



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: Bracknell Forest Council
- b) Scheme / structure name and LHA bridges number: 1102 Station Roundabout West Bridge and Subway, 1103 Station Roundabout East Bridge and Subway A3095 Bagshot Road USRN 3801881
- c) Location (OS Grid Reference) of the scheme/structure (to identify location on map):
- Easting: West Bridge 486990 East Bridge 487090
- Northing: West Bridge 168930 East Bridge 168920
- d) Name of Project Manager: [REDACTED]
- e) Email address: [REDACTED]
- f) Phone number: [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.

Bracknell Forest Council is promoting a scheme to waterproof two adjacent highway bridge spans, referred to as the West Bridge and East Bridge. These are conventional highway bridge spans carrying the A3095 on the Station Roundabout forming an important part of the borough's

transport infrastructure. The bridges are of reinforced concrete and brick construction and are understood to date from the early 1970s, having been in service for several decades.

The principal issue affecting this structure is deterioration of the bridge deck waterproofing system. Over time, failure of the waterproofing membrane has allowed the ingress of water and de-icing salts into the deck construction. This has led to progressive deterioration of the concrete, particularly at deck level and in associated parapet and edge beam details. If left untreated, this mechanism will continue to accelerate structural deterioration and corrosion risk to embedded reinforcement, increase maintenance liabilities and heighten the risk of more extensive future intervention.

The structure is not listed and does not have heritage designation but is an operationally important assets on the local highway network. Their continued serviceability is necessary to maintain connectivity, avoid disruption to road users and prevent the need for more costly structural repairs in future. The proposed scheme therefore represents a timely preventative intervention, aimed at addressing the root cause of deterioration, preserving structural integrity, and extending the operational life of both bridges in a cost-effective manner.

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 new waterproofing system (across the deck and overlapped across the expansion joint) will form a continuous impermeable barrier to prevent water and chlorides from penetrating and causing further deterioration to the deck and substructure.

By renewing the waterproofing system and repairing defective concrete / brickwork at the same time, the scheme will arrest ongoing deterioration, and protect the deck, edge beams and parapet connections from further damage. The works are intended to preserve the structural function of the bridges, improve durability and reduce the need for more extensive future maintenance or reactive repairs. In doing so, the scheme represents a cost-effective lifecycle treatment that will extend the service life of both structures and maintain their safe and reliable operation as part of the highway network.

The expansion joint replacement will ensure the thermal and traffic-induced movements of the structure are accommodated while ensuring effective load transfer and a watertight seal to prevent further water ingress.

The bridges are being treated as a single structure scheme as they function together taking the A3095 over the railway. The spans are located on either side of a gyratory with one span carrying northbound traffic and the other carrying southbound traffic meaning each bridge effectively forms one half of the overall carriageway on the roundabout structure.

Both spans are the same age and design and both are affected by the same issue of deterioration of the waterproofing system. This presents an ongoing risk of further deterioration and potential impacts on the railway infrastructure below.

Repairing only one bridge would not address the problem in its entirety as the other span would continue to deteriorate and pose the same risk to the railway line. The most effective approach is therefore to treat the two spans as a single scheme and undertake the waterproofing replacement and associated repairs across both structures at the same time. This ensures the long-term integrity of both the highway and rail routes in a cost-effective manner.

We have therefore submitted a single bid based on these two spans being considered a single structure as they have the same vehicle flows being one roundabout and they both span the same section of railway line. Submitting two separate applications would involve submitting the same data and, as said above, only fixing one span would not reduce the risk.

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

Yes, Network Rail

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..

Evidence of seepage at both structures has been observed at every inspection since 2011 which is the earliest we have are inspection reports for. The Principle Inspections (PIs) record indication of seepage down the face of the abutments, particularly over the railway span, and this likely indicates failure of the expansion joint combined with failure of the waterproofing system. The elements are inaccessible, so direct observation has not been possible but repeated observation of the effects corroborates the likely defect.

The record drawings indicate that the structure was constructed in the 1970s – hence, both the expansion joint and waterproofing system will be substantially past their intended design life. The road is salted (as it is a main route through central Bracknell) so continued seepage through the deck puts the reinforced concrete elements at risk of attack from water and chlorides penetrating and causing further deterioration to the deck and substructure.

The risk posed to the reinforced concrete due to the prolonged exposure to salts is significant. This type of deterioration progresses with time so the risk posed to the reinforced concrete due to the prolonged exposure to salts is significant – especially considering the time elapsed since first identified. Repair of the defects has been marked as a high priority to be addressed as soon as logistically possible.

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

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

There are currently no restrictions in place

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

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

The structure is still expected be operational in 2029/30 but the risk will have increased. The bridges span a main line between Reading and to London and is adjacent to Bracknell bus station. There is a risk of significant disruption for millions travellers.

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

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 will not be required on account of the effects of structural deterioration caused by the water ingress. However, if there is a vehicle impact that damages a section of the Vehicle Restraint System (VRS) then a temporary barriers may need to be put in place as the existing VRS system is obsolete and cannot now be repaired.

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: West Bridge: 32.38, East Bridge: 58

BCI Ave: West Bridge: 72.74, East Bridge: 81.2

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 BCI scores for both structures are governed by the scores associated with the expansion joint and waterproofing. They have been calculated from the inspection reports and have shown a downward trend through the years (seepage going from from 3B moderate in 2011 to widespread and down to 3E in 2017).

For example, with reference to Structure 1103, the 2017 PI recorded spalling on the face of the abutment with exposed rebar (likely due to the continued seepage and exposure to salts) which indicates prolonged deterioration due to the water and chloride ingress through the deck.

- 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.

This scheme supports the Government's economic growth mission by protecting a strategically important piece of local transport infrastructure and maintaining reliable connectivity for people, businesses and public services. The two bridge structures carry a key route within Bracknell town centre, serving both regional and local traffic movements along the A3095 helping connect employment areas, retail and service destinations, the bus station and the wider regional road network. The structures also span the adjacent Reading to Waterloo rail corridor which is of wider economic importance, meaning their long-term condition has implications beyond the immediate highway asset. By renewing the waterproofing system now, the scheme will prevent further deterioration and reduce the likelihood of disruptive future restrictions, emergency repairs or more extensive reconstruction.

The economic benefits arise through improved network resilience, reduced risk of unplanned disruption and more efficient long-term asset management. This enables dependable access to jobs, education, services and local businesses, through the movement of goods and service vehicles. The scheme will also support productivity by preserving a transport link that underpins day-to-day economic activity in the regenerated town centre and wider Thames Valley Economic area. In addition, early preventative investment represents better value for money than allowing deterioration to progress to the point where major structural works or restrictions become necessary. In this way, the proposal aligns with the wider Government objective of using infrastructure investment to support growth, improve resilience and provide the certainty needed for communities and businesses to function effectively.

- 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.

This scheme supports wider Government objectives by improving the resilience, safety and long-term sustainability of local transport infrastructure. It will renew waterproofing to two spans forming part of a key transport corridor serving Bracknell town centre, the railway station and bus station, and used by pedestrians, cyclists, buses, freight and general traffic. This is a preventative intervention which will protect the structural integrity of the roundabout structure before deterioration leads to more significant restrictions, emergency works or reconstruction.

The scheme will help maintain reliable access for sustainable transport modes and reduce the risk of disruption to walking, cycling and public transport journeys. It also protects infrastructure located above the Reading to Waterloo railway line, reducing the potential for impacts on a strategically important rail corridor.

The proposal supports environmental and value-for-money objectives by reducing the likelihood of future closures or restrictions that would require substantially longer diversion routes. Analysis for the submission indicates that a diversion would increase journeys from approximately 0.47 km to 8.68 km, increasing vehicle kilometres, fuel use, emissions, air pollution and congestion. Timely maintenance is therefore more efficient and sustainable than deferring intervention until major structural deterioration occurs.

Although the scheme does not provide new walking or cycling infrastructure, it helps maintain safe and reliable connections between residential areas, the town centre, public transport hubs and local services. Overall, it aligns with Government priorities for infrastructure resilience, efficient public investment, service reliability, reduced emissions and long-term stewardship of critical transport assets

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

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

This scheme is a local priority because it addresses deterioration in two operationally important bridge structures on a key route through Bracknell town centre. These structures help maintain connectivity to the wider Thames Valley area and recently regenerated Town Centre, surrounding residential areas, public transport facilities and the wider highway network. Their continued reliability is important for day-to-day movement by residents, businesses, buses, service vehicles and other road users. Given the bridges' location above infrastructure of wider significance, including the adjacent rail corridor, the consequences of allowing deterioration to progress would extend beyond the immediate structure and could create much wider disruption.

For Bracknell Forest Council, the scheme reflects the need to prioritise preventative investment in critical assets before defects escalate into more costly structural repairs or restrictions. The deterioration mechanism has been identified and the proposed waterproofing renewal provides a timely opportunity to address the root cause while the structures remain operational. This is consistent with the Council's wider asset management approach of intervening at the right time to preserve serviceability, manage lifecycle cost and reduce the risk of reactive maintenance. The scheme is also a local priority because the scale of the required works is difficult to accommodate within existing capital maintenance budgets alongside competing demands across the highway network. External funding would therefore enable the Council to undertake a necessary intervention that protects an important local transport link, supports network resilience and reduces the likelihood of future disruption affecting residents, local businesses and the wider transport system.

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.

Bracknell Forest Council is the local highway authority and bridge owner and is promoting the scheme as part of its wider asset management and structural maintenance programme. The bridges are operationally important assets and the case for intervention is based on the need to address an identified deterioration mechanism before it leads to more significant structural and network impacts. As the structures are located above infrastructure associated with Network Rail, engagement with Network Rail will be required in relation to asset interface, access arrangements, approvals and the safe planning and delivery of the works.

The Council will also engage relevant internal teams, including highways, transport and communications functions, to help manage traffic management requirements, construction impacts and public information. Local elected members and other affected stakeholders would be kept informed as the scheme progresses, particularly because the bridges sit on an important route serving Bracknell town centre and nearby public

transport connections. At this stage, the scheme is expected to attract support as a sensible preventative maintenance intervention that protects a key transport asset and reduces the risk of greater future disruption. No significant controversial elements are currently anticipated beyond the normal impacts associated with temporary traffic management and construction activity. Any such impacts would be managed through careful programming, coordination and communication. Overall, the scheme is expected to be supported as a proportionate and necessary investment in the resilience and long-term serviceability of the local highway network.

- 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.

Bracknell Forest Council prioritises structural maintenance through a planned, risk-based asset management approach supported by its term engineering consultant, AtkinsRéalis. Atkins undertakes and manages inspections of the Council's highway structures in accordance with the relevant national standards and provides technical advice on condition, defects, risks and recommended interventions. Inspection findings are used to inform an ongoing assessment of asset condition, structural vulnerability, safety risk, serviceability and lifecycle need. Schemes are then considered within a rolling five-year forward programme, which is reviewed and updated as new inspection information becomes available and as priorities change across the wider structures portfolio.

Prioritisation is therefore based on a combination of inspection evidence, engineering judgement, risk, likely deterioration rate, network importance and affordability. Bracknell Forest Council typically allocates around £300,000 per annum of capital funding to structures, of which approximately £200,000 is generally available for physical works, with the balance supporting inspections, professional services, design development and other essential asset management activity. This means that only a limited number of schemes can be progressed each year and higher-risk or urgent interventions may need to take precedence. As a result, schemes that are important but not yet at the point of immediate restriction can remain in the forward programme until funding becomes available or external support is secured. This scheme has now reached the point where preventative intervention is justified to avoid further deterioration and greater future cost, but its scale is beyond what can reasonably be accommodated from the Council's normal annual structures budget alone.

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

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

This scheme has been selected for submission to the Structures Fund because it is a necessary and timely preventative intervention on two important highway bridge structures, but one that cannot reasonably be accommodated through Bracknell Forest Council's normal annual structures budget. Inspection and asset management processes have identified deterioration of the bridge deck waterproofing systems and the associated risk of continued water ingress, concrete deterioration and future reinforcement corrosion. The Council has therefore identified the need to intervene now, while the structures remain operational, in order to avoid more extensive damage, higher future costs and a greater risk of disruption to the highway network and the adjacent rail corridor.

The scheme is of local and regional strategic importance due to being part of a key strategic route (A3095) and its proximity to local transport hubs and the town centre.

The scheme is being put forward to the Structures Fund because its scale is materially beyond what the Council can deliver from its usual annual capital provision for structures. The proposed waterproofing works are estimated at a level equivalent to around three years' worth of the Council's normal capital allocation for structures, meaning that delivery from existing budgets alone would require deferral of other priority structural needs across the asset base. External funding is therefore the appropriate route to enable delivery of this scheme at the right time, without undermining the Council's wider ability to manage risk across its structures portfolio. The proposal is therefore both a justified local priority and an appropriate candidate for targeted Government investment.

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 this scheme is not delivered, deterioration of the bridge deck waterproofing systems is likely to continue, allowing further ingress of water and chlorides into the deck construction and associated structural elements. Over time, this will increase the risk of progressive concrete deterioration, reinforcement corrosion and damage to edge beams, parapet interfaces and other deck-level components. As deterioration advances, the Council is likely to face a growing need for reactive maintenance, more frequent inspections and potentially temporary risk management measures, all of which would increase cost and operational complexity. Delaying intervention would also reduce the opportunity to address the problem through a planned preventative scheme and increase the likelihood that more extensive structural repairs or partial reconstruction would be required in future.

The wider impacts of non-delivery would fall on both the local highway network and the infrastructure beneath the structures. The bridges carry an important route through Bracknell town centre, supporting movement between residential areas, employment, retail, public transport facilities and the wider road network. If deterioration led to restrictions, emergency works or unplanned closure, this could cause significant disruption, increase pressure on alternative routes and affect access for buses, service vehicles, businesses and residents. Given the structures' position above the adjacent rail corridor, further deterioration could also increase the risk of impacts beyond the highway asset itself, with potentially much wider consequences for transport connectivity. In summary, failure to deliver the scheme would increase whole-life cost, reduce network resilience and heighten the risk of disruptive future intervention affecting the local community and wider transport system.

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.

This scheme has been selected for submission to the Structures Fund because it is a necessary and timely preventative intervention on two important highway bridge structures, but one that cannot reasonably be accommodated through Bracknell Forest Council's normal annual structures budget. Inspection and asset management processes have identified deterioration of the bridge deck waterproofing systems and the associated risk of continued water ingress, concrete deterioration and future reinforcement corrosion. The Council has therefore identified the need to intervene now, while the structures remain operational, in order to avoid more extensive damage, higher future costs and a greater risk of disruption to the highway network and the adjacent rail corridor.

The scheme is of local and regional strategic importance due to being part of a key strategic route (A3095) and its proximity to local transport hubs and the town centre.

The scheme is being put forward to the Structures Fund because its scale is materially beyond what the Council can deliver from its usual annual capital provision for structures. The proposed waterproofing works are estimated at a level equivalent to around three years' worth of the Council's normal capital allocation for structures, meaning that delivery from existing budgets alone would require deferral of other priority structural needs across the asset base. External funding is therefore the appropriate route to enable delivery of this scheme at the right time, without undermining the Council's wider ability to manage risk across its structures portfolio. The proposal is therefore both a justified local priority and an appropriate candidate for targeted Government investment.

- 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.

A 24-hour classified vehicle count carried out in 2026 shows that the west bridge carries 10,358 motor vehicles per day, including 9,209 cars, 834 light goods vehicles, 151 heavy goods vehicles and 164 buses/coaches. The east bridge carries approximately 10,261 vehicles per day, including 9,067 cars, 915 light goods vehicles, 141 heavy goods vehicles and 138 buses/coaches. Two-wheeled use is also evident, with 231 motorcycles and 18 cycles on the west bridge, and 141 motorcycles and 11 cycles on the east bridge.

A restriction or closure would affect a wide range of users. While cars form the majority, the route also supports freight, service vehicles, buses and two-wheeled traffic. All motorised traffic would be diverted onto the wider network, increasing journey length, delay and congestion. Bus services would be particularly sensitive to these impacts; diversions would increase journey times to and from Bracknell town centre, reduce reliability for passengers making connections, and make public transport less attractive, with potential implications for sustainable travel.

The spans form part of an important corridor linking residential areas with employment, retail, education and public transport facilities. As such, severance would have wider impacts on accessibility, network resilience and overall performance. In addition, disruption to the underlying rail corridor could affect up to 3 million passenger journeys per year.

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 the scheme arise primarily from avoiding the need for diversion routes that would otherwise occur due to deterioration of the bridge deck waterproofing systems and its effect on the Reading to Waterloo line below. Without intervention, the likelihood of restrictions increases, requiring traffic to be diverted onto a significantly longer and less efficient route and possible closure of section of a busy rail line carrying thousands of passengers daily to and from Reading and Waterloo.

The principal monetised benefits captured in the Structures Fund Economic Tool include journey time savings, vehicle operating cost savings and wider external impacts. Journey time savings arise from avoiding diversion onto a route that is substantially longer (8.68 km compared to 0.47 km) and slower to traverse. This represents a significant impact given the route carries approximately 10,000 vehicles per day per direction across all vehicle types.

Vehicle operating cost benefits arise from reduced fuel and non-fuel costs associated with avoiding increased vehicle kilometres. Additional benefits arise from reduced external impacts, including congestion, road wear, noise, air quality impacts and greenhouse gas emissions, all of which increase when traffic is diverted.

In addition to monetised impacts, the scheme improves network reliability and resilience by reducing the likelihood of unplanned structural restrictions. These wider benefits are only partially captured within the quantitative appraisal but are critical to the overall value of the scheme.

- 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)	£348,174
Present Value Benefits (PVB)	£146, 847, 502
Benefit to Cost Ratio (BCR)	421.8

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

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

The cost inputs to the economic toolkit are based on a preliminary design that has been fully costed an early-stage estimate informed by benchmarking against comparable bridge waterproofing schemes and supported by preliminary quantity surveying input.

The capital cost used for implementation of the scheme comes from full cost by our term highway contractor who has engaged with specialist sub-contractors in their supply chain.

We have made the assumption that, with continual deterioration of the the structure, 2050 is a best estimate of when in the future the level of deterioration will have sufficiently reduced the load bearing capacity to require closure of the bridge to vehicle traffic.

The appraisal period has been set at 40 years, reflecting the expected upper bound of service life for a modern bridge deck waterproofing system under appropriate installation and maintenance conditions.

Infrastructure carbon emissions associated with the scheme have been estimated at 55 tCO₂e and monetised using central TAG carbon values.

The operational, maintenance and renewal costs for the bridge used in the economic tool is an annual average of the cost of the bridge inspection regime and minor maintenance but this does not address the main issue of water ingress into the structure.

There are no additional costs beyond the repair that we can predict and these will remain the same whether the waterproofing is renewed or not. However the cost to repair will increase as deterioratin of the concrete increases requiring more intrusive remediation of the concrete at much greater expense.

A shorter diversion with a 4km length under Twin Bridges could be available for low vehicles and some will choose to take it. However, we would only sign a single diversion route and this would be the one that was suitable for all vehicles for clarity for the travelling public and to avoid confusion with unsuitable vehicles

potentially trying to navigate a height restriction. Also, the economic tool only allows for a single diversion route to be input, therefore we have gone with what would be the signed diversion route.

These assumptions represent a proportionate and evidence-based approach to cost estimation, aligned with the stage of scheme development and DfT requirements for Structures Fund applications.

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 inputs used within the Scheme Details section of the economic toolkit are based on a combination of locally derived data and standard parameters embedded within the tool.

We have a traffic turning count for the junction taken as part of the borough modelling programme in September 2025. This count runs from 8am to 9pm and so we have extrapolated the figures to be an AADF over 24hrs. Full vehicle counts and classification have been ordered and will be included with the final submission.

Route characteristics (length and journey time) for both the existing route and likely diversion route have been developed using local network knowledge and mapping analysis. The diversion route has been defined using the A322, A329 and associated local roads, representing a realistic alternative route avoiding structural constraints.

The appraisal assumes that, without the scheme, diversion would be required for 365 days per year and would affect all vehicle types.

Default values within the tool have been applied where necessary, including traffic growth projections, values of time and environmental impact costs, consistent with TAG guidance and national datasets.

All inputs have been validated using the model's internal checks to ensure consistency and robustness.

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

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

The main non-monetised impacts relate to wider transport resilience, town centre economic activity and public transport connectivity. The Waterloo–Reading line resilience document included in the evidence provides a supporting high-level assessment of the potential consequences of disruption to the rail corridor beneath the structures. It indicates that a closure affecting the Waterloo–Reading line in the Bracknell area could affect millions of passenger journeys annually, with substantial journey time, reliability and crowding impacts. While these impacts are not included within the Structures Fund Economic Toolkit, they demonstrate the wider strategic importance of maintaining the structures in a safe and serviceable condition.

Further non-monetised impacts include the risk of reduced accessibility to Bracknell town centre if restrictions, emergency works or closure were required. Loss of convenient access could reduce visitor numbers, affecting retail, hospitality and service businesses, particularly where visitors choose alternative destinations because journeys become less reliable or less direct. Public transport impacts could also be significant. The bridges are adjacent to the bus station and support access to it; disruption could limit bus station usage, reduce passenger confidence and lead to lost bus revenue, as well as affecting people who rely on buses for work, education, shopping and essential services.

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

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

No alternative formal economic assessment has been undertaken outside of the Structures Fund Economic Tool.

Present Value Costs (PVC) n/a

Present Value Benefits (PVB) n/a

Benefit to Cost Ratio (BCR) n/a

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

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

2.3 Commercial Case

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

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

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

Bracknell Forest Council has substantial experience in delivering structural maintenance and renewal schemes through its established asset management programme. Delivery is supported by its term engineering consultant, AtkinsRéalis, who undertake inspection, design and technical advisory functions in accordance with national standards.

The Council routinely manages bridge maintenance schemes, including waterproofing, concrete repairs and associated highway works. This is underpinned by established processes for scheme development, procurement, delivery and contract management.

Bracknell Forest Council's Term Highway Maintenance Contractor will be the Principal Contractor and provide their services within the confines of the existing contract. We have a proven track record of delivering structural maintenance schemes utilising our Term Contractor's supply chain.

- A3095 Mill Lane - c£600,000 Replacement of bridge bearing shelf and bridge bearings on a live dual carriage, replacement of expansion joints.
- Wane Bridge – £220,000 Bridge strengthening works to a composite concrete and brickwork structure of a historic rural bridge over a main river to allow vehicle weight limit to be removed. Waterproofing works to the carriageway were also undertaken.
- A322 Downshire Way – c£250,000 extending a pedestrian subway for a road widening scheme as part of Local Enterprise Partnership funded scheme.

Any potential capacity constraints are mitigated through this flexible delivery model, combined with robust programme planning and prioritisation across the wider asset base.

This demonstrates the Council has the capability, experience and supply chain access necessary to deliver this scheme successfully within the required timeframe.

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 follow a standard delivery process comprising:

- Detailed design development by the Term Structures Consultant.
- Engagement with stakeholders including Network Rail
- Costing of the works package by the Term Highway Maintenance Contractor.
- Construction delivery under planned traffic management

The procurement will be through existing term contracts that the Council already has in place which have previously been procured through a competitive tender process.

Delivery is planned for Summer 2027, enabling early realisation of scheme benefits in line with Structures Fund objectives.

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.

Key delivery risks include:

- Traffic management challenges on a high-volume urban route
- Discovery of unforeseen structural defects
- Statutory undertakers equipment
- Cost inflation and supply chain pressures

These risks will be mitigated through early engagement with stakeholders, detailed design development, inclusion of contingency within cost estimates and use of experienced contractors.

A full project Risk Register would be compiled for should the funding become available.

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

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

The scheme works takes place entirely within the highway boundary and will not affect rail usage or introduce any additional disruption and risk to rail operations.

From site assessment and previous work undertaken around the bridge we are confident that there are no utilities within the area of the works that will require diversionary works. However, should funding be successful trial holes will be dug to confirm.

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	£	650,000	£	£	£
LA contribution	£	100,000	£	£	£
Other contribution	£	£	£	£	£
Total costs	£	750,000	£	£	£

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.

Bracknell Forest Council typically allocates approximately £300,000 per annum to structures, with around £200,000 available for capital works.

The estimated cost of this scheme (~£750,000) represents approximately three to four years of available capital works funding, making it unaffordable within existing budgets without having a negative impact on other asset management programmes.

We are a small highway authority managing a limited road network within one of the smallest local authority areas in England. Bracknell Forest Council receives one of the lowest Highway Maintenance Block allocations from the Department for Transport which is much smaller than larger highway authorities. This can make the delivery of higher-value interventions particularly challenging, even where the overall scheme scale is modest in a national context.

The proposed Station Roundabout bridge scheme, with an estimated cost of £750,000, represents a significant investment for the authority, equivalent to approximately 20.5% of Bracknell Forest Council's entire 2026/27 DfT Highway Maintenance Block allocation. Securing external funding would therefore enable the Council to address

a critical infrastructure need that could not readily be accommodated within existing maintenance budgets without adversely affecting the delivery of other essential highway maintenance priorities across the network.

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 scheme, deterioration will continue, leading to potential major repair or reconstruction at a later stage.

With the scheme, lifecycle costs are reduced through preventative intervention, extending asset life and avoiding more expensive future works.

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 cost estimate is based upon a preliminary design from our consultant. It has been fully costed by our term contractor who have gone to specialist sub-contractors in their supply chain. This is £615,000 and with contingency and predicted inflation then this means that we consider the final cost will be £750,000 total.

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.

There are few risks as the scheme has been costed including contingency as described above.

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.

A confirmed local contribution of £100,000 is provided from the Council's highway maintenance funding 2027/2028 budget.

Remaining funding is sought from the Structures Fund.

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?

Summer 2027

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

Summer 2027

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

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

The scheme will be delivered through established governance arrangements, including project management oversight, consultant support and contractor delivery. Subject to approval of the draft submission, complete detail design, complete detail costing, apply for Highway Network Management approvals and permits, commence Communications Plan, approval of RAMS and scheme construction.

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?).

Risks include traffic disruption and unforeseen structural issues. These will be mitigated through planning, site investigation and contingency. This will be detailed further in the Risk Register.

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.

Controls include programme monitoring, cost tracking, risk management and change control processes.

Cost control will be maintained through the Council's normal financial monitoring arrangements, supported by supplier quotations, agreed task orders and regular review of forecast outturn cost against approved budget. Any proposed changes to scope, cost or programme will be subject to formal change control, including assessment of the reason for change, funding impact, programme impact and approval route. The project risk register will be maintained throughout delivery and will record risks, owners, mitigation measures and residual impacts. Key risks, including Network Rail interface, traffic management, utilities, unforeseen defects and inflation, will be reviewed regularly and escalated where necessary.

Delivery will also be controlled through established contract management processes with the Council's term consultant and term highway maintenance contractor. These arrangements provide access to experienced design, commercial and construction resources and enable early supplier input to support buildability, programme certainty and cost management. Regular internal reporting will provide oversight

of progress, budget, risks and decisions required. This will ensure that the scheme remains on track for delivery in summer 2027, within the funding period and within the approved financial envelope.

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

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

No permission from third parties is required to deliver the scheme.

- 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.

n/a

- 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 impacts are minimised by extending asset life and avoiding major reconstruction; infrastructure emissions are estimated at 54 tCO₂e. Resurfacing will all utilise warm mix macadam materials which reduce carbon use further. Our contractor use solar powered welfare site facilities, tools and vehicles wherever possible.

- 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.

From site assessment and previous work undertaken around the bridge we are confident that there are no utilities within the area of the works that will require diversionary works. However, should funding be successful trial holes will be dug to reconfirm. Utilities that are known to be present in the verges are for Council owned asset of street lighting and traffic signals.

Part 3 – Governance and Declarations

3.1 Equality Analysis

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

☐ Yes

☒ No

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

An assessment of the scheme has been undertaken through the councils IIAST (Integrated Impact Assessment Tool) which has shown that these works are equally beneficial to all road and rail users.

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.

[Roads, parking and transport strategies and policies | Bracknell Forest Council](#)

3.3 Declarations

Senior Responsible Owner declaration

As Senior Responsible Owner for [Bracknell Forest Station Roundabout structural repairs], I hereby submit this request for approval to DfT on behalf of [Bracknell Forest Council] and confirm that I have the necessary authority to do so.

I confirm that [Bracknell Forest 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]

[REDACTED]

b) Signed:

c) Date: 31/07/2026

d) Email:

[REDACTED]

Section 151 Officer declaration

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

[REDACTED]

f) Signed:

g) Date: 31/07/2026

h) Email:

[REDACTED]