

Transparency report – Technical Annex template

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	£23.699m	£37.502m	£37.502m
Other DfT capital funding utilised by local authority for highways maintenance	£3.014m	£6.298m	£20.542m
Other Government capital funding allocated by local authority to Highways Maintenance	£0.00	£0.000m	£0.000m
Other capital funding allocated to highways maintenance	£0.00	£0.000m	£0.00
Total Capital funding allocated to highways maintenance	£26.713m	£43.800m	£58.044m

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	£25.674m	£41.391m	£58.044m
Total highways maintenance revenue spend	£18.799m	£20.104m	£19.138m

Total spend	£44.473m	£61.495m	£77.182m
-------------	----------	----------	----------

B1.2.2 - Additional information on total spending figures

Total spend has increased year on year thanks to the additional funding received from the EMCCA TCR budget and the additional delivery capacity arising from the Derbyshire Highways Transformation Programme.

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	£4.350m	£0	£8.275m	£0
Structural carriageway maintenance	£9.863m	£0	£8.377m	£0
Planned carriageway repair / patching programmes	£12.37m	£0	£11.400m	£0
Reactive carriageway maintenance				
Reactive carriageway repairs / patching (temporary repairs)	£0	£4.446m	£0	£4.350m
Reactive carriageway repairs / patching (permanent repairs)	£14.840m	£0	£13.200m	£0
Reactive carriageway repairs / patching (total)	£14.840m	£ 4.446m	£13.200m	£4.350m
Other carriageway-related spend	£	£	£	£
Total	£41.423m	£4.446m	£41.252m	£4.350m

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

The above figures don't include unallocated programme contingencies

Preventative maintenance includes treatments to prolong the life of the carriageway. These include surface dressing, micro-asphalt and carriageway rejuvenation. The above table shows how Derbyshire has targetted an increase in preventative treatments.

Structural maintenance includes resurfacing and reconstruction works that renew the surface and structure of the carriageway when preventative treatments are no longer recommended.

Planned carriageway repair patching are isolated repairs that renew the surface course and the structural layers of a carriageway and is used either as a standalone treatment or as pre-patching in advance of surface dressing or micro-asphalt.

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	115 km	50 km	No data held	No data held	No data held
2026-27 projected	137 km	54 km	No data held	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.	No
--	-----------

B2.1.2 – Further information and context

The above figures don't reflect all Derbyshire's treatments and repair activities. We split our carriageway workstreams as follows: Workstream 1A: Permanent pothole repair to make safe and fix the problem. Workstream 1B: Temporary pothole repair to make safe until permanent repairs can be programmed. Workstream 2: Targeted minor patching to permanently fix Type 1B repairs and/or other surface defects. Workstream 3: Larger planned patching or minor resurfacing works, targetting bigger areas of carriageway deterioration (included in 2025/26 structural maintenance figures but not 2026/27). Workstream 4: Major schemes on our annual capital programme (included in 2025/26 and 2026/27 structural maintenance figures).	
--	--

B3 – Pothole repairs

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
Carriageways	Minimum 40mm deep.	The width and depth of pothole. Hierarchy of road. Speed limit. Where it is on the road: in a junction area, wheel track, middle of a running lane, pedestrian crossing point, cycle lane. Is the condition likely to worsen if left untreated.	32-hours (next working day); 9 days; 28 days.	32-hours (next working day); 9 days; 28 days.
Footways, and on the carriageway at pedestrian crossing points (controlled and uncontrolled)	Minimum 20mm deep	Junction; Crossing Point	32 hours (next working day); 9 days; 28 days.	32 hours (next working day); 9 days; 28 days

B3.2 – Number of potholes filled

B3.2.1 - Number of potholes filled in 2025-26 (estimate)	66,784
--	--------

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
no data held	no data held	28%	72%

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

No data is held relating to the numbers allocated for each specific method of pothole resolution.

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)	£ 88.15	Unit/average cost of a temporary pothole repair on your network (reactive)	£ Variable
--	---------	--	------------

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

The figure above is an estimate based on an average hot-box reactive maintenance gang with an average of 100 repairs per week. The differing types of pothole repairs (Type A – Permanent and Type B – Temporary) along with the various methods we use to remedy the pothole, i.e.: conventional reactive maintenance gangs, planned maintenance gangs, innovative methods such as thermal patching, JCB Pothole-Pro, spray injection patching and Elastomac mastic asphalt with recycled rubber crumb makes it difficult to give an accurate figure for a Permanent and Temporary repair cost per pothole.

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 requirement to those delivering all repairs is a minimum guarantee period of 12 months, with some proprietary treatments having a 24month guarantee as appropriate.

The expected performance life for a permanent repair is expected to exceed the guarantee in all cases. Planned Intervention materials are in-line with the DCC Materials Policy. These materials are monitored and any changes to policy due to the failure or adoption of new products are made during each regular review.

We have historic data for major interventions such as resurfacing and major patching and we can validate the longevity if issues become apparent.

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

Members of the public and elected members report road faults which are prioritised and repaired in accordance with our highways asset management policy.

Reactive repairs are assessed in the AEI survey and allocated a score based on the proportion of the road that has received reactive repairs.

This is used in the situational score and, along with the site condition score, forms the final Value Management Score for the site.

We are awaiting an API between our new Causeway Asset Strategy module and our Causeway Asset Management system to feed in individual reactive maintenance jobs into the prioritisation process.

B3.5.4 - Tools used for reporting

Derbyshire uses a citizen reporting tool; this is an online portal to report road faults from members of the public and county councillors into our CRM (Granicus) which is populated through to our Asset Management system, Causeway Asset Management.

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	1,192
4.1.2	Number of highway structures with interim measures in accordance with CS470 applied?	43
4.1.3	Number of structures due a General Inspection in 2025-26 in accordance with CS450	886
4.1.4	Number of General Inspections carried out in 2025-26	886
4.1.5	Number of structures due a Principal Inspection in 2025-26 in accordance with CS450	30
4.1.6	Number of Principal Inspections carried out in 2025-26	28

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	
	Link to: Highways infrastructure asset management - Derbyshire County Council	
5.1.3	Please provide the date it was last reviewed or updated strategy:	15/09/2025 and Policy 08/05/2026
5.1.4	Please provide proof of the review or update.	
	The Asset Management Policy was approved by the Highways Director and the Cabinet Member for Highways on 8 May 2026. The Asset Management Strategy was approved by the Assistant Director for Highways on 15 September 2025.	
5.1.5	If your asset management policy or strategy has not been reviewed or updated since 1 August 2024, please confirm that it will be reviewed or updated by 30 September 2027 and provide a brief timetable for doing so.	
	Not applicable	

B5.1.6 - Further context (optional)

Our Highway Asset Management policies are based on the recommendations in the 2016 Code of Practice 'Well-managed highway infrastructure' and were first approved in 2018.

We have reviewed our policies every two years to ensure that these are still appropriate.

In addition, we have been externally audited twice by insurance companies, who have supported our approach.

Policies are seen as live documents, so that if any changes are required between review dates these can be implemented and signed off by our Highways Director.

We are committed to updating our policy documents once the updated Code of Practice is released.

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

5.2.1 - Further context (optional)

Footways and cycleways – The footway and cycleway survey network has been refined from its first iteration in 2020. We are proposing to carry out a new footway condition survey to establish full footway network life cycle planning.

Drainage Assets are continuing to be collected, although the underground nature of most of these assets makes location and identification more involved.

B5.3 – Asset data integration and management

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

B5.3.1 – Asset data integration

How is asset inventory and condition data for your key highway assets primarily managed? (please indicate one option with an X)

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

B5.3.2 - Further context (optional)

Our strategic approach to our asset management systems adopts open architecture, with Causeway Asset Management software as the hub and 'single source of truth'.

We are developing our integrations with Causeway Asset Management and have adopted the Causeway Asset Strategy module.

Kaarbontech were engaged in 2025 to review the existing cyclical gully cleansing operation and have advised how moving to a risk-based approach would improve efficiencies and reduce costs.

AMX database provides a centralised source of information for highway structure assets. It manages and schedules inspection programmes and maintenance and renewal works and maintains up-to-date condition records and key asset information.

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

B5.4.4 - Evidence Summary

Derbyshire's most valuable asset is its carriageway network. Life cycle planning is part of effective asset management, identifying maintenance need over the life of the asset and providing an overall maintenance backlog assessment.

A basket of treatments was produced in 2017 and has since been developed to bring in additional treatments to target locations where an intervention may be required.

The basket of treatments sits with other key principles and outputs for providing a robust Life Cycle Planning system:

- Network Hierarchy
- Survey Regimes
- Treatment Options/Costs/Lives
- Life Cycle Options
- Baskets of Treatments
- Life Cycle Scenarios
- Backlog
- Maintenance Need calculations.

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

We use KPIs to monitor our highways asset management approach. We have undertaken two value-for-money peer reviews.

We analyse and submit road condition data to the DfT in respect of the annual road condition statistics, the NHT CQC survey and the Asphalt Industry Alliance Alarm Survey.

Our internal KPIs measure the effectiveness and performance of reactive safety measures, with KPIs on pothole repairs and safety inspections. These are for 32-hours (next working day); 9-day and 28-day targets

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	8.74 km
6.1.3	For 2026-27, please provide the length of footways that you have earmarked for preventative maintenance treatments	14.64 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)	N/A
	b. Preventative maintenance treatments (in km)	N/A

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

Derbyshire maintains footways and cycle infrastructure through a risk-based asset management approach supported by condition data, network hierarchy and local knowledge. During 2026-27, 8.74km of footways are programmed for structural renewal and 14.64km for preventative maintenance treatments.

Inspection frequencies range from monthly on prestige and primary walking routes to annual inspections on local access footways. Priority footways and cycle routes are included within winter maintenance and vegetation management programmes. Maintaining safe, accessible and serviceable infrastructure for pedestrians and cyclists forms an important part of Derbyshire's wider asset management strategy and supports active travel objectives across the county.

B6.1.7 - Evidence Summary

Please see link to [Highways Infrastructure Assets Safety Inspections Manual](#)

Please see link to [Pavement repair 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	24%
	b) Planned maintenance (routine/cyclical and/or risk-based)	76%
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
	Guidance – This is space for additional information on sensors/technologies for remote monitoring – please list technologies used in bullet form, including approximate number of installations. DCC currently have installed as part of the A6 Challenge Fund project: • 4 UD live DMS live grid gully sensors in a known flooding hotspot, to trial their effectiveness in providing real time water level information. • We also have 2 UD LIVE sensors located in another frequently flooded hotspot on a dual carriageway. The results of the trial are being monitored through a live mapping portal and will be reviewed accordingly as to their effectiveness.	

B7.1.5 - Evidence Summary

Adopted a risk-based approach to how reactive work is prioritised using the principles set out in the HMEP guidance on the effective management of Highway Drainage assets. Causeway Asset Management software automatically prioritises each reactive request, using the principles as set out.

Kaarbontech were engaged in 2025 to review DCC's existing cyclical gully cleansing operation and have advised how moving to a risk-based approach will improve efficiencies and reduce costs.

DCC have used this information to review its gully maintenance regime, and will continue to review to realise these efficiencies, using real time data/evidence to inform future decision making.

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

A Drainage Strategy is currently being developed, which will embed all of the principles and approaches as to how DCC currently manages its drainage assets, and this will be reviewed on an annual basis.

DCC is also undertaking a proactive approach to asset data collection, including a programme of sub-900mm culvert surveys. A gap analysis of current drainage asset data will be undertaken, to understand how DCC can enhance its knowledge and understanding of drainage assets, which will assist in increasing our effectiveness in managing our drainage assets.

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

We have annual Performance Development Reviews (PDRs) to identify training needs and have previously carried out gap analysis with the HMEP competency framework, which identified development needs.

We support early career development and employ apprentices and graduates who undertake training and NVQ qualifications. We develop staff through the PDR process and support ONC/HNC/Degree qualifications.

Many of our members of staff have developed their technical knowledge within the service, achieving Eng Tech, Incorporated Engineer and Chartered Engineer qualifications.

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.	09/2025
9.1.4	Have you identified locations that are repeatedly affected by extreme weather (e.g. flooding, heat damage, storms)?	Yes – formally recorded
9.1.5	Which climate-adaptation measures are currently implemented on your network?	
	- Targeted drainage upgrades or maintenance	Yes

	- Natural flood management / SuDS	Yes
	- targeted slope / ground stability / landslip mitigation	Yes
	- Heat-resilient materials or surface treatments	Yes
	- Tree planting / shading for heat management	Yes
	- 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?	Yes

B9.1.8 - Evidence Summary

Derbyshire has embedded climate resilience and decarbonisation principles within its asset management approach. We are working with Severn Trent Water to deliver retrofit SuDS systems within the highway and have developed a Derbyshire Retrofit SuDS Design Manual to support future delivery. Identified flooding hotspots and climate-vulnerable locations are prioritised for investment using a risk-based approach. We participate in both the ADEPT Carbon Leadership Programme and Live Labs 2 to benchmark emissions and identify opportunities to reduce carbon. Current trials include lower energy street lighting solutions using LED technology, reduced material requirements and alternative construction approaches that support both carbon reduction and long-term asset resilience.

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

Derbyshire is increasing investment in preventative maintenance treatments including surface dressing, micro-asphalt, asphalt rejuvenation and preservation techniques. These treatments extend asset life, improve network resilience and reduce whole-life carbon by postponing more intensive reconstruction activities. We have adopted heavily modified polymer modified binders that provide improved flexibility and resistance to cracking, helping the network withstand temperature extremes and increased rainfall. A programme of landslip remediation and targeted drainage improvements is also being delivered to address known climate-related risks and improve the resilience of critical routes across the county.

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

DCC has an Innovations Project Group and has conducted trials and used innovative materials including:

- Elastomac materials for pothole repairs.
- Highly modified Polymer Modified Binder (PMB) surface course materials.
- Use of Stress Absorbing Membrane Interface (SAMI) layer mixtures.
- Agesafe PMB bitumen.
- PMB binder course material.
- Calcine Bauxite grit applied onto a newly laid Stone Mastic Asphalt (SMA) surface course to increase skid resistance.
- Methyl Methacrylate (MMA) fast curing road markings.
- IKO PacoPatch PMB reinstatement system around ironwork.
- Cold applied joint sealant to prevent water ingress.
- Lock chip post surface dressing treatment.

B10.1.5 - Further context on your innovation activities

Derbyshire is an active participant in the ADEPT Live Labs 2 programme and continues to evaluate innovative approaches that improve service delivery, reduce carbon emissions and extend asset life. Current initiatives include lower-energy street lighting systems, carriageway recycling techniques, asphalt rejuvenation treatments and advanced asset management technology through the Causeway Asset Strategy module. Innovation opportunities are reviewed through our Innovation Project Group and informed by engagement with the Future Highways Research Group (FHRG), industry conferences, professional networks and delivery partners. Where innovations demonstrate measurable benefits in durability, efficiency, safety, customer outcomes or carbon reduction, they are incorporated into standard maintenance programmes and business-as-usual operations.

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.

- ***Elastomac materials for pothole repairs:***
This treatment is more expensive than a conventional pothole repair but does not need repeat visits and therefore is cost-effective by saving time and disruption. A durable first time fix also reduces carbon by preventing repeat visits and the use of additional materials. This is used county-wide.
- ***Use of highly modified Polymer Modified Binder (PMB) surface course materials:***
This material is more expensive as it is a premium product. However, its additional durability over a standard 40/60 paving grade bitumen lengthens service life by increased flexibility leading to crack prevention and it is more able to cope with extreme temperatures without deformation. This is used at High-stress locations county-wide.
- ***Use of Stress Absorbing Membrane Interface (SAMI) layers***
These are more expensive to adopt, but SAMI mixtures are highly flexible asphalts that reduce reflective cracking and early failure of surface courses and are conventionally laid on top of the concrete or cobbles before the binder and surface

course. The prolonged flexibility avoids early failure on difficult sites, which justifies the initial spend. Used in concrete/cobbled roads county-wide.

- **Use of Methyl Methacrylate (MMA) fast curing road markings.**
Higher cost is outweighed by the speed of application, resulting in reduced traffic management costs and disruption to traffic. Durability of road marking promotes road safety and cost benefits. Used county-wide in high stress locations.
- **Use of IKO PacoPatch PMB reinstatement system around ironwork.**
Proprietary ironwork adjustment system utilising pacopatch bricks and polymer modified mastic asphalt grout. It provides a low void and durable repair system to ironwork. It is used county-wide in difficult locations where repeated repairs caused by overrun would be an issue saving time and disruption on repeated visits.
- **Cold applied joint sealant to prevent water ingress.**
Cold applied joint sealing is a product that seals cracks and failing construction joints in carriageways by curing at ambient temperature though the addition of chemicals. Used county-wide to prolong the service life of existing surface course and prevent continued pothole repairs.
- **Lock chip on surface dressing to prevent chipping loss and water ingress to prevent potholes.**
This product is added to a recently laid surface dressing after sweeping to seal in the chippings and prevent chipping loss and water penetration making the surface dressing more durable by preventing cracking and potholing. Used at specific sites county-wide.

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?	No
11.1.5	Have you conducted a traffic sensitive review in the last three years?	Yes

11.1.6 - Evidence Summary

Derbyshire coordinates highway maintenance and utility works through its streetworks management processes, permit scheme arrangements and regular engagement with utility companies. Planned works are reviewed to identify opportunities for coordination, reducing repeated disruption to road users. Utility works quality is monitored and enforced where necessary, and traffic-sensitive routes are regularly reviewed. The Council is currently undertaking a permit scheme review and traffic-sensitive review to identify further opportunities to improve network management, reduce congestion and minimise disruption for residents, businesses and road users.

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

Derbyshire retains in-house technical capability to assess interventions proposed by contractors. We have a materials policy that identifies surface course materials per road hierarchy.

We have contributed to the MHA+ benchmarking programme previously. However, variations in unit rates through our mixed economy delivery model and the numerous tenders involved make it difficult to establish a “true” set of unit rates.

Performance of the contractor is governed by our KPIs, i.e. 32-hours, 9-day, and 28-days.

We prioritise a single-visit permanent pothole repair (Type A) and only use a temporary repair (Type B) where it would not be safe to do so.

B12.1.6 - Further context

Reactive works and planned works are issued daily via tablet and all completed works are closed on Causeway Asset Management. In-house technicians and supervisors carry out quality checks to ensure quality standards are maintained and this is backed up by materials testing by Derbyshire’s in-house Highways Laboratory. This ensures that materials used comply with the appropriate specification to ensure durability and achieve their expected life cycles. If a material is non-compliant the sample evidence enables remedial measures to be identified.