

Authority: Nottingham City Council

Document: Local highways maintenance transparency report (technical annex)

Published Date: 10th September 2026

B1 Highways maintenance funding and spending figures

TABLE 1: CAPITAL FUNDING ALLOCATION SOURCES

Financial year	2024-25	2025-26	2026-27 ¹
Highways maintenance capital funding allocated through DfT	£3,117,000	£6,173,000	£8,014,000
Other DfT capital funding utilised by local authority for highways maintenance	£	£425,000	£3,545,000
Other Government capital funding allocated by local authority to Highways Maintenance	£	£	£
Other capital funding allocated to highways maintenance	£	£	£2000
Total Capital funding allocated to highways maintenance	£3,117,000	£6,598,000	£11,560,000

B1.1.2 Additional information on funding figures

The funding “allocated through DfT” reflects maintenance funding allocated by EMCCA. The EMCCA allocation of Streets for People funding apportioned to maintenance is included under the ‘other’ funding. Streets for People is a neighbourhood-based improvement programme focused on meeting the needs of local residents.

B1.2 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
--	-----

¹ Projected

TABLE 2: TOTAL SPENDING

Financial year	2024-25	2025-26	2026-27 ²
Total highways maintenance capital spend	£3,117,000	£6,598,000	£11,560,000
Total highways maintenance revenue spend	£1,993,000	£2,330,000	£2,826,000
Total spend	£5,110,000	£8,929,000	£14,386,000

B1.2.2 Additional information on total spending figures

Included in the figures for 2026-27 is £1.5m capital and £0.84m revenue which is still subject to an approval process scheduled for September 2026.

TABLE 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	Revenue 2026-27
Planned maintenance				
Preventative carriageway maintenance	£1,469,000	£0	£2,528,000	£0
Structural carriageway maintenance	£3,678,000	£0	£6,409,000	£0
Planned carriageway repair / patching programmes	£5000	£0	£160,000	£0
Reactive carriageway maintenance				
Reactive carriageway repairs / patching (temporary repairs)	£0	£325,000	£0	£712,000
Reactive carriageway repairs / patching (permanent repairs)	£0	£1,158,000	£0	£860,000
Reactive carriageway repairs / patching (total)	£0	£1,484,000	£0	£1,572,000
Other carriageway-related spend				
Total	£5,153,000	£1,484,000	£9,097,000	£1,572,000

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

The following budget are subject to approval in September 2026

- £0.5m for capital planned preventative maintenance
- £0.5m for capital planned structural maintenance
- £0.5m for capital and a further 0.5m for revenue planned carriageway patching programmes

² Projected

B2 Highway Maintenance Activity (Surface Treatments and Repairs)

TABLE 4: 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	5.4 km	11.2 km	3375 m ²	6426 m ²	2114 m ²
2026-27 ³	10.9 km	15.0 km	5000 m 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

Further information and context

Included within the figures for planned structural maintenance in table 4 (road resurfacing and surface treatments) above is approximately 0.57 km of carriageway recycling. Known as retread, carriageway recycling is used on lightly trafficked roads that require more than just surface treatment. It's less disruptive than the alternatives, requires very little new material imported onto site and minimises the amount waste generated during construction.

B3 Pothole repairs

B3.1 Pothole/Defect intervention criteria

The table below shows a summary of the investigatory levels for common safety defects set out in our [Highway Safety Inspection Manual](#). It should be noted that these definitions are provided as guidance for the inspector to understand the initial defect. Their risk assessment at the point of inspection will determine the appropriate response and every case is subject to on-site professional judgement.

TABLE 5: POTHOLE/DEFECT INTERVENTION CRITERIA

Defect	Investigatory levels	
	Carriageway	Footway and cycleway
Pothole	Depth >= 50mm	Depth >= 25m Depth >= 20mm in M201 only
Difference in level	Depth >= 50mm length >0.6m	Depth >= 25m Depth >= 20mm in M201 only
Modular paving uneven	Depth >= 50mm	Depth >= 25m Depth >= 20mm in M201 only
Flooding	Affecting >25% of the lane or footway width	

³ Projected

Rutting	Depth >= 50mm length >5m	
Abrupt difference in level	Depth >= 50mm	Depth >= 25m Depth >= 20mm in M201 only

Risk matrices are used to determine the appropriate response times for safety defects. Probability of highway users interacting with safety defects is affected by a range of factors, but primarily the volume of traffic or class of road/footway. Impact is affected most by the severity of the defect. In all cases, these are maximum response times, and any reference to days is working days unless otherwise stated.

TABLE 6: RISK ASSESSMENT MATRIX

		Probability of highway user interacting with the safety defect				
		Negligible (1)	Low (2)	Medium (3)	High (4)	Severe (5)
Impact on highway user	Negligible (1)	1	2	3	4	5
	Low (2)	2	4	6	8	10
	Medium (3)	3	6	9	12	15
	High (4)	4	8	12	16	20
	Severe (5)	5	10	15	20	25
	Response	Cat2C Monitor	Cat2B 28 days	Cat2A 14 days	Cat1U 36 hours	Cat1E 2 hours

B3.2 Number of potholes filled

TABLE 7: NUMBER OF POTHOLES FILLED

Number of potholes filled in 2025-26 (estimate)	8540 m ²
---	---------------------

B3.2.2 How many were resolved using each of the following approaches?

TABLE 8: METHOD / TYPE OF POTHOLE REPAIR

Planned repair / patching programmes	Planned structural maintenance programmes	Reactive repair using temporary repair methods	Reactive repair using permanent repair methods
No data held	No data held	6426	2114

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

B3.2.3 Additional information on numbers of potholes resolved

We estimate that we raised total of 2453 jobs to repair highway surface defects (potholes) between April 2025 and March 2026, covering a total of 9700 m². Many of these jobs will have addressed multiple surface defects in a single visit, especially when a permanent repair is made using a patch.

So, for reporting purposes we're estimating that we fixed a total of 9700 potholes, 3094 of which were permanent repairs. For comparison, the same methodology has been applied to data from previous years below:

TABLE 9: POTHOLES REPAIRED BY YEAR

Financial year	Temp repair	Permanent repair	Total potholes fixed
22/23	4457	2897	7354
23/24	6780	3182	9962
24/25	6524	2224	8748
25/26	6426	2114	8450

B3.3 Prices of pothole interventions

TABLE 10: PRICES OF POTHOLE INTERVENTIONS

Unit/average cost of a permanent pothole repair on your network (reactive)	£57.12 m ²	Unit/average cost of a temporary pothole repair on your network (reactive)	£27.33 m ²
--	-----------------------	--	-----------------------

B3.3.1 Additional information on pothole prices

At Nottingham City Council we use our own in-house delivery teams to repair potholes. The cost of the works is based on our estimates of the staff time and materials (with an allowance for plant) required to undertake repairs. Unlike other local authorities that use term maintenance contractors for service delivery, there is no profit element in our costs.

B3.4 Defect repair quality

TABLE 11: DEFECT REPAIR QUALITY

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?	No
3.4.2	If yes, do you base your material and process specifications on these longevity requirements?	No
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

Reactive repairs and planned patching schemes are delivered by our in-house maintenance teams. Materials and processes are selected according to site specific requirements and lowest whole life cost. We've adopted a performance monitoring process requiring random samples of the maintenance teams work be subjected to quality checks by our highway safety inspectors. This is in addition to requiring maintenance teams to provide before and after photos of all work undertaken.

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

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

Verified reports of highway defects are used in the process of prioritising candidate maintenance schemes (value management). The higher the number of defect reports on a road or footway the greater the weighting added to a schemes score. Our Streets for People program takes the principal of stakeholder directed maintenance schemes a step further, allowing ward members to select from a list of candidate schemes after consulting with residents. We provide feedback on defects reported to our web-based reporting tool using the integration with our highway asset management system.

B3.5.4 Tools used for reporting

Our web-based citizen reporting tool (Report a problem) is built on the Granicus government experience solution. Citizens are guided through the process of reporting highway defects to ensure that their issue is prioritised and assigned correctly. Reports can be logged anonymously, but for Nottingham residents that have created accounts the process is streamlined.

B4 Maintenance of highway structures

B4.1 Highway Structures

TABLE 12: HIGHWAY STRUCTURES (B4.1)

ID	Question	Answer
4.1.1	Number of highway structures on your highway network	176
4.1.2	Number of highway structures with interim measures in accordance with CS470 applied?	0
4.1.3	Number of structures due a General Inspection in 2025-26 in accordance with CS450	110
4.1.4	Number of General Inspections carried out in 2025-26	109
4.1.5	Number of structures due a Principal Inspection in 2025-26 in accordance with CS450	22
4.1.6	Number of Principal Inspections carried out in 2025-26	22

B5 Asset Management

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	
	NCC Highway Asset Management Policy NCC Highway Asset Management Strategy	

5.1.3	Please provide the date it was last reviewed or updated	- August 2025 - September 2025
-------	---	---

5.1.4	Please provide proof of the review or update.	
	See document history (version control) on page two of both the Highway Asset Management Policy and Strategy	
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.	
	Not applicable.	

B5.2 Asset data

Asset type	Asset inventory held?	Condition data held?
Carriageways	Full	Full
Footways and cycleways	Full	Full
Structures	Partial	Partial
Drainage assets	Partial	Partial
Street lighting	Full	Full
Traffic signals	Full	Full

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?	
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 <i>(please set out in further context)</i>	

B5.3.1 Asset data integration

Most highway assets are managed within Confirm. Street lighting in Nottingham is currently subject to a PFI contract arrangement and managed in a separate system. The traffic signals team also utilise specialist software which has limited integration with Confirm. Going forward, we're exploring opportunities for increased integration between these systems. In the short term we would like to facilitate exchange of data using published web feature services.

B5.4 Lifecycle planning and investment decision-making

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?	Yes
5.4.3	Do you use lifecycle plans for structures to support investment decisions?	No

B5.4.4 Evidence Summary

We commissioned consultants to undertake condition projection modelling to facilitate long-term highway investment planning. The model considered the effects of different funding scenarios over the next twenty years on the condition of our highways. The findings estimate the maintenance budget required to maintain steady state (current condition) over the study period. Any additional investment above this level should result in improvements to the overall condition of our highway network.

B5.5 Performance monitoring and continuous improvement

5.5.1	Do you have a defined set of key performance indicators (KPIs) to monitor the outcomes of your highway 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

A Highway Asset Service Levels and Performance Indicators Framework is used to ensure all highways assets are managed efficiently and effectively. A Performance Clinic approach ensures frequent reviews are undertaken with the asset managers and that strategies are put in place to ensure targets are met.

We participate in a biennial, independently conducted and certified Value for Money (VfM) assessment of our highway services conducted by the Future Highways Research Group (FHRG). The VfM assessment provides detailed performance analysis in five key dimensions and was last undertaken in June 2026.

B6 Maintaining footways and cycleways

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	in km

6.1.3	For 2026-27, please provide the length of footways that you have earmarked for preventative maintenance treatments	In 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 / No
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:	Yes / No
	a. Structural maintenance / reconstruction (in km)	In km
	b. Preventative maintenance treatments (in km)	In km

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

One of our priorities is to promote a "healthy Nottingham" and to improve the quality of life of our residents. Well maintained walking and cycling infrastructure is essential if we're to achieve our aims. Routes are categorised in accordance with their significance to the city and the communities they serve, measured by how number of walkers and cyclists that use them. All footways and cycleways are subject to regular safety inspections, as described in our [Highway Safety Inspection Manual](#).

B6.1.7 Evidence Summary

In addition to routine safety inspections, our footways and cycleways are all subjected to an Annual Engineering Inspection (AEI). This provides an overview of condition and identifies areas that should be prioritised for maintenance. Candidate schemes are prioritised using a value management process, in similar fashion to our carriageway maintenance schemes.

B7 Drainage

7.1.1	Please provide an estimate of your drainage maintenance expenditure split (in percentages) between:	
	a) Reactive (incident- or failure-driven) maintenance	30%
	b) Planned maintenance (routine/cyclical and/or risk-based)	70%
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.	No

B7.1.5 Evidence Summary

We currently use Confirm from Siemens to manage our highway drainage assets. All highway gullies are subject to routine maintenance and inspection on one of three different regimes (3-monthly, annual and biennial). Reactive maintenance and inspections are undertaken when requested by residents or our highway safety inspectors. Asset inventory is stored in Confirm, alongside inspection history and site-specific risks. We record (in Confirm) whether gullies are within hotspots (areas with a recorded history of flooding) or that require additional sweeping due to overhanging trees.

B7.1.6 Further context on approach to drainage asset management

B8 Skills and training

8.1.1	Do you have an up-to-date training and development plan for those responsible for highways asset management in your authority?	Yes
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?	No
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)?	No
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

Nottingham City Council is one of the city's largest employers and runs a well-established, nationally recognised and multiple award-winning apprenticeship scheme. Recently our focus has been on the development of existing team members using higher-level apprenticeships. Chartered engineers for structures are brought in on a framework as required. Nottingham City Council does not contribute towards professional membership. Regular performance appraisals to assess competency and training requirements for staff involved with managing highways assets.

B8.1.8 Further context on skills/training (optional)

We've developed a competency and training strategy to ensure that highway services are delivered by competent and appropriately qualified staff. All highway staff, including those with asset management responsibilities, are assessed against a competency framework to identify any gaps or areas for improvement as part of their personal development review.

B9 Adapting roads to withstand climate pressures

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.	08/2025
9.1.4	Have you identified locations that are repeatedly affected by extreme weather (e.g. flooding, heat damage, storms)?	Yes – formally recorded
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	No
	- Heat-resilient materials or surface treatments	No
	- Tree planting / shading for heat management	Yes
	- Other (please specify)	No
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.	No
9.1.7	Have you formally engaged with the DfT funded ADEPT live labs 2 Programme, to understand what lessons your authority can utilise	No

	to increase the efficiency of your operations and support decarbonisation efforts?	
--	--	--

B9.1.8 Evidence Summary

Locations which experience recurring flooding are assessed and if required, added to the gully cleansing hotspot list which means they receive more regular jetting to remove blockages to ensure adequate capacity during heavy rain events. Events resulting in the flooding of 5 or more properties, and/or critical infrastructure experience, trigger a formal Section 19 investigation. This report considers whether the appropriate public bodies took adequate action, explores causes of the flooding and potential mitigation. In addition, whenever flooding is reported the Lead Local Flood Authority (LLFA) keep records to inform future decision making.

In accordance with planning policy, Sustainable Drainage Systems (SuDS) are required on major new developments, where appropriate. Opportunities to incorporate SuDS within public realm improvement schemes are also actively pursued and already feature in the new Maid Marian Way junction in the city centre and Ribblesdale Road in Sherwood.

Opportunities for natural flood management are limited in the city due to the highly urban nature of our catchments. However, such measures are considered and implemented where suitable locations are identified.

B9.1.9 Further context on your adaptation / resilience activities

We're acutely aware of the effects of increased risk of floods, severe winters and hotter summers and are developing processes to minimise the adverse effects on the highway network. Areas with a history of flooding (hotspots) have been identified so that all affected drainage assets can benefit for an enhanced maintenance regime. Green infrastructure is important to us, and since 2022 we've planted or rejuvenated 290 trees through the Streets for People project. For any gullies affected by heavy leaf fall we've arranged for additional sweeping.

B10 Innovation

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?	N/A

10.1.4 Evidence Summary

Our procurement and contracting approach actively encourages innovation through further competition under the framework, allowing suppliers to differentiate themselves through new technologies, methodologies and added-value solutions. The use of NEC Option C promotes a collaborative commercial environment, aligning the interests of the Authority and contractor to drive continuous improvement and better outcomes. Framework competition ensures that the Authority can benefit from evolving market practices and innovations developed after the framework was

originally established. Access to an approved network of specialist subcontractors enables contractors to introduce niche expertise and innovative solutions whilst maintaining procurement compliance. Together, these mechanisms create clear opportunities for innovation to be proposed, evaluated and implemented throughout the project lifecycle.

B10.1.5 Further context on your innovation activities

We're exploring a potential partnership with the University of Nottingham engineering department to develop an 'AI-Driven Intelligence for Resilient Local Road Asset Management'. The University team are in the process of seeking funding from a Transport Research and Innovation Grant (TRIG) to develop an asset management system that translates fragmented evidence from various sources into defensible maintenance decisions. Nottingham City Council would be providing use-case definition, sample data and stakeholder validation.

B10.2 Examples of innovations that have been adopted

After a successful trial, we've now started using Elastomac, an eco-friendly, hot-applied pothole and crack repair material manufactured by Roadmender. The treatment uses recycled asphalt, bitumen, and end-of-life waste tyres to deliver faster, cheaper, and lower-carbon road repairs compared to traditional excavation method.

B11 Working with utility companies to reduce disruption to road users

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

Nottingham City Council works closely with utility companies through quarterly street works coordination meetings to plan activities, minimise programme conflicts and reduce disruption to road users. The authority uses Section 58 restrictions under the New Roads and Street Works Act 1991 to protect newly resurfaced roads from planned excavations for up to five years. A permit scheme is also in operation to coordinate works, manage traffic impacts, reduce clashes between activities and ensure compliance with permit conditions through monitoring and enforcement where necessary.

B11.1.7 Further context

Coordination with utility companies is embedded within the Council's network management approach. Forward planning meetings enable maintenance and utility programmes to be reviewed together, allowing conflicts to be identified early and works to be rescheduled where appropriate. The use of Section 58 restrictions helps protect recent highway investment, while the permit scheme

provides ongoing control of activities on the highway, helping to maintain traffic flow, improve coordination and minimise disruption for residents and road users.

B12 Managing highways maintenance contracts effectively

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?	No
12.1.3	Do you have defined KPIs for your highways 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?	N/A

12.1.5 Evidence Summary

We haven't routinely analysed unit costs for our core highway maintenance activities. Planned maintenance is delivered by contractors selected from a framework based on a competitive tender whilst reactive maintenance is undertaken by our in-house delivery team. We consider all available options for benchmarking costs with peers but are currently initiating more detailed discussions with both the Midlands Highways Alliance (MHA+) and the East Midlands Combined County Authority (EMCCA) on this subject.

As far as possible, our in-house delivery teams fix road defects permanently during the initial visit. However, sometimes more severe defects on busier roads will require an immediate visit to make safe before a permanent repair can be scheduled.