

Kent County Council

Local Highway Maintenance Transparency Report 2026 - Technical Annex

This section of the transparency report is to provide a more detailed view of your service. It will also need to be published on your website and provided to DfT alongside the core report but does not need to have the same level of prominence on your website as the core report.

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	£42,006,020	£58,552,050	£59,701,760
Other DfT capital funding utilised by local authority for highways maintenance	£2,524,320	-	-
Other Government capital funding allocated by local authority to Highways Maintenance	-	-	-
Other capital funding allocated to highways maintenance	£27,563,250	£22,080,150	£39,124,520
Total Capital funding allocated to highways maintenance	£72,093,590	£80,632,200	£98,826,280

B1.1.2 - Additional information on funding figures

KCC currently supplements the capital funding provided by the DfT by about £25 million per year through capital borrowing. In addition, for 2026/27, KCC provided £8m of funding to address Category 1 significant maintenances risks.

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	£72,093,590	£80,632,200	£98,826,280
Total highways maintenance revenue spend	£34,329,180	£36,497,280	£38,659,870
Total spend	£106,422,770	£117,129,480	£137,486,150

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	£5,861,050		£5,489,590	
Preventative carriageway maintenance	£9,081,030	-	£8,785,230	-
Structural carriageway maintenance	£25,109,660	-	£32,975,700	-
Planned carriageway repair / patching programmes	£28,447,780	-	£29,906,670	-
Reactive carriageway maintenance				
Reactive carriageway repairs / patching (temporary repairs)	-	£1,839,294	-	£1,698,405
Reactive carriageway repairs / patching (permanent repairs)	-	£14,881,568	-	£13,741,649
Reactive carriageway repairs / patching (total)	-	£16,720,862	-	£15,440,054
Other carriageway-related spend	£12,132,680		£21,669,090	
Total	£80,632,200		£98,826,290	

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

We prioritise planned maintenance to reduce/prevent reactive maintenance. This is based on a good understanding of our highway assets, their condition and likely lifecycle performance. For example, for roads, we use an asset condition modelling tool to understand the deterioration of road surfaces so that we can, where funding allows, intervene before potholes occur and target finite resources to maximise the positive effect of investment. Accordingly, in 2025/26, we delivered £35m of road surface renewal and preservation.

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	126.67km	49.1km	197,007m ²	10,737m ²	32,086m ²
2026-27 projected	125km	52.6km	175,000m 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
--	------------

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
Carriageway Defect – Pothole	50mm Depth	Risk-based approach considering location, road type, traffic speed and volume, and the potential impact on vulnerable users including cyclists and motorcyclists.	2 hours	28 day repair

Carriageway Defect – Fretting and Delamination	50mm depth – Would generally require patching	Risk-based approach considering location, road type, traffic speed and volume, and the potential impact on vulnerable users including cyclists and motorcyclists.	2 hours	90 day repair
Carriageway Defect – Edge deterioration	50mm depth – Would generally require patching and / or haunching	Risk-based approach considering location, road type, traffic speed and volume, and the potential impact on vulnerable users including cyclists and motorcyclists.	2 hours	90 day repair

B3.2 – Number of potholes filled

B3.2.1 - Number of potholes filled in 2025-26	53,537
---	--------

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
10,714	[no data held]	10,737	32,086

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

The figures provided above comprise of the following:

53,537 – Total potholes repaired of which:

32,086 permanent reactive repairs which have been repaired by our highway maintenance contractor. These include:

- 24,367 Reactive orders for pothole repairs.
- 7,719 Reactive orders for patching works.

10,737 temporary reactive repairs which include:

- 7,097 repaired by KCC staff (treated as temporary repairs).
- 3,640 temporary repairs delivered by our highway maintenance contractors.

10,714 potholes that have been repaired as part of / within wider planned 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.

B3.3 - Prices of pothole interventions

Unit/average cost of a permanent pothole repair on your network (reactive)	£83.97	Unit/average cost of a temporary pothole repair on your network (reactive)	£83.97
--	--------	--	--------

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

We re-commissioned our Highway Term Maintenance Contract (HTMC) in 2026. We do not yet have longer term data on overall programme cost against number of repairs delivered that may provide accurate actual costs.

The pothole repair costs provided above are taken from our 2026 HTMC price list as the expected cost per defect. This will apply to potholes in flexible bituminous roads, with repairs in more specialist materials likely to cost more. These do not include complex traffic management and the cost of repairs in difficult/busy locations can increase significantly if temporary traffic lights or road closures are required.

The price is consistent for both permanent and temporary pothole repairs, up to 1m².

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?	a) Yes b) 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

3.4.1 - Requirements are included in highway maintenance contracts for appropriate defect periods, that repairs must remain defect free. Normally 12 months for reactive repairs, minimum of 2 years for larger planned works.

3.4.2 - Material and process specifications set out these longevity requirements and are incorporated in contract documents. Kent Pavement Manual also provides technical guidance to all KCC Highways staff

3.4.3 – Ordered works subject to review by commissioning team, Heads of Service and Director, alongside regular monitoring of repair types to identify trends.

3.4.4 - Contract performance measures assess the number of repairs which are defect free at the end of the defect period.

B3.4.6 - Additional information

Measurement of supplier performance against the longevity requirements is important to ensure quality repairs are delivered. Contract performance measures allow identification and quantification of quality of repairs delivered by supplier so this can be tackled and performance improved.

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

3.5.1 – Defect reports inform district operations teams maintenance plans. Local needs sites allow them to identify areas of frequent customer contact for planned renewal/preservation works.

3.5.2 - Our fault reporting tool will update customers automatically as the status of enquiries is changed. They can also check the current status of their enquiry online. Callback requests are added to enquiries where customers request to be updated, which are then tracked. Officers have KPIs for enquiry response times set out in our Highways and Transportation business plan and compliance with KPI timescales is monitored monthly.

B3.5.4 - Tools used for reporting

We use an in-house fault reporting tool (www.kent.gov.uk/highwayfaults) for customers to report highway related defects. Our reporting tool is currently built in java script (we are in the process of transitioning to a new tool built in Granicus). The tool interfaces with our customer enquiry management system.

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	2,031
4.1.2	Number of highway structures with interim measures in accordance with CS470 applied?	31
4.1.3	Number of structures due a General Inspection in 2025-26 in accordance with CS450	992
4.1.4	Number of General Inspections carried out in 2025-26	940
4.1.5	Number of structures due a Principal Inspection in 2025-26 in accordance with CS450	86
4.1.6	Number of Principal Inspections carried out in 2025-26	75

Additional Context

Kent County Council manages a highway structures stock of 2,031 assets, including bridges, culverts, retaining walls and other highway structures. Inspection programmes are managed in accordance with CS450 and are derived from the Council's asset management system.

During 2025/26, 940 of 992 General Inspections and 75 of 86 Principal Inspections were completed. The small shortfall against the planned programme reflects planned schemes/maintenance on the network and operational challenges such as access constraints, road space availability and inspection scheduling within the reporting period.

A total of 31 structures were subject to interim measures in accordance with the DMRB document CS470 - Management of sub-standard highway structures. These measures are applied as part of KCC's risk-based asset management approach to ensure the continued safe operation of structures while further assessment, monitoring, maintenance or strengthening works are undertaken.

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	
	www.kent.gov.uk/about-the-council/strategies-and-policies/service-specific-policies/roads-paths-and-transport-policies/managing-highway-infrastructure	
5.1.3	Please provide the date it was last reviewed or updated	16 July 2021
5.1.4	Please provide proof of the review or update.	
	The document was initially published on the 16 th July 2021. This is shown on the version history included in the published document.	
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 are currently reviewing and updating our Highways Asset Management Plan. This will be completed and the updated documents published before the 30th September 2027 deadline. Our indicative programme for this update process is for the internal review and document drafting to be completed before the end of December 2026. The documents will then go through appropriate governance processes, with the intention to have them approved, adopted and published before the end of March 2027.	

B5.1.6 - Further context (optional)

After the publication of our Highway Asset Management Plan, internal reviews have since been undertaken. However, due to other commitments such as the procurement of our Highways Term Maintenance Contract, these have not resulted in any update to the document being published since the initial publication.

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.

Please complete the table below for your key highway assets.

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

5.2.1 - Further context (optional)

We have paused condition data collection for footways and cycleways as the FMS and FNS surveys did not meet our needs. We have developed a bespoke Kent footway condition survey which we are testing for usage next year.

We are developing our signs and lines asset data including both asset inventory and asset condition data on key routes.

Alongside these and our key assets above, we also hold the following asset data:

Crash Barrier - Full asset inventory - Partial asset condition

Tunnels - Full asset inventory - Partial asset condition

Intelligent Traffic Systems - Full asset inventory - Partial asset condition

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	
A single digital platform or a set of connected platforms used across the highways service	
Other (please set out in further context)	X

B5.3.2 - Further context (optional)

Our answer for B5.3.1 reflects our use of multiple digital platforms with *considerable* integration.

We primarily use WAMS to manage our network and asset data. This Confirm-based platform also manages our routine customer enquiries, along with works ordering for our primary highway maintenance contracts.

WAMS also interfaces with other systems such as Predictor, CPA, our fault reporting tools, Oracle, Power BI and ParkMap.

However there are exceptions, with some assets using stand-alone platforms, such as Esri Arcmap for drainage data, Causeway Horizons as our pavement management system and both AMX and ThinkProject to manage our structures and tunnels assets.

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

Since publication, our Highways Asset Management Plan has been used to inform maintenance investment decisions, not least since highway asset management should be considered to be a multi-year activity rather than an annual one. This contains detailed lifecycle planning analysis for our major asset groups including carriageways, footways & structures.

This lifecycle planning includes investment scenarios with predicted condition outcomes, along with details of our expected steady state costs, shortfall from this and our maintenance backlog.

The decisions on our KCC-supplied funding for highway maintenance since the publication of our HAMP has been based on the details it contains.

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

5.5.1 – KPIs are measured across our highway maintenance contracts. KPIs to measure the performance of our Highways and Transportation service are part of the KCC Quarterly Performance Report for Cabinet.

5.5.2 – These KPIs are regularly reviewed by the relevant contract boards, leadership teams and Council Cabinet.

5.5.3 – These groups monitor the KPIs for trends, with a focus on identifying areas of poor performance and potential solutions, along with informing decision making and planning at all levels.

5.5.4 – A thorough review of our service, including value for money and peer involvement, was undertaken alongside the recent commissioning of our new Highways Term Maintenance Contract.

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	22.9 km
6.1.3	For 2026-27, please provide the length of footways that you have earmarked for preventative maintenance treatments	34.2 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)	
	b. Preventative maintenance treatments (in km)	

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

We have a defined footway/cycleway hierarchy and have adopted a risk-based approach to our footway inspections and maintenance. We are currently reviewing our hierarchy to better support inspection frequency and maintenance decisions.

We have recently completed a project to map the off-road cycle network. We plan to include a section on cycle route maintenance in our upcoming HAMP update, which will inform future structural and preventative maintenance.

We undertake routine vegetation clearance on footways/cycleways through our standard vegetation works. This also includes detached footpaths/cyclepaths during the summer for access. We also have an enforcement regime for overhanging private vegetation.

B6.1.7 - Evidence Summary

6.1.1 – Existing footway network hierarchy.

6.1.2 & 3 – List of planned footway/cycleway schemes for 2026/27 is included in our forward works programme.

6.1.4 – List of high-usage footways identified for priority winter maintenance. Soft landscapes vegetation cut-back programme.

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	31%
	b) Planned maintenance (routine/cyclical and/or risk-based)	69%
7.1.2	Does your authority utilise a digital drainage management platform, covering asset inventory, inspection history, sensor data, and risk scoring?	Yes
7.1.3	Do you maintain a record of locations where drainage issues are known to cause or contribute to carriageway deterioration or surface water ponding?	Yes
7.1.4	Do you utilise smart sensors or other remote monitoring technologies to monitor performance of your drainage assets. If yes please provide some high level information in bullet points below	No

B7.1.5 - Evidence Summary

7.1.1 – Budget breakdown of our drainage service, including reactive and planned spending. Emergency works, reactive cleansing and 90% of ironwork replacement is believed to be reactive spend.

7.1.2 – Extracts from our Highways Term Maintenance Contract which show requirement to provide, support and transition to new digital drainage management system.

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

We used Kaarbontech digital drainage management platform. We have recently transitioned to an Esri-based system, commissioned as part of our new Highways Term Maintenance Contract.

We identify flooding hotspots, though do not automatically link these to carriageway condition. Close collaboration between our Drainage and Road and Footway asset teams

allows issues to be identified and resolved prior to or during planned maintenance schemes, such as blocked/broken gullies.

We have trialled and used smart sensors previously. They were found to be of limited effectiveness and did not provide the representative and systemic view that is needed. We are looking to review this and explore alternative systems in future.

B8 – Skills and training

ID	Question	Answer
8.1.1	Do you have an up-to-date training and development plan for those responsible for highways asset management in your authority?	No
8.1.2	Do you or your main highways contractors support professional development through a recognised professional training scheme (e.g. Institution of Civil Engineers (ICE) or Institution of Highway Engineers (IHE))?	No
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

8.1.4 – Structures and Tunnels Asset Manager role profile includes requirement for CEng professional qualification.
 8.1.6 – KCC and supply chain engagement on apprenticeships. Training plans are used to manage trainees progress.

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

We know workforce development is critical to safeguarding our future service delivery. We have previously identified our aging workforce and loss of institutional knowledge as experienced officers retire to be significant risks.

Roles in highway maintenance require specialist skills and understanding. There is a limited pool of this nationally and especially in the southeast, outside of London.

To help mitigate this, we encourage workforce development, giving opportunities for junior and less technically skilled officers to learn, obtain qualifications and progress internally within Highways and Transportation. We adopt a “grow our own” approach to the skills shortages with a view to enabling sustainable long term service delivery.

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.	November 2022
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	Yes
	- Tree planting / shading for heat management	No
	- Other (please specify)	Yes
	- 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?	Yes

B9.1.8 - Evidence Summary

9.1.1 – Our HAMP includes recognition of the impacts of climate change and how we should mitigate these.

9.1.2&3 – The document “Definition of the Resilient Highway Network in Kent” sets out our resilient network and its approval.

9.1.4 – Records are kept of known flooding hotspots. We maintain a list of flood prone structures and run a special inspection regime to safeguard structures from scour in flood events.

9.1.5 – SUDS is heavily promoted as the preferred drainage system for new developments in the Kent Design Guide. Heat resilient surface dressing using super premium PMB binder is being trialled.

9.1.6 – KCC has signed up to the Carbon Leadership Programme and is currently preparing our data submission. We have worked with the National Highways & Transportation Network (NHT) to assess our value for carbon. Carbon emission reporting and benchmarking has been built into our primary highway maintenance contracts.

9.1.7 – We have supported a series of presentations by Live Labs 2 participants, including Giles Perkins (Programme Director) to share the lessons learned across our organisation.

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

KCC recognises the importance of adapting to withstand climate pressures and the challenges in doing this, both in terms of decarbonisation and climate change resilience.

Since our RHN publication, it has been regularly reviewed informally, including recently as part of our new maintenance hierarchy implementation. We are also undertaking a detailed review to reflect wider factors, including LTP4, the local transport delivery plan and climate change adaptation.

Our trials process, ensuring a holistic approach to trials of new materials and processes has been updated to support innovations relating to emissions reductions/climate adaptation.

3 KCC officers have served on the Association of Directors of Environment, Economy, Planning & Transport (ADEPT) local highway adaptation document advisory board.

Our key highway maintenance contracts have been commissioned and are now being managed with a focus on climate adaptation. This includes carbon reporting requirements and for our Road Asset Renewal Contract, carbon emission reduction targets.

An important area of focus has been on building awareness and understanding of climate adaptation across our business. We have run a series of presentations accessible to all Highways and Transportation officers, covering a range of topics including climate adaption. Carbon Leadership Programme & Institute of Sustainability and Environment Professionals (ISEP) training is also available for officers involved in projects relating to this.

Our structures asset team have also moved to consider carbon emissions in replacement and repair work identification. We also consider carbon emissions in structural technical approval assessments.

B10 – Innovation

ID	Question	
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

10.1.1 – KCC Procurement Strategy underpins this. Extracts from recent procurements and contracts are also provided showing promotion of innovation.

10.1.2 - Trials process and register demonstrate holistic approach to assessment of innovative materials/practices.

10.1.3 – Evidence of trials results which have been shared externally and communicate the results.

B10.1.5 - Further context on your innovation activities

Innovation is a key consideration in procurement and contracting. Appropriate consideration during procurement allows us to identify opportunities before contracts are produced. Contract management is also undertaken with consideration to innovation to ensure opportunities are assessed and incorporated where appropriate.

KCC has implemented a trials process. This provides a flexible framework to ensure we use a scientific and coordinated approach to the assessment, communication and, where appropriate, integration, of innovative materials and practices.

The Kent lane rental scheme also supports and encourages innovation, both by KCC and statutory undertakers.

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.

Lightweight composite manhole lids to reduce manual handling strain and corrosion issues in tunnels were trialled in 2023 and are being installed in other tunnel assets.

Following trials, wider usage of Low Temperature Asphalt has been rolled out, along with high grade polymer modified binder mixes to provide increased durability and lower carbon emissions.

We have trialled a polymer embellishment kit to provide a more sustainable solution to providing 'heritage' style streetlights. This also enables structural testing and maintenance without needing to remove the embellishment kit. We have adopted this onto our standard material list.

This year we have trialled and implemented school flashing warning lights with remote monitoring and control. This provides the functionality to detect faults as soon as they happen; manage the programming remotely and react to changes in term dates or school events.

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?	Yes
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

11.1.6 - Evidence Summary

11.1.2 - Kent Lane Rental Scheme has been in operation since May 2013.
11.1.3 - HAUC meeting minutes showing collaboration on programmes.
11.1.5 – Details of traffic sensitivity review are provided.

B11.1.7 - Further context

Forward works programmes are shared at Kent HAUC and Quarterly Coordination meetings to work collaboratively and to reduce disruption, Streetworks coordination teams also actively look for opportunities.

KCC carry out sample NRSWA inspections on a selected percentage of street works undertaken by utility companies and contractors. Their purpose is to check that works are being carried out safely and that reinstatements meet the required standards. In 2025/26, KCC inspectors completed 15,956 inspections.

The Traffic Sensitive Street consultation was carried out in 2023 with the NSG update completed by February 2024.

The last Kent Permit scheme review was in 2021.

B12 – Managing highways maintenance contracts effectively

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

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

12.1.1 – KCC Highways and Transportation structure charts show scale of in-house technical capability
12.1.2 – Extracts from key highway maintenance contracts showing benchmarking clause in contract.
12.1.3 – Extracts from key highway maintenance contracts showing performance measures
12.1.4 – Details of contract performance measures which measure and incentivise this

B12.1.6 - Further context

KCC generally takes an informed client approach, with interventions selected and ordered by KCC officers using their engineering knowledge and judgement. Some specialist treatments or complex engineering schemes may involve some elements designed or proposed by contractors/consultants. Any such proposals will be reviewed by KCC officers with an appropriate level of skill and knowledge to ensure they are appropriate.

Ensuring value for money is an important part of our procurement and contract management. For example in our recent HTMC procurement an independent cost consultant was employed to assess value for money at each of the different tender stages. We have also incorporated benchmarking into key contracts, as frequently as every 5 years and before extension approval.

Contract performance measures are designed to identify poor performance and incentivise correct behaviour.