

Highways maintenance transparency report

Contents

Contents	1
Transparency report – Technical Annex	2
B1 - Highways maintenance funding and spending figures	2
B2 – Highway Maintenance Activity (Surface Treatments and Repairs)	5
B3 – Pothole repairs	6
B4 – Maintenance of highway structures	10
B5 – Asset Management	11
B6 - Maintaining footways and cycleways	14
B7 – Drainage	15
B8 – Skills and training	16
B9 – Adapting roads to withstand climate pressures.	17
B10 – Innovation	19
B11 – Working with utility companies to reduce disruption to road users.	20
B12 – Managing highways maintenance contracts effectively.	21

Transparency report – Technical Annex

B1 - Highways maintenance funding and spending figures

B1.1 – Capital funding allocation sources

Financial year	2024-25	2025-26	2026-27 (projected)
Highways maintenance capital funding allocated through DfT	£3,728,604	£4,426,563	£4,477,117
Other DfT capital funding utilised by local authority for highways maintenance	£100,731	£	£
Other Government capital funding allocated by local authority to Highways Maintenance	£	£	£
Other capital funding allocated to highways maintenance	£984,975	£1,315,892	£2,453,650
Total Capital funding allocated to highways maintenance	£4,814,310	£5,742,455	£6,930,767

B1.1.2 - Additional information on funding figures

The figures shown reflect allocated CRSTS and Highways Maintenance block funding provided through the Tees Valley Combined Authority. Any difference between actual expenditure and allocated funding will be managed through the Council's programme delivery process and carried forward into future years.

B1.2 - Spending

B1.2.1 – Total spending

Please confirm that you understand the answers provided in this section (B1.2.1) relate to your compliance under the 2026-27 local highways maintenance incentive funding requirements, as set out to your authority via letter to your chief executive in April and as published online .	Yes
--	------------

Financial year	2024-25	2025-26	2026-27 (projected)
Total highways maintenance capital spend	£4,974,514	£5,453,772	£7,228,050
Total highways maintenance revenue spend	£4,941,419	£5,276,900	£5,649,550
Total spend	£9,915,933	£10,730,672	£12,877,600

B1.2.2 - Additional information on total spending figures

--

B1.2.3 Spending on carriageways by type of spend in financial year 2025-26 and 2026-27 (projected)

Carriageway spend related maintenance type	Capital 2025-26	Revenue 2025-26	Capital 2026-27 (projected)	Revenue 2026-27 (projected)
Planned maintenance				
Preventative carriageway maintenance	£36,118	£0	£79,272	£0
Structural carriageway maintenance	£2,927,499	£0	£3,636,928	£0
Planned carriageway repair / patching programmes	£428,746	£0	£614,200	£0
Reactive carriageway maintenance				
Reactive carriageway repairs / patching (temporary repairs)	£0	£69,966	£0	£64,920
Reactive carriageway repairs / patching (permanent repairs)	£84,055	£279,865	£104,250	£259,680
Reactive carriageway repairs / patching (total)	£84,055	£349,832	£104,250	£324,600
Other carriageway-related spend	£137,266	£1,439,195	£147,240	£1,610,863
Total	£3,613,683	£1,789,027	£4,581,890	£1,935,463

B1.2.4 - Additional information on spending on carriageways by type of spend.

The figures reported for 2025/26 may differ from those included in the 2026/27 submission because of changes in guidance and associated clarification on how authorities should classify and report different types of highways maintenance activities.

In particular, the revised guidance has affected the interpretation of what is included or excluded within each spend category, including the distinction between planned and reactive activities, and between temporary and permanent pothole carriageway repairs.

The 2025/26 figures are also now presented as actual outturn figures, whereas the previous submission was based on forecast information available at the time.

These factors mean that some year-on-year differences reflect changes in reporting classification and data status, rather than changes in maintenance activity alone.

B2 – Highway Maintenance Activity (Surface Treatments and Repairs)

B2.1 – Road resurfacing and surface treatments

Financial year	Road receiving preventative road surface treatments (length, km)	Road receiving planned structural maintenance (length, km)	Area receiving planned repair / patching programmes	Area receiving reactive repair / patching (permanent methods)	Area receiving reactive repairs/ patching (temporary methods)
2025-26	2.35km	17.78km	4035m ²	3223m ²	1229m ²
2026-27 projected	6.527km	20.169km	4954m ²	n/a	n/a

B2.1.1 – additional information on surface treatments and repairs

Does table B2.1 reflect all your carriageway-related road surface treatments & repair activities (for example, including pothole repairs)? If no , please add further information on any other types of treatments (planned to be) delivered and their extent in the table below.	Yes
--	------------

B2.1.2 – Further information and context

Reactive repair areas are estimated because the Council's operational system records individual pothole repairs but does not routinely record the total square metre area of reactive repairs. For transparency reporting, 2025/26 areas have been estimated using recorded expenditure for permanent and temporary reactive carriageway repairs and the corresponding average unit rates. This produces estimated areas of approximately 3,223 m² for permanent repairs and 1,229 m² for temporary repairs.	
--	--

B3 – Pothole repairs

This section sets out how authorities identify and repair potholes and other defects in carriageways, and how this activity fits within their wider maintenance approach. The Department is clear that prevention is better than cure: planned, preventative maintenance should be the foundation of a well-managed network, reducing the need for repeated reactive interventions.

B3.1 – Pothole/Defect intervention criteria

Pothole/Defect category name (as used by your authority)	Minimum investigatory or definitional threshold (e.g. depth, area, width – include units)	Additional risk or contextual factors considered (e.g. road hierarchy, traffic levels, location in carriageway)	Target response time – make safe	Target response time – permanent repair
Category 1 – Priority 1	Carriageway pothole/spalling or other abrupt level difference: Categories 2, 3(a) and 3(b): ≥ 30 mm depth and ≥ 150 mm wide in any horizontal direction. Categories 4(a) and 4(b): ≥ 40 mm depth and ≥ 150 mm wide in any horizontal direction.	Risk factor 25. Risk assessment considers defect depth/extent, traffic volume/type/speed, pedestrian use, network hierarchy, defect position, proximity to junctions/bends, position relative to users/wheel tracks, vulnerable users, interaction with other defects and weather conditions.	Within 2 hours – immediate hazard to be repaired or made safe.	Permanent repair where practicable. If temporarily made safe, the repair is reassessed and a permanent repair ordered within 7, 30 or 99 working days according to the residual risk.
Category 1 – Priority 2	Same carriageway pothole investigatory levels as above.	Risk factor 15–20. Same risk-assessment factors; represents an imminent rather than immediate hazard.	Within 24 hours – defect to be repaired or made safe.	Permanent repair where practicable. If temporarily made safe, the repair is reassessed and a permanent repair ordered

				within 7, 30 or 99 working days according to the residual risk.
Category 2 – Priority 3	Same carriageway pothole investigatory levels as above.	Risk factor 10–12. Risk assessment considers defect extent, location, hierarchy, user exposure, vulnerable users, weather and likelihood/consequence of harm. All Category 2 defects in town-centre areas receive Priority 3.	Make safe and/or permanent repair within 7 working days.	Permanent repair within 7 working days where repair is required.
Category 2 – Priority 4	Same carriageway pothole investigatory levels as above.	Risk factor 5–9. Same risk-assessment process, with lower assessed impact/probability than Priority 3.	No separate make-safe target specified in the Manual.	Permanent repair within 30 working days.
Category 2 – Priority 5	Same carriageway pothole investigatory levels as above.	Risk factor 1-4	No separate make-safe target specified in the Manual.	Permanent repair within 99 working days / next programme / further inspection or review

B3.2 – Number of potholes filled.

B3.2.1 - Number of potholes filled in 2025-26 (estimate)	12,346
--	--------

B3.2.2 - Of these how many do you estimate were resolved using each of the following approaches?

Planned repair / patching programmes	Planned structural maintenance programmes	Reactive repair using temporary repair methods	Reactive repair using permanent repair methods
No data held (see B3.2.3)	No data held (see B3.2.3)	1,950	10,396

B3.2.3 - Additional information on numbers of potholes resolved, by treatment type.

The Council records individual reactive pothole repairs, allowing temporary and permanent repairs to be estimated separately.

Potholes resolved through planned patching or structural maintenance are not recorded individually because these treatments address larger areas of carriageway rather than discrete defects.

During 2025/26, the Council delivered planned patching and structural maintenance which may have resolved or prevented potholes, but the number of individual potholes treated through these programmes is not held.

CAUTION FOR READERS – Authorities have different criteria for identifying potholes and different methodologies for counting how many they have filled or resolved. Summing the figures in the above table across authorities will therefore not provide a reliable estimate of the total number of potholes filled across England.

B3.3 - Prices of pothole interventions

Unit/average cost of a permanent pothole repair on your network (reactive)	£112.90	Unit/average cost of a temporary pothole repair on your network (reactive)	£56.95
--	---------	--	--------

B3.3.1 - Additional information on pothole prices (optional)

Average repair costs are calculated from 2025/26 pothole repair activity and include labour, plant and materials on a per m2 basis. Please refer to section B2.1.2.

B3.4 - Defect repair quality

ID	Question	Yes/no
3.4.1	Do you set requirements to those delivering repairs about the longevity of both a) planned repairs/patching and b) reactive repairs using permanent methods?	Yes
3.4.2	If yes, do you base your material and process specifications on these longevity requirements?	Yes
3.4.3	Do you regularly monitor the appropriateness of the carriageway interventions chosen by your workforce or contractor and the quality of work delivered?	Yes
3.4.4	If yes, do you systematically record information about expected and delivered longevity of repairs?	No

B3.4.5 - Evidence Summary

Planned patching and permanent reactive repairs are delivered in accordance with the Council's highway maintenance specifications and relevant material and workmanship requirements.

The suitability of repair methods and the quality of completed works are monitored through operational supervision, site inspections and subsequent highway safety inspections, with any identified defects or failures followed up through the appropriate delivery or contractual process.

The Council does not currently maintain a systematic record comparing the expected and actual longevity of individual repairs.

A defect correction period of 12 month is stated within the highway surfacing contract.

B3.4.6 - Additional information

--

B3.5 - Public reporting system for defects and other issues

ID	Question	Answer
3.5.1	Are defect reports from the public routinely used as an input into maintenance planning and inspection regimes?	Yes
3.5.2	Do you inform users about the outcomes from their feedback, including when no action is to be taken?	Yes

B3.5.3 - Evidence Summary

Public defect reports are received through the Council's online reporting services, [FixMyStreet](#), telephone, email and Member enquiries.

Each report is logged, assigned a unique reference number and passed to the relevant highway team for review. The team assesses the report and responds with the outcome or action being taken. Where the reporting channel allows, this information is then fed back to the member of the public or elected member who raised the enquiry.

Reports submitted through [FixMyStreet](#) follow a similar process, with updates and responses made.

Information from public reports can also inform wider inspection and maintenance planning.

B3.5.4 - Tools used for reporting.

Members of the public can report defects and other highway defects via the following.

Online pothole reporting service: [report-a-pothole](#)

Other highway defects reporting service: [report-a-problem-with-a-path-street-light-or-street-furniture](#)

Defects can be reported through [FixMyStreet](#)

Residents can also contact the Council directly by telephone on 01642 774774 or by emailing; contactus@redcar-cleveland.gov.uk.

B4 – Maintenance of highway structures

B4.1 Highway Structures

ID	Question	Answer
4.1.1	Number of highway structures on your highway network	272
4.1.2	Number of highway structures with interim measures in accordance with CS470 applied?	4
4.1.3	Number of structures due a General Inspection in 2025-26 in accordance with CS450	77
4.1.4	Number of General Inspections carried out in 2025-26	62
4.1.5	Number of structures due a Principal Inspection in 2025-26 in accordance with CS450	33
4.1.6	Number of Principal Inspections carried out in 2025-26	17

The figures above relate to highway structures maintained by Redcar and Cleveland Borough Council and exclude public rights of way bridges and third-party owned structures.

Outstanding Principal Inspections in 2025/26 were mainly due to procurement delays, with the inspection contract commencing in November 2025, together with access requirements, vegetation clearance and consultant resourcing constraints.

Outstanding General Inspections reflect the late contract commencement, an existing inspection backlog and limited internal resource. Outstanding inspections have been carried forward into the 2026/27 inspection programme and are being progressed in accordance with the Council's structures management arrangements.

B5 – Asset Management

This section focuses on asset management practices that underpin how the authority plans, prioritises and delivers highways maintenance. It is intended to provide confidence that decisions are evidence led, risk based and aligned to whole life value, in line with the Code of Practice for Well Managed Highways Infrastructure.

B5.1 - Asset Management Strategy and Policy

5.1.1	Please confirm that you understand the answers provided in this section (B5.1) relate to your compliance under the 2026-27 local highways maintenance incentive funding requirements, as set out to your authority via letter to your chief executive in April and as published online.	Yes
5.1.2	Please provide a link to your authority's published highways asset management policy and strategy. Link	
	Link to Highway Asset Management Policy Highway Asset Management Policy Link to Highway Asset Management Strategy Highway Infrastructure Asset Management Strategy.pdf	
5.1.3	Please provide the date it was last reviewed or updated	Date: Policy - Drafted November 2025, approved April 2026 Strategy – approved August 2026
5.1.4	Please provide proof of the review or update.	
	Highway Asset Management Policy Cabinet report – Item 55	
5.1.5	If your asset management policy or strategy has not been reviewed or updated since 1 August 2024, please confirm that it will be reviewed or updated by 30 September 2027 and provide a brief timetable for doing so.	
	<i>Not applicable</i>	

B5.1.6 - Further context (optional)

Skidding Resistance Policy Skidding resistance policy Resilient Network Policy Highway Asset Management Resilient Network Policy Maintenance Hierarchy Policy Highway Asset Management Maintenance Hierarchy Policy Winter Service Policy Winter service Policy
--

Key aspects of highways asset management approach

B5.2 - Asset data

Asset type	Asset inventory held? (None / partial / full)	Condition data held? (None / Partial / Full)
Carriageways	Full	Full
Footways and cycleways	Full	Partial
Structures	Full	Partial
Drainage assets	Partial	Partial
Street lighting	Full	Full
Traffic signals	Full	Full

5.2.1 - Further context

Condition surveys for all footpaths and footways will be commissioned in 2026/27, providing detailed assessments to support future maintenance planning.

The Council holds a full highway structures inventory through its ongoing General and Principal Inspection programme, with fuller condition data to be developed.

For drainage, inventory and condition data is held for gullies, trash screens and ditches; however, information on sub-surface drainage assets remains limited and will be improved as asset records are developed.

B5.3 – Asset data integration and management

B5.3.1 – Asset data integration

How is asset inventory and condition data for your key highway assets primarily managed? (please indicate one option with an X)

Discrete spreadsheets or documents held by individual teams	
Multiple digital platforms with limited integration	x
A single digital platform or a set of connected platforms used across the highways service	
Other (please set out in further context)	

B5.3.2 - Further context

XA, XAIS-PTS is the Council's current asset management platform.

It is a cloud-hosted, web-based system used to manage, visualise and prioritise highway infrastructure and pavement condition data.

The platform holds highway asset records, including carriageways, footways, drainage and street lighting. It supports the management of asset inventory and condition data, helping inform works planning, prioritisation and evidence-led maintenance decisions across the highway network.

ArcGIS is used by the Council's structures team as a geographic information system (GIS) mapping platform. It enables the team to create, analyse, manage and share spatial data, supporting the visualisation of highway structures and geographic information.

B5.4 – Lifecycle planning and investment decision-making.

ID	Question	Yes / No
5.4.1	Do you use lifecycle plans for carriageways to support maintenance investment decisions?	Yes
5.4.2	Do you use lifecycle plans for footways to support maintenance investment decisions?	No
5.4.3	Do you use lifecycle plans for structures to support investment decisions?	No

B5.4.4 - Evidence Summary

The Council uses lifecycle planning for its carriageway asset to support longer-term maintenance and investment decisions.

The published Lifecycle Planning and Prioritisation Strategy uses carriageway condition information to consider future maintenance needs, treatment options and the effect of different investment approaches. These outputs are used alongside network hierarchy, safety risk, available funding and engineering judgement to support treatment selection, prioritisation and development of forward carriageway programmes.

Equivalent lifecycle modelling is not currently established for footways or structures.

The Council intends to develop its footway lifecycle approach following planned improvement in footway condition data, including further AEI surveys.

[Highways Lifecycle Planning](#)

B5.5 – Performance monitoring and continuous improvement

ID	Question	Answer
5.5.1	Do you have a defined set of key performance indicators (KPIs) to monitor the outcomes of your highway's asset management approach?	Yes
5.5.2	Are these KPIs reviewed on a regular basis (at least annually)?	Yes
5.5.3	Are KPI trends used to inform maintenance planning, prioritisation or changes to forward programmes or investment decisions?	Yes
5.5.4	Have you conducted a value for money review or peer review of your service in the last 3 years	Yes

B5.5.5 - Evidence Summary

The Council monitors a defined KPI set covering highway defects, road network availability, street lighting outages, highway safety inspection completion, culvert trash screen maintenance, gully cleansing programme delivery, structures inspections, Lead Local Flood Authority planning responses and Section 19 flood investigation reporting timescales.

KPIs are reviewed through service performance arrangements and used to inform operational priorities, maintenance planning, forward programmes and service improvement.

The service was also subject to an internal audit peer review in 2025, with all agreed outcome measures implemented.

B6 - Maintaining footways and cycleways.

ID	Question	Answer
6.1.1	Do you have a defined footway hierarchy (e.g. based on footway function and usage levels) that underpins a risk-based approach to inspection frequencies and maintenance programmes?	Yes
6.1.2	For 2026-27, please provide the length of footways that you have earmarked for structural maintenance / reconstruction / renewal	3.396 km
6.1.3	For 2026-27, please provide the length of footways that you have earmarked for preventative maintenance treatments	0.965 km
6.1.4	Are priority footways and cycleways included in your winter service (e.g. gritting or snow clearance), and in a routine programme for keeping them clear of overgrown vegetation and debris (e.g. sweeping, cutting back)?	Yes
6.1.5	For 2026-27, are you planning to deliver structural or preventative maintenance to cycleways which is not yet covered as part of your carriageway maintenance programmes or footway maintenance programmes (e.g. segregated cycleways that are not shared with pedestrians or motorists). If yes, please set out the length of such cycleways that you have earmarked for:	No
	a. Structural maintenance / reconstruction (in km)	0 km
	b. Preventative maintenance treatments (in km)	0 km

B6.1.6 - Please provide any brief additional information you consider helpful in explaining your approach to maintaining footways and cycleways.

Cycleway maintenance is generally delivered through the wider maintenance programme for the asset on which the cycle route is located.

Defects affecting cycle facilities provided within footway assets are identified and treated through the footway inspection and maintenance programme, while defects affecting cycle routes located within the carriageway are managed through the carriageway inspection and maintenance programme.

This ensures cycleway defects are considered as part of the Council's wider risk-based maintenance approach, even where there is no separate standalone cycleway maintenance programme.

There is no cycleway schemes scheduled for 2026 / 2027.

B6.1.7 - Evidence Summary

The 2026/27 footway maintenance figures are taken from the Council's planned maintenance programme and supporting cost/scheme records. The programme identifies approximately 3.396 km of structural footway resurfacing/reconstruction and 0.965 km of preventative treatment.

These figures align with the footway programme reported in Section A5 and are supported by the Council's 2026/27 preventative and reconstruction programme.

[Planned Carriageway and Footway works 2026-2027](#)

We have a defined footway hierarchy based on footway function and usage policy.

[Highway Asset Management Maintenance Hierarchy Policy](#)

Priority footways and cycleways are included in our winter service provision, please refer to our [Winter service Policy](#)

B7 – Drainage

ID	Question	Answer
7.1.1	Please provide an estimate of your drainage maintenance expenditure split (in percentages) between:	
	a) Reactive (incident- or failure-driven) maintenance	20%
	b) Planned maintenance (routine/cyclical and/or risk-based)	80%
7.1.2	Does your authority utilise a digital drainage management platform, covering asset inventory, inspection history, sensor data, and risk scoring?	Yes
7.1.3	Do you maintain a record of locations where drainage issues are known to cause or contribute to carriageway deterioration or surface water ponding?	Yes
7.1.4	Do you utilise smart sensors or other remote monitoring technologies to monitor performance of your drainage assets. If yes please provide some high-level information in bullet points below	No

B7.1.5 - Evidence Summary

Since October 2025, RCBC has used a risk-based model to determine its gully cleansing maintenance programme, drawing on historic cleansing data, environmental parameters and data from other authorities.

RCBC is currently building and updating current records of known locations with drainage issues and working to towards increasing the digitised records of our highway drainage network.

A full review and asset capture of highway gullies was completed in 2024. The recording method for grids and screen maintenance is also under review to improve consistency and support future planned maintenance decisions

B7.1.6 – Further context on approach to drainage asset management

RCBC uses a risk-based, probabilistic model to plan cyclical highway gully cleansing, ensuring resources are focused where they deliver the greatest benefit. This targeted approach supports effective management of higher-risk gullies and helps improve network resilience.

The Council is also expanding its planned preventative drainage activity, including borough-wide ditching reviews, renewal and upgrading of gully pots, and increased CCTV survey work to identify issues before they affect the highway.

Locations with previous drainage issues are recorded and prioritised for regular planned maintenance, helping to reduce repeat reactive attendance and support a more proactive, data-led drainage service.

B8 – Skills and training

ID	Question	Answer
8.1.1	Do you have an up-to-date training and development plan for those responsible for highways asset management in your authority?	No
8.1.2	Do you or your main highways contractors support professional development through a recognised professional training scheme (e.g. Institution of Civil Engineers (ICE) or Institution of Highway Engineers (IHE))?	Yes
8.1.3	Does your authority contribute towards the cost of professional membership or professional development required for relevant highways roles?	Yes
8.1.4	Do you employ a professionally qualified engineer (e.g. Chartered Engineer (CEng) or equivalent competence) with responsibility for the management of highway structures (either in house or through a contracted arrangement)?	Yes
8.1.5	Does your authority define competence requirements for key highways asset management roles and take steps to address any identified gaps (either directly or through contractual arrangements)?	Yes
8.1.6	Do you or your main contractors support early career development in your local area, for example through apprentice schemes, traineeships or pre-apprenticeship programmes, sponsored qualifications (e.g. HNC/HND, degree, MSc), graduate schemes etc	Yes

B8.1.7 - Evidence Summary

The Authority uses Skill Gate for mandatory in-house training and supports professional development through LCRIG sessions, Tees Valley asset management forums and funded CIHT membership.

All positions within Asset Management of Engineers and above are minimum HNC qualified and record at least 25 hours of CPD annually.

The Senior Asset Engineer is BEng (Hons) qualified and recently attended the LCRIG asset management forum residential course.

The Senior Structures Engineer is qualified to MEng level with 8 years' experience at senior level.

The Authority supports early careers, with four civil engineering apprentices currently working in the Highways team through ICE-accredited apprenticeships.

B8.1.8 – Further context on skills/training

--

B9 – Adapting roads to withstand climate pressures.

Climate and environmental factors, such as heavy rainfall, prolonged heat, and freeze-thaw cycles, are integral to effective highways asset management, as they influence asset performance, deterioration rates and long-term resilience. Understanding both the impacts of a changing climate and the carbon implications of maintenance activities supports better decision-making, helping authorities to optimise durability, manage risk and deliver best whole life value from their assets.

ID	Question	Yes/no
9.1.1	Have you updated your asset management policy and strategy to reflect the increased probability of extreme-weather and/or geohazards now and in the future?	Yes
9.1.2	Have you identified your resilient network and agree this with senior decision-makers	Yes
9.1.3	If yes, when did you last update this.	12/2025
9.1.4	Have you identified locations that are repeatedly affected by extreme weather (e.g. flooding, heat damage, storms)?	Yes – known informally.
9.1.5	Which climate-adaptation measures are currently implemented on your network?	
	- Targeted drainage upgrades or maintenance	Yes
	- Natural flood management / SuDS	Yes
	- targeted slope / ground stability / landslip mitigation	Yes
	- Heat-resilient materials or surface treatments	Yes
	- Tree planting / shading for heat management	Yes
	- Other - Electric vehicle charging on street from residential properties	Yes
	- None of the above	
9.1.6	Have you measured and benchmarked the greenhouse gas emissions from your highways maintenance service using a recognised industry standard? Or do you have arrangements in place to do this, such as by signing up to the DfT funded ADEPT Carbon Leadership Programme.	Yes
9.1.7	Have you formally engaged with the DfT funded ADEPT live labs 2 Programme, to understand what lessons your authority can utilise to increase the efficiency of your operations and support decarbonisation efforts?	No

B9.1.8 - Evidence Summary

The Council's Highway Asset Management Policy, Strategy, Resilient Network Policy and supporting maintenance arrangements provide the framework for managing weather and climate-related risks to the highway network.

Known locations affected by flooding and other weather-related issues are identified through operational records, drainage information and local engineering knowledge. Current resilience activity includes targeted drainage maintenance and use of materials such as Polymer Modified Binder where appropriate to improve durability under higher temperatures and traffic loading.

The Council does not currently benchmark highways maintenance carbon emissions using recognised industry methodology. The authority has signed up to DfT funded ADEPT Carbon Leadership Programme

B9.1.9 - Further context on your adaptation / resilience activities

The Council does not currently undertake carbon accounting at a level that enables robust measurement, benchmarking or reporting of emissions attributable solely to the Highways service. However, it does measure and publicly report its corporate Scope 1 and Scope 2 emissions and continues to improve the granularity of carbon reporting across service areas.

The Highways service supports the Council's climate objectives through accredited Carbon Literacy training, incorporating carbon considerations into procurement, and adopting lower-carbon materials, equipment and techniques where appropriate. Carbon calculators have been explored; however, a service-specific emissions reporting methodology has not yet been adopted.

As an authority we utilise heat resistant materials in our surface treatment projects by using materials that incorporate Polymer Modified binder (PMB). PMB is more heat resistant compared to traditional bitumen. The incorporation of PMB reduces deformation and rutting of our highways from heavy vehicle movements during periods of hot weather.

The authority have signed grant paperwork from TVCA (Tees Valley Combined Authority) for the installation of cross pavement Electric vehicle charging "on street" from residential properties. This will allow residents to charge electric vehicles from their own properties. We will be launching the scheme to residents in September 2026.

B10 – Innovation

ID	Question	Yes / No
10.1.1	Do your procurement and contracting approaches encourage and reward innovative practice?	Yes
10.1.2	Can you demonstrate that innovative materials and practices are regularly reviewed and, where appropriate, integrated into business as usual operations?	Yes
10.1.3	If you have conducted innovation trials, have you shared the findings of these publicly or with professional networks?	No

10.1.4 - Evidence Summary

The surfacing contract is weighted 60% quality and 40% price, with innovation and carbon reduction forming part of the quality assessment, helping encourage practical improvement through procurement.

Warm mix asphalt is now used as standard on resurfacing schemes, demonstrating successful innovation moving into business-as-usual delivery.

In 2024/25, ACLA carbon-negative material was also used within the binder course on a resurfacing scheme between Guisborough and Charlton's, delivering an estimated 7-tonne carbon saving.

Findings from the trial schemes will be published once monitoring has been completed and the outcomes have been reviewed.

B10.1.5 - Further context on your innovation activities

During 2024/25, RCBC trialled graphene-enhanced asphalt at Flatts Lane Country Park, with Genable™ additive incorporated into over 150 tonnes of asphalt produced at Coxhoe asphalt plant in Durham. The use of graphene was intended to improve durability, extend surface life, reduce rutting and cracking, and increase resistance to pothole formation

[Flatts Lane Country Park Graphene trial](#)

A Further graphene trial was undertaken at Locke Road/Trafalgar, Redcar in 2026/27.

[Locke Road / Trafalgar Terrace Graphene](#)

10.2 – Examples of innovations that have been adopted

Warm mix material is now used as standard on all resurfacing projects, reducing carbon compared with traditional hot mix materials.

The Council also uses heat-resilient materials in surface treatment schemes, including products incorporating Polymer Modified Binder (PMB). PMB provides greater resistance to heat than conventional bitumen, helping reduce deformation and rutting caused by heavy vehicle movements during periods of hot weather.

Joint sealing is also now being used across the borough as a preventative treatment, helping to limit water ingress, slow deterioration and extend the life of carriageway surfaces.

B11 – Working with utility companies to reduce disruption to road users.

ID	Question	Yes / No
11.1.1	Do you routinely monitor and enforce utility works quality as part of your streetworks management?	Yes
11.1.2	Have you undertaken a senior-endorsed assessment of whether a lane rental scheme would be suitable for your area?	No
11.1.3	Do you seek input from utility companies when determining your highways maintenance programme to help reduce disruption?	Yes
11.1.4	Have you conducted and published a permit scheme evaluation within the last three years?	No
11.1.5	Have you conducted a traffic sensitive review in the last three years?	Yes

B11.1.6 - Evidence Summary

The Council monitors and enforces utility works through NRSWA inspections, reinstatement defect records, Street Manager data and utility performance monitoring.

Defects are recorded and followed through the appropriate enforcement process. Utility companies are engaged through regular coordination meetings and forward planning to help align street works with highway maintenance activity.

No formal senior-endorsed lane rental assessment has been undertaken. A permit scheme evaluation has been completed but not published. A traffic-sensitive streets review was completed in 2025.

B11.1.7 - Further context

The Authority monitors utility works through NRSWA inspections of live works and completed reinstatements.

Defects are recorded, enforced and tracked through Street Manager to support compliance and reduce repeat interventions.

Inspection outcomes are reviewed to identify recurring issues and drive improvement.

Although no formal senior-endorsed Lane Rental assessment has been undertaken, existing permit and traffic management arrangements are considered effective.

Permit conditions manage time, duration and impact, particularly on traffic-sensitive routes.

The Authority works with utilities to coordinate programmes, reduce disruption and support early planning. Recent permit scheme evaluation and traffic-sensitive reviews inform ongoing network management.

B12 – Managing highways maintenance contracts effectively.

Only answer this sections if you utilise a contractor to deliver any of your **carriageway** maintenance operations, including: structural maintenance, planned repairs / patching, or reactive repairs / patching

ID	Question	Yes / No
12.1.1	Does your authority retain in-house technical capability to independently assess maintenance interventions proposed by contractors?	Yes
12.1.2	Do you routinely analyse actual unit costs (for example £/m ² of road surface treatments, or £/pothole repair) for core highways maintenance activities delivered under contract and compare them against benchmarks or historic performance?	Yes
12.1.3	Do you have defined KPIs for your highway's maintenance contract(s), and are they actively monitored by your authority to manage performance?	Yes
12.1.4	If reactive pothole repairs are delivered by a contractor, do your contracting arrangements incentivise single-visit permanent repairs where it is safe and appropriate to do so?	No (Not applicable)

12.1.5 - Evidence Summary

The Council retains in-house technical expertise to assess and challenge contractor proposed maintenance interventions, including scheme development, treatment selection and site monitoring.

Contracted scheme costs are reviewed against historic rates and comparable activities to ensure value for money, with recognised Frameworks used to secure capped tendered rates. Competitive processes are undertaken where appropriate, with price used as part of the award criteria.

The surfacing contract includes eleven KPIs covering programme delivery, Social Value and carbon reporting, with performance monitored to ensure compliance and address issues.

Reactive pothole repairs are predominantly delivered in-house rather than through the maintenance contractor.

B12.1.6 - Further context

The Asset Team and Service Delivery Team retain sufficient in-house technical capability to review and challenge contractor proposals, validate defects, agree appropriate treatments and monitor works through delivery.

Contract performance is managed through regular operational meetings, site inspections and review of completed works.

Cost information from previous schemes and comparable activities is also considered when planning and reviewing maintenance works.

These arrangements allow the Council to act as an informed client, challenge proposals where necessary, support value for money and ensure interventions are appropriate, durable and aligned with the longer-term management of the highway network