



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: Kent County Council
- b) Scheme / structure name and LHA bridges number: A226 Galley Hill
- c) Location (OS Grid Reference) of the scheme/structure (to identify location on map):
- Easting: 560711
- Northing: 174878
- d) Name of Project Manager: [REDACTED]
- e) Email address: [REDACTED]
- f) Phone number: [REDACTED]
- g) What type of eligible structure would your scheme address? (select all that apply)

☐	Bridges	☐	Cutting/embankment
☐	Fly-overs	☐	Tunnels
☐	Retaining walls	☒	Local highway repairs due to landslip
☐	Culverts	☒	Local highway repairs due to collapse
☐	Other structure type (please specify): Carriageway reconstruction due to geological instability		

- 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 A226 Galley Hill forms part of the Kent Resilient Network (KRN), a network which aims to protect economic activity in the county, providing access to key services and infrastructure. The A226 is a key strategic highway link between Dartford and Gravesend, broadly parallel to the A2 and is the only other continuous east-west route between the towns suitable for HGVs. As such, it performs a key strategic function within the local and sub-regional highway network.

Galley Hill passes over a raised east-west linear ridge of chalk. The chalk spine was formed as a result of historical quarrying in the 19th century where excavation was carried out on both the north and south sides of the road alignment.

On 10 April 2023, a significant section of this chalk spine failed, resulting in a landslip which removed part of the carriageway and footway. Buried utility infrastructure in the highway was substantially damaged affecting local telephone and broadband services. Geotechnical investigations of the spine have confirmed that disaggregated material extends the full width of the spine at the location of the collapse.

The scale of the collapse presents an ongoing safety risk and has necessitated the continued closure of the route. This has led to sustained disruption across the wider network, with traffic diverted onto less suitable routes, impacting communities and businesses. In the absence of funding the highway is unable to be reinstated.

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 the reinstatement of the A226 Galley Hill through the delivery of a permanent structural solution, alternative to using the existing chalk spine. Options for the scheme have been refined to a bridge structure, the exact form of which is to be developed in a subsequent design stage. The bridge is proposed to be in line with the former route lost to the landslip, with highway connections into the existing A226. As such the solution is effectively a like-for-like replacement of the route, with improved active travel facilities, and so will avoid lengthening the journey time compared to the original route.

Restoration of the route is vital for the successful delivery of key strategic housing allocations and the reinstatement of the sustainable transport Fastrack bus network. As part of the Kent Resilient Network, the scheme is also crucial for the efficient management of highway network flows and will become increasingly important with the potential delivery of Lower Thames Crossing.

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

The A226 Galley Hill is designated highway. As the highway authority, Kent County Council's (KCC) ownership physically extends to the top two spit-depths of the soil (approximately 45cm) with rights below this to construct, maintain and protect road structure, including its foundations. Beyond this functional depth, the deeper subsoil and cliff structure remains with adjoining property owners, extending to the middle of the road under the "ad medium filum" legal presumption. In the permanent scenario, KCC have programmed to acquire the land below the proposed structure to allow for ongoing maintenance and access.

Due to the requirement of the scheme to remove significant volumes of chalk and position cranes for lifting the bridge components, in the temporary scenario the scheme will require access to land both to the north and south of the collapsed chalk spine. KCC are in the process of completing the purchase of the Site of Special Scientific Interest (SSSI) land parcel directly to the south of Galley Hill, showing dedication to minimising the land acquisition risk.

It is the preference of KCC to acquire the land to the north of the spine by voluntary acquisition and cooperation. However, to minimise the risk to the programme, and to ensure that KCC can meet the deadlines required by the Structures Fund, KCC has allowed for Compulsory Purchase within the current programme.

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

Prior to the collapse of the underlying chalk spine, the A226 Galley Hill corridor formed a critical component of the strategic diversion route for planned closures of the A2 between B255 Bean Road (Bluewater) junction, the A2 Ebbsfleet junction and the A2260 Pepper Hill junction. This function was especially

important for maintaining network resilience during planned maintenance or emergency closures, ensuring that both general traffic and Heavy Goods Vehicles (HGVs) could be safely and efficiently diverted via a suitable parallel route.

With the closure of A226 Galley Hill, there is no longer a suitable SRN diversion route for this stretch for HGVs north of the A2. As a result, National Highways has been required to amend its established diversion strategies, including changes to permanent signage on both the local and strategic road networks to redirect traffic. The closure of A226 Galley Hill limits the ability of National Highways to shut the A2 without causing significant congestion, particularly if closures are as a result of a collision.

The absence of an appropriate diversion route has materially reduced the resilience of the network and limits the ability of National Highways to implement A2 closures without causing severe congestion. This is particularly acute during unplanned incidents, such as collisions, where rapid diversion is essential. In these circumstances, the lack of a viable alternative route can lead to widespread disruption, increased journey times, and displacement of traffic onto inappropriate local roads.

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.

As previously noted, a major collapse of the underlying chalk spine at A226 Galley Hill in April 2023 resulted in the loss of sections of carriageway and footway and caused significant damage to utility infrastructure. The route has remained closed since this event, with exclusion zones and temporary measures in place to manage safety risks. The closure will remain in place indefinitely unless a permanent reinstatement solution is delivered, as such the need for a repair prior to 2029/30 is evident. A geotechnical summary report has been submitted alongside this document summarising the current extent of failure (Appendix 3.1.1; 3.1.2). Images of the failure are included within Appendix 3.1.3.

- 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.

Due to the condition of the route, the A226 Galley Hill is currently closed to all traffic, both motorised and non-motorised users. Following the collapse of the underlying chalk spine in April 2023, the route has been fully closed under a Temporary Traffic Regulation Order to traffic to prevent access to the unstable area. Secure exclusion zones and monitoring arrangements remain in place to manage safety risks.

- 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.

A226 Galley Hill is already subject to a complete traffic restriction.

- 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.

Temporary measures at Galley Hill have focused on managing immediate safety risks following the collapse of the chalk spine. The A226 from Swanscombe High Street to Snowden Hill has been fully closed to prevent access to the unstable area, supported by the establishment of secure exclusion zones. Various measures such as CCTV and palisade fencing have also been installed to deter trespassers. Risks to adjacent land and businesses affected by the landslide have been managed, and damaged utility infrastructure has been diverted either temporarily (broadband) or permanently (gas and water). Specialist consultants have been engaged to monitor ground conditions and undertake investigations.

In parallel, traffic management and diversion measures have been implemented across the wider network to mitigate the impact of the closure. KCC has decommissioned traffic signals at the western end and modified the junction to improve traffic flow, reconfigured the permanent traffic signals at the eastern end of the closure and installed signage to enable enforcement of the 7.5t weight limit across the residential area of Swanscombe which has seen an increase in errant HGVs who are no longer able to use the main route. There is a fully signed diversion route for Galley Hill Road including the erection of new permanent signs alongside alterations to existing.

- 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 geological structure is already subject to temporary measures as described in part e. These measures will remain in place indefinitely until the spine is able to be reinstated.

- g) If the answer to f) above is yes, then estimate the likelihood of this occurring:

- ☐ Low confidence in temporary measures being required
- ☐ Medium confidence in temporary measures being required
- ☐ High confidence in temporary measures being required

- h) If available and applicable, what is the current Bridge Condition Indicator score (average and critical) of the relevant structure?

BCI Crit: N/A

BCI Ave: N/A

- i) Which elements of the structure are negatively contributing to the BCI scores and how has this changed in the last 5 years.

Reference should be made to recent inspections and highlight the type and extent of the defects.

Question i: This is not applicable to A226 Galley Hill. Question J: A geotechnical report of the chalk spine is submitted alongside this template (Appendix 3.1.1; 3.1.2).

- 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.

Ebbsfleet Garden City, which surrounds Galley Hill represents a significant growth opportunity, combining large-scale development delivery with strategic infrastructure investment. Ebbsfleet is championed by Government and the Development Corporation, aiming to deliver 15,000 new homes and commercial space, thereby supporting job creation and attracting inward investment.

The garden city principles promote high-quality placemaking, which can increase land values and long-term economic resilience. The failure of Galley Hill jeopardises this by fettering local transport and access for both construction and occupation of development. This impacts Ebbsfleet Central, the urban centre of the city, which has planning permission but cannot sustainably build out with the route closed.

The Northfleet Harbourside proposed local plan site which hosts Ebbsfleet United is also potentially allocated for redevelopment. Galley Hill is the main access to and from the west of this development. Without it, the economic prospects for the redevelopment are at risk, with unacceptable highway network congestion. A quantitative estimate of the economic impact of these developments is attached (Appendix 3.2.1).

Underpinning economic prospects for the area is the Fastrack bus rapid transit system. The road closure prevents Fastrack from undertaking its full network route. Reinstatement is important for delivering a modal shift target of 40% including for new developments. The Fastrack B service was bucking the national trend of bus usage decline with the highest ever usage of the service in the month prior to the collapse. The collapse caused an attributable 20% reduction in patronage (Appendix 3.3.2 contains economic impact to the service).

- 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 government's Integrated Transport Strategy *Better Connected* has set eight priorities including providing dependable and safe journeys and also aligning transport with development. The current situation with the loss of Galley Hill Road is antithetical to achieving these principles for the local area.

Journeys have become less dependable with significant severance created by the closure of the road, making some local journeys impossible without a large diversion. Journeys are now subject to increased variability in journey time due to heightened congestion from diverted traffic using other, already congested routes. Vehicles not following diversions such as HGVs increase safety risks, with local community complaints made to KCC about inappropriate use of local roads. Transport network capacity and public transport provision is significantly adversely affected and now misaligned to where it is required to support new development around the Galley Hill Road area.

The government's missions include breaking down barriers to opportunity. The loss of the road link has added a barrier, introducing substantial severance that limits choice for education, especially primary, with local schools that bookend Galley Hill (e.g. Lawn Road Primary, Craylands Primary, early years nurseries)

cut off from local communities located at the opposite end of Galley Hill Road. Children have worse access to the education that best fits their needs.

Addressing significant safety risks arising from the route's closure aligns with the Safer Streets mission. Reinstatement will substantially reduce risk exposure restoring pedestrian infrastructure and supporting safer, more reliable public transport in line with the National Bus Strategy.

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.

A226 Galley Hill is identified as a priority within KCC's Local Transport Plan 5 (LTP5), highlighting the need to reduce pressure on the network and restore the key public transport corridor between Dartford and Gravesham. The plan also identifies funding shortfalls for maintaining highway assets as a core challenge, linking directly to the priority proposal for the local road network – to maintain it, enabling Kents business and residents to complete the journeys they need to make to support a growing economy. Fundamentally, without access to external funding, it is not possible for KCC to reinstate Galley Hill.

Dartford Borough Council's Local Plan proposes 9,000-18,000 jobs and 11,900 homes by 2037, many of which are located within Ebbsfleet Garden City. However, the existing network is already experiencing severe congestion because of the collapse and is unable to sustainably accommodate additional demand from planned developments. Key sites, including Ebbsfleet Central, are therefore constrained by the continued closure.

The reinstatement of the sustainable transport Bus Rapid Transport Network (BRT) is a vital priority for Kent. The restoration of the Fastrack B bus route would provide an alternate model for the existing and planned developments and is a key component for Ebbsfleet Developments which have a modal shift target of 40%. From the collapse to November 2024, the estimated potential revenue loss for the Fastrack service was £919k. Local Arriva bus services have also been severely impacted, with links between Gravesham and Dartford either being delayed or cancelled due to congestion.

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.

KCC has led the development of the A226 Galley Hill scheme, working closely with key stakeholders including Dartford Borough Council, Gravesham Borough Council and Ebbsfleet Development Corporation, all of whom strongly support reinstatement due to the route's critical role in enabling planned housing and economic growth within the area.

There is clear and consistent cross-party support for the Galley Hill scheme from elected Members, local partners and the wider community. Labour Dartford MP Jim Dickson has repeatedly raised the issue in Parliament to secure funding to repair the collapsed route. These approaches have been strongly supported by Reform UK's KCC members, who have reaffirmed support for the scheme through Growth Environment and Transport Cabinet Committee meetings.

The prolonged closure of Galley Hill has had significant impacts on residents and businesses. There is therefore strong local backing for reinstatement of the route as a priority infrastructure intervention. KCC holds regular engagement sessions with elected members from Dartford, Gravesham and Swanscombe Town Councils. Recurring public meetings have also been held since the closure to update residents.

KCC has engaged with utility providers and ensured coordination with technical stakeholders such as Network Rail High Speed and Natural England to develop an engineering solution that minimises the impact to the railway and any ecological sensitivities at the site. No significant opposition to the scheme has been identified; however, delivery will require careful management of land to minimise the environmental impacts.

- 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.

In Kent highway infrastructure, including structures, are managed in accordance with the Highway Asset Management Plan. This document sets out a detailed methodology for identifying maintenance priorities and ensures KCC's compliance with the principles of the Well-managed Highway Infrastructure Code of Practice. Like most local authorities, KCC faces significant challenges in maintaining a safe and reliable highway network during a time of limited resource, deteriorating condition and increasing public expectation. The rate at which local roads in England are deteriorating far exceeds the rate of investment and as such KCC must prioritise the needs of the county.

KCC has adopted a risk-based approach for all aspects of highway infrastructure maintenance, including setting levels of service, inspections, response, resilience, priorities and programmes. The management of current and future risks has been embedded within our approach to asset management and service delivery.

KCC has managed the A226 Galley Hill collapse by prioritising public safety, initial investigations and development of feasible engineering solutions. To date KCC has spent c.£2m by reprioritising planned schemes and maintenance to release funds. It is crucial to understand that the collapse was entirely unforeseen, and therefore future costs to reinstate the Galley Hill Road were not budgeted for.

The exceptional scale and complexity of the failure and remedy, with total reconstruction costs estimated in the region of £45m, means that KCC are unable to afford the scheme within the existing maintenance budget.

- 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 Galley Hill scheme has been selected as a priority for the Structures Fund due to the unforeseen catastrophic failure of a critical highway asset and the consequential impacts on network performance, safety, and economic activity. Unlike other potential schemes, the need is immediate as the structure has already failed, meaning no prior capital provision was in place. KCC has sought to manage impacts using existing revenue budgets and reserves, however this has been insufficient given the exceptional scale and complexity of the failure, as detailed in the Financial Case.

The scheme fully aligns with the Fund's strategic objectives and supports delivery of the Government's missions:

Growth - The ongoing closure of Galley Hill has constrained sustainable growth within Ebbsfleet, a nationally significant growing garden city. Reinstatement will improve journey time reliability for businesses, including freight access to industrial areas. This will enhance productivity, supporting growth.

Cleaner Energy

Current diversions increase journey lengths and emissions. Reopening the route will reduce vehicle kilometres travelled, improving air quality and lowering carbon impacts.

Healthier and Safer Streets

The diversion of traffic, including HGVs, onto local roads has negatively impacted road safety and local amenity. Reopening Galley Hill will remove inappropriate traffic from residential routes and restore safer conditions for all road users.

Breaking Down Barriers

The loss of the A226 has created significant community severance between Dartford, Gravesham and surrounding areas. Reinstating the structure will reconnect communities, restore access to employment and services, and support planned development dependent on the route being operational

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.

As detailed in Section 2.1A to 2.1F, failure to deliver the scheme would result in the continuation of existing adverse impacts, with these effects likely to worsen as network pressures increase.

Severance

Ongoing community severance will continue to restrict the ability of local communities either side of Galley Hill to conveniently reach local services as detailed in Section 2.1h.

Economic Disbenefit

The area will continue to suffer from economic disbenefit due to the continued use of prolonged diversionary routes and rat-running through residential streets by high volumes of traffic including LGV and HGV vehicles associated with the commercial and industrial uses along the Thames.

This will exacerbate congestion at existing hotspots; for example, Pepperhill roundabout is already forecast to experience capacity issues by 2042, and the rerouting of traffic due to the Galley Hill closure further worsens its performance. Modelling indicates that the closure of Galley Hill has a greater negative impact on network performance than the addition of Local Plan growth.

Constraint to growth

The absence of this link constrains sustainable development, by removing a critical section of the main road network and a core access route to major sites including Ebbsfleet Central. Without delivery of the scheme, the ability of Local Planning Authorities to plan for and deliver sustainable growth—including the unlocking of additional sites—will be significantly constrained.

The planned network flows associated with the Lower Thames Crossing will be altered, affecting the scheme's ability to accommodate future traffic patterns and realise benefits.

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 closure of Galley Hill has resulted in a severe increase in community severance. The loss of both carriageway and footway connectivity has significantly disrupted links between residential areas in Swanscombe, Greenhithe and Ebbsfleet and key destinations, including schools, preschools and nurseries, commercial and retail premises, local transport such as Swanscombe station, along with green space and parkland, leisure and entertainment destinations (e.g. Ebbsfleet United stadium).

The current diversionary routes are less direct, particularly for pedestrians, cyclists and bus users. These routes often require use of congested corridors or indirect crossings, increasing journey times, reducing perceived safety, and in some cases discouraging active travel entirely. Public transport services have also been impacted by congestion and rerouting, reducing reliability and accessibility to employment, education and essential services.

As a result, access to everyday destinations such as preschools, nurseries, primary schools and local shops—typically undertaken on foot or by cycle—has been disproportionately affected. Individuals without access to a private vehicle are particularly impacted, facing increased reliance on bus services or taxis to navigate around the severance, resulting in higher costs and reduced travel choice.

The reinstatement of the A226 Galley Hill would directly address this severance by restoring a critical east–west connection for all modes. The scheme would re-enable direct walking and cycling routes, reduce diversion distances, and improve conditions for active travel. The restoration of reliable bus services would improve access to employment and education, particularly for vulnerable and non-car users. A severance assessment is appended (Appendix 3.2.3).

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

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

The closure of the A226 Galley Hill corridor severs the communities of Swanscombe and Northfleet resulting in a material deterioration in network performance and accessibility.

The closure impacts 8,650 vehicles daily, comprising 6,793 cars, 1,775 LGVs, 82 HGVs and an unknown number of PSVs (Appendix 3.2.4). For motorised traffic, the collapse has necessitated the use of an extended diversion route totalling 9.1km via the A226 Thames Way, A2260 Ebbsfleet Gateway, A2 (Strategic Road Network), and the B255. Buses have been re-routed, disrupting connections between Ebbsfleet International and Bluewater.

Vehicles unrestricted by the 7.5T weight limit on B259 Southfleet Road may choose alternative, but congested diversion routes. The closure has led to increased journey times, higher vehicle operating costs, and congestion on alternative routes which have limited spare capacity to accommodate displaced demand.

For non-motorised users (Appendix.3.2.5), the impacts are pronounced, with the closure resulting in severance reduced connectivity between communities and facilities. Alternative routes for pedestrians and cyclists are less direct, less legible, and of variable quality. Non-motorised users can use a 1.5km diversion via a shared use path that routes between Ebbsfleet Business Park and Stanhope Road.

The path is perceived to be less safe, bounded by a high fence and without passive surveillance. This has implications for user safety and accessibility, particularly for vulnerable groups, including those with mobility impairments or without access to private vehicles. Diversion routes for non-motorised users are less structured and rely on existing local networks, leading to a disproportionate disbenefit for these groups.

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 reopening of A226 Galley Hill provides benefits to journey times, vehicle operating costs, and external impacts. Journey time savings represent the largest proportion of the benefit at £565m, with vehicle operating costs representing a smaller proportion of the benefit at £81m. These benefits are directly based on the increased trip length of vehicles using the signed diversion route as with A226 Galley Hill closed, vehicles must divert around using a diversion of 9.1km (5.7 miles).

Reducing traffic on the diversion route has benefits which have been captured as external impacts, including decongestion benefits of £168m, accident benefits of £56m, air quality benefits of £1.9m, noise benefits of £4.8m, greenhouse gases benefits of £23m, and indirect taxation benefits of £4.5m.

The carbon impacts of the bridge have been assessed using the Local Transport Infrastructure Carbon Benchmark Tool, which calculates an impact of -£1.18m.

The total benefits are £903.6m. These benefits are based on all vehicles following the appropriate signed diversion, whereas some may seek alternative routes (see Appendix 3.3.2 sensitivity test). The economic toolkit cannot capture the existing and forecast levels of delay on the surrounding network, additional growth from proposed developments, such as Ebbsfleet Central, and changing travel patterns from the opening of Lower Thames Crossing. The additional traffic modelling (Appendix 3.3.3) captures this. The modelling shows differing levels of benefit than the economic toolkit but only captures the AM and PM peak periods. However, it compounds the case for investment showing a high BCR even with detailed assessment.

- 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)	£47,209,006
Present Value Benefits (PVB)	£903,612,932
Benefit to Cost Ratio (BCR)	19: 1

- 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 detailed cost plan has been prepared covering preparation, design, supervision and construction. The base cost estimate (Q3 2026 prices) was produced from a Bill of Quantities, with rates built up from first principles, using planned resources, on-costs and overheads for similar schemes in Kent. No costs have been treated as sunk. See Appendix 3.4.1.

Inflation was applied to the base estimate using the BCIS Civil Engineering Cost Index, then adjusted using the TAG GDP deflator in line with TAG Unit A1-2. Expenditure was profiled according to the current programme.

Following TAG Unit A1-2, an allowance for risk or optimism bias, whichever is higher, was added. The risk allowance was approximately 21%, whereas the appropriate optimism bias for a scheme at SOC stage is 55%, based on the TAG value for bridges and tunnels. Therefore, 55% optimism bias was applied.

The investment costs, inclusive of inflation and exclusive of optimism bias by cost component are:

Preparation = £8,308,429

Land = £2,965,649

Construction = £24,719,228

Supervision = £557,475

Maintenance costs were considered for highway resurfacing, bridge inspections, and earthwork inspections post opening. Earthwork inspections would also be required without the scheme in place, and these have also been included as a without-scheme cost and therefore, cancel out. 23% optimism bias has been applied to maintenance costs based on sources provided in TAG Unit A1-2. The PVC for the scheme is £47.2m, which has been input into the summary above.

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

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

The Gravesham Traffic Model, an enhanced version of the Kent Transport Model, provided inputs for the economic toolkit, including route lengths, journey times (with and without diversion), and traffic volumes. Scenarios were run with Galley Hill open and closed for both the forecast opening year and design year. The methodology and assumptions are detailed in the Galley Hill Forecast Modelling Report (Appendix 3.2.4). A diversion route has been included in the economic toolkit's supporting evidence.

A 2030 scheme opening year has been selected based on programme timescales, with benefits appraised over 60 years. Traffic volumes for cars, LGVs and HGVs have been factored up to AADT using ATC data. PSV flows are not known and have not been included. HGV splits (60% OGV1 and 40% OGV2) were derived from count data and aligned with the TUBA assessment.

Carbon infrastructure emissions were estimated using the Local Transport Infrastructure Carbon Benchmark Tool (Appendix 3.4.3), based on a Structures – Road Bridge scheme for a bridge 130m long and 15m wide. Construction durations were taken from the cost plan. The LTICBT calculated an emissions value of 3,939 tCO₂e.

Congestion band 3 was selected using the volume to capacity (V/C) of modelled links on the diversion route. This revealed links on the diversion route operating with V/Cs aligned to congestion bands 2, 3 and 4, with 3 selected as an average. As A226 Galley Hill Road is currently closed to traffic, the diversion is shown to operate from 2026 for 365 days of the year.

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.

Economy (Wider Economic Impacts, Regeneration):

The scheme supports local economic resilience through improved journey time reliability for business and freight movements, particularly to Manor Way, Northfleet Industrial Estates and port services. This reliability benefit, while not fully monetised, is critical to operational efficiency and supply chain certainty.

The reopening of the route underpins planned and consented developments, such as Ebbsfleet Central, which was approved predicated on the availability of the A226 corridor, thereby facilitating regeneration and housing delivery in the Ebbsfleet/Northfleet area.

Environment (Landscape, Townscape, Climate Resilience):

The scheme restores a key transport corridor reducing reliance on diversion routes that place pressure on surrounding communities and landscapes. Although construction generates carbon emissions, the scheme improves network efficiency. Reducing diversions in turn reduces traffic noise impacts and improves air quality along surrounding routes. Additionally, stabilisation of the chalk spine enhances long-term land stability and resilience to future geotechnical failure, which is not fully captured in standard monetised metrics.

Social (Access, Connectivity, Community Impacts):

Reopening Galley Hill Road significantly improves local connectivity, reducing severance for communities and improving access to employment, education and services, as discussed within the Strategic Case. The scheme reinstates a direct link for non-motorised users between Swanscombe and Northfleet. Bus services will be able to return to the route improving access across the corridor. There are also safety and amenity benefits associated with removing traffic from unsuitable local roads currently used as diversion routes, which are not fully monetised within the economic appraisal.

- 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).

The scheme has also been assessed using the Gravesham Transport Model (GTM) and TUBA, which calculates benefits for travel time savings, vehicle operating cost changes, and changes to indirect taxation revenues.

TUBA reports a PVB of £83.7m. Although this is less than the benefits from the economic toolkit, they are based on the AM and PM peaks only. The TUBA PVB would increase with the addition of inter-peak, off-peak and weekend modelling, which are not currently available.

The GTM is better able to capture the changing routing of traffic and congestion impacts of the closure. For instance, the economic toolkit assumes 100% compliance with the signed diversion route for all traffic, whereas car and LGV traffic in the model is free to find alternative paths. HGVs remain restricted to the diversion route.

TUBA shows large benefits for the 0–2-minute bracket. This represents more marginal time savings, it shows that it is the high traffic volumes on the network that drive the benefits, indicating the scheme benefits large numbers of people.

The benefits were analysed using a sector system based on the Local Authority areas within Kent. This shows the scheme provides benefits for trips travelling east-west between Gravesham (Gravesend) and Dartford (Ebbsfleet / Greenhithe), Dartford (Dartford town), and towards London (inner M25). These sector-to-sector movements account for approximately 65% of the travel time benefits.

The PVC excludes the external impacts of maintenance reported in the Toolkit, as they are not applicable. More detail is provided in the accompanying report.

The results provide assurance additional to the economic toolkit results that benefits are likely to substantially outweigh the costs and therefore, coupled with the other cases for the scheme, it would likely constitute a very worthwhile use of public funds.

Present Value Costs (PVC)	£49,891,000
Present Value Benefits (PVB)	£83,676,000
Benefit to Cost Ratio (BCR)	1.68

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.

KCC has a proven track record of delivering major transport schemes. These projects cover a wide range of schemes including within ecologically sensitive areas, complex geotechnical and structural construction, high quality public realm and work over and near the railway network.

KCC is currently constructing the Sturry Link Road, a major new highway and bridge crossing over the River Stour and railway corridor. This scheme required substantial structural engineering, environmental mitigation, and management of planning and ecological constraints and is directly comparable to many of the challenges presented at Galley Hill.

Other recent examples of completed schemes include Dover Fastrack, comprising a link road and new bridge over the A2 to facilitate bus rapid transit and Coldharbour Roundabout, a scheme to enlarge a roundabout with the aim to reduce congestion, improve journey times and support the M20. Coldharbour roundabout opened ahead of the scheduled programme.

Other notable projects completed are the Maidstone Bridges Gyratory project, M20 Junction 4 bridge widening, St Clements Way, and Rathmore Road.

Contractors were all proactive in resolving issues in partnership with KCC to the mutual benefit of all parties. Lessons learnt exercises were undertaken at the end of each contract and where appropriate improvements made in the procurement process and contract documents of subsequent contracts.

These demonstrate a considerable amount of capacity and recent experience in procuring major road schemes and effectively managing construction contracts to achieve outputs to programme and budget.

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.

Design Procurement Strategy

Design and planning work has been procured through the Kent Professional Services Framework. The Framework provides access to specialist expertise needed for structural design.

Delivery Plans (Appendix 2.5.1)

The following headline programme has been developed with robust timescales allowing for risks:

Completion Preliminary Design: Oct 2026

Planning: July 2027 – Jan 2028

Detailed design: April 2027 – Jan 2028

Procurement: Mar 28 – Nov 28

Mobilisation and Construction: Nov 28 – Feb 30

Construction Procurement Strategy

KCC has in-house procurement specialists, and a Major Capital Programme Team (MCPT) that will be used to oversee the procurement exercise and manage the scheme delivery (Appendix 2.5.2).

The KCC Strategic Commissioning division supports the MCPT, providing specialist advice for the procurement process starting with the development of the Procurement Strategy through to contract award. The team ensures that the contract is procured ethically, legally and with minimal risk to KCC and any in line with the Procurement Act 2023 requirements.

Due to the specialist nature of the scheme, the procurement strategy has identified the Competitive Flexible Procedure (modelled on a Competitive Procedure with Negotiation) to be the most advantageous procurement method for the construction contract. The programme duration is 6 to 8 months, including both an SQ, ITT, Negotiation and ISFT stage. KCC will publish the works specification with the minimum requirements and evaluation criteria and is then able to negotiate with bidders to better achieve the desired outcome or identify areas for improvement. This is KCC's preference when not utilising frameworks.

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 key delivery risks associated with the Galley Hill scheme relate to planning consent, land acquisition, and ecological risks. These risks are interdependent and sit on the critical path to delivery. KCC have, however, prepared a robust programme which includes generous allowances for all key risk items.

Planning

A full detailed Planning Strategy has been prepared on behalf of KCC to inform the consenting approach, programme and risk profile for the scheme. The proposed development falls within Schedule 2 of the EIA Regulations 2017 as a road project within a sensitive area exceeding 1 hectare. It is expected, due to the scale of the proposed works and the interaction with the SSSI, that a positive EIA Screening Opinion will be issued, in which case Article 3(10) of the GPDO would disapply Permitted Development rights.

As such, a full planning application has been included within the programme. This will provide certainty, support the CPO process if required, and enable a secure consenting route. To further mitigate any consenting risk, an EIA Screening Opinion is in the process of being sought.

The programme is proceeding on the basis that a full planning application supported by an Environmental Statement will be required. The detailed design programme is scheduled to align with the planning and EIA process to reduce the risk of abortive work.

A realistic timescale for planning application submission has been included within the programme. Subject to successful funding, the application will be made summer 2027, with determination anticipated in late 2027/early 2028. This submission date is driven by ecology survey seasonality and Natural England engagement.

Land acquisition

Due to the requirement of the scheme to remove significant volumes of chalk and position cranes for lifting the bridge components, in the temporary scenario during construction the scheme will require access to land both to the north and south of the collapsed chalk spine.

KCC is in the process of completion on the SSSI land parcel directly to the south of Galley Hill, showing dedication to minimising the land acquisition risk. This has already proven beneficial to the scheme, removing the need for land consents for ecological surveys and any future mitigation works to the south of the spine.

It is the preference of KCC to acquire the land to the north of the spine by voluntary acquisition and cooperation. However, in order to minimise the risk to the programme, and to ensure that KCC can meet the deadlines required by the Structures Fund, KCC has allowed for Compulsory Purchase within the current programme. Further still, time for a Public Inquiry has been programmed. Should this not be required, it is anticipated that the programme could be shortened by up to eight months.

Ecological risk

The MCPT is experienced and well-equipped managing infrastructure schemes in close proximity of protected sites. The Swanscombe Peninsula SSSI is located within the site boundary to the south of Galley Hill. The SSSI has been designated for its geology, floral populations and assemblages of breeding birds and invertebrates.

The Preliminary Ecological Appraisal Report (PEA) undertaken by Arcadis in 2025 classifies the habitat types present on site as mixed scrub, hawthorn scrub, bramble scrub, chalk cliff face and developed land. The PEA identified the site's potential for roosting bats, an active badger sett and the site's potential to support protected and notable species including notable plants, invertebrate assemblages, reptiles, breeding birds, hazel dormouse and hedgehog.

KCC has already mitigated the risk to the project posed by the presence of the SSSI and ecologically protected species through early engagement with Natural England, who have provided information which has shaped the proposed bridge design.

Ahead of the Structures Fund availability KCC has commissioned ecological surveys to ensure that all required surveys can be carried out within the programme timescales to inform both planning and the construction methodology.

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

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

The scheme has developed a comprehensive stakeholder management plan, and KCC is already working with key third parties. This early engagement aims to reduce the risk of delays in securing planning consent, obtaining environmental approvals, and agreeing land access with private landowners. Engagement with landowners is being progressed and has already resulted in the ongoing completion of land to the south.

Natural England

There is ongoing dialogue between KCC and Natural England. This has allowed for the development of a design which aims retain as much of the existing chalk face as possible within the geotechnical constraints.

Network Rail High Speed (NRHS)

Galley Hill is near the HS1 railway bridge north of Ebbsfleet International. Indeed, access to the southern side of the spine is gained through HS1 land. KCC have worked with NRHS from the outset and will continue to do so to ensure all approvals for works are achieved. KCC expects to enter into a Protected Provisions Agreement with NRHS for the scheme due to the proximity of the railway, although railway possessions are not anticipated. This process is common for large schemes, and the MCPT will work with NRHS to ensure that programme deadlines are met.

Statutory Undertakers

KCC has worked directly with Statutory Undertakers to isolate and divert apparatus affected by the scheme. SGN and Thames Water apparatus have already been permanently diverted. Other apparatus (Openreach and Vodafone) has been temporarily diverted and KCC will continue to work closely with these providers throughout programme delivery.

2.4 Financial Case

a) Provide estimated outturn costs (£million) for the scheme in the table below. The table should be completed with total costs, requested DfT investment, LHA contribution and third-party contributions. Only capital funding costs should be included in the table.

To note, the prospectus sets out that:

- schemes should be delivered by end-2029/30.
- schemes with early delivery (i.e. in 2026/27) may be prioritised.
- schemes should not be affordable from existing LA budgets.
- local contributions are required for proposed schemes.
- preference will be given to schemes with higher local contributions and/or those where there is a high percentage of local contribution.
- preference will also be given where the local contribution is:
 - not from other central government funding sources.
 - partially funded from other third-party sources.

	2026/27	2027/28	2028/29	2029/30	Total
Requested DfT investment	£2,385,289	£1,511,560	£21,236,795	£15,678,870	£40,812,514
LA contribution	£m	£m	£m	£3,000,000m	£3,000,000m
Other contribution	£-	£-	£-	£1,500,000	£1,500,000
Total costs	£2,385,289	£1,511,560	£21,236,795	£20,178,870	£45,312,514m

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.

KCC has managed the A226 Galley Hill collapse using existing revenue budgets and reserves, prioritising public safety, initial investigations and development of feasible engineering solutions. To date KCC has spent c.£2m, by reprioritising planned schemes and maintenance to ensure funding has been made available. However, this approach has been insufficient to enable reinstatement due to the exceptional scale and complexity of the failure, with total reconstruction costs estimated in the region of £45m. For context, the KCC Highway Maintenance Block Grant for the whole county for 2026/27 is £56m and the cost of the scheme alone (excluding associated safety maintenance work) would represent one fifth of the total maintenance grant over the next three years.

KCC's wider approach to managing maintenance funding requires allocation across the entire highway asset base, prioritising routine maintenance and risk-based interventions. The funding does not provide capacity to fund major, unexpected structural failures of this magnitude. KCC maintains approximately 5400 miles of highway network, with an estimated like-for-like replacement value of over £24.4 billion; we have statutory obligations under the Highways Act 1980 and other legislation to maintain the highway in an appropriately safe and functioning condition. KCC will not be able to adequately perform its duty across the remainder of the network should funding be allocated to Galley Hill.

The requirement for a new structural solution and the absence of available match funding, has further constrained earlier delivery. As a result, permanent repair is not considered achievable without access to significant external capital funding.

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 intervention, the whole-life costs associated with the continued closure of the A226 Galley Hill would be significant and ongoing. These costs arise not only from the deteriorating asset itself, but also from increased maintenance pressures on the surrounding network. For example, the Grove Road roundabout has experienced surface deterioration as a result of increased vehicle and HGV movements, with remediation costs estimated at £60k for this relatively small area alone.

In accordance with ADEPT guidance on Commuted Sums for the Relief of Maintenance and Reconstruction of Bridges, an initial commuted sum has been calculated at £7.1m (Appendix 3.4.2). This represents the total future cost of owning, operating, and maintaining the bridge over its design life (120 years). Unlike other structures, A226 Galley Hill was not previously designated as a formal 'structure' whereby it would have been considered within KCC Structures maintenance regime, instead it was classed as a geological feature and considered only within general highway maintenance considerations, such as for surfacing. In line with the DfT requirements for the Structures Fund, KCC have not included this commuted sum cost within this bid but have compared this directly against future costs to maintain the closure.

Over the full lifecycle, the cost of maintaining the new structure is estimated to be lower than the cumulative cost of sustaining the existing closure. This includes ongoing interventions required to manage further instability caused by weathering. In addition, significant unquantifiable risks would remain without intervention, including further failure, potential property damage and loss of lives.

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 (Appendix 3.4.1) has been prepared by Allen Dadswell Construction Consultants (ADCC), an RICS regulated quantity surveying firm. ADCC have worked closely with KCC's Major Capital Programme team in delivering major road schemes in Kent for nearly twenty years.

It was considered that a detailed cost build up was necessary to estimate the cost of the works, given the specialised and unique nature of the project. The cost estimate was therefore produced based on a detailed measure of the works and itemised as a Bill of Quantities broadly in accordance with the Method of Measurement for Highway Works. KCC approached an experienced contractor to advise on the constructability of the scheme and to assist in deriving appropriate assumptions for the delivery of the works.

Composite items and rates have been utilised where appropriate for a scheme at the current stage of design. The rates and allowances have been derived from the extensive cost data available to ADCC from recently tendered or completed schemes across the county, including the comparable Sturry Link Road scheme which is currently under construction.

Non-construction costs including design fees, professional fees, supervision costs, land acquisition costs and all other anticipated project costs have been included within the cost estimate, priced with guidance from KCC and ADCC's own experience of preparing cost plans and monitoring such schemes for KCC.

The cost estimate is base dated July 2026, and these costs were uplifted using the BCIS General Civil Engineering Cost Index to the assumed construction start date. The BCIS General Civil Engineering Cost Indices were deemed the most appropriate index to use given the nature of the Galley Hill works and offer a higher degree of accuracy than generic indices such as the Consumer Price Index (CPI).

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

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

A proportionate approach to risk has been taken in preparing the cost estimate, combining quantified and measurable allowances for understood risks, with an additional percentage-based contingency for residual and emerging risk.

Where a risk is understood it has been priced directly into the estimate. For example, the earthworks measures include allowances for excavating soft spots and other voids and for the disposal of contaminated material. The cost estimate includes a fully costed programme assessment based on the Programme Strategy produced by KCC, which includes consideration for the key risks associated with planning consent, land acquisition and ecological risks.

A 5% uplift for "pricing risk" has been applied to the construction cost estimate to allow for sundry items which have not been separately itemised within the Bill of Quantities. A risk sum has been included within the cost estimate at 27% of the construction and non-construction costs, based on experience of previous KCC schemes at this stage of design development and consideration of the specific risks associated with this scheme. For example, diversions of gas, water and electricity are a key risk on highways projects, and these have been diverted in advance of the works and are therefore, not considered as part of the risk allowance.

A robust governance framework has been established to oversee scheme delivery and financial management. The project is managed through a tiered governance structure comprising a Project Steering Group, Programme Board and Sponsoring Group. A quantified risk assessment will be produced at the detailed design stage and be updated throughout the scheme delivery. As the scheme progresses into construction, delivery will be governed through NEC4 contract management arrangements, with dedicated project management, supervision and change-control processes to manage risk and monitor expenditure.

In the event of residual cost pressures exceeding the included contingency allowance, KCC would review the scope, programme and delivery strategy to identify appropriate mitigation measures. Any unavoidable cost overruns would be managed through KCC's established capital governance processes and funding approvals, whereby KCC would identify further funding within its capital programme or work with third parties to identify further funding.

The existing cost plan includes for financial risk such as sourcing additional funding from the wider capital programme, developer contributions or utilising alternative funding sources. Staff cost allowances and programme float have been built into the estimate for managing the scheme funding, such that funding can be secured without delaying delivery.

- 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.

KCC has identified £1.5m of Strategic Transport Infrastructure Programme (STIP) funding which will be utilised as match funding for the scheme. STIPs is a historic partnership transport investment programme covering the Dartford and Gravesham area. The programme utilises developer contributions and other grant funding to deliver strategic transport infrastructure needed to support development in North Kent. If successful, KCC will formally add the Galley Hill scheme to the programme. A further £1.5m has been secured from the KCC Highway Capital Funding, totalling £3m total match funding from the Council.

In accordance with the requirements of the fund, historic development costs of c.£2m have not been included within this match funding, or within the scheme costs. These costs have been sourced from existing revenue budgets and reserves.

Ebbsfleet Development Corporation, Dartford Borough Council and Gravesham Borough Council have been supportive throughout the development of this scheme. EDC have committed a total of £1.5m match funding towards the scheme and will work in close partnership with KCC due to the importance of the scheme to Ebbsfleet.

A Community Infrastructure Levy bid is being prepared to present to Dartford Borough Council specifically for active and sustainable travel improvements to High Street/A226 junction (the western end of the scheme). This funding is not confirmed as such, KCC has not included it in the confirmed match funding amount.

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?

November 2028

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

February 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.

KCC has a track record in successfully procuring and delivering projects of varying size and complexity and has comprehensive project management, governance and assurance systems in place to deliver the Galley Hill scheme. KCC has established a robust governance structure to provide accountability and a clear decision-making process for major capital projects within its remit.

The project will have a designated project manager, who is an appropriately trained and experienced member of KCC staff with a wealth of experience in the delivery of Major Capital Projects. A scheme organogram is appended (Appendix 3.5.2 and 3.5.3).

The project will be managed in house by APM trained and NEC experienced officers, using a well-established governance structure, which has been successfully applied to deliver other transport improvement schemes. KCC will utilise our in-house commercial and procurement specialists within the KCC Strategic Commissioning division to support procurement, providing specialist advice for the full procurement process. Through this process KCC will ensure that potential contractors have identified subcontractors and provided assurance of an effective supply chain prior to appointment.

It is anticipated that the in-house resource and any design contracts would be transferred to the relevant authority post Local Government Reorganisation to ensure continuity within the scheme delivery.

The established high-level governance structure that has been used for recent projects and that will be employed for the management and delivery of Galley Hill is structured as follows: Project Steering Group; Highlight Report; Programme Board Meeting; Sponsoring Group Progress Report; Sponsoring Group Meeting.

Project Steering Group meetings will be held monthly, with progress discussed in technical detail to allow for the proactive management of programme and project. The resulting Highlight Report will identify and escalate any areas of concern or where decisions are required to the Programme Board.

Programme Boards will be held monthly, with attendees from the delivery team, and KCC leadership. This is an opportunity to drill into specific details and review financial progress. Where the board is unable to resolve an issue, it is escalated to the Sponsoring Group.

The Sponsoring Group is held bi-monthly, and chaired by the KCC Head of Transportation, with the Corporate Director and Directors of Highways & Transportation and Growth and Environment. Technical advisors are invited where necessary to close out any issues escalated to this point. The Sponsoring Group is the final decision point for any escalated issues.

As the project transitions into construction, the Project Management role will transfer to an appropriate resource who will be responsible for the administration of the NEC4 contract management arrangements described in the Commercial Dimension. The NEC4 Project Manager will be supported by a supervisor and site-based supervision team. The NEC4 Project Manager and Supervisor will also provide a site presence to deal with all contract variations/issues and early warnings/compensation events.

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?).

KCC recognises that effective risk management is vital. A risk and opportunity register has been created and is reviewed regularly. Risk management has been integrated into the daily management of the programme ensuring that emerging issues are considered and addressed so they can be avoided, mitigated, transferred or brought into acceptable allowances. Land acquisition, planning and ecological risk are discussed in Section 2.3.C and further detailed in Appendix 3.5.4. A quantified risk assessment will be produced during detailed design. Further risks are discussed below.

Risk: Availability of funding or cash flow

Mitigation: KCC have included a healthy cost risk allowance in the scheme costs. Should cost overrun occur KCC will review possibility of use of funds from the wider capital programme, identifying developer contributions and utilising alternative funding sources. KCC understands the DfT grant is limited to the award amount.

Risk: Unexpected ground conditions increasing costs during construction

Mitigation: Geotechnical surveys have already been carried out to understand key geotechnical risks. Further ground surveys will be carried out as necessary to fully understand the stability of the chalk prior to entering into a construction contract.

Risk: Diversion costs

Mitigation: Due to the impact of the collapse, gas and water utilities have already been permanently diverted away from Galley Hill. C3s have already been provided by the remaining most affected statutory undertakers and used to inform the cost plan. KCC will commission dedicated utility liaison specialist consultants (Paige Solutions) to work proactively with BT, Vodafone and UKPN to inform the design.

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

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

The robust governance structure will ensure that project controls are implemented effectively. Scheme contracts will be managed through Contracts (previously CEMAR) a contractual management system. Progress reports will provide updates on programme delivery, finances, issues and risks, while Highlight reports will identify areas of concern and matters requiring Programme Board decisions.

Regular project meetings and reporting will enable KCC to monitor risks, manage issues and exceptions, and ensure delivery remains aligned with programme objectives. The project management team will complete weekly reporting, supported by a project management log maintained by the core Project Team to record and track delivery issues, and actions. The Programme Board will meet monthly to review progress, financial performance, key risks, and forthcoming activities.

Change control will be managed through the established NEC structured, proactive system centred on compensation events, early warnings, and regular programme updates. These will assess the implications for project objectives, budget and programme. Changes with delegated authority limits will be reviewed by the Project Manager and Project Team, whilst material changes with significant cost, programme or scope implications will be escalated to the Programme Board for approval.

Project assurance reviews will be undertaken at key milestones to provide confidence that Galley Hill can progress successfully to the next stage of delivery. Where performance concerns are identified, a targeted assurance and recovery approach will be implemented. This will include the preparation of an improvement plan setting out required actions, responsible owners and timescales to address issues and support the recovery of the programme.

- 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.

Planning consent

Planning consent represents the key permission required to progress the A226 Galley Hill scheme. As such the submission and supporting information must be comprehensive and sufficient for the planning officer's requirements and allow time for the relevant planning committees. Consent will require additional condition discharges, as such sufficient time for that approval has been allowed for prior to the start of construction. The Galley Hill project team has already produced a planning strategy document and will be submitting for a formal Scoping Opinion with respect to environmental matters. The Major Capital Programme Team are well versed in preparing planning application and discharging associated conditions. Sufficient time and expert resources have been lined up to ensure that planning consent can be gained in line with the current programme. Due to the mandatory 10% Biodiversity Net Gain (BNG) requirements and the constrained nature of the site, KCC will be pursuing an off-site BNG area within Ebbsfleet and be securing this through a S106 agreement. Investigations have already begun to identify a sufficient area.

Statutory Approvals

Should compulsory purchase be required, KCC have recent experience and expertise in the preparation and progressing of Statutory Orders. KCC will always seek Counsel's advice. Identifying the full extent of the land required and identifying all land interests is vital and this is expected to be known at the end of preliminary design. Engagement with the market through a contractor workshop, has resulted in a clear understanding of the working space required.

HS1 approvals

KCC are already working closely with Network Rail High Speed (a wholly owned subsidiary of Network Rail Infrastructure Ltd who are responsible for operating, maintaining and renewing the High Speed 1 tracks). KCC anticipates entering into an Protected Provisions Agreement with HS1 for the Galley Hill scheme due to its proximity to the railway; however, railway possessions are not currently expected. This is a standard requirement for major schemes with a rail interface, and the Major Capital Programme Team will work collaboratively with HS1 to ensure programme deadlines are achieved.

Ecological Licences and related approvals

Although Galley Hill is not within a European designated site, the presence of a SSSI and surrounding habitats indicate the potential for protected species to be present. The requirement for ecological surveys, seasonal constraints and, if necessary, protected species licences (for example under the Conservation of Habitats and Species Regulations 2017) will be identified as part of the preliminary design process. All works will be designed to comply with relevant wildlife legislation, with suitable mitigation incorporated where required. KCC has already commissioned relevant ecological surveys of the site ahead of securing full funding to mitigate the risk of delay and has further ensured ample programme allowance for the licence processes.

- 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 has incorporated climate adaptation and resilience throughout the development and assessment of options. This has been undertaken through a qualitative assessment of how each option responds to key climate-related risks, proportionate to the level of design development.

The principal climate risks relate to increased rainfall intensity, groundwater variation, surface water erosion and long-term weathering of the chalk spine. These risks have been considered in evaluating the resilience of each option, particularly in terms of their reliance on near-surface chalk and susceptibility to ongoing deterioration.

Options have been assessed based on their ability to reduce exposure to these risks. The bridge option has been identified as providing greater long-term resilience than alternatives that rely on the continued performance of the existing slope. By spanning the most unstable section and transferring highway loads to

competent ground beyond the failure zone, it reduces reliance on degraded near-surface chalk and weathered materials that may be susceptible to deterioration under future climate conditions.

The bridge option also minimises large-scale excavation within the landslip area, reducing disturbance to the existing slope and limiting the potential for construction activities to adversely affect groundwater pathways or slope stability. Appropriate drainage measures will be incorporated to manage surface water runoff, reduce infiltration into the slope and mitigate the effects of increased rainfall intensity.

Further design stages will include detailed drainage design, geotechnical assessment and consideration of climate projections to ensure the scheme demonstrates long-term resilience and supports reliable performance of the highway network under future climate conditions.

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).

The scheme has incorporated carbon management throughout the development and comparative assessment of options for the Galley Hill Road remediation. This has been undertaken through, a qualitative assessment to identify the principal sources of embodied and construction-related carbon across the shortlisted options, proportionate to the level of design development.

Key carbon drivers assessed include the extent of excavation, material handling and transport, structural material quantities (notably steel and concrete), and the scale of temporary works. This assessment identified that excavation-led solutions and the reinforced soil option would result in significantly higher embodied carbon due to large volumes of material removal, processing, haulage and potential import of stabilising materials.

Bridge-based solutions that minimise excavation were therefore identified as offering reduced carbon impact in terms of earthworks and associated transport emissions, while allowing opportunities to optimise structural efficiency. The bridge option currently being progressed represents a balance between minimising large-scale earthworks and reducing structural material requirements through design optimisation.

The current assessment is qualitative and appropriate to the stage of scheme development. A detailed whole life carbon assessment will be undertaken at subsequent design stages, including quantified carbon calculations in line with industry best practice. This will identify key carbon hotspots and inform targeted reduction measures, including material selection, construction methodology and supply chain opportunities. Climate adaptation will also be considered during detailed design through measures such as high-capacity expansion joints and flexible pavement interfaces at bridge approaches and deck transitions. These features will accommodate thermal expansion and contraction associated with increasing temperature extremes, helping to reduce the risk of structural distress, pavement damage and future maintenance requirements.

The scheme will continue to adopt a carbon reduction approach through design development, demonstrating alignment with national objectives to minimise greenhouse gas emissions and improve sustainability outcomes.

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.

KCC has worked directly with Statutory Undertakers to facilitate the isolation and diversion of utility apparatus away from Galley Hill Road and has removed all apparatus that was left suspended by the initial collapse. SGN and Thames Water apparatus have been permanently diverted. Other apparatus (BT and Vodafone) has been temporarily diverted through ducting above the carriageway surface on the southern

side of the spine.

As the scheme progresses, engagement with utility providers will be crucial to ensure that existing apparatus is managed effectively and to also identify a methodology for diversions during the bridge construction. C3 estimates have already been received from Vodafone for a complete diversion, and KCC will continue engagement with these providers to minimise the impact on the programme. Should the remaining utilities need to be completely diverted to allow for the scheme construction, KCC will progress this in advance of the main works contract so as to remove the risk to the construction programme.

The Major Capital Programme Team works closely Paige Solutions who are a specialist utilities consultant to manage statutory undertaker interfaces across scheme development and delivery. Their role includes identifying utility constraints, coordinating diversion and protection works, and acting as the primary liaison with utility providers. Paige Solutions supports programme delivery by aligning utility activities with construction sequencing, maintaining cost and approvals trackers, and providing ongoing design and site support. This approach reduces programme risk, improves coordination with utility companies, and ensures compliance with statutory requirements

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 has been undertaken for the Galley Hill scheme. These impacts have been considered as part of the scheme development process and will continue to be assessed through ongoing engagement and detailed design.

The closure has had a severe negative impact on accessibility and journey reliability for all users, including vulnerable groups.

The most affected protected characteristic groups include:

- Disabled people, who are more reliant on public transport and have experienced greater disruption due to reduced accessibility and longer diversion routes.
- Elderly people and those with reduced mobility, who have considered to be disproportionately affected by changes to travel patterns and temporary loss of direct routes.
- Pregnant women and parents with young children, who benefit from safe, accessible walking routes.
- Ethnic minority groups, who statistically rely more on public transport, and whose journeys have been impacted by the closure and construction works.

KCC has employed mitigation measures include maintaining alternative routes and travel options throughout the closure period and will continue to do so through construction. The reinstated highway will be designed to improve accessibility, and the scheme will deliver wider long-term positive impacts, including improved highway surfaces, enhanced pedestrian infrastructure, and restored public transport connectivity, which will particularly benefit vulnerable and protected groups.

Ongoing stakeholder engagement will ensure equality impacts are continuously reviewed and addressed.

3.2 Public Sector Transparency

When LHAs submit proposals for funding to DfT, as part of the Government's commitment to greater openness in the public sector under the Freedom of Information Act 2000 and the Environmental Information Regulations 2004, they must also publish a version excluding any commercially sensitive information on their own website within two working days of submitting the final proposal to DfT.

a) Please specify the weblink where this proposal will be published.

<https://www.kent.gov.uk/roads-and-travel/road-projects/in-progress-road-projects/galley-hill-road>

3.3 Declarations

Senior Responsible Owner declaration

As Senior Responsible Owner for [A226 Galley Hill], I hereby submit this request for approval to DfT on behalf of [Kent County Council] and confirm that I have the necessary authority to do so.

I confirm that [Kent County 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:

[REDACTED]

b) Signed:

c) Date: 30/07/2026

d) Email:

[REDACTED]

Section 151 Officer declaration

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

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

e) Name:

[REDACTED]

f) Signed:

g) Date: 31/07/2026

h) Email:

[REDACTED]