Thurrock Council

Local Highways Maintenance Transparency Report 2026-27

Technical Annex

Highways maintenance transparency report Technical Annex – Thurrock

Contents

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	£ 2,888,599.94	£ 3,313,051.87	£ 4,734,350.73
Other DfT capital funding utilised by local authority for highways maintenance	£ nil	£ nil	£ nil
Other Government capital funding allocated by local authority to Highways Maintenance	£ 199,079.45	£ 60,920.30	£ nil
Other capital funding allocated to highways maintenance	£ 1,439,153.77	£ 2,963,822.21	£ 5,568,394.08
Total Capital funding allocated to highways maintenance	£ 4,526,833.16	£ 6,377,370.85	£ 10,302,744.81

B1.1.2 - Additional information on funding figures

-

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	£ 4,526,833.16	£ 6,377,370.85	£ 10,302,744.81
Total highways maintenance revenue spend	£ 3,980,439.77	£ 3,867,320	£ 4,104,541
Total spend	£ 8,507,272.93	£ 10,244,690.85	£ 14,407,285.81

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	£ 450,000	£ nil	£ 830,000	£
Structural carriageway maintenance	£ 400,000	£	£ 460,000	£
Planned carriageway repair / patching programmes	£ 2,608,000	£	£ 2,168,000	£
Reactive carriageway maintenance				
Reactive carriageway repairs / patching (temporary repairs)	£ nil	£ nil	£ nil	£ nil
Reactive carriageway repairs / patching (permanent repairs)	£ nil	£ 850,667	£	£ 942,415
Reactive carriageway repairs / patching (total)	£ nil	£ 850,667	£	£ 942,415
Other carriageway related spend	£ nil	£	£	£
Total	£ 3,458,000	£ 850,667	£ 3,458,000	£ 942,415

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

-

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	2.5 km	9.8 km	1900m^2	4950m^2	0m^2
2026-27 projected	3.3 km	8.6 km	3000m^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 consists of pothole and other carriageway defect repair/patching.	

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

Building on section A3.1, please set out in the table below how your local authority defines potholes and other carriageway defects, and the intervention criteria that apply.

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
Pothole	>=50mm (depth) x >=75mm across	Priority 1 (P1) based upon risk assessment as per Maintenance Strategy	-	Not greater than 24h
Pothole	>=50mm (depth) x >=75mm across	Priority 2 (P2) based upon risk assessment as per Maintenance Strategy	-	Not greater than 72h
Pothole	< 50mm (depth) x >=75mm across	Priority 2 (5P2) based upon risk assessment as per Maintenance Strategy	-	Not greater than 5 days
Pothole	< 50mm (depth) x >=75mm across	Priority 3 (P3) based upon risk assessment as per Maintenance Strategy	-	Not greater than 28 days
Pothole	< 50mm (depth) x <.75mm across	Priority 4 (P4) based upon risk assessment as per Maintenance Strategy	-	Within 90 days or add to planned maintenance programme
General Carriageway Defects	>=50mm (depth) x >=75mm across	Priority 1 (P1) based upon risk assessment as per Maintenance Strategy	-	Not greater than 24h
General Carriageway Defect	>=50mm (depth) x >=75mm across	Priority 2 (P2) based upon risk assessment as per Maintenance Strategy	-	Not greater than 72h
General Carriageway Defect	< 50mm (depth) x >=75mm across	Priority 2 (5P2) based upon risk assessment as per Maintenance Strategy	-	Not greater than 5 days
General Carriageway Defect	< 50mm (depth) x >=75mm across	Priority 3 (P3) based upon risk assessment as per Maintenance Strategy	-	Not greater than 28 days
General Carriageway Defect	< 50mm (depth) x <.75mm across	Priority 4 (P4) based upon risk assessment as per Maintenance Strategy	-	Within 90 days or add to planned maintenance programme

B3.2 – Number of potholes filled

B3.2.1 - Number of potholes filled in 2025-26 (estimate)	4,045

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
1,956	No data held	0	4,045

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

Permanent Reactive repairs taken from Reactive works data – temporary repairs are not recorded, as Thurrock has taken the approach of selecting a permanent carriageway repair or making safe on carriageway defect types. Planned repair data comes from Velocity Jet Patcher programme and not published on 'Potholes Filled' webpage as scheme work. Though not officially recorded, using data from public enquiries (excluding reactive works), cross-referenced with programme schemes for 2026-27 it can be determined that approximately 322 potholes were filled from planned structural maintenance schemes in 2025-26.

B3.3 - Prices of pothole interventions

Unit/average cost of a permanent pothole repair on your network (reactive)	£ 126.59	Unit/average cost of a temporary pothole repair on your network (reactive)	£ 126.59

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

Thurrock deemed that all reactive pothole identified were designated as permanent repairs. Each additional pothole identified in the direct vicinity of the first pothole will be charged at £57.65/unit.

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?	**Yes**

B3.4.5 - Evidence Summary

Planned pothole repairs using the Jet Patcher spray-injection system does adhere to set application and material requirements, which are monitored by Thurrock highways engineers and are also provided regular reports from the Jet Patcher supplier (https://velocityroads.co.uk/spray-injection-patching) . Reactive Maintenance also use pre-defined materials and working procedures as per specification.

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

As previously mentioned in A3.3 & A3.4 of the Annex A report, residents/network users have different methods of logging defect enquiries to Thurrock, of which a transferred through a CRM module to a Highways Asset and Works Management system. Those enquiries are correctly selected to the relevant team then are actioned suitably. Those customers who provided a contact email are contacted at each stage of the enquiry, those who didn't can contact Customer Services.

B3.5.4 - Tools used for reporting

By accessing via the Thurrock website (www.thurrock.gov.uk). The public can access the 'Report It' link in the top-right of the homepage and navigate through 'Travel & Transport' to 'Street Maintenance' and select 'Potholes' which then links to the ReportIt portal where various defects for highway assets can be reported geospatially.

B4 – Maintenance of highway structures

Please set out information about other highway structures and assets

B4.1 Highway Structures

ID	Question	Answer
4.1.1	Number of highway structures on your highway network	118
4.1.2	Number of highway structures with interim measures in accordance with CS470 applied?	11
4.1.3	Number of structures due a **General Inspection** in 2025-26 in accordance with CS450	48
4.1.4	Number of **General Inspections** carried out in 2025-26	48
4.1.5	Number of structures due a **Principal Inspection** in 2025-26 in accordance with CS450	7
4.1.6	Number of **Principal Inspections** carried out in 2025-26	6

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

The questions in this section (B5.1) relate to the asset management condition set out in the 2026–27 local highways maintenance incentive funding requirements. Completion of this section forms part of the evidence required to meet this incentive funding condition.

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
	Highway Asset Management Strategy

5.1.3	Please provide the date it was last reviewed or updated	Date 11/09/2025

5.1.4	Please provide proof of the review or update.
	Please review Document Control Sheet, also retained email to support publishing of document onto Thurrock website.
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.
	New Asset Management Policy & Strategy suite is being developed – Strategy and Policy will be complete by December 2026.

B5.1.6 - Further context (optional)

As mentioned in 5.1.5, the new Asset Management Policy & Strategy suite is being developed – Strategy and Policy will be complete by December 2026.

Key aspects of highways asset management approach

To get a sense of how each local highway authority is implementing best practice for asset management, we ask that you provide the following information across a sample of key areas.

B5.2 - Asset data This section seeks to establish whether asset management decisions are supported by appropriate and up-to-date condition data.

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

5.2.1 - Further context (optional)

With regards to Drainage assets, Thurrock holds full gully inventory, with large percentage of SW manhole covers and ditches, but limited information on other drainage assets.

B5.3 – Asset data integration and management

This section seeks to understand the maturity of how asset data is managed and integrated to support planning and investment decisions.

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 (optional)

Thurrock uses multiple platforms for key asset storage:

- Aurora – Most highway inventory assets, with the exception of:
- XA – Carriageway and Footway condition data
- BridgeStation – Structures inventory and condition
- MayRise – Streetlighting inventory and condition
- Planet – Streetlighting fault data
- IMTRAC – Traffic and controlled crossing systems, VMS inventory and condition
- MyCity – Traffic and controlled crossing systems, VMS fault data

B5.4 – Lifecycle planning and investment decision-making

This section focuses on whether the authority uses **lifecycle planning** to inform maintenance investment decisions, rather than relying solely on reactive demand or short-term pressures.

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?	**Yes**
5.4.3	Do you use lifecycle plans for **structures** to support investment decisions?	**Yes**

B5.4.4 - Evidence Summary

Though Thurrock does utilise life cycle planning to support investment for the maintenance programming, it also must factor in reactive demand as having the limited funding it does, as well as meeting the needs of the local cabinet. This will be further expanded with the introduction of the new Asset Management Policy and Strategy suite.

B5.5 – Performance monitoring and continuous improvement

This section focuses on whether the authority monitors the effectiveness of its asset management approach and uses performance information to inform ongoing investment and prioritisation decisions.

ID	Question	Answer
5.5.1	Do you have a defined set of key performance indicators (KPIs) to monitor the outcomes of your highways 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

Thurrock Council monitors the effectiveness of its highway asset management approach through a range of performance measures including highway condition indicators, pothole repair volumes, compliance with repair response-time KPIs, inspection frequencies and programme delivery outputs. These measures are used alongside condition surveys and asset management data to prioritise investment, maintain network condition and assess service performance. The KPIs are reviewed annually and along with historic defect records, road usage information, customer reports and lifecycle planning are used to develop maintenance programmes and target investment. KPI's to monitor the Network are linked through all levels of Highways management, from Contracts, Senior Leadership and individual Teams.

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**	**4.8 km**
6.1.3	For 2026-27, please provide the length of **footways** that you have earmarked for **preventative** maintenance treatments	**0 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)	**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

It is recognised through the analysis of reactive repair and insurance claims that a higher proportion of claims and monetary value claims relate to the slabbed footways. Therefore, the Authority has generated a renewal programme specifically targeting these areas.

B6.1.7 - Evidence Summary

-

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	**60% for A**
	b) Planned maintenance (routine/cyclical and/or risk-based)	**40% for B**
7.1.2	Does your authority utilise a digital drainage management platform, covering asset inventory, inspection history, sensor data, and risk scoring?	**No**
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**

	Guidance – This is space for additional information on sensors/technologies for remote monitoring – please list technologies used in bullet form, including approximate number of installations.

B7.1.5 - Evidence Summary

Drainage information logged separately in Sharepoint system.

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

Since the introduction of Thurrock's new Asset Management system, we are beginning to develop and incorporate drainage management onto the platform.

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?	**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?	**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

Evidence available on request

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

-

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.	**12/08/2025**
9.1.4	Have you identified locations that are repeatedly affected by extreme weather (e.g. flooding, heat damage, storms)?	**Yes**
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	**No**
	- Other (please specify)	**No**
	- None of the above	**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.	**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

Thurrock is in the process of producing a new Asset Management Policy & Strategy suite – looking for completion by the end of 2026, which incorporates current and future environmental concerns. Thurrock also undertook the ADEPT Carbon Leadership Programme toolkit to identify current good practices but also shortcomings that would need to be addressed moving forward.

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

-

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

Thurrock's introduction of the MyCity management system for ITS underwent strict review of performance changes to demonstrate efficiencies.

B10.1.5 - Further context on your innovation activities

-

10.2 – Examples of innovations that have been adopted

Guidance - please provide examples of innovations that have moved beyond trial into operational use in your authority. For each example outline: What was implemented, what impacts it has had (e.g. cost, performance, safety), and the scale of adoption.

Thurrock has recently upgraded its Asset, Works & CRM Management system (Aurora by Symology), which have simplified working processes, ensured much wider monitoring capabilities, and increased efficiencies between client and contractor works. In addition to reduce the risk associated with confined spaces Thurrock has deployed a number of drone surveys to assess structures. Reducing risk, time and costs in doing so, this technique is being used proactively going forward. With respects to materials and innovation we have seen the development of preventative maintenance treatments to intercept the surfacing before the tipping point and we are looking at trailing the use of a different treatment. Thurrock has also adopted the MyCity system (by SWARCO) because it provides a modern, cloud-based platform that enables the monitoring, management and optimisation of traffic signals and other transport assets from a single system, helping the Council improve traffic flow, reduce congestion and respond more quickly to network issues.

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?	**Yes**
11.1.5	Have you conducted a traffic sensitive review in the last three years?	**Yes**

11.1.6 - Evidence Summary

-

B11.1.7 - Further context

-

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 £/m² 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 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?	**No**

12.1.5 - Evidence Summary

Reactive maintenance works delivered via in-house team and subject to route quality audits. (SCQ Audits Contractor KPI audits etc.)

B12.1.6 - Further context

-