

Transparency report – Technical Annex

Highways maintenance funding and spending figures

Capital funding allocation sources

Financial year	2024-25	2025-26	2026-27 (projected)
Highways maintenance capital funding allocated through DfT	<u>£5,585,000</u>	<u>£4,408,000</u>	<u>£5,275,000</u>
Other DfT capital funding utilised by local authority for highways maintenance	<u>£520,000</u>	<u>£3,136,000</u>	<u>£5,155,000</u>
Other Government capital funding allocated by local authority to Highways Maintenance	<u>£2,046,000</u>	<u>£861,000</u>	<u>£653,000</u>
Other capital funding allocated to highways maintenance	<u>£7,037,578</u>	<u>£9,833,340</u>	<u>£11,699,996</u>
Total Capital funding allocated to highways maintenance	<u>£15,188,578</u>	<u>£18,638,340</u>	<u>£22,782,996</u>

Spending

Total spending

The questions in this section relate to the spending 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.

Please confirm that you understand the answers provided in this section 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	£15,188,578	£18,638,340	£22,278,996
Total highways maintenance revenue spend	£4,426,362	£4,577,268	£4,577,268
Total spend	£19,614,940.49	£23,215,607.80	£27,360,263.80

Additional information on total spending figures

These total costs also include the provision of the Winter Service and the overall highway staff costs.

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	£0	£0	£350,000	£0
Structural carriageway maintenance	£250,000	£0	£200,000	£0
Planned carriageway repair / patching programmes	£4,000,000	£150,000	£4,000,000	£150,000
Reactive carriageway maintenance				
Reactive carriageway repairs / patching (temporary repairs)	£0	£0	£0	£0
Reactive carriageway repairs / patching (permanent repairs)	£500,000	£371,250	£500,000	£392,750

Reactive carriageway repairs / patching (total)	£0	£ 0	£0	£0
Other carriageway-related spend	£2,417,738	£0	£5,967,793	£0
Total	£7,167,738	£521,250	£11,017,793	£ 542,750

Additional information on spending on carriageways by type of spend

Some of our figures are estimated as we are currently in a transition to a new highways asset management system.

Highway Maintenance Activity (Surface Treatments and Repairs)

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	0 km	3.75 km	n/a	n/a	n/a
2026-27 projected	3.3 km	7 km	n/a	n/a	n/a

Additional information on surface treatments and repairs

Does the table 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.	No
---	-----------

Further information and context

We are currently transitioning to a new Highways Asset Management System, and all our historic data is being regularised to enable its transfer and use (reporting) in the new system. Therefore, we are currently unable to detail current areas of potholes/patching etc.

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

Pothole/Defect intervention criteria

Pothole / Defect Category Name (as used by your authority)	Minimum investigatory or definitional threshold	Additional risk or contextual factors considered	Target response time – make safe	Target response time – permanent repair
Cat 1 Emergency	40mm deep and 300mm in one direction	All Roads	2 hours	72 hours (subject to available road space)
Cat 1A Urgent (A127 and A13)	40mm deep and 300mm in one direction			72 hours (subject to available road space)
Cat 1A Urgent (All other Monthly Inspected Roads)	40mm deep and 300mm in one direction			7 days
Cat 1A Urgent (All 3 Monthly Inspected Roads)	40mm deep and 300mm in one direction			14 days
Cat 1B Routine	40mm deep and 300mm in one direction	Inspected 6 monthly or annually		28 days

Number of potholes filled

Number of potholes filled in 2025-26 (estimate)	899
---	-----

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	No data held	0	899

Additional information on numbers of potholes resolved, by treatment type

Our totals reflect only the reported or inspected potholes found, that meet our intervention levels and were subsequently repaired.

Our intervention levels are set out in our Highways Inspection Policy, but it should be noted that other highway authorities set differing criteria for their assessment of what should be considered as a pothole.

However, as detailed previously, our scheme prioritisation and scoring mechanism takes into account the number of previous maintenance works on the road and reported potholes so number of potholes dealt with is likely much higher but we don't record the number actually resolved by our planned schemes and patching works.

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.

Prices of pothole interventions

Unit/average cost of a permanent pothole repair on your network (reactive)	£270	Unit/average cost of a temporary pothole repair on your network (reactive)	£ N/A
--	------	--	-------

Additional information on pothole prices

Our costs include all works required, including traffic management etc. As detailed previously, we now permanently repair all of our potholes, therefore any make safe or temporary repairs prior to the permanent completion are included in our overall average cost.

Defect repair quality

Question	Yes/no
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
If yes, do you base your material and process specifications on these longevity requirements?	Yes
Do you regularly monitor the appropriateness of the carriageway interventions chosen by your workforce or contractor and the quality of work delivered?	Yes
If yes, do you systematically record information about expected and delivered longevity of repairs?	Yes

Evidence Summary

The longevity of repairs is set out in our term maintenance infrastructure contract, and all repairs have a 12-month guarantee window. Highway Inspectors will routinely check repairs made during their inspections and report if any issues are found. Our policies, including our Highway Inspection policy are regularly reviewed and updated as required. We have recently just completed a review of the Highway Inspection Policy, and the revised version is available on request using the link below. In addition, we have also recently reviewed and updated our Highway Inspection frequencies to ensure each road is monitored in the correct way. [Highway inspection – Highway enforcement and inspection – Southend-on-Sea City Council](#)

Additional information

With regard to the question 'do you systematically record information about expected and delivered longevity of repairs?', we have recently transitioned to a new highways asset management system and working with the supplier to develop the most appropriate way to deliver the information and record any areas where a revisit is required or failure of a repair is captured and appropriate measures are taken.

Public reporting system for defects and other issues

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

Evidence Summary

With regard to reports being part of maintenance planning as detailed previously, and used in the calculation of our schemes prioritisation scores. In addition, we use reports to alert us to urgent changes in condition of the network and react as appropriate and undertake additional works as required.

Feedback is automated back from our Asset Management System to the user, and if they have signed up for an account, they can review all their submitted cases, their current status and ask further questions/issues as appropriate.

Tools used for reporting

Southend utilises its own inhouse system 'MySouthend' for reporting all highway related defects. MySouthend is a core function to the authority and all services, applications, reporting etc are made through this central system and then actioned through linked systems by appropriate officers.

Maintenance of highway structures

Highway Structures

Question	Answer
Number of highway structures on your highway network	172
Number of highway structures with interim measures in accordance with CS470 applied?	1
Number of structures due a General Inspection in 2025-26 in accordance with CS450	172
Number of General Inspections carried out in 2025-26	139
Number of structures due a Principal Inspection in 2025-26 in accordance with CS450	0
Number of Principal Inspections carried out in 2025-26	2

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.

Asset Management Strategy and Policy

The questions in this section 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.

Please confirm that you understand the answers provided in this section 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
--	------------

Please provide a link to your authority's published highways asset management policy and strategy:

[Highway Infrastructure Asset Management Plan](#)

Please provide the date it was last reviewed or updated: June 2017

Please provide proof of the review or update: Southend had been waiting for the release of LTP4 guidance so that both documents could be developed in parallel. Since the recent release of the guidance, work started on the review. The initial review of the current HIAMP has already taken place by the Transport Strategy team and it is now under review by the Highways Infrastructure Assessment Management team.

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: Linked to the statement above, our LTP4 is due out for public consultation in September 2026 and is currently going through member approval stage. Once released and subject to the outcomes, the intention, as stated on the Council's published Forward Plan, is to take the finalised LTP4 and the Highways Infrastructure Asset Management Plan to Cabinet in March 2027, for approval and adoption of both documents.

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.

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	Partial
Drainage assets	Full	Full
Street lighting	Full	Partial
Traffic signals	Full	Full

Further context

During the last 3 years, Southend has fully updated its Highways Asset Register (including coastal assets) and conducts annual 100% coverage condition surveys on carriageway and footways. In addition, we have also included some elements of visual condition (e.g. signs).

For drainage data, we have acquired a new system and had a 100% condition survey undertaken on the gully assets.

For structures, we have recently conducted 100% of general inspections to create a priority list and now following that up with targeted principal inspections.

During 2027/28 we will be embarking on programme on inspections for street lighting and traffic signals.

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.

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>)	

Further context

Southend has recently implemented a new highway asset management system, but our condition and gully data are held on separate systems. We are working with the software companies to link these systems and hope to have this in place during 2027/28 to allow the implementation of one single connected data platform.

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.

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

Evidence Summary

Southend used Lifecycle Plans to develop key funding improvements. Previously Highways Improvement funding was around £3m in total per annum, but following a report to cabinet, supported by lifecycle modelling, the funding was increased to £10m per annum. We have maintained similar levels of funding, which has enabled us to reduce our performance indicators year on year.

For Structures, we undertook a 100% GI last year and now moving to a priority PI plan, with subsequent life cycle modelling, to develop a priority list for works and unlock further available authority funding subject to a viable business case.

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.

Question	Answer
Do you have a defined set of key performance indicators (KPIs) to monitor the outcomes of your highways asset management approach?	Yes
Are these KPIs reviewed on a regular basis (at least annually)?	Yes
Are KPI trends used to inform maintenance planning, prioritisation or changes to forward programmes or investment decisions?	Yes
Have you conducted a value for money review or peer review of your service in the last 3 years	No

Evidence Summary

We successfully reduced PIs year on year since 2019 across all network classes. We utilise a priority listing to continue this work. While condition remains our focus, we also consider risk ensuring key networks remain in general good condition, ensuring the effective highway network operation.

Our new Infrastructure Contract uses an extensive KPI framework to challenge the contractor and ensures:

- high project delivery
- safety
- quality
- innovation
- environmental performance
- social value
- annual delivery plans.

Although no Peer Review was completed in the last three years, a 2019 LGA review resulted in:

- full staff restructure
- improved member and stakeholder engagement
- ensuring staff competency
- improved leadership
- succession planning
- improved communications.

Maintaining footways and cycleways

Question	Answer
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
For 2026-27, please provide the length of footways that you have earmarked for structural maintenance / reconstruction / renewal	15.7 km
For 2026-27, please provide the length of footways that you have earmarked for preventative maintenance treatments	0 km
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
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
a. Structural maintenance / reconstruction (in km)	2.20 km
b. Preventative maintenance treatments (in km)	0 km

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

Southend-on-Sea City Council is in the final stages of developing its LCWIP, which will provide a long-term vision for a comprehensive walking, wheeling and cycling network across the city. The plan identifies a programme of short, medium and long-term schemes designed to improve active travel infrastructure and connectivity.

As part of the LCWIP, a series of walking zones have been identified where targeted public realm improvements will be implemented, including enhanced footways, upgraded crossing facilities and measures to create more attractive and accessible pedestrian environments.

Evidence Summary

As detailed in the section 'How decisions are made on our maintenance plans', our footway programme is based on a prioritised approach, using annually collected 100% condition data and risk assessments, in the same way as our carriageways. This informed the development of a five-year programme, now in its third year.

The cycleway network is also being developed through this approach. A successful Safer Roads Programme bid secured £3.2m to improve the A13 corridor, including safer crossing points and a significant new cycle track, providing a safe off-road route and extending links from the seafront into the wider network.

Drainage

Question	Answer
Please provide an estimate of your drainage maintenance expenditure split (in percentages) between:	
a. Reactive (incident- or failure-driven) maintenance	20% for A
b. Planned maintenance (routine/cyclical and/or risk-based)	80% for B
Does your authority utilise a digital drainage management platform, covering asset inventory, inspection history, sensor data, and risk scoring?	Yes
Do you maintain a record of locations where drainage issues are known to cause or contribute to carriageway deterioration or surface water ponding?	Yes
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

Evidence Summary

Our highways maintenance contractor has invested (on our behalf) in the deployment of a digitised drainage management system. The setup of this system has also included a full condition survey, including collection of silt levels for all our highway gully's (circa 23,000 units).

From this, a prioritised programme of gully maintenance will be produced, focussing on those areas most at risk. From 2027/28, the authority will take ownership of the system and look to directly link with our highway asset management system.

Further context on approach to drainage asset management

For our new Infrastructure term contract which started 1st April 2026, there is a requirement for an annual Innovation Plan, and as part of this year 2 (2027/28) we plan to deploy gully sensors at key locations, that have been identified from a full condition survey and priority assessment detailed above.

Skills and training

Question	Answer
Do you have an up-to-date training and development plan for those responsible for highways asset management in your authority?	Yes
Do you or your main highways contractors support professional development through a recognised professional training scheme (e.g.	Yes

Institution of Civil Engineers (ICE) or Institution of Highway Engineers (IHE)?	
Does your authority contribute towards the cost of professional membership or professional development required for relevant highways roles?	Yes
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
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
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

Evidence Summary

All key staff in Southend have the required levels of experience and competency. All are subject to annual performance development plan reviews, where their goals and training are reviewed and further developed. Following a previous highway restructure, all roles are subject to detailed job descriptions, which detail both essential and desired skill sets for their respective roles.

The Head of Service for Highways has over 37 years' experience in Highways, with a key focus of that career in Highway Asset Management and maintenance. They are supported by 3 key Service Managers with extensive experience in their respective fields:

- Highways Asset Management
- Transport Strategy
- Project Delivery

Further context on skills/training

The authority has often struggled to attract consistent levels of suitable highway staff, and therefore we are now looking at Apprentices to allow a suitable programme of development to be established in the highway field. However, this is still in the early stages and will also be subject to Southend's forward journey under Local Government Reorganisation.

As part of our new Infrastructure term contract, we have introduced a Professional Services element, and our intention is to utilise our contractors' partners and their key qualified staff to add the required depth to our decision making. Looking at qualified engineers with responsibility for the management of highway structures above specifically, we can and do utilise the skills of a highly respected person in the structures field.

Adapting roads to withstand climate pressures

Climate and environmental factors, such as heavy rainfall, prolonged heat, and freeze-thaw cycles, are integral to effective highway 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.

Question	Yes/no
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
Have you identified your resilient network and agree this with senior decision-makers	Yes
If yes, when did you last update this.	Reviewed in 2025
Have you identified locations that are repeatedly affected by extreme weather (e.g. flooding, heat damage, storms)?	Yes – known informally
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	No
• Tree planting / shading for heat management	Yes
• Other (please specify)	
• None of the above	
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
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

Evidence Summary

Working with Anglian Water through AWINEP, we are delivering projects to reduce flooding and manage surface water more effectively. This includes a significant attenuation system (major water storage system) as part of the Better Queensway Development, additional storage at Seaway Car Park, and SuDS projects such as rain gardens in Woodgrange Drive.

We completed slope improvement works below Marine Parade at Belton Way West in 2025/26, with further works planned at Belton Way East in 2026/27.

Consultants have been commissioned to produce a Quantifiable Carbon Report, informing emerging LTP4 policies and assessing carbon impacts associated with strategy delivery.

Further context on your adaptation / resilience activities

We are developing our proposals for the measurement of our emissions in terms of our highway maintenance activities. We have a lead from our environment team, who will work with us and our contractor, supporting the developing carbon management plan and the first action is to sign up for DfT ADEPT Carbon Leadership Programme.

Southend's emerging Fourth Local Transport Plan (LTP4) considers the resilience of the highway network. The policy relating to this states that, we will design and maintain our infrastructure so that it is safe for all, ensuring the highway network is in a good standard and resilient to external incidents.

This policy encompasses a number of actions:

- Maintain the highway network according to the Highway Infrastructure Asset Management Plan (HIAMP) & Highway Maintenance Efficiency Programme (HMEP) developing our strategy/maintenance to bring about further preventative treatments.
- Implement the Southend Coastal Erosion Plan and the Shoreline Management Plan to ensure the highway network remains resilient to external incidents.
- Implement new Sustainable Drainage Systems (SuDS) at key locations across Southend.
- Introduce trials to upgrade Sustainable Drainage Systems (SuDS) across Southend as part of the catchment to coast partnership.
- Support highway maintenance schemes delivered by water companies through the Advanced Water Industry National Environment Programme (A WINEP).

Innovation

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

Evidence Summary

Our recent tender for our term Infrastructure contract had specific questions and associated marks for Innovation.

As part of the now awarded contract, our contractor is required to produce an annual Innovation Plan. As such this is being developed, but as detailed in the evidence summary within the 'Drainage' section, they have already invested into a new drainage management system and full condition survey on our behalf. In addition, for 2026/27, they will be deploying Road AI in their supervisors' vehicles and that will allow the daily update of road condition and imagery to be uploaded and made available for the authority to further enhance our decision-making abilities.

Further context on your innovation activities

As detailed, we are positive in our approach to innovation, already developing key items in this area. We look to further this through the annual revision of our Innovation Plan.

We have looked at various trials, including using Pothole Pro on several sites. Southend was one of the first authorities in the UK to utilise a new innovative Radar system. This monitors speed and traffic and also analyses near misses and causation. This has already been effective, leading to the development of 2 traffic chicanes in Southend. Alongside securing funding from the Safer Roads Foundation to raise a zebra crossing with previous pedestrian collision history.

Examples of innovations that have been adopted

Our gully management system was initially a trial by our contractor as part of an innovation collaboration, however, due to the data and management improvement provided, it will now be developed into a key part of our drainage and flood improvements going forward.

Rhevia's Radar system, as detailed in the further context on innovation activities above, has moved from a feasibility study to becoming a key tool in our road safety delivery and improvement. It has been responsible for several safety improvements, junction collision causation and it will now form a key part of our Safer Roads Strategy, predominantly providing the evidential information to support the development.

Working with utility companies to reduce disruption to road users

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

Evidence Summary

We have monthly meetings with utilities and our contractors to determine any major works, in relation to resurfacing programmes and plan works around this or look at collaboration.

Further context

We also liaise with Essex Highways where major works take place on borough boundaries for further collaboration.

The Council has previously considered whether a lane rental scheme would be appropriate for the area and undertook an initial assessment of this option. However, implementing a lane rental scheme would require significant time, resources and detailed data collection to develop and operate effectively. With Local Government Reorganisation (LGR) underway, the Council will become part of a new authority, which will have a larger geographical area and wider highway responsibilities. It was therefore considered more appropriate to defer further consideration of a lane rental scheme until the new authority is established, enabling any future assessment to be undertaken across the full area and remit of the new authority.

The last review of Traffic Sensitive Streets was carried out in 2010. Regulation 16 of the 2007 Noticing Regulations sets out the criteria that may lead to a traffic sensitive designation, it was amended in 2022 with changes coming into force in April 2023.

Managing highways maintenance contracts effectively

Question	Yes / No
Does your authority retain in-house technical capability to independently assess maintenance interventions proposed by contractors?	Yes
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
Do you have defined KPIs for your highways maintenance contract(s), and are they actively monitored by your authority to manage performance?	Yes
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?	Yes

Evidence Summary

Two Heads of Service (Highways and Major Infrastructure) have significant experience in the highways field and can assess these areas if required, retaining in-house capability.

For costs, a recent tender exercise for our Infrastructure contract included benchmarking our costs against other authorities. We are also part of the Eastern Highways Alliance (EHA) where we routinely benchmark many highway related matters with other authorities in the group.

Key KPIs are set for our new term Infrastructure contract, which both parties routinely monitor.

All reactive pothole repairs are now first time permanent repairs. With an incentive element for our contractor to perform well in all delivery functions.

Further context

Southend drives the contractor decisions, and we ensure we follow best practice and the direction from DfT, for example bringing in preventative treatments for 2026/27 and will look to expand this area for 2027/28.

As detailed, Southend is a member of the EHA and have benchmarked many elements between the component authorities over the last 5 years including costs, intervention levels, surfacing types, system use, gritting routes (ensuring nothing missing on boundary joins) etc.

We have effectively recorded the number of potholes since 2019 and feel the reduction clearly shows our switch to permanent repair only, is now showing its value.

We have developed an extensive list of KPIs for our contract, which ensures effective delivery, safety, innovation, carbon management and incentivises the contractor to perform well against them. These are received monthly and reviewed between authority and contractor on a quarterly basis.