



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: Solihull Metropolitan Borough Council
- b) Scheme / structure name and LHA bridges number: Old Road Retaining Wall, Meriden
- c) Location (OS Grid Reference) of the scheme/structure (to identify location on map):
- Easting: 425150
- Northing: 281995
- d) Name of Project Manager: Matthew Derrington
- e) Email address: matthew.derrington@solihull.gov.uk
- f) Phone number: 07768615198
- 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 scheme concerns the reconstruction of the Old Road retaining wall. The structure is a stone masonry retaining wall located on the south side of Old Road, Meriden, with Birmingham Road (B4104) running above. Old Road is a single carriageway local road, while Birmingham Road is a key route between Coventry and Solihull. The wall dates from the early 19th century and is

associated with Thomas Telford's historic highway works, giving it heritage significance (non-designated).

The wall varies in height and condition along its approximately 450 m length. It is a gravity retaining structure, constructed using stone masonry with a rubble core and originally lime-bound mortar. The structure retains an embankment supporting the carriageway and footway above, while Old Road runs at a lower level adjacent to the wall.

The primary issue is structural deterioration, with sections of the wall having failed or become highly unstable. Temporary measures such as Legato blocks have been installed in some areas but do not provide a long-term solution. Deterioration is attributed to factors such as loss of mortar, vegetation growth, root damage, and poor drainage, leading to weakening of the wall and increased earth pressures.

The most critical section (approximately 120 m) is classified as severe risk and requires full reconstruction. Other sections are classified as high or intermediate risk and require remedial works, including repointing, rebedding and stabilisation. Without intervention, there is a risk of further failure, posing hazards to the footway along the B4104 above and Old Road below.

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

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

The proposed intervention comprises a combination of full reconstruction, structural stabilisation, and targeted repairs to address the deterioration and instability of the Old Road retaining wall.

The primary solution for the most critical (severe risk) section is to dismantle and completely rebuild approximately 120 m of the existing wall. The replacement structure will be a stone masonry gravity retaining wall, constructed using traditional methods and materials (including lime mortar), to remain consistent with the historic character while providing sufficient mass to resist earth pressures. This directly addresses the loss of structural integrity and instability observed in the failed section.

To improve the stability of the retained embankment, the scheme incorporates soil nailing installed behind the wall. These soil nails act to reinforce the retained soil mass, reducing lateral earth pressures acting on the structure and improving overall global stability. This measure mitigates the risk of further movement or collapse, particularly where ground conditions and slope instability contribute to failure.

For the remaining high and intermediate risk sections, the intervention consists of remedial works, including repointing, rebedding and replacement of damaged stonework, as well as vegetation removal. These repairs aim to restore the structural continuity of the wall and prevent further degradation.

Additionally, a comprehensive drainage solution (free-draining backfill with perforated pipes) will be installed to control water ingress and relieve hydrostatic pressure, which is a key factor in the wall's deterioration.

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

No part of the structure is owned by a third party. The structure is a local authority asset under Solihull Metropolitan Borough Council, with no interfaces with third-party infrastructure owners.

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

The B4104 Birmingham Road, and the corresponding footway which is supported by the Old Road retaining wall structure, is not a diversion route for the SRN. However, the B4104 originates and finishes on the A45, which runs in parallel to the B4104 while avoiding Meriden village. The A45 is a diversion route for the M6 between Junction 2 and Junction 4.

1.2 Understanding the Condition of the Structure

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

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

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

The need for intervention has been identified through a structured assessment process comprising site inspections, condition surveys, and formal engineering studies, culminating in a detailed Ground Investigation Report (2024) and a Structures Options Report (April 2025).

These assessments identified that the retaining wall exhibits significant deterioration and instability, including areas of structural failure where temporary measures such as Legato blocks have been installed. The deterioration is associated with loss of mortar, vegetation growth, drainage deficiencies, and embankment instability, leading to increased earth pressures and reduced structural performance. The wall has been categorised into severe, high-risk and intermediate risk sections, reflecting differing levels of urgency.

The most critical section (approximately 120 m) is classified as severe risk, indicating that the wall is currently unstable and requires immediate reconstruction. Furthermore, the temporary Legato blocks installed along this section currently encroach into the carriageway, restricting the available width for vehicles and impeding access for emergency services, which can delay response times and poses a risk to public safety in the event of incidents. This represents clear evidence that the structure is in need of repair at present, rather than at a future date.

The remaining sections, although less critical, still exhibit defects that will continue to worsen without intervention, leading to further instability and potential failure. Without these repairs, there is an increasing risk to public safety and highway operation. Failure to the wall would lead to a slip/settlement of the embankment with the embankment fill deposited onto Old Road, necessitating road closure.

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

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

No formal traffic restrictions are currently in place as a result of the retaining wall's condition. However, the wall includes sections classified as severe risk and unstable, indicating an immediate need for intervention.

While no permanent width limit signage is currently in place, Old Road is very narrow and constrained in geometry to the east of Eaves Green Lane. The junction with Eaves Green Lane forms a T-junction approximately midway along Old Road, beyond which the carriageway narrows

significantly. In this section, the available width is only sufficient to accommodate a single vehicle at a time, effectively operating on an informal give-and-take basis and limiting its use by larger vehicles. Old Road lacks continuous dedicated facilities for pedestrians, cyclists or equestrians, and all users are required to share the carriageway in several locations along its length.

In addition, temporary Legato block structures have been installed along sections of the retaining wall to prevent collapse. While these provide necessary short-term structural support, they further encroach into the carriageway, reducing the available running width even more.

These existing constraints significantly limit the functionality of Old Road, particularly for larger vehicles, service access, and emergency vehicles, and contribute to reduced network resilience. The combination of inherent narrow geometry and temporary stabilisation measures highlights both the existing operational limitations and the need for a permanent structural solution to restore safe and reliable use of the route.

- 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.

Old Road and the B4104 Birmingham Road are not formally forecast to be subject to formal traffic restrictions as a result of the condition of the retaining wall by the end of the 2029/2030 financial year. Traffic restrictions (including closure of Old Road) are anticipated during the scheme construction phase.

However, without intervention, the ongoing deterioration of the wall, driven by factors such as loss of structural integrity, poor drainage, and vegetation impacts are expected to increase the likelihood of further instability or collapse. This would necessitate the introduction of formal traffic restrictions, such as partial or full closure of Old Road, to maintain public safety.

- 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 Old Road retaining wall is currently subject to temporary risk management measures. Sections of the retaining wall, particularly within the eastern extent, have experienced structural failure and instability, and have been temporarily supported through the installation of precast concrete Legato blocks. These blocks have been placed against the face of the wall to provide short-term stabilisation and prevent further collapse.

While these measures reduce the immediate risk of failure, they are not a permanent engineering solution and do not restore the original structural performance of the wall. In addition, the legato blocks encroach into the carriageway of Old Road, reducing the available width and impacting the safe and efficient operation of the highway.

No propping systems or similar temporary structural supports are identified; however, the presence of Legato blocks is considered a temporary intervention to manage risk, pending full reconstruction and remedial works.

- 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.

The Old Road retaining wall is currently temporarily supported through the installation of precast concrete Legato blocks. While no further temporary measures have been prescribed before the end of the 2029/2030 financial year, it is likely that additional temporary risk management interventions are likely to be required if permanent remedial works are not undertaken.

- 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: 0

BCI Ave: 68.21

- 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.

Between 2020 and 2025 inspections at the Old Road retaining wall, there was an increase in BCI Average from 58.65 to 68.21, associated with an overall minor improvement in condition. However, this is likely attributable to temporary stabilisation measures such as the Legato blocks, which were installed between inspections. Meanwhile, the key structural elements contributing most significantly to the BCI scores are the primary and secondary retaining wall elements, which remain in poor condition and continuing to present a significant risk. They are classified as having very high importance and therefore carry the greatest weighting in the overall index.

The primary retaining wall remains the most critical element. While temporary stabilisation measures resulted in a very marginal improvement in score between 2020 and 2025, the element remains in poor condition, reflecting ongoing defects such as masonry deterioration, loss of mortar, displacement of wall units and localised instability. The scale and severity of these defects are evidenced by the need for these temporary stabilisation measures, indicating that the underlying structural issues persist.

The condition of the foundations remain largely the same between 2020 and 2025, with moderate severity of degradation widespread across the structure.

While the BCI Average has marginally improved over the last five years, the BCI Critical score remains at 0.00, indicating that the most severe defects within the structure have not been resolved. This demonstrates that the most critical element continues to be in very poor condition, and that underlying structural risks persist despite temporary improvements.

- 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.

This scheme supports the Government's economic growth mission by maintaining critical local transport infrastructure and improving network reliability, which underpins economic activity and productivity.

The Old Road retaining wall supports Birmingham Road (B4104), a key route connecting Solihull and Coventry. Its current deterioration is constraining Old Road below, limiting access for larger vehicles, servicing traffic and emergency services. The already narrow geometry, further restricted by temporary stabilisation measures, reduces network efficiency and reliability. Without intervention, further deterioration would likely result in formal restrictions or full closure of Old Road, leading to disrupted journeys, increased travel times and reduced accessibility.

While the B4104 is not itself an SRN diversion route, it connects directly to the A45, which operates as a diversion route for the M6 between Junctions 2 and 4. Maintaining the integrity of this local route therefore supports the resilience of the wider network, particularly during incidents affecting the SRN.

The scheme will deliver economic benefits through improving connectivity and productivity by ensuring reliable movement of people, goods and services, supporting local businesses through continued access for deliveries, servicing and customers, and enhancing network resilience by reducing the risk of disruption. Construction will generate direct employment and support specialist supply chains, including heritage skills. Additionally, preventing unplanned closures will minimise economic losses associated with delays and diversions, ensuring the network remains fit for purpose in supporting local and regional economic activity.

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

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

The scheme supports a range of wider Government policy objectives aligned with the UK's current missions by maintaining and enhancing a critical section of local highway infrastructure, delivering safety, resilience and sustainability benefits.

In relation to the "Strong Foundations" mission, the scheme ensures the continued operation of Old Road and the overlying Birmingham Road (B4104), avoiding disruption that would arise from further deterioration or potential failure of the retaining wall. By restoring structural integrity and preventing unplanned closures, it supports economic stability, reliable local connectivity and resilience of routes that interface with the A45 corridor, an SRN diversion route.

The scheme also supports the "An NHS Fit for the Future" and "Safer Streets" missions by improving emergency access and overall road safety. Temporary Legato blocks currently reduce carriageway width and can impede emergency vehicles; their removal and replacement with a

permanent solution will enable more reliable response times. The removal of the Legato blocks will increase the available carriageway width, providing additional space for pedestrians and cyclists. This will reduce potential conflicts between active travel users and vehicles, lowering the risk of collisions and improving overall safety. In turn, this reduces the number of road traffic incidents and associated injuries, easing pressure on emergency and healthcare services and contributing to improved public health outcomes.

The proposal aligns with the “Break Down Barriers to Opportunity” mission by maintaining access for residents and businesses, ensuring continued connectivity to services, employment and education.

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 Old Road retaining wall is a local priority due to its critical role in maintaining safe and reliable operation of both Old Road and the overlying Birmingham Road, which together support connectivity within Meriden and the wider Solihull Borough. The need to maintain a resilient and accessible highway network is consistent with Solihull’s strategic transport and asset management objectives.

SMBC’s Highway Infrastructure Asset Management Plan identifies highway structures as essential to the Borough’s economic vitality and emphasises the importance of maintaining assets in a condition that is safe and fit for purpose through a long-term, whole-life approach. The current deterioration, combined with the presence of temporary stabilisation measures, demonstrates that the wall is no longer meeting these service expectations and requires priority intervention to prevent further decline and increased safety risk.

The scheme also aligns with the Solihull Connected Transport Strategy, which prioritises maintaining a reliable transport network that supports access to jobs, services and local centres. Old Road serves local residents and businesses, including hospitality venues, and forms part of a recreational walking route. Current constraints limit access for larger vehicles and emergency services, and intervention will restore safe and reliable access for all users.

Furthermore, the scheme supports the resilience of journeys along the B4104 corridor, which connects with the A45 and contributes to wider network performance. By preventing potential closures and avoiding disruption, the scheme helps maintain connectivity, reduce delays and support local economic activity, while also minimising the environmental impacts associated with diversionary traffic.

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 project is at an early stage and limited stakeholder engagement has taken place to date.

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 Authority applies a risk-based approach to prioritising maintenance works across its structures stock, aligned with current national guidance. Structures are subject to routine inspections at

defined intervals, with condition data recorded at an element level. This information feeds into a long-term asset management plan, which is periodically updated to forecast required capital expenditure across structures identified as requiring intervention.

Each structure is assigned a condition score based on identified defects, considering their severity, extent and associated risks, including estimated remedial costs. To inform prioritisation, the condition score is considered alongside additional factors, including route hierarchy, structural importance, impact of failure, and specific safety risks. These factors are combined to produce an overall prioritised ranking, allowing the Authority to identify funding requirements and any shortfall against the available Bridges Capital allocation.

The Old Road retaining wall has been subject to routine inspection and maintenance, with known defects historically managed through localised and reactive interventions, including the installation of temporary stabilisation measures such as Legato blocks. While these measures have mitigated immediate risks, they do not address the underlying structural issues.

Recent inspections have identified that the condition of the wall, particularly the primary retaining structure, remains poor and that defects persist despite interim measures. The presence of temporary works, ongoing instability and constrained geometry increases the risk to public safety and network operation.

As a result, the scheme has been advanced within the Authority's programme as a higher priority intervention, requiring a comprehensive, permanent solution rather than continued reactive maintenance.

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

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

The Old Road retaining wall has been selected for submission to the Structures Fund due to the increasing risk posed to public safety, its importance in supporting both Old Road and the overlying Birmingham Road (B4104), and the level of investment required to deliver a permanent solution, which exceeds the Authority's available annual bridges capital allocation.

The structure is currently performing below acceptable standards, as evidenced by the presence of temporary stabilisation measures, including legato blocks, installed to prevent collapse. This demonstrates that the wall has reached a critical point in its service life. While these measures reduce immediate risk, they do not address the underlying defects and continue to constrain the carriageway.

The retaining wall supports a key part of the local highway network. Without intervention, existing instability is expected to worsen, increasing the risk of structural failure and the need for traffic restrictions or full closure of Old Road, resulting in reduced accessibility, disruption to local movement and increased community severance. There are also potential implications for the safe operation of the overlying B4104, affecting wider network resilience.

The scheme provides a comprehensive, permanent solution, including reconstruction, embankment stabilisation and targeted repairs, restoring safe carriageway conditions and improving accessibility for all users. It will also avoid costly emergency works and wider disruption, delivering long-term safety, resilience and value for money in line with the Structures Fund objectives.

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 this scheme would result in progressive deterioration of the Old Road retaining wall, increasing the risk of structural failure and necessitating costly reactive safety measures. This would likely lead to the introduction of formal traffic restrictions or full closure of Old Road, significantly impacting local accessibility – particularly for residents of Old Road.

Closure or restriction of Old Road would contribute to community severance, particularly for residents and businesses that rely on the route for day-to-day access. Alternative routes in the area are limited and may be indirect, resulting in longer diversion routes, increased journey times and reduced connectivity to services, employment and education. The constrained nature of the surrounding network means these impacts would be disproportionately felt at a local level.

There would also be implications for the operation of the overlying Birmingham Road (B4104), with potential risks to its structural support and increased pressure on adjacent routes. Given its connection to the A45 corridor, which serves as an SRN diversion route, disruption could have wider network resilience impacts, particularly during incidents on the strategic network.

In addition, continued reliance on temporary measures would further restrict carriageway width and compromise safety, including reduced access for emergency services. This would increase the likelihood of incidents and delays in response times.

Overall, not delivering the scheme would result in increased safety risks, reduced network resilience, community severance, and wider social and economic disruption, alongside the need for more costly reactive interventions in the future.

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

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

The scheme will help prevent the likelihood of community severance by maintaining safe and reliable access along Old Road for all transport modes, including pedestrians, cyclists, vehicles, and emergency services. The current condition of the retaining wall, combined with constrained carriageway width and temporary stabilisation measures, already limits accessibility and usability of the route.

Old Road provides local access to residential properties, businesses and hospitality venues, including a public house and restaurant, as well as forming part of the route used by 'A Coventry Way', a well-established 65km circular recreational walking route around the city. This route attracts both local residents and visitors, supporting active travel and local economic activity. Any restriction or closure would interrupt this walking route, reducing footfall for local businesses on Old Road and potentially requiring lengthy or unattractive diversions via alternative routes that may not be suitable or direct.

If the retaining wall continues to deteriorate, this could lead to instability of the footway on B4104 Birmingham Road. Given its connection to the A45 corridor, which functions as a Strategic Road Network (SRN) diversion route, disruption at this location could have wider network resilience impacts, particularly during incidents affecting the strategic network.

By delivering a permanent solution, the scheme will restore full carriageway functionality to Old Road, ensuring that all users can continue to access the route safely and conveniently. This will maintain connectivity within the community, support access to local amenities and services, and avoid the social and economic impacts associated with severance

- 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.

No traffic surveys have been undertaken at this stage, but it is expected that traffic volumes are relatively low (i.e. <250 vehicles per day).

2.2 Economic Case

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

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

Describe the main benefits the scheme is expected to deliver.

The scheme will generate a range of economic benefits by improving the reliability, safety and functionality of the local highway network, supporting both local activity and wider connectivity.

The main economic benefits of the scheme stem from the avoidance of elongated journey times resulting from diversions if the structure were to fail. The current constrained conditions on Old Road, combined with the risk of deterioration, increase the likelihood of disruption. Without intervention, restrictions or closure would result in diversionary routes, leading to longer journey times for residents, businesses and service providers. The scheme prevents these impacts by maintaining a direct and reliable route.

In addition, the scheme will reduce long-term maintenance costs by replacing the current reliance on temporary stabilisation measures and reactive repairs with a permanent solution, improving whole-life asset performance and reducing future inspection, monitoring and emergency intervention requirements.

Environmental benefits arise through the avoidance of increased vehicle mileage and emissions associated with diversionary routes. By maintaining a direct route, the scheme reduces congestion and supports more sustainable travel patterns.

Finally, the construction phase will generate direct employment and supply chain activity, including specialist engineering and heritage works, contributing to short-term economic stimulus.

- 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)	£ 1,243,438
Present Value Benefits (PVB)	£ 1,807,778
Benefit to Cost Ratio (BCR)	1.5

- 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 high-level scheme cost estimate has been prepared for the works. The estimate has been developed with QS input, based on quantities measured from the concept design, and benchmarked against previous schemes

- 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 volumes have been estimated. Diversion journey lengths have been measured using journey planning software for the most logical route.

- 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 deliver a range of non-monetised economic, environmental and social benefits that are not fully captured within quantitative appraisal.

From a social perspective, the scheme will improve safety and accessibility along Old Road by removing temporary Legato blocks and restoring full carriageway width. This will reduce conflict between vehicles, pedestrians and cyclists, improve conditions for non-motorised users, and enhance emergency service access, contributing to better public safety outcomes. The scheme will also prevent community severance, maintaining connectivity for residents and businesses, as well as preserving access along A Coventry Way, a recreational walking route that supports health and wellbeing.

From an environmental perspective, the scheme will minimise the need for diversionary routes that would increase vehicle mileage, congestion and emissions. By delivering a long-term solution, it reduces the likelihood of carbon-intensive emergency works and adopts a more sustainable, whole-life approach, including reuse of existing materials where possible.

From an economic and place-based perspective, the scheme will support local vitality by maintaining access to businesses and hospitality venues along Old Road, helping to sustain customer activity and local spend. It will also protect the function of the overlying B4104 corridor, contributing to wider network resilience.

In addition, there are heritage benefits, as the scheme will sensitively repair and reconstruct a historic retaining wall associated with early 19th-century infrastructure, preserving the character of the local environment.

Overall, these non-monetised impacts strengthen the case for intervention by demonstrating wider benefits beyond those captured in economic modelling.

- 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

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.

SMBC demonstrates strong capacity and experience in delivering comparable bridge and highway infrastructure schemes. The authority has already commissioned AtkinsRéalis through its Professional Services Framework Contract (PSFC) to undertake the structural assessment, options appraisal and preliminary design for the Old Road Retaining Wall. This provides continuity of technical knowledge and ensures that experienced designers familiar with the asset will support detailed design in 2026/27, reducing delivery risk.

SMBC also has proven experience delivering similar schemes, most notably the Fillongley Road Bridge Replacement (completed in 2022), which provides a relevant precedent in terms of scale, complexity and procurement approach. In addition, the authority is currently delivering the A45 Damson Parkway Junction Improvements, demonstrating its ongoing capability to manage large infrastructure projects through design, procurement and construction phases.

For construction, SMBC has access to established and well tested procurement routes, including SCAPE, where Balfour Beatty is the regional civil engineering contractor. This framework has been successfully utilised on previous schemes, providing confidence in programme certainty, cost control and contractor competence. Additional flexibility is available via regional frameworks such as Midlands Highway Alliance MSF4 and Warwickshire County Council frameworks.

The authority is likely to adopt an NEC Engineering and Construction Contract (Option A), reflecting best practice and prior experience.

Any capacity gaps are effectively mitigated through the use of experienced framework consultants and contractors, ensuring sufficient technical, commercial and delivery capability to progress the scheme to completion.

- 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.

AtkinsRéalis have been engaged by the Authority through the Professional Services Framework Contract (PSFC) to undertake all works to date on the Old Road retaining wall scheme, including assessment, options appraisal and preliminary design. It is anticipated that AtkinsRéalis will continue to support the Authority through the PSFC in progressing detailed design during the 2026/27 financial year.

The authority has several established routes to market for the pre-construction and construction phases of the proposed replacement scheme. It is anticipated that delivery through SCAPE will be explored with Balfour Beatty regional civils in place as the principal contractor. SCAPE has and is being utilised by the authority on previous large scale infrastructure schemes such as Fillongley Road Bridge Replacement completed in 2022 and A45 Damson Parkway Junction Improvements which is ongoing and due for delivery between the 2026-2028 financial years.

Additionally, the authority has access to regional framework contracts such as Midlands Highway Alliances Medium Schemes Framework (4) and Warwickshire County Councils Provision of Engineering and Construction Framework (2023). Any mechanism for delivery will need to be reported and approved through internal governance procedures prior to any award of contract.

Based on the Fillongley Road Bridge Replacement Scheme, it is likely that the authority would seek to deliver the proposed works utilising an NEC Engineering Construction Contract arrangement, likely to be an Option A contract. This will be subject to detailed design and procurement of the delivery phases.

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

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

The delivery of the Old Road retaining wall scheme is subject to several key risks that could impact programme certainty and delivery within Structures Fund timescales.

A primary risk relates to the presence of multiple statutory undertakers' assets, including water (Severn Trent), gas (Cadent), electricity (National Grid) and telecommunications (Neos Networks) within both Old Road and B4104 Birmingham Road. The exact location and depth of these utilities is uncertain and must be verified through surveys, with potential requirements for diversion, protection or permits to dig, all of which may introduce delays.

There are also risks associated with the unknown construction and foundation details of the existing wall, as no historical drawings are available. Unforeseen ground or structural conditions during demolition and excavation may require design changes or additional works.

The site is constrained, requiring full closure of Old Road during construction and careful traffic management, which introduces programme risk and sequencing challenges. Works adjacent to live highways also present safety risks that must be managed.

Environmental and ecological constraints, including vegetation removal and potential protected species, may impose seasonal restrictions and require mitigation measures.

In addition, the heritage sensitivity of the structure requires reconstruction to match existing materials and methods, which may limit construction approaches and extend delivery time.

The scheme also requires third-party engagement, including statutory undertakers and the Council's Conservation Officer, with further consultation and approvals needed during detailed design.

These risks will be mitigated through early surveys, stakeholder engagement, phased construction planning, and adherence to asset protection and heritage requirements to minimise impacts on programme delivery.

- 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.

N/A

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	£	£	£1,159,083	£261,297	£1,420,380
LA contribution	£	£110,000	£	£	£110,000
Other contribution	£	£	£	£	£
Total costs	£	£110,000	£1,159,083	£261,297	£1,530,380

- 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.

SMBC has sought to manage the Old Road retaining wall within its existing bridges capital allocation through routine inspections, reactive maintenance and localised repairs, consistent with its wider asset management approach. Defects have historically been monitored and mitigated where feasible, including the installation of temporary stabilisation measures to manage immediate risks.

This approach is no longer viable. Recent inspections and assessments have identified persistent structural defects and instability, particularly within the primary retaining wall, demonstrating that the structure now requires major intervention. While temporary measures have reduced immediate risks, they do not address the underlying causes of deterioration and continue to constrain the operation of Old Road. The scale and cost of the required works exceeds the Authority's annual bridges capital allocation, which must be distributed across a wider portfolio of assets. Delivery through existing budgets would therefore require displacement of other high priority schemes and is not considered affordable.

SMBC allocates funding using a risk-based prioritisation framework, with structures scored based on condition, defect severity, route hierarchy and consequence of failure. These outputs inform a rolling investment programme targeting the highest-risk assets.

The condition of the Old Road retaining wall has now reached a point where defects can no longer be effectively managed through routine or reactive maintenance, and the risk to public safety and network operation has increased accordingly. Key challenges delaying earlier intervention include constrained funding, progressive deterioration, and the need for a comprehensive, permanent solution. External funding is therefore required to deliver a sustainable outcome

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

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

Without the proposed scheme, the Old Road retaining wall would continue to be managed through reactive maintenance and temporary stabilisation measures, such as the existing Legato blocks. This approach would result in ongoing inspection, monitoring and intervention costs, including repeated maintenance of masonry defects (e.g. repointing, rebedding and vegetation removal) and continued installation or adjustment of temporary works. Over time, these costs would increase as the wall condition deteriorates further.

There is also a significant risk of unplanned emergency works arising from further instability or localised failure. Such interventions are typically more costly and less efficient than planned works, often requiring urgent mobilisation, traffic management and temporary road closures. In the event of partial or full structural failure, costs would escalate substantially due to the need for major reconstruction under emergency conditions, alongside wider economic impacts from disruption.

In contrast, the proposed scheme provides a permanent, whole-life solution, including reconstruction of the most critical section of wall and stabilisation of the retained embankment using soil nails. This will address the root causes of deterioration, improving durability and reducing susceptibility to defects such as water ingress and wall displacement. The incorporation of improved drainage measures will further reduce long-term maintenance requirements by limiting deterioration mechanisms.

The scheme is designed to achieve a design life of up to 120 years for rebuilt sections, significantly reducing future intervention frequency. As a result, it minimises whole-life costs by reducing planned maintenance, eliminating the need for temporary works, and avoiding the high costs associated with emergency repairs and disruption.

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 scheme cost estimate has been developed by AtkinsRéalis as a high-level estimate based on professional judgement and previous experience of comparable retaining wall and structures schemes. It has not been derived from a detailed bill of quantities or contractor tender, but instead reflects an early-stage estimate informed by typical construction and project cost components.

The estimate is split into two main elements. The core construction cost, including direct works, preliminaries, traffic management and contractor overheads and profit, is estimated at approximately £575,000. In addition, a range of other scheme-related costs (including design development, project and programme management, surveys, public consultation, risk and contingency allowances, Early Contractor Involvement (ECI), and potential utility diversions or protection) are estimated at a further £320,000. This gives a total indicative scheme cost in the range of £1.5million.

No specific inflation assumptions have been applied at this stage, and the estimate is presented in current prices without adjustment for future cost escalation. Future iterations of the estimate will incorporate inflation and optimism bias in line with standard appraisal guidance once the scheme progresses and greater cost certainty is available.

Overall, the estimate provides a reasonable order-of-magnitude cost to inform funding discussions, with the understanding that further development will refine accuracy.

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 key project risks, that may have a significant impact on the forecast scheme costs have been identified in Question 2.3c. A principal risk relates to utilities and statutory undertakers' apparatus, where the location, depth and condition of assets are not fully defined. Potential diversion, protection or coordination with asset owners may introduce additional cost and programme delays, particularly where specialist working methods or approvals are required.

There is also uncertainty associated with the existing structure and ground conditions, including unknown foundation details and the potential for unforeseen conditions during demolition and excavation. This could result in design changes, additional materials or extended construction duration, increasing both direct costs and preliminaries.

The scheme is located in a constrained environment, requiring full road closures and complex traffic management, which introduces risk to both programme and cost if construction is extended. In addition, heritage and environmental constraints, including requirements to match original construction methods and manage vegetation or protected species, may limit construction approaches and increase costs.

Further risks include stakeholder and approval requirements, such as drainage consents, conservation considerations and utility agreements, which may impact programme and lead to additional professional and management costs.

These risks are collectively captured within the £495,000 allowance for other costs, which includes a provision for contingency. Given the early stage of scheme development, this represents a proportionally high contingency allowance to reflect current uncertainties. As the scheme

progresses through detailed design and site investigation, risks will be better defined, allowing contingency to be refined and potentially reduced.

- 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.

It is anticipated that approximately £110,000 will be allocated from the authority's annual bridges capital allocation, funded from the appropriate financial years. This funding will support the progression of the detailed design stage, associated internal officer fees linked to general project management, design coordination, and oversight activities, as well as any further consultation or engagement activities and internal governance approvals required to advance the scheme to the pre-construction phase.

The authority therefore is seeking to secure the full capital funding required for the physical delivery of the scheme through the Structures Fund. This request totals £1.5m and is intended to cover all remaining phases of the project after detailed design, including pre-construction activities such as site investigations, procurement processes, and contractor mobilisation, in addition to the main construction works themselves. It is noted that this figure remains subject to detailed design and procurement of works. At present, it is assumed that no supplementary funding sources will be pursued, and the scheme will be reliant on the Structures Fund allocation for delivery.

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?

2028

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

2029

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

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

The delivery of the scheme is governed through a structured, multi-level management framework led by SMBC as the accountable body. From the current development stage through to completion, the scheme will be managed in accordance with the UK Central Project Management Framework, ensuring robust oversight, control, and compliance. The scheme will be delivered under SMBC's established governance framework, with the Council retaining statutory

responsibility, commercial authority and strategic oversight.

Overall Delivery Approach: SMBC retains statutory responsibility, strategic oversight, and commercial authority, while private sector partners deliver technical design, construction, and key infrastructure elements under its direction. Governance is structured across:

Strategic level – SMBC Cabinet (funding, approvals, oversight)

Programme level – UKC Portfolio and Programme Boards (coordination and assurance)

Project level – Project Board, Technical Steering Group and Project Team (delivery)

The scheme will progress through defined Gateway stages (Detailed design → design freeze → construction → handover), ensuring formal review and approval before advancing.

Technical design, construction and elements of the proposed scheme will be delivered by private sector partners under SMBC direction. SMBC will adopt the NEC4 ECC, which offers a comprehensive framework for identifying, managing, and mitigating the risks of delay or disruption to anticipated services. Key contingency mechanisms include early warning procedures, programme re-sequencing, Compensation Event processes, risk allocation under the chosen ECC Option, and structured governance of cost and time contingencies. These arrangements ensure that any disruption is managed proactively, transparently, and collaboratively, minimising impact on service delivery and maintaining value for money.

- 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?).

A structured approach to risk management will be embedded throughout the scheme lifecycle. Risk Workshops will be undertaken on a regular basis to inform the development of a comprehensive Risk Register. This will capture risks identified for further design and delivery stages, with each risk assigned a clear owner and supported by defined mitigation measures to eliminate or reduce potential impacts. Risk and issue management will be fully integrated within the scheme's governance and assurance framework, ensuring transparency, accountability, and timely escalation and decision-making. As set out in Section 2.3c, the key delivery risks relate to the unknown utility locations and ground conditions. These risks are being actively managed through the design development process. The key financial risk at this stage is uncertainty around the design level and the potential requirement for land acquisition and additional highway works. The risk is being managed through the Detailed Design process. Early Contractor Involvement will further reduce delivery risks by incorporating construction expertise into design development, improving buildability and programme certainty. The use of established framework contracts reduces procurement risk and provides greater cost certainty. Contingency allowances will be maintained and reviewed as the design develops, and any cost pressures will be managed through value engineering and scope optimisation where necessary. This proactive and structured approach ensures that risks are identified early, managed effectively, and maintained within acceptable tolerances, supporting confident and 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.

To ensure that the project and its implementation remain fully compliant with all funding requirements and conditions, the appointed Project Manager will be supported by SMBC's Assurance Team. This team provides specialist guidance on adherence to funding regulations, policies, and reporting obligations. The assurance function, located within the SMBC Funding and Commercialisation Team, is further supported by SMBC's Procurement and Finance teams, which work closely with Assurance on all matters relating to externally funded projects. SMBC will continuously monitor project progress against agreed timescales, budget parameters, and key milestones. This will ensure that progress, risks, and issues are identified, reported, and escalated in a timely manner. Regular updates will be provided to project partners, subcontractors, and stakeholders, and SMBC will work collaboratively with all parties to address emerging issues. These governance and assurance processes will also apply to any technical or professional consultants appointed as part of the project. In particular: All project expenditure will be approved under defined cost headings, with every item of spend, regardless of value, fully evidenced and traceable to individual transactions. Outputs and outcomes will be monitored throughout the project lifecycle in accordance with the agreed benefits realisation framework. This includes ensuring that all deliverables align with expected benefits such as business growth support, new business creation, job generation, and contributions to public sector reform.

- 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.

An 'Environmental and Planning Appraisal' and a 'Preliminary Ecological Appraisal Report' have been prepared to assess the required consenting route and an indication of the likely permissions from other bodies. The Environmental and Planning Appraisal concluded that, based on the concept design, the proposed scheme could benefit from Permitted Development rights under Schedule 2, Part 9, Class A of the Town and Country Planning (General Permitted Development) Order 2015. It was also concluded that the proposed works do not exceed the threshold to trigger EIA screening under Schedule 2, Category 10(f) of the Town and Country Planning (Environmental Impact Assessment) Regulations 2017. However, it is noted that if the Local Planning Authority (also SMBC) decide that permitted development rights cannot be utilised, or if the proposed works falls outside the limits of permitted development (i.e. due to design changes), a full planning application under the TCPA would be required.

- 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 scheme development has incorporated measures to address climate-related risks and enhance the long-term resilience of the highway network, informed by site investigations, environmental assessments and design development. A key climate risk at this location is water ingress and poor drainage, which are recognised contributors to deterioration of the existing retaining wall. The proposed design includes an improved back-of-wall drainage system, incorporating free-draining material and perforated pipework to manage groundwater and surface water effectively. This will reduce the risk of hydrostatic pressure build-up, erosion and freeze-thaw

damage, all of which may be exacerbated by more intense rainfall events under future climate scenarios. The scheme also addresses slope stability and extreme weather resilience through the introduction of soil nailing to stabilise the embankment, ensuring the structure can withstand increased loading and variability in ground conditions associated with climate change. These measures reduce the likelihood of landslip or structural failure during prolonged rainfall or extreme weather events. Material selection and construction methods have been designed to ensure durability and adaptability, including the use of traditional stone masonry with lime-based mortar, which provides flexibility and permeability, helping to accommodate thermal movement and moisture variation. In addition, the scheme reduces the need for reactive interventions and emergency repairs, which are typically more vulnerable to disruption from extreme weather. By delivering a robust, long-life solution, the scheme ensures that both Old Road and the overlying B4104 remain operational and safe under future climate conditions, thereby supporting the resilience of the wider highway network.

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

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

A Carbon Management Plan (CMP), aligned with PAS 2080 principles, will be developed in the next design stage. The CMP will provide a summary of potential mitigation measures such as material optimisation, efficient construction methods and reduced energy use. The CMP will also establish clear roles, responsibilities and governance for carbon management, together with outline targets or ambitions and a commitment to monitor and review carbon performance as the design develops. In line with PAS 2080, it would emphasise early-stage decision-making, collaboration with the supply chain, and the integration of carbon considerations into design, procurement and delivery. A carbon reduction opportunities log will be maintained to record options assessed, decisions made, and measures implemented as the scheme progresses. This will set out a proportionate approach to identifying, managing and reducing whole-life carbon associated with the scheme. A key consideration is the use of materials and construction methods aligned with the existing structure, including the reuse of stone masonry where feasible and the use of lime-based mortar. Reusing existing materials reduces embodied carbon associated with new material production and transport, while lime mortar provides a lower-carbon alternative to cement-based materials and improves long-term durability. The scheme also incorporates design measures that reduce whole-life carbon, including the introduction of improved drainage systems and embankment stabilisation (soil nailing), which address the root causes of deterioration. This reduces the need for frequent maintenance, reactive repairs and future reconstruction, thereby lowering long-term carbon emissions associated with ongoing intervention.

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

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

The scheme is affected by several statutory undertakers, including Severn Trent Water, Cadent Gas, National Grid Electricity Distribution and Neos Networks, with apparatus located within both Old Road and the overlying Birmingham Road (B4104). These utilities present a key constraint to

delivery due to their proximity to the retaining wall and the proposed construction activities, particularly excavation, soil nailing and reconstruction works. Initial engagement has been undertaken through the LSBUD enquiry process, which has identified affected asset owners and confirmed the presence of buried services within the scheme area. However, further detailed engagement will be required during the next stage to confirm asset locations, depths and protection requirements, as existing records are indicative and not guaranteed to be accurate. The presence of utilities introduces potential programme and cost risks, including the need for diversion or protection works, asset owner approvals, and potential supervision requirements during construction. These may affect sequencing and delivery timescales if not resolved early. The proposed works also introduce a risk to existing utilities, as excavation and ground stabilisation activities may impact support to buried apparatus, particularly where foundations are unknown or where drainage and soil conditions are altered. Deterioration of the existing retaining wall may already pose a risk to utility stability through ground movement or loss of support. These risks will be managed through early utility surveys, trial holes and permit-to-dig procedures, alongside ongoing coordination with asset owners. The delivery programme will allow for utility-related activities, including potential diversions, and asset protection requirements will be incorporated into the construction methodology to minimise disruption and ensure safe delivery of the scheme.

Part 3 – Governance and Declarations

3.1 Equality Analysis

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

☐ Yes

☒ No

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

An Equality Impact Assessment (EqIA) will be undertaken for the proposed Old Road retaining wall scheme. The EqIA will support compliance with the Equality Act 2010 and the Public Sector Equality Duty (PSED), ensuring that the scheme is developed with due regard to eliminating discrimination, advancing equality of opportunity, and fostering good relations between different groups.

The assessment will consider possible impacts on the protected characteristic groups (PCGs), including age, disability, gender reassignment, marriage and civil partnership, pregnancy and maternity, race, religion or belief, sex, and sexual orientation. Where relevant, additional groups such as carers and those experiencing rural isolation may also be considered.

The scope of the EqIA will include a structured review of potential impacts arising from the scheme during both construction and operation. This will cover key themes such as accessibility, safety, connectivity, temporary diversions, and the overall user experience of the transport network, recognising that rural contexts can present specific challenges for inclusive access.

The assessment will involve:

- A review of baseline demographic and relevant local evidence
- Identification and appraisal of potential impacts on PCGs
- Consideration of intersectionality where impacts may overlap
- Development of proportionate mitigation measures and enhancement opportunities

The approach will align with Solihull Council's Equality, Diversity and Inclusion (EDI) Strategy, supporting its focus on understanding communities, reducing inequalities, and designing services that meet diverse needs.

Findings will be clearly documented, with recommendations to inform the design, delivery and operation of the scheme, alongside proportionate monitoring considerations where appropriate.

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.

www.solihull.gov.uk

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: Dean Ward
- b) Signed: 
- c) Date: 31/07/2026
- d) Email: dean.ward@solihull.gov.uk

Section 151 Officer declaration

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

- 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: Andrew Felton
- f) Signed: 
- g) Date: 31 July 2026
- h) Email: andrew.felton@solihull.gov.uk