



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: Stockport Metropolitan Borough Council
- b) Scheme / structure name and LHA bridges number: Warren Wood Embankment Stabilisation
- c) Location (OS Grid Reference) of the scheme/structure (to identify location on map):
- Easting: 393270
- Northing: 388740
- d) Name of Project Manager: [REDACTED]
- e) Email address: [REDACTED]
- f) Phone number: [REDACTED]
- g) What type of eligible structure would your scheme address? (select all that apply)

☐	Bridges	☒	Cutting/embankment
☐	Fly-overs	☐	Tunnels
☐	Retaining walls	☐	Local highway repairs due to landslip
☐	Culverts	☐	Local highway repairs due to collapse
☐	Other structure type (please specify): Click or tap here to enter text.		

- h) Provide an overview of the structure proposed for intervention and the nature of the problem. (Maximum 250 words)

This could include, for example, the age, construction type, feature carried and feature crossed of the relevant structure and if the structure has listed heritage status.

This project involves the stabilisation of a large natural embankment that is currently experiencing a progressive slip failure. The embankment retains the primary A626 carriageway linking Stockport town centre to Marple district centre.

The A626, is a key transport route and the primary road link between Stockport and Marple. Continued deterioration could result in traffic restrictions, disruption to local journeys, increased maintenance costs, and potential safety risks for highway users.

In addition to supporting the adopted carriageway and footway, the embankment accommodates infrastructure belonging to all major utility providers. Further movement could therefore affect not only the primary highway network but also critical utility services, increasing the potential impact of any failure.

The proposed works are essential to protect this strategically important transport corridor, maintain network resilience, and safeguard both highway and utility assets from further deterioration.

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.

A package of complementary engineering measures are proposed to stabilise the natural earth embankment supporting the A626 and ensure the continued operation of this important primary route between Stockport and Marple. The scheme is designed to address the progressive slip failure currently affecting the embankment and to provide a long-term solution for the identified defects.

The proposed works include the installation of soil anchors within the embankment face to strengthen the slope and provide structural support to the area affected by ground movement. The existing retaining wall which is located at the top of the embankment, and is experiencing rotational failure, will be replaced with a new retaining structure founded at a greater depth to provide enhanced restraint and improved long-term stability.

In addition, the carriageway will be locally realigned to reduce loading at the crest of the embankment, where the instability is most pronounced. This will help lessen the loading contributing to the slip and stop any further movement.

Together, these measures will stabilise the embankment, and restore the structural integrity of our infrastructure. The works will safeguard the A626 from future deterioration, improving the resilience of the highway network, ensuring a reliable transport link for local communities, businesses, and road users is maintained.

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.

N/A

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..

Local authorities have a statutory duty to maintain public highways and their supporting structures, including embankments and slopes. In this case, the affected embankment is located on densely

vegetated land, which obscured its condition and limited visibility of any developing defects for many years.

Following reports of cracks forming within the footway and movement of the adjacent parapet wall, a series of visual safety inspections and photographic surveys were undertaken. These inspections confirmed the presence of progressive slope movement and clearly identified the extent of the defect affecting the embankment.

While the evidence gathered to date demonstrates that significant instability is present, further detailed ground investigations and engineering assessments will be undertaken as part of the project to establish the full extent and underlying causes of the failure mechanism. These investigations will help inform the detailed design and confirm the most appropriate remedial measures.

The proposed stabilisation works have been developed to provide a robust and resilient solution to the identified instability. The effectiveness of the proposed engineering measures is not expected to be significantly affected by the outcome of the investigations, as they are designed to address the overall stability of the embankment rather than relying on the behaviour of temporary or variable slope conditions.

The scheme will therefore provide a long-term solution to the ongoing movement, protecting the highway, footway, and associated infrastructure while maintaining the safety and reliability of this important transport corridor.

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 footway adjacent to the defective part of the slope is permanently closed to all pedestrian traffic on safety grounds due to subsidence of the footway and instability of the adjacent retaining wall and parapet.

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.

Should the progressive slope movement continue and begin to affect the adjacent carriageway, then additional traffic management measures will be implemented to maintain public safety. This would likely require the closure of the eastbound traffic lane, with vehicles managed under temporary three-way traffic signal control utilising the westbound carriageway and the junction with Shearwater Road which provides access to a residential housing estate. These measures would ensure continued access along the route while reducing risks associated with further embankment movement. Operationally, these measures would result in severe traffic congestion to the primary A626 carriageway and surrounding road network.

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 edge of the adopted highway is currently supported by the use of temporary sheet piles to provide an additional edge restraint from the ongoing progressive slippage of the embankment. The sheet piles also provide restraint to existing Statutory Undertakers apparatus within the adjacent footway which include gas, water and electricity in addition to providing support to the adjacent carriageway.

- 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.

As noted above within part 1.2c, should the progressive failure of the natural earth embankment continue, then in addition to existing measures to the footway, highway loading along the top of the structure would need to be reduced to mitigate the ongoing embankment failure. This would be achieved by closing the eastbound lane of the A626 on a permanent basis until the progressive embankment failure was fully rectified.

- 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: N/A

BCI Ave: N/A

- 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.

N/A

- 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 A626 carriageway realignment and embankment stabilisation scheme between Stockport and Marple directly supports the UK Government's economic growth mission by protecting a strategic transport corridor, improving network resilience and enabling sustainable economic activity across the area.

The scheme will create employment opportunities during the design, construction and maintenance phases, supporting local contractors and the wider supply chain. Investment in highway infrastructure will generate demand for skilled jobs, materials and services, helping to strengthen the regional economy.

By securing the long-term stability of the embankment and preventing future disruption, the project will improve the reliability of journeys for commuters, businesses and freight operators travelling between Stockport, Marple and surrounding communities. Reduced delays and unplanned closures will lower transport costs, improve journey time certainty and increase productivity for existing businesses that rely on the route to access labour markets, customers and suppliers.

The proposal will also help attract investment by providing confidence that critical infrastructure is safe, resilient and capable of supporting future growth. A reliable transport network is a key factor in business location decisions and supports the delivery of housing, regeneration and employment opportunities across Greater Manchester.

These benefits will be delivered through infrastructure investment that safeguards connectivity, creates jobs in the construction sector, enhances the efficiency of the local transport network and improves access to economic opportunities. By maintaining a vital link within the highway network, the scheme will support economic competitiveness, business confidence and long-term sustainable growth.

- 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 A626 carriageway realignment and embankment stabilisation scheme supports a range of wider Government policy objectives beyond economic growth, particularly those relating to infrastructure resilience, transport connectivity, public safety, environmental sustainability and place-based regeneration.

The scheme will enhance the resilience of a key local transport route by addressing embankment instability and reducing the risk of future failures, supporting the Government's objective of maintaining reliable and climate-resilient infrastructure. By safeguarding connectivity between Stockport, Marple and surrounding communities, the project will help ensure continued access to employment, education, healthcare and other essential services.

The proposal also supports road safety objectives by reducing the risk associated with deteriorating highway infrastructure and improving long-term network reliability for all users. Improved journey reliability will encourage sustainable economic and social activity by reducing disruption to residents, businesses and public transport services.

In environmental terms, stabilising the existing highway infrastructure represents a sustainable asset-management approach, extending the life of the network and reducing the need for more extensive future interventions. Maintaining an operational route can also minimise traffic diversion onto longer alternative routes, helping to reduce congestion and associated vehicle emissions.

The scheme aligns with national and regional ambitions for levelling up communities and supporting local growth by ensuring that towns and rural communities remain well connected to economic opportunities. It will help protect access to existing employment areas, support future development and strengthen the long-term resilience of Greater Manchester's transport network, contributing to safer, more sustainable and better-connected communities.

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 A626 carriageway realignment and embankment stabilisation scheme is a high local priority because it addresses a critical infrastructure risk on an important transport corridor connecting Stockport, Marple and surrounding communities. The route provides essential access to employment, education, healthcare, local services and the wider strategic highway network. Without intervention, continued embankment instability could lead to restrictions or closures that would adversely affect residents, businesses and public transport services.

The scheme aligns strongly with local and regional transport and growth priorities, including the objectives of the Greater Manchester Transport Strategy 2040 and Stockport Council's ambitions to deliver a safe, reliable and resilient transport network. By maintaining connectivity and improving network resilience, the project supports the movement of people and goods, enabling sustainable economic growth and access to opportunities across the borough.

The proposal also supports local priorities for place-making and regeneration by safeguarding a key route that serves existing communities and future development areas. Improved infrastructure resilience will provide confidence for investment and help ensure that local businesses can continue to access customers, suppliers and labour markets efficiently.

In addition, the scheme contributes to local priorities around safety and asset management by addressing a known highway risk before more significant intervention becomes necessary. Delivering preventative investment now represents a cost-effective approach that protects a valuable public asset and reduces the likelihood of more disruptive and expensive emergency works in the future.

Overall, the scheme is a clear local priority because it secures a vital transport link, supports economic and community wellbeing, and helps deliver wider transport, growth and resilience objectives across Stockport and Greater Manchester.

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.

Early engagement on this scheme has been undertaken with a range of key stakeholders to ensure the proposal is deliverable, supported and responsive to local needs.

Stockport Council has engaged with local elected members, including ward councillors and the local MP, to communicate the nature of the embankment risk, the need for intervention and the anticipated benefits of securing the long-term resilience of the route. Feedback has recognised the

importance of maintaining connectivity between Stockport, Marple and surrounding communities and has generally been supportive of measures that protect the highway from future disruption.

Initial discussions have also been held with adjacent landowners to identify potential land requirements, access arrangements and opportunities to minimise impacts during construction. Engagement with utility providers will be undertaken to understand any diversion or protection requirements to the identified services and reduce delivery risks during the construction phase.

Local residents and community stakeholders have been informed of the need for the scheme and the potential impacts associated with construction activity. Key issues raised have focused on maintaining access, minimising traffic disruption, protecting the local environment and ensuring effective communication throughout the delivery period. These concerns have informed the development of the scheme and will continue to be considered through detailed design and delivery.

- 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.

Whilst Stockport Council has a statutory responsibility to inspect, maintain and manage the highway network and its supporting assets, the Council adopts a risk-based approach to structural maintenance, prioritising investment according to asset condition, public safety, risk of failure, network importance and potential impacts on communities and the local economy.

The A626 embankment had not previously been identified as requiring major intervention because it is located on densely vegetated land, where the condition of the slope was largely obscured from view. As a result, developing defects within the embankment were not readily visible during routine inspections and there was no evidence to indicate a significant stability issue requiring prioritised structural maintenance works.

The issue became apparent following reports of cracking within the footway and movement of the adjacent parapet wall. In response, the Council undertook a series of visual safety inspections and photographic surveys which confirmed progressive slope movement and identified a developing embankment instability problem. The evidence gathered demonstrated that the asset had deteriorated to a condition where intervention was required to protect public safety and maintain the integrity of the highway.

As the extent and nature of the defect only became evident through these recent inspections, the scheme has now been elevated as a priority within the Council's structural maintenance agenda. Further ground investigations and engineering assessments will be undertaken to fully understand the failure mechanism and inform the detailed design of an appropriate long-term solution. This approach ensures that limited maintenance funding is directed towards the highest-risk assets and interventions that deliver the greatest benefit to network resilience and public safety.

- 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.

Due to ongoing pressures on local authority finances, the funding available for highway structural maintenance is insufficient to address all identified renewal and improvement needs across the network. As structures age, deterioration continues to increase maintenance liabilities and the risk of more extensive defects developing if interventions are delayed. Limited capital budgets require

councils to prioritise only the highest-risk and most urgent schemes, leaving a backlog of preventative and lifecycle maintenance works.

Additional funding is therefore being sought to enable the delivery of essential structural maintenance projects that cannot be accommodated within existing budgets. Early investment in these assets helps prevent further deterioration, avoids the need for more costly future repairs or emergency interventions, and supports the long-term resilience of the transport network. It also reduces the risk of weight restrictions, lane closures or disruption to residents, businesses and public services.

Securing additional funding would allow Stockport Council to adopt a more proactive asset management approach, delivering works at the optimum time in an asset's lifecycle and achieving better value for money. The investment would help preserve critical infrastructure, improve network reliability and support the Council's objectives of maintaining a safe, serviceable and sustainable highway network for 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 A626 this embankment stabilisation scheme would present significant risks to the resilience of the local transport network and the communities it serves. Continued deterioration of the embankment could result in further ground movement, leading to damage to the adjacent carriageway, footway, parapet wall and associated highway infrastructure. Over time, this may necessitate traffic restrictions, lane closures or the complete closure of the route to protect public safety.

Closure of the A626 would create substantial community severance, reducing connectivity between Stockport, Marple and neighbouring communities. Residents would face longer and less convenient journeys to access employment, education, healthcare, retail centres and other essential services. Public transport services operating along the route would also be affected, reducing accessibility for those who rely on sustainable transport options.

Lengthy diversion routes would place additional pressure on surrounding local roads, increasing congestion, journey times and vehicle operating costs for residents, businesses and freight operators. Traffic displaced onto alternative routes could also create environmental impacts through increased emissions and reduced air quality within affected communities.

The consequences of inaction are also likely to increase future costs. Progressive embankment failure could lead to more extensive damage to highway and utilities assets, requiring emergency repairs that are typically more disruptive and expensive than planned preventative works. In the event of a significant failure, reconstruction works could be complex, costly and prolonged.

Delivering the scheme now will safeguard a critical transport link, avoid community disruption, protect public safety and secure the long-term resilience of the highway network and its supporting infrastructure.

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 A626 embankment stabilisation scheme will help prevent community severance by maintaining a safe and reliable transport connection between Stockport, Marple and surrounding communities.

Without intervention, continued embankment movement could result in restrictions or closure of the route, affecting all transport modes including private vehicles, buses, pedestrians and cyclists. Such disruption would reduce accessibility to local schools, colleges, healthcare facilities, town centres, community venues and employment locations, particularly for residents who rely on public transport or active travel. Vulnerable groups, including older people, young people and those without access to a car, would be disproportionately affected.

The loss of the A626 as a through route would require traffic and bus services to use alternative routes, particularly via A6 London Road, resulting in longer journey distances and increased travel times. Diversions would place additional pressure on surrounding local roads, increasing congestion and reducing the reliability of public transport services. For pedestrians and cyclists, route closures or restrictions could significantly increase journey lengths and reduce access to key destinations.

By stabilising the embankment and maintaining the operation of the highway, footway and associated infrastructure, the scheme will preserve connectivity across the local area, safeguarding access to employment, education, healthcare, retail and community facilities. The scheme will therefore prevent significant social and economic impacts associated with severance, while supporting inclusive access to opportunities and services for all transport users.

- 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 A626 is a key transport corridor that accommodates significant daily traffic movements between Stockport, Marple and surrounding communities. Department for Transport traffic count data for the A626 corridor (dated 2025) indicates that 14,783 motor vehicles use the route each day, comprising around 12,465 cars and taxis, 1,840 light goods vehicles (LGVs), 171 heavy goods vehicles (HGVs), 119 buses and coaches, and 189 motorcycles daily. The route also supports active travel, with 78 pedal cycle movements per day recorded at the nearest count location 91105.

If embankment failure resulted in a closure or significant restriction of the route, all users would be affected. Motorised traffic would be diverted onto alternative routes through the local highway network, increasing journey times, congestion and travel costs for approximately 14,500 daily vehicle movements. Bus services would experience longer and less reliable journeys, affecting access to employment, education, healthcare and local services.

The impacts on non-motorised users could be proportionally greater. Pedestrians and cyclists typically rely on direct local connections and may face longer, less convenient routes with reduced accessibility and potentially less suitable infrastructure. This could discourage walking and cycling trips to schools, local centres, public transport interchanges and community facilities.

In line with TAG A4.4 Social Impact Appraisal guidance, the resulting severance would reduce accessibility and increase travel burdens for a wide range of users, particularly those without access to a car. By maintaining the A626 corridor, the scheme will preserve connectivity for both motorised and non-motorised transport, avoid lengthy diversions and protect access to essential services, employment opportunities and community networks.

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.

I refer to the Value for Money Supplementary Guidance document dated November 2024 (Section 1.1.6 and Box 1.2). I note the Present Value of Costs (PVC) is negative; the Present Value of Benefits (PVB) is positive; and therefore the resulting BCR calculation (PVB/PVC) produces a negative value. In such cases, the guidance indicates such schemes are generally classified as representing Very High Value for Money.

Further, the key sources for the economic benefits brought about by this project being undertaken are as follows.

Firstly, considering the benefits to highway users (both vehicular and pedestrian). Should the embankment be stabilised, then no diversion routes will be needed, maintaining existing journey times and not creating congestion elsewhere on the network. For pedestrians, the footway which passes adjacent to the embankment and has been closed permanently for a number of years could be reopened to traffic.

Considering Life Cycle efficiencies, a proactive maintenance approach would reduce the likelihood of more expensive urgent repairs being necessary should there be a catastrophic failure in the future.

There would be environmental benefits in that potential increases to vehicle emissions within the borough and also increased fuel consumption used if a diversion had to be put in place would never occur.

There is also greater resilience to the borough highway network, ensuring the A626 remains permanently open for all road users and it also directly supports the local economy by maintaining logistical connectivity between Stockport and Marple.

- 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)	-6,374,041
Present Value Benefits (PVB)	2,430,270,506
Benefit to Cost Ratio (BCR)	-381.3

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

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

A cyclical Principal Inspection of the embankment has been included within the OMR costs for the “with scheme” costs.

For the “without scheme” costs, it is assumed that traffic management would be required permanently from 2028 onwards and costs relating to that eventuality have been included per year.

- 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).

Traffic data utilised has been taken from count point 91105. <https://roadtraffic.dft.gov.uk/count-points/91105>

Carbon Infrastructure emissions have been calculated using the National Highways Carbon Tool spreadsheet v.2.7.

The Congestion Band stated refers both to the traffic data stated, and also Appendix A of the TAG 4-5 document.

The route length stated assumes traffic is travelling between Stockport town centre to Marple district centre or vice versa. The A626 at the location of the progressive embankment collapse is the primary route utilised to travel between those two destinations.

- 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.

Key non-monetised factors which have been considered in respect of this project are community severance should the A626 need to be narrowed or closed due to the progressive natural earth embankment failure. This relates specifically to restricting access for local residents or highway users and cutting off access to destinations.

By ensuring that the embankment is stabilised with no highway restrictions, additional congestion on other diversion routes would not occur which would have resulted in increased stress for highway users. Local residents have also been considered given highway diversions would create additional noise and distress for prolonged periods due to increased traffic levels.

Ecological effects have also been considered in that the failure of the embankment would inevitably result in considerable damage to a large area of the embankment. The embankment is heavily vegetated / tree lined in places, and this mature habitat is consequently designated a Green Belt and a Site of Biological Importance. Remediation of the progressive embankment failure would ensure this habitat is not lost due to a sudden embankment failure in the future.

- 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).

N/A. An alternative economic assessment has not been undertaken.

Present Value Costs (PVC)	N/A
Present Value Benefits (PVB)	N/A
Benefit to Cost Ratio (BCR)	N/A

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

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

2.3 Commercial Case

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

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

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

Stockport Council has substantial experience in delivering highway asset maintenance, geotechnical and structural renewal schemes through its established highways, structures and asset management processes. The Council is responsible for maintaining an extensive network of highways, retaining structures, embankments and associated infrastructure, and has successfully delivered a range of interventions including embankment stabilisation works, retaining wall repairs, drainage improvements, slope remediation schemes and carriageway reconstruction projects across the borough.

The proposed A626 carriageway realignment and embankment stabilisation scheme is consistent with the type of asset management and infrastructure resilience projects routinely planned and delivered by the Council. The authority has access to experienced highway, geotechnical, structural engineering and project management teams, supported by established procurement arrangements and specialist contractor frameworks, providing confidence in its ability to deliver the scheme effectively and efficiently.

The Council has already undertaken visual inspections and monitoring activities to assess the developing embankment instability and has established processes in place to progress further ground investigations, detailed design, procurement and construction management. These arrangements provide a clear delivery pathway from project development through to construction and completion.

In recent years, pressures on local authority capital budgets have constrained the number of major structural and geotechnical maintenance schemes that can be delivered through the Council's core funding programme. As a result, investment has been prioritised towards the highest-risk assets and immediate safety-critical interventions. The embankment instability on the A626 has only recently become evident following the appearance of surface defects and subsequent inspections.

Additional external funding would enable the Council to utilise its existing expertise, resources and delivery arrangements to implement the scheme promptly, ensuring value for money, protecting a critical transport link and minimising disruption to highway users and local communities.

- 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.

This scheme would be procured under the Stockport Highways Framework – Lot 9.2 (Highway Structures)

Lot 9.2 forms part of Stockport Council's Alliance Framework for Highway Related Services, which was procured through STaR Procurement and is used by Stockport and other Greater Manchester authorities for highway and transportation infrastructure projects. Lot 9.2 is used to procure medium-sized highway structure projects with an estimated value between £50,000 and £500,000.

The lot covers work on highway structures such as bridge repairs and structural maintenance of highway assets.

Rather than undertaking a full procurement exercise for each project, Stockport can appoint contractors from a pre-approved framework, saving time and ensuring compliance with public procurement requirements. The framework also promotes collaborative working and value for money through the NEC4 form of contract.

When a structural scheme is identified within the £50k–£500k value range, the Council can call off work from these approved suppliers, typically through a mini-competition or other framework procedure.

Lot 9.2 provides Stockport Council with a fast, compliant and cost-effective route for delivering medium-value highway structure projects, helping maintain and improve critical infrastructure across the borough.

The provisional conceptual design has already been developed for this scheme based on similar slope stabilisation schemes recently carried out. Initial feasibility study has also been carried out detailing all known constraints, specifications and requirements.

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 A626 carriageway realignment and embankment stabilisation scheme has been subject to an initial risk assessment and a number of key delivery risks have been identified. Appropriate mitigation measures will be developed and implemented throughout the design and construction process to minimise the likelihood and impact of these risks.

Ground Conditions and Design Risk

As the full extent and cause of the embankment instability are not yet fully understood, there is a risk that unforeseen ground conditions could affect the scope, cost or programme of works. This risk will be mitigated through detailed ground investigations, geotechnical assessments and ongoing monitoring to inform the design and ensure that the selected solution is appropriate and robust.

Construction and Network Disruption

Works on a live highway have the potential to cause traffic disruption, delays and impacts on local communities. Careful construction planning, traffic management strategies and phased delivery will be used to minimise disruption and maintain access wherever possible. Early communication

with residents, businesses and public transport operators will help manage expectations and reduce impacts.

Utilities Risk

Underground and overground utility apparatus may be present within or adjacent to the works area. Unexpected utility conflicts could result in programme delays and additional costs. Early engagement with utility providers, comprehensive utility searches and trial investigations will be undertaken to identify and manage these constraints.

Land and Environmental Constraints

The scheme may require access to adjacent land and works within a sensitive, vegetated environment. Early engagement with landowners, environmental surveys and appropriate ecological mitigation measures will help reduce risks associated with land access, consenting and environmental compliance.

Cost and Programme Risk

Inflation, market conditions and unforeseen site conditions could affect project costs and delivery timescales. These risks will be managed through detailed cost planning, risk allowances, robust procurement processes and active project management throughout delivery.

Overall, the identified risks are typical of infrastructure and geotechnical projects and can be effectively managed through established project governance, technical investigations and stakeholder engagement processes. This provides confidence that the scheme can be delivered safely, efficiently and with acceptable levels of risk.

- 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.

Framework Contractor

The appointed contractor under the highways framework lot 9.2 would undertake the slope stabilisation works and associated carriageway realignment works, providing construction management, specialist labour, plant and quality assurance.

Utility Companies

Utility providers may need to be consulted if there are unforeseen/unrecorded apparatus within or adjacent to the slope or if the need for realignment became apparent, including:

Electricity providers

Gas network operators

Water companies

Telecommunications providers

Utility searches and protection measures are carried out as standard prior to construction commencing.

Transport for Greater Manchester (TfGM)

TfGM will need to be consulted regarding network impacts, public transport operations, diversion routes and coordination with other schemes on the wider strategic transport network via GMRAPS and Streetworks coordination meetings.

Emergency Services

Greater Manchester Police, Greater Manchester Fire and Rescue Service, and North West Ambulance Service should be informed of traffic management arrangements, particularly if lane closures, diversions or reduced carriageway capacity are proposed.

Nearby Local Authorities

N/A

Key Stakeholders

Additional engagement may be required with Adjacent landowners, Local businesses Residents and Developers.

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	0	0	409,500.00	877,500.00	1,287,500.00
LA contribution	0	0	45,500.00	97,500.00	143,000.00
Other contribution	0	0	0	0	0
Total costs	0	0	455,500.00	975,000.00	1,430,000.00

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 project to remediate the progressive embankment failure at Warren Wood on the A626 would cost an amount greater than the annual budget provided to Stockport Metropolitan Borough Council through the Highways Maintenance block funding. It has therefore not been possible to remediate from existing budgets.

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.

With the ongoing progressive failure of the natural earth embankment, it is inevitable that the failure will eventually extend to encompass the carriageway. The “without intervention” option would result in a permanent ongoing cost to ensure members of the public remain safe and separated from any potential injury as a result of the ongoing embankment failure. To achieve this, there would be an ongoing provision for the supply of traffic management at both the location of the failure, but also throughout the diversion route identified. This would be an extremely expensive ongoing cost and would include the provision of the equipment to segregate the failure location from the public, provide permanent traffic management at the site and around the diversion route, plus the regular inspection of the traffic management infrastructure to ensure it remains in good order.

The “with intervention” cost affords good value for money as highlighted by the Value for Money Supplementary Guidance document dated November 2024 (Section 1.1.6 and Box 1.2) and would resolve an issue involving a progressive failure which will expand in magnitude.

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 overall cost estimate stated for the embankment remediation project utilises a number of individual costs. These include estimates for the installation of ground anchors to the embankment face, the provision of a replacement reinforced concrete retaining structure at the top of the embankment to replace the existing failed structure, quotations to realign affected Statutory Undertakers apparatus, and quantity surveyors have estimated the costs for highway surfacing repairs.

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.

At the present time, an outline design solution for the rectification of all structural defects had been developed. This includes costs for the following items :-

- 1) new Highway Structures e.g. ground anchors and a replacement retaining wall to replace the temporary sheet piles retaining the A626,
- 2) the removal of Statutory Undertakers apparatus immediately adjacent to the progressive embankment collapse to facilitate the structural remediation works.
- 3) Highway remediation and surfacing costs.

These costs vary in their maturity with some detailed or confirmed by Statutory Undertakers, and others being feasibility estimates. A contingency has been applied to activities which have the lowest maturity to ensure these activities will not exceed initial confidence boundaries resulting in future unaffordability issues. For the highway and structures elements of work, a 20% contingency has been applied.

Inflation has been considered within both the “with intervention” and also the “without intervention” costs, however this will remain estimated and be subject to various future political or economic pressures.

Delivery of the construction work is considered to be a low risk given Stockport Metropolitan Borough Council intends to utilise its Highway Services Framework to procure the work in conjunction with our existing contractor partners.

- 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.

Match funding would be set aside from the annual Highway Structures block funding provided to Stockport Metropolitan Borough Council.

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?

April 2028

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

March 2030

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

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

A detailed project programme is developed at the outset, identifying key milestones, critical activities, procurement lead times and construction durations. Progress is regularly monitored against the baseline programme, allowing any delays to be identified early and corrective action implemented where necessary. Cost management and budget monitoring are undertaken throughout delivery. A project cost plan is established during design and updated as the scheme develops. Expenditure is tracked against the approved budget, with regular financial reporting and forecasting used to identify potential overspends at an early stage. A formal risk management process is maintained, with project risks recorded in a risk register. Risks are reviewed regularly and assigned mitigation measures, owners and target dates. This enables issues such as

unforeseen structural defects, adverse weather, traffic management restrictions and material supply delays to be actively managed. Change control procedures are used to assess any proposed changes to scope, cost or programme before implementation. This ensures that project impacts are fully understood and approved through the appropriate governance process. Regular project meetings and progress reviews are held with designers, contractors, Stockport Council officers and other stakeholders to monitor performance, address emerging issues and coordinate activities. Quality assurance measures, including inspections, testing and compliance checks, are undertaken throughout construction to ensure works are completed to the required standards and to minimise the risk of defects and rework. Together, these controls help provide effective governance, maintain programme certainty, manage costs and support successful project delivery.

- 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 key delivery risks associated with the A626 carriageway realignment and embankment stabilisation scheme relate to ground conditions, project costs, utility infrastructure, land access and construction impacts on the travelling public. A principal risk is the presence of unforeseen ground conditions or a more extensive failure mechanism than currently understood. This will be addressed through detailed ground investigations, geotechnical assessments and ongoing monitoring to inform the design and ensure that the selected engineering solution is appropriate and cost effective. Financial risks include inflation, construction market volatility, design development and the potential for unforeseen site conditions to increase project costs. These risks will be managed through robust cost estimation, risk allowances, value engineering, regular cost reviews and strong project governance throughout the development and delivery stages. Procurement will be undertaken using established Council frameworks and procedures to ensure value for money and effective cost control. There is also a risk that existing utility apparatus may affect the proposed works. This will be mitigated through early engagement with utility providers, detailed utility surveys and the incorporation of any diversion or protection requirements within the programme. Construction activities may create temporary disruption to road users and local communities. Careful traffic management planning, phased construction and proactive stakeholder communication will be used to minimise these impacts and maintain access wherever possible. The scheme will require temporary access to land adjacent to the highway boundary. Land ownership requirements will be confirmed through detailed design and legal review. Where third-party land is required, the Council will engage with landowners at an early stage to secure the necessary agreements and access rights, reducing the risk of programme delays and ensuring timely delivery of the scheme.

- 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.

Stockport Council will employ established project management, financial control and governance procedures to ensure the A626 carriageway realignment and embankment stabilisation scheme is delivered on time and within budget. The project will be managed through the Council's highways and asset management framework, with clear governance arrangements, defined responsibilities and regular reporting to senior management. A dedicated project team comprising highway, geotechnical, structural and project management professionals will oversee scheme development and delivery. Robust programme management controls will be implemented throughout the project lifecycle, including detailed project planning, milestone tracking, risk management and progress

monitoring. Key risks will be maintained within a live risk register and reviewed regularly to ensure that emerging issues are identified and addressed at the earliest opportunity. Financial control will be achieved through detailed cost estimates, regular budget reviews, change control procedures and ongoing monitoring of expenditure against approved budgets. Appropriate risk and contingency allowances will be incorporated into project cost plans to manage uncertainties associated with ground conditions, utility diversions and construction activities. Value engineering principles will also be applied during design development to ensure that the chosen solution delivers the required outcomes in the most cost-effective manner. Procurement will be undertaken using established Council procedures and approved contractor frameworks, providing access to experienced suppliers and ensuring value for money.

- 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.

Whilst generally no formal permissions are required in order to deliver this scheme: Transport for Greater Manchester (TfGM) TfGM will need to be consulted regarding network impacts, public transport operations, diversion routes and coordination with other schemes on the wider strategic transport network via GMRAPS and Streetworks coordination meetings. Emergency Services and utilities companies and private landowners will need consulting for any considerations prior to mobilisation.

- 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.

Climate change resilience has been embedded within the A626 carriageway realignment and embankment stabilisation scheme to ensure the embankment and adjacent carriageway/footway remains safe, operational and durable under future weather conditions. The scheme recognises the increasing likelihood of more intense rainfall events, higher frequencies of surface water flooding, greater temperature extremes and accelerated deterioration of infrastructure materials associated with climate change. The completed design and specification will provide improved water tightness, enhanced drainage performance and increased durability compared with the existing assets.

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

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

Carbon emissions arising from the A626 carriageway realignment and embankment stabilisation scheme will be managed in accordance with Stockport Council's Climate and Nature Strategy and Bethell Construction's Carbon Reduction Plan. The scheme adopts an asset-management approach that extends the life of existing infrastructure, avoiding the embodied carbon associated with full slope/embankment reinstatement during construction, emissions will be reduced through efficient programming of works, minimisation of waste, responsible material sourcing, use of low-emission plant and vehicles where practicable, and the application of Bethell Construction's

environmental management and carbon reporting procedures. These measures support Stockport Council's commitment to operational net zero by 2030 and the framework contractors commitment to achieve Net Zero by 2050.

- 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.

Statutory undertakers that may affect the delivery of the A626 carriageway realignment and embankment stabilisation scheme include United Utilities, Electricity North West, Cadent Gas, BT Openreach and Virgin Media, with apparatus known to be present within the carriageway and footway adjacent to the affected embankment. These assets represent both a delivery risk and a constraint on the design and construction of the proposed works. The presence of utility infrastructure may influence the alignment, extent and sequencing of construction activities. There is a risk that apparatus located close to the slope failure could require protection, diversion, temporary support or detailed redesign of elements of the scheme. Utility diversion works can have significant lead-in periods, particularly where detailed design, legal agreements, road space coordination or specialist contractors are required. Consequently, utility investigations and stakeholder engagement will be progressed early in the project programme to minimise the risk of delays. The Council will manage this element of the programme through comprehensive utility searches, ground penetrating radar surveys as required, trial holes and ongoing engagement with statutory undertakers. Utility requirements will be incorporated into the project programme, risk register and cost estimates from an early stage, ensuring that sufficient time and budget allowances are available should diversions be required. Failure to stabilise the embankment could expose utility assets to increasing risk. Continued slope movement may damage buried pipes, ducts, cables and associated infrastructure, potentially resulting in service interruptions affecting water supply, electricity distribution, gas networks and telecommunications services. Such outages could impact residents, businesses, public services and emergency service communications. The extent and duration of disruption would depend on the specific asset affected but could be significant if major utility infrastructure were compromised by further embankment deterioration or failure.

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 be developed and delivered in accordance with Stockport Council's duties under the Equality Act 2010, with consideration given to the potential impacts on all protected groups through the Equality Impact Assessment (EqIA) process. Particular attention will be given to maintaining safe and accessible travel routes throughout the construction period to minimise disruption to residents, businesses and visitors.

Temporary traffic management arrangements can disproportionately affect individuals with disabilities, older people, and those with limited mobility. Diversions, temporary footway closures, altered crossing points and changes to public transport access can create barriers to movement and reduce independence. To address this, pedestrian routes will be maintained wherever practicable, alternative accessible routes will be clearly signed, and any temporary crossings will be designed to accommodate wheelchair users, mobility scooters, pushchairs and visually impaired users.

The scheme will also consider the needs of groups who rely more heavily on walking, cycling and public transport, including women, young people, ethnic minority communities and those without access to private vehicles. Safe pedestrian and cycle access to employment, education, healthcare and local services will be maintained throughout the works wherever possible.

Consideration will also be given to community cohesion and access to local facilities, including places of worship, community centres and local businesses. Advance communication and stakeholder engagement will help ensure affected groups are aware of planned works and available alternative routes.

Where feasible, works will be undertaken during off-peak periods or overnight to reduce disruption. Any full closure of routes will be limited to the shortest duration practicable, ensuring continued access and minimising adverse impacts on all highway users and local communities.

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.stockport.gov.uk/topic/transportation-policy>

3.3 Declarations

Senior Responsible Owner declaration

As Senior Responsible Owner for [Scheme Name], I hereby submit this request for approval to DfT on behalf of [name of organisation] and confirm that I have the necessary authority to do so.

I confirm that [name of organisation] will have all the necessary statutory powers and other relevant consents in place to ensure the planned timescales in this proposal can be realised.

- a) Name: [REDACTED]
[REDACTED]
b) Signed: [REDACTED]
c) Date: 03 August 2026
d) Email: [REDACTED]

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]:

- has allocated sufficient budget to deliver this scheme on the basis of its proposed funding contribution.
- accepts responsibility for meeting any costs over and above the DfT contribution requested, including potential cost overruns and the underwriting of any funding contributions expected from third parties.
- accepts responsibility for meeting any ongoing revenue requirements in relation to the scheme.
- accepts that no further increase in DfT funding will be considered beyond the maximum contribution requested and that no DfT funding will be provided after 2029/30.
- confirms that the authority has the necessary governance and assurance arrangements in place and that all legal and other statutory obligations and consents will be adhered to.

- e) Name: [REDACTED]
[REDACTED]
f) Signed: [REDACTED]
g) Date: 03/08/26
h) Email: [REDACTED]