



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: Royal Borough of Kensington and Chelsea
- b) Scheme / structure name and LHA bridges number: Albert Bridge – Thames River Crossing
- c) Location (OS Grid Reference) of the scheme/structure (to identify location on map):
- Easting: 527300
- Northing: 177500
- d) Name of Project Manager: Gary Noble
- e) Email address: gary.noble@rbkc.gov.uk
- f) Phone number: 07971320887
- 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.

Albert Bridge is a road bridge over the River Thames connecting Chelsea on the north bank to Battersea on the south. Designed by Rowland Mason Ordish and opened in 1873, it is now more than 150 years old and is one of only two central London Thames road bridges that have never been replaced. It is a Grade II* listed structure, and a unique hybrid design.

Shortly after opening in 1887, a 5T weight limit was imposed and it has had some form of weight restriction ever since. After a new centre pier was built in the 1970s to help support the bridge, the limit was reduced to 2T. This was raised to the current 3T limit following strengthening works undertaken by the Council in 2010-2011.

In February, a crack in one of the cast iron bearing supports was found during a routine inspection and the bridge has been shut to vehicular traffic since. The bridge is open to pedestrians and cyclists. The vehicular closure is putting pressure on other strategic routes both north and south of the river.

The bridge has been stabilised with temporary works whilst design optioneering is taking place for the permanent works, aimed at reopening the bridge to vehicular traffic in 2027.

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 intervention provides a permanent remediation of the northern caissons that will restore the structural integrity and operational functionality of the bridge. The works are designed to enable the safe reopening of the bridge to vehicles, pedestrians and cyclists at the earliest opportunity by addressing the root causes of the structural defects and ensuring the load path through the affected caissons is fully reinstated.

At the northeast caisson, temporary stabilisation measures will first be installed. The defective cast iron caisson ring and top plate will then be removed and replaced with a purpose designed steel beam and column frame that replicates the structural function of the original components while providing enhanced durability. The new steelwork will be connected to the retained caisson ring sections using existing bolt locations. Defective rocker assemblies will be replaced with equivalent fabricated steel components, and the bearing assembly will be grit blasted, greased and repainted to restore free movement.

For the remaining three caissons, preventative maintenance comprising grit blasting, greasing and repainting around the top pin assemblies will be undertaken to maintain functionality and reduce future deterioration. Collectively, these works provide a robust, heritage-sensitive and permanent solution that restores structural resilience and ensures the bridge can safely return to full operational use.

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

No

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

No due to existing weight restriction, to protect the structure.

1.2 Understanding the Condition of the Structure

Please set out the current condition of the structure in this section.

a) Provide evidence that the relevant structure is in need of repair either now or by the end of the 2029/30 financial year. (Maximum 250 words)

Provide details of the process used for determining whether this structure is in need of repair and the timescale in which the repair is needed..

The bridge is currently shut to vehicular traffic, due to the damage discovered to the bridge caisson and bearing. Pedestrians and cyclists are allowed to use the structure, but there are limitations on crowd loading if events are held in the area.

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

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

The structure is closed to vehicular traffic, from February 2026.

- 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.

To protect the structure, Albert Bridge already has a 3T weight limit enforced by width restrictions.

- 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.

A temporary prop was installed in April to help stabilise the structure and maintain access for pedestrians and cyclists.

- 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.

Click or tap here to enter text.

- 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: 78.88

BCI Ave: 88.36

- 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 last inspection (undertaken in 2025) indicates that Albert Bridge is generally in good condition overall, with a BCI Average of 88.36, but the BCI Critical score remains lower at 78.88, reflecting the ongoing influence of a small number of poorer elements. It should be noted that the current BCI scores do not factor in the current structural issue identified in February 2026 with regards to the NE Caisson. Over the past five years, the bridge has shown a gradual improvement in BCI scoring, largely attributable to targeted capital works including carriageway deck renewal, waterproofing repairs and renewal of expansion joint seals. These interventions have successfully

addressed key durability issues, particularly historic water ingress. However, several defects continue to adversely affect performance. Most notably, corrosion across primary structural elements, including the suspension system and wrought iron girders, these remain the principal factor suppressing the BCI Critical score. In addition, localised deterioration of towers and piers, including areas assessed at higher severity, continue to contribute to lower condition ratings. While historic calcite staining across the deck system is largely residual, it still influences scoring due to its extent and association with previous defects. Furthermore, universal coating failures, evidenced by flaking paint and exposed surfaces are enabling ongoing corrosion across multiple elements, including parapets and ancillary features.

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

Part 2 – Understanding the Case for Investment

2.1 Strategic Case

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

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

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

The reopening of Albert Bridge directly supports Government's economic growth mission by restoring a critical crossing in central London, where connectivity is constrained by existing bridge closures, restrictions and congestion.

The scheme aligns with Government's *Invest 2035* strategy by reinstating access to key innovation and employment centres, including Imperial College London and the WestTech London corridor, supporting sectors with significant growth potential. It also underpins wider regional ambitions, including the GLA's *London Growth Plan*, which identifies transport investment as essential to driving £107bn of growth in London's and the national economy by 2035, and Hammersmith & Fulham's "*Upstream London*" strategy, targeting 13,000 jobs and £10bn of GVA, depends on resilient transport.

The closure displaced almost 15,000 daily vehicle movements onto alternative routes, with journey times increasing by up to an hour at peak periods. For commercial operators, a 15-minute detour consumes 3-5% of a driver's daily allowable driving time, reducing delivery capacity and raising operating costs.

Reopening will restore network efficiency, improve journey reliability and increase resilience across the network, relieving pressure on Battersea and Chelsea Bridges, which routinely experience severe congestion. This will improve labour mobility and support businesses, particularly SMEs reliant on efficient servicing and customer access. Key workers, including those undertaking multiple daily social care visits, will benefit from more reliable journeys.

The repair programme will also generate skilled construction and heritage engineering jobs, with improved accessibility supporting footfall and investment.

A £4.7 million Structures Fund contribution, alongside RBKC's contribution, will reopen a nationally significant Thames crossing.

- 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.

Delivering a full repair of Albert Bridge directly supports outstanding Government objectives:

Cleaner energy and climate resilience

Reopening will shorten journey distances and cut idling, delivering immediate air quality benefits. The scheme will incorporate energy-efficient LED lighting funded by RBKC. Critically, the repair will strengthen the Bridge's resilience to extreme weather. Recent heatwaves triggered abnormal

movement requiring a precautionary 48-hour closure to cyclists and pedestrians. Repairing key components now will help the Bridge withstand rising temperatures, aligning with Government's *NAP3*, which focuses on improving infrastructure resilience to climate risks.

Healthier and safer streets

A reliable crossing will relieve pressure on surrounding routes, improving journey reliability and road safety, supporting faster emergency response times and more consistent bus services currently affected by congestion. The scheme will maintain walking and cycling provision, and a new deck panel system will reduce road joints, improving the cycling experience line with Government's *CWIS3*.

Breaking down barriers

The closure has further constrained north-south connectivity in west London, compounding Hammersmith Bridge's closure. Affected communities in Hammersmith and Fulham and Richmond offer a clear, current example of community severance and business decline, which we cannot let happen with Albert Bridge. Reopening will keep communities connected and prevent long-term isolation, restoring access to key amenities including Chelsea and Westminster Hospital, Royal Brompton Hospital, King's Road shops and Battersea Park. The closure directly affects the estimated 35,000 residents across the adjoining wards of Chelsea Riverside, Royal Hospital and Battersea Park, with wider impacts felt across RBKC and Wandsworth's combined population of over 500,000.

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 full repair and reopening of Albert Bridge is an urgent local priority, reflecting its critical role in London's transport network, the impact of its unplanned closure, and the Council's duty to safeguard a nationally significant heritage asset. Closure on safety grounds caused immediate disruption, underlining the need for timely intervention.

Before closure, the Bridge carried significant daily traffic between north and south London. With no time to adapt, residents and businesses faced longer, less reliable journeys, alongside reduced footfall, employment and service access. These impacts have been especially acute for carers, health workers and emergency services needing efficient cross-river access, and for school travel. Over twenty schools sit within a mile of the Bridge, serving around 8,500 pupils.

With Hammersmith Bridge closed and Vauxhall Bridge weight restricted indefinitely from 1 July, West London's river crossings are increasingly constrained, exposing the network to disruption and excess risk. Repairing Albert Bridge will relieve this pressure and restore resilience across RBKC and neighbouring boroughs.

Early intervention is also sound financial stewardship. Addressing known issues now will avoid escalating deterioration, reduce long term costs and minimise the risk of prolonged closure. As custodian of a Grade II* listed bridge, the Council has a duty to act as a responsible guardian, protecting the structure whilst maintaining operational function.

Investing in Albert Bridge's full repair is therefore both an immediate operational necessity and a prudent, value for money decision for taxpayers, safeguarding the future of a critical piece of transport infrastructure.

- 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.

There is strong and consistent support for the repair and reopening of Albert Bridge from local MPs, elected Members, neighbouring authorities and wider stakeholders, reflecting broad recognition of its importance to communities, the transport network and the local economy. MPs and councillors across affected areas have been clear that reopening the bridge is a priority, citing significant disruption to residents, businesses and key workers, and urging timely delivery. There has also been considerable support from Members of the House of Lords, in particular Baron Bridges of Headley.

This support has been reflected in extensive local and national media coverage, highlighting the scale of disruption and the strategic importance of restoring this critical cross-river link. Media attention has amplified stakeholder concern and underlined the scheme's significance beyond the immediate locality.

Neighbouring authorities have worked closely with RBKC throughout the closure and remain strongly supportive of restoring vehicular access to relieve pressure on the wider network. Transport for London is similarly aligned, recognising the scheme's role in reducing congestion and improving reliability across West London. Engagement with heritage bodies, engineering experts and industry stakeholders further demonstrates consistent backing for a timely and permanent solution.

Stakeholders also recognise the funding anomaly with Albert Bridge. The Council is solely responsible for financing a strategically significant Thames crossing used by multiple boroughs, unlike comparable crossings supported by TfL or historic trust funding arrangements. This strengthens the case for national investment.

There are no controversial elements: stakeholders are united in wanting the bridge reopened as soon as it is safe, demonstrating a clear, deliverable and widely supported case for investment.

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

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

The Council uses a risk-based asset management approach to prioritising bridge maintenance and renewal, ensuring available funding is directed towards structures where intervention delivers the greatest benefit in terms of safety, resilience, serviceability and whole-life value. This approach aligns with national guidance, including the principles of the UK Roads Leadership Group (UKRLG) Highway Infrastructure Asset Management framework.

Bridges are subject to regular inspection, assessment and monitoring, including principal and general inspections and specialist structural investigations where required. The results are used to assess structural condition, identify deterioration trends and determine the likelihood and consequences of failure.

Prioritisation is based on factors including public safety, structural condition, operational performance, network criticality, resilience, maintenance liabilities and value for money. Albert Bridge is maintained through an ongoing regime appropriate to its Grade II* listed status and national significance. At 153 years old, the component that failed was an original part of the bridge. This failure could not reasonably have been predicted or budgeted for, which is why this application has been submitted.

Whole-life cost principles ensure timely interventions before defects escalate into more extensive and costly repairs. The authority also considers the wider impacts of bridge restrictions on communities, businesses and transport networks when determining investment priorities.

Projects are ranked through established governance and asset management processes, supported by engineering evidence and business case assessments. This ensures investment decisions are transparent, evidence-led and support a safe, reliable and resilient transport network. The prioritisation of works to Albert Bridge reflects its strategic importance, current condition, operational constraints and the significant benefits of restoring its full transport function.

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

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

The reopening of Albert Bridge has been selected for funding through the Structures Fund because it addresses a critical infrastructure need on one of London's most important and historic river crossings. Structural deterioration and associated traffic restrictions have significantly reduced the bridge's transport function, resulting in reduced vehicular connectivity between Chelsea and Battersea and placing additional pressure on neighbouring Thames crossings.

The bridge plays an important role in supporting local and strategic transport movements, including buses, taxis, servicing vehicles, emergency services and general traffic. Its closure to vehicles has increased journey distances, reduced network resilience and contributed to congestion elsewhere on the highway network. The restrictions have also created community severance and reduced accessibility for residents, businesses and visitors.

Funding is required to undertake essential repair and strengthening works that will restore the bridge's full operational capability and secure the long-term future of this nationally significant asset. The proposed investment will extend the service life of key structural elements, reduce future maintenance liabilities and avoid the escalating costs associated with ongoing restrictions and reactive interventions.

The scheme aligns strongly with the objectives of the Structures Fund by preserving a vital transport asset, improving network performance, supporting economic activity and protecting an important heritage structure. The relatively modest capital investment of £4.5 million will unlock substantial transport, economic and social benefits while ensuring that Albert Bridge continues to serve communities on both sides of the River Thames for many years to come.

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.

Failure to deliver the Albert Bridge reopening scheme would result in the continued closure of the bridge to vehicular traffic, with significant transport, economic and social consequences. The loss of a direct Thames crossing would perpetuate community severance between Chelsea and Battersea, reducing access to employment, education, healthcare, retail and leisure destinations.

Motor traffic would remain dependent on lengthy diversion routes via neighbouring crossings. This would continue to increase journey times, travel costs and network unreliability, while placing additional pressure on the surrounding highway network. The redistribution of traffic has contributed to congestion and increased vehicle emissions. It has also required the postponement of planned asset improvement schemes.

Reopening Albert Bridge is increasingly important for network resilience. Major repairs are required to the two Thames crossings immediately downstream within the next four years. Restoring Albert Bridge would provide an essential alternative route during planned maintenance, incidents or restrictions on neighbouring crossings. The Council has already received petitions concerning severe congestion on diversion routes.

The closure also affects local businesses through reduced accessibility for customers, employees and deliveries, with potential impacts on economic activity and investment confidence. This is reflected in cross-party support from local politicians for the scheme.

Failure to undertake the proposed repairs risks further deterioration of this historic structure, potentially increasing future intervention costs. Continued closure would require ongoing monitoring, inspection and maintenance expenditure without restoring the bridge's full transport function.

Overall, failure to deliver would result in reduced connectivity and resilience, greater pressure on surrounding infrastructure, increased congestion and emissions, and a growing maintenance liability for a nationally significant transport and heritage asset.

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.

Reopening Albert Bridge to vehicular traffic would significantly reduce community severance and improve connectivity between communities on both sides of the River Thames, in line with the principles set out in TAG A4.2 Social Impact Appraisal guidance. The closure to vehicles has reduced the ability of residents, businesses and visitors to make direct journeys between Chelsea and Battersea, increasing the physical and perceived barrier effect created by the river.

The closure has particularly affected users reliant on taxis, servicing vehicles and private vehicles, all of whom must divert via alternative Thames crossings. These diversion routes can add several kilometres and significantly increase journey times, particularly during peak periods. The resulting inconvenience can discourage trips and reduce accessibility to employment, education, healthcare, retail, leisure and community facilities.

The impacts are felt most acutely by those with reduced mobility, older people, families with young children, businesses dependent on vehicle access and individuals who rely on private transport connections. Longer and less reliable journeys can reduce access to opportunities and services, while also weakening social connections between communities that have historically been linked by the bridge.

Although pedestrian and cycle access has been maintained, the loss of vehicular connectivity has affected the overall accessibility of the transport network and reduced route choice across multiple modes.

Reopening the bridge would restore direct cross-river connectivity, improve private and taxi journey reliability, enhance access to key services and employment areas, and strengthen social and economic links between communities. The scheme would reduce severance, improve social inclusion and support equitable access to opportunities across the local area.

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.

The closure of Albert Bridge to vehicular traffic has affected a wide range of transport users and reduced connectivity between Chelsea and Battersea. Prior to the closure, although the structure had a 3T weight limit to protect it, the bridge accommodated a mix of, taxis, private vehicles, servicing traffic, cyclists and pedestrians, providing an important local Thames crossing and helping to distribute movements across the wider transport network.

The most significant impacts have been experienced by motorised users who must now divert via neighbouring Thames crossings, typically using Battersea Bridge or Chelsea Bridge. These diversions increase journey distances and travel times, particularly during peak periods, and reduce the efficiency and resilience of the transport network. The resulting redistribution of traffic has also contributed to congestion on surrounding roads and crossings. Bus users are affected by reduced service efficiency on congested roads while emergency and servicing vehicles face longer response and operating times respectively.

Non-motorised users have been less directly affected because pedestrian and cycle access across Albert Bridge has been maintained. However, those who use Chelsea or Battersea Bridges, or nearby roads, are affected by increased traffic, congestion and vehicle emissions. The nature of diversion impacts varies by mode. Reopening the bridge would restore direct connectivity and reduce these mode-specific impacts.

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.

Reopening Albert Bridge to traffic would generate economic benefits through several recognised transport appraisal categories:

Journey time savings

- Reduced delays for general traffic through increased network capacity and route choice.
- Time savings for freight and servicing vehicles, lowering business operating costs.
- Vehicle operating cost savings
- Smoother traffic flow reduces fuel consumption, wear and tear, and stop-start inefficiencies.
- More direct routing will reduce overall vehicle kilometres travelled.

Reliability improvements

- Reducing congestion on surrounding crossings (e.g. Chelsea Bridge, Battersea Bridge) improves travel time predictability—particularly valuable for commercial traffic and time-sensitive trips.

Wider economic impacts (agglomeration/productivity)

- Improved connectivity between north and south of the Thames can enhance labour market accessibility.
- Businesses benefit from better access to customers, suppliers, and employees, supporting productivity gains.

Environmental impacts (carbon and air quality)

- Reduced congestion can lower emissions per vehicle trip (carbon and NOx/PM).

Safety impacts

- Changes in traffic patterns may reduce collisions if congestion and unsafe diversions are reduced.

Network resilience

- Additional river crossing capacity improves redundancy, reducing economic disruption during incidents, repairs, or closures elsewhere.

Collectively, these benefits provide a strong economic case for restoring Albert Bridge's full transport function.

- 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)	-13,132,599
Present Value Benefits (PVB)	1,543,993,261
Benefit to Cost Ratio (BCR)	-117.6

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

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

The capital costs for the project are based on cost plans, a comprehensive works package of measures, which includes from closure of the structure, developing the and implementing stabilisations measures, enabling works so the temporary works and permanent repairs can take place in order to reopen the bridge as soon as practical. These figures are included in the Capital Cost assessment.

Optimism bias (capital costs/ OMR costs), has been assessed at 28% (Stage 3) - based on Table from TAG A1.2 as the project is well advanced.

Risk (capital cost), has been assessed at 23%, as the project is well advanced.

- 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).

- 1) **Time/Distance** - The time and distance inputs for the without scheme case have been reviewed to ensure they reflect the full extent of the proposed diversion route, in accordance with the DfT Economic Toolkit methodology. These values are collected from Google Maps journey planning and are evidenced within the Supporting Evidence tab of the Economic Toolkit. The comparison demonstrates the substantial increase in distance and travel time that would occur without the scheme.

- 2) **Congestion band** – We have selected Band 5 – based on Table from TAG A5.4, the diversion route due to the bridge closure is already at capacity and has many major signalised junctions.
- 3) **Optimism Bias** – Assessed at 28% (Stage 3) - based on Table from TAG A1.2 as the project is well advanced.
- 4) **I-Costs** – DfT has confirmed that early starts for scheme funding allocations in financial year 26/27 will be considered and in section 2.4 (a) 'Financial Case' allows LAs to indicate if funding is required in financial years 26/27. However, the economic sheet requests (calendar) year of 'opening' as the start of the funding request. This doesn't allow for requesting funds to be shown in 2026 as our programme to get the bridge reopened is in 2027, so to complete the input checklist, scheme costs are shown starting in 2027. Whereas in 2.4 (a) we have shown costs starting in 26/27.

We have assumed following feedback from the draft submission that this difference will not affect the requested funding for financial year 26/27.

- 5) **OMR Costs** – 'with scheme' we have assumed initial ongoing monitoring costs, with low maintenance costs following the proposed repairs and maintenance works. In 2029 a PI is programmed, assuming continued nominal maintenance until 2034 when ongoing maintenance would increase £50k/annum and £650k/annum 'without scheme' based on existing cost which has been indexed by 3% yearly.
- 6) **Input Checklist** – There appears to be an error in the sheet. On the final line 'Inputs Check' we should get a tick as all required lines are completed.
- 7) **Average Speed Check** – Actual figures show the diversion route speed is below that accepted in the economic tool. The diversion route is over capacity and has many major traffic signalled junctions, which is why journey time speeds are so low.

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.

Reopening Albert Bridge to vehicular traffic would deliver a range of important economic, environmental and social benefits that are not fully captured through conventional monetised appraisal.

From an economic perspective, the scheme would restore confidence in the long-term viability of a strategically important Thames crossing and improve accessibility for local businesses, deliveries, emergency services and visitors. The bridge's continued operation supports the attractiveness of the surrounding area for investment and economic activity while maintaining connectivity between communities on both sides of the river.

Environmentally, reopening the bridge would reduce the need for lengthy diversionary routes via neighbouring crossings. This would help reduce unnecessary vehicle mileage, congestion-related emissions and localised air quality impacts across the wider network. By making bus services more direct and reliable, the scheme may also encourage greater use of sustainable transport modes.

Socially, the scheme would reduce community severance created by the bridge closure and restore direct access between Chelsea and Battersea. Improved connectivity would enhance

access to employment, education, healthcare, retail and leisure opportunities, particularly for residents who rely on bus services, taxis or private vehicles. The scheme would also strengthen social cohesion by reconnecting communities historically linked by the bridge.

In addition, safeguarding the continued use of this iconic Grade II* listed structure helps preserve an important historic asset, maintaining its role as both a transport link and a valued part of London's cultural heritage. These wider benefits strengthen the overall case for the scheme beyond those impacts that can be robustly monetised.

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

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

Click or tap here to enter text.

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

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

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

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

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

2.3 Commercial Case

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

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

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

The Royal Borough of Kensington and Chelsea was responsible for the major refurbishment and strengthening of Albert Bridge in 2010-11. The team involved with this contract is managing these works, under the direction of Andrew Burton, who led the work to reopen Deptford Creek bridge. We have been able to call upon expertise in our supply chain that worked on the 2011 refurbishment. Although the nature of the current issue has not happened before in 153 years and was not envisaged, the expertise and knowledge of the bridge places the Council in a strong position.

- 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 Council has commissioned a strong team to manage the initial stabilisation of the structure and subsequently work on a plan and programme for a permanent solution to enable the bridge to reopen to motor traffic⁰. The team is made up of our term structures contractor FM Conway who have work in the borough for over 15 years and their well-established supply chain. Arcadis are provided the permanent works design, supported by COWI as independent bridge specialists and CAT 3 checkers. The Council is using the term contract for the procurement of the works elements and commissions to our consultants for permanent works design. The Council through its decision processes has given the Director of Highway and Regulatory Services, Andrew Burton, the delegated authority to develop and implement measures in order to open the bridge to traffic again.

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

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

The delivery programme for reopening Albert Bridge is 2027, so this will not affect the end date for the Structures Fund.

The uniqueness of the structure Grade II*, its age and the existing materials used (cast and wrought iron), make the design solution bespoke to Albert Bridge. Although risks have been assessed, data collected and monitored, part of the enabling works will require the bridge bearings to be grit blasted and cleaned to enable better articulation of the bearing. If not successful it may mean that further works are undertaken to the additional bearings.

- 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 structure is owned and managed by the Royal Borough of Kensington and Chelsea as Highway Authority. We have been liaising with Port of London Authority, Heritage England, RBKC Heritage Team, Wandsworth Council as neighbouring authority, Transport for London (TfL) and London Bridges Engineering Group (LoBEG). All organisations have given their support to the Council's target of reopening the bridge to vehicular traffic in 2027.

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	2.5m	2.2m	£	£	4.7m
LA contribution	1.53m	1.5m	£	£	3.03m
Other contribution	0.77m	£	£	£	0.77m
Total costs	4.8m	£	£	£	8.5m

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 Council has a revenue budget for routine maintenance of its structures. Larger scale works are subject to capital bids. The crack in the bridge bearing component was unexpected, unplanned and unbudgeted for, leading to the closure of the bridge to vehicular traffic on safety grounds, and to protect the bridge from further damage. The subsequent emergency works were undertaken to stabilise the structure, enabling engineers to continued design works to establish a permanent repair to be identified. The Council has already spent significant unplanned sums of money to continue to develop a solution to enable it to be reopened to vehicular traffic.

This year's DfT Highways Maintenance capital fund will be used to part fund, along with Council funds, to replacement all the bridges carriageways decking panels. Previous DfT funding has used for highways carriageway maintenance and identified in our yearly transparency reports.

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 reopening Albert Bridge to vehicular traffic, significant whole-life costs would continue to accrue to the bridge owner, highway authorities, transport operators and the wider economy. The bridge would remain in a constrained operational state, requiring ongoing monitoring, inspections, traffic management measures and maintenance interventions to manage deterioration while delivering only a proportion of its intended transport function. This would also include limitations on crowd loading, Albert Bridge being a key crossing for Battersea Park and all the events that take place.

The absence of a permanent solution would increase future maintenance liabilities. Continued restrictions can alter load distribution and operational requirements, potentially necessitating more frequent inspections, structural assessments and temporary works. In addition, prolonged closure to vehicles would continue to impose indirect costs through longer diversion routes, increased congestion at alternative crossings, reduced public transport efficiency and impacts on local businesses and communities.

The proposed £4.5 million scheme to reopen Albert Bridge addresses underlying defects and restores the bridge's full operational capability. By undertaking targeted repairs and strengthening works now, the scheme is expected to reduce the frequency and scale of future interventions, improve asset resilience and extend the serviceable life of key structural elements. Planned maintenance can then be delivered through routine asset management rather than more costly reactive repairs.

From a whole-life perspective, the capital investment represents a relatively modest cost compared with the cumulative expense of ongoing restrictions, repeated inspections, temporary traffic management, emergency repairs and the wider economic impacts of reduced connectivity over many years. Reopening the bridge therefore provides better value for money by restoring the bridge's transport function, reducing future maintenance risk and avoiding escalating costs associated with a prolonged or permanent vehicle closure

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 bridge was shut on the 7th February, when the extent of the damage to the structure was established. The Council has a strong supply chain, and we were able to mobilise our bridge term contractors FM Conway and consultants Arcadis. Arcadis staff were involved in the bridge refurbishment and strengthening between 2010 to 2012 and their knowledge and expertise of the structure, was invaluable.

Costs are based on four main elements;

Emergency Works – Bridge closure, monitoring and initial stabilisation

Stabilisation Works- Development, preparation and implementation of prop to bridge bearing, following design and CAT3 sign-off

Data collection, bridge modelling temporary works – non-destructive testing of components, stress and strain gauges, investigatory works, bridge monitoring equipment, lidar and drone surveys, detail modelling for bridge analysis, detailed independent modelling for CAT3 permanent works. Enabling works design and listed structures applications.

Temporary and permanent works design and implementation – workshops to develop options for the temporary and permanent works which is key in establishing scheduling and sequencing.

The scheme to repair and reopen Alber Bridge has been developed with expertise from across the industry, and specialist sub-contractors commissioned in developing the measures involved.

Partners include; FM Conway, Arcadis, COWI, specialist sub-contractors, WSP as cost controllers and TAA for the Council. Costs are developed and agreed in collaboration with partners, schedule of rates and specific quotations from sub-contractors and specialists. The scheme development has progressed at pace, and the programme is currently at pre-construction phase.

Works are planned within the next year, so inflation is accounted for. The bridge is a unique structure along with the solution developed.

e) Explain the financial risks that have been considered and factored into the estimate and what contingency is allowed for.

Explain the key risks and their impact on the cost and programme, including how these link to the overall contingency allowed for in the estimate.

The Council has appointed WSP as our cost controller for the project, which is at an advanced stage of development and design solution, the structure having been stabilised, temporary works for the enabling element of the project to take place, along with the submission for listed building consent submitted.

The damage is believed to have been caused by the rocker bearing in the NE abutment being ceased, enabling works includes grit blasting the other three abutment caisson bearings, and adding additional monitoring equipment to check the bridge is articulating as expected.

The structure is unique and the solutions proposed are unique, working on a 153-year-old Grade II* structure, so we have included a risk contingency within our estimates, 23%. The project is controlled and managed with weekly meeting with our contractors and suppliers to manage programme, risks and contingencies. The Council has set out a clear strategy for the scheme development which was signed off by the Council Leadership Team in the early stages of the project, which enables a clear mandate and focus to reopen the bridge to vehicular traffic.

- 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 Council has committed to getting Albert Bridge reopen to vehicular traffic, as soon as practically possible. The works proposed are not only designed to repair the structural elements, but also to carryout maintenance on the structure to reduce the need for future closures.

Whilst the enforced closure of the bridge is in place, it is prudent and sensible to carryout maintenance, the majority of the maintenance will be funded by the Council from its capital budget, this has been approved by the Council Leadership Team. This work will include upgrading the decorative lighting to LEDs to reduce the structures carbon footprint, repair the four historic Toll Booths and redeck the bridges wooden carriageway with longer lasting newer composite panels, the same as successfully used on the historic Tower Bridge in London. Part of the redecking costs will be contributed from the DfT Highways maintenance block allocation to the Council. The total funding of this is £778k (£478k baseline and £300k incentive), it has been assumed that the full £778k will be used and allocated by DfT.

The structures fund is requested to support the costs of getting the bridge fully reopened to traffic, which is programmed to be complete in 2027.

2.5 Management Case

Outlines how the project will be delivered and managed effectively.

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

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

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

[The aim is to start the permanent works by the end of 2026.](#)

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

[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 Albert Bridge reopening scheme will be delivered through a structured project management approach that builds upon the extensive investigations, condition assessments and design

development already completed. The project is at an advanced stage of development, providing a high degree of confidence in the scope, programme and delivery requirements. The scheme will be managed through established governance arrangements, with clear accountability for programme management, technical assurance, commercial management and stakeholder engagement. A dedicated project team comprising asset management, engineering, commercial and project delivery specialists will oversee implementation and manage programme risks through regular monitoring and reporting. Specialist contractors and suppliers with experience of bridge refurbishment, structural steelwork, heritage structures and highway infrastructure will be procured through existing framework arrangements or compliant procurement routes. Early engagement with the supply chain will ensure the availability of specialist materials, fabrication capacity and skilled resources, reducing delivery risks and programme uncertainty. The proposed works are technically well understood, and the repair methodology has been informed by detailed inspections and engineering assessments. Key risks have been identified and mitigation measures developed, including contingency planning for construction sequencing, stakeholder coordination and traffic management. Confidence in delivery is strengthened by the completion of preliminary investigations, established stakeholder support and the relatively modest scale of the £4.5 million intervention compared with major bridge renewal projects. The scheme scope is focused on targeted repairs and strengthening works necessary to restore vehicular access, enabling delivery within the proposed timescale while maintaining effective control of cost, quality and programme performance.

- e) Explain the key delivery risks and challenges and how the local authority intends to address them. Answers should also explain any financial risks and how any cost overruns will be addressed by the local authority. (Maximum 250 words)

Explain how key financial risks are being managed and mitigated. Explain how other risks are being managed (e.g. are there any points of complexity or requirements regarding planning or land ownership?).

The principal delivery risks associated with reopening Albert Bridge relate to construction on a historic and operational bridge with many original components in cast and wrought iron – which are often unpredictable materials. As a Grade II listed structure, works must be undertaken sensitively to protect the bridge's historic significance while meeting modern engineering and safety requirements. These risks are being mitigated through detailed inspections, condition assessments and design development completed in advance of construction, ensuring the scope of works is well understood. Construction risks will be managed through the appointment of experienced contractors and specialist suppliers with expertise in bridge refurbishment, heritage assets and structural repair works. Early contractor and supply chain engagement will help secure specialist materials and fabrication capacity, reducing programme and procurement risks. A robust programme management framework will be implemented, including regular risk reviews, stakeholder engagement and technical assurance processes. Financial risks principally relate to unforeseen defects, inflationary pressures and potential changes in construction costs. These risks have been mitigated through detailed asset investigations, cost planning and the development of a defined scope of works. Appropriate contingency allowances have been incorporated within project estimates to address residual uncertainty. Should costs exceed the approved funding allocation, the local authority will manage any overruns through its established capital programme governance arrangements and asset management budgets, ensuring the project remains deliverable without compromising safety or quality. Ongoing cost monitoring, change control procedures and commercial oversight will provide early identification of emerging issues and enable corrective action where necessary. The scheme is not expected to require complex planning approvals beyond those associated with undertaking works to a listed structure, with stakeholder engagement and statutory approvals being managed as part of the project delivery process.*

- f) Describe the key project controls that will be employed by the local authority to ensure that schemes are delivered on time and in budget. (Maximum 250 words)

Provide details of the methods that the authority uses to ensure timely delivery within budget.

The Council Leadership Team has already agreed the strategy for delivery of the project and delegated powers to the Director of Highway and Regulatory Services, which has expedited scheme delivery. The Council is employing a comprehensive suite of project controls to ensure the Albert Bridge reopening scheme is delivered safely on programme and within budget. Delivery is being governed through established capital project and asset management procedures, with clear accountability for scope, programme, cost and risk management. A dedicated project team is providing strategic oversight and monitoring progress against agreed milestones, budgets and performance indicators. Detailed project and construction programmes have been developed and regularly reviewed to identify critical activities, manage dependencies and address emerging issues before they impact delivery. Robust cost control procedures have been implemented throughout the project lifecycle. These include detailed cost estimates, defined contingency allowances, monthly financial reporting, forecasting and change control processes. Any proposed changes to scope, programme or budget will be subject to formal review and approval to prevent uncontrolled cost growth. Risk management will be undertaken through a live risk register that identifies, assesses and monitors delivery, commercial, technical and stakeholder risks. Risks are reviewed regularly by the project team and escalation procedures applied where required. Progress is monitored through regular weekly meetings, site inspections, programme reviews, and technical audits. Technical assurance processes, including independent design reviews, quality inspections and engineering approvals, ensure that works are delivered to the required standards. These controls provide confidence that the scheme can be delivered efficiently, maintaining effective control over programme, cost, quality and risk while achieving the objective of restoring Albert Bridge to full operational use.

- 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.

As a Grade II* structure, the enabling works and permanent works will be subject to Listed Building consent. This is undertaken by the Council planning department in association with Historic England. Meetings have taken place to establish what means are needed and applications submitted for approval. These elements are built into the scheme programme, along with ongoing updates to partners and interested parties. The design checks for the initial temporary prop and permanent works will go through CAT3 technical checks and approvals, independently by leading structures experts, and signed off by the Council as Technical Approval Authority (TAA). The Council Leadership Team already agreed the strategy for delivery of the project and delegated powers to the Director of Highway and Regulatory Services, which has expedited scheme delivery.

- 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.

Ongoing monitoring of the structure will continue after scheme completion to detect any changes in movement resulting from extreme temperatures and wind. This monitoring will be part of new maintenance and inspection protocols. The additional measures funded by the Council to replace the bridge deck whilst the structure is closed, will allow replacement of any existing timber panels below the carriageway boards. The deck will be completely waterproofed before the new composite running deck is installed. This new system, which includes larger boards, will reduce the number of joints and fixings and thus will improve long-term resilience against the effects of climate change, providing greater longevity before replacement and reduce risks due to excessive rainfall and heat contributing to regular maintenance. The measures installed will maintain the network performance, minimising closures in future.

- h) Explain the considerations have been made or will be developed to account for the management of carbon for the development of the scheme.

This may include development of a carbon management plan dealing with whole life carbon (e.g. using low carbon construction measures to deliver the scheme or reducing emissions though reducing vehicle miles).

The Albert Bridge reopening scheme has been developed with consideration of whole-life carbon principles, recognising that the retention, repair and continued use of existing infrastructure typically delivers significantly lower embodied carbon impacts than major replacement or reconstruction. The scheme's primary objective is to extend the service life of the existing bridge through targeted repair and strengthening works, thereby preserving the substantial embodied carbon already invested in the structure. Opportunities to reduce embodied carbon will be considered through material selection, efficient structural solutions, minimisation of waste, reuse of existing components where practicable and optimisation of construction methodologies. Construction-related emissions will be managed through the use of efficient logistics planning, minimising material movements, reducing site energy consumption and encouraging the use of lower-emission plant and equipment where feasible. Contractors will be required to demonstrate how carbon reduction measures are incorporated into their delivery approach. The scheme is also expected to generate operational carbon benefits. Reopening the bridge to vehicular traffic will reduce the need for lengthy diversionary routes via alternative Thames crossings, decreasing vehicle miles travelled, congestion and associated emissions. Improved connectivity and journey reliability may also support greater use of sustainable transport options. By extending the life of an existing asset, reducing future maintenance interventions and lowering network-wide transport emissions, the scheme supports both local and national carbon reduction objectives while delivering a resilient and sustainable transport outcome.

- i) What statutory undertakers affect the proposed scheme? Has any engagement been undertaken and how has this been accounted for within the delivery approach?

Set out the relevant statutory undertakers, the impacts they may have on the programme – including planning – and how this part of the programme will be managed. If applicable, describe how deterioration of the structure has or may impact utilities services and the extent of this disruption.

The project is confined to certain structural components of the bridge, stats surveys have been undertaken, and works do not impact any statutory undertakers' plant.

Part 3 – Governance and Declarations

3.1 Equality Analysis

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

☒ Yes

☐ No

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

The reopening of Albert Bridge to vehicular traffic is expected to have a positive equality impact by improving accessibility and connectivity for a wide range of users, particularly those who may be disproportionately affected by the current closure.

The current closure has the greatest impact on individuals who rely on accessible motorised transport, including older people, disabled people, those with mobility impairments, and people travelling with young children. Longer diversion routes and reduced transport options can make it more difficult to access employment, education, healthcare, community facilities and social networks. The reopening of the bridge will help reduce these barriers by restoring direct cross-river connectivity for private vehicles and taxis.

An Equality Impact Assessment (EqIA) will be updated as the scheme progresses to identify any adverse impacts on protected groups and ensure that opportunities to improve accessibility are maximised. Particular consideration will be given to disabled people, older people, pregnant women and those with caring responsibilities who may be more sensitive to changes in transport accessibility and journey times.

During construction, measures will be implemented to minimise temporary impacts, including maintaining safe pedestrian and cycle access where practicable, providing clear signage and communications, and coordinating traffic management to reduce disruption. Engagement with local communities and accessibility stakeholders will help inform delivery plans and mitigation measures.

Overall, the scheme is expected to improve accessibility, reduce transport-related barriers and support more equitable access to services, employment and community opportunities across both sides of the River Thames.

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.rbkc.gov.uk/streets-and-transport/albert-bridge-repairs>

3.3 Declarations

Senior Responsible Owner declaration

As Senior Responsible Owner for [Albert Bridge], I hereby submit this request for approval to DfT on behalf of [Royal Borough of Kensington and Chelsea] and confirm that I have the necessary authority to do so.

I confirm that [Royal Borough of Kensington and Chelsea] 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: Andrew Burton Director Highway and Regulatory Services

b) Signed: 

c) Date: 31/07/2026.

d) Email: andrew.burton@rbkc.gov.uk

Section 151 Officer declaration

As Section 151 Officer for [name of organisation], I declare that the scheme cost estimates quoted in this proposal are accurate to the best of my knowledge and that [name of organisation]: As Section 151 Officer for [Royal Borough of Kensington and Chelsea], I declare that the scheme cost estimates quoted in this proposal are accurate to the best of my knowledge and that [Royal Borough of Kensington and Chelsea]:

- 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: Liam McCusker

f) Signed: 

g) Date: 31/07/2026

h) Email: Liam.McCusker@rbkc.gov.uk