



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: Bath and North East Somerset Council
- b) Scheme / structure name and LHA bridges number: Protection to highway vaults and cellars in Bath City Centre
- c) Location (OS Grid Reference) of the scheme/structure (to identify location on map):
- Eastings: 375228
- Northing: 164735
- d) Name of Project Manager: Mike Johnson
- e) Email address: mike_johnson@bathnes.gov.uk
- f) Phone number: 01225 396152
- 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): Arched vaults and cellars with reinforced concrete slabs over		

- h) Provide an overview of the structure proposed for intervention and the nature of the problem.
- In Bath city centre, there are over 6500 cellars, vaults and arches under public highway. They are all significant age and are in a wide range of condition or condition is not known. Some of the cellars and vaults are listed buildings and the majority are privately owned. In some streets, the

cellars and vaults have been protected in the past by the use of individual reinforced concrete slabs which only extend over the plan area of each vault arch. The council as highway authority is responsible for the concrete slabs. These slabs have reached the end of their working life. As a result, the cellars and vaults are at risk of failing due to overloading and movement of the slabs above increasing peak pressures beyond the capacity of the historic arches of the cellars and vaults. A recent partial collapse of a privately owned vault with a Council maintained concrete slab over in St James's Parade ([Link to article](#)) has led to long term traffic management in a traffic sensitive area of the city. This has caused disruption to bus travel and cycling, increased congestion and will lead to increased levels of air pollution. Twelve bus services (1, 4, 5, 5a, 19, 20THE, 39, 700, 716, 779, A4 & X39) have been directly affected during the initial closure and the current one way system. The condition of the Terrace Walk bridge structure is at a level where the structure has had to be propped for around three decades.

i) Provide an overview of the proposed intervention and how the works will address the problem.

This should set out the method of resolving the issue that is to be addressed.

The proposed scheme is a package of four sites (See Annex 8 for Location Maps of the four sites of the scheme and the extent of the known cellars and vaults under the highway)

- Northern half of A3039 Manvers Street
- A3039 Pierrepont Street
- North Parade (West of North Parade Bridge and not the bridge)
- A3039 Terrace Walk

For the first three elements, the proposal is to remove the concrete slabs and fill material over the arched vaults, ensure that they are effectively waterproofed, fill over the vaults with foam concrete to effectively saddle the arches and install a new reinforced concrete slab that spans over multiple vault arches to reduce traffic load effects on any one arch of the vaults/cellars below. This solution allows the road over the vaults to remain available for use as the majority of the cellars and vaults are privately owned and cannot be filled/decommissioned because of their listed status. The current scheme that is on site for the Southern end of Manvers Street ([Link to Manvers Street project website](#)) is using this approach and the intention is to use the same method for the areas that the Structures Fund scheme will deliver. Using this established method will have solutions developed for construction risks and demonstrates that the scheme can be delivered by 2030. See Annex 2 for the details of the current Manvers Street scheme which is on site. See Annex 4 for the preliminary details of the proposed Pierrepont Street and the remaining section of Manvers Street that is included in the scope for this scheme.

For Terrace Walk the approach will be different as it is a bridge structure with reinforced concrete beams and deck slab in a very poor condition. The intention here is to remove the defective deck

slab and construct new structure to support the carriageway. Options for Terrace Walk have been explored by the authority over a number of years with the preferred option being a structure replacement to maximise the social and economic benefits that the space under the highway were to provide if it were safe to occupy. See Annex 3 for the Terrace Walk proposals.

The Bath Central Riverside Feasibility/Outline Business Case ([Bath-Central-Riverside-OBC](#)) provides more commentary on the benefits of replacing the structure.

The proposed scheme will therefore ensure that the highway network of the city remains available to public transport operators and access for Goods Vehicles making deliveries to businesses.

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

Yes, a large number of the vaults and cellars are privately owned. A small proportion are owned by the council.

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

If the A36 East of Bath is closed or restricted the A3039, which includes Manvers Street, Pierrepont Street and Terrace Walk, will receive additional vehicles. The A3039 will not be part of the formal diversion route if the A36 is closed but it will receive significantly more vehicles as motorists will use unofficial diversion routes in an attempt to reduce journey times. It is also likely that the A3039 will see more large goods vehicles using it during a closure of the A36 as they also follow satnav directions.

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..

Terrace Walk is currently propped and has been for around three decades. Propping will need to be fully replaced within next two to five years to be able to keep the road over open.

The existing concrete slabs at Manvers Street, Pierrepont Street and North Parade are all moving under traffic loads and are not providing the required protection to the vaults and cellars.

Structural damage to the historic arches will occur and the safe passage of vehicles, pedestrians and cyclists will be impaired if the work is not carried out within five years.

Inspections have been carried out on the vaults under that support the highway. Extracts from the inspection reports accompany this submission in Annex 1 and the full inspection reports are

available if required. Condition information for the highway over the vaults is also included in Annex 6.

Note: The inspection report for North Parade Bridge included in Annex 1 has been included for the detail it contains on the cellars/vaults to the West of the bridge. North Parade Bridge itself is not included in the proposed Structures Fund scheme.

The consequences of not carrying out these works are demonstrated by the recent partial collapse of a privately owned arch under St James's Parade. Without intervention, partial or full collapses are likely across all the areas that are being addressed by this proposed scheme.

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.

No formal structural weight restrictions are currently in place.

Terrace Walk is propped and if the regular inspections observe a failure of those props or of the structure between the props, the highway supported by the structure will be closed to all vehicles with no advance warning. The deterioration of the slabs spanning over the vaults is being monitored and restrictions may also have to be put in place if it becomes unsafe. There is potential for restrictions and closures to be in place on Manvers Street, Pierrepont Street, North Parade and Terrace Walk at the same time within five years which will have a severe impact on the movement of public transport, goods vehicles and private vehicles through the city.

If restrictions or closures are put in place, the following bus services will have to be rerouted:

3, 11, 228, 734, City, City Tour, Sky(Oakleigh), Skyline Tour, U1, U1N, X83. These are a combination of local services, University bus services and Tourist bus services. The impact is therefore wide ranging, affecting access to employment, education and the tourist industry.

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, 7.5 tonne restrictions are likely to be required if work is not carried out. Full prohibition of vehicles will be required if condition deteriorates sufficiently. This would have a significant impact on ten bus services as well as the ability of businesses in the city centre to receive deliveries. The roads affected are in close proximity to Southgate Shopping Centre and the main Royal Mail depot for the city.

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.

Terrace Walk has quarterly inspections carried out on the propping. The other roads do not currently have risk management measures in place other than normal safety inspections carried out by the highway inspectors. Where defects are identified targeted monitoring is put in place.

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.

More propping in the privately owned vaults and cellars may be required. Weight restrictions will also be required. Collapses will lead to immediate road closures with no advance warning. Businesses and public transport operators will be severely impacted by these as they will not be able to plan in advance and mitigate any losses.

If the proposed scheme does not proceed, remote monitoring of the Terrace Walk structure and propping will be implemented during 2027/28. It is estimated that the annual cost of the remote monitoring in Terrace Walk will be £100k.

Remote monitoring may also have to be installed in the privately owned cellars and vaults to enable decisions to be made on whether road closures are required. At an approximate cost of £10k per year for each of the arch structures, this could easily result in an annual monitoring cost of £250k to £500k.

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: 22

BCI Ave: 41

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 concrete slabs over the arched vaults are considered to be secondary deck elements. They are being used to disperse vehicle loads so that peak pressures on the arches are reduced. These slabs have become unstable and are rocking across the arches causing uneven dispersal of traffic loads that is affecting the structural integrity of the arches (which are the primary element of the structure).

The Terrace Walk structure is deteriorating by corrosion of reinforcement and concrete cover spalling. While the structure is propped, it is still deteriorating between the props and is approaching a time when the propping layout will need to be redesigned to effectively support the highway above. The props themselves are also ageing and are being replaced as the temporary support inspections find that they are no longer effective. Refer to Annex 1 for the 2024 Principal Inspection of Terrace Walk and the Inspection carried out in May 2026. This shows that the secondary deck elements have deteriorated in two years from 3C to 4C and the Pier/Column elements have deteriorated from 3D to 4D. As a result the BCI Crit has reduced from 50 in 2024 to 22 in 2026. Likewise the BCI Avg has reduced from 55 in 2024 to 41 in 2026. This rate out deterioration will result in a full closure of the A3039 over the structure within five years while the propping arrangement is redesigned to account for the structural deterioration.

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

Inspection reports are included in Annex 1.

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.

Without this scheme, reducing access to the city centre highway network by buses and goods vehicles will restrict the economic growth in the city as it will become more difficult for businesses to remain profitable due to reduced visitor numbers. Job growth will be harmed as businesses move to other areas that will be easier to access and investment into the city will reduce. The proposed scheme will ensure that buses and goods vehicles can use the key North/South route on the Eastern edge of the historic centre along with one of the small number of roads that cross the River Avon from the East.

The proposed scheme will contribute towards delivering the economic benefits that were identified in the Bath Central Riverside regeneration programme that was set out in the outline business case submitted to the West of England Combined Authority. (See link here: [Bath-Central-Riverside-OBC](#)). It will support the potential to provide over 10000 square metres of new commercial space, up to 80 new residential dwellings, 788 new jobs and new public realm infrastructure.

Ensuring that the space within the vaults and cellars can be safely brought back into use will allow the creation of flexible adaptable spaces for mixed economy use and also for use by public events and entertainment providers. This will enable delivery of the Government growth objective, helps reduce journey time disruption, reduce congestion and improve productivity and profitability.

- 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.

- **National Planning Policy Framework (NPPF):** The NPPF introduces a 105% increase in housing targets across the region. In response, the B&NES Local Plan is being updated to identify new housing locations and intensification opportunities. This includes significant city centre growth, such as student accommodation and key regeneration sites including Bath Central Riverside and the Milsom Quarter. Maintaining effective access into the city centre will be critical to supporting this planned growth.

- **West of England Growth Strategy:** Bath city centre is identified as a priority growth area. As noted (p.9): *“Our major cities have a unique and diverse economic mix, including a thriving creative sector, internationally significant digital sector strengths and a culture that attracts visitors and new residents. With large scale development opportunities including housing growth – our cities will be our engines of growth.”*
- **BANES Journey to Net Zero (2022) and Movement Strategy for Bath** (planned for adoption July 2026 following cabinet on 2nd July): Pierrepont Street is identified as a key corridor for both bus movement and active travel, making it a priority route for maintaining network performance. This supports improved travel choice, accessibility, and sustainable access to the city centre, alongside enabling economic activity.
- **BANES Economic Strategy (2024 – 2034):** Aligns with the ambition to *“Develop a riverside technology & innovation corridor that links existing assets from Manvers St to Bath Quays as scoped in the Enterprise Area Masterplan”* reinforcing the strategic importance of this corridor.

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 scheme supports the Bath Central Riverside regeneration programme as well as the Movement Strategy for Bath ([Link to Movement Strategy](#)).

The Movement Strategy clearly identifies that the roads included in this proposed scheme are strategic in importance both to general traffic and to the bus network. The strategy has been developed to help meet the goal to create a city by 2035 where people can move around easily, safely and sustainably – walking, wheeling, public transport and private vehicles. If this scheme is not delivered the target year of 2035 is unlikely to be achieved and the authority will fall short on the net zero vision. The failure to meet the net zero vision will reduce the ability the authority has towards meeting the strategic priorities set out in the Climate Emergency Strategy ([Link to Climate Emergency Strategy](#))

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.

Private owners of the vaults and cellars have been identified in the Manvers Street and Pierrepont Street area as part of the development of the Manvers Street scheme that is currently underway and engagement with those owners will continue as this scheme is developed. Refer to the “Manvers and Pierrepont Street Remediation Project” report reference 10011342-ATR-SBR-XX-RP-CB-000002 in Annex 4.

The private owners of vaults and cellars in North Parade have been identified and informal discussion with them has taken place during recent inspection visits. Formal engagement will take place during 2026 if the funding is awarded. Formal engagement has not taken place prior to this to avoid raising expectations.

Engagement with stakeholders such as English Heritage, utility companies, Environment Agency, etc has taken place for the current scheme being carried out on Manvers Street and this will be expanded to include the other areas that this scheme will cover.

Elected members have been briefed on the scope of this scheme and are supportive.

The West of England Combined Authority have been provided with details of the scheme and have confirmed that they support the proposal as it meets their goals for growth in the city and will maintain a high quality public transport provision. See Annex 10 for WECA letter of support.

- e) Provide a summary of the local approach to prioritisation of structural maintenance work.
(Maximum 250 words)

Set out any weighting, scoring or other methodology which explains why this scheme has not been subject to work prior to this point.

Structural maintenance work within Bath & North East Somerset is carried out on both a reactive and planned basis. The reactive maintenance work is generally in response to observing defects in our planned inspection programme that if left will lead to an accelerated deterioration of the structure. This reactive work is prioritised currently through engineering judgement and has no formal prioritisation system, although factors like condition, route criticality, traffic sensitivity, public transport impact, safety, likelihood of closure and economic impact are considered when selecting schemes. This work contributes towards keeping the condition at a steady state.

The planned maintenance work is generally larger improvement or strengthening schemes carried out on elements of the structures that have failed or are approaching the end of their working life. Because of a significant backlog of structures requiring this type of work, it is being planned around the capital budget available which on average in the last 5 years has been £775,000. The funding level has not been sufficient to contribute towards keeping the structures stock condition at a steady state. The type of work has focussed on improvements or element replacement that has been simple to design and implement to keep design and investigation costs to a minimum. It is recognised that this approach is not sustainable, however the funding allocations and the staff resource available has not allowed for better prioritisation to be developed and to carry out larger and more complex schemes to deal with the significant backlog.

- 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.

While it has been recognised for a long time within the authority that the deterioration of the slabs over the vaults and the failed structure at Terrace Walk is a significant risk, the approach has been to monitor and carry out localised interventions to keep the roads open. It has reached a point where this approach is no longer viable and road closures or weight restrictions are increasingly likely. Because of the potential detrimental impact of not carrying out the works on the proposed structures, no other structure or group of structures in the authority is in a condition that would affect the economy and communities to the same scale. The A36 Cleveland Bridge replacement scheme would have a similar impact but the scheme has not been developed enough to be certain of a 2030 completion.

Because the current Manvers Street scheme is underway with detailed design complete and contractors on site, the design solution that will be utilised has been proven and risks fully understood. This understanding gives confidence that if the funding is awarded, this scheme can be delivered within the required timeframe.

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.

Should the scheme not be delivered, the plans for regeneration of the central riverside area of the city will not deliver the economic and social benefits anticipated. The area will effectively be cut off from public transport that brings people into employment in this vibrant area that also attracts significant tourist visitor numbers. Journey times for public transport will increase that will make the use of public transport less attractive and may increase private car usage. Public transport operators may decide that some routes will become uneconomical and may withdraw provision. Businesses will experience a drop in footfall that will affect viability and employment opportunities will also reduce as a consequence.

The reputation of the city as a must see place for tourists will be harmed and this will have a wider economic impact to the region as tourist numbers decline.

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.

Employment opportunities in the city centre central riverside area will be secured if the scheme is delivered. Employees will be able to directly travel to the area using public transport from the wider region ensuring the potential pool of high quality employees is maintained.

The University of Bath Virgil Building will be inaccessible to vehicles and bus services will not directly serve the facility. This will reduce the availability of an important study facility for the University students.

The public car park at Manvers Street will have access limited or prevented which reduces provision of parking for those who need to drive into the centre, including those who need to use disabled parking bays, directly impacting those who need to use blue badge parking.

The community to the East of the River Avon will not be able to enter the city centre by public transport, private car or goods vehicles using the North Parade Road. A lengthy diversion to the North (2.5km which uses a route that has an 18T weight restriction on it) or South (5.3km) will have to be used. This will effectively cut off access to the historic city centre from the East and will result in some people not being able to use the amenities in the vibrant city centre.

- 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.

Non-motorised traffic would not be significantly affected as there are sufficient alternative traffic free routes through this area of the city.

Private car users, goods vehicles and public transport, approximately 6000 vehicles a day, would not be able to enter the city from east of the River Avon across North Parade bridge. They would have to either enter the city from the South across Windsor Bridge, to avoid the 7.5 tonne environmental weight restriction that Churchill Bridge has or enter from the North which has a 7.5 tonne environmental weight restriction and which also uses Cleveland Bridge that has an 18 tonne structural weight restriction.

Coupled with pedestrianised areas of the city, movement of all vehicles will be severely hampered and journey times on the diversion routes will increase. Buses will have to be rerouted which will prevent buses from serving the community in the city centre.

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.

Economic benefits are derived from removal of diversionary routing that would otherwise be required due to asset restrictions at appraised locations. The Structures Fund Economic Tool monetises benefits associated with reduced journey times, vehicle operating costs and changes in vehicle kilometres, alongside external impacts including decongestion, accidents, local air quality, noise, greenhouse gas emissions, indirect taxation and infrastructure carbon. The appraisal has been undertaken separately for relevant locations and vehicle-routing assumptions, including separate car/PSV and HGV toolkits where diversion routes differ, costs included only in car/PSV toolkits to avoid double-counting.

Results show largest source of economic benefit is journey-time savings, valued at approximately £1,275.4m in 2023 present value terms. Further benefits from vehicle operating cost savings £142.8m, decongestion benefits £313.4m, accident benefits £59.3m, greenhouse gas benefits £36.1m, noise benefits £7.7m and local air quality benefits £2.4m. These are partly offset by negative indirect taxation £2.0m and a small negative infrastructure carbon impact £0.1m. The negative infrastructure carbon value reflects the embodied carbon emissions associated with construction of the scheme assets, which are monetised in accordance with DfT appraisal guidance and deducted from overall economic benefits. However, this disbenefit is minimal relative to the substantial user and network benefits generated through avoiding lengthy diversion routes. Overall, appraisal produces Present Value Benefits of £1,835.1m and a Net Present Value of £1,858.5m in 2023 prices and values.

Terrace walk has not been appraised with a toolkit due to no suitable diversion.

See Annex 11 for the Economic Toolkits.

- 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)	-£23,395,630
Present Value Benefits (PVB)	£1,835,078,417
Benefit to Cost Ratio (BCR)	-78.4

- 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 current Manvers Street scheme has been used to derive the costs of the proposed scheme. A rate per linear metre has been derived from the activity schedule and multiplied by the length the

proposed scheme. An optimism bias of 55% in accordance with Tag Unit A1-2 guidance has been used. A risk allowance of 30% has been included to reflect the design development required. The existing structures are at the end of their life with less than five years predicted before road closures are required. Minimal maintenance in the form of resurfacing will be carried out prior to that. After this the structures will be unserviceable and roads will be closed. Terrace Walk temporary propping system will be replaced within five years at a cost of £500,000 with future annual cost of £150,000 for inspection and maintenance. New temporary propping will have maximum lifespan of 10 years after which it will be at end of serviceable life. Manvers Street, Pierrepont Street and North Parade will have a design working life of 60 years, with no maintenance except for resurfacing every 15 years. Terrace Walk will have a 120 year design working life. Structural maintenance will be required every 20 years at a cost of £50,000 for each intervention. Principal Inspections will be required every six years and General Inspections carried out every 2 years. Costs have only been included in the non-HGV toolkit to ensure they are not duplicated when adding the results together.

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).

Two toolkits exist for each vault, one for cars and LGVs and the second for HGVs. HGVs will have a different diversion due to existing traffic restrictions. All the toolkits are included in Annex 11. The traffic count data has been obtained from the traffic signal detectors at the signal controlled junctions of North Parade/Pierrepont Street, Manvers Street/Dorchester Street and Pierrepont Street/Terrace Walk. The data produced unclassified vehicle counts passing through those junctions which have been used to derive the AADT used in the economic case.

Existing and diversion route journey times have been produced using TomTom data from the TomTom web based tool. Links for all TomTom reports have been provided in the Manvers Street Economic Toolkit.

No data is available to accurately determine the congestion band for this area. As the scheme is located in central Bath, congestion is likely to be relatively high. However, in the absence of supporting data, the authority's default congestion band has been assumed. The default value is likely to be lower than the actual given the central location and therefore represents a lower estimate.

Carbon has been calculated for the current Manvers Street scheme and then pro rated per site by the scheme length. These are included in the non-HGV versions of the toolkits to ensure there is no duplication.

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

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

The scheme delivers a range of important non-monetised benefits associated with network resilience, accessibility and the wider functioning of Bath city centre. By maintaining structural integrity and avoiding future weight restrictions or closures, the scheme enhances network reliability and resilience, reducing the risk of unplanned disruption and providing greater certainty for public transport, freight and general traffic movements. It also prevents community severance, ensuring continued access to key services, employment and social activities, particularly for vulnerable users reliant on buses and local connections.

The intervention supports town centre vitality and place quality by retaining accessibility for visitors and supporting the ongoing viability of central retail, hospitality and tourism uses, which are particularly sensitive to access constraints. There are also heritage and urban realm benefits, as the scheme enables continued use of historic vaults and cellars without intrusive infill, thereby preserving listed structures and the character of the city.

In addition, the scheme contributes to safety and operational quality by reducing reliance on sub-standard diversion routes and maintaining well-understood traffic patterns. It also supports public transport reliability and attractiveness, reinforcing mode choice and social inclusion objectives. Collectively, these impacts strengthen the case for intervention beyond the quantified economic benefits.

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 economic assessment has been undertaken

Present Value Costs (PVC) [Click or tap here to enter text.](#)

Present Value Benefits (PVB) [Click or tap here to enter text.](#)

Benefit to Cost Ratio (BCR) [Click or tap here to enter text.](#)

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

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

2.3 Commercial Case

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

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

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

The scheme will be delivered by the Capital Programme & Project Delivery team of Bath & North East Somerset Council. This team has extensive experience in delivering complex transport and highway improvement programmes. They are currently successfully delivering the CRSTS programme as well as the current Manvers Street scheme. The team have an experienced group of programme managers, project managers, commercial and procurement expertise.

Where specialist design and other specialist technical resources are required, where necessary, this will be provided by the Strategic Delivery Partner (Atkins Realis) or one of the consultants on the West of England Combined Authority Professional Services Framework. These procurement routes for professional services are efficient in terms of time required to carry out the appointment and ensures that there is a wide enough pool to draw on from local offices and from the wider network in the UK.

Technical design assurance will be provided by the in-house Design and Projects team, ensuring that the design meets appropriate standards and local requirements. Structural Design Technical Approval will be carried out by the in-house structures team.

- 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.

Preliminary Design has been carried out for the Manvers Street and Pierrepont Street elements of the scheme which included Early Contractor Involvement. The scope of the current Manvers Street scheme will be expanded and utilise the same management team, design team and (subject to meeting procurement regulations) the same contractor. The current Manvers Street scheme has established which consents are required and the appropriate construction processes, including temporary works requirements. See Annex 2.

The Manvers Street element of the project will be carried out in the first half of 2027/2028

The Pierrepont Street element will be carried out in the second half of 2027/2028 (with a break over the Christmas embargo period).

The North Parade element of the project will be completed in the first half of 2028/2029.

Terrace Walk, will be completed during January 2029 through to February 2030.

As the Terrace Walk structure replacement will use a different design and construction approach, the design process will commence with appropriate investigations and Early Contractor Involvement will commence as soon as the funding is in place. By the time the Manvers Street and Pierrepont Street elements are completed, the design will have been completed and contractor procured and in place to commence work. Phasing the scheme in this way will ensure that works can start on site within twelve months of the funding being confirmed and completion of the whole scheme by the end of the 2029/2030 financial year.

- 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.

Because the scheme is largely based on the current Manvers Street scheme that is in progress, the risks have been identified and mitigation measures have been established. The risk register for the current Manvers Street scheme accompanies this submission in Annex 2 and will be used as a basis for the proposed scheme.

Key Risks identified are:

Asbestos being present increases costs and time to remove and dispose of while protecting the public and the workforce. The current scheme has shown that more trial holes and material testing are required in advance of main works than originally planned for.

Utilities requiring diversions. While utilities can be identified using established techniques like trial holes and Ground Penetrating Radar, the condition of some of the apparatus can be unclear. The current scheme identified that an old cast iron water main was present, but it only became apparent late in the planning phase that it was leaking. This led to a replacement of the main being put in place with delays being incurred to the construction programme. The proposed scheme will ensure that investigations are completed early in the programme to confirm condition of buried apparatus to ensure that programme risks are mitigated.

Condition and dimensions of existing vaults. If the condition of the existing vaults is too poor then additional refurbishment works will be required to ensure that the arches remain stable when the fill is removed. Dimensions like the arch barrel thickness and arch geometry will be confirmed in advance of the work commencing to confirm that when complete the structure can carry all normal vehicles.

Unexploded Ordnance is a risk and a watching brief by specialists will be required to mitigate the health and safety risk during construction.

Unidentified heritage features may be found during the excavations and will require a watching brief by specialists to identify these at an early stage to mitigate against programme delays.

- 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.

Listed building consent from English Heritage will be required for the structures that are currently listed. As this has been required for the current Manvers Street scheme that is underway, there is a clear understanding that the design and construction approach is acceptable. This will be continued through the proposed scheme. Pre-application advice is also in place through the Bath Central Riverside project that helps inform the design and construction approach. Previous design development work on Terrace Walk has also established heritage constraints. These will be refreshed in conjunction with English Heritage.

Owners of the private vaults affected have been informally approached during recent inspections of the vaults. There is support from those owners for the proposed scheme as it will help protect the spaces within the vaults that are used by the owners/occupiers for a variety of purposes.

Formal engagement will commence following submission of the Structures Fund proposal to avoid raising expectations unnecessarily.

Ecology studies will be carried out to confirm whether any protected species like bats are present. If they are present, early engagement with Natural England will be carried out.

Engagement with statutory undertakers has been carried out during the preliminary design phase for Manvers Street and Pierrepont Street. This will be continued for the remaining elements of the proposed scheme. Previous design and investigation work on the Terrace Walk structure has established the presence of apparatus and this will be refreshed.

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 (Includes 30% risk and 55% Optimism Bias in each of the years)	£673,162	£9,995,970	£8,890,985	£12,855,558	£32,415,675
LA contribution	£0	£78,750	£81,750	£84,750	£245,250
Other contribution	£0	£0	£0	£0	£0
Total costs	£673,162	£10,074,720	£8,972,735	£12,940,308	£32,660,925

b) Outline how the LHA has sought to manage this scheme from existing budgets and why that has been unsuccessful.

Explain the local approach to managing the existing DfT contribution across its highway assets and what specific challenges have meant that this structure was not repaired earlier.

The existing Manvers Street scheme is being funded from the Challenge Fund element of the CRSTS programme provided by the West of England Combined Authority. This funding stream is not going to be available to continue the scheme and there are other regional pressures that the combined authority may prioritise.

Bath and North East Somerset Council cannot allocate sufficient funding from the normal highway maintenance block allocation to deliver the scheme in a reasonable timeframe to eliminate the risk of failure of the structures without adversely affecting high priority work on other highway structure assets, carriageway condition, street lighting condition and drainage asset condition.

Council budgets and reserves are under significant pressure generally which prevents sufficient funding being allocated from other council funding sources.

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 slabs over the vaults and cellars in Manvers Street, Pierrepont Street and North Parade are considered to be at the end of their life with less than five years predicted before road closures are required, minimal maintenance will be carried out prior to that. The emphasis will be in keeping the carriageway as safe as possible in the form of resurfacing once in the remaining five years of life left. Anticipated cost around £300,000. After this the structures will be unserviceable and roads will be closed.

Terrace Walk temporary propping system will be reviewed and replaced within five years at an anticipated cost of £500,000 with a future annual cost of £150,000 to maintain remote monitoring, inspection and maintenance of propping system. New temporary propping will be designed to have maximum lifespan of 10 years after which it will be at end of serviceable life.

Manvers Street, Pierrepont Street and North Parade will have an anticipated design working life of 60 years, with no maintenance except for resurfacing every 15 years at a cost of £300,000 for each resurfacing event making a total cost of £900,000.

Terrace Walk will have a 120 year design working life. Structural maintenance is anticipated to be required every 20 years at a cost of £50,000 for each intervention. Principal Inspections will be required every six years at a cost of £10,000 for each inspection. The total inspection and maintenance cost of the proposed Terrace Walk element will be £440,000.

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 for the scheme has been derived from the existing Manvers Street scheme costs. The length of Manvers Street in the current scheme has been used with the total scheme costs to derive a rate per metre. This has then been used pro rata to develop a cost for the proposed scheme. It is known that a similar approach to the existing scheme will be followed for the proposed scheme which gives confidence that the estimated costs are realistic. The cost for each element then has a 30% risk allowance added and finally 55% Optimism Bias included. This will allow for any variations and uncertainties.

Inflation has been calculated using BCIS Civil Engineering Tender Price Index (Series number 7805, last updated 17 June 2026) which is 5% in 2027, 9% in 2028 and 13% in 2029.

Refer to the spreadsheet in Annex 9 for details of cost calculation.

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 mitigated by the annual inflation allowance, 30% risk allowance and 55% Optimism Bias.

Financial risks are:

Higher than expected inflation. Inflation has been assumed using BCIS Civil Engineering Tender Price Index (Series number 7805, last updated 17 June 2026). See spreadsheet in Annex 9.

Construction costs rapidly rise over a short period, causing problems for contractor in obtaining materials at price expected at the time of tendering. This will be a contractor risk but could affect programme. Early appointment of the contractor so that they can place orders and fix prices wherever possible.

Utility diversions costs higher than anticipated. Mitigated by keeping the size of excavations open at any one time to a minimum, avoiding need for expensive temporary support systems. Proposed method of construction is not anticipated to need utilities to be diverted. GPR surveys and trial trenches will be carried out as soon as possible after funding has been awarded to ensure that all utilities are located and statutory undertakers can confirm requirements.

Proposed scheme is phased over three year period and elements are linked but not dependent on the adjacent sections. If costs on a phase are higher than expected, design and implementation of the subsequent phases can be adjusted to reduce costs in following years of scheme. Potential to descope some elements of scheme if financial forecasts indicate budget available will be exceeded. That will leave risk of future closures of some of the highway network within five years as the structures deteriorate.

- f) Provide details of the local and other contributions, including the relevant funding sources and the certainty of whether these contributions are available. (Maximum 250 words)

Describe the various sources of funding and their availability.

The local contribution will come from the Highway Maintenance Block allocation. The level of local contribution has been set to avoid a detrimental impact on the high priority work required on other highway assets. £75k per year for the local contribution has been set aside, inflated using the BCIS Civil Engineering Tender Price Index (Series number 7805, last updated 17 June 2026). S106 funding sources were investigated but none is available for this project.

Council reserves are under severe pressure so cannot be used for the local contribution.

Corporate borrowing would be an option but servicing the interest on the debt would not be sustainable to the authority.

Obtaining a contribution from each of the private owners of the individual vaults and cellars was considered and was not pursued. The owners of the private vaults and cellars are only obliged to keep them in a reasonable structural condition, similar to when they were first constructed, largely prior to motorised goods vehicles and are not obliged to carry out any works outside of the waterproofing to the extrados of the arches. Negotiating with the numerous private owners to try and agree a contribution would not be effective.

2.5 Management Case

Outlines how the project will be delivered and managed effectively.

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

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

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

01/04/2027

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

28/02/2030

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

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

The scheme will be managed by the council's Capital Programme & Project Delivery team who have successfully delivered large complex highway infrastructure projects, for example the CRSTS programme. This team has programme and project management resources already in place to deliver the current Manvers Street scheme. These resources will remain in place to ensure continuity with this proposed scheme. Maintaining that continuity of project management staff will carry all the lessons learnt in the current scheme through into the proposed scheme. The same designer will also be engaged to complete the proposed scheme. If possible, the same contractor will be retained to complete the proposed Manvers Street element along with the Pierrepont element. This will ensure that the construction methods and supply of specialist materials and plant are carried forward to the proposed scheme. While the Manvers Street and Pierrepont Street elements of the proposed scheme are being constructed, the design of North Parade and Terrace Walk will be completed and procurement of a contractor will be carried out to ensure that best value is tested rather than continuing with the same contractor. Phasing the scheme in this way builds in time to carry out a procurement exercise for the construction of the North Parade and Terrace Walk elements.

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?).

Click or tap here to enter text.

The key delivery risks and challenges are:

- Receiving notification from DfT that the funding is in place for the scheme early enough so that the current Manvers Street project team, designers and contractor can be retained to carry their knowledge and experience into the proposed scheme. If award of the funding does not take place until 2027, the current project team may not still be in place.
- Cost overruns will be mitigated by the phasing of the scheme in to four distinct elements. As each element is completed, costs will be reviewed against remaining budget and if it becomes clear that budget available will not be sufficient, the scope of the scheme will be adjusted and elements scheduled to be completed in 2028/2029 and 2029/2030 may be removed.
- Late approval of proposals by English Heritage. The current Manvers Street scheme has established the design and construction methods that meet the requirements of English Heritage. The same approach will be used for the Manvers Street, Pierrepont Street and North Parade elements of the scheme which reduces the risk of English Heritage delaying the approval. For the Terrace Walk element, there has been engagement on the listed building status for the Bath Central Riverside OBC that has been developed. Once funding is awarded, this engagement will be continued as design develops. Phasing the elements of the scheme so that Terrace walk is the last element to be constructed ensures that there is sufficient time to obtain listed building consent.

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.

Click or tap here to enter text.

Clear governance of the scheme will be in place that will consist of Programme and Project Boards where decisions are required that exceed the project manager's delegated authority. The project manager will monitor budget spend and ensure that resources are in place for design and procurement activities at the right time. The scheme details will be held in project for the web which the council uses for all capital projects. The system allows the project details to be viewed in a dashboard format by those who need access to it. Members of the project and programme boards, along with key senior staff like the SRO or S151 officer, can see clearly whether the scheme is on track, how risks and issues are being mitigated and whether budget or programme pressures are emerging. This visibility allows action to be taken promptly as issues arise by the appropriate party in the governance structure.

Dedicated project manager resource will be assigned to the scheme supported by specialists in the procurement and finance teams. Design specialists will be resourced from the Strategic Delivery Partner (Atkins Realis) or by consultants on the West of England Combined Authority professional services framework.

Design assurance will be provided by the in house Design & Projects team who have been providing design assurance and technical approval for the CRSTS and current Manvers Street projects.

Structural Technical Approval will be carried out by the in house Structures team.

- 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.

Click or tap here to enter text.

The scheme will require permission from English Heritage to work over and adjacent to the listed structures. Permission has been secured for the current Manvers Street scheme and the same process will be followed for the elements of the scheme starting with the North half of Manvers Street. This consent will be applied for as soon as funding has been granted and because it is a design and construction process that English Heritage have previously agreed, there is high confidence that consent will be in place to allow construction to start when required. Discussions about consent for Terrace Walk will commence when funding has been awarded, giving the project team and English Heritage at least 24 months to ensure that consent is in place. Previous listed building applications for Terrace Walk provides the background needed to develop an updated application that provides confidence that consent will be forthcoming.

Consent to work around utilities will be required but as there are no significant diversions anticipated, it is not envisaged that consent will be problematic in the time available.

Permission is not required from the owners of the private vaults/cellars. This can be done within Highways Act powers. However, the owners will need to grant permission to install monitoring equipment in the vaults/cellars to provide reassurance that the work over is not affecting the structures.

Statutory Undertakers will need to grant permission to work around their apparatus but because diversions are not considered necessary, and excavation sizes will be minimised it is unlikely that permission will be denied as long as suitable protection measures are implemented.

- 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.

Click or tap here to enter text.

There is limited scope to include climate adaptation measures in this scheme as it needs to work within the constraints of a city highway network. The scheme does help prevent the predicted increase in rainfall (both volume and intensity) from causing damage to the historic vaults by more effectively preventing water penetrating the mortar joints and causing wash out. The current arrangement has multiple joints between the reinforced concrete slabs over the vaults that allows water to penetrate into the fill material under the slabs which results in wash out and settlement and allows the slabs to move under vehicle loads which affects the load path to the vaults and increases the peak pressures on the historic arches. Using foamed concrete between the arches and the new larger reinforced concrete slab, ensures that wash out is minimised, providing a more resilient arrangement for increased rainfall.

The proposed reinforced concrete slab will be designed with suitable movement joints to accommodate a greater range of temperature change to help with the predicted more frequent hot weather. These joints in the concrete slab will also be present in the surfacing which will ensure that reflective cracking is avoided, prolonging the life of the surfacing. The proposed surfacing is a grouted macadam surface course that has been successfully used elsewhere in the authority which reduces water ingress and provides flexibility for movement of the underlying materials.

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).

Click or tap here to enter text.

A carbon assessment of the current Manvers Street scheme (see Annex 2) has been carried out to establish a baseline for the construction carbon. The same approach will be used as the proposed scheme develops. A carbon comparison register will be established to evaluate the alternative materials and construction processes. This could include:

- Cement replacement products and recycled aggregates will be considered when specifying the foamed concrete infill.
- Consideration will be given to the use of lower embodied carbon materials like Fibre Reinforced Polymers (FRP) for the Terrace Walk replacement structure.
- Identifying local suppliers of materials to reduce transport delivery carbon emissions.

- Work with supply chain to identify where alternative fuels can be used in plant and vehicles. E.g. Electric Vehicles and plant, HVO to replace diesel, Biomethane powered vehicles and plant.

Reducing the construction duration by using longer working hours to keep diverted vehicle emissions as low as possible will be considered, although this will be balanced against the quality of life for nearby residents that could be harmed through noisy construction activities in extended working hours.

The proposed design has been selected to reduce maintenance interventions which will remove the need to replace the concrete slabs over the cellars/vaults. This will minimise the whole life carbon, with only the surface course of the carriageway needing periodic replacement.

- 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.

Click or tap here to enter text.

Utilities searches have been carried out for all four elements of the scheme. Results of these searches are in Annex 7. The apparatus present is:

- Gas
- Electricity
- Surface Water sewers
- Foul Water sewers
- Water supply
- Street Lighting power supplies
- Highway drainage systems

As the proposed scheme will use a construction method that will not require the diversion of utilities, the requirements of the statutory undertakers are not anticipated to be significant. This has been the case for the current Manvers Street scheme.

Approval of temporary support to the apparatus will be required and supervision by representatives of the statutory undertakers will be allowed for.

Detailed engagement with the statutory undertakers will commence as soon as funding has been awarded, giving sufficient time to plan the work required. The statutory undertakers may want to take the opportunity to replace some of their older apparatus at the same time as the construction of the scheme is carried out. There is scope to allow for this in the construction durations

available for the elements of the scheme which will bring added benefits of improving the resilience of the apparatus and reducing the likelihood of that apparatus needing to be worked on after the scheme has finished. This will help reduce future congestion and disruption to the transport network in the city.

Part 3 – Governance and Declarations

3.1 Equality Analysis

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

☐ Yes

☒ No

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

An equality impact assessment will be carried out before 01/04/2027. This will use the Bath & North East Somerset Council Equalities toolkit. ([Link to EQIA Examples](#))

A wide range of equality profiles will be considered, including local demographics of Bath residents, North East Somerset residents as well as those travelling into and through the city, including tourists and commuters.

The following are examples of protected characteristics that will be considered and impacts mitigated:

- Sex – National travel survey data indicates women take 30% more local bus journeys than men. Women may feel unsafe using public transport, walking or cycling which may result in them not using these travel modes.
- Pregnancy and maternity – Keeping the roads supported by the structures open to all traffic ensures that pregnant people and parents with young children can access local amenities, healthcare and education centres.
- Disability – Carrying out this proposed scheme ensures access to blue badge parking in this area of the city remains available for those who cannot use public transport and rely on private car use.
- Race – The highest proportion of people who use local buses are black. Black people make the lowest proportion of trips by car or van. Ensuring that the roads remain open to public transport will provide all ethnic groups appropriate choice of travel modes.

Other protected characteristics that will be considered are:

- Age
- Sexual Orientation
- Gender Reassignment
- Marriage and Civil Partnership
- Religion/Belief

- Care Experienced (not covered under the Equality Act but adopted by B&NES as a protected characteristic)

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.bathnes.gov.uk/departments-transport-structures-fund>

3.3 Declarations

Senior Responsible Owner declaration

As Senior Responsible Owner for [Protection to vaults and cellars in Bath City Centre], I hereby submit this request for approval to DfT on behalf of [Bath and North East Somerset Council] and confirm that I have the necessary authority to do so.

I confirm that [Bath and North East Somerset 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: Chris Major



b) Signed:

c) Date: 31/07/2026

d) Email: chris_major@bathnes.gov.uk

Section 151 Officer declaration

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



f) Signed:

g) Date: 03/08/2026

h) Email: stuart_donnelly@bathnes.gov.uk