introduce programme delays and cost escalation. Mitigation measures include early engagement, strategic planning, advance enabling works, and completion of utility enquiries well in advance of construction. A [REDACTED] contingency allowance has been included to address potential cost increases. The third major risk concerns the possibility that the structural condition is worse than currently understood, resulting in additional scope. Managed through early review of principal inspection findings, further intrusive inspections and testing, and conservative allowance within the quantitative risk assessment for potential beam replacements. Cost overruns beyond contingency provisions would be managed through the Council's established governance and funding approval processes.

- 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.

Wandsworth will adopt project controls to the 5 core areas. 1. Schedule Controls - Gantt Charts to roadmap the tasks, to track milestones and to identify any task interdependencies, to ensure timely completion. The use of a critical path method and milestone checkpoints. 2. Cost Controls - Earned Value Management to integrate scope, schedule and cost to measure performance and calculate variances. Budget forecasting utilising performance data to predict final project costs and vendor & financial approvals with structures payment and authorisation processes to keep expenditure within budget limits. 3. Scope Controls - Change Controls Board to process, review, evaluate and approve/reject requested changes to the scope, mitigating scope creep. 4. Risk Controls - Risk Register used to identify, log, assess and develop mitigation strategies for potential project risks. Issue Logs tracking mechanisms used to address and resolve active 'roadblocks' that currently impede project progress. 5. Quality & Performance Controls - Quality Assurance Checklists, inspection and test plans to verify deliverables consistently meet stakeholder expectations and technical standards. Performance dashboards to monitor project KPI's in real time, enabling quick, informed decision-making by project managers.

- 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 most complex of the consents for this project will be with Network Rail. We have identified them, not only as a key stakeholder but as a required partner for these works. Through early engagement we have identified construction opportunities, to coordinate with Network Rail's planned works programmed for 2028/29. Approval in principle of the works and coordination is included in the form of a letter from Network Rail in Appendix 2 of the supporting information. We will require an Asset Protection Agreement with Network Rail as well as possessions/blockades in order to undertake the works safely. In advance of this, additional

access will be required to allow for inspections and testing, to enable the outstanding detailed design works. The risk of possessions is associated to the sharing of costs, with NR implementing a model where costs are shared across projects. This will not be confirmed until after the possessions have taken place though, as they will seek further collaboration opportunities. The scheme will require planning permission and we will work with the planning authority to achieve this in the required programme. Highway consents will be coordinated for required closures to facilitate the construction programme with lead times for coordination manageable within the delivery window.

- 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.

The design of bridges necessitates consideration of temperature changes. Given the replacement span is short and simply supported, thermal effects will be small and the spans will be resilient to future climate change. The scheme will also address durability to minimise ongoing maintenance and repairs to the concrete elements. This includes full spray-applied waterproofing to the service troughs and a secondary waterproofing barrier above the service troughs under the footways. A full structural slab is proposed between the simply supported spans to provide continuity and mitigate leakage at the piers. Together with sub-surface and surface drainage measures (currently non-existent) these will help manage water off the bridge to maximise the durability of the road pavement and bridge structure. The entire bridge will be fully resurfaced with at least 120mm thickness (not currently achieved) to latest highways specification to accommodate both high traffic volumes and changing climatic conditions. As demonstrated by the condition of the concrete beams, the new span will be replaced with weathering steel girders which will require very little to no maintenance as they will be protected by the composite deck slab and deck slab cantilevers above which will be fully waterproofed. The ironwork Spans 1 and 2 and iron columns supporting Spans 3 to 5 will be blasted to bare metal and repainted with a modern fluoroethylene vinyl ether (FEVE) paint system with durability up to 60 years with no maintenance, under much worse climatic conditions over brackish water as evidenced in Japan and USA.

- 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 through reducing vehicle miles).

As with all schemes a carbon management plan will be developed and will consider the capital carbon, operational carbon and the user carbon. The user carbon levels will be significantly impacted by lengthy diversions, so the scheme to avoid this will provide great benefit. The optioneering has opted for steel beams as they are much lighter and will require a much smaller number of beams and number of lifts. It also results in us being able to re-use the existing piers, removing the requirement for replacement. Through good design practice all materials will be minimised as much as possible to achieve an efficient design. The measures noted in j) above will ensure maximum durability, which minimises whole life carbon through reducing necessary maintenance and resulting carbon from materials, plant, equipment, associated emissions and

road traffic delays / lane / bridge closures. The non-structural concrete elements (e.g. possibly for footway infill, will utilise light weight concrete and low-carbon options.

- 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.

Network Rail is a key statutory undertaker involved in this scheme. It is essential to get their support and collaboration to successfully deliver the works. Early engagement and in principle support has been received and estimated possession costs provided. The project team will continue to engage and coordinate works with NR whilst also agreeing the levels of asset protection with them to safely undertake the works. The other statutory undertaker that is a public body involved in the scheme, is Transport for London. With around 1300 bus movements a day over the bridge, early engagement has commenced and an understanding of bus impact mitigation measures will be devised for the 'works'. Wandsworth as the Highways Authority will undertake all necessary coordination checks to facilitate the essential works. Finally, we are aware of the presence of UKPN (power), Cadent (Gas), Open Reach (Telecoms) and Thames Water utilities within the footways of the bridge. We have undertaken initial C2 enquiries to obtain the details and records from the utility providers. We will work closely with providers to divert or cap the services to allow the works to proceed. We have already developed a proposed temporary works design to allow for the utilities to be slewed and will be discussing this with the utility providers in October 2026. The temporary diversions are required to replace span 3 and to fully waterproof the footways, north and south.

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)

Wandsworth has an established process for undertaking Equality Impact Assessments (EqIAs) on major transport and infrastructure schemes to ensure that the needs of protected characteristic groups are considered throughout scheme development. This approach has been successfully applied on previous bridge, highway and public realm improvement projects across the borough, helping to identify potential impacts and embed mitigation measures within both design and construction planning.

An EqIA will be undertaken as part of the development of the St John's Hill Bridge scheme to inform the detailed design, construction methodology and stakeholder engagement strategy. The assessment will consider the potential impacts on groups protected under the Equality Act 2010, including older people, disabled people, children and young people, people with caring responsibilities, pregnant women, and those from different ethnic, religious and socio-economic backgrounds.

Given the bridge's strategic role in providing access across the railway corridor and to Clapham Junction Station, particular consideration will be given to the needs of mobility-impaired users, wheelchair users, people with visual impairments, and those who may be disproportionately affected by temporary changes to access arrangements during construction.

Drawing on findings from previous EqIAs undertaken by the borough, potential mitigation measures are likely to include maintaining step-free access wherever practicable, providing clear wayfinding and signage, ensuring adequate lighting and personal safety measures, minimising construction-related disruption, preserving pedestrian and cycle connectivity, and undertaking targeted engagement with affected communities and accessibility groups.

By integrating EqIA findings into scheme development, the project will seek to ensure that the benefits of protecting St John's Hill Bridge from reduced capacity or closure are realised equitably, while minimising adverse impacts on those groups most reliant on accessible and reliable transport connections.

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.wandsworth.gov.uk/st-johns-hill-bridge-project/>

3.3 Declarations

Senior Responsible Owner declaration

As Senior Responsible Owner for [St Johns Hill Bridge Refurbishment and Strengthening], I hereby submit this request for approval to DfT on behalf of [Wandsworth Council] and confirm that I have the necessary authority to do so.

I confirm that [Wandsworth 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:

[Redacted]

b) Signed:

c) Date:

[Redacted]

d) Email:

[Redacted]

Section 151 Officer declaration

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

[Redacted]

f) Signed:

g) Date:

[Redacted]

h) Email:

[Redacted]