Agenda

Meeting held in private: **Environment Directorate - Corporate Director and Executive Member - Highways and Transportation**

Date: **Monday, 3 August 2026**

Time: **10.30 am**

Venue: **Via Microsoft Teams**

These meetings are private meetings. The agenda and papers for the meeting have been published for the purposes of openness and transparency. If a member of the public or press wishes to attend these meetings where there are extenuating circumstances, then they can request to do so via Maureen Wilson. Each request will be considered on its own merits.

Business

Items for Corporate Director and Assistant Director Resources (ENV) decision

1. Application for grant funding from the DfT Structures Fund *(Pages 3 - 8)*

Barry Khan
Assistant Chief Executive
(Legal and Democratic Services)

County Hall
Northallerton

Friday, 24 July 2026

This page is intentionally left blank

North Yorkshire Council

Corporate Director – Environment

03 August 2026

Application for grant funding from the DfT Structures Fund

Assistant Director – Highways and Infrastructure

1.0 Purpose of the Report

1.1 To request approval from the Corporate Director of Environment in consultation with the Chief Financial Officer, sub-delegated to the Assistant Director of Resources to submit an application to the Department for Transport (DfT) Structures Fund.

2.0 BACKGROUND

2.1 North Yorkshire Council (NYC) has received notification of transport funding from the DfT for a Structures Fund aimed to allow local highway authorities (LHA) to apply for funding for repairing or replacing highway structures, including bridges where the LHA cannot afford to maintain or restore the bridges themselves. There is no upper limit to the amount which can be requested and LHA's can put forward for repair or replacement a single structure or a 'package scheme' for a coherent set of structures in an area.

2.2 The funding is made available in support of the government's missions:

- Growth - Reduction in journey times and congestion will improve business productivity and profitability across the country
- Cleaner energy - Every route closure and diversion avoided or ended through the Fund will reduce emissions and improve air quality. Structures that have suffered from and/or are vulnerable to the increasing risk of extreme weather due to climate change can be adapted, building climate resilience
- Healthier and safer streets - Repairing, enhancing or replacing key structures for public transport and walking and cycling routes will have positive health impacts for individuals using these
- Breaking down barriers - Repairing local highway structures will reduce community severance, helping reopen local transport networks and supporting travel routes to jobs in affected communities. Structures that are replaced or enhanced should meet current design standards, enabling them to be more easily utilised by all road users.

3.0 DFT STRUCTURES FUND

3.1 This is a one-off funding stream, with numerous submissions required all within tight timescales.

3.2 The scale of funding is considerable with no upper limit for a single package of schemes. Schemes need to meet the requirements set out by the DfT.

3.3 LHA's can put forward a single structure or a 'package scheme' for a coherent set of structures in an area.

OFFICIAL

3.4 The timeline for the structures fund is as follows:

- 25 May 2026 – Expression of Interest submission
- 19 June 2026 – Draft submission deadline. Recommended date to submit initial proposals for feedback before final submission
- 03 August 2026 – Final submission deadline. Deadline for full applications to the fund
- Autumn 2026 – Funding decisions. Successful schemes announced
- by March 2030 – Delivery deadline. All funded projects must be completed by this date.

3.5 Align Property Services has worked with the NYC Bridges team to develop the submission required for the application to the structures fund, including the drafting of a business case. This has been supported by numerous disciplines across NYC to ensure the proposals are aligned with the Selby Transforming Cities Fund and other council schemes and priorities.

4.0 NYC DFT STRUCTURES FUND SUBMISSION

4.1 NYC is proposing to submit a package scheme consisting of the two Selby swing bridges.

4.2 **Selby Toll Bridge (A19).** This bridge was rebuilt in 1969 by the Selby Bridge Company and then later passed to North Yorkshire County Council in 1991 to maintain and operate. The bridge was designed with a 60-year design life and numerous structural components are nearing end of life. The submission will include a replacement bridge at this location along with allowance for a temporary pedestrian bridge or bus service. However, we accept extensive repairs could be carried out to extend the life of the bridge and believe they would be undertaken in a much shorter duration closure than a replacement bridge. It may therefore not be possible to carry out a replacement bridge using funding from the DfT Structures Fund, in which case repairs to the existing structure would be carried out. Until design and early contractor involvement (ECI) is progressed it is not possible to make a firm decision on this.

4.3 Engagement with a contractor through an ECI process for Selby Toll bridge has started through the Scape framework on an informal basis with no contract in place, so far, we have had a site visit with Balfour Beatty which has assisted with the production of a budget price for this submission. The next stage will be preliminary design discussions around deliverability of the replacement of the bridge given the funding deadline for completion by March 2030.

4.4 The **Selby bypass bridge (A63)** was built in 2004 by the Highways Agency and responsibility for operation and maintenance passed to North Yorkshire County Council in 2007. Extensive repairs, mainly to mechanical and electrical components, are needed. Since 2022 the bridge has been unable to swing for boats, which as yet has not prevented any boats passing the bridge however NYC is under a legal obligation to maintain the bridge in a condition where it could. Unfortunately, it has become apparent that the funding settlement agreed in 2007 by the Highways Agency will not meet the costs to bring the bridge back into operation and funding from the highways capital budget would be required at the expense of other schemes.

4.5 The improvements to Selby bypass bridge could be developed using an existing maintenance framework for the bridge. Depending on final design and expected value for the work, it could be delivered through this framework or as a competitive tender. There is already a defined scope for the improvements required and a budget price received.

4.6 The two structures are considered coherent in this instance, although being very different structures they are the only road crossings of the River Ouse close to Selby.

OFFICIAL

4.7 Consultation and engagement have been carried out with numerous groups, including local councilors, York and North Yorkshire Combined Authority (YNYCA) and local Member of Parliament.

4.8 Support has been taken from the DfT though a Technical Advisory Board (TAB), this has allowed NYC to ask questions and receive feedback on the proposals during the development of the submission.

4.9 There will be a resource demand on NYC for delivery of this project, this will be delivered either inhouse by recruiting or using seconded staff if required or through our consultancy partner APS. The use of the scape framework and a design and build contract on a cost reimbursable contract for the delivery of the Selby Toll bridge will simplify and keep the project management resource requirements low during the construction stage by removing any requirement to review or negotiate on compensation events.

5.0 CONTRIBUTION TO COUNCIL PRIORITIES

5.1 The 'North Yorkshire Council 'Council Plan 2024-2028' sets out the priorities for the next four years. One such priority is to 'promote and encourage active travel including walking, wheeling and cycling'. The replacement of Selby Toll bridge will allow a wider structure to be constructed, making the crossing safer for pedestrians and cyclists.

5.2 The YNYCA Strategic Transport Framework commits to ensuring that active travel is a core part of an integrated transport network. In the long term this means a comprehensive network of lit, well-maintained walking, wheeling and cycle routes across the Combined Authority. The schemes within this bid will improve walking, wheeling and cycling routes across North Yorkshire.

5.3 The emerging YNYCA Local Transport Plan acknowledges that structures such as bridges are critical pieces of infrastructure on the region's highway network. As such they must be maintained to ensure that access is maintained for all users, including active travel and public transport.

5.4 Engagement with the NYC team delivering the Selby Transforming Cities Fund (TCF) will be ongoing through this process with the potential for further highway improvements to the junction with Ousegate possible as a result of this scheme.

5.5 The ongoing maintenance to the swing bridges will have economic benefits to the Selby and wider area.

6.0 FINANCIAL IMPLICATIONS

6.1 If successful, the DfT funding for the swing bridge repairs would allow other capital funding to be allocated to other structures in North Yorkshire.

6.2 The current estimate for scheme costs is £92.3m including contingency, with a bid amount of £89.3m supported by £3m of match funding (which is subject to a bid to Local Transport Grant). The spend profile is expected to be;

Sept 2026 – March 2027	£2m
April 2027 – March 2028	£14m
April 2028 – March 2029	£15.3m
April 2029 – March 2030	£58m

OFFICIAL

The breakdown is;

Toll Bridge Replacement	£32m
Junction works	£2m
Flood Gates	£1m
Bypass Bridge	£8.4m
Lane Rental	£1.3m
VMS	£1m
Client Costs (incl PM)	£5m
15% Risk allowance	£7.6m
10% Contingency	£5.8m
44% Optimism Bias	£28.2m

6.3 This is based on current estimates, however this is still being worked on, and the final figure may be higher or lower following application of optimism bias percentages as required by the DfT. Local contribution must be included in the submission; however no minimum local contribution is set. The funding guidance notes that proposals with higher contributions will be assessed positively, but that must be offset against the schemes not appearing affordable to the LHA. The Selby swing bridge maintenance budget was £334k in 2025/26 for three bridges (includes Cawood). It is proposed an amount of £3.0m of match funding will be built into the submission, a Local Transport Grant (LTG) application is to be submitted for this funding. This would need to be reviewed if the LTG grant is not successful, other options include Local Transport Plan funding.

6.4 The proposed contract is an NEC4 Engineering and Construction Contract (ECC) Option E, a cost-reimbursable form of contract with an agreed fee, procured through the Scape Framework. This approach is considered to offer the best value in the absence of a fully defined scope, while also promoting a collaborative working relationship between the client and contractor. Given the programme constraints, a traditional procurement route involving completion of the design followed by a competitive tender process is not considered feasible. Such an approach would significantly extend the delivery timescale and introduce substantial risks to the project. Based on our experience across the construction sector, entering into a fixed-price contract without a complete design would expose the Authority to considerably greater risk and is likely to result in protracted discussions regarding change control and compensation events. Throughout the contract period, robust cost forecasting will be undertaken to provide increasing levels of cost certainty as the design develops. While there is inevitably a greater degree of cost risk before the design is finalised, the proposed approach provides the most effective opportunity to apply value engineering during the design process, where it can deliver the greatest benefit, rather than seeking efficiencies after the design has been completed.

6.5 The contract form described in 6.4 allows for the contract to be awarded before the DfT announces its decision on grant funding, this enables NYC to enter into contract to start on preliminary design. The use of suitable Z clauses can be used to allow termination if NYC is unsuccessful in getting DfT funding or the amount is to low to deliver the scheme. There would also be an option to consider descoping at this stage, and suitable Z clauses will be used to limit any potential claim as a result in loss of contract value.

6.6 There is a risk that additional costs identified as the project develops over and above the original budget and grant available would be a cost to the Council. There could be an element of descoping to manage the project budget. However, the descoping would need to be carried out earlier in the programme due to the order of the works as the less complex works at the Selby bypass would be carried out first while the design of the Selby Toll bridge is carried out.

OFFICIAL

6.7 NYC would manage risk of project cost pressures and funding availability by considering elements of descoping as per 6.6 or identifying alternate funding such as Local Transport Grant. However, any remaining additional unfunded costs would need to be met by North Yorkshire Council.

7.0 LEGAL IMPLICATIONS

7.1 If successful, the funding settlement would ensure that NYC can continue to operate these bridges in line with acts of parliament without significantly impacting on our highways capital budget.

7.2 As a Highway Authority NYC is under an obligation under the Highways Act 1980 to maintain the highway network.

7.3 Other legal obligations may exist at the Selby Toll bridge as a result of this previously being a privately owned toll bridge which had its own acts of parliament, a review of this legislation is required as parts of some acts got repealed when the bridge was handed to NYCC in 1991 – covered in the Statute Law (Repeals) Act 1993.

7.4 Legal services will review the grant terms and conditions once available, and prior to the acceptance of any grant funding. A compliant procurement procedure is intended to be utilised for expenditure of any grant monies received.

8.0 EQUALITIES IMPLICATIONS

8.1 There are no equality implications arising from this report. There will be implications for the delivery of schemes, but a future report will cover this.

9.0 CLIMATE CHANGE IMPLICATIONS

9.1 There are no climate change issues arising from this report. There will be implications for the delivery of schemes, but a future report will cover this.

10.0 REASONS FOR RECOMMENDATIONS

10.1 The submission to the DfT Structure's Fund will allow NYC to bid for funding for works to the Selby swing bridges which will allow NYC to replace the Selby Toll bridge and carry out essential maintenance to the Selby bypass bridge.

11.0 RECOMMENDATION

11.1 It is recommended that the Corporate Director of Environment in consultation with the Chief Financial Officer, sub-delegated to the Assistant Director of Resources approve the submission for the "package scheme" consisting of Selby Toll and Selby Bypass Swing bridges to be considered for funding from the Department for Transport Structures Fund for a bid amount of £89.3m along with match funding of £3m proposed to be met following a bid to the Local Transport Grant.

11.2 Following a successful application for the grant, full approval will be sought from Executive to accept the grant subject to appropriate terms and conditions being received and confirmation of the match funding being in place.

OFFICIAL

APPENDICES: None

Background documents: None

Barrie Mason
Assistant Director – Highways & Infrastructure County Hall
Northallerton DL7 8AD

Report Author – Philip Richardson, Bridges Manager

OFFICIAL