



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: Royal Borough of Greenwich
- b) Scheme / structure name and LHA bridges number: Regeneration Greenwich and Woolwich Foot Tunnels Structure No. S.01 and S.02
- c) Location (OS Grid Reference) of the scheme/structure (to identify location on map):
- Easting: Greenwich: 538276 Woolwich: 543256
- Northing: Greenwich: 178005 Woolwich: 179555
- d) Name of Project Manager: Anand Singh
- e) Email address: Anand.Singh@royalgreenwich.gov.uk
- f) Phone number: 07496 654831
- g) What type of eligible structure would your scheme address? (select all that apply)

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

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

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

GREENWICH FOOT TUNNEL

The Greenwich Foot Tunnel is located beneath the River Thames in East London, linking the Royal Borough of Greenwich (RBG) next to the Cutty Sark Gardens UNESCO World Heritage

Site on the south bank. RBG co-owns the Foot Tunnel with LBTH however it is solely responsible for managing and maintaining the tunnel on behalf of both authorities under a legal agreement. The foot tunnel was opened in 1902. The tunnel was constructed as a traditional single bore with cast iron segmental lining 1,215 feet (370.2 m) long, internal diameter 2.74m and pedestrian footway 2.73m.

At each end of the tunnel there are vertical shafts 50 feet (15.2 m) deep. Each shaft contains a helical staircase and one passenger lift, access is available 24 hours a day all year round for pedestrians and dismounted cyclists.

At the top of the vertical shaft there is a rotunda building which forms the entrance and exit points. The north entrance was listed Grade II in 1973, and South Entrance Building was listed Grade II in 1975.

Single passenger lifts were originally installed in 1904 at both ends of the tunnel, and replaced in 1992 with a bespoke single elongated hexagonal shaped lift car with lift components that are now obsolete. The lifts were modernised in 2010 and in 2021 replacement parts were manufactured from scratch as a medium-term strategy to extend their service life for another five years.

WOOLWICH FOOT TUNNEL

The Woolwich Foot Tunnel was opened in 1912 formed as a traditional single bore with cast iron segmental lining. The tunnel is 504.4m long with an internal diameter 3.4m, and a pedestrian footway 2.86m wide. Similar to Greenwich, at each end of the tunnel there are vertical shafts 52 feet (16 m) deep. Each shaft contains a helical staircase and one passenger lift, access is available 24 hours a day all year round for pedestrians and dismounted cyclists. The shaft headhouse its rotunda entrance/exit buildings north and south shafts are both given Grade II listed status in 1989.

The single passenger lifts were originally installed in 1912 at both ends of the tunnel and replaced in 1992 with a single elongated hexagonal shaped lift car with major components that are now obsolete. The Woolwich lifts were modernised in 2010 with parts manufactured from scratch, with the intention of extending their service life for another ten years, that has now expired, presenting ongoing reliability issues resulting in closure of the north lift since 2022.

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 for both foot tunnels is broadly the same which is as follows:

1) Passenger Lift replacement

Replacement of the 1992 single passenger lifts with dual lifts. This will require RIBA Stage 3 design, RIBA stage 4 Technical Design and works for specialist manufacturing, supply and installation within the footprint of the existing lift shaft.

(2) National Heritage Listed Building fabric conservation.

Restoration of the fabric in the tunnel lining and shafts – and schedule of defect findings as given in the Appendix 3 RIBA stage 2 Report not limited to water ingress , roofing elements

(3) Mechanical Electrical modernisation (4) Combined Walking/Cycling Network Development
Modernisation and renewal of the environmental systems in the tunnels such as restoring the ventilation system, digital lighting and digital advertising as given in the Appendix 4 -RBG Tunnels Regeneration Strategy

(4) Combined Walking/Cycling Network Development

provision of a segregated cycling/pedestrian facility in the tunnel to national design standards and good practice guidance. Incorporating better cycle provision into the new lift car design, appropriate signage, existing cross falls and gradients in the main tunnel, drainage. as presented in the Appendix 4 -RBG Tunnels Regeneration Strategy

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

RBG co-owns both the Greenwich Foot Tunnel with London Borough of Tower Hamlets (LBTH) and Woolwich Foot Tunnel with London Borough of Newham (LBN) respectively. RBG is the managing borough for maintaining the tunnel on behalf of both partnering boroughs under separate legal agreements. Regeneration has been under long term stakeholder engagement and lobbying with TFL and the Greater London Authority (GLA) and alongside agreeable partnering boroughs to integrate various stakeholder aspirations for regeneration.

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

Neither of the tunnels is on the SRN

1.2 Understanding the Condition of the Structure

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

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

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

The 'Greenwich & Woolwich Foot Tunnels Lift Replacement Strategy Study – Stage 2 Report' prepared by Barton Engineers submitted with this application details the recommended repairs to the tunnels including the lift replacement options. The proposed improvements can be found in pages 25 to 32.

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.

Both tunnels are regularly restricted for users requiring step-free access in order to use the tunnels, particularly those who are impaired from using the helical staircases whenever the lifts are out of working order. In the case of the Woolwich Tunnel one of the lifts has been permanently out of order since 2022.

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.

If the lifts are not replaced soon, lift reliability will get worse. Every time a lift is out of action a proportion of users who are unable to use the helical staircase will be restricted from using the

tunnel. In the case of the Woolwich Tunnel this situation already exists as one of the lifts is permanently out of action. This means that persons unable to use the staircase will be restricted from using the tunnel as there is little point in using the one working lift if the lift at the other end of the tunnel is out of action.

d) If the answer to c) above is yes, then please estimate the likelihood of this occurring: (select box that applies):

- ☐ Low confidence in restriction occurring
- ☐ Medium confidence in restriction occurring
- ☒ High confidence in restriction occurring

e) Please indicate if the relevant structure is **currently** subject to other temporary measures to manage risk.

Reference should be made to measures such as propping, etc.

The foot tunnels are not currently the subject of temporary measures

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.

None

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: Not Applicable

BCI Ave: Not Applicable

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.

Not Applicable

j) Submit, alongside this submission template, the most recent, dated copy of the structural inspection proforma or a report summarising this.

- Adapting Structures- under the proposals we are wanting to adapt the structure by making dual lifts at each end helping to improve reliability.
- Healthcare Improvement, energy transition, reducing emissions- by repairing and fixing the tunnels it will encourage more people to use active travel to get around the city which will improve their health, fitness and improve air quality.

The scheme also feeds into the London Mayors Transport Strategy policy that by 2041 80% of journeys will be made by walking, cycling and public transport. The Tunnels also provides valuable cross Thames active travel in walking and cycling, Both Greenwich and Woolwich Tunnels identifies in TfL's cycling strategic cycling analysis studies in the highest potential corridors- Refer to Appendix 1 - TfL Strategic Cycling Analysis

c) Explain why this scheme is a local priority. (Maximum 250 words)

Provide a summary of the scheme's alignment to local priorities and policies.

The Royal Borough of Greenwich has over half of the residential population not being able to access to a car making public transport, walking and cycling infrastructure essential, especially for vulnerable groups. It is also a borough where the population aged over 65 has risen by 15.6% since 2011 and 51.8 % of households are classified as being deprived in one of more of the following areas: employment, education, health and disability and housing. The Royal Borough of Greenwich's Corporate (2024-2028) is a plan that is structured around 5 'Themes' – Refer to Appendix 2 Our Greenwich Plan

- 1) Communities: Focusing on the Council's interaction both directly and indirectly with residents and communities
- 2) People: Focusing on meeting the needs of residents of Greenwich
- 3) Place: Focusing on developing Greenwich as a place
- 4) Economy: Focusing on the development Greenwich's economy
- 5) Organisation: Focusing on improving how the Council works

The strategic mission for mobility in the Plan is Mission 7 which sets out clearly that the council aim to make it 'easier, safer and greener to move around the borough and the rest of London'. Mission 7 is directly linked to improving mobility for all, with a strong emphasis on accessibility, safety and environmental sustainability. At the moment neither of the foot tunnels are working optimally in terms of efficiently moving people of all abilities from one side of the river to the other. The foot tunnel improvement proposals feed directly into the walking and cycling infrastructure ambitions of the council without discriminating against people (Mission 2).

The Plan also commits to making Transport networks safer and more accessible which will benefit older adults, children and people with disabilities. This links integrally with Greenwich's Transport Strategy.

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.

Part 2 – Understanding the Case for Investment

2.1 Strategic Case

This section of the template captures the wider need for the scheme and how it aligns to the objectives of the Structures Fund.

- a) Provide a summary of how this scheme contributes to the Government's economic growth mission (Maximum 250 words)

Describe how the proposal will support economic growth (e.g. by creating jobs, attracting investment, improving productivity, or enabling new business activity) and set out the mechanisms through which these benefits will be delivered.

The Greenwich and Woolwich Foot Tunnels provide a vital free-of-charge link across the Thames between the Royal Borough of Greenwich on the south of the River Thames, to the Isle of Dogs north of the Thames in the London Borough of Tower Hamlets, and North Woolwich in the London Borough of Newham also on the northern bank of the Thames.

The Greenwich Foot Tunnel is close major tourist attractions such as the Cutty Sark and Gardens which is a designated UNESCO World Heritage site, the National Maritime Museum and the Royal Observatory. On the North Bank of the tunnel is the Isle of Dogs, this is a bustling mix of residential, commercial and cultural places and home to Canary Wharf. The Foot Tunnel provide a vital link to both these communities north and south of the river and to the businesses that exist within them which support numerous jobs vital to the local economy.

Both foot tunnels aide movement of people between these communities and therefore important to the local community.

The scheme meets the Governments Economic Growth mission as the foot tunnels connects key growth areas and homes/business districts without having to use public transport or a bridge. Greenwich Foot Tunnel links directly with Tower Hamlet's plans to deliver 31,000 new homes and 110,000 new jobs in the Isle of Dogs Opportunity Area and the Woolwich Foot Tunnel provides links to the Elizabeth Line and DLR stations alongside London City Airport. Retaining these vital strategic links for London are important for economic growth of the locality and London as a whole.

- 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 Greenwich and Woolwich Foot Tunnel links to the key missions outlined by the government which includes:

- Reducing journey times and congestion- This will alleviate any congestion on the Docklands Light Railway alongside by improving journey times for all active travel users as will be able to access the tunnels quickly.
- Public Safety / improving health and safety- By undertaking the repairs it will allow the assets to be completely open to all and be safe for all. Currently there are key repairs which need to happen including replacing the lifts/ electrical upgrades including fire alarm systems and building conservation work.
- Breaking down barriers- the scheme helps the Council break down barriers by allowing mobility impaired, young, elderly and pregnant/maternity protected characteristics to access the tunnels/river crossing unimpeded. Furthermore, with the crossing being free it allows anyone to use it.

RBG stakeholders include London Borough of Newham, London Borough of Tower Hamlets, Transport for London, Greater London Authority, Councillors, our designers / contractors, residents/businesses alongside the Resident Action Groups petitioning for work to occur on the tunnels.

Under any scheme proposal or maintenance, we are bound by making sure our neighbouring boroughs are supportive. We have maintenance agreements being finalised currently with them.

A Communications Plan was created alongside robust stakeholder mapping for any reactive works which need to occur on the tunnels. This has allowed us to understand all residents and businesses who need to be informed. We usually update our website to let them know of any planned closures/works and publicise this also via Press Releases and social media. We are also engaging with TfL journey planning and app developers to make sure it can be coordinated into any navigation tools for customers.

We have cross party support from Royal Borough of Greenwich, London Borough of Newham, Tower Hamlets and Transport for London. This has been referenced within our quarterly Steering Groups regarding continued support and has been voiced at Full Council- 'Full regeneration' planned for Greenwich and Woolwich foot tunnels and lifts - My London. It is worth noting we currently have funding in design to RIBA 3 Spatial coordination.

- 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.

RBG' has a proactive approach to scheduled routine maintenance upkeep in the Tunnels for maintaining the fabric in the tunnel lining and shaft stairways. The council has internal services for a routine cleansing, sweeping, lift cleaning . There is also housing services provided in routine attendance servicing and repair to existing passenger lifts. Electrical safety patrols are undertaken through the council's term contractor supply chain also undertaking reactive maintenance in surfacing and other reported safety issue were afforded within revenue budgets. At intervention level, we have rolling programme for modernisation and digital, evidence CCTV, public address and voice alarm systems and fire alarms .

- 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 Woolwich and Greenwich Foot tunnels provide a vital link between communities on the north and south banks of the River Thames; their sole function is to take pedestrians and cyclists from one side of the Thames to the other. Whilst able bodied people can utilise the helical staircases, these are emergency exits. Designated access to and from the tunnels are the passenger lifts that is increasingly unreliable due to the regular breakdown, often for lengthy periods. In the Woolwich Tunnel the north lift has been out of action since 2022, this effectively means that the tunnel is no longer available to those who are entirely reliant on step-free access. Lift reliability is an increasing problem, and repairs are difficult to make due to obsolete components. The lifts in both tunnels need to be replaced to modern standards, the fear is that if one of the lifts in the Greenwich Tunnel fails and is out of action for a considerable amount of time, neither foot tunnel will be available to those who are unable to use the stairs as they are totally reliant on the lifts for step-free access. The cost for all the proposed work in the Greenwich Tunnel is estimated to be £3.6 million and

£3.05 million for Woolwich i.e. a total of £6.65 million of which £3.23 million is for the lift replacement work. Regrettably the DfT Structures Fund is the only potential source of funding available to Greenwich to undertake this work given the current strain on public finances.

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.

The Woolwich Foot Tunnel no longer provides step-free access because the North lift has been out of action since 2022. If the scheme does not go ahead, and the lifts in particular are not replaced and one of the lifts in the Greenwich Tunnel is out of action for an indefinite period of time, those pedestrians relying on step-free access would not be able to use either tunnel. With the high numbers of lift failures in the Greenwich Tunnel, which is steadily increasing year on year, coupled with obsolete component parts, the risk of a catastrophic lift failure in the Greenwich Tunnel in the near future is considered to be a highly likely. This would mean the most vulnerable in our society, typically wheelchair bound users or users who need devices to help them walk will have to seek alternative modes of transport by either using public transport such as buses, London River Services and DLR. Cyclists will also be affected unless they are able to carry a cycle down the stairs.

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.

For pedestrians requiring step free access for the Greenwich Tunnel there are alternative modes travel. The Cutty Sark Docklands Light Railway (DLR) Station is within 220 metres of the south entrance of the Greenwich Foot tunnel entrance. The DLR takes passengers under the Thames to Island Gardens Station on the north side of the river which is approximately 180 meters away from the north entrance of the foot tunnel, the frequency of trains is every 5 minutes, and the journey time is 1 minute. There is also a London River Boat Service from Greenwich Pier which is adjacent to the south entrance of the Greenwich Foot Tunnel entrance. The service runs every 20 minutes from Greenwich Pier to MastHouse Terrace Pier during peak times and 30 to 40 minutes off-peak, the journey time is also about 1 minute. MastHouse Terrace Pier is approximately 1,200 metres away from the north entrance of the Greenwich Foot Tunnel. All the stations on the DLR and River Service piers have step free access. For pedestrians unable to use step free access at the Woolwich Foot Tunnel due to the north lift being indefinitely out of action, alternative step free access can be obtained via DLR and River Boat Services.

The DLR operate a frequent service (every 10 minutes) between Woolwich Arsenal and King George V stations, Woolwich Arsenal Station is a maximum of 1,200 metres away from the south entrance of the foot tunnel and King George V station is approximately 530 metres away from the north entrance of the foot tunnel. The journey time between Woolwich Arsenal and King George V Station on the DLR is approximately 3 minutes. The Woolwich Ferry which operates between piers which are approximately 250 metres away from the north and south entrances of the Woolwich Tunnels, provide a second alternative step free means of crossing the River Thames. Disabled persons on all the services mentioned above i.e. DLR, London River Services and Woolwich Ferry can use their Disabled Persons Freedom Card and travel for free. This also applies to anyone living in London over the age of 66.

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.

Greenwich Cyclists 12hr 7am-7pm			
	Low	Average	High
2017 observed	1190	1670	2140
2026 forecast	1700	2420	3140
Woolwich Cyclists 12hr 7am-7pm			
	Low	Average	High
2017 observed	170	290	420
2026 forecast	240	420	610

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.

Click or tap here to enter text.

- 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) Not applicable- non- compatibility of the Economic Tool Kit to Pedestrian/cyclists NMU traffic.

Present Value Benefits (PVB) Not applicable- non- compatibility of the Economic Tool Kit to Pedestrian/cyclists NMU traffic.

Benefit to Cost Ratio (BCR) Not applicable- non- compatibility of the Economic Tool Kit to Pedestrian/cyclists NMU traffic.

- 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.

Not applicable- non- compatibility of the Economic Tool Kit to Pedestrian/cyclists NMU traffic.

However calculating the carbon used should the schemes be closed has been calculated but based on worst case situation of all those walking and cycling using a car for Greenwich Foot Tunnel as would need to use Blackwall Tunnel and the Ferry for Woolwich Tunnel. This shows 5.88 tCO₂e / day for Greenwich Foot Tunnel users and 0.11 tCO₂e / day for Woolwich Foot Tunnel users. However, it is worth noting the Woolwich Foot Tunnel diversion is not operational 24/7.

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).

We have tried utilising various Carbon Calculators, but many do not include the bespoke elements we will encounter with the scheme and furthermore we are only at RIBA Stage 2 and do not therefore know all quantities of materials to make an informed carbon emission calculation. We are though committed to complete the Infrastructure Carbon Emissions as part of any RIBA 3 / 4 submission.

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.

Non monetised impacts from the scheme will include:

- Improved perception of active travel environment due to clearer designation for walking and cycling alongside improved wayfinding and lifts.
- Improved perception of safety and accessibility due to lifts being fixed and potentially transparent allowing for greater feeling of safety. It also will allow anyone with bikes, mobility aid or pushchair to access the tunnels.
- Increase in people utilising the tunnels due to improved lifts meaning more people can access it.
- Potential increase in business revenue for Greenwich Town Centre and Woolwich Town Centre due to conservation works, alongside accessibility improvements.

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).

Not applicable- non- compatibility of the Economic Tool Kit to Pedestrian/cyclists NMU traffic.

Present Value Costs (PVC) Not applicable

Present Value Benefits (PVB) Not applicable

Benefit to Cost Ratio (BCR) Not applicable

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.

Greenwich have managed and maintained the lifts since the Greater London Council was abolished in the late 1980's. During that period there have been refurbishments of the tunnels including major upgrades to the lifts in 1992 and 2010, therefore Greenwich consider they are well placed with experienced resources to manage the proposed upgrade works on the tunnels and don't consider they have a capacity issue.

b) Explain the delivery plans and procurement strategy for the scheme. (Maximum 250 words).

This section should include explanation of the various stages of the scheme that are required for completion. This may include design, consents and construction processes.

The work programme will broadly follow the RIBA Stages, currently the schemes is at RIBA Stage 3 – Spatial coordination.

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.

There are a number of risks associated with the current scheme which are found below:

- Reputational risks- do nothing represents a large risk to the Council and politicians. Campaign groups and petitioning from active groups have been pushing and pushing for regeneration of these tunnels. Currently the Council and partners have committed funds to get the scheme to end of RIBA 3 and 4. We are communicating this clearly to stakeholders that we require third party funding to deliver the schemes in their entirety.
- Financial risks- cost increases going beyond available budget. We have clear controls in that the RIBA 2 cost was estimated by a Quantity Surveyor. In addition, we have clear project controls in place such as a budget control spreadsheet and follow a Stage Gate process internally to make sure at each design stage we are estimating construction.
- Design expertise- due to lack of experience in dealing with Foot Tunnels, conservation works and mechanical and electrical experience. Greenwich are procuring a multi-disciplinary team which is likely to not be solely one organisation so can make sure all aspects of the structures are taken into account.
- Planning permission- the schemes will require planning permission due to the Grade two listed natures of the structures and the conservation work which needs to take place. Officers have already engaged with the Heritage Officer and Planning Officer regarding the scheme to feed into design briefs for the consultants Greenwich will procure.

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.

Royal Borough of Greenwich are required to liaise with London Borough of Newham and London Borough of Tower Hamlets regarding any works which are required for the structures. Both organisations are extremely supportive of the scheme and are currently part funding maintenance and design work relating to

the structure regeneration. We hold quarterly meetings with the other boroughs to ensure that they know what is happening and provide programme alongside designs and cost information. It is extremely unlikely that the other organisations will be a risk to delivery.

Royal Borough of Greenwich are also updating the maintenance agreements with the other authorities.

The main decision maker will be Royal Borough of Greenwich though and this will mainly be through the planning permission process.

The Council also require other third-party organisations to deliver the design and construction of the scheme. This is going through full procurement processes, and we are looking to go out to tender services for RIBA 3 and 4 design in August 2026. We do not expect this to create a risk to delivery as the services we will be obtaining will allow the scheme to progress forward to 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					
LA contribution					
Other contribution					
Total costs					

b) Outline how the LHA has sought to manage this scheme from existing budgets and why that has been unsuccessful.

Explain the local approach to managing the existing DfT contribution across its highway assets and what specific challenges have meant that this structure was not repaired earlier.

The Council currently has reactive and routine maintenance for the structure- £111,000 for Woolwich and £112,550 for Greenwich Foot Tunnel in 2025/26. This maintenance is also part funded by the neighbouring authorities of London Borough of Newham and London Borough of Tower Hamlets. However, the lifts and parts of the structure are at end of life and require fully replacing to be able to be used for the next generation. This is funding well beyond the Department for Transport funding.

The level of funding for regeneration of the Tunnels is beyond LHA revenue budgets in maintenance as outlined in 2.4a Local approach. The Tunnels regeneration is not a new concept. Strategic investment and modernisation in Tunnels with returns for growth in Cross Thames Active Travel (Walking and Cycling) west of Blackwall / Silvertown Tunnel, was recognised for several years previously and through lobbying with TFL and GLA, alongside RBG partnering with the Tunnels co-owners the London Borough of Tower Hamlets and London Borough of Newham. We have been unsuccessful in obtaining funding so far to bring these assets up to standard and continue to lobby.

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.

Over the last 10 years we have spent £2,992,981 of revenue on Greenwich Foot Tunnel and £2,694,180 on Woolwich Foot Tunnel. Revenue has increased over time as well as the assets (in particular lifts) degrade over 10-year lifespan.

There are diverse and non-monetised risks without the proposed scheme for regeneration of the tunnels in four areas - (1) Passenger Lift replacement (2) National Heritage Listed Building fabric conservation. (3) Mechanical Electrical modernisation (4) Combined Walking/Cycling Network Development.

Without passenger lift replacement there is limiting lifecycles for replacement and repairs of bespoke lift parts of obsolescence needing to be manufactured from scratch. RBG has completed this medium-term strategy with previous parts replacements. Actual costs were £97.5K per passenger elevator per lift shaft. Parts replacements has complexities with diminishing reliability from 80% over only a 3-5year design life.

Indicative costs for Lift replacements at RIBA stage 2 is of the order £1M for dual elevator replacements per lift shaft to 20-year design life.

Without conservation, the tunnels would continue to fall into a state of disrepair with accelerated worsening and costs. Without mechanical and electrical modernisation there would harmful non-monetised costs and associated risk of negligence for e.g. council operating a pre-known M&E hazard in buried confined space of substandard ventilation / electrical systems not fit for purpose. There is also associated risk of tunnels closures for not having a co-existing transport function in the lifts whilst keeping a buried asset in service. Tunnel closure would result in loss of the asset (itself), loss of income such of advertising, community severance, loss of electorate, status and reputation.

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.

Cost estimates for the scheme are estimated for areas of tunnels regeneration (1) Passenger Lift replacement (2) National Heritage Listed Building fabric conservation. (3) Mechanical Electrical modernisation (4) Combined Walking/Cycling Network Development. Refer to Appendix 5 Spend Profile

Estimated costs for The RIBA stage 5 Manufacturing and Construction (1) Passenger Lift replacement (2) National Heritage Listed Building fabric conservation are estimated from RIBA Stage 2 Report.

Estimated costs RIBA Stage 3 spatial coordination and RIBA stage 4 Design Technical design has been estimated by officers using RIBA design rates and hours for outcomes. prescriptive and descriptive information

- 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.

Design cost contribution in RIBA Stage 3 and 4 are low financial risks in proportion to overall value of Regeneration

- 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.

Royal Borough of Greenwich will be providing £60,000 of capital contribution in 2026/27 towards the scheme to be able to deliver RIBA 3 design.

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?

The anticipated start date RIBA Stage 3 is expected to be October 2027.

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

Construction end date is expected to be March 2029

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

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

The scheme will follow the RIBA staged process. RIBA 3 / 4 – Officers are currently finalising tender documents due to go out to procure in August 2026. The procurement will be for a multi-disciplinary team to deliver developed and technical design for the tunnel's regeneration including but not limited to building conservation work, mechanical and electrical upgrades, new lifts, advertising and improvements for active travel. To resource and project manage this stage internally we have one Full-Time Equivalent resource (Principal Lift Engineer) which we are currently advertising at the Council. This person will report to the Public Realm Infrastructure Manager who manages all 70 highway structures in the borough. The scheme will also follow an internal Stage Gate process aligned with RIBA stages to ensure at each stage all documentation (designs, project management documentation and approvals) have occurred before progressing. In addition, a decision report will need to be written to be signed off by Chief Officer to allow us to procure contractors which will be written internally. To construct the scheme we will procure another contractor, potentially through a valid framework. Due to a lot of specialisms within the design it is important we get a contractor with a good supply chain of experts with lift and building

conservation. This will again be managed by our Full-Time Equivalent resource. An organogram of the team is given in Appendix 5 Organogram

- 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?).

There are a number of risks associated with the current scheme which are found below:

- Reputational risks- do nothing represents a large risk to the Council and politicians. Campaign groups and petitioning from active groups have been pushing and pushing for regeneration of these tunnels. Currently the Council and partners have committed funds to get the scheme to end of RIBA 3 and 4. We are communicating this clearly to stakeholders that we require third party funding to deliver the schemes in their entirety.*
- Financial risks- cost increases going beyond available budget. We have clear controls in that the RIBA 2 cost was estimated by a Quantity Surveyor. In addition, we have clear project controls in place such as a budget control spreadsheet and follow a Stage Gate process internally to make sure at each design stage we are estimating construction.*
- Design expertise- due to lack of experience in dealing with Foot Tunnels, conservation works and mechanical and electrical experience. Greenwich are procuring a multi-disciplinary team which is likely to not be solely one organisation so can make sure all aspects of the structures are taken into account.*
- Planning permission- the schemes will require planning permission due to the Grade two listed natures of the structures and the conservation work which needs to take place. Officers have already engaged with the Heritage Officer and Planning Officer regarding the scheme to feed into design briefs for the consultants Greenwich will procure.*

- 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.

Within Royal Borough of Greenwich, we have a Stage Gate process lifecycle. This allows us to pause and review all documentation before proceeding. This will include designs, programme, resources, finances, technical approvals, business case etc. This process has been successful on a number of major schemes delivered by the Council. In addition, we hold a Programme Board currently (solely internally) to make sure schemes are on track with time, cost and quality. This scheme will attend that and is chaired by our Director of Communities, Environment and Central. Any schemes with changes are required to submit change control requests to be able to be signed off and therefore have clear project controls. In addition there are key project management documents which have to be delivered for any scheme in the Councils Transport scheme and these include: Project Initiation Document, Budget Control Tracker, Programme, Communication and Engagement Plan, RAID Log (Risks, Assumptions, Issues and Dependencies), Lessons Learned Log, Benefits Log. Furthermore we have quarterly steering group meetings with partners to inform and update them regarding progress and it allows those partners to hold Greenwich to account.

- 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.

Only permission to be obtained is Planning Permission which will be from Royal Borough of Greenwich.

- 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 foot tunnels scheme does not require consideration of climate adaptation. However, under the RIBA 3 /4 design we will make sure the building conservation work takes into account any consideration of climate adaptation (as much as feasibly possible).

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

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

A carbon management plan will be developed for the scheme should it be successful in attracting funding. The Plan will identify the high emission elements of the scheme in terms of carbon at an operational level as well as embodied carbon in the material choices. The Plan will identify carbon reduction targets based on a review on those high emission activities and how emissions can be reduced. The Plan will also require the use of activity-based carbon calculation methodology and the use of supplier provided information such as EPD's as much as possible. The use of calculating carbon using the spend based methodology will be discouraged.

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

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

The Tunnels were constructed as a traditional single bore with cast iron segmental lining and within carries a pedestrian walkway that has statutory designation "private highway" and not classed as a NRSWA street. The tunnels are constructed a sub- invert service bay that accommodates a privately maintained water mains and Daulton cable trays that specifies the "route" classed as Electronic Communication Apparatus (ECA). The ECA contains cross Thames fibre, Arrangements have been ongoing to regularising a commercial agreement with fibre providers that consolidate fibre ducting within the service bays and modernise conveyance trucking in the shafts within the programme of regeneration.

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)

Greenwich is home to many diverse communities which is seen as a strength but we also recognise the challenges this can present and inequalities which need to be addressed to fulfil our statutory obligations under the Equality Act 2010. To ensure the council's equality policy is carried out, managers of the Tunnel Regeneration Programme will carry out an equality impact assessment of the project on the whole community, and particularly the impact of any closures, diversion routes and traffic management generally.

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.

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.

3.3 Declarations

Senior Responsible Owner declaration

As Senior Responsible Owner for [Regeneration Greenwich and Woolwich Foot Tunnels Structure No. S.01 and S.02], I hereby submit this request for approval to DfT on behalf of [Royal Borough of Greenwich] and confirm that I have the necessary authority to do so.

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

Section 151 Officer declaration

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

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