

Highways maintenance transparency reports template

Contents

Contents.....	1
Transparency report – Technical Annex template	2
B1 - Highways maintenance funding and spending figures.....	2
B2 – Highway Maintenance Activity (Surface Treatments and Repairs).....	3
B3 – Pothole repairs	4
B4 – Maintenance of highway structures	7
B5 – Asset Management	7
B6 - Maintaining footways and cycleways.....	10
B7 – Drainage	11
B8 – Skills and training	12
B9 – Adapting roads to withstand climate pressures.....	13
B10 – Innovation	14
Hydro-demolition of bridge plinths.....	15
Spray-injection pothole patching.....	16
Viafix cold-lay repair material	16
Risk-based gully cleansing	16
Electrification of the supervisory vehicle fleet	16
Early market engagement for PAS 2161 surveys	17
B11 – Working with utility companies to reduce disruption to road users	17
B12 – Managing highways maintenance contracts effectively	18

Transparency report – Technical Annex template

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	£4,312,000	£4,970,000	£10,662,081
Other DfT capital funding utilised by local authority for highways maintenance	£0	£0	£0
Other Government capital funding allocated by local authority to Highways Maintenance	£0	£0	£0
Other capital funding allocated to highways maintenance	£4,097,994	£4,714,695	£1,112,464
Total Capital funding allocated to highways maintenance	£8,409,994	£9,684,695	£11,774,545

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	£8,130,859	£8,616,262	£11,774,545
Total highways maintenance	£1,081,896	£1,359,551	£1,136,000

revenue spend			
Total spend	£9,212,756	£9,975,813	£12,911,145

B1.2.2 - Additional information on total spending figures

Previous 2025/26 incentive submission included Streetlighting energy and other minor amounts in total highways revenue for 2024/25 & 2025/26 in error. B1.2 has now been corrected to exclude energy costs.

Where in year spend is reported as less than total budget the shortfall is from within our own Bury Council capital allocations not allocations from DfT.

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	£840,574	£0	£918,135	£0
Structural carriageway maintenance	£3,464,805	£0	£5,098,161	£0
Planned carriageway repair / patching programmes	£195,000	£0	£90,000	£0
Reactive carriageway maintenance				
Reactive carriageway repairs / patching (temporary repairs)	£0	£34,371	£0	£49,400
Reactive carriageway repairs / patching (permanent repairs)	£862,911	£0	£217,254	£0
Reactive carriageway repairs / patching (total)	£967,911	£34,371	£0	£49,400
Other carriageway-related spend	£73,931	£19,750	£215,557	£20,000
Total	£5,437,221	£54,121	£6,539,107	£ 69,400

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

'Other' includes only road markings expenditure and not inspections or survey costs.

B2 – Highway Maintenance Activity (Surface Treatments and Repairs)

B2.1 – Road resurfacing and surface treatments

Financial year	Road receiving preventative road surface	Road receiving planned structural	Area receiving planned repair /	Area receiving reactive repair /	Area receiving reactive repairs/
----------------	--	-----------------------------------	---------------------------------	----------------------------------	----------------------------------

	treatments (length, km)	maintenance (length, km)	patching programmes	patching (permanent methods)	patching (temporary methods)
2025-26	10 km	7.6 km	2600 m ²	4254 m ²	800 m ²
2026-27 projected	15 km	9.2 km	3000 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

Highway maintenance activities are delivered through a combination of planned annual programmes and responsive interventions. The Council seeks to apply the most suitable treatment for each location, ranging from preventative surface preservation techniques to larger-scale carriageway renewal. Coordination with utility works, active travel schemes and other capital projects is considered where opportunities arise, helping to reduce disruption and optimise investment across the highway network.	No
--	-----------

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
Footway Defect	25mm depth	Road hierarchy (determining factors inc. classification, characteristics, condition data, operational considerations)	2hr, 24hr, 14 days and 28days (determined by risk factor)	2hr, 24hr, 14 days and 28days (determined by risk factor)
Carriageway Defect	40mm depth	Road hierarchy (determining factors inc.	2hr, 24hr, 14 days and	2hr, 24hr, 14 days and

		classification, characteristics, condition data, operational considerations)	28days (determined by risk factor)	28days (determined by risk factor)
Carriageway Defect (at pedestrian crossing point)	25mm depth	Road hierarchy (determining factors inc. classification, characteristics, condition data, operational considerations)	2hr, 24hr, 14 days and 28days (determined by risk factor)	2hr, 24hr, 14 days and 28days (determined by risk factor)
Kerb Defect	50mm displacement	Road hierarchy (determining factors inc. classification, characteristics, condition data, operational considerations)	2hr, 24hr, 14 days and 28days (determined by risk factor)	2hr, 24hr, 14 days and 28days (determined by risk factor)

B3.1 – Further information and context

Our evidence pack includes our policy for highway safety inspections which includes the risk matrix and related table of priority response times.

B3.2 – Number of potholes filled

B3.2.1 - Number of potholes filled in 2025-26 (estimate)	9,430
--	-------

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	1,805	7,625

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

The total number of potholes filled in 2025-26 is based on defects recorded and repairs completed within the Council's highway asset management system. Reactive repair methods are recorded within the system and have therefore been split between temporary and permanent repairs. We do not currently hold reliable pothole counts specifically attributable to planned repair / patching programmes or planned structural maintenance, as these works are usually recorded by scheme, area or treatment type rather than by individual pothole.

Guidance – Please include the following text to explain that authorities can use different criteria for identifying and counting potholes:

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)	£ 71	Unit/average cost of a temporary pothole repair on your network (reactive)	£ 35
--	------	--	------

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

Figures provided are the average overall costs based on the expenditure recorded in financial year 2025/26 for all types of pothole repair.

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?	No
3.4.2	If yes, do you base your material and process specifications on these longevity requirements?	N/A
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

Bury Council undertakes routine quality assurance of highway maintenance activities through supervisory inspections and a programme of validation checks. A minimum 20% sample of Highway Safety Inspections and associated repairs is independently reviewed to verify compliance with policy, workmanship standards and appropriate intervention selection. Repairs delivered by external contractors are subject to contractual defect correction periods, with any early-life failures identified through follow-up inspections, customer reports and routine safety inspections. Information on repair performance and failures is recorded within the highway asset management system and used to inform continuous improvement and contractor performance monitoring.

B3.4.6 - Additional information

We adopt a risk-based approach to defect management, seeking to deliver permanent repairs wherever practicable. Temporary repairs are primarily used to make defects safe where immediate intervention is required, pending a permanent repair or inclusion within a planned maintenance programme. Quality monitoring findings are reviewed by operational managers and used to identify trends, improve repair techniques and support ongoing service improvement.

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

Bury Council signposts residents to report highway defects through our Customer Contact Team or via our online geospatial reporting portal. All reports are logged within our highway asset management system and assessed in accordance with our risk-based inspection and maintenance procedures. Customers receive updates on the outcome of their report, including where repairs are programmed, completed, or where an inspection determines that no immediate action is required. The geospatial reporting system identifies existing reports, preventing duplication of reporting.

B3.5.4 - Tools used for reporting

Bury Council provides several channels for reporting highway defects. Residents can report issues through our online geospatial mapping portal, which allows locations to be identified accurately on an interactive map, or by contacting our Customer Contact Team by telephone. All reports are recorded within our highway asset 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	128
4.1.2	Number of highway structures with interim measures in accordance with CS470 applied?	0
4.1.3	Number of structures due a General Inspection in 2025-26 in accordance with CS450	51
4.1.4	Number of General Inspections carried out in 2025-26	51
4.1.5	Number of structures due a Principal Inspection in 2025-26 in accordance with CS450	47
4.1.6	Number of Principal Inspections carried out in 2025-26	0

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	Yes
-------	--	------------

	out to your authority via letter to your chief executive in April and as published online.	
5.1.2	Please provide a link to your authority's published highways asset management policy and strategy. Link	
	Highway Asset Management Plan (HAMP) - Bury Council	
5.1.3	Please provide the date it was last reviewed or updated	October 2025
5.1.4	Please provide proof of the review or update. <i>The update is date stamped on our website as per the link in 5.1.2 above. The HAMP was approved by Cabinet on 15th January 2026, see below: Agenda for Cabinet on Thursday, 15th January, 2026, 6.00 pm - Bury Council</i>	
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.	
	N/A	

B5.1.6 - Further context (optional)

Our HAMP is considered a developing policy which is reviewed regularly.

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	Partial
Structures	Full	Full
Drainage assets	Partial	Partial
Street lighting	Partial	Partial
Traffic signals	N/A	N/A

5.2.1 - Further context (optional)

Traffic signals

Traffic signal assets are managed across Greater Manchester by Traffic for Greater Manchester.

Carriageways & Footways

We have both UKPMS and polygon representations of our carriageway and footway network, which records classifications and other information. Gullies/Street Lighting, Signs, bollards and guardrail have been collected in GIS format and can be represented in both our Alloy system and Mapinfo/Cadcorp GIS.

Drainage

Highway drainage assets are only partially mapped as we only keep records of gully locations, some of our larger culverts are considered structures and are therefore included on our structures database and inspected / maintained as such. See notes on structures below.

Structures

Structures are managed using our structures asset management database, PONTIS. This allows us to record full details of all our structures, including records of inspections, repair history, condition data, works programming, life-cycle planning. The PONTIS software is a shared resource with other GM Authorities and TfGM, which includes additional annual subscriptions for software updates and enhancements. This allows easier collaboration for boundary structures and abnormal load routes.

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 (<i>please set out in further context</i>)	

B5.3.2 - Further context (optional)

Our Asset data is stored in our Causeway 'Alloy' Asset Management application. Carriageway and Footway condition data has routinely been collected annually and stored in a UKPMS system. Due to the PAS2161 changes to the way condition data can be collected, we are currently assessing the need for a standalone UKPMS application. PAS2161 surveys will be commissioned in 2026. We also utilise Mapinfo and Cadcorp Graphical Information systems to perform analysis and visualisation of asset data both internal and in our web maps.

Structures are managed using our structures asset management database, PONTIS. This allows us to record full details of all our structures, including records of inspections, repair history, condition data, works programming, life-cycle planning. The PONTIS software is a shared resource with other GM Authorities and TfGM, which includes additional annual subscriptions for software updates and enhancements. This allows easier collaboration for boundary structures and abnormal load routes

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?	Yes
-------	---	------------

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	No

B5.5.5 - Evidence Summary

We monitor the effectiveness and outcomes of our highways asset management approach using condition KPI's. They are reviewed to assess network condition, performance trends and the effectiveness of maintenance our interventions.

The results of KPI monitoring are actively used to inform maintenance planning, prioritisation and investment decisions. For example, the condition data was the driver to propose through the Cabinet reporting process (see cabinet report [Highways Capital Programme - Highway Maintenance Funding 2023/24 to 2026/27 and Integrated Transport Block 22/23](#)) evidence for revising the balance of investment towards an 80/20 split, between local and strategic roads ensuring that available funding is targeted where it delivers the greatest benefit to network condition and long-term asset performance.

Although we have answered "No" to the question regarding a value for money review or peer review within the last three years, this is solely because the most recent formal Local Government Association peer review falls outside the three-year reporting period. It was undertaken in June 2022.

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	10 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

Our footway maintenance approach combines risk-based inspections and minor maintenance with a planned refurbishment programme, supplemented by establishing preventative interventions to maintain asset condition, enhance safety, and minimise whole-life costs.

During very severe weather conditions, when snow or ice may remain for several days, we consider treating some public footways, providing that all our priority gritting routes are clear and we have sufficient resources available. Footways are chosen based on hierarchical prioritisation.

B6.1.7 - Evidence Summary

Details of our Winter Service can be found on our website [here](#).
Details of our Footway Maintenance can be found [here](#).

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	14 % for A
	b) Planned maintenance (routine/cyclical and/or risk-based)	86 % for B
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
	Guidance – This is space for additional information on sensors/technologies for remote monitoring – please list technologies used in bullet form, including approximate number of installations.	

B7.1.5 - Evidence Summary

Bury Council maintains a digital record of highway drainage assets and known drainage-related issues, including locations where drainage deficiencies contribute to carriageway deterioration and surface water ponding. Drainage defects identified through inspections, customer reports, flooding investigations and routine maintenance activities are recorded and used to inform risk-based maintenance programmes. Through cyclic gully cleansing operations, silt levels are assessed and recorded, providing evidence of asset performance and informing future cleansing frequencies. Whilst the Council does not currently utilise smart sensor technology, asset records and operational intelligence are used to identify priorities and target resources to areas of greatest risk and need.

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

Highway drainage assets are managed using a risk-based approach that combines asset records, inspection findings, customer reports and operational intelligence to identify priorities for intervention. Planned cyclic gully cleansing is undertaken across the network, with silt levels recorded during cleansing activities to monitor asset performance, inform future cleansing frequencies and enhance cyclic maintenance regimes. Locations with a history of flooding, ponding or drainage-related deterioration are monitored and prioritised for investigation and maintenance. Drainage activities are integrated with the wider highway asset management approach to support a resilient network, minimise deterioration and target investment where it will deliver the greatest benefit.

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

All Bury Council Staff have annual performance reviews, in which training needs can be documented.
Competence requirements are set out for staff, and training gaps are recorded in annual reviews.

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

We are currently progressing three trainees through sponsored ONC/HNC/BSc qualifications with integrated professional memberships of ICE.
We are currently progressing a restructure of our Engineering function, in which we will be looking to recruit more graduate posts, who we will support with onward qualification and professional memberships.

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.	08/2025
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)	Yes / No (if yes, please specify)
	- None of the above	N/A
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.	No
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

Polymer Modified Binder are specified as standard practice in our resurfacing schemes. Existing highway drainage systems are assessed and upgraded as appropriate on our highway maintenance schemes.
We collaborate with the Environment Agency, GMCA and United Utilities to provide SUDS and natural land management schemes throughout the borough.

We have a number of ongoing landslip mitigation projects, including a project on the A56 and Springwater Park.
All recent public realm improvement schemes have incorporated SUDS schemes.
We partner with City of Trees and have delivered significant tree planting programmes including woodland creation.

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

The Council incorporates climate adaptation and resilience considerations within its asset management and maintenance planning processes.
Our Resilient Network policy identifies responses associated with extreme weather events, including flooding, prolonged rainfall, heat stress and freeze-thaw cycles.
The Council maintains a designated resilient highway network to support access during adverse weather and emergency events.
Drainage asset inspections, cyclic cleansing programmes and targeted maintenance activities are used to mitigate the impacts of flooding and surface water.
Lessons learned from severe weather events, customer reports and asset performance data are used to inform future investment decisions and improve network resilience.
The authority works collaboratively with Greater Manchester partners to share best practice and support adaptation to future climate challenges.
Maintenance programmes are prioritised using a risk-based approach that considers network hierarchy, critical infrastructure, safety and serviceability.

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

Our procurement and delivery approach encourages innovation through outcome-based specifications and early market engagement, exemplified by our PAS 2161 survey procurement, which invited suppliers to propose innovative solutions rather than prescribing methods.
Innovative materials, technologies and working practices are regularly reviewed, trialled and integrated into business-as-usual operations where benefits are demonstrated.
Examples now adopted operationally include Evo temporary traffic signals, HDPE gully traps, hydro-demolition for bridge repairs, spray-injection pothole patching, Viafix repair materials, and fleet electrification. Findings and learning from these innovations are routinely shared through project reviews, supplier engagement and professional networks to support wider industry improvement.
Greater Manchester has established a number of collaborative peer groups where innovations are shared and discussed.

B10.1.5 - Further context on your innovation activities

Free text – optional - 100 words maximum

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.

Evo temporary traffic signal technology

What was implemented: Evo signal technology has been deployed where existing signals could not practicably be retained, including at a junction where revised kerb alignments required detector loops to be cut and the site was not connected to UTC. The system provides more advanced functionality than traditional REMOS equipment, including simultaneous phasing, programmable intergreen matrices, phase delays and filtering.

Impact: The technology avoided significant programme delays, provided greater operational flexibility and enabled the temporary arrangements to be tailored more effectively to site conditions. It also supported safer and more efficient traffic management during the works.

Scale of adoption: The technology has moved into operational use on suitable traffic management schemes and is considered where conventional temporary signal arrangements would not provide the required functionality.

HDPE gully traps

What was implemented: HDPE gully traps have been introduced as an alternative to traditional precast concrete units for appropriate highway drainage works.

Impact: Their lower weight reduces transport requirements, mechanical handling and manual-handling risks, while enabling faster installation. The use of HDPE can also reduce embodied carbon and improve resistance to deterioration in aggressive conditions.

Scale of adoption: HDPE units are now used operationally on suitable new and replacement drainage installations, rather than being limited to a standalone trial.

Hydro-demolition of bridge plinths

What was implemented: Hydro-demolition was used to remove deteriorated concrete from existing plinths on Market Street Bridge. High-pressure water selectively removed defective material while preserving the existing reinforcement.

Impact: This reduced the risk of damage associated with mechanical breaking, retained more of the existing structure and reduced the need for replacement steel and other materials. It also reduced waste and supported a more targeted, whole-life approach to structural maintenance.

Scale of adoption: The technique has been successfully used on a live bridge maintenance scheme and is available for use on other suitable structural repairs.

Spray-injection pothole patching

What was implemented: A spray-injection patcher is used operationally to undertake pothole and localised carriageway repairs. The process cleans the defect, applies binder and installs aggregate using specialist equipment.

Impact: The technique enables repairs to be completed quickly, improves productivity and reduces the time operatives are exposed to live traffic. Shorter working times also reduce disruption to road users and allow more defects to be treated during each shift.

Scale of adoption: Spray-injection patching forms part of the Authority's operational pothole maintenance capability and is used where site and defect conditions are suitable.

Viafix cold-lay repair material

What was implemented: Viafix cold-lay bituminous material is used for selected pothole repairs as an alternative to conventional temporary cold-lay materials or hot-mix repairs.

Impact: The material can be installed without hot-mix production and is suitable for rapid or reactive repairs, including in less favourable weather conditions. This improves operational flexibility, reduces aborted works and can provide a more durable repair than conventional temporary materials when correctly applied.

Scale of adoption: Viafix is in operational use for suitable defects, with the repair method selected according to defect size, location, condition and available access.

Risk-based gully cleansing

What was implemented: Silt levels are recorded during gully cleansing operations to build an evidence base on the condition and cleansing requirements of individual drainage assets. This data is being used to move from a uniform annual cleansing target towards a risk-based programme.

Impact: The approach enables cleansing resources to be targeted at gullies with the greatest need or consequence of failure. It reduces unnecessary visits to consistently low-silt gullies, supports more frequent attention at higher-risk locations and improves understanding of drainage performance. It is expected to improve efficiency while reducing vehicle movements, carbon emissions and disruption.

Scale of adoption: Silt data is being collected through the operational cleansing programme and used progressively to inform future cleansing frequencies and priorities across the network.

Electrification of the supervisory vehicle fleet

What was implemented: Electric vehicles have been introduced into the operational fleet for highway supervisory staff.

Impact: This reduces tailpipe emissions and operational carbon from routine site inspections and journeys. Electric vehicles also offer lower noise levels and potentially lower fuel and servicing costs, while demonstrating the practical use of lower-emission vehicles in day-to-day highway operations.

Scale of adoption: Electric vehicles are in routine operational use by supervisory staff and form part of the Authority's wider transition towards a lower-carbon fleet.

Early market engagement for PAS 2161 surveys

What was implemented: An early market engagement process has been introduced for the proposed procurement of PAS 2161 surveys. Rather than prescribing a technical solution at the outset, the Authority is asking suppliers to describe current capabilities, technologies and deliverable outcomes.

Impact: This reduces the risk of specifying an outdated approach, supports an outcome-based procurement and creates opportunities for suppliers to offer improved survey, data and delivery solutions. It should provide better alignment between the Authority's asset-management needs and market capability.

Scale of adoption: Early market engagement has been adopted as the procurement approach for this commission. As the resulting survey service has not yet entered operational delivery, this is presented as a procurement and process innovation rather than an operational survey technology.

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

The GMRAPS Scheme document which can be found [here](#) explains our Streetworks framework across Greater Manchester.

The Bee Network Committee report which can be found [here](#) sets out the recommendation to continue development of the lane rental scheme.

Traffic sensitive street review work is in progress. A review of the networks has been completed and we are about to go to consultation on the proposed changes.

B11.1.7 - Further context

We are part of the Greater Manchester Road Activity Permit Scheme (GMRAPS). This provides consistency and a joined-up approach to co-ordination in the Greater Manchester region.

We hold regular coordination meetings with utility companies, particularly where they have a large infrastructure development plan. During those meeting coordination with our own resurfacing and other work programmes is discussed to optimise clashes. We will defer work if a major install is planned.

A report was taken to the Bee Network Committee (BNC) in July 2025 to endorse proposals for a joint authority Lane Rental scheme. Transport for Greater Manchester have employed consultants to look into a Greater Manchester Lane Rental scheme and currently working with all Greater Manchester local authorities to seek approval to go to consultation on a scheme.

The Greater Manchester Road Activity Permit Scheme (GMRAPS) 12-year review is currently being drafted to be published later this year.

The review has been carried out for the whole of Greater Manchester, and the results have been approved by all ten Greater Manchester local authorities. Transport for Greater Manchester are dealing with this on our behalf and the notice to utility companies is due to go out later in 2026/27.

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?	N/A (in-house provider)

12.1.5 - Evidence Summary

The Authority undertakes regular cost analysis to ensure that highway maintenance and related activities are delivered efficiently and provide best value. Cost benchmarking is

facilitated through the various procurement frameworks utilised by the Authority, each of which contains multiple suppliers and agreed schedule of rates. This enables comparison of costs, service quality and performance across a range of providers.

Different frameworks are utilised where increased value can be demonstrated, taking account of factors such as cost, quality, programme requirements, specialist expertise and whole-life outcomes. Supplier rates and tendered prices are reviewed as part of ongoing contract management and procurement processes to ensure that the most economically advantageous solutions are selected.

The outcomes of cost analysis are used to inform procurement decisions, challenge costs where appropriate, and support the efficient allocation of resources, helping to maximise value for money while maintaining service quality and network performance.

B12.1.6 - Further context

Free text – optional – maximum 150 words