

Transparency report – Technical Annex

B1 - Highways maintenance funding and spending figures

B1.1 – Capital funding allocation sources

Financial year	2024-25	2025-26	2026-27 (projected)
Highways maintenance capital funding allocated through DfT	£0	£0	£1,509,790
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	£4,881,621	£0	£34,000
Other capital funding allocated to highways maintenance	£0	£978,947	£2,086,924
Total Capital funding allocated to highways maintenance	£4,881,621	£978,947	£ 3,596,714

B1.1.2 - Additional information on funding figures

- In 2024-25 £180,000 of HS2 funding was reallocated to London Borough of Lambeth which was spent on improving depreciate carriageway assets where potholes were present, as per the guidance. To note, this was treated as a revenue expenditure.
- In 2025-26 TFL allocated £200k for BPRN funding for enabling works of which only £12k was utilised and balance wasn't claimed due to delays in governance process.
- The 2026-27 £1,509,790 DfT funding allocation comprises £586,790 of 2025/26 Incentive carry-forward funding and £923,000 of 2026-27 baseline funding. This amount does not include 2026-27 incentive funding, which will be confirmed at a later date.

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	£4,881,621	£978,947	£ 3,596,714
Total highways maintenance revenue spend	£1,719,709	£1,893,561	£1,756,000
Total spend	£6,601,330	£2,872,508	£4,067,555

B1.2.2 - Additional information on total spending figures

The 2025/26 Incentive funding of £586,790 carry forward was approved by the DfT and plans are in place for the funding to be spent in 2026-27.

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	£0	£0	£0	£0
Structural carriageway maintenance	£371,052	£0	£1,500,000	£0
Planned carriageway repair / patching programmes	£0	£0	£34,000	£0
Reactive carriageway maintenance				
Reactive carriageway repairs / patching (temporary repairs)	£0	£0	£0	£0
Reactive carriageway repairs / patching (permanent repairs)	£0	£946,780	£0	£878,000
Reactive carriageway repairs / patching (total)	£0	£0	£0	£0
Other carriageway-related spend	£0	£0	£0	£0
Total	£371,052	£ 946,780	£2,399,024	£ 878,000

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

B2 – Highway Maintenance Activity (Surface Treatments and Repairs)

B2.1 – Road resurfacing and surface treatments

Financial year	Road receiving preventative road surface treatments (length, km)	Road receiving planned structural maintenance (length, km)	Area receiving planned repair / patching programmes	Area receiving reactive repair / patching (permanent methods)	Area receiving reactive repairs/ patching (temporary methods)
2025-26	0 km	0 km	0 m ²	4488 m ²	0 m ²
2026-27 projected	0 km	3.56km	107 m ²	4600 m ²	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

Average carriageway patching repair is between 1.7 and 1.75 m ²	Yes
--	-----

B3 – Pothole repairs

B3.1 – Pothole/Defect intervention criteria

Pothole/Defect category name (as used by your authority)	Minimum investigatory or definitional threshold (e.g. depth, area, width – include units)	Additional risk or contextual factors considered (e.g. road hierarchy, traffic levels, location in carriageway)	Target response time – make safe	Target response time – permanent repair
Carriageway Defect	40mm-54mm	Shielded	N/A	N/A
Carriageway Defect	40mm-54mm	Sides/Middle	N/A	25 days
Carriageway Defect	40mm-54mm	Crossing Point/ Bend	N/A	5 days
Carriageway Defect	55mm-69mm	Shielded	N/A	25 days
Carriageway Defect	55mm-69mm	Sides/Middle	N/A	5 days
Carriageway Defect	55mm-69mm	Crossing Point/ Bend	24 hours	24 hours
Carriageway Defect	70mm +	Shielded	N/A	5 days
Carriageway Defect	70mm +	Sides/Middle	24 hours	24 hours
Carriageway Defect	70mm +	Crossing Point/ Bend	2 hours	2 hours

B3.2 – Number of potholes filled

B3.2.1 - Number of potholes filled in 2025-26 (estimate)	642
--	-----

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	no separate data held	642

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

During the period covered by this dataset, Lambeth completed 642 pothole repairs. We do not record temporary and permanent repairs separately. In addition to pothole repairs, 1,188 other carriageway surface repairs, and 2,514 footway surface repairs, giving a total of 4,226 reactive highway surface repairs.

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)	£315.59	Unit/average cost of a temporary pothole repair on your network (reactive)	£315.59
--	---------	--	---------

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

Lambeth's reactive highway maintenance service is delivered through a term maintenance contract covering potholes and other highway defects. Based on total reactive maintenance expenditure of £1,893,561 and approximately 6,000 work orders completed, the average value of a reactive work order is £315.59; however, this reflects all reactive maintenance activities and is not representative of the cost of an individual pothole repair. The Council does not record permanent and temporary pothole repairs separately, and all recorded pothole repairs have therefore been reported as permanent repairs

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

One year warranty period on all reactive repairs.

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?	No
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

Lambeth actively uses reports from residents as part of its risk-based highway maintenance approach. Reports submitted through the Council's online reporting system

are reviewed, recorded and assessed by the Highways Team and Area Engineers alongside safety inspection data and other asset information. Public reports help identify defects requiring investigation and help inform future planned maintenance programmes. Residents are advised of the outcome of their reports through the Council's customer management system, including where repairs are undertaken, monitored for future action, referred to another service or where no further action is required based on the Council's maintenance policy.

B3.5.4 - Tools used for reporting

Residents can report potholes and other highway defects through Lambeth Council's online reporting service, available via the Council website. The system allows users to pinpoint locations on a map, upload photographs and provide additional details. Reports are routed to the relevant service for investigation and action.

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	20
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	9
4.1.4	Number of General Inspections carried out in 2025-26	5
4.1.5	Number of structures due a Principal Inspection in 2025-26 in accordance with CS450	0
4.1.6	Number of Principal Inspections carried out in 2025-26	0

B5 – Asset Management

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: Highway Asset Management Policy and Strategy 2026

5.1.3	Please provide the date it was last reviewed or updated	Date: 04/09/2026
-------	---	---------------------

5.1.4	Please provide proof of the review or update.
	Link to previous version: Highways Strategy and Policy – Planned Maintenance

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.
	<i>The 2026 update is an operational and technical document for officers, setting out an enhanced risk-based approach to support service delivery in 2027/28 ahead of a new Highways Asset Management Strategy and Policy. A link to the previous version has been included for transparency and to demonstrate the progression of the approach. As the Council changed political administration in 2026, the final strategy and policy will be subject to review and approval through the appropriate governance process before publication in 2027.</i>

B5.1.6 - Further context (optional)

--

Key aspects of highways asset management approach

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	Full
Structures	Full	Full
Drainage assets	Full	Partial
Street lighting	Full	Full
Traffic signals	Full	None

5.2.1 - Further context (optional)

For Carriageway, Footway and cycleways a new condition survey has been commissioned for 2026 through the RAMS Framework, compliant with PAS2161

B5.3 – Asset data integration and management

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)

Asset inventory and condition data are managed across multiple specialist systems with limited integration. Carriageways, footways and most highway assets, including street furniture (excluding street lighting), are managed in Symology Insight. Highway structures are managed in LoBEG BridgeStation, while street lighting assets are maintained separately in Muse under the Council's PFI contract. The Council is exploring opportunities to improve integration between these systems to provide a more unified view of highway asset data.
--

B5.4 – Lifecycle planning and investment decision-making

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

B5.4.4 - Evidence Summary

Lambeth uses whole-life asset management and lifecycle planning principles to inform investment decisions across carriageways, footways and highway structures. Carriageway and footway investment programmes are developed using condition surveys, deterioration modelling, risk assessments and lifecycle forecasts to identify the most cost-effective interventions and minimise future maintenance liabilities. The Highways Improvement Programme (HIP) prioritises schemes based on asset condition, risk and long-term value for money. Highway structures are managed using inspection data, condition assessments, risk reviews and whole-life cost evaluations, with investment targeted towards assets where intervention will reduce future liabilities, improve resilience and extend asset life

B5.5 – Performance monitoring and continuous improvement

ID	Question	Answer
5.5.1	Do you have a defined set of key performance indicators (KPIs) to monitor the outcomes of your highways asset management approach?	No
5.5.2	Are these KPIs reviewed on a regular basis (at least annually)?	NA
5.5.3	Are KPI trends used to inform maintenance planning, prioritisation or changes to forward programmes or investment decisions?	NA
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

The development of a Performance Management Framework is subject to approval of a ten-year capital investment programme which requires ratification through governance processes.

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	1.km
6.1.3	For 2026-27, please provide the length of footways that you have earmarked for preventative maintenance treatments	0
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)	0
	b. Preventative maintenance treatments (in km)	0

B6.1.6 - Evidence Summary

Lambeth maintains footways using a risk-based approach supported by a defined hierarchy that informs inspection frequencies, defect response times and maintenance priorities. Asset condition data, routine inspections and maintenance history are used to identify renewal needs and prioritise investment. For 2026/27, approximately 1 km of footway renewal works is planned to improve asset condition, safety and accessibility. Priority footways and shared-use routes are included within the Council's winter service arrangements and routine programmes for sweeping, vegetation management and debris clearance. Cycleway maintenance is delivered through carriageway and footway maintenance programmes where applicable.

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	3.58% for A
	b) Planned maintenance (routine/cyclical and/or risk-based)	96.42% for B
7.1.2	Does your authority utilise a digital drainage management platform, covering asset inventory, inspection history, sensor data, and risk scoring?	No
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

Lambeth's highway drainage maintenance is delivered through the Council's contract with Serco, which includes planned gully cleansing and reactive responses to blocked gullies and flooding reports. Analysis of three years of operational attendance data indicates that approximately 96.4% of drainage activity is planned maintenance and 3.6% is reactive. The Council maintains records of locations where drainage issues contribute to carriageway deterioration or surface water ponding to support maintenance prioritisation. Whilst drainage assets and maintenance records are managed through existing operational systems, the Council does not currently use a dedicated drainage management platform or smart sensor technology.

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?	Yes
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)?	No
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	No

B8.1.7 - Evidence Summary

Two officers will be attending CIHT preventative maintenance course. Lambeth Highways has a Competence Framework to assess competence levels required for different roles.
--

B9 – Adapting roads to withstand climate pressures

ID	Question	Yes/no
9.1.1	Have you updated your asset management policy and strategy to reflect the increased probability of extreme-weather and/or geohazards now and in the future?	Yes
9.1.2	Have you identified your resilient network and agree this with senior decision-makers	Yes
9.1.3	If yes when did you last update this.	112020
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	No
	- Tree planting / shading for heat management	Yes
	- Other (please specify)	No (if yes, please specify)
	- 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	Yes

	place to do this, such as by signing up to the DfT funded ADEPT Carbon Leadership Programme.	
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

Lambeth has updated its approach to managing highway assets to consider the increasing impacts of climate change. We have identified our resilient road network and keep records of locations affected by flooding and other severe weather events. To improve resilience, we carry out targeted drainage improvements and maintenance, install Sustainable Drainage Systems (SuDS), and support tree planting. Climate risks are considered when planning maintenance and investment works. We also measure the carbon emissions associated with our highways maintenance activities using recognised industry standards, helping to support the Council's wider commitment to reducing emissions and improving environmental sustainability.

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?	No
10.1.3	If you have conducted innovation trials, have you shared the findings of these publicly or with professional networks?	N/A

10.1.4 - Evidence Summary

Innovation is encouraged through the Council's procurement and contract management arrangements, which allow suppliers to propose improved methods of working and efficiencies where they demonstrate value for money, safety and service benefits. While the Council has not undertaken formal innovation trials or systematically reviewed innovative materials for routine adoption during the reporting period, opportunities for innovation continue to be considered as part of contract delivery, asset management activities and future service improvements.

10.2 – Examples of innovations that have been adopted

Not Applicable

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?	Yes
11.1.5	Have you conducted a traffic sensitive review in the last three years?	Yes

11.1.6 - Evidence Summary

Lambeth completed a full review of its traffic-sensitive network in line with the application for a Lane Rental Scheme in 2025, undertaking comprehensive traffic counts, detailed reviews of each street and the designations associated to these and reduced its total traffic-sensitive roads from 178 to 89 as a result. It has since operated a Lane Rental Scheme since 27th April 2026.

B12 – Managing highways maintenance contracts effectively

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

12.1.5 - Evidence Summary

Lambeth has NEC4 term service contract with Option A (lumpsum)

END OF SECTION