



# 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: Trafford Metropolitan Borough Council

b) Scheme / structure name and LHA bridges number: A56 Crossford New Bridge, Str No. 10

c) Location (OS Grid Reference) of the scheme/structure (to identify location on map):

Easting: 379123E

Northing: 393157N

d) Name of Project Manager: James Lomax

e) Email address: James.lomax@trafford.gov.uk

f) Phone number: [Click or tap here to enter text.](#)

g) What type of eligible structure would your scheme address? (select all that apply)

|                                     |                                        |                          |                                       |
|-------------------------------------|----------------------------------------|--------------------------|---------------------------------------|
| <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> | Bridges                                | <input type="checkbox"/> | Cutting/embankment                    |
| <input type="checkbox"/>            | Fly-overs                              | <input type="checkbox"/> | Tunnels                               |
| <input type="checkbox"/>            | Retaining walls                        | <input type="checkbox"/> | Local highway repairs due to landslip |
| <input type="checkbox"/>            | Culverts                               | <input type="checkbox"/> | Local highway repairs due to collapse |
| <input type="checkbox"/>            | Other structure type (please specify): |                          |                                       |

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.*

Constructed circa 1965, Crossford New Bridge is a three-span steel girder and reinforced concrete slab composite structure carrying the A56 Cross Street southbound over the River Mersey, immediately south of Junction 7 of the M60. The A56 forms part of the Greater Manchester (GM) Key Route Network (KRN) and is a designated heavy load route, providing a vital transport link for

approximately 20,600 vehicles per day between Trafford, the M60 and Manchester city centre. See Appendix A1 for the scheme location plan.

The bridge provides a key connection to strategic assets including Old Trafford Stadium, Manchester Airport and Trafford Park. It supports key public transport connectivity, and is situated close to environmentally sensitive areas, including Sale Water Park. The bridge also spans the River Mersey, which supports important wildlife habitat and biodiversity.

Inspection records identify a range of deteriorating structural elements, including corrosion of deck steelwork, substandard and corroded parapets, and life-expired bridge bearings, presenting a risk to the long-term structural performance and safe operation of the bridge. A targeted special inspection of the bearings was completed in July 2026, with preliminary findings informing the proposed bearing repair and replacement strategy. Signs of distress, including bearing tilt and progressive vertical cracking within the substructure, indicate the potential for seized or defective bearings and associated movement restraint.

Without intervention, continued deterioration is expected to necessitate weight or operational restrictions. Given the strategic function of the A56, such restrictions would have significant impacts on freight movements, public transport and local connectivity.

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 comprises targeted structural repair and renewal works designed to address the identified deterioration affecting Crossford New Bridge, restore the structure to a safe, serviceable and compliant condition, extend its service life and maintain structural capacity.

The scheme builds on a previously developed and costed design in 2023, which was not progressed due to affordability constraints.

The scope includes replacement of deteriorating bridge bearings, replacement of substandard parapets and associated stringcourse strengthening to meet current standards, repair and refurbishment of structural steelwork, including reinstatement of protective coatings, and concrete repairs to address spalling and cracking and restore durability and structural integrity. Bridge deck waterproofing and expansion joints will be replaced, and drainage improved to prevent ongoing water ingress, a key driver of deterioration, providing long-term protection to the superstructure and reducing future maintenance requirements.

Informed by the July 2026 targeted special inspection, specialist bearing assessment and ongoing structural appraisal, the scheme includes replacement of ageing bearings. The inspection identified deterioration and defects consistent with impaired bearing performance and movement restraint. The proposed works will address the resulting risks to structural behaviour, load transfer and long-term serviceability of the bridge.

Collectively, these interventions will address both visible defects and underlying deterioration mechanisms, extend the service life of the structure, and reduce the likelihood of future reactive maintenance or structural restrictions. The scheme will ensure the continued safe and reliable operation of this strategically important route for all users, including freight, public transport and active travel.

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

No third-party ownership.

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

The structure is located on an SRN diversion route of the M60 between junction 7 and 8. In the event of a closure of the M60 between junctions 7 and 8, westbound traffic could be diverted onto the A56 at junction 7, crossing the Mersey on the Crossford New Bridge before following the A6144 back to the M60 at junction 8, or continuing via B roads towards junctions 9 and 10.

The M60 between junctions 7 and 8 includes a collector-distributor road running adjacent to, but fully separated from, the main carriageway. The distributor road does provide an alternative in the event of incident on the main M60 carriageway, thus decreasing the likelihood of the southbound A56 being called on to carry motorway traffic. However, this is dependent on the circumstances of the incident / works, and there will be occasions when the A56 is required.

Similarly, the A56 southbound could be used as a diversion in the case of a closure between M60 junctions 7 and 6 eastbound. Traffic would be diverted at junction 7 travelling southbound on the A56, then turning left and using the A6144 to re-enter the M60 at junction 6. However, there are two alternatives to this route being used; northbound on the A56 to the A5145, then back on at junction 6 or utilising the eastbound collector-distributor road.

See Appendix A2 for a map showing the routing of the diversion routes.

## **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 need for intervention is evidenced through recent structural inspections undertaken in accordance with CS 450 and ongoing asset management processes, which identify progressive deterioration affecting key structural elements of the bridge.

Inspection findings highlight corrosion of primary steelwork associated with breakdown of protective coatings, alongside evidence of persistent water ingress through failed expansion joints and inadequate drainage. This has resulted in deterioration of deck steelwork and localised concrete defects, including cracking and spalling.

The existing parapets are substandard and have deteriorated, presenting a safety and compliance risk and requiring replacement to meet current standards.

Particular concern relates to the bridge bearings, which are original to the structure and considered life-expired. A targeted special inspection undertaken in July 2026, together with specialist bearing assessment, identified deterioration and defects affecting bearing performance. Associated signs of distress, including bearing tilt and progressive vertical cracking within the substructure, are consistent with bearing deterioration and movement restraint, presenting a credible risk to the long-term structural performance and serviceability of the bridge.

A CS451 Structural Review undertaken for the bridge recommended further assessment to evaluate structural capacity, including the effects of deterioration and potential bearing restraint on the superstructure. This reinforces the need to address both visible defects and underlying structural deterioration.

The identified defects are progressive in nature and, without intervention, are expected to worsen over time, increasing maintenance requirements, reducing structural resilience and heightening the risk of future operational or weight restrictions.

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 not currently subject to traffic restrictions due to its condition. However, recent requests for significant abnormal indivisible load movements have been declined due to concerns regarding the structural condition of the bridge, despite the section of A56 being a designated heavy load route. This indicates that the operational performance of the route is already being constrained by the condition of the structure.

Should the condition of the bridge continue to deteriorate, there is potential for the introduction of future traffic management measures, including weight, width or HGV restrictions, to safeguard the structure and maintain public safety. Such restrictions would adversely affect freight movements, route resilience and network connectivity, particularly given the strategic role of the A56 in accommodating commercial and heavy vehicle traffic.

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.*

Based on inspection evidence and supporting engineering assessment, there is a credible risk that Crossford New Bridge may require traffic restrictions by the end of the 2029/30 financial year if no intervention is undertaken.

The condition of the steel parapets, which are substandard and exhibit section loss due to corrosion, presents an increasing safety risk. Continued deterioration is likely to require lane or width restrictions to manage risk to road users, particularly in the event of vehicle impact.

Progressive deterioration of key structural and durability-related components is expected to increase water ingress and accelerate degradation of the bridge deck and supporting elements, particularly the bridge bearings. This will reduce structural performance over time and necessitate the introduction of weight restrictions to manage increasing safety risks.

d) If the answer to c) above is yes, then please estimate the likelihood of this occurring: (select box that applies):

- ☐ Low confidence in restriction occurring
- ☒ Medium confidence in restriction occurring

☐ High confidence in restriction occurring

e) Please indicate if the relevant structure is **currently** subject to other temporary measures to manage risk.

*Reference should be made to measures such as propping, etc.*

The structure is not currently subject to other temporary measures to manage risk. However, risks associated with the condition of the structure are managed through routine inspections and monitoring in accordance with established asset management practices.

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.*

Without intervention, it is expected that temporary measures may be required within the current funding period to manage increasing structural risk.

Further active risk management measures, including crack monitoring and targeted bearing monitoring/investigation, are likely to be required. Structural assessment, taking account of potential bearing restraint as recommended by the CS 451 Structural Review, could necessitate implementation of operational controls to manage structural performance and ensure the safe use of the structure.

In parallel, the substandard and deteriorating condition of the bridge parapets presents a safety and compliance risk. Continued degradation is likely to require interim measures, such as temporary protection works, lane restrictions or width restrictions, to maintain user safety.

These measures would represent reactive interventions to manage risk and would have adverse impacts on network performance. Proactive intervention is therefore required to address the underlying causes of deterioration.

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:* 34.93

*BCI Ave:* 69.64

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 principal contributors to the poor BCI scores are defects identified in the bridge deck steel girders and concrete slab, progressive cracking within the abutments and piers, deteriorated bearings and bearing plinths, substandard and corroded parapets, defective expansion joints, and deterioration of protective coating system to steelwork.

The most recent Principal Inspection identified progression of a number of defects. In particular, cracking within the piers and south abutment has increased significantly in both extent and width compared with previous inspections. Together with the findings of the July 2026 targeted bearing Special Inspection, this indicates deterioration of the bridge bearings and potential movement restraint, which may be adversely affecting load transfer through the substructure. These issues, combined with the ongoing deterioration of other key structural elements, have contributed to the decline in the bridge's overall condition

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

The most recent Principal Inspection Report and the bearing Special Inspection preliminary reports are available within Appendix B1.

---

## 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 A56 Crossford New Bridge scheme supports the Government's economic growth mission by maintaining the reliability and resilience of a key transport corridor serving major employment, industrial, retail and logistics destinations across Greater Manchester. By preventing further deterioration of the structure and thus restrictions, the scheme will protect connectivity for businesses, employees, freight operators and visitors, helping to sustain productivity and reduce the risk of disruption to economic activity.

The route provides important access to Trafford Park, one of Europe's largest industrial estates, which accommodates over 1,300 businesses and more than 41,000 employees. The route supports access to the Trafford Centre, which attracts more than 40 million visitors annually, as well as planned housing, industrial and warehousing growth locations. One of these is the forthcoming New Carrington development, which aims to deliver over 5,000 new homes and 350,000 square metres of employment floorspace and is expected to increase demand on strategic routes connecting Sale, Trafford and the M60.

The bridge is the principal gateway into Sale from the M60 and south-west Greater Manchester, making it a critical link in maintaining connectivity between Sale and the borough's key growth and employment locations. Trafford is one of Greater Manchester's key economic drivers and has accounted for almost one in four new jobs created across the city region over the last two decades. Maintaining reliable access supports conditions for continued investment and growth.

Overall, the scheme safeguards a critical transport asset that underpins employment, investment, productivity and long-term economic growth across Greater Manchester.

- b) Explain how the scheme supports other Government policy objectives. (Maximum 250 words)

*Provide a summary of the scheme's alignment to UK Government policy objectives as represented by the remaining missions.*

The scheme contributes to the Government's **Levelling Up** mission by maintaining reliable connectivity, supporting access to employment, services and economic opportunities across Trafford and Greater Manchester. Transport infrastructure plays a key role in reducing regional disparities and ensuring that communities can access jobs, education, healthcare and other essential destinations.

The scheme improves network efficiency by preventing congestion and delays, lowering fuel use and emissions. It aligns with **Decarbonising Transport** by extending the service life of existing infrastructure through targeted maintenance and renewal rather than carbon-intensive replacement. Avoiding future weight restrictions and lengthy diversion routes will reduce fuel use, emissions and operating costs for freight operators whilst maintaining the efficient movement of goods. The scheme also addresses weather-vulnerable defects, improves resilience to future

climate impacts, and supports the continued operation of local bus services, encouraging sustainable travel choices. The bridge is located within a designated AQMA, making efficient traffic flow particularly important.

The scheme supports the **Safer Streets Mission** by maintaining a safe and reliable transport corridor while minimising the need for diversionary traffic on less suitable local roads. Bridge repairs, drainage improvements and parapet upgrades will improve safety for all users, including pedestrians and cyclists, whilst preserving reliable access for emergency services. By avoiding future restrictions and associated diversions, the scheme will limit adverse noise, air quality and environmental impacts on neighbouring communities. Maintaining the bridge also protects existing bus, walking and cycling connections, supporting wider objectives to create healthier, safer and more sustainable places.

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 preserves a critical local transport asset on the A56, a key corridor connecting Altrincham and Sale with Stretford, Old Trafford, Salford and Manchester city centre. As part of the Greater Manchester Key Route Network, the route accommodates substantial commuter, freight, business and public transport movements. Without intervention, continued deterioration of Crossford New Bridge could result in restrictions that reduce network resilience, increase journey times and affect access to employment and services across Trafford.

The bridge provides a crossing of the River Mersey, meaning any loss of capacity would place additional pressure on alternative crossings and surrounding routes. Maintaining the structure supports **Trafford Local Plan Policy TM5**, which seeks the maintenance and improvement of the highway network to ensure it operates in a safe, efficient and environmentally sustainable manner.

The scheme is also important for supporting sustainable transport objectives. Crossford New Bridge sits adjacent to segregated cycle infrastructure on the A56 with aspirations to extend active travel provision further south. Failure to invest in the structure could limit opportunities to expand Trafford's active travel network, reducing the attractiveness of sustainable travel choices and undermining wider objectives to encourage modal shift.

Furthermore, the bridge is located near Sale Water Park and several designated nature conservation sites, including local nature reserves and Sites of Biological Importance. By preserving the existing structure and reducing the likelihood of future restrictions, closures or major reconstruction works, the scheme will minimise disruption, avoid unnecessary diversionary traffic and support both transport and environmental objectives across Trafford.

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.*

The proposed maintenance works to Crossford New Bridge have been developed in consultation with key local stakeholders to ensure alignment with operational, strategic, and community priorities.

Engagement has been undertaken with Trafford Council as the local highway authority, who are supportive of the scheme as it aligns with their asset management responsibilities and commitment to maintaining a safe and reliable transport network. TfGM is a key stakeholder due



to the bridge's location on the KRN and its role in supporting strategic movement across the city region. TfGM will be engaged throughout scheme delivery to minimise impacts on bus services and network performance.

A letter of support from TfGM and the Trafford Executive Member for Highways and Environmental Services has been included in Appendix B5. Discussions with statutory undertakers, including utility providers, have been held to identify any constraints related to buried services and to coordinate works efficiently, minimising disruption.

Engagement has been carried out with the Environment Agency (EA) due to the structure spanning the River Mersey regarding potential requirements for a Flood Risk Activity Permit and to ensure that construction activities appropriately manage flood risk and protect the water environment. Consultation with environmental specialists has informed ecological considerations, including requirements for nesting bird checks, invasive species management, and pollution prevention measures.

No significant objections have been identified; however, potential concerns relate to temporary traffic management, including lane closures and short-term delays. These impacts will be mitigated through programming and stakeholder communication. Overall, there is a high level of stakeholder support for the scheme.

- 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.*

Trafford Council adopts a risk-based asset management approach to prioritising structural maintenance, ensuring that limited funding is directed to schemes delivering the greatest benefit in terms of safety and network performance.

A multi-criteria scoring system is used to rank the Council's structures portfolio, aligning with UKRLG guidance, DMRB principles, and the National Highways Scheme Justification and Appraisal guidance. Each structure is assessed using condition information from inspections, Structural Reviews and assessments, and scored against four key criteria: safety, functionality, value for money, and environmental impact. These criteria are weighted to reflect consequence of failure, with safety and network functionality carrying the greatest influence.

Scores are derived from factors such as structural condition, risk to the public, traffic volumes, route hierarchy (including KRN designation), and the potential disruption arising from failure. Risk is assessed as a function of likelihood and consequence across the criteria. This enables each structure to receive an overall prioritisation score and schemes to be ranked within the capital programme.

Crossford New Bridge ranks the highest priority asset within the portfolio, driven by identified safety risks, ongoing structural deterioration, and its strategic importance within the highway network.

Recent inspection findings have confirmed continued deterioration, increasing the risk profile of the structure. Its inclusion in the programme reflects a prioritised, risk-led intervention aimed at addressing known defects, preventing further degradation, and avoiding more significant future costs associated with delayed maintenance.

An extract of the prioritisation matrix showing the Crossford New Bridge assessment scores can be found in Appendix A3.

- 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 Crossford New Bridge maintenance scheme has been selected for this application to the Structures Fund due to the increasing risk associated with the condition and strategic importance of the structure within Trafford's highway network. The bridge carries three southbound carriageways over the River Mersey and therefore represents a critical transport link, supporting high traffic volumes and connectivity between key residential, commercial, and regional routes.

Recent inspection findings have identified areas of deterioration which, while not immediately critical, present a growing risk to structural performance and long-term serviceability. Without timely intervention, this deterioration is expected to accelerate, potentially leading to load restrictions, increased maintenance costs, or unplanned closures, with significant impacts on network resilience and the local economy.

The scheme aligns with a risk-based asset management approach, where intervention is advanced before the structure reaches a critical condition, ensuring value for money and minimising whole-life costs. The scheme was previously identified for delivery under the 2023 CRSTS funding; however, due to its cost, it was not progressed within the available budget allocation.

The Structures Fund therefore provides an appropriate funding opportunity to deliver the scheme at the right time in the asset lifecycle. By securing this funding, the scheme will address existing defects, extend the asset's service life, and maintain safe and reliable operation of this essential route.

Overall, the scheme represents a proactive, high-value investment, justified by its condition, network criticality, and the need to prevent more significant operational and financial consequences in the future.

- 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 A56 Crossford New Bridge maintenance scheme would lead to continued structural deterioration, increasing safety risks and the likelihood of operational restrictions, including load limits or partial or full closure. As a key crossing of the River Mersey, this would result in significant community severance, reducing connectivity between communities and limiting access to employment, education, and essential services. Emergency response times could also be adversely affected.

Any restriction or closure would divert traffic onto alternative routes, leading to longer journey times, increased congestion, and added pressure on surrounding highway infrastructure. As a strategically important heavy loads route and designated diversion link for the SRN between M60 Junctions 7 and 8, and 7 and 6, disruption would have wider network implications. Diverted traffic would also increase wear and loading on local roads and structures not designed for such volumes.

The route supports critical economic activity, including freight movement, access to Manchester Airport, and key employment locations such as Trafford Park and Manchester city centre. Disruption would reduce reliability, increase transport costs, and impact business productivity. Major event venues, including Old Trafford Stadium and the Lancashire Cricket Club, would also experience increased congestion and access issues.

Without planned maintenance, uncoordinated or emergency works would be required, limiting mitigation measures and increasing disruption. Overall, failure to deliver the scheme would reduce network resilience, exacerbate severance, and result in significant social, economic, and infrastructure impacts across the wider area.

- h) If applicable, explain how the scheme helps prevent the likelihood of community severance for all transport modes and the impact that this severance would have or already has. (Maximum 250 words)

*Answers should explain the impact on connecting local people to facilities, services, employment, education and local communities. The response should also summarise the extent of diversions for communities, which modes are impacted and how. Applicants may wish to use the guidance in TAG A4-4 Social Impact Appraisal.*

The scheme is essential in preventing community severance and maintaining connectivity between communities on either side of the River Mersey, with the nearest alternative crossing located approximately 5–6 km away via the M60. The diversion is likely to add at least three minutes to local journeys; longer for journeys starting north of Sale town centre.

Closure of the bridge would divert significant traffic onto local routes, increasing noise, air pollution, and road safety risks on infrastructure not designed for such volumes, including added difficulty in crossing the road due to increased traffic volumes. Due to the length of the signed diversion route, it is expected that most drivers instead use the M60 to reconnect with the local road network. Consequently, the impacts of severance would extend well beyond communities along the diversion route. There is also a risk of larger vehicles diverting onto sensitive routes such as the A6144 Harboro Road, which is subject to an environmental weight restriction.

A closure would adversely affect access to local schools, including Sale Grammar, Stretford Grammar, and Ashton on Mersey School, whose transport options currently use the bridge. Furthermore, local residents might experience longer journey times to essential services such as supermarkets, as well as medical and leisure facilities.

By maintaining the bridge, the scheme preserves capacity across both carriageways, supports all transport modes, and sustains social interaction, economic activity, and access to opportunities. A map showing the community amenities in the vicinity of the structure can be found in Appendix A4.

- 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.*

Traffic and non-motorised user surveys were undertaken in June 2026 (summary attached as Appendix D). The southbound A56 currently accommodates approximately 20,600 vehicles daily, including around 100 buses and coaches. It is an important route for several bus services, notably

service 245 between Trafford Centre and Altrincham, operating every 30 minutes, and service 263 between Manchester and Altrincham, operating every 20 minutes. In addition, multiple school services serving Loreto Grammar School, St Ambrose College, Sale High School, and Blessed Thomas Holford College rely on this route. Prolonged closure would increase journey times, reduce service reliability and viability, and likely encourage greater car use.

Motorised vehicles would be most affected by the lengthy diversion route via the A-road network, particularly local journeys, which would experience the greatest proportional increases in journey time. This would especially impact individuals with mobility constraints, relying on private vehicles.

Approximately 90 pedestrians use the southbound bridge daily. Although access would remain via the northbound bridge, this may lead to increased crossing activity on the A56, raising safety concerns, particularly for children and those with mobility impairments, as well as increased journey times and reduced journey quality.

Around 160 cyclists use the southbound cycle provision daily. Closure would require dismounting to use the footway on the parallel structure or diverting via the canal, adding approximately 1.4 km to journeys.

The bridge also forms part of the Manchester Marathon and half marathon routes, which attract a combined total of over 60,000 runners and approximately 150,000 spectators each year.

## **2.2 Economic Case**

This section sets out the assessment for Value for Money of the project. Applications must use the provided economic toolkit, but if alternative methods have also been used to support the economic case, this section provides the opportunity for the results to be reported.

- a) Set out the key sources for the economic benefits (e.g. journey-time savings, carbon, etc.) of the scheme. (Maximum 250 words)

*Describe the main benefits the scheme is expected to deliver.*

The maintenance scheme is expected to deliver a range of economic benefits, primarily derived from transport user impacts as defined within Transport Analysis Guidance (TAG), where journey time savings, vehicle operating costs, and reliability improvements typically form the largest proportion of benefits.

The principal economic benefit arises from avoiding future delays that would occur if the structure were subject to restrictions or closure. These make up around 65% of the calculated scheme benefits, excluding the calculated carbon disbenefits. The scheme prevents the need for diversions, thereby reducing travel time for commuters, freight, and public transport users.

Secondly, the scheme delivers vehicle operating cost savings, as avoiding diversions reduces fuel consumption, vehicle wear and tear, and overall operating costs. These impacts make up around 11% of benefits.

The scheme also contributes to network reliability, ensuring consistent journey times and reducing uncertainty caused by congestion or disruption. Reliable transport networks support business efficiency and freight movement, contributing to wider economic productivity. Traffic not causing congestion along the diversion route is worth approximately £7m over the appraisal period, generating 7% of the total scheme benefits.

In addition, there are environmental benefits, particularly related to greenhouse gas reduction, as shorter and more efficient journeys reduce fuel use and associated emissions.

Finally, the scheme supports wider economic impacts, including maintaining access to employment, services, and commercial activity, thereby protecting local economic performance and supporting growth.

Overall, the scheme achieves a 'very high' BCR, delivering economic benefits through improved efficiency, reduced costs, and enhanced network resilience.

- 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)    | £2,279,740  |
| Present Value Benefits (PVB) | £91,196,133 |
| Benefit to Cost Ratio (BCR)  | 40.0        |

- 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 have been developed using an elemental, bottom-up estimating approach based on a defined scope of works. Costs are broken down by construction element (e.g. expansion joints, waterproofing, parapet replacement, stringcourse strengthening, bearing replacement, steelwork and concrete repairs), with measured quantities multiplied by unit rates derived from recent schemes, industry benchmarks and supplier inputs. Rates are presented in both base and outturn years, with inflation applied consistently. Inflation has been applied at the GDP Deflator rate as described in the TAG Databook.

Operating, Maintenance and Renewal (OMR) costs have been developed using a parametric, whole-life cost modelling approach informed by asset management practice and engineering judgement. Costs are structured by activity type (inspections, routine maintenance, cyclical renewals and major interventions) and scheduled over the appraisal period based on assumed frequencies and deterioration profiles. Unit costs are derived from historic schemes, benchmarks and typical structures maintenance rates.

Optimism Bias of 55% has been applied to costs within the Economic Toolkit, as suggested in Table 7 within TAG Unit A1.2. While the majority of the design work is substantially complete, the bearing design work is preliminary and therefore, the higher optimism bias rate was applied. The risk allowance has been derived from the completed Quantitative Risk Analysis (QRA).

In line with the guidance, the risk allowance has been removed from the cost inputs to the economic toolkit.

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

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

The Scheme Details section of the economic toolkit has been informed by a combination of primary survey data, established appraisal guidance, and scheme-specific assumptions.

Traffic demand data has been derived from a traffic count undertaken in June 2026, considered a neutral time. The count provided vehicle flows by class and estimated total daily flow as 20,600 vehicles once an AADT expansion factor had been applied.

Diversion impacts have been defined following a desk top analysis of potential options; the final route was deemed the most realistic diversion route, even though it cannot be the signed diversion route as it utilises the motorway network. Route distances and travel times were identified using GIS mapping and Google mapping and the shortest diversion length (5.3 km and 9 minutes) was applied in the economic toolkit.

Congestion band calculations have been undertaken in accordance with DfT TAG Unit A5.4: Marginal External Costs assuming a Forge area code of 5 'Remainder of former Metropolitan counties - rest of Greater Manchester'. 'A' road capacity assumed to be 1100 PCU/lane/hour and 'B&C' roads 790 PCU/lane/hour. Traffic values are based on the TfGM 2023 SATURN transport model, and flows were extracted for all links which make up the diversion route. Very short links and junction only links were excluded and the overall congestion banding was determined based on the banding applying to the longest distance.

A carbon assessment was undertaken using One Click LCA software.

Further detail and mapping are available within the economic toolkit.

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 generates several non-monetised impacts across social and environmental dimensions. The most significant impact relates to severance and is assessed as major beneficial. The A56 Crossford New Bridge forms an important connection between Sale, Altrincham, Manchester and key employment locations, including Trafford Park. By preventing future weight restrictions or closure, the scheme maintains connectivity for residents, businesses, and visitors, reducing the risk of lengthy diversions and disruption to economic activity.

Security impacts are assessed as slight beneficial. Whilst the scheme itself does not alter lighting, surveillance or personal security measures, it prevents the need for pedestrians and cyclists to divert via the Bridgewater Way towpath, which is unlit and benefits from limited natural surveillance, resulting in poorer security conditions.

Townscape impacts are assessed as slight beneficial. Refurbishment works will address deterioration of the existing structure, improving the condition and appearance. The scheme will extend the life of the asset without altering the character of the area.

Biodiversity impacts are assessed as slight beneficial. Extending the life of the bridge reduces the likelihood of emergency interventions which would likely cause substantial ecological disturbance. Water environment impacts are assessed as moderate beneficial, as the scheme includes drainage improvements, which will improve water management on the structure, reduce water ingress and prevent uncontrolled run-off into the River Mersey. These measures will help protect both the bridge structure and the surrounding water environment.

Option and non-use values are assessed as moderate beneficial, reflecting the value of preserving the bridge.

- 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).*

Even though the assumptions made within the economic case are robust and the appraisal follows a conservative approach, the scheme achieves a 'very high' BCR of 40. Due to the high BCR of the scheme, a sensitivity test was undertaken which tests the impact of suppressed demand on the BCR by reducing the number of vehicles affected by the works. The extremely pessimistic and unrealistic assumption was to assume a substantial trip suppression rate of 50%, meaning that half of the usual trips across Crossford New Bridge would not occur if the bridge was closed. This assumption is intentionally conservative and significantly exceeds typical levels of suppression expected on a strategic route serving key employment, freight and commuter movements. Under this scenario, the scheme delivers a BCR of 16.8, approximately half of the core assessment. Therefore, the scheme continues to demonstrate 'very high' value for money, indicating that the economic case is robust to substantial reductions in forecast transport benefits.

|                              |             |
|------------------------------|-------------|
| Present Value Costs (PVC)    | £2,711,818  |
| Present Value Benefits (PVB) | £45,495,268 |
| Benefit to Cost Ratio (BCR)  | 16.8        |

To enable the assessment of the economic case, please submit the supporting information listed below to [StructuresFundTAB@dft.gov.uk](mailto: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 One Trafford Partnership (OTP) is a collaborative partnership between Trafford Council and Amey, established in 2015. The partnership is responsible for managing public services across the borough, including highway and infrastructure maintenance. OTP provides a clear governance framework with defined roles, escalation routes and collective oversight, supporting transparent decision-making, shared ownership of risks and benefits, and stronger assurance for funders.

OTP has confirmed that sufficient internal resources are available to develop the scheme, complete the design, procure the works, and administer the contract.

OTP has extensive experience in delivering capital highway and structures schemes through established asset management, procurement and project management arrangements. This provides a high level of confidence in the authority's ability to deliver the proposed scheme to time, budget and quality requirements. Comparable schemes recently delivered or currently being delivered by OTP include:

- A5081 Barton Dock Road Bridge (2024) – Concrete repairs and cathodic protection, steelwork and bearing refurbishment and repainting, deck waterproofing and joint replacement
- A6144 Ashton Bridge (2024) – Concrete repairs, deck waterproofing, joint replacement, parapet repairs and repainting, road settlement rectification
- A6144 Warburton Mill Bridge (2026) – Concrete repairs, deck waterproofing, joint replacement, damaged parapet replacement

Through OTP, Trafford Council can also draw upon Amey's national wide engineering capability and specialist structures expertise, providing access to additional technical resources and experience in major bridge maintenance and renewal projects.

Trafford Council's Highway Infrastructure Asset Management Plan (HIAMP) provides assurance that structural maintenance schemes are identified, prioritised and delivered through a robust, evidence-led and risk-based framework.

b) Explain the delivery plans and procurement strategy for the scheme. (Maximum 250 words).

*This section should include explanation of the various stages of the scheme that are required for completion. This may include design, consents and construction processes.*

The scheme builds on a previously developed and costed structural renewal design in 2023. The current scope has been updated to include enhanced intervention to the bridge bearings, which were previously limited to local refurbishment due to affordability constraints.

A targeted Special Inspection of the bridge bearings has been completed in July 2026, with preliminary findings confirming the assumed extents of bearing repairs and replacement required.

Structural analysis and bearing replacement option appraisal are being progressed by OTP. Detailed design is programmed to be completed by May 2027, with construction start anticipated in January 2028 and construction end anticipated for May 2029.

Early Contractor Involvement (ECI) has been undertaken with EKSPAN as well as the internal OTP delivery team. ECI forms Trafford Council's preferred partnership-based approach, enabling contractor input into buildability, programming and risk management at the early project stages.

A competent Principal Contractor will be appointed through an existing framework for structural engineers and contractors. By using an established procurement route, this ensures a standardised, compliant and transparent approach to sourcing works contracts. Tendering the works contract will ensure that value for money is achieved. All contractors within this framework satisfied a robust Suitability Assessment Questionnaire (SAQ)/PQQ phase and a thorough tender award process.



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

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

A number of delivery risks have been identified for the scheme, consistent with its location on a strategic, heavily trafficked corridor and the nature of the proposed structural interventions.

A key risk that is currently under review relates to uncertainty associated with the condition of the bridge bearings. The targeted Special Inspection was undertaken in July 2026, which confirmed condition and informed the final scope, supported by ongoing structural assessment and option appraisal.

Consents associated with works over the River Mersey present a further programme risk, particularly in relation to EA requirements for flood risk and environmental protection. This risk is being mitigated through early and ongoing engagement with the relevant stakeholders to identify constraints and incorporate requirements into the scheme design and programme.

The presence of statutory undertakers' assets and the need to maintain traffic flow on the A56 also present delivery challenges. These are being addressed through early engagement with utility providers and key stakeholders, and through the development of appropriate traffic management strategies to minimise disruption.

Early Contractor Involvement has been undertaken with the internal OTP delivery team, long-term supply chain partners, and specialist bearing contractors and manufacturers. This enables buildability and delivery risks to be identified and mitigated at an early stage.

Overall, delivery risks have been identified at an early stage and will be actively managed through ongoing design development, stakeholder engagement and programme planning, providing confidence in the successful delivery of the scheme within the Structures Fund period.

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

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

The scheme interfaces with several third parties, with the most critical dependency associated with works over the River Mersey.

Engagement with the EA has not identified significant constraints. A flood risk permit will be required. However, this is anticipated to follow standard procedures and is not expected to materially affect the delivery programme. Engagement will continue through the detailed design stage to ensure timely submission and approval of the required consents.

Overall, third-party risks are typical of infrastructure schemes of this nature. Key interfaces have been identified and are being actively managed, with no indications at this stage that they will prevent or materially delay delivery. This includes coordination with highway authorities, public transport operators and emergency services to agree appropriate traffic management arrangements and minimise disruption during construction.

Initial engagement with TfGM has been undertaken and they are supportive. A letter of support for the scheme has been appended as Appendix B5.

## 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 | £       | £       | £       | £       | £4.586 |
| LA contribution          | £       | £       | £       | £       | £0.24  |
| Other contribution       | £       | £       | £       | £       | £      |
| Total costs              | £       | £       | £       | £       | £4.826 |

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 structure has been subject to an ongoing inspection and monitoring regime.

A structural renewal scheme was developed and costed during 2023, with the intention of delivering the works through the City Region Sustainable Transport Settlement (CRSTS) funding available at that time. However, the estimated cost of the works significantly exceeded the available budget, and the scheme was placed on hold following a risk-based review alongside other programme priorities.

Subsequent efforts were made to reduce the scope of works to focus on safety-critical elements. Despite this, revised cost estimates for the reduced scope remained above the level of funding available through the Local Transport Plan (LTP) allocation and the Council's capital budgets.

Trafford Council's average annual structures capital budget is approximately £0.5m, and must be used to maintain and manage the wider structures portfolio. This is significantly lower than the funding required to deliver the proposed scheme.

As a result, the required works cannot be delivered within existing funding streams. External funding is therefore necessary to progress the scheme and address the identified safety and structural risks in a timely and sustainable manner.

c) Describe the whole life costs anticipated without the proposed scheme. Explain how the proposed scheme mitigates costs from a whole life perspective. (Maximum 250 words)

*Explain maintenance considerations for maintaining the structure and compare these to the scheme cost to demonstrate the financial benefit of delivering this scheme.*

The whole life costs anticipated without the proposed scheme have been derived from estimating the maintenance costs likely to be incurred if the scheme is not constructed and additional costs are incurred due to the deterioration of the structure.

While some costs, such as cyclical maintenance, bridge deck waterproofing and joint replacement, as well as routine bridge inspections, would remain similar with or without the scheme, other costs are likely to increase without the scheme.

This includes sporadic remedial works to the parapet, steelwork and concrete repairs, and costs related to the deteriorating bearings. The whole life cost, inclusive of inflation, anticipated without the proposed scheme is approximately £21m, while costs over the same time period with the scheme are only £7m. This is not inclusive of construction costs.

This presents a scheme saving of £14m over a period of 60 years. Enabling the scheme to be undertaken now therefore represents a significant cost saving.

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 capital costs have been developed using an elemental, bottom-up estimating approach based on a defined scope of works. Costs are broken down by construction element (e.g. expansion joints, waterproofing, parapet replacement, stringcourse strengthening, bearing replacement, steelwork and concrete repairs), with measured quantities multiplied by unit rates derived from recent schemes, industry benchmarks and supplier inputs. A previously received tender price for some of the elements of the scheme in 2023 and subsequently 2026 has been taken into consideration.

Rates are presented in both base and outturn years, with inflation applied consistently. The rate of inflation has been applied at the GDP Deflator rate as described in the TAG Databook. This was selected to ensure that the rate could be applied consistently from one source throughout the entire scheme appraisal period.

Operating, Maintenance and Renewal (OMR) costs have been developed using a parametric, whole-life cost modelling approach informed by asset management practice and engineering judgement. Costs are structured by activity type (inspections, routine maintenance, cyclical renewals and major interventions) and scheduled over the appraisal period based on assumed frequencies and deterioration profiles. Unit costs are derived from historic schemes, benchmarks and typical structures maintenance rates.

Further Early Contractor Involvement is planned during the detailed design stage of the bearings refine cost assumptions and improve confidence in the costing information.

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

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

A Quantified Risk Assessment (QRA) has been undertaken, giving a more detailed and nuanced evidence base relating to project risk and financial implications. The total value of risk is approximately £700,000 (exclusive of inflation), representing roughly 15% of the total scheme cost. The QRA is available within Appendix B6.

This risk is included in the table above (2.4.a) and is the difference between the costs included in the table and costs included in the economic case, as these are exclusive of risk. The total risk as calculated by the QRA has been attributed proportionately to the delivery cost.

The principal risks identified in the QRA relate to the condition of the bridge bearings. A targeted Special Inspection was undertaken in July 2026, with preliminary findings informing the proposed bearing replacement scope. The final specialist assessment report is currently being completed. Additional risks include construction cost inflation exceeding forecast allowances and the limited availability of specialist contractors, which could reduce competition and lead to higher tender returns.

The estimate also reflects the risk of quantity variation, as the full scope of repairs will only be confirmed once investigations and detailed design are complete. This may affect the extent of concrete repairs, bearing works, waterproofing, and associated temporary works.

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

*Describe the various sources of funding and their availability.*

Given the structure's importance and the risks associated with its condition, the Council has committed to contribute £240,000, approximately 5% of the estimated total scheme costs, from its own capital funding.

As the structure is wholly owned, operated, and maintained by Trafford Council, there are no opportunities to secure third-party private sector contributions towards the capital or delivery costs of the proposed scheme.

## **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?

January 2028

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

May 2029

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

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

The scheme will be delivered through Trafford Council's established capital project management arrangements, supported by the existing OTP delivery team. From the current stage of development, the OTP team has undertaken and will continue to undertake key technical and design activities, including option development, detailed design, cost development and risk identification, therefore ensuring continuity and retention of scheme knowledge. A detailed programme of activities is appended as Appendix B4.

As the scheme progresses, detailed design and preconstruction activities will be completed under Trafford's governance framework, supported by specialist advisors where required. Procurement of construction works will be undertaken through established, compliant routes with suppliers on an existing framework, enabling timely contractor appointment and cost certainty.

It is envisaged that the contract form for all works contracts will be the NEC4 Engineering and Construction Contract (ECC), including those awarded via frameworks. This is widely used across the construction industry due to its robust mechanisms for ensuring the quality of works and its suite of available contract options provides flexibility in the overall approach. Trafford Council and OTP are familiar with NEC contracts and scheme delivery using these contracts.

During construction, Trafford Council will act as client, managing programme, cost, quality, health and safety and stakeholder engagement. Progress will be monitored through regular reporting and risk management, with clear escalation routes. On completion, the scheme will be formally handed over and integrated into ongoing asset management and maintenance processes.

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 primary delivery risks relate to working on an existing structure, where the full extent of defects may only become apparent after further investigations or during construction. This could result in scope growth, cost increases, or programme delays. Trafford intends to manage this risk through early investigations, conservative assumptions within the cost estimate, and the inclusion of appropriate risk allowances through a QRA.

The existing OTP team's involvement and continuity in design and scheme development helps to reduce uncertainty by retaining detailed asset knowledge.

Programme risks include traffic management constraints, interface with the SRN and neighbouring

local authorities, restricted working windows and potential weather impacts. These will be mitigated through early planning, stakeholder coordination, and flexible programming. Procurement and market risks, including contractor availability, materials lead time, and price volatility, will be addressed through established procurement routes supported by an existing framework for structural engineers and contractors, enabling competitive tension and early contractor engagement.

Financial risks, including cost overruns, will be managed through active cost control, change management procedures and contingency allowances. Trafford Council will act as accountable body and will not commit to works beyond available funding. Any cost increases beyond approved budgets would be managed through scope review, reprioritisation within the capital programme, or identification of additional local funding, ensuring no unmitigated exposure to the funding body.

- 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 One Trafford Partnership (OTP) operates through a structured governance framework that provides strategic leadership while supporting effective project delivery. At its core is the OTP Board, which sets Trafford's long-term vision, priorities and outcomes, providing collective oversight of public sector investment and delivery. Beneath this, the OTP Delivery Board and thematic boards translate strategic priorities into delivery plans, oversee performance and manage risks. For this scheme, the HIAMP Capital Delivery Group will be responsible for project delivery and reporting through the governance hierarchy. Formal decision-making, financial approvals and statutory accountability remain with Trafford Council, ensuring democratic oversight, legal compliance and audit assurance.

Delivery will be subject to gateway review controls, providing formal assurance points at key stages of development. Progression between stages requires approval of defined outputs, including the approval of the funding bid, design reviews, procurement readiness and construction approvals. This ensures that costs, risks, programme implications and deliverability are thoroughly assessed before further commitments are made.

NEC4 engineering contracts provide additional project controls through proactive management and clear governance procedures. A detailed programme must be regularly updated and accepted by the Project Manager, providing visibility of progress and risks. The Early Warning process requires the timely notification and mitigation of issues affecting scope, cost or programme. Compensation Events provide a structured mechanism for assessing change, while defined roles, communication procedures and contractual response times support accountability and transparency. Regular reporting, risk reduction meetings and performance monitoring further strengthen project control and delivery assurance.

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

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

The bridge spans the River Mersey, requiring permissions from the Environment Agency (EA) for temporary works affecting the watercourse, flood risk, and any associated environmental and ecological considerations.

The consenting process presents a potential programme risk. However, this risk is being mitigated through early and ongoing engagement with the EA, enabling key constraints and requirements to be identified and incorporated into the scheme design, construction methodology and programme at an early stage.

Coordination is required with National Highways, neighbouring local authorities, public transport and emergency services in relation to traffic management arrangements and duration. Early engagement has been initiated to support alignment on these requirements where possible. Overall, proactive stakeholder engagement, early identification of consent requirements, and integration of third-party constraints into the delivery strategy provide confidence in the successful 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.*

Consideration of climate adaptation and long-term resilience has been integrated into the development of the proposed scheme, including management of the effects of increased rainfall, flood risk and accelerated deterioration associated with changing environmental conditions. The bridge spans the River Mersey and is therefore subject to potential impacts from flood events and high river levels. The scheme includes improvements to drainage and replacement of waterproofing systems to reduce water ingress, which is a key driver of deterioration and is expected to become more significant under future climate scenarios. By addressing these mechanisms, the scheme will improve the resilience of the structure to increased rainfall intensity and prolonged wet conditions. The repair and refurbishment of structural steelwork, including reinstatement of protective coatings, and targeted concrete repairs will enhance durability and reduce the rate of corrosion and degradation associated with more variable and extreme weather conditions. Renewal of parapets to current standards will also improve safety and resilience to vehicle impacts under changing traffic and weather conditions. The proposed intervention strategy for the bridge bearings will address uncertainty associated with critical structural elements, ensuring that the bridge remains serviceable under future loading and environmental conditions. Overall, the scheme represents a proactive intervention that will improve the resilience of the structure, reduce future maintenance requirements, and support the long-term reliability of this strategically important route within the highway network.

- 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).*

Consideration of carbon management has been incorporated into the development of the scheme, with a focus on reducing both embodied and operational carbon through proportionate and practical measures. Carbon management will be undertaken in line with PAS 2080 principles, with Amey acting as designer under its accredited carbon management framework. This will be supported by the use of specialist carbon modelling tools, including One Click LCA, enabling robust quantification of carbon impacts across design options, materials and construction activities, and informing decision-making throughout scheme development. The proposed intervention prioritises the retention and refurbishment of the existing structure where feasible, enabling the reduction of embodied carbon by extending the serviceable life of primary structural elements and minimising the need for new materials. Material selection and construction methods will be reviewed during detailed design to identify opportunities to reduce carbon impacts, including the use of lower-carbon materials, efficient construction techniques, and reduced waste generation. Early Contractor Involvement will support the identification of further carbon reduction opportunities, including the use of local supply chains, efficient plant utilisation, and optimisation of construction activities. In addition, by addressing deterioration and preventing future structural restrictions, the scheme will help maintain efficient traffic flow on a key route, avoiding diversionary impacts that would otherwise increase journey lengths, congestion and associated emissions. Overall, the scheme adopts a proportionate whole-life approach to carbon management, considering embodied, construction, maintenance and user-carbon impacts where data is available and supporting a more resilient and lower-carbon highway network. A Carbon Management Plan has been developed and is appended as Appendix B7.

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

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

The bridge carries a range of statutory undertakers' assets, including telecommunications, gas, electricity, street lighting and water services.

The bridge carries a range of statutory undertakers' assets, including telecommunications, gas, electricity, street lighting and water services. Relevant statutory undertakers were engaged as part of the previously developed scheme in 2023 and agreed in principle to the proposed construction methodologies. This included arrangements for temporary support and protection of services during key activities such as deck excavation, waterproofing and stringcourse strengthening. Further engagement has been initiated as part of the current scheme development, particularly in relation to the proposed bearing repair and replacement works, which represent the principal addition to the previous scope. Engagement will continue throughout the detailed design stage to confirm requirements, with any necessary protection, diversion or temporary works incorporated into the design, construction methodology and programme at an early stage. This proactive approach to stakeholder engagement and coordination provides confidence that statutory undertaker requirements are understood and will be effectively managed as part of scheme delivery.



## 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 scheme will preserve the existing connectivity for all movements, improving safety and reliability for all users and is unlikely to have any long-term negative impacts beyond the construction phase.

However, should the scheme not go ahead the following consequences are identified in case of bridge closure:

- Disabled people would be particularly affected due to longer and more complex diversion routes (approximately 6 km via M60), which may be difficult to navigate and increase reliance on private vehicles or less accessible public transport. Whilst pedestrian access across the River Mersey would remain available via the northbound bridge, the nearest crossing point is approximately 500m away, resulting in additional walking distances and inconvenience for those with mobility impairments. Increased traffic on alternative routes would also reduce safety and accessibility.
- Similarly, older people may experience reduced confidence when travelling longer distances or using unfamiliar routes. Increased journey times to essential services, including healthcare, could negatively affect wellbeing.
- Children and young people would be impacted through disruption to school journeys (e.g. Sale Grammar, Stretford Grammar, Ashton on Mersey). Whilst connectivity would be maintained, the diversion of traffic may result in longer journey times.
- Women, who are more likely to undertake trip-chaining (e.g. combining school drop-offs, shopping, and work), may experience greater inconvenience and time burden due to extended journeys and reduced reliability.

The above issues are also of concern whilst construction is carried out, and some mitigation is likely to be required. The full EqIA has been attached as Appendix C.

### 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.trafford.gov.uk/streets-roads-and-transport/roads-highways-and-pavements>

### 3.3 Declarations

#### Senior Responsible Owner declaration

As Senior Responsible Owner for the Crossford New Bridge scheme, I hereby submit this request for approval to DfT on behalf of [Trafford Metropolitan Borough Council] and confirm that I have the necessary authority to do so.

I confirm that [Trafford Metropolitan Borough 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 Morris
- b) Signed:
- c) Date: 03/08/2026
- d) Email: [Click or tap here to enter text.](#)

#### Section 151 Officer declaration

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

- 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: Nikki Royle
- f) Signed:
- g) Date: 03/08/2026
- h) Email: [Click or tap here to enter text.](#)