

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	£23,217,246	£33,681,790	£34,779,000
Other DfT capital funding utilised by local authority for highways maintenance	£0	£0	£4,000,000
Other Government capital funding allocated by local authority to Highways Maintenance	£0	£0	£0
Other capital funding allocated to highways maintenance	£786,754	£602,032	£0
Total Capital funding allocated to highways maintenance	£24,004,000	£34,283,822	£38,779,000

B1.1.2 - Additional information on funding figures

--

B1.2 - Spending

B1.2.1 – Total spending

The questions in this section (B1.2.1) 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 (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	£22,953,689	£33,595,200	£38,779,000

Total highways maintenance revenue spend	£15,952,262	£14,763,595	£17,003,395
Total spend	£38,905,951	£48,358,795	£55,782,395

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	£5,361,004	£0	£6,439,473	£0
Structural carriageway maintenance	£10,395,110	£0	£13,120,906	£0
Planned carriageway repair / patching programmes	£11,369,117	£0	£11,645,023	£0
Reactive carriageway maintenance				
Reactive carriageway repairs / patching (temporary repairs)	£0	£1,282,439	£0	£1,471,184
Reactive carriageway repairs / patching (permanent repairs)	£211,039	£0	£0	£0
Reactive carriageway repairs / patching (total)	£211,039	£1,282,439	£0	£1,471,184
Other carriageway-related spend	£1,458,207	£9,069,848	£1,204,581	£10,775,420
Total	£28,794,477	£10,352,286	£32,409,983	£12,246,604

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	Road receiving	Area receiving	Area receiving	Area receiving
----------------	----------------	----------------	----------------	----------------	----------------



	preventative road surface treatments (length, km)	planned structural maintenance (length, km)	planned repair / patching programmes	reactive repair / patching (permanent methods)	reactive repairs/ patching (temporary methods)
2025-26	88 km	57 km	121,689 m ²	20,373 m ²	602 m ²
2026-27 projected	138 km	58 km	120,000 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
--	-----

B2.1.2 – Further information and context

--	--

B3 – Pothole repairs

B3.1 – Pothole/Defect intervention criteria

Pothole/Defect category name (as used by your authority)	Minimum investigatory or definitional threshold (e.g. depth, area, width – include units)	Additional risk or contextual factors considered (e.g. road hierarchy, traffic levels, location in carriageway)	Target response time – make safe	Target response time – permanent repair
Pothole (Cat 2,3A & 3B)	40mm deep, 150mm diameter	Road hierarchy	7 days	NA
Pothole (Cat 2,3A & 3B)	100mm deep, 150mm diameter	Road hierarchy	1 day	NA
Pothole (Cat 4A & 4B)	40mm deep, 150mm diameter	Road hierarchy	28 days	NA
Pothole (Cat 4A & 4B)	100mm deep, 150mm diameter	Road hierarchy	7 days	NA

B3.2 – Number of potholes filled

B3.2.1 - Number of potholes filled in 2025-26 (estimate)	31,851
--	--------

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
2,495	1,334	914	27,108

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

All potholes are recorded in a central management system including a precise location; similarly, the location of work is also precisely recorded.

CAUTION FOR READERS – Authorities have different criteria for identifying potholes and different methodologies for counting how many they have filled or resolved.

Summing the figures in the above table across authorities will therefore not provide a reliable estimate of the total number of potholes filled across England.

B3.3 - Prices of pothole interventions

Unit/average cost of a permanent pothole repair on your network (reactive)	£108	Unit/average cost of a temporary pothole repair on your network (reactive)	N/A
--	------	--	-----

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

The pothole costs have been calculated over 2025-26. While it is not possible to separate the costs for permanent and temporary repairs, almost all repairs are permanent and hence only a value has been provided for this type.

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

Our maintenance contracts stipulate that repair work has a warranty of two years for both planned and permanent reactive repair. Our material and process specifications are chosen to ensure that repairs last and enable the contractors to share a reasonable amount of risk. Work completed by our contractors is reviewed through works completion reports, weekly quality discussions, follow-on highway inspections or following a dedicated site visit towards the end of the warranty period. Work that has failed or is not of sufficient quality is recorded as a remedial for resolution by the Contractor.

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

Defect reports are an important parameter for the prioritisation of maintenance work. As well as reducing reactive costs, such reports also allow the Council to assess the value to the community in undertaking maintenance.

Once the Council has decided on the appropriate response, a response is provided if an email address has been provided, or an update on the case is shown in FixMyStreet. The response can be work will be done, work has already been done or work is not going to be progressed at this time.

B3.5.4 - Tools used for reporting

Shropshire Council currently uses FixMyStreet as a Citizen reporting tool. It can be accessed directly or at improvingyourroads.shropshire.gov.uk.

B4 – Maintenance of highway structures

B4.1 Highway Structures

ID	Question	Answer
4.1.1	Number of highway structures on your highway network	1,009
4.1.2	Number of highway structures with interim measures in accordance with CS470 applied?	1
4.1.3	Number of structures due a General Inspection in 2025-26 in accordance with CS450	321
4.1.4	Number of General Inspections carried out in 2025-26	321
4.1.5	Number of structures due a Principal Inspection in 2025-26 in accordance with CS450	15
4.1.6	Number of Principal Inspections carried out in 2025-26	14

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	
	https://next.shropshire.gov.uk/roads-and-highways/plans-policies-and-strategies/asset-management/	
5.1.3	Please provide the date it was last reviewed or updated	2018

5.1.4	Please provide proof of the review or update.
	A full update of the Policy and Strategy has been completed and is currently working through the Council's formal approval process.
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.
	We confirm that the Asset Management Policy and Strategy will be updated by 30 September 2027. The documents have been presented for internal member scrutiny and recommendations will be considered by Cabinet for formal adoption/approval in the Autumn committee cycle'

B5.1.6 - Further context (optional)

Although the Policy and Strategy are under review in accordance with the DfT requirements, the approach and strategy has been subject to an annual review in every year with recommendations for action.

Key aspects of highways asset management approach

B5.2 - Asset data

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

5.2.1 - Further context (optional)

Full inventory means that the data held is sufficient to operate the asset and plan maintenance according to our asset management approach. Full condition data means that it is considered that there is sufficient coverage and currency to make accurate decisions about the asset.

Drainage inventory and condition data remains Partial as it is considered unaffordable to collect the full inventory and in-depth condition. Data is collected as part of our normal operations.

B5.3 – Asset data integration and management

B5.3.1 – Asset data integration

Discrete spreadsheets or documents held by individual teams	
Multiple digital platforms with limited integration	
A single digital platform or a set of connected platforms used across the highways service	X
Other	

B5.3.2 - Further context (optional)

A detailed asset data management plan has been developed to ensure that data is properly managed as an asset in itself. The asset data management plan covers the scope of the data, the data owner, its purpose, storage location and ancillary information. The asset data management plan facilitates the use of asset data across multiple platforms.

B5.4 – Lifecycle planning and investment decision-making

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

B5.4.4 - Evidence Summary

Carriageway and Footway life cycle plans have been developed using on the HMEP life cycle toolkits and the outputs checked using alternative life cycle models. Life cycle plans for Structures are formed using a bespoke model; the SAMI toolkit has also been used. Life cycle plans are used to understand the impact of different maintenance strategies and the investment requirements for our assets.

B5.5 – Performance monitoring and continuous improvement

ID	Question	Answer
5.5.1	Do you have a defined set of key performance indicators (KPIs) to monitor the outcomes of your 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	No

B5.5.5 - Evidence Summary

Our performance management framework includes a monthly update for internal purposes which is published annually on the Council website. Trends are monitored and reported to the management team to alert them of any significant changes in performance. The published performance dashboard can be viewed using the following link: <https://next.shropshire.gov.uk/media/mkwm1ys0/2026-asset-management-dashboard.pdf> A peer review has not yet been undertaken. However, the Council has been subject to significant financial scrutiny for some considerable time. Highways has been through various process of evaluation of spend across services and contracts. We also participate in the CQC Efficiency Network that allows us to benchmark money spent.

B6 - Maintaining footways and cycleways

ID	Question	Answer
6.1.1	Do you have a defined footway hierarchy (e.g. based on footway function and usage levels) that underpins a risk-based approach to inspection frequencies and maintenance programmes?	Yes
6.1.2	For 2026-27, please provide the length of footways that you have earmarked for structural maintenance / reconstruction / renewal	3 km
6.1.3	For 2026-27, please provide the length of footways that you have earmarked for preventative maintenance treatments	10 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	Yes

	keeping them clear of overgrown vegetation and debris (e.g. sweeping, cutting back)?	
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

The majority of Footway and Cycleway surfaces are bituminous; consequently, preventative, surface treatments have formed the majority of our maintenance plans in recent years.

B6.1.7 - Evidence Summary

Service standards for Cycleways and heavily used Footways are set out in the Council's Winter Service Policy Statement. There is a routine programme of sweeping and debris clearance; this does not include overgrown vegetation on private land which is managed through existing powers under the Highways Act.

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	70%
	b) Planned maintenance (routine/cyclical and/or risk-based)	30%
7.1.2	Does your authority utilise a digital drainage management platform, covering asset inventory, inspection history, sensor data, and risk scoring?	Yes
7.1.3	Do you maintain a record of locations where drainage issues are known to cause or contribute to carriageway deterioration or surface water ponding?	Yes
7.1.4	Do you utilise smart sensors or other remote monitoring technologies to monitor performance of your drainage assets. If yes please provide some high level information in bullet points below	Yes
	Shropshire Council are trialling: LoRaWAN-enabled gully sensors in 6 high-risk locations across Shropshire.	

B7.1.5 - Evidence Summary

The LoRaWAN-enabled wireless sensing technology allows early flood detection, community resilience, and data-driven decision making, allowing Shropshire Council to monitor silt levels in real time. This trial will allow the Council to move from reactive flood response to a predictive flood risk management approach in these locations. Whilst currently a trial project, the Council are also exploring if this can be expanded in other priority areas across the County. The Council also utilise a number of gauges and cameras on high-risk grilles to allow remote monitoring and pre-emptive cleansing.

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

Drainage asset management in Shropshire is a data-led approach using the GullySmart asset management system.

We have a planned programme of cleaning on A and B roads and some C roads. We are seeking to introduce a limited cyclical cleaning programme on main roads and in known problem areas.

Reactive cleaning is managed locally and the public are able to report any issues using the FixMyStreet system.

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?	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)?	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

Our training and development plan has been formed based on the UKRLG Asset Management Competence Framework.

The Council undertakes annual appraisals to ensure staff development and to assess competency and performance with appropriate interventions for improvement where required.

The Council also requires the same of its services delivered through third party contractors and requires support for local skills development through social value clauses contained in contract terms and conditions.

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

The Council is currently developing proposals to integrate career paths within departmental structures and the employment of apprentices to promote succession and to sustain skills, capability and capacity to delivery services locally.

B9 – Adapting roads to withstand climate pressures

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.	10/2025
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	Yes
	- 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

The Resilient Network is reviewed annually to ensure that it remains fit-for-purpose. A set of high-risk storm and flooding sites has been recorded together with pre and post event mitigation measures.

We have commissioned WSP to provide specialist advice for implementing the Carbon Quantification Guidance in order to embed this approach in the service. Once the guidance is embedded and carbon quantities calculated, it will be possible to benchmark our highway maintenance activities with other authorities.

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

Resilience and managing the impacts of climate change are the key updates in the latest draft of the asset management strategy.

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?	Yes

10.1.4 - Evidence Summary

Shropshire Council delivers highway services through a term maintenance contract, using Strategic Partnering Boards and Client Forums to share innovation, and a defect repair contract that prioritises innovative dynamic work planning. The Council has developed a turnkey delivery model. It has trialled tex banding, warm mix asphalt, thermal patching, and the UK's first carbon neutral resurfacing programme. It has actively shared learning with other authorities, including experience with warm mix asphalt and the turnkey model through LCRIG awards.

B10.1.5 - Further context on your innovation activities

Types of pothole treatment | Shropshire Council

<https://lcrig.org.uk/2023/07/14/shropshire-council-to-collaborate-with-multevo-in-an-industry-first-using-the-new-lcrig-ips/>

<https://lcrig.org.uk/2024/10/24/shropshire-council-and-multevo-win-second-highways-award-in-a-week/>

The key contracts are coming to a natural conclusion, and the Council is carrying out pre-market engagement (PME) to identify procurement and contracting strategies that encourage and reward innovation for inclusion in the next generation contracts

10.2 – Examples of innovations that have been adopted

The turnkey delivery model has improved productivity and customer satisfaction, and reduced network disruption.

In addition, we have adopted: tex-banding on roundabouts; Warm-Mix Asphalt; and developed a range of pothole treatments.

Tex-banding has provided an efficient method of dealing with defects in busy locations.

Warm-Mix Asphalt has reduced carbon emissions at no extra cost, it is expected that the material will provide longer service lives.

The range of pothole treatments allows us to tailor the repairs on particular roads for the greatest value.

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

The authority works closely with utility companies and works promoters to minimise disruption to road users. Quality of utility works is monitored and enforced through the permit scheme and national inspection Code of Practice. As a WaSP Scheme member, the authority holds regular performance and quarterly coordination meetings with utilities, highway teams and developers to review compliance, align programmes and identify collaborative opportunities. Collaborative works are recorded and monitored. Utility programmes are reviewed alongside highway maintenance and capital planning to ensure works are coordinated and scheduled ahead of resurfacing or improvement schemes.

B11.1.7 - Further context

The authority has not undertaken a formal assessment of lane rental suitability reflecting the nature and characteristics of the local road network and limited local appetite for such a scheme. A permit scheme evaluation report is currently being prepared and is expected to be published during 2026. GeoPlace have been commissioned to undertake a comprehensive review of traffic sensitive streets which is currently in progress. The authority remains committed to collaborative working through WaSP membership, regular utility performance meetings and quarterly network coordination forums involving all major works promoters.

B12 – Managing highways maintenance contracts effectively

ID	Question	Yes / No
12.1.1	Does your authority retain in-house technical capability to independently assess maintenance interventions proposed by contractors?	Yes
12.1.2	Do you routinely analyse actual unit costs (for example £/m ² of road surface treatments, or £/pothole repair) for core highways maintenance activities delivered under contract and compare them against benchmarks or historic performance?	Yes
12.1.3	Do you have defined KPIs for your 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?	Yes

12.1.5 - Evidence Summary

Shropshire Council has transformed its highways maintenance service into a mixed-economy model, combining in-house reactive and drainage teams with local contractors and a strengthened partnership with Kier for major programmes. Comprehensive data analysis underpins all activity, with repairs recorded in the central management system, including before-and-after photos, ensuring strong governance and transparency. This approach has improved efficiency and quality, with 96% of defect repairs completed right, first time as permanent fixes.

B12.1.6 - Further context

--