Department for Transport

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: Brighton & Hove City Council

b) Scheme / structure name and LHA bridges number: A259 Seafront Arches Phase 6 and 7

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

Easting: 530822

Northing: 103951

d) Name of Project Manager: Nick Bean

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.

The A259 Kings Road is a major arterial route passing along the seafront at Brighton. The route is of vital importance to the highway network and to the economic health of the area. This main road is supported by Victorian arches which are approaching the end of their useful life and are in urgent need of replacement to avoid collapse and the closure of the road which would bring

severe negative impacts for transport, the economy and employment as well as affecting tourism and impacting negatively on the environment. Health & Safety incidents over the last 20 years include partial collapse of sections directly above arches causing major disruptions and the Council is committed to monitoring, managing and acting where necessary to temporary negate further likely incidents. This includes programming major works in phases.

Earlier phases of the arches have been planned to be renewed, having found to be in a very poor structural condition following structural surveys and inspections in line with DMRB Management of Highway Structures Code of Practice.

The 38 Arches in this application scheme were built at the same time and exhibit similar issues as confirmed by structural surveys carried out in June 2026. As with earlier phases, the imminent health and safety risk of failure requires urgent attention, the conclusion of the assessments is that if no action is taken to address the critical state of the structures it would be necessary to close the westbound carriageway of the A259 and adjacent cycleway.

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

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

The proposed scheme to reconstruct the seafront arches will provide a stable highway structure for the long term, maintaining the existing provision for pedestrians, cycles and vehicle traffic.

The scheme will ensure the continued economic growth of the city and enable key strategic developments to be realised. The arch strengthening will provide for a 120-year life extension of the structure and enable weak structures that also house businesses within the space / voids fronting the Lower Promenade to be refurbished and continue to provide commercial floorspace and other opportunities that will generate additional economic activity and revenue and help further regenerate the area.

The carriageway, cycle lane (National Cycle Route) and footway of the A259 will be able to continue to perform their strategic function for vehicle and people movements approaching the city centre. The failure of the structures could significantly affect east-west movements and therefore severely impact on journey times and increase the cost of some journeys.

The failure of the structures supporting the highway would necessitate diversion of vehicle traffic, adding to congestion on the alternative routes with a consequential reduction in air quality locally and on a city wide basis; the proposed works will prevent this.

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

Within the proposed scheme the majority of the 38 arches are in direct ownership of Brighton & Hove City Council; however, there are 12 arch structures privately owned by 5 separate owners. [redacted] In the past arch owners have collaborated and worked with the council when structural issues affecting their occupancy or ownership have needed to be addressed. The Council has already started the process of investigating occupancy freehold title in respect of demised space.

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

The structure is on the MRN, performing a crucial role for both local and strategic traffic movement. The A27 north of Brighton is part of the SRN. If the structures failed there would be additional pressure on other parts of the MRN and the SRN created by the diversion of traffic.

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..

Structural Assessment and Principal Inspections carried out since 2009 identified defects including cracking in the roof slabs of other seafront arches built at the same time. BHCC started the Arches Renewal Programme in 2015 which include the i360 and Shelter Hall. Works on Phase 4-5 are planned to start in 2026. Inspections (June 2026) confirm the poor condition of arches in Phases 6-7, which identified areas presenting evidence of deterioration including:

- Cracking and localised spalling
- Minor areas of corrosion to steel joists
- Water ingress, staining and seepage
- Paint flaking and deterioration of finishes
- Other water-related defects to elements supporting or immediately below the deck

Extensive areas of the filler joist slab deck soffits were concealed by paint, cladding and suspended finishes, which may have obscured evidence of deterioration. Consequently, the condition of all deck soffits could not be fully verified, although the defects observed are considered representative of the exposed areas inspected. In addition, sampling and assessment of previous completed works at the demolition stage has shown the urgent need for replacement. There is no evidence from this most recent survey to alter the previous conclusions and recommendations relating to the need to replace the existing filler joist slab decks.

The observed condition of the exposed filler joist slab soffits, together with the previously completed structural assessments, supports the continued recommendation that all existing filler joist slab decks need to be replaced. June 2026 condition survey and the latest BCI scores are attached.

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

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

There is no vehicle traffic restriction but the handrails on the upper promenade are too low for modern standards and following several Health and Safety incidents and near miss reports from the public barriers have been installed to mitigate the high risk of people falling from height. This has restricted access in parts for pedestrians and cyclists along the length of the scheme.

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.

Earlier phases of the Arches Renewal Programme are structurally deficient and have needed propping to maintain their integrity and access to the public. As Phases 6-7 were built at the same time and have been exposed to similar sea front conditions all evidence and on-going inspections indicate the need to carry out urgent repairs to prevent a major incident and road closure. In the event collapse or partial failure occurred there would be a danger to life and impact on the travelling public, businesses, pedestrian's and cyclist due to traffic restrictions and diversions.

Closure of an adjacent section of A259 in 2012 and 2014 because of structural failure of the supporting arches lead to significant delays to traffic and the knock-on negative effects to business and tourism in the area for around 12 months while a localised repair was put in place.

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 handrails on the upper promenade are too low for modern standards and there is a high risk of people falling over these, as such they are barriered off which restricts the space for pedestrians and cyclists along the length of the scheme. The proposed scheme would replace these to modern standards, improving safety and enabling the safe use of the upper promenade. This is currently a specific health and safety concern for pedestrians and cyclist as the handrails protect against a fall of around 6 meters.

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 described above, there have been incidents within similar adjacent arches that have required temporary measures to manage risk, such as propping. The recent inspections show clearly that the condition of the structure is at high risk and will require significant measures by the end of 2029/30 FY. In 2014 a partial collapse of the A259 occurred when work to an arch caused a support failure. This resulted in part lane closure and extensive emergency shoring and complex rebuilding of the weakened structural areas were completed by early 2015.

As a result, there has been an increase in health and safety concerns along this stretch of the A259 which are monitored on an ongoing basis as well as the normal yearly inspections. Regular contact with the occupiers and the highlighting of increased observations (like water ingress or increased cracking) have already resulted in some temporary measures. This has included within the last two

years the introduction of steel support beams to two of the arches.

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: There are four sections to the structures with BCI Critical scores these are BS.5619= 9.72 BS.5620=55.48, BS.5621=31.00, BS.5622=21.12

BCI Ave: There are four sections to the structures with BCI Average scores these are BS.5619= 87.99, BS.5620=84.12, BS.5621=79.04, BS.5622=87.90

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.

Principal inspections are undertaken every six years and general inspections undertaken every year. The most recent Principal Inspection has been undertaken in June 2026. The major concern and risk areas are to the southern parts of the structures whereby the highway is supported on circa 1880 filler beam slabs and deteriorated brick piers. These exhibit cracking and spalling throughout. Due to the filler beam slabs being constructed of unreinforced concrete with cast in steel beams spanning in one direction its failure mechanism is in shear which is sudden and catastrophic. The load carrying capacity is of the filler beam section of the structure is 5KN/m2 which is far less than recommended 40T AWL for aspects of a highway structure that run adjacent to the highway. The kerb line has been moved in the past to protect the filler beam slabs and a pedestrian barrier mounted along the kerb line, which gives some additional protection but this does not constitute a vehicle restraint system as due to historic, conservation and large pedestrian movements a VRS is not feasible along Brighton seafront. It is intended to replace the substandard and at risk structural areas with new compliant reinforced concrete frames, slabs and foundations; that are fit for purpose and safe for use. The overall structural condition continues to deteriorate year on year, and the works are designed to arrest this and provide new areas that comply with modern highway loading criteria.

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 arches repair aligns with policy at all levels and will provide a positive difference to the area, enhancing access and economy for all users. The new arches will support GROWTH by providing improved commercial spaces within the arches that are safe to use and fit for purpose, creating jobs and attracting investment. The current employment within the affected arches is circa 152 and this is likely to increase following the works.

The arches will safely support a key part of the transport network which enables delivery of new housing, commercial and leisure developments including King Alfred (leisure centre and housing) Black Rock (conference centre), Brighton Marina (new homes) and Waterfront (commercial, retail and housing). CLEANER ENERGY would be met by ensuring the future of a much improved link for active travel, avoiding significant diversion and potential increase in vehicle trips on the surrounding network. HEALTHIER AND SAFER STREETS would be provided by enabling active travel journeys, avoiding the negative effects of traffic diverting through the City which would increase emissions and congestion whilst negatively impacting safety. BREAKING DOWN BARRIERS as it supports travel routes to schools, employment and local facilities. The improved structures will meet current design standards which open up the area for active travel journeys and maintain the important link for all users along the corridor.

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.

NPPF includes objectives, which the proposed bridge will support

▪ Economic: to help build a strong, responsive and competitive economy…

o The strengthened arches will support the economy of the local and wider area, by providing modern usable commercial space within the arches and keeping the main seafront road open to enable movement by all modes for the benefit of the wider economy.

Social: to support strong, vibrant and healthy communities…

o The strengthened arches are vital for access to local attractions including the beach and seafront open spaces as well as supporting the growth of strong and healthy communities by providing high quality cycle and pedestrian facilities which would be closed if the arches fail.

Environmental: to protect and enhance our natural, built and historic environment; including making effective use of land, improving biodiversity, using natural resources prudently, minimising waste and pollution, and mitigating and adapting to climate change, including moving to a low carbon economy

o The strengthened arches will improve active travel by providing safe pedestrian and cycle routes, minimising pollution and helping moves to a low carbon economy, reducing emissions through reduced reliance on private car travel. The arches are an iconic part of the historic

environment in Brighton, they are designated heritage assets and the proposal will enhance historic environment and make effective use of the spaces within to provide enhanced commercial space, built to modern standards

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.

Health and Safety is a priority and repairing the structures will provide a new asset that is safe and fit for purpose, delivering fresh commercial space creating additional business opportunities that will generate additional economic activities and revenue resulting in regeneration of this area. The scheme brings significant economic benefits and employment opportunities the City.

The Council's Sustainable Transport Strategy as set out in the local Transport Plan includes several aims which would be met by this scheme including; reducing danger for all road users, improving accessibility for environmentally friendly transport, reducing road traffic, pollution and congestion within and around the city, promote and improve the economic environmental and social viability of the city.

Kings Road (A259) is the main strategically and locally important transport link running the entire length of Brighton's seafront, it carried more than 26,00 vehicle per day and provides a crucial cycle link as part of National Cycle Route 2.

BHCC recently completed LUF funded Kingsway to the Sea. Enabling access to these new facilities and improved area by strengthening the arches is essential in achieving the full potential of the LUF scheme.

Redevelopment of King Alfred Site is progressing, providing a new leisure facility and residential development. Arches replacement is vital for access to by all modes.

Key city opportunity areas / development sites, referenced in the City Plan Parts 1 and 2, including The Waterfront, Black Rock sites, rely on the continued operation of the A259.

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 scheme is very well supported, forming part of the wider arches renewal programme which has brought significant improvement to the area.

The arches are heritage assets and therefore irreplaceable, therefore the design of these structures requires detailed engagement with conservation officers, planning officers and Historic England as has taken place on the earlier phases. Regular meetings are held with Stakeholders, such as the Seafront and Property Management Teams to accommodate the current and future business needs within the structures. Transport Planning, Highways and Structures teams to ensure an environment that is safe and fit for purpose. Discussions have also been held with local amenity and conservation groups such as CAG and the Regency Society.

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

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

The majority of the seafront structures that support the highway along the A259 are over 130 years old. We have a programme of replacement of defective and end of survivable life highway structures. The replacement structure programme started with the most serve and at risk areas which may cause harm to the public and transportation. Therefore all available funding has been exhausted due to being expended on previous phases of works. Due to budgetary constraints, it is impossible to undertake the critical replacement and strengthening works needed going forward on the current identified works without external funding. This current phase of works which forms part of a multi year programme is now the next priority for replacement and strengthening.

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.

Structural Assessment and Principal Inspections carried out since 2009 identified defects including cracking in the roof slabs of other seafront arches built at the same time. BHCC started the Arches Renewal Programme which has already seen the improvement of Phases 1-3 which include the i360 and Shelter Hall. Works on Phase 4-5 are planned to start in 2026. Recent inspections (June 2026) confirm the poor condition of arches in Phases 6-7, the subject of this bid, and the need to continue the renewal programme. With knowledge and experience of the arches from earlier phases, the scheme can be delivered by 2030.

The conclusion of the assessments by structural engineers is that the arches need to be addressed as soon as possible to avoid structural failure. Continued degradation will result in continued reduction of structural capacity. Current condition and degradation trends indicate [redacted] these structures will be deemed unsafe by 2030. [redacted]

The scheme complements other recent / proposed projects in the area to maintain and enhance the transport link and economic vitality of the City's seafront. The scheme fits within the City Council LTP.

The wider programme of works entails ensuring the integrity of the road support and safety of road user, as well as the enabling commercial use of the arches with installation of shops and other tourist and retail establishments under the road structure.

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 of the arches will result in closures of the A259 having significant impact on access to an important area of the city.

Traffic diverted on to lengthy diversion routes for extended periods will adversely affect traffic conditions, air quality and result in increased collision risk on less suitable more congested routes causing community severance.

Loss of key active travel facilities if existing structures become unviable - increased traffic and/or pedestrians and cycles on less suitable routes will have wider implications on road safety, air quality and health.

Failure to protect the A259 link would have a significant negative impact on the city, acting as a deterrent to business and visitors alike. The implications of this would be long lasting and not just restricted to periods of forced closures.

The failure of these arches and subsequent closure of sections of the seafront would undermine the investments already made, delaying maintenance will ultimately cost more money due to the failure of the arches and subsequent knock-on negative effects to the movement of people, traffic and the economy. These links are by all modes with not only vehicular connections along the south coast and to the central car parks but also National Cycle Network Route 2 and a wide pedestrian 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 diverted traffic resulting from westbound traffic lane closure will cause a moderate to severe level of severance for pedestrians and people along the diversion routes which affect an area home to more than 100,000 residents.

The diverted traffic will increase noise, road danger and pollution on the diversion routes making pedestrian journeys much less attractive and in some areas a considerable hinderance. The closure of the southern footway of A259 will increase journey distance for pedestrians, making walking trips less attractive or potentially unviable, leading to moderate or severe impacts.

National Cycle Network Route 2 runs along the seafront providing an incredibly valuable link for all manner of cyclists, including; family / leisure, tourists, local and long distance commuters.

Maintaining this link would not only provide for these users; if the structures failed, the subsequent diversion of traffic would not only have negative consequences on the movement of traffic but would increase conflict between traffic and other users on the diversion routes within other areas of the city.

It is likely that the closure of the cycle route would deter many cyclists from making their journeys on routes without high quality cycle infrastructure, this would result in severe severance impacts.

The severance would be experienced locally and city wide, affecting trips to leisure and tourism on the seafront, shopping and employment in the centre, school and commuting in the wider area.

i) Summarise the volumes of traffic by mode that are impacted as a result of any community severance (Maximum 250 words).

Explain the impacts on non-motorised and motorised traffic flow. Describe how diversions may differ by mode.

2024 data show 11,922 motorised vehicles travel westbound on A259 (24hr AADT). The cycle

route carries 1,466 cycles, all of whom would be affected by the structure failing and the closure of the westbound traffic lane and cycle route. The area has very high footfall though no data is readily available, a high number of pedestrians would be impacted by the failure of the structures.

Diversion routes were identified in the FBC for Phases 4-5. These will apply to Phases 6-7 and traffic flows have been applied to these based on journey distance; local (<2miles), through traffic (<10miles + 50% of trips >10miles) and strategic routes (remaining 50% of trips >10miles).

The diversion for cyclists would result in an additional 0.55km, they would be diverted to areas where there are no dedicated cycle facilities, which would increase the risk of cycle related accidents.

The structures are centrally located within the City seafront area, meaning the diverted traffic would pass through densely populated areas. The local and through traffic diversion routes would impact on a higher number of people, being home to over 100,000 people (Census 2021). Traffic on the strategic diversion would impact areas where there is a higher proportion of people over 65 years old and a higher proportion of households with some degree of deprivation.

Being central also means significant number of tourists and workers would also be affected.

The scheme supports the Council's BSIP ambitions by ensuring nearby high frequency corridors are not affected by diverted traffic

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.

Key sources for economic benefits come from journey time savings, congestion reduction and will include values for carbon in the final submission. Improvements to the road network, pedestrian pathways and accessibility to the lower promenade have already been proven (previous phases) in terms of transforming this area of the sea front into a vibrant, family friendly and inclusive space. The transformation over the last 15 years has raised the quality of the urban environment, increased sociable footfall and improved business trading and rental income for the council. Phases 6 & 7 will not only address the health and safety concerns urgently required but improve the network, employment, social cohesion with greater accessibility for all.

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)	41,841,771
Present Value Benefits (PVB)	804,526,799
Benefit to Cost Ratio (BCR)	19.2

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 costs included within the economic toolkit have been derived from benchmark rates based on the tendered construction costs for Kings Road Arches Phases 4 and 5, the closest comparable schemes within the wider regeneration programme. Tendered costs were converted into composite rates (£/m²) and applied to the proposed footprint areas of Phases 6 and 7 based on the anticipated scale and complexity of the works.

A 10% construction risk allowance has been included to account for the current level of project definition and potential scope development, design complexity, unforeseen structural repairs and other construction-related risks.

As construction is anticipated during 2028/29 to 2029/30, a 15% construction inflation allowance has been applied to reflect forecast increases in labour, plant, material and contractor costs.

Allowances for professional fees, surveys, statutory undertaker works, tenant compensation and other project-related costs have been based on standard percentage allowances informed by previous phases of the Kings Road Arches programme.

An optimism bias of 25% has been applied to reflect the early stage of project development. Whilst lower than typically applied at this stage, it reflects the greater level of certainty provided by previous phases, including a detailed understanding of likely costs, design requirements, structural interventions and delivery constraints. However, as no detailed design or intrusive investigations have yet been undertaken, a residual level of uncertainty remains.

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).

Data from BHCC's permanent traffic counters has been used to understand traffic flows and the volume of diverted traffic using 2024 data.

The diversion routes follow an accepted approach used for earlier phases of the Arches Renewal, that considered three diversion routes based on journey type (local traffic, through traffic and strategic traffic). The medium length, through traffic, diversion route has been used in the appraisal tool as it captures the largest share of diverted trips.

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 will ensure the continued economic growth of the city and enable key strategic developments to be realised. The arch strengthening will provide for a 120-year life extension of the structure and enable weak structures that also house businesses within the space/voids fronting the Lower Promenade to be refurbished and continue to provide commercial floorspace and other opportunities that will generate additional economic activity and revenue and help further regenerate the area.

These works will ensure the condition of these structures will be maintained for the next 120 years and therefore the carriageway, cycle lane (National Cycle Route) and footway of the A259 will be able to continue to perform their strategic function for vehicle and people movements approaching the city centre. The failure of the structures could significantly affect east-west movements and therefore severely impact on journey times and increase the cost of some journeys.

The works will provide opportunities to improve the public realm and further add to the attractiveness of the seafront, by reducing severance and increasing connectivity between the promenade and the Waterfront site and the city centre, in addition to decluttering and improving street furniture.

The strengthening of the city's seafront structures that are active (approximately a 2.5 km section) will also help the regeneration of the more rundown parts of the seafront. Wherever possible, works will maximise the internal areas to be brought into use (or be upgraded) as commercial premises which will add vitality, activity and new business opportunities to this location.

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

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

Click or tap here to enter text.

Present Value Costs (PVC)	Click or tap here to enter text.
Present Value Benefits (PVB)	Click or tap here to enter text.
Benefit to Cost Ratio (BCR)	Click or tap here to enter text.

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

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

2.3 Commercial Case

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

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

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

BHCC have successfully delivered earlier phases of the arches strengthening programme. The Council has a well-established management and governance arrangement for delivering major projects, including the reconstruction of Shelter Hall, seafront arches and Valley Gardens. The team has extensive expertise for delivering comparable schemes and an ongoing, long-term relationship with consultants who have assisted with delivery of these major projects and would be on hand to support this scheme if needed. The proposed team and governance structure are appended.

It is worth noting that the redevelopment of the now award-winning Shelter Hall (2016/17/18) and associated strengthening works to the highway structure has transformed the sea front area

creating a family friendly environment and huge social value increases in accessibility, wellbeing and inclusive activities. What was considered a run-down part of the City in the early to mid 2000s has become a vibrant, friendly safe space for all. This has been driven by key works to the national road network and particularly the strengthening aspect that provides better useable space underneath the A259.

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 same strategy will be adopted as recently used for Phases 4&5, using the Hampshire County Council (HCC) GEN5 Construction Framework as the preferred procurement route for delivery. The framework provides a fully compliant, pre-procured and competitive route to market, with direct access to appropriately experienced civil engineering and public realm contractors who are capable of delivering complex coastal, structural and highways works. In selecting GEN5, the Council has also drawn upon positive experience from a previous major infrastructure project, successfully delivered under the same framework, providing confidence in contractor capability, governance processes, reporting structures and dispute-avoidance culture. Furthermore, the framework benefits from specialist commercial and technical support delivered by the HCC GEN5 team, which provides additional value through procurement assurance, application of lessons learned, dispute prevention guidance, and contract management advisory support. The selected procurement approach offers the following key advantages:

- Fully compliant public-sector framework route avoiding lengthy statutory procurement processes
- Known and proven delivery partners with coastal, structural and public realm experience
- Balanced quality and cost evaluation (50/50) supporting value for money and capability assurance
- Contract price certainty using NEC4 ECC Option A with Activity Schedule
- Clear change-management and risk-allocation model including Early Warnings and Compensation Events
- Ability to achieve programme certainty via rapid mobilisation and pre-approved supply chain
- Support from the GEN5 framework management team, strengthening delivery assurance and governance
- Alignment with previous successful BHCC major project delivery
- experience

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.

Costs and risks under the NEC4 ECC Option A contract will be managed using NEC's collaborative risk-management principles, with clearly defined responsibilities, robust change-

control processes and ongoing commercial transparency. Under Option A, the contractor is required to deliver the works at the agreed Activity Schedule prices, subject only to change via formally instructed Compensation Events, providing a high degree of price certainty for the Council.

Risk identification, allocation and mitigation will be actively managed through Early Warning notifications, joint risk reviews and programme management, ensuring emerging risks are captured, assessed and acted upon promptly. Client-owned risks, including residual design risk, planning-related matters, statutory undertakers and third-party approvals, will be managed by BHCC with support from the Project Manager, whereas contractor-owned delivery risks associated with methodology, workmanship, temporary works, sequencing and site management will remain with the contractor.

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.

Various occupiers / operators within the arches, including UKPN substations, who will be engaged with to secure access and support. BHCC have powers under the Highways Act to carry out the works regardless so risk will be minimised.

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	£	£6,213,100	£15,426,200	£15,426,200	£40,915,500
LA contribution	£	£	£	£4,000,000	£4,000,000
Other contribution	£	£	£	£	£
Total costs	£	£6,213,100	£15,426,200	£19,426,200	£41,065,500

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.

Brighton & Hove City Council is responsible for a large number of structural highway assets. The estimated Gross Replacement Cost (GRC) of all the highway structures assets is approximately £530 million. This represents a significant number of socially inclusive assets, which are managed by the Council. Many of these assets are used on a daily basis and are fundamental to the economic, social and environmental wellbeing of the community. Keeping the city moving, growing the economy and making better use of public money are key corporate priorities for Brighton & Hove City Council.

In accordance with the 'Management of Highway Structures' Code of Practice, and ADEPT (Association of Directors of Environment, Economy, Planning and Transport), formally the CSS (County Surveyors Society) Bridge Group's report 'Funding for Bridge Management' the recommended annual maintenance allocation for structures (including arches) is 1% of the Gross Replacement Cost. This would equate to an annual maintenance allocation of approximately £5.3M per annum for all structures – the average combined revenue and capital maintenance expenditure for the last five years was approximately £350,000 per annum; this equates to 0.07% far less than the recommended amount.

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.

At present financial resources are being used to undertake emergency repairs, propping where required, monitoring, inspections and basic increasing maintenance due to the ageing structures condition, being over 130 years old and beyond their survivable state. The Council has completed previous phases of replacement and repair and no maintenance has been required to these new replaced areas within 12 years of the first phase. It is anticipated that no meaningful maintenance should be required for the first 15 years following construction as meticulous attention is used on suitability of materials and detailing. It is considered that only small areas such as repointing and replacement of guttering being between 15 to 30 years after construction. Minor maintenance is considered appropriate between 30 – 50 years after construction. Wholesale repointing, re-waterproofing and resurfacing of the deck from years 50-75. Furthermore, it is anticipated that a number of the existing substandard structures that support the A259 will require substantial propping in future years; this is a lived experience of past phases that have now been replaced. The propping requires that all businesses contained within the structures are evicted and thus reduces the economic and social benefit of the aera. Any structural failure to the areas of the proposed scheme would require reductions in running lanes on the A259 to reduce impact and surcharge loading and thus necessitate the need for contraflows and diversions.

d) Summarise how the cost estimate for the scheme has been developed.

Set out the basis for the estimate. For example, is it based on an estimate from similar work, developed by a quantity surveyor or a contractor quotation. Describe the inflation assumptions used and the rationale for these.

The cost estimate has been developed using benchmark rates derived from the tendered construction costs for Kings Road Arches Phases 4 and 5: most recent comparable within the wider regeneration programme. The estimate has been prepared in conjunction with the project Quantity Surveyor, who has been involved in the delivery and cost management of the previous

phases of the Kings Road Arches programme. Tendered costs were converted into composite rates (£/m²) and applied to the proposed footprint areas of the Phase 6 and 7.

A 10% construction risk allowance has been included to reflect the current stage of project development and provide for potential scope evolution, design development and unforeseen construction requirements.

A 15% construction inflation allowance has been applied to reflect anticipated increases in labour, plant, material and contractor costs between the benchmark tender dates and the anticipated construction period in 2028/29 to 2029/30. This allowance has been informed by current industry forecasts for construction tender price inflation.

Allowances for professional fees, surveys, statutory undertaker works, tenant compensation and other project-related costs have been based on experience from previous phases of the Kings Road Arches programme and standard industry percentage allowances.

An optimism bias (25%) has been applied to reflect the remaining uncertainty associated with the early stage of project development. Whilst lower than typically applied at this stage, it reflects the increased level of certainty provided by previous phases of the Kings Road Arches programme and the direct use of comparable tendered cost data in developing the estimate.

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

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

The estimate includes allowances to address the principal financial risks associated with the early stage of development of Kings Road Arches Phases 6 and 7. Key risks include the potential for additional structural repairs arising from future investigations, scope changes during design development, unforeseen site conditions, utility diversions, stakeholder requirements, statutory approvals, tenant requirements and changes to construction methodology.

A 10% construction risk allowance has been included within the construction estimate to provide contingency for project-specific risks that may arise as the design develops and more detailed information becomes available. This allowance is intended to cover potential changes in scope, increased design complexity, unforeseen construction requirements and other risks that could affect the final construction cost.

In addition, a 15% construction inflation allowance has been applied to reflect the risk of increases in labour, plant, material and contractor costs between the benchmark tender dates and the anticipated construction period in 2028/29 to 2029/30.

Given that no detailed design, intrusive investigations or condition surveys have yet been undertaken, an optimism bias of 25% has also been applied to reflect the residual uncertainty associated with the overall project scope, design requirements, approvals and delivery strategy. Whilst lower than typically applied at this stage, it reflects the increased certainty provided by the delivery of previous phases of the Kings Road Arches regeneration programme.

Collectively, these allowances provide a proportionate contingency appropriate to the current level of project definition and will be reviewed as the scheme progresses and cost certainty improves.

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

Describe the various sources of funding and their availability.

The available funding sources will come from reallocation of maintenance budget which would fund construction to avoid / minimise future ongoing maintenance.

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?

March 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.

In July 2013 BHCC set up the Seafront Overview and Scrutiny Panel to investigate and report the challenges the seafront faces and recommended how the council could work with stakeholders to meet those challenges. In response BHCC set up a Seafront Investment Board (SIB) that feeds into the Greater Brighton Economic Board. SIB sits every six weeks, is responsible for key decisions and is made up of senior officers chaired by the Executive Director Environment Development & Housing. BHCC's Annual Governance Statement demonstrates a sound system of governance.
Ensuring the council are responsible the delivery of the aims and objectives of the Council Plan, ensuring best value for City residents. A Project Board will be responsible for delivery of the project. This team will sit every month and report to the SIB. The Board will take responsibility for the Business Plan and achievement of outcomes, responsibility for the strategic direction and management of the programme or project. The Board is responsible for approving budgets, monitoring risks, quality and timeliness. Roles and responsibilities of the Board are: responsibility for the Business Plan and achievement of outcomes, ensure the scope aligns with the requirements of the stakeholder groups, Address issues with major implications for programme or project, Reconcile differences and resolve disputes, Take on responsibility for any corporate issues associated with the project, Identify and manage risks through the Risk Register, Understanding of programme and project management, Be committed to, and actively involved in pursuing the programme or project's outcomes,

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?).

THESE WILL INCLUDE THE FOLLOWING – Contractual (liquidation, unable to cover costs, suppliers liquidation), Design / stakeholder (stakeholder changes, changes to design due to unforeseen circumstances). Construction (access, utilities diversions, ground conditions), Financial (time overrun, price variance). The council will prepare and keep updated on a monthly basis throughout a project risk register for the overall programme. BHCC will work proactively with the contractor and design team to ensure all risks are identified, recorded and monitored – they will be categorised as High Medium and Low. Specific mitigation strategies will be developed to minimise risk impacts to the scheme and allocated to the specific risk owner

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.

A Project Delivery Team will be set up to be responsible for delivery of the project; the project team will sit every month and report into the Seafront Investment Board, producing all necessary reports for them. The Project Delivery Team will benefit from fitting into an existing strategic decision making board. BHCC has a well-established management and governance arrangement for delivering major projects, including the reconstruction of Shelter Hall, seafront arches and Valley Gardens. BHCC's management of the project is based on lines of accountability linking the project team to the senior leadership within the Council. this ensures progress can be monitored, accountability is taken and issues can be addressed and escalated when needed. Specifically for Phase 6&7, a Project Board will be set up to be responsible for delivery of the project. This team will sit every month and report to the SIB, producing all necessary reports for them. The members of the Project Board include the Internal Project Sponsor (Charles Field Interim Director for City Infrastructure), the Internal Project Client, representatives from areas most impacted by the project (Transport, Planning, Seafront estate and Network management) and the project's Communications Manager/Office. The function of the Board is to take responsibility for the strategic direction and management of the programme or project. The Board is responsible for approving budgets, defining and achieving benefits, and monitoring risks, quality and timeliness.

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 scheme is located within prime conservation areas. The overall Architectural design of the new structures must enhance and correspond to their setting to form a coherent aesthetical relationship with the remainder of Brighton's historic seafront. All architectural designs will be subject to full Planning Approval, conservation approval and heritage approval. All internal architectural design will be subject to building regulations and environmental health regulations approval. As with earlier phases of the arches renewal. The Council is highly aware of the importance of the structures and will continue its excellent relationships with appropriate officers and organisations within and external to the Council.

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.

The future of A259 operation secured as part of these works, the arches supporting the highway network. The structure forms part of Shoreline Management Plan which considers future operation of the seafront in response to climate change. The scheme will avoid failure of the structures and the subsequent diversions and resulting negative climate effects through increased vehicle mileage and pollution. A Flood Risk Assessment will be included as part of the planning application. With the redevelopment of the sea front area the City has already extensively reviewed being resilient to climate change and there are already a number of coastal defence improvements currently being carried out and also planned. This includes the beach areas along the A259.

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).

For earlier phases of the arches renewal programme a Carbon Management Plan (CMP) was prepared, supported by a Whole Life Carbon Assessment (WLCA) and Carbon Summary Table. The findings and understanding from these has informed the design development of the scheme to reduce carbon in the construction. The delivery of the scheme will avoid structural failure which would close the westbound traffic lane, resulting in increased vehicle emissions in sensitive areas caused by diverting traffic. Details of the traffic diversions are included within the Economic Tool.

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.

UKPN substations are within the arches and liaison with these will be ongoing through scheme development. There are key services to be improved or moved and these have been included within our main works cost analysis.

Part 3 – Governance and Declarations

3.1 Equality Analysis

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

☒ Yes

☐ No

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

An Equalities Impact Assessment will be carried out as part of the wider social impact. The Council is committed to be a City of Sanctuary with a wide and diverse population of residents and visitors. All development carried out by the council or its partners are required to make improvements to the urban environment; increasing equality, fairness, inclusion, and accessibility. Design, particularly around the streetscape targets improvements using key data:

Age:
41,735 0-15yrs (15%)
196,394 16-64yrs (71%)
38,978 65+ yrs (14%) 6% aged over 75.

Health:
51,000 (22%) adults have two or more long term health conditions
19,000 (8%) adults have mental / physical disabilities
13,500 blue badge holders in the city
6,900 disabled concessionary bus pass holders in the city

Pregnancy and Maternity:
25% of households have dependent children.

Race and Ethnicity:
19.5% are from Black and Racially Minoritised groups,
80.5% are White British.
8.3% do not speak English as their preferred or first language

Sex and Gender:
Gender of Brighton & Hove's population is even (50/50).
0.35% of people aged 16 years plus identify as non-binary

Children and school-aged
Aged 0-15 there are slightly more males (51%) than females (49%).
Age 0-4: 12,987 - Male: 6,715 (52%) - Female: 6,272 (48%)
Age 5-10: 17,384 - Male: 8,873 (51%) - Female: 8,511 (49%)
Age 11-15: 14,379 - Male: 7,386 (51%) - Female: 6,993 (49%)

Deprivation and Poverty
49,833 (17.2%) of Brighton & Hove residents live in one of the most deprived 20% of areas in England

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.

TBC – but published via the Brighton and Hove City Website Brighton & Hove City Council

.

3.3 Declarations

Senior Responsible Owner declaration

As Senior Responsible Owner for Kings Road Arches Phases 6 & 7, I hereby submit this request for approval to DfT on behalf of Brighton and Hove City Council and confirm that I have the necessary authority to do so.

I confirm that Brighton and Hove City 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: Alison McManamon

b) Signed:

c) Date: 3rd August 2026

d) Email:

Section 151 Officer declaration

As Section 151 Officer for Brighton and Hove City 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. This will be confirmed by a formal Cabinet decision in September 2026
- 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: Elizabeth Griffiths

f) Signed:

g) Date: 03/08/2026

h) Email: Elizabeth.Griffiths@brighton-hove.gov.uk