



*Meeting:* **Highways and Transport Overview and Scrutiny Committee.**

*Date/Time:* **Thursday, 4 September 2025 at 2.00 pm**

*Location:* **Sparkenhoe Committee Room, County Hall, Glenfield**

*Contact:* **Mr A. Sarang (0116) 305 8644**

*Email:* **Aqil.Sarang@leics.gov.uk**

### **Membership**

Mr. B. Piper CC (Chairman)

Dr. J. Bloxham CC	Mr. M. T. Mullaney CC
Mr. S. Bradshaw CC	Mr. O. O'Shea JP CC
Mr. G. Cooke CC	Mr. P. Rudkin CC
Mr. N. Holt CC	Mr. C. A. Smith CC
Mr. B. Lovegrove CC	Mr. A. Thorp CC
Mr. P. Morris CC	Mr. B. Walker CC

### **AGENDA**

<u>Item</u>	<u>Report by</u>
1. Minutes of the meeting held on 5 June 2025.	(Pages 3 - 10)
2. Question Time.	
3. Questions asked by members under Standing Order 7(3) and 7(5).	
4. To advise of any other items which the Chairman has decided to take as urgent elsewhere on the agenda.	
5. Declarations of interest in respect of items on the agenda.	
6. Declarations of the Party Whip in accordance with Overview and Scrutiny Procedure Rule 16.	



7. Presentation of Petitions under Standing Order 36.
8. Highways and Transport Performance Report to June 2025. Director of Environment and Transport and Director of Corporate Resources (Pages 11 - 30)
9. Outcome of the 18 - Month Medium Term Financial Strategy Street Lighting Dimming Trial. Director of Environment and Transport (Pages 31 - 64)
10. Date of next meeting.  
  
The next meeting of the Highways and Transport Overview and Scrutiny Committee will be held on 6 November 2025 at 2.00pm.
11. Any other items which the Chairman has decided to take as urgent.

Minutes of a meeting of the Highways and Transport Overview and Scrutiny Committee.  
held at County Hall, Glenfield on Thursday, 5 June 2025.

PRESENT

Mr. B. Piper CC (in the Chair)

Dr. J. Bloxham CC  
Mr. S. Bradshaw CC  
Mr. G. Cooke CC  
Mr. N. Holt CC  
Mr. B. Lovegrove CC  
Mr. J. McDonald CC

Mr. P. Morris CC  
Mr. M. T. Mullaney CC  
Mr. O. O'Shea JP CC  
Mr. D. Page CC  
Mr. B. Walker CC

In Attendance

Mr. C. Whitford CC – Cabinet Lead Member for Highways, Transport and Waste  
Mr. A. Tilbury CC – Cabinet Lead Member for Environment and Flooding

1. Appointment of Chairman.

RESOLVED:

That Mr. B. Piper CC be appointed Chairman for the period ending with the date of the Annual Meeting of the County Council in 2026.

Mr. B. Piper CC in the Chair

1. Appointment of Vice Chairman.

RESOLVED:

That Mr. P. Morris CC be elected Deputy Chairman for the period ending with the date of the Annual Meeting of the County Council in 2026.

3. Minutes.

The minutes of the meeting held on 6 March 2025 were taken as read, confirmed and signed.

4. Question Time.

The Chief Executive reported that two questions had been received under Standing Order 35.

1. Question asked by Mr. Adam Stares:

In the Highways & Transport Grown & Savings section of the current MTFs (Appendix B, point 44 of this Committee's January meeting) there is a proposal to cut spending on bus

subsidies marked as a “Service Reduction” to save £400,000 each year from 2026/27.

Is the Council still committed to this upcoming spending cut which it has described as a “service reduction” and what does it expect that the impact will be on service users from 2026/27?

[http://cexmodgov01/documents/s187653/MEDIUM%20TERM%20FINANCIAL%20STRATEGY%20202526%20202829.pdf?\\$LO\\$=1](http://cexmodgov01/documents/s187653/MEDIUM%20TERM%20FINANCIAL%20STRATEGY%20202526%20202829.pdf?$LO$=1)

Reply by the Chairman:

The £400,000 savings requirement to ‘review the application of the subsidised bus policy, post Covid’, was included in the MTFS prior to award of one-off central government funding for 2025/26 for bus services (Bus Grant). Whilst government funding remains in place, budgets will continue to be maintained at pre-grant award levels, with any inflation increases being met by grant funding. As things stand, we currently have a one-year Bus Grant allocation for 2025/26 from the Department for Transport of £8.1m (split between £5.0m revenue and £3.1m capital). No further funding has been announced for future years at this stage.

In terms of impacts on bus users, should there be no further grant funding then savings will be required and proposals to reduce bus services paid for by the County Council would be developed and engagement with the community on those proposals would take place. Community feedback and any changes proposed would be considered by cabinet for approval before any saving is implemented. It may be helpful to note that the County Council’s Medium Term Financial strategy is reviewed annually.

In the meantime, aided by the one off ‘Bus Grant’ funding, the Council is well underway with a comprehensive passenger transport network review to create more travel opportunities for Leicestershire residents in line with its Passenger Transport Policy and Strategy. Full details of the phases of this review and new, amended and improved services including new app based demand responsive transport Foxconnect services are available on the Council’s website here: <https://www.choosehowyoumove.co.uk/public-transport/get-around-by-bus/leicestershire-buses/leicestershire-network-review/> Details of the new services that have been launched this week in the Charnwood, Harborough and South West Leicestershire areas are also available on the website.

Mr. Stares asked the following supplementary question:

“Firstly, thank you for providing the response to my question. It is good to hear that there is grant funding available for this financial year but could I clarify with my question that without the grant the County Council will not be able to maintain the service in the next financial year and if there is a time table for when we might know if there is a grant and what that process of community engagement will look like and then in that engagement process will it be about whether to make those cuts or will it be about which services to cut or not.”

At the invitation of the Chairman, the Director of Environment and Transport stated that the grant came from the Department for Transport (DfT) and its current policy was very supportive of buses which was reflected in this element of funding. However, the funding had only been confirmed for the current financial year and whilst the DfT had indicated that its policy would not change and it was intended that this grant would continue, this was yet to be confirmed through the Government’s spending review.

In response to whether services would need to be cut, if the grant funding did not

continue then, it was noted this was a possibility. The Council's base budgets would not cover the cost of these services. The Director highlighted that the money allocated was significant, more than the County Council's base budgets had been for many years.

The Director advised that the County Council reviewed its MTFS annually, and the Department would, as part of this process if the funding ceased, consider its budgets, along with each community's needs taking account of alternative public transport available, and consult with the public on any proposed changes.

The Director stated that the Department was hopeful the grant funding would continue as it was an extensive task to procure a bus service, and the Council sought to continue these over a long period to achieve best value for money. It was hoped that there would be an announcement of multi-year funding settlements this year to enable the Department to make such long-term plans.

**2. Question asked by Ms. Rachael Wigginton:**

"I would like to ask the following question on behalf of the Leicestershire Active Travel Alliance, the Leicestershire arm of the UK's Active Travel Alliance, a national campaigning group to increase investment in active travel for healthier lives and safer, quieter streets.

My question is as follows:

Resident frustration is growing around the significant increase in the volume of traffic and streets completely dominated and overwhelmed by vehicles parked on every spare inch of public space in their local communities. This is massively impacting health and wellbeing. A key part of the solution is increasing the focus and investment in the alternative quieter healthier forms of transport specifically safe cycling routes to local schools, shops and stations/transport hubs.

Leicestershire County Council has received a significant amount of money from Active Travel England to be spent on active travel schemes. Will the Oadby cyclops scheme that was consulted on last year now go ahead? If not, why not and what will happen to the funding? We are concerned that the council will be deemed to lack ambition, as has happened in the past, and will not secure the funding that is likely to be available in the future for Leicestershire."

Reply by the Chairman:

The Council remains committed to delivering high-quality active travel infrastructure that supports healthier, safer, and more sustainable transport choices.

The public engagement for the proposed CYCLOPS scheme at The Parade, Oadby, highlighted a number of issues including concerns around the one-way circulatory layout not aligning with cyclists' natural desire lines, potentially leading to a risk of conflict between different users of the junction. The Council is considering these concerns and discussing options for a way forward with Active Travel England.

The details of the concerns raised during the consultation along with recommended way forward will be fully considered via Council's democratic process. Subject to the outcome, any revisions to the scheme recommended following discussion with ATE, will be subject to further public engagement.

The Council continues to be mindful of the importance of demonstrating ambition and capability in order to maintain future eligibility for external funding, including from Active Travel England.

The Chairman advised that Ms. Wigginton was not in attendance and had not raised any supplementary questions.

The Chairman thanked Mr. Stares and Ms. Wigginton for their questions.

5. Questions asked by members.

The Chief Executive reported that no questions had been received under Standing Order 7(3) and 7(5).

6. Urgent Items.

There were no urgent items for consideration.

7. Declarations of interest.

The Chairman invited Members who wished to do so to declare any interest in respect of items on the agenda for the meeting.

Mr. J. McDonald CC declared a disclosable pecuniary interest in agenda item 10 (Home to School Transport Annual Report 2024/25 and Key Priorities for 2025/26) as he held contracts with the County Council to provide bus services to school children. He undertook not to participate in the discussions on this item.

8. Declarations of the Party Whip.

There were no declarations of the party whip.

9. Presentation of Petitions.

The Chief Executive reported that no petitions had been received under Standing Order 36.

10. Home to School Transport Annual Report 2024/2025 and Key Priorities for 2025/2026.

The Committee considered a report of the Director of Environment and Transport, the purpose of which was to provide an update on Home to School Transport 2024/25 and Key Priorities for 2025/26. A copy of the report marked 'Agenda Item 10' is filed with these minutes.

Arising from discussion, the following points were made:

- (i) Members acknowledged the challenges faced by the Service and commended the Department for the transformation work undertaken over the years. Members also recognised the level of effort that went into the delivery of the service and shared their appreciation with the team.
- (ii) Members expressed concerns regarding the continued rise in demand for Special Educational Needs (SEN) Transport. It was noted that there was close work with the Children's and Families Department to understand the level of growth which was not slowing down. Growth was, however, forecast and built into the budget

and ongoing work with commercial operators was in place to help manage this. Indicators from the Department for Education (DfE) suggested that a change in legislation could potentially stem the growth.

- (iii) In response to a Member's query regarding eligibility for home to school transport it was noted that the Authority provided what was required by legislation, however it did have some discretion to determine locally how best to deliver this. As a statutory service it had to meet demand and so in previous years there had been an overspend due to a rise in the cost of transport as well as increasing demand for home to school transport. A growth bid had been submitted and there was now greater confidence that going forward the service would be able to deliver within budget.
- (iv) It was highlighted that mainstream school transport numbers although not guaranteed were stable and less volatile with bus operators bidding for contracts. SEN transport was costing more due to various factors including the need for specialist provision to meet individual needs which could result in solo transport having to be provided, where service users were being allocated a school place which could be some distance from their home, and the need for medically trained support professionals.

It was acknowledged that there were late applications for SEN transport which limited the ability for the service to plan for this in advance, often resulting in less efficient and cost effective transport options being used. This was unavoidable in such circumstances as the Authority had a statutory duty to provide the transport.

#### RESOLVED:

That the report on the Home to School Transport Annual Report 2024/2025 and Key Priorities for 2025/2026 be noted.

#### 11. Flood Risk Management.

The Committee considered a presentation by the Director of Environment and Transport, which provided an update on ongoing Flood Risk Management activity and work undertaken to focus on flood preparedness, response and recovery. A copy of the presentation marked 'Agenda Item 11' is filed with these minutes.

Arising from the discussion, the following points were made:

- (i) Members recognised that conducting flood exercises and building flood resilience would be critical for the future and commended the Department for the ongoing awareness work undertaken including planned information drop-in sessions which the public could attend.
- (ii) It was highlighted that there were a number of factors that could cause flooding, and a blocked gully was only one possibility. There were over 130,000 local gully assets which were part of a complex system which the County Council had responsibility for maintaining to minimise risks of flooding. The authority's previous gully cleansing cycle operated under a standard schedule. That this had been reviewed to prioritise those gullies that needed clearing more frequently, using data collected from a range of sources which helped provide for a more efficient targeted approach. At the request of a Member, the Director undertook to provide more information regarding the Council's gully cleaning cycles.

- (iii) Members raised concerns regarding the impact of development proposals within district council local plans and whether ongoing Section 19 investigations in previously effected areas had to be completed before proceeding with those plans. It was noted that these were separate processes, and there was no requirement for a Section 19 investigation to be completed before a development plan could be progressed. It was suggested that the available evidence and data should, however, inform the development of a district council local plan and that the County Council when consulted as the Lead Local Flood Authority (LLFA) and Highways Authority would also feed into that process based on the most up to date information it had available.
- (iv) A Member raised specific concerns about Harborough District Council's Local Plan proposals and the increased risk this could pose to flooding in the area. The Director reported that as a consultee, the Council as the LLFA was considering taking a policy position in the Local Plan that would require improvement to address flood risk. The statutory minimum requirement was that a development should cause no detriment in the situation prior to that development.
- (v) It was highlighted that if there were findings from a Section 19 investigation relevant to a local plan, then there was scope for interim action to be taken rather than having to wait for the investigation to be completed. Funding any remediation works would vary depending on the source of the problem and ownership of the land concerned. As part of the planning process, the County Council would be consulted and would comment depending on the differing needs and circumstances for different areas.

#### RESOLVED:

- (a) That the presentation on Flood Risk Management be noted;
- (b) That the Director of Environment and Transport be requested to provide more information on the Council's gully cleaning regime.

#### 12. Draft Rights of Way Improvement Plan 2025-2035.

The Committee considered a presentation by the Director of Environment and Transport, which provided an update on the development of the Council's draft Rights of Way Improvement Plan for 2025-2035. The report sought the Committee's views on the Plan and the actions identified, as part of the public consultation process to manage and improve Leicestershire's rights of way network for its current and future users. A copy of the presentation marked 'Agenda Item 12' is filed with these minutes.

Arising from the discussion, the following points were made:

- (i) It was highlighted that, of those that said they used the rights of way network, over 85% said this was for health and fitness purposes. Members suggested that the Authority should be encouraging local residents to make use of this resource.
- (ii) It was noted that the Local Transport Fund had been allocated for one year and would deliver some of the maintenance work required on the network. Although a very small budget, this was considered a local priority and a shared asset. It was recognised that local people were keen on supporting this based on the noticeable improvement work already carried out so far.

- (iii) Members supported the idea of community activities being held to support the delivery of improvement plans. It was suggested that there were communities within rural areas that would and could support these initiatives. However, it was also noted that this was a complex situation, the Council having legal duties and only a small budget which would not support the entire network.
- (iv) It was noted that, as with cutting grass verges, the Authority, would always provide the core service to keep rights of way accessible. However, there were communities that had the capacity to maintain these over and above what the Council was able to provide. The Director emphasised that there were practical constraints on what the Council could enable and encourage the public to do.
- (v) A Member suggested that maintenance of the rights of way network could be delivered by those sentenced to community service orders and that this might be a better use of their time. It was suggested that this option could be explored but that this would come with associated costs.
- (vi) Members acknowledged the importance of maintaining historic footpaths across the County but raised concerns about the increase in byways open to all traffic which were being abused and left impassable. It was suggested that this was due to the behaviours of some and although there were sensitive issues and strong feelings by different parties, the overall impact on the Highways Authority responsible for maintaining the byways was becoming problematic.
- (vii) Members shared their frustrations with signage being left behind upon the completion of road work carried out in the highway, noting that this often ended up in hedge rows and waterways. It was noted that the Council shared in residents' frustrations and the Director highlighted the difficulties faced by the Council in being able to address this. It was noted that companies carrying out works on the highway now used multiple contractors each carrying out specific works and who were responsible for putting up and taking down all signage. The Authority could seek to encourage the behaviour of companies to act on this more quickly and the Director asked that any signage left behind after completed works be reported to the Department.

#### RESOLVED:

- a. That the report on the Draft Rights of Way Improvement Plan be noted;
- b. That the comments made by the Committee be considered as part of the consultation process and presented to the Cabinet for consideration in due course;
- c. That the Director of Environment and Transport be requested to investigate concerns raised by a Member regarding the footpath running alongside Gartree prison which was severely overgrown.

#### 13. Date of next meeting.

#### RESOLVED:

It was noted that the next meeting of the Committee would be held on 4 September 2025 at 2.00pm.

2.00pm – 3.46pm  
05 June 2025

CHAIRMAN



**HIGHWAYS AND TRANSPORT OVERVIEW AND SCRUTINY  
COMMITTEE – 4 SEPTEMBER 2025**

**HIGHWAYS AND TRANSPORT PERFORMANCE  
REPORT TO JUNE 2025**

**JOINT REPORT OF THE CHIEF EXECUTIVE AND DIRECTOR OF  
ENVIRONMENT AND TRANSPORT**

**Purpose of the Report**

1. The purpose of this report is to provide the Highways and Transport Overview and Scrutiny Committee with the latest performance update on the Key Performance Indicators (KPIs) that the County Council is solely or partly responsible for within its Strategic Plan covering Highways and Transport Services (within the Environment and Transport Department) to June 2025 (Quarter One).

**Policy Framework and Previous Decisions**

2. The updates in this report reflect progress against the Council's Strategic Outcomes Framework within the Strategic Plan 2024-2026, the Highways and Transport (HT) performance framework, and related high-level plans and strategies which inform the current performance framework and indicators in this report.

**Background**

3. This report highlights the performance of a variety of HT KPIs against the Council's key outcomes: Strong Economy, Transport and Infrastructure, Safe and Well, and Clean and Green.
4. The performance dashboards, appended to this report as Appendix A, provide details of the performance of all of the KPIs that support the Highways and Transport corporate aims. Definitions and data sources of these KPIs are included in Appendix B for reference. The dashboards include several indicators where the Council has limited influence or control over delivery, such as satisfaction with local bus services or average vehicle speeds. These have been included to provide a greater oversight of the wider HT outcomes in Leicestershire and to help to understand what life is like in the County. They include a mixture of national and locally developed performance indicators. Measuring these may highlight areas for the scrutiny of delivery by other agencies, or the need for lobbying to influence the Government's policy and funding. It is expected that action by a range of agencies will improve a number

of these metrics over time. Internal indicators, where the Council has the most control, are identified with an 'L' within the performance dashboards.

5. For each indicator reported, the performance dashboards show the latest data (if available), the previous update, the Direction of Travel (DOT), the target, the Red / Amber / Green rating (RAG) (if applicable) and the quartile position compared to other English county councils (where available). The dashboards also show trends over time.
6. Coloured DOT arrows (red, amber, green) show whether there has been an improvement or deterioration in performance compared to the previous result, for recently updated data, within the performance dashboards. Up arrows show an improvement in performance, whereas down arrows show a decline in performance, and horizontal arrows show no change. Grey DOTs mean that there is no recent update available, this may be due to the time taken to obtain data from third parties and calculate the results or because many indicators are updated less frequently, such as annually.
7. The performance dashboards include information on the latest data against the target (where relevant) which generates a RAG rating if applicable. Red indicates that close monitoring, or significant action is required, as the target is not or may not be achieved. Amber indicates that light touch monitoring is required as the performance is currently not meeting the target, or it is set to miss the target by a narrow margin. Green indicates that no additional action is required as the indicator is currently meeting the target or it is on track to meet the target.
8. The Council assesses its comparative performance through a benchmarking process where it benchmarks its performance against up to 32 English county authorities which cover large, principally non-urban geographical areas. Where it is available, the performance dashboards within Appendix A show which quartile Leicestershire's performance falls into. The first quartile is defined as performance that falls within the top 25% of county councils (highest performing). The fourth quartile is defined as performance that falls within the bottom 25% of county councils (lowest performing). The comparison quartiles are updated annually.
9. The frequency with which the indicators are reported varies, as some are quarterly, many are annual, and some data is reported even less frequently. Most of the quarterly data is at least one quarter in arrears. For clarity, the time-periods that the data covers are contained in the performance dashboards in Appendix A.

### **Performance Update – latest data to June 2025**

10. The quarterly performance dashboard shows HT performance up to June 2025. Overall, there are 18 performance indicators included in this report which are aligned with the Council's Strategic Plan Outcomes. Performance indicator results are presented in the HT performance dashboards in Appendix A and indicators' definitions and sources are provided in Appendix B. This report

provides an overview of performance of all the HT indicators. Subsequent performance reports will focus only on indicators that have been updated within the relevant quarter.

11. The latest overall position shows that, of all of the indicators with targets (15), four had met their target or are on track (green).
12. When compared to other English county councils, the Council performs above average as it has 10 indicators in the top quartile (listed in Appendix A with green first quartile positions) and five indicators in the second quartile (listed in Appendix A as yellow). The Council performs below average for two indicators (listed in Appendix A with orange (third) and red (fourth) quartile positions). Quartile indicator performance is described in more detail in the following paragraphs.
13. The following updates cover the latest performance for all of the HT indicators up to June 2025 (Quarter One). The performance details are contained in paragraphs 14to34.

### **Strong Economy, Transport and Infrastructure**

14. The National Highways and Transport Network (NHT) Annual survey gathers respondents' satisfaction levels with a range of HT services, ranging from the condition of the highways to local bus services in Leicestershire. The survey is typically sent to 5,600 households across the Authority area annually. In 2024 the survey had a 22% response rate in Leicestershire (1,267 responses). This was made up of 198 online responses and 1,069 postal (paper) responses. Leicestershire has taken part in the NHT survey for over a decade. It has proven useful to indicate satisfaction levels through an independent survey over a long time period and to better understand the Council's comparative performance. There are seven indicators within this report that are sourced from this survey.
15. The Council was amongst the highest rated councils for 'Overall satisfaction with condition of highways' in the NHT Survey 2024 (in the top quartile). Satisfaction levels remained static at 22% for 2024 and missed its 38% target. For this indicator, low satisfaction levels are typical across the Country, and the Council remains in the first quartile (best) compared to other English county councils (26 counties participated in the NHT Survey for 2024). The latest data is below the long-term average of 33% from 2014, so a worse performance than the long-term.
16. The 'percentage of the principal (A class) roads within the road network in Leicestershire where structural maintenance should be considered' remained static at 3% during 2024/25 and has slightly missed its 2% target. Maintaining this at 3% demonstrates continued good performance as the percentage of principal roads requiring maintenance is very low. This indicator remains in the second quartile when compared to other English county councils in 2023/24, showing above average performance.

17. The 'percentage of the non-principal (B and C) class roads where structural maintenance should be considered' also had static performance with 4% in 2024/25, and it remains within target. In terms of how this indicator compares against other English county councils, it is in the first quartile (best) for 2023/24.
18. The 'percentage of unclassified road network where maintenance should be considered' also had static performance with 12% in 2024/25. It remains within its 13% target. In terms of how this indicator compares against other English county councils, it is in the second quartile (2023/24) (above average).
19. Results from the NHT Survey 2024 showed that 43% of respondents were satisfied with local bus services, showing little change since the previous year (42% in 2023). This indicator had missed its 56% target. Satisfaction with bus services appears to have started to plateau in recent years. In comparison with other English county councils, it remains below average, in the third quartile, for 2024.
20. The 'Local bus passenger journeys originating in the authority area (millions)' improved in performance by 1% since the previous update to 10.86m journeys in Quarter Four 2024/25 from 10.71m journeys in Quarter Three 2024/25. This is a forecast outturn for the year, which is updated each quarter, based on year-to-date figures collected. It has exceeded (met) its 10m target. Although having increased significantly from a low of 3m during the Covid-19 pandemic, the most recent passenger numbers are now similar to the long-term average of 11.1m annual journeys since 2015. Data is one quarter in arrears. Figures come from bus operators as part of the Department for Transport's (DfT) Public Service Vehicle Survey and verified data is published annually. This indicator remained in the fourth (bottom) quartile when compared to other English county councils for 2023/24 (comparison data covers the number of passenger journeys on local buses per head).
21. The latest update for the 'Number of park and ride journeys' showed a 6% decrease in performance since the previous quarter as journeys declined from 198,093 in Quarter Three 2024/25 to 186,192 in Quarter Four 2024/25. This compares to an overall decrease of 1% since the same period last year of 188,522 park and ride journeys (Quarter Four 2023/24). However, the latest results are above the long-term average of 142,032 journeys since 2015/16, showing better recent performance. The data is one quarter in arrears.
22. The 'Overall satisfaction with cycle routes and facilities (NHT)' was 31% in 2024. This was a slight decline in satisfaction and performance as this indicator decreased (by four percentage points) from 35% in 2023 and missed its 38% target. However, this falls within the top quartile when compared to other English county councils in 2024, demonstrating good comparative performance.
23. The 'Overall satisfaction with the Rights of Way network (NHT)' was 38% in 2024. Satisfaction and performance had decreased (by four percentage points) from 42% in 2023 and missed its 52% target. Despite this, it remains in the top quartile when compared to other English county councils in 2024, showing good comparative performance.

24. The 'Overall satisfaction with the condition of pavements and footpaths (NHT)' remained relatively static at 55% in 2024 compared to the previous year but missed its 65% target. However, the Council remained in the top quartile when compared to other English county councils in 2024.
25. The 'Overall satisfaction with traffic levels and congestion (NHT)' was 30% in 2024. It had improved in performance (by three percentage points) from the 27% satisfaction rate in 2023. Despite this improvement, it missed its 42% target. In terms of the comparative performance, this indicator is in the second quartile when compared to other English county councils in 2024, which is above average.
26. The 'Average vehicle speed on locally managed 'A' roads' was 30mph in 2024. It had decreased slightly (4%) from 31mph in 2023. This indicator has demonstrated very consistent rates over recent years, and it remains within its expected range of 29-34mph suggesting no performance concerns. In terms of its comparative performance, it performed above average in the 2nd quartile for 2024 and which is better than the England rate of 23mph for 2024.

### **Safe and Well – Road Safety**

27. The Department supports the Safe and Well outcome primarily through its road safety initiatives. Overall, Leicestershire is a high performing authority, which is reflected in the fact that all five road casualty indicators are in the top quartile when compared to other English county councils. While every effort is made to capture collision data as accurately as possible, there are factors outside of the control of the Council that can affect data quality. For a collision report to be submitted to the Council, it must relate to a collision either attended by a police officer or reported to a police station or online. These figures, therefore, do not represent the full range of collisions or casualties in Leicestershire. The comprehensive Road Casualty Reduction in Leicestershire Annual Report provided the latest available details on road casualties, schemes and initiatives to reduce casualties, and it was presented to this Committee on 6 March 2025.
28. Within this outcome, four indicators were updated this quarter with provisional road casualty data up to March 2025 (as the data is available one quarter in arrears). In summary, only the 'Total casualties on Leicestershire roads' indicator had met its target. Only the 'Number of people killed or seriously injured (KSI), walking, cycling and motorcyclists (excluding cars) had seen a decline of more than 1%, indicating improving performance. The Council monitors and reports on provisional in year results, as they are useful in gaining an early indication of accidents, but verified year end results are more reliable in terms of accuracy and determining long term trends (as reported in the Council's Annual Performance report). Greater detail on these indicators is provided in the following paragraphs 29 to 33 of this report.
29. The 'Road safety satisfaction' in the NHT Survey was 45% in 2024. This had declined in performance by five percentage points from a 50% satisfaction rate in 2023, and it missed its 59% target. In comparison with other English county

councils, this indicator is in the top quartile when compared with other English county councils in 2024.

30. The 'Total casualties on Leicestershire roads' declined in performance by 1% as casualties increased from 940 in December 2024 to 953 in March 2025. However, it performed well against its 1,076 refreshed target (rolling 12-month figure, and in-year data is provisional, sourced from Leicestershire Police Road Accident data). Over the longer-term, this indicator performs much better than the average of 1,206 casualties since 2015 (sourced from verified long-term data from the DfT). In comparison with other English county councils, it is in the top quartile for 2023.
31. The 'Number of people killed or seriously injured (KSI)' remained similar to the previous update at 284 in March 2025 (three-year rolling average and in-year data is provisional and sourced from Leicestershire Police Road Accident data). This latest result had not met its new refreshed target of 258 KSIs. Over the longer-term, this indicator performs worse than the average of 229 since 2015 (sourced from verified long-term data from the DfT). In comparison with other English county councils, it is in the top quartile for 2023.
32. The 'Total casualties involving road users, walking, cycling and motorcyclists (excluding cars)' declined in performance by 5% since the previous update on 6 March 2025, as casualties increased from 289 in December 2024 to 304 in March 2025 (rolling 12-month figure, and in-year data is provisional and sourced from Leicestershire Police Road Accident data). It missed its new refreshed target of 291 casualties. Over the longer-term, this indicator performs better than the average of 332 casualties since 2015 (sourced from verified long-term data as published by the DfT). In comparison with other English county councils, it is in the top quartile for 2023.
33. The 'Number of people killed or seriously injured walking, cycling and motorcyclists (excluding cars)' improved in performance slightly (2%) since the previous update as KSIs decreased from 127 in December 2024 to 125 in March 2025 (three-year rolling average and the in-year data is provisional and sourced from Leicestershire Police Road Accident data). However, the latest result had not met its refreshed target of 116 KSIs. Over the longer-term, the latest result is higher (worse performance) than the long-term average of 107 since 2015 (sourced from verified long-term data as published by the DfT). In comparison with other English county councils, it is in the top quartile for 2023.

### **Clean and Green**

34. This outcome includes an indicator that monitors the impact of transport on carbon emissions within the County. Whilst the Council has limited control over this, where possible, it does seek to improve outcomes for Leicestershire through a variety of schemes and initiatives (identified in the Department's key HT plans and strategies), and internal ways of working. The most recent update covering 2023 showed that 'Carbon emissions (estimates) from transport within Local Authority influence (Kt)' was 1,147 Kt. This had remained similar to the previous update of 1,152 Kt in 2022. This indicator is sourced from the

Department of Energy Security and Net Zero and it is updated annually. It is approximately 18 months in arrears. It excludes emissions that the Authority does not have direct influence over, such as the following: Motorways; Emissions Trading System sites; Diesel railways; Land use, Land use change, and Forestry. This indicator continues to perform above average (2nd quartile) for 2023 compared to other English county councils.

### **Background Papers**

Leicestershire County Council's Strategic Outcomes Framework and Strategic Plan 2024-2026:

<https://www.leicestershire.gov.uk/sites/default/files/2025-01/LCC-Strategic-Plan.pdf>

Report to the Highways and Transport Overview and Scrutiny Committee on 6 March 2024, Road Casualty Reduction in Leicestershire (previous report):

<https://democracy.leics.gov.uk/documents/s181716/01.%20FINAL%20Casualty%20Reduction%202022-23%20-%20Annual%20Report%20HT%20Scrutiny%20070324.pdf>

NHT (National Highways & Transport Network) Survey results for 2024:

<https://www.nhtnetwork.co.uk/isolated/page/793>

Leicestershire County Council's Local Transport Plan 4 (2025-2050):

<https://www.leicestershire.gov.uk/roads-and-travel/local-transport-plan/local-transport-plan-ltp4>

### **Circulation under Local Issues Alert Procedure**

None.

### **Equality Implications**

35. There are no specific equality implications to note as part of this report.

### **Human Rights Implications**

36. There are no human rights implications arising from the content of this report.

### **Appendices**

Appendix A – Strategic Plan Performance Dashboards by Outcomes covering Highways and Transport Performance to June 2025.

Appendix B – Highways and Transport KPI Definitions

### **Officers to Contact**

Ann Carruthers

Director, Environment and Transport Department

Tel: (0116) 305 7000

Email: [Ann.Carruthers@leics.gov.uk](mailto:Ann.Carruthers@leics.gov.uk)

Nicola Truslove

Business Partner, Business Intelligence Service

Tel: (0116) 305 8302

Email: [Nicola.Truslove@leics.gov.uk](mailto:Nicola.Truslove@leics.gov.uk)

## Strategic Plan Performance Dashboards by Outcomes covering Highways and Transport Performance to June 2025

T&H KPIs updated to June 2025


### Strong Economy, Transport and Infrastructure Outcome

Indicator (* = Statutory Returns)	Latest Data	Period	Prev. Data	Perform. DOT	Target (Yearly)	RAG	Quartiles	Previous Updates	C/L
Overall satisfaction with the condition of highways (NHT satisfaction survey) (%)	21.6	2024/25	21.8	→	38	R	1st 2024		L
* % of principal (A class) road network where structural maintenance should be considered	3	2024/25	3	→	2	A	2nd 2023/24		L
* % of non-principal (B & C class) road network where structural maintenance should be considered	4	2024/25	4	→	4	G	1st 2023/24		L
% of the unclassified road network where maintenance should be considered	12	2024/25	12	→	13	G	2nd 2023/24		L
Overall satisfaction with local bus services/(sustainable travel options) (NHT satisfaction survey) (%)	42.6	2024/25	41.8	→	56.3	R	3rd 2024		C
Local bus passenger journeys originating in the authority area (millions)	10.86	Q4 2024/25	10.71	↑	10	G	4th 2023/24		C
Number of park and ride journeys	186,192	Q4 2024/25	198,093	↓		NA	NA		C
Overall satisfaction with cycle routes & facilities (NHT satisfaction survey) (%)	31.4	2024/25	35.1	↓	38	A	1st 2024		L
Overall satisfaction with the Rights of Way network (NHT satisfaction survey) (%)	37.7	2024/25	42.4	↓	52	R	1st 2024		L
Overall satisfaction with the condition of pavements & footpaths (NHT satisfaction survey) (%)	55.3	2024/25	55.7	→	65	A	1st 2024		L
Overall satisfaction with traffic levels & congestion (NHT satisfaction survey) (%)	29.7	2024/25	27.4	↑	42	R	2nd 2024		C
Average vehicle speed - on locally managed 'A' roads (mph)	29.5	2024	30.6	↓		NA	2nd 2024		C

### Safe & Well Outcome

Indicator (* = Statutory Returns)	Latest Data	Period	Prev. Data	Perform. DOT	Target (Yearly)	RAG	Quartiles	Previous Updates	C/L
Road safety satisfaction (NHT satisfaction survey) (%)	44.8	2024/25	49.7	↓	59	R	1st 2024		L
Total casualties on Leicestershire roads (provisional)	953	Mth 03 Mar 2025	940	↓	1,076	G	1st 2023		L
Number of people killed or seriously injured (KSIs) (provisional)	284	Mth 03 Mar 2025	285	→	258	R	1st 2023		L
Total casualties involving road users, walking, cycling & motorcyclists (excluding cars) (provisional)	304	Mth 03 Mar 2025	289	↓	291	A	1st 2023		L
Number of people killed or seriously injured (KSI), walking, cycling & motorcyclists (excluding cars) (provisional)	125	Mth 03 Mar 2025	127	↑	116	A	1st 2023		L

## Clean &amp; Green Outcome

Indicator (* = Statutory Returns)	Latest Data	Period	Prev. Data	Perform. DOT	Target (Yearly)	RAG	Quartiles	Previous Updates	C/L
Carbon emissions (estimates) from transport within LA influence (Kt)	<b>1,147</b>	2023	1,152	→		NA	2nd 2023		C

## Data notes

In order to ensure comparisons are unbiased and insightful the following indicators are used in deriving annual quartile positions as part of the Council's corporate benchmarking approach. These indicators use published statistics from the relevant government departmental (e.g. Department for Transport) and Office of National Statistics population data.

Number of passenger journeys on local bus services per head of population

Reported casualties per million population

Reported casualties involving road users, walking, cycling & motorcyclists (excluding cars) per million population

Reported KSI per million population

Reported KSI walking, cycling & motor cycling per million population

CO2 emissions from transport within LA control per head

## Appendix B – Highways & Transport KPI Definitions

Indicator Title	Definition	Source	Frequency	Branch	Sub outcome	Polarity
<b>Carbon emissions (estimates) from transport within LA influence (Kt)</b>	This is the estimate in kilo tonnes of carbon dioxide equivalent (kt CO2e) emissions for the transport sector within the scope of influence of Local Authorities. This is the sum of CO2 emission estimates for: Road Transport (A roads); Road Transport (Minor roads); Transport Other. Road transport fuel use estimates at LA level were compiled by Ricardo Energy & Environment for Department for Energy Security and Net Zero (DESNZ). Two other small sources of emissions from road traffic are included in the inventory. These are emissions from combustion of lubricants and from vehicles which run on LPG. The Other Transport sector also includes emissions from inland waterways, coal combustion in the rail sector and aircraft support vehicles. Transport emissions include both freight and passenger transport, both private and for business purposes. It excludes emissions that authorities do not have any direct influence over, these include: Motorways; EU Emissions Trading System sites; Diesel railways; Land use, Land Use Change, and Forestry (all emissions belonging to the LULUCF Net Emissions). Polarity: Low. Updated annually in June. 2 years in arrears.	Department for Energy Security and Net Zero	Annually	Transport & Highways (Clean & Green Outcome)	Clean & Green	Low
<b>Overall satisfaction with the condition of highways (NHT satisfaction survey) (%)</b>	The National Highways & Transport Network (NHT) Annual survey gathers respondents' satisfaction levels regarding the condition of highways in Leicestershire. Leicestershire has taken part in the NHT survey for over a decade. The survey is typically sent to 5,600 households across the authority area annually. In 2024 the survey had a 22.4% respondent rate in Leicestershire (1,267 responses). This was made up of 198 online responses and 1,069 postal (paper) responses. Polarity: High. Reported annually.	The National Highways & Transport Network	Annually	Transport & Highways	Strong economy, transport & infrastructure	High

<b>% of principal (A class) road network where structural maintenance should be considered</b>	This indicator is the percentage of the local authority's A-road and principal (that is, local authority owned) M-road carriageways where maintenance should be considered. It is derived from a survey of the surface condition of the local authority's classified carriageway network, using survey vehicles that are accredited as conforming to the SCANNER (Surface Condition Assessment for the National Network of Roads) specification and processing software that is accredited as conforming to the UKPMS (UK Pavement Management System) standards. Polarity: Low value is good. Reported annually.	Department for Transport.	Annually	Transport & Highways	Strong economy, transport & infrastructure	Low
<b>% of non-principal (B &amp; C class) road network where structural maintenance should be considered</b>	The performance indicator is derived from a survey of the surface condition of the local authority's classified carriageway network, using survey vehicles that are accredited as conforming to the SCANNER (Surface Condition Assessment for the National Network of Roads) specification and processing software that is accredited as conforming to the UKPMS (UK Pavement Management System) standards. Results reported are a combination of (a) 100% of the B-class network surveyed in both directions; and (b) 100% of the C-class network surveyed in one direction. Polarity: Low value is good. Reported Annually.	Department for Transport.	Annually	Transport & Highways	Strong economy, transport & infrastructure	Low
<b>% of the unclassified road network where maintenance should be considered</b>	This is the percentage of the local authority's unclassified roads where maintenance should be considered. Unclassified roads are those in the least important categories, such as local distributor and access roads. Source name: Department for Transport. Collection name: Road condition. Polarity: Low is good. Reported annually.	Source name: Department for Transport.	Annually	Transport & Highways	Strong economy, transport & infrastructure	Low

<b>Overall satisfaction with local bus services/(sustainable travel options) (NHT satisfaction survey) (%)</b>	The indicator gives an Overall satisfaction with the local bus services from the National Highways and Transport Network (NHT) annual survey. The survey gathers respondents' satisfaction levels regarding the condition of highways in Leicestershire. Leicestershire has taken part in the NHT survey for over a decade. The survey is typically sent to 5,600 households across the authority area annually. In 2024 the survey had a 22.4% respondent rate in Leicestershire (1,267 responses). This was made up of 198 online responses and 1,069 postal (paper) responses. Polarity: High. Reported annually.	The National Highways & Transport Network	Annually	Transport & Highways	Strong economy, transport & infrastructure	High
<b>Local bus passenger journeys originating in the authority area (millions)</b>	This is the number of local bus journeys originating in the area by local authority in millions. Unit of measure: Millions. Polarity: High. Reported quarterly. In year data sourced from E&T department (LCC). It is a forecast outturn for the year, which is updated each quarter period, based on year-to-date figures collected (Year to date (YTD) refers to the period beginning on the first day of the fiscal year up to the current date). Q4 represents the actual and final figures for the year. Comparison data covers No. of passenger journeys on local buses per head. It includes all bus operators serving the general public but excludes school buses, or dial-a-ride services. The local authority figures shown here relate to bus only. In year data sourced from E&T department (LCC). Reported Quarterly. Unit of measure: Millions. Polarity: High.	In year data sourced from E&T department (LCC)	Quarterly	Transport & Highways	Strong economy, transport & infrastructure	High

<b>Number of park and ride journeys</b>	Number of Park & Ride passenger journeys in Leicestershire. This is quarterly data. Park & Ride is a transportation scheme in which travellers park their vehicles some distance away from a city centre, tourist attraction, etc and complete the journey by public transport (a park-and-ride bus). On a monthly basis data is taken from 'Ticketer' (Roberts Coaches database) where a total figure is summarised and entered into Pentana. BM calculate the quarter position (adding three months data for the quarter) and report to BI on quarterly (not cumulative) basis. Polarity High.	Ticketer	Quarterly	Transport & Highways	Strong economy, transport & infrastructure	High
<b>Overall satisfaction with cycle routes &amp; facilities (NHT satisfaction survey) (%)</b>	The indicator gives an Overall satisfaction with the condition of cycle routes and facilities in Leicestershire from the National Highways and Transport Network (NHT) annual survey. The survey gathers respondents' satisfaction levels regarding the condition of highways in Leicestershire. Leicestershire has taken part in the NHT survey for over a decade. The survey is typically sent to 5,600 households across the authority area annually. In 2024 the survey had a 22.4% respondent rate in Leicestershire (1,267 responses). This was made up of 198 online responses and 1,069 postal (paper) responses. Polarity: High. Reported annually.	The National Highways & Transport Network	Annually	Transport & Highways	Strong economy, transport & infrastructure	High
<b>Overall satisfaction with the Rights of Way network (NHT satisfaction survey) (%)</b>	The indicator gives an Overall satisfaction with the condition of cycle routes and facilities in Leicestershire from the National Highways and Transport Network (NHT) annual survey. The survey gathers respondents' satisfaction levels regarding the Rights of way Network in Leicestershire. Leicestershire has taken part in the NHT survey for over a decade. The survey is typically sent to 5,600 households across the authority area annually. In 2024 the survey had a 22.4% respondent rate in Leicestershire (1,267 responses). This was made up of 198 online responses and 1,069 postal (paper) responses. Polarity: High. Reported annually.	The National Highways & Transport Network	Annually	Transport & Highways	Strong economy, transport & infrastructure	High

<b>Overall satisfaction with the condition of pavements &amp; footpaths (NHT satisfaction survey) (%)</b>	The indicator gives an Overall satisfaction with the condition of pavements and footpaths in Leicestershire from the National Highways and Transport Network (NHT) annual survey. The survey gathers respondents' satisfaction levels regarding the Rights of way Network in Leicestershire. Leicestershire has taken part in the NHT survey for over a decade. The survey is typically sent to 5,600 households across the authority area annually. In 2024 the survey had a 22.4% respondent rate in Leicestershire (1,267 responses). This was made up of 198 online responses and 1,069 postal (paper) responses. Polarity: High. Reported annually.	The National Highways & Transport Network	Annually	Transport & Highways	Strong economy, transport & infrastructure	High
<b>Overall satisfaction with traffic levels &amp; congestion (NHT satisfaction survey) (%)</b>	The indicator gives an Overall satisfaction with traffic levels and congestion in Leicestershire from the National Highways and Transport Network (NHT) annual survey. The survey gathers respondents' satisfaction levels regarding the Rights of way Network in Leicestershire. Leicestershire has taken part in the NHT survey for over a decade. The survey is typically sent to 5,600 households across the authority area annually. In 2024 the survey had a 22.4% respondent rate in Leicestershire (1,267 responses). This was made up of 198 online responses and 1,069 postal (paper) responses. Polarity: High. Reported annually.	The National Highways & Transport Network	Annually	Transport & Highways	Strong economy, transport & infrastructure	High
<b>Average vehicle speed - on locally managed 'A' roads (mph)</b>	The 'Average vehicle speed on locally managed A roads' covering data since 2022 onwards (formally 'Average vehicle speed – weekday morning peak on locally managed 'A' roads (mph)'). Data is sourced from the table CGN0503d and covers all day average speeds calculated across the complete 24-hour period and includes all days (weekdays, weekend & bank holidays). Annual data. Polarity range: 29-34mph.	Department for Transport	Annually	Transport & Highways	Strong economy, transport & infrastructure	Target range 29-31mph.

<b>Road safety satisfaction (NHT satisfaction survey) (%)</b>	The indicator gives an overall satisfaction with road safety in Leicestershire from the National Highways and Transport Network (NHT) annual survey. The survey gathers respondents' satisfaction levels regarding the Rights of way Network in Leicestershire. Leicestershire has taken part in the NHT survey for over a decade. The survey is typically sent to 5,600 households across the authority area annually. In 2024 the survey had a 22.4% respondent rate in Leicestershire (1,267 responses). This was made up of 198 online responses and 1,069 postal (paper) responses. Polarity: High. Reported annually.	The National Highways & Transport Network	Annually	Transport & Highways	Safe & Well	High
<b>Total casualties on Leicestershire roads</b>	In year data is provisional, from police. The statistics refer to personal injury accidents on public roads (including footways) which become known to the police within 30 days. Road Traffic Accident data reports are received from the Police, validated, and entered into AccsMap to determine the number of casualties of all severities. This is a rolling 12-month figure. The information used to create these statistics are collected by police forces, either through officers attending the scene of accidents or from members of the public reporting the accident in police stations after the incident, or more recently online. There is no obligation for people to report all personal injury accidents to the police (although there is an obligation under certain conditions, as outlined in the Road Traffic Act). These figures, therefore, do not represent the full range of all accidents or casualties in Leicestershire. Statistics on road safety are mostly based on accidents reported to the police via the STATS19 system. Polarity: Low. Reported quarterly.	Leicestershire Police (STATS19)	Quarterly	Transport & Highways	Safe & Well	Low

<b>Number of people killed or seriously injured (KSIs)</b>	<p>In year data is provisional, from police. People killed or seriously injured in road traffic accidents. This is the number of people of all ages killed or seriously injured in road traffic accidents. As the number of casualties is in some areas quite small, the data is expressed as a 3 year (calendar) rolling average, up to the current year. This minimises the impact of fluctuations when looking at the percentage change from year to year. This indicator includes only casualties who are fatally or seriously injured, and these categories are defined as follows: Fatal casualties are those who sustained injuries which caused death less than 30 days after the accident; confirmed suicides are excluded. Seriously injured casualties are those who sustained an injury for which they are detained in hospital as an in-patient, or any of the following injuries, whether or not they are admitted to hospital: fractures, concussion, internal injuries, crushings, burns (excluding friction burns), severe cuts and lacerations, severe general shock requiring medical treatment and injuries causing death 30 or more days after the accident. The information used to create these statistics are collected by police forces, either through officers attending the scene of accidents or from members of the public reporting the accident in police stations after the incident, or more recently online. There is no obligation for people to report all personal injury accidents to the police (although there is an obligation under certain conditions, as outlined in the Road Traffic Act). These figures, therefore, do not represent the full range of all accidents or casualties in Leicestershire. Statistics on road safety are mostly based on accidents reported to the police via the STATS19 system. Polarity: Low. Polarity: Low value is good. Reported quarterly.</p>	Leicestershire Police (STATS19)	Quarterly	Transport & Highways	Safe & Well	Low
--	---	---------------------------------	-----------	----------------------	-------------	-----

<b>Total casualties involving road users, walking, cycling &amp; motorcyclists (excluding cars)</b>	<p>In year data is provisional, from police. The statistics refer to personal injury accidents on public roads (including footways) which become known to the police within 30 days. Road Traffic Accident data reports are received from the Police, validated, and entered into AccsMap, to determine the total number of casualties involving road users, walking, cycling &amp; motorcyclists (excluding cars) of all severities. This is a rolling 12-month figure. The information used to create these statistics are collected by police forces, either through officers attending the scene of accidents or from members of the public reporting the accident in police stations after the incident, or more recently online. There is no obligation for people to report all personal injury accidents to the police (although there is an obligation under certain conditions, as outlined in the Road Traffic Act). These figures, therefore, do not represent the full range of all accidents or casualties in Leicestershire. Statistics on road safety are mostly based on accidents reported to the police. Polarity: Low. Reported quarterly.</p>	Leicestershire Police (STATS19)	Quarterly	Transport & Highways	Safe & Well	Low
---	--	---------------------------------	-----------	----------------------	-------------	-----

<b>Number of people killed or seriously injured (KSI), walking, cycling &amp; motorcyclists (excluding cars)</b>	<p>In year data is provisional, from police. People killed or seriously injured in road traffic accidents. This covers the number of people killed or seriously injured (KSI), walking, cycling &amp; motorcyclists (excluding cars). As the number of casualties is in some areas quite small, the data is expressed as a 3 year (calendar) rolling average, up to the current year. This minimises the impact of fluctuations when looking at the percentage change from year to year. This indicator includes only casualties who are fatally or seriously injured. The information used to create these statistics are collected by police forces, either through officers attending the scene of accidents or from members of the public reporting the accident in police stations after the incident, or more recently online. There is no obligation for people to report all personal injury accidents to the police (although there is an obligation under certain conditions, as outlined in the Road Traffic Act). These figures, therefore, do not represent the full range of all accidents or casualties in Leicestershire. Statistics on road safety are mostly based on accidents reported to the police. Since May 2023 Leicestershire Police changed their reporting to capture accident reports made to them online, which they believe gives them a more complete picture of incidents. Polarity: Low. Reported quarterly. When using the STATS19 data, it should therefore be appreciated that it is not a complete record of all injury accidents. However, STATS19 data remains the most detailed, complete and reliable only source of information on road casualties covering the whole of Great Britain, in particular for monitoring trends over time.</p>	Leicestershire Police (STATS19)	Quarterly	Transport & Highways	Safe & Well	Low
--	---	---------------------------------	-----------	----------------------	-------------	-----

This page is intentionally left blank



**HIGHWAYS AND TRANSPORT OVERVIEW AND SCRUTINY  
COMMITTEE – 4 SEPTEMBER 2025**

**OUTCOME OF THE 18-MONTH MEDIUM TERM FINANCIAL  
STRATEGY STREET LIGHTING DIMMING TRIAL**

**REPORT OF THE DIRECTOR OF ENVIRONMENT AND TRANSPORT**

**Purpose of the Report**

1. The purpose of this report is to advise the Committee of the outcome of the 18-month street lighting dimming trial and to seek its views shaping the future street lighting service, prior to presenting a report to the Cabinet on 12 September 2025.

**Policy Framework and Previous Decisions**

2. The Medium-Term Financial Strategy (MTFS) 2023/24 – 2026/27, which was agreed by the County Council in February 2023, identified savings of £500,000 to be achieved by 2024/25 from the street lighting service. The savings requirements were amended in both the 2024/25 MTFS and 2025/26 MTFS bringing the total savings requirement to £540,000.
3. A reduction in street lighting will also aid a reduction in carbon emissions (CO<sub>2</sub>e) supporting the Council's Strategic Plan 2022-26, specifically, the Clean and Green strategic outcome in the County Council's Strategic Plan. This is achieved by reducing energy use as part of the dimming trial to lower the lighting intensity to 30% (of the lighting unit's full power) from 20:00 hours across the lighting stock which will support the reduction of 315 tonnes in CO<sub>2</sub>e as previously reported.
4. The Cabinet agreed on 19 December 2023 to implement a trial to dim street lighting, including on traffic routes, to 30% from 20:00 hours across the County. This followed a public consultation exercise in the summer of 2023.

**Design Standards**

5. The design of safe and appropriate street lighting is governed by relevant British Standards, specialist guidance notes and a Code of Practice (Well Managed Highway Infrastructure 2016). The key principle of this Code is that Highway Authorities will develop their own levels of service and the Code

therefore provides guidance for authorities to consider when developing their approach in accordance with local needs, priorities and affordability.

6. One of the over-arching principles of the Code of Practice is the establishment of those local levels of service through risk-based assessment. For street lighting, the Code encourages 'the delivery of the right quality and amount of light in the right place and at the right time'.
7. The option to dim to 30% intensity from 20:00 hours moves away from compliance with current British Standards and is deemed a 'Departure from Standards' and will, therefore, require the Cabinet's approval to implement as a permanent measure. Given that there is not a specific legal duty on the Council to provide lighting, it is presently considered that the risk of a judicial review challenge would be low and in the event of a challenge, it is likely to be unsuccessful.

### **Background**

8. The duty to maintain the highway under Section 41 of the Highways Act 1980 does not imply a duty to provide street lighting. Rather, local authorities have a discretion about whether to provide streetlights (Section 97 of the Highways Act 1980).
9. However, once street lighting is provided, the local authority has a duty to maintain the system in a safe condition. This is because local authorities can be held liable if they introduce a danger to the highway and fail to neutralise it (see *McCabe v Cheshire West and Chester Council* 2014).
10. The standards for street lighting are laid down in British Standard: BS.5489 and European Standard BS EN 13201.
11. Street lighting touches not only on the issue of preventing road accidents. Section 17 of the Crime and Disorder Act 1998 provides that it shall be the duty of each authority to exercise its responsibilities to do all that it reasonably can to prevent crime and disorder in its area.
12. In February 2023, the MTFS 2023/24 to 2026/27 was approved by the County Council. It identified a requirement to save £500,000 on street lighting. This was reduced to £430,000 in the 2024/25 MTFS following safety concerns raised as part of the consultation exercise and further exceptions to the dimming proposals. During 2024/25, a further £110,000 savings target was agreed for the 2025/26 MTFS as a result of savings being higher than expected due to changes in energy rate, bringing the total revised savings requirement to £540,000.
13. Any reduction in street lighting energy will also provide a reduction in the Council's carbon emissions therefore also contributing to its environmental commitments.
14. The Council currently maintains approximately 70,190 street lighting assets.

15. The dimming trial took place from January 2024 until June 2025 and dimmed the vast majority of all County streetlights to 30% intensity from 20:00 hours until 07:00 hours, apart from those that met the criteria (listed below) of the risk assessment:
- a) Vertical traffic calming features;
  - b) Town centres;
  - c) Zebra crossings – in line with methodology for lighting zebra crossings, but at new reduced lighting levels, providing increased illumination on the crossing itself;
  - d) Areas with evidenced increased night time crime/anti-social behaviour where maintaining streetlights at existing levels was supported by the police;
  - e) Areas with increased night time road traffic accidents with increased killed or serious injuries at conflict areas;
  - f) Currently illuminated steps.
16. The following were also monitored as part of the risk assessment:
- a) Increased pedestrian interactions with street furniture.
  - b) Increased interactions between vehicles outside of conflict areas.
  - c) Increased interactions between vehicles, cyclists and pedestrians outside of conflict areas.
17. Any streetlights that met the criteria in the risk assessment remained at their previous lighting levels.

### **Trial Findings**

18. Savings achieved during the trial period are shown in Figure 1 below. They consisted of:
- a) Total energy savings – 1,442,770 kWh,
  - b) Total financial savings – £539,759,
  - c) Total carbon savings – 319.3 tonne.

Figure 1 – Savings achieved

Financial year	Description	Energy Saved (kWh)	Financial savings (£)	Carbon Savings (T)
2022/23	Baseline - Dimming to British Standards	n/a	n/a	n/a
2023/24	Implementation of 20:00 hours dimming to 30% power in Q4	370,688	£131,224	82.5

Financial year	Description	Energy Saved (kWh)	Financial savings (£)	Carbon Savings (T)
2024/25	First full year with 30% power at 20:00 hours	1,000,131	£391,997	223
2025/26	Q1 savings to end June 2025. End of trial period*	71,951	£16,538	13.9

\*Savings achieved due to better weather compared to same period last financial year.

### **Engagement from the Members of the Public During the Trial Period**

19. A total of seven customer enquiries were received during the trial specifically mentioning dimming of streetlights, with two citing fear of crime and five citing the streetlights were not bright enough.
20. The police was contacted for their views on the two enquiries citing fear of crime but no concerns were raised by the police.
21. No changes were made to any street lighting programmes as a result of the enquiries received.
22. No complaints were received during the trial period.
23. No requests to install reflective strips on street furniture were received during the trial period.

### **Insurance Claims**

24. A total of eight insurance claims were received during the trial period that mentioned street lighting, of which six related to vehicles or cyclists hitting potholes but did mention street lighting in their claim. The remaining two claims were due to trips within the highway.
25. To date, £70 has been paid to one claim which was due to a pothole and not street lighting but has been included because when the claim was submitted, it mentioned street lighting.

### **Road Traffic Collisions (RTC)**

26. Full year data for RTCs between 20:00 hours and 07:00 hours is shown below in Figure 2.

Figure 2 – RTC data

	2022	2023	2024	2025*
No. of RTCs	30	64	50	29
Casualties	37	91	65	41
Slight	30	73	37	31
Serious	5	17	26	10
Fatal	2	1	2	0
Powered two-wheel	6	8	13	3
Cycles	2	2	11	0
Pedestrians	4	13	12	5
Child	0	2	3	0
60+	2	9	6	4

\*Data for 2025 is for January to June only  
Shading indicates trial period

27. Data for 2022 has been included for comparative purposes; 2023 is the baseline year but 2022 and 2023 RTC figures regard the pre-trial period and lighting provided was in line with British Standard requirements for roadway lighting.
28. It is worth noting that the number of RTCs increased when comparing figures from 2022 and 2023. Data for 2022 may be reduced due to the effect of the Covid-19 pandemic and a possible reduction in the number of journeys taking place with fewer people traveling.
29. The total number of RTCs reduced in 2024 compared to the baseline data of 2023 before the trial was implemented.
30. However, the severity of accidents that occurred increased in 2024 and particularly for those using two-wheeled means of transport (i.e. motor bikes and bicycles). These accidents occurred at roundabouts or major junctions (conflict areas), with no RTCs at the same sites.
31. There may be other contributing factors at play and the reasons may not be attributed solely to street lighting being dimmed. Things like driver error, driver impairment, cyclists not wearing bright reflective clothing or using lights, and speeding could all potentially play a part in contributing to the increase.
32. The Authority will continue to monitor and review RTC statistics. It is able to return street lighting to previous lighting levels using the street lighting Central

Management System (the system that is used by the Council to remotely monitor, dim and turn on and off individual streetlights), if a pattern appears and it is clear that street lighting is a contributing factor.

### **Crime**

33. Requests for turning lights back to their original programme were managed in the same way as the existing part-night lighting requests.
34. Any request received from members of the public to turn up street lighting citing crime is referred to Leicestershire Police to confirm if crime has increased. If this is the case, brighter lighting would be reinstated for a period of three months to aid the police with their investigations. This would be reviewed after three months and either revert to the original programme or remain lit and then reviewed again after a period agreed with the police.
35. During the 18-month street lighting dimming trial, one request from the police was received to increase lighting levels - on Sidings Walk, Loughborough. This request affected two streetlights and changes were made in March 2025 using the Central Management System to reprogramme back to the original lighting levels. The lighting levels for these lights are due to be reviewed again with the police in September 2025.
36. Figure 3 below compares nighttime crime statistics from 20:00 hours until 07:00 hours from 2023 and 2024.

Figure 3 – Nighttime crime statistics

2023									
Offence Group	Blaby	Charnwood	Harborough	Hinckley & Bosworth	Melton	NWLeics	Oadby & Wigston	County Total	
Burglary	224	344	104	174	58	182	143	1229	
Criminal Damage & Arson	195	557	144	259	150	323	143	1771	
Interference with Motor Vehicle	34	83	17	28	8	56	10	236	
Other Theft	104	189	69	104	50	118	33	667	
Robbery	7	22	5	13	4	14	6	71	
Sexual	110	200	77	92	59	109	64	711	
Theft Cycle	17	75	2	9	4	5	8	120	
Theft from Dwelling	5	25	2	13	5	7	5	62	
Theft from M/C or Meter	1					2		3	
Theft from Person	7	20	1	3	9	15	1	56	
Theft from Vehicle	129	192	54	85	21	182	39	702	
Theft of Motor Vehicle & TWOC	53	111	44	99	17	78	21	423	
Violence Against the Person	788	1894	717	1045	507	1206	524	6681	
Totals	1674	3712	1236	1924	892	2297	997	12732	
2024									
Offence Group	Blaby	Charnwood	Harborough	Hinckley & Bosworth	Melton	NWLeics	Oadby & Wigston	County Total	YOY % Change
Burglary	229	402	197	243	85	161	115	1432	16.52%
Criminal Damage & Arson	185	452	155	256	119	274	104	1545	-12.76%
Interference with Motor Vehicle	34	84	18	29	5	44	9	223	-5.51%
Other Theft	91	167	77	96	40	129	30	630	-5.55%
Robbery	11	44	4	12	6	12	6	95	33.80%
Sexual	88	196	79	105	35	99	36	638	-10.27%
Theft Cycle	10	58	3	12	1	5	12	101	-15.83%
Theft from Dwelling	10	19	5	14	2	13	3	66	6.45%
Theft from M/C or Meter		1		1				2	-33.33%
Theft from Person	9	21	3	13	6	14	7	73	30.36%
Theft from Vehicle	118	197	81	117	17	140	47	717	2.14%
Theft of Motor Vehicle & TWOC	60	108	32	78	17	93	17	405	-4.26%
Violence Against the Person	779	1678	610	1009	438	1010	450	5974	-10.58%
Totals	1624	3427	1264	1985	771	1994	836	11901	-6.53%
YOY % Change	-2.99%	-7.68%	2.27%	3.17%	-13.57%	-13.19%	-16.15%	-6.53%	

37. Overall, the number of nighttime crimes committed has fallen by 6.53% in 2024.
38. However, some types of crimes have increased since the trial was implemented, including burglary, robbery, theft from dwelling, theft from person and theft from vehicle. The increase in these types of crimes may be due to reduced lighting levels, but there may also be a larger more complex societal issues at play such as inflation, increased cost of living, reduction in living standards.
39. Looking at those crimes, robbery and theft from person are the most likely to occur on the highway. Data has been collated from 20:00 hours to 00:00 hours in Figure 4 below.

Figure 4 – Robbery and theft from person from 20:00 hours to 00:00 hours

	Blaby	Charnwood	Harborough	Hinckley & Bosworth	Melton	NWLeics	Oadby & Wigston
2023	6	20	3	11	6	15	4
2024	24	42	6	34	8	28	14
Increase	18	22	3	23	2	13	10
% increase	300%	110%	100%	209%	33%	87%	250%
Times increase	4.0	2.1	2.0	3.1	1.3	1.9	3.5

40. During the trial, Leicestershire Police did not raise any concerns with the County Council or ask for any lighting levels to be increased other than Sidings Walk in Loughborough mentioned above.
41. For comparison, the data below in Figure 5 shows data for robbery and theft from person with Leicester City and Rutland between 20:00 hours and 00:00 hours.

Figure 5 – Crime comparison between Leicester City and Rutland

The Shire				
2023	65	Increase	% increase	Times increase
2024	156	91	240%	2.4
The City				
2023	154	Increase	% increase	Times increase
2024	394	240	256%	2.6
Rutland				
2023	3	Increase	% increase	Times increase
2024	8	5	267%	2.7

42. Both Leicester City and Rutland have seen increases in robbery and theft from person from 20:00 hours greater than Leicestershire. Neither Leicester City nor Rutland dim their streetlights to the extent Leicestershire has during the dimming trial.
43. Looking at anti-social behaviour, the data in Figure 6 below shows levels within Leicestershire both within the dimming time period and outside these times.

Figure 6 – Anti-social behaviour

Outside street light dimming non-affected times				Within street light dimming affected times			
CDRPName	2023	2024	YOY Increase %	CDRPName	2023	2024	YOY Increase %
Blaby	534	531	-0.56%	Blaby	144	235	63.19%
Charnwood	941	1449	53.99%	Charnwood	299	435	45.48%
Harborough	306	319	4.25%	Harborough	76	135	77.63%
Hinckley And Bosworth	446	526	17.94%	Hinckley And Bosworth	136	200	47.06%
Melton	238	280	17.65%	Melton	47	97	106.38%
North West Leicestershire	611	792	29.62%	North West Leicestershire	175	268	53.14%
Oadby and Wigston	266	302	13.53%	Oadby and Wigston	75	122	62.67%
<b>County Total</b>	<b>3342</b>	<b>4199</b>	<b>25.64%</b>	<b>County Total</b>	<b>952</b>	<b>1492</b>	<b>56.72%</b>

44. Anti-social behaviour had increased by 25.64% outside of the trial times but increased by 56.72% between 20:00 hours and 00:00 hours.
45. For comparison, Figure 7 below includes figures for anti-social behaviour for Leicester City and Rutland.

Figure 7 – Anti-social behaviour comparison

Street dimming non-affected times				Street dimming affected times			
CDRPName	2023	2024	YOY Increase %	CDRPName	2023	2024	YOY Increase %
Blaby	534	531	-0.56%	Blaby	144	235	63.19%
Charnwood	941	1449	53.99%	Charnwood	299	435	45.48%
Harborough	306	319	4.25%	Harborough	76	135	77.63%
Hinckley And Bosworth	446	526	17.94%	Hinckley And Bosworth	136	200	47.06%
Leicester	2790	3841	37.67%	Leicester	1034	1760	70.21%
Melton	238	280	17.65%	Melton	47	97	106.38%
North West Leicestershire	611	792	29.62%	North West Leicestershire	175	268	53.14%
Oadby and Wigston	266	302	13.53%	Oadby and Wigston	75	122	62.67%
Rutland	90	147	63.33%	Rutland	30	60	100.00%
<b>Totals</b>	<b>6222</b>	<b>8187</b>	<b>31.58%</b>	<b>Totals</b>	<b>2016</b>	<b>3312</b>	<b>64.29%</b>

46. Outside of dimming trial times, Leicester City's anti-social behaviour levels had increased by 37.67% and Rutland's had increased by 63.33%.
47. During the dimming trial times, Leicester City's anti-social behaviour levels increased by 70.21% and Rutland's by 100%.
48. Neither Leicester City nor Rutland dim their streetlights to the same levels as the County Council and during the period of the dimming trial saw greater increases in anti-social behaviour than the County.

### **Resource Implications**

49. Ongoing monitoring and review of the County streetlights will be required and will be undertaken in collaboration with Leicestershire Police.

50. Ongoing monitoring and review of accident statistics, as well as identifying any patterns or trends, may result in lighting levels being increased temporarily in areas where concerns are raised at high RTC sites.
51. These tasks will require ongoing staff resource from the Street Lighting Team.
52. The total annual energy costs for street lighting in 2024/25 was £1,975,921. The street lighting dimming has resulted in financial savings of £540,000, in line with the revised MTFS target.
53. The Director of Law and Governance and the Director of Corporate Resources have been consulted on the content of this report.

### **Timetable for Decisions**

54. The outcome of the street lighting dimming trial will be presented to the Cabinet on 12 September 2025 with a recommendation that streetlights are permanently dimmed to 30% from 20:00 hours to 07:00 hours across the County.

### **Conclusions**

55. The dimming trial has delivered on its aim to reduce costs associated with the street lighting service, as shown in paragraph 18 of this report.
56. In 2024, the number of RTC was reduced although severity of collisions increased. At present, there is no conclusive evidence that street lighting levels were a factor in this.
57. Overall levels of crime had reduced during the dimming trial period but some types of crime have seen increases (including burglary, and thefts from dwellings, persons and vehicles). However, greater increases in these types of crimes were also recorded in Leicester City and Rutland which do not dim their streetlights to the extent done in the trial.
58. Levels of anti-social behaviour increased both during the dimming trial window (20:00 hours until 0:00 hours) and outside of these times. Again, greater increases in anti-social behaviour were also recorded within Leicester City and Rutland.
59. The Committee is asked to comment on the outcome of the trial and the proposal to lower street lighting intensity to 30% from 20:00 hours until 07:00 hours as a permanent measure in the County.

### **Background Papers**

Energy Reduction For Street Lighting Project – Report to the Cabinet – 15 December 2009 - <https://bit.ly/3VSnRDk>

Future Provision of Street Lighting – Report to the Cabinet - 9 July 2015 - <https://bit.ly/42pAdoR>

Environment Strategy – Report to the Cabinet - 6 July 2018 - <https://bit.ly/3o4cQSU>

Strategic Plan (May 2022) - <https://bit.ly/3Wggd64>

Provisional Medium Term Financial Strategy 2023/24 - 2026/27 – Report to the Cabinet - 10 February 2023 - <https://bit.ly/3pCHzXA>

Absence of Street Lighting May Prevent Vehicle Crime, but Spatial and Temporal Displacement Remains a Concern (January 2022) - <https://bit.ly/3lgwx0W>

Street Lighting proposed service changes – Report to Cabinet 23 June 2023 - <https://politics.leics.gov.uk/ieListDocuments.aspx?CId=135&MID=7077#AI75374>

### **Circulation under the Local Issues Alert Procedure**

60. A copy of this report will be circulated to all Members.

### **Crime and Disorder Implications**

61. The Council will continue to work with the police to monitor and review crime and anti-social behaviour levels and temporarily increase lighting levels if required to aid the police in their investigations.

### **Equality Implications**

62. An Equality Impact Assessment (appended to this report) was undertaken on 30 October 2023 and again reviewed post-trial; it found that the proposal may impact several protected characteristics in terms of their ability to navigate the network, their perceived increases in crime and vulnerability and may change their current behaviour.

### **Human Rights Implications**

63. There are no human rights implications arising from the content of this report.

### **Environmental Implications**

64. The trial had shown that the energy costs, energy consumption and carbon production associated with street lighting reduced as shown in paragraph 18 of this report. Dimming streetlights also reduced light pollution within the County due to reduced lighting levels.

### **Appendix**

Equality Impact Assessment

**Officers to Contact**

Ann Carruthers  
Director of Environment and Transport  
Email: [Ann.Carruthers@leics.gov.uk](mailto:Ann.Carruthers@leics.gov.uk)  
Tel: 0116 305 7000

Pat Clarke  
Assistant Director for Highways and Transport Operations  
Email: [Pat.Clarke@leics.gov.uk](mailto:Pat.Clarke@leics.gov.uk)  
Tel: 0116 305 4244

## Appendix

# Equality Impact Assessment Form

Before completing this form, please refer to [the supporting guidance document](#)

The purpose of this form is to aid the Council in meeting the requirements of the Public Sector Equality Duty contained in the Equality Act 2010. This requires the Council to have “due regard” of the impact of its actions on the need to eliminate unlawful discrimination, advance equality of opportunity and foster good relations between persons who share a relevant protected characteristic and those who do not.

The assessment is used to identify and record any concerns and potential risks. The following actions can then be taken to address these issues.

- Remove risks: abandon the proposed policy or practice
- Mitigate risks – amend the proposed policy or practice so that risks are reduced
- Justify policy or practice in terms of other objectives

<b>1- Policy details</b>	
<b>Name of policy</b>	Street Lighting – Proposed Service Changes
<b>Department and service</b>	Environment & Transport Department Structures & Street Lighting
<b>Who has been involved in completing the Equality Impact Assessment?</b>	Pat Clarke DEG members
<b>Contact details</b>	<a href="mailto:pat.clarke@leics.gov.uk">pat.clarke@leics.gov.uk</a>
<b>Date of completion</b>	15/05/23 Updated 30/10/23 and circulated to DEG for comments. No comments received.
<b>2- Objectives and background of policy or practice change</b> Use this section to describe the policy or practice change What is the purpose, expected outcomes and rationale? Include the background information and context	

**What is the proposal?**

**What change and impact is intended by the proposal?**

Leicestershire County Council continues to face significant financial challenges with the Council's budget gaps set to rise to nearly £90m by 2026. The Council is also committed to reducing the impact of climate change. Through its Medium-Term Financial Strategy (MTFS), the Council originally identified potential savings of approximately £500,000 with a street lighting proposal which also reduces energy consumption by 1,508,000 kwh and carbon emissions by 315 tonnes a year. Advances in LED lighting and their management systems mean the Council has an opportunity to tweak lighting levels during less busy periods. Currently, all streetlights are lit to various levels across the county, some of which gradually dim through the night.

The proposal is to reduce lighting intensity to 30% from 20:00 hours (currently 22:00 hours). Lighting will remain on but will be slightly dimmer than current levels for the hours between 20:00-22:00, from which time most residential lights are already dimmed to 30%. The changes are proposed to be county-wide and will impact all areas covered by the Council owned and managed street lighting. In parallel to the consultation exercise risk, we have risk assessed a number of locations that we thought might need to be made exempt. In the risk assessment documents these locations have been highlighted and the lights in these places will not be dimmed to 30%.

In order to reduce risk, lighting levels will be retained as follow:

- Places where there are vertical calming measures such as speed bumps;
- At zebra crossings;
- In town centres, extent to be determined by the Council;
- Where steps are currently illuminated;
- Where there are evidenced increases in night- time crime and anti- social behaviour between 20:00-22:00 hours;
- Where there are evidenced increases in night-time vehicular accidents between 20:00-22:00 hours (specifically increases in accidents of greater severity at conflict areas such as roundabouts or key junctions);
- Where there are evidenced increases in night-time crime/anti-social behaviour between 20:00-22:00 hours.

	<p>On an on-going basis we will monitor:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Any increased interaction between pedestrians and street furniture;</li> <li>• Increased conflict of vehicles outside conflict area;</li> <li>• Increased conflict between vehicles pedestrians and cyclists outside conflict areas.</li> </ul> <p>Knowing whether or how individuals will be affected by the proposed changes can depend on a number of factors such as eyesight, health, variations in lighting, spaces between lights, the presence of additional hazards and measures people already take themselves to manage risk when out and about on dark evenings.</p> <p>The initial Equality Impact Assessment (EIA) identified a potential increased risk of slips/trips/falls during hours of darkness for people with certain disabilities, vulnerabilities or pregnancy and that some people with certain protected characteristics may fear an increased risk of crime and anti-social behaviour during the hours of darkness. The consultation has largely confirmed those initial views in the initial EIA and this updated document reflects what people have said and how mitigations might reduce the risk to individuals.</p>
<b>What is the rationale for this proposal?</b>	<p>The Council needs to make significant financial savings over the next four years. This means that difficult decisions are having to be made on what the Council continues to do, and which services it may need to reduce. Following risk assessment work, it is proposed to dim fewer lights than first envisaged. A number of important risk mitigation measures have been put in place following this.</p> <p>It is now estimated that the proposal would save £ 380,000 per annum based on current energy prices taking into account areas that would be exempt from the proposal.</p> <p>The proposal also supports the Council's commitment to achieving net zero carbon emissions in Leicestershire by 2045. It is estimated that the proposal would save 1.5 million kWh energy and 315 tonnes of CO<sub>2</sub>e (revised carbon and energy figs need to go in when available).</p> <p>Whilst residents value street lighting, the Council has the power to light the highway but not a duty to do so.</p>

British Standard (BS) 5489 states that 'Road lighting should provide visual clues and reveal obstacles so that safe vehicular progress is possible. It should reveal all the features of the road and traffic that are important to all road users, including pedestrians.'

The proposal moves away from compliance with current British Standards, so it is deemed a 'Departure from Standards' and will, therefore, require the Cabinet's approval. We cannot make the proposed savings without departing from British Standards.

The fear of crime on winter evenings is recognised by the Council as a concern to citizens. Where people have said that they would change their behaviour if proposed change takes place, this is noted in the document.

Responsibility for managing crime and the fear of crime is, however, the responsibility of the police and officers will work closely with the police if any issues of concern are noticed due to the dimming of the streetlights between 20:00-22:00 hours continue to be a factor.

Although there is no legal requirement to provide street lighting, the Council would still provide lighting at this time albeit at a reduced level, and this should reduce adverse impacts to some extent.

Users of the highway would need to continue to take due care and attention while navigating the network, in line with current individual responsibility.

If the change proposal is approved the Cabinet, an 18-month pilot is to be undertaken continuing to manage any risk that may emerge, working closely with the Leicestershire Constabulary and the other emergency services.

### 3- Evidence gathered on equality implications - Data and engagement

What evidence about potential equality impacts is already available?

This could come from research, service analysis, questionnaires, and engagement with protected characteristics groups

**What equalities information or data has been gathered so far?**

The Street Lighting Energy Reduction Project (2009) included an equalities assessment.

There have been further initiatives that build on this in the years since. The most recent was in 2022 and its purpose was to achieve energy and cost savings by reducing the operational hours of circa 29,000 residential Part-Night Lighting (PNL) assets by adjusting the ambient light settings that trigger the switch-on and switch-off times at twilight (sunset and sunrise) from 15 LUX to 5 LUX (5 LUX is slightly darker than 15 LUX). An Equality and Human Rights Impact Assessment (EHRIA) was developed for this project.

It is assumed that the current project's impacts will be similar, so this EIA draws from that experience.

**What does it show?**

Engagement has now been held on the proposals and specific feedback on how people with protected characteristics may be impacted has been received, which will feed into the final proposals for change. The 2009 EHRIA referred to outcomes from PNL pilots in Essex and Gloucestershire. The most relevant excerpt states:

"Essex County Council has recently finished a Part-Night Lighting pilot involving about 6,000 lights, which have been switched off from midnight to 5.30 am since April 2007. During this period, crime in the area has actually dropped slightly and traffic accidents have not increased. Fear of crime was measured by asking citizens if they felt safe after dark. The percentage of people who felt safe after dark in the pilot areas dropped after the Part-Night Lighting was introduced (it dropped overall in Essex as well). However, it did recover a year after the pilot had been in place to a higher level than its starting point before the pilot started."

Council Accident Investigation and the Leicestershire Police were consulted one year after PNL implementation in each village/town, with no evidence of an increase in accidents or crime. A further Council crime study was completed in 2015 showing no increase in crime in PNL areas.

**What engagement has been undertaken so far?**

The savings requirement was set out in the MTFS which was subject to formal consultation prior to approval in February 2023.

An engagement exercise on proposed changes to street-lighting was undertaken with members of the public between 3 July and 6 August 2023.

A presentation was given to the Leicestershire Equalities Challenge Group (LECG) on 21 July and minutes for consideration were received following the presentation.

Of the recipients who responded to the engagement exercise and provided feedback, approximately 45% of those agreed with the proposals and 55% objected to the proposals. The main concerns were fear of crime and general vulnerability. The main reason respondents thought they would be affected by the proposal was concern about lighting levels and concern about personal safety.

**What does it show?**

Feedback from LECG raised the following points:

- 1) More consideration needs to be given for people with sight loss potential hazards and differ for different vision impairments.
- 2) Issues in rural areas particularly for people with dementia and mental health issues.
- 3) Safety issues for women, elderly and vulnerable people.
- 4) More reassurance to reduce negative perceptions/impacts of increased thefts, hate crime and antisocial behaviours.

These points are considered in the relevant sections of this EIA.

#### 4- Benefits, concerns and mitigating action

Please specify if any individuals or community groups who identify with any of the '[protected characteristics](#)' may **potentially** be affected by the policy and describe any benefits and concerns including any barriers.

Use this section to demonstrate how risks would be mitigated for each affected group

Group	What are the benefits of the proposal for those from the following groups?	Are there any known concerns for these groups?	What are the known concerns and how will they be mitigated?
Age	<p>No direct benefits.</p> <p>Indirect benefits of carbon reduction.</p> <p>Indirect benefits of LCC financial sustainability across its wider services.</p>	Yes	<p><u>Initial EIA assessment</u></p> <p>There is a potentially higher risk of slips trips and falls due to lower lighting levels as well as an increase in road traffic accidents and collisions, where people have visual problems and /or mobility issues that can occur in older people. Individuals may also feel more at risk of crime or antisocial behaviour. For some people this may impact their ability to go out in the evenings causing them to become socially isolated.</p> <p><u>What people have told us about their concerns</u></p> <p>Respondents aged 45-54 represented the highest response rate and disagreed most with the proposals. Fear of crime and general vulnerability were the main reasons for this. Personal safety and lighting levels were cited as the greatest impact of the proposals but only 4% of this group indicated that this would change their behaviour because of this.</p>

			<p>Those aged 65-74 were the most supportive of the proposal citing light pollution and saving money as their reasons for support.</p> <p>LECG also note concerns for elderly people.</p> <p><u>Mitigations</u></p> <p>A risk assessment of those areas where there could be a greater likelihood of harm occurring was carried out and it identified some situations where lights will not be subject to proposed dimming (see part two of the document for further details).</p> <p>Retaining lighting albeit at a reduced level, should also reduce adverse impacts to some extent.</p> <p>Running a safety campaign through the winter to remind people how to stay safe and visible during dark nights in winter.</p> <p>Monitoring any increased reported risk as part of a pilot project and taking action where necessary working closely with the police and emergency services.</p> <p>Crime and antisocial behaviour levels will be monitored and the Council will be working with the police to aid their investigations. Should the police require levels of lighting to be increased temporarily, this can be done via the Central Management System controlling the LED streetlights. Continuing to listen to Leicestershire residents and acting on any complaints or enquires to elected members on increased individual risk.</p> <p>No specific mitigations have been identified on account of age alone but people who have additional mobility, sight or mental health issues have additional challenges in managing risk and this is covered in the section on disability.</p>
<b>Disability</b>	No direct benefits.	Yes	<u>Initial EIA Assessment</u>

	<p>Indirect benefits of carbon reduction.</p> <p>Indirect benefits of LCC financial sustainability across its wider services.</p>	<p>People with disabilities could be adversely impacted depending on the nature of their disability. Some disabilities such as visual impairment or mobility could mean the proposals make things more difficult and potentially increase the risk of slips trips and falls, road traffic accidents and collisions. Individuals may also feel more at risk of crime or antisocial behaviour. For some people this may impact their ability to go out in the evenings causing them to become socially isolated.</p> <p><u>What people have told us about their concerns</u></p> <p>Disabled respondents were concerned about proposed change to the dimming of lights between 20:00-22:00 hours to a slightly increased degree compared with all respondents.</p> <p>The main concerns were general vulnerability and fear of crime.</p> <p>LECG has suggested that people with visual impairments are likely to face additional challenges and suggest that the Council gives more consideration to this, such as putting light reflective strips on each lamppost. LECG also advised that the Council gives more consideration to people with dementia and mental health issues, but no specific suggestions were made.</p> <p><u>Mitigations</u></p> <p>A risk assessment of those areas where there could be a greater likelihood of harm occurring was conducted and it identified some situations where lights will not be subject to proposed dimming (see part two of the document for further details).</p> <p>Retaining lighting albeit at a reduced level, should also reduce adverse impacts to some extent.</p>
--	---	---

			<p>Running a safety campaign through the winter to remind people how to stay safe and visible during dark nights in winter.</p> <p>Monitoring any increased reported risk as part of a pilot project and taking action where necessary working closely with the police and emergency services.</p> <p>Crime and antisocial behaviour levels will be monitored and the Council will be working with the police to aid their investigations. Should the police require levels of lighting to be increased temporarily, this can be done via the Central Management system controlling the LED street lights.</p> <p>Continuing to listen to the residents and acting on any complaints or enquires to elected members on increased individual risks.</p> <p><u>Additional Mitigations Considered</u></p> <p>The Council has considered whether it could put visible strips on streetlights to help people with visual impairments. There are approximately 69,600 streetlights in the county and unfortunately the cost of this would be prohibitive overall.</p> <p>It is acknowledged that some people with visual impairments do face additional challenges in taking due care and attention when using the highway and may already have measures in place to reduce risk when out and about, particularly in the evening.</p> <p>However, the Council proposes to maintain an ongoing dialogue with Vista, to consider risks affecting specific individuals with visual impairments. Mitigations could include putting reflective strips on potential hazards in locations that cause individuals particular difficulty.</p>
--	--	--	--

			<p>LECG also asked that greater consideration is given to those experiencing dementia or mental health.</p> <p>It is accepted that some types of dementia and metal health illnesses can cause confusion and disorientation, posing some individuals at greater risk day and night.</p> <p>It is not, therefore, considered possible to mitigate this risk in a general sense, however, should this be raised, an individual risk on a case by case basis will be examined.</p> <p>It is anticipated that individuals open to Adult Social Care Services and to NHS mental health services will also have appropriate risk assessments in place as part of care planning.</p>
<b>Race</b>	<p>No direct benefits.</p> <p>Indirect benefits of carbon reduction.</p> <p>Indirect benefits of LCC financial sustainability across its wider services.</p>	Yes	<p><u>Initial EIA assessment</u></p> <p>Some people may feel more at risk of racially motivated crime or antisocial behaviour impacting on their choices about evening activities and potentially increasing social isolation for some.</p> <p><u>What people have told us about their concerns</u></p> <p>Whilst most respondents were White British, those from Asian or Asian British, Black or Black British or mixed groups backgrounds raised concerns about proposed change due to fear of crime and general vulnerability.</p> <p><u>Mitigations</u></p> <p>A risk assessment of those areas where there could be a greater likelihood of harm occurring was conducted and it identified some situations where lights will not be subject to proposed dimming (see part two of the document for further</p>

			<p>details). Providing lighting albeit at a reduced level, should also reduce adverse impacts to some extent.</p> <p>Monitoring any increased reported risk as part of a pilot project and taking action where necessary working closely with the police and emergency services.</p> <p>Crime and antisocial behaviour levels will be monitored with the police and emergency services and lighting levels can be amended temporarily via the Central Management System if required.</p> <p>Continuing to listen to residents and acting on any complaints or enquires to elected members on increased individual risk.</p>
<b>Sex</b>	<p>No direct benefits.</p> <p>Indirect benefits of carbon reduction.</p> <p>Indirect benefits of LCC financial sustainability across its wider services.</p>	Yes	<p><u>Initial EIA Assessment.</u></p> <p>Crimes against women have increased each year since 2019. Therefore, women may face real or perceived risks as a result of the proposed change. This could impact on their choices about evening activities, resulting in increased isolation for some.</p> <p><u>What people have told us about their concerns</u></p> <p>More females responded to the engagement exercise than any other groups combined. Women and those who preferred not to state their gender felt strongly that there would be an impact (77% and 70%) compared to 62% of men.</p> <p>19% of women felt that they would be impacted by personal safety with 9% saying that they would change their behaviour due to the proposals.</p> <p>The LECG also felt that women would be impacted by the proposals.</p> <p><u>Mitigations</u></p>

			<p>A risk assessment of those areas where there could be a greater likelihood of harm occurring was conducted and it identified some situations where lights will not be subject to proposed dimming (see part two of the document for further details).</p> <p>Retaining lighting albeit at a reduced level, should also reduce adverse impacts to some extent.</p> <p>Monitoring any increased reported risk as part of a pilot project and taking action where necessary working closely with the police and emergency services.</p> <p>Crime and antisocial behaviour levels will be monitored with the police and emergency services and lighting levels can be amended temporarily via the Central Management System if required.</p> <p>Continuing to listen to the residents and acting on any complaints or enquires to elected members on increased individual risk.</p>
<b>Gender Reassignment</b>	<p>No direct benefits.</p> <p>Indirect benefits of carbon reduction.</p> <p>Indirect benefits of LCC financial sustainability across its wider services.</p>	Yes	<p><u>Initial EIA Assessment</u></p> <p>Some people at any stage of gender reassignment may have a perception of being more at risk of crime or anti-social behaviour. This could impact on their choices about evening activities, which may man and increase in social isolation for some.</p> <p><u>What people have told us about their concerns.</u></p> <p>A small number of people with this protected characteristic responded to the survey. None of the respondents indicated they would change their behaviour as a result of the proposals. However, the Council remains mindful of the prejudice and hate crime that this group can experience in developing mitigations. Had</p>

			<p>more people with this protected characteristic responded, it is possible that findings would be similar to those with other protected characteristics.</p> <p><u>Mitigations</u></p> <p>A risk assessment of those areas where there could be a greater likelihood of harm occurring was conducted and it identified some situations where lights will not be subject to proposed dimming (see part two of the document for further details).</p> <p>Retaining lighting albeit at a reduced level, should also reduce adverse impacts to some extent.</p> <p>Crime and antisocial behaviour levels will be monitored with the police and emergency services and lighting levels can be amended temporarily via the Central Management System if required.</p> <p>Continuing to listen to the residents and acting on any complaints or enquires to elected members on increased individual risk.</p>
<b>Marriage and Civil Partnership</b>	No direct benefits. Indirect benefits of carbon reduction. Indirect benefits of LCC financial sustainability across its wider services.	No	<p><u>Initial EIA Assessment</u></p> <p>No concerns were initially identified on the basis of marriage and civil partnership.</p> <p><u>What people have told us about their concerns</u></p> <p>No concerns have been raised, however, this will continue to be monitored.</p>
<b>Sexual Orientation</b>	No direct benefits. Indirect benefits of carbon reduction.	Yes	<p><u>Initial EIA Assessment</u></p> <p>LGBT+ residents may feel fearful and vulnerable to hate incident/crime because of this proposal. This could impact on their choices about evening activities, which may mean an increase in social isolation for some.</p>

	Indirect benefits of LCC financial sustainability across its wider services.		<p><u>What people have told us about their concerns</u></p> <p>577 respondents gave information on their sexual orientation. Of the respondents not identifying as heterosexual, 70% felt that the proposals would impact them. Fear of crime and personal safety were the main reasons. 10% said they would change their behaviour as a result.</p> <p><u>Mitigations</u></p> <p>A risk assessment of those areas where there could be a greater likelihood of harm occurring was conducted and it identified some situations where lights will not be subject to proposed dimming (see part two of the document for further details).</p> <p>Retaining a reduced level of lighting albeit at a reduced level should also reduce adverse impacts to some extent.</p> <p>Crime and antisocial behaviour levels will be monitored with the police and emergency services and lighting levels can be amended temporarily via the Central Management System if required.</p> <p>Continuing to listen to the residents and acting on any complaints or enquires to elected members on increased individual risk.</p>
<b>Pregnancy and Maternity</b>	No direct benefits. Indirect benefits of carbon reduction. Indirect benefits of LCC financial sustainability across its wider services.	Yes	<p><u>Initial EIA Assessment</u></p> <p>A potential greater risk of slips trips and falls may disproportionately impact pregnant women. There may also be a perception of being more at risk of crime and antisocial behaviour. This could impact on their choices about evening activities which may mean an increased in social isolation for some. There could be concerns about travel to access maternity care during the hours impacted by the proposal.</p>

			<p><u>What people have told us about their concerns</u></p> <p>This did not emerge as a specific concern during the engagement.</p> <p><u>Mitigations</u></p> <p>Whilst pregnancy alone may not result in increased risk, pregnant women who are unwell or who have certain disabilities may be at more risk generally when out on dark evenings.</p> <p>Pregnant women with these additional challenges may be more vulnerable. Those known to NHS services should be in receipt of advice on how to manage risk, from their GP and NHS maternity services.</p> <p>A risk assessment of those areas where there could be a greater likelihood of harm occurring was conducted and it identified some situations where lights will not be subject to proposed dimming (see part two of the document for further details).</p> <p>Retaining a reduced level of lighting albeit at a reduced level should reduce adverse impact to some extent.</p> <p>Running a safety campaign through the winter to remind people how to stay safe and visible during dark nights in winter.</p> <p>Monitoring any increased reported risk to people from this protected characteristic as part of a pilot project and taking action where necessary working closely with the police and emergency services.</p> <p>Crime and antisocial behaviour levels will be monitored with the police and emergency services and lighting levels can be amended temporarily via the Central Management System if required.</p>
--	--	--	---

			Continuing to listen to the residents and acting on any complaints or enquires to elected members on increased individual risk.
<b>Religion or Belief</b>	No direct benefits. Indirect benefits of carbon reduction. Indirect benefits of LCC financial sustainability across its wider services.	Yes	<p><u>Initial EIA Assessment</u></p> <p>The proposal could impact members of faith communities attending or returning from places of worship during the times affected by the proposals. There may be a perception of increased risk of violence or antisocial behaviour against this group.</p> <p><u>What people have told us about their concerns.</u></p> <p>People from different religions cited their main reasons for disagreeing with the proposal were fear of crime and general vulnerability.</p> <p><u>Mitigations</u></p> <p>A risk assessment of those areas where there could be a greater likelihood of harm occurring was conducted and it identified some situations where lights will not be subject to proposed dimming (see part two of the document for further details).</p> <p>Retaining lighting albeit at a reduced level, should also reduce adverse impacts to some extent.</p> <p>Running a safety campaign through the winter to remind people how to stay safe and visible during dark nights in winter.</p> <p>Monitoring any increased reported risk to people from this protected characteristic as part of a pilot project and taking action where necessary working closely with the police and emergency services.</p>

			Crime and antisocial behaviour levels will be monitored with the police and emergency services and lighting levels can be amended temporarily via the Central Management System if required.
<b>Other groups: e.g., rural isolation, deprivation, health inequality, carers, asylum seeker and refugee communities, looked after children, deprived, armed forced, or disadvantaged communities</b>	No direct benefits. Indirect benefits of carbon reduction. Indirect benefits of LCC financial sustainability across its wider services.	Yes	<p><u>Initial EIA Assessment</u></p> <p>Some people in any of these other groups may have a perception of being more at risk of crime or antisocial behaviour. This could impact on their choices about evening activities, which may mean an increase in social isolation for some.</p> <p>Carers may also have concerns about lower-level lighting when travelling during late or early hours to carry out their duties.</p> <p><u>What people have told us about their concerns</u></p> <p>The LECG has identified people in rural communities as being affected by change although it is not clear how. As Leicestershire is made up of many rural communities, any patterns that emerge during the pilot will be looked into and an appropriate action will then be taken.</p> <p>Although no specific concerns have emerged about carers, it is noted that these are predominantly women, and covered by relevant mitigations.</p>

<b>5- Action Plan and Recommendations</b> Use this section to describe concerns further Produce a framework to outline how identified risks/concerns will be mitigated.			
<b>What concerns were identified?</b>	<b>What action is planned?</b>	<b>Who is responsible for the action?</b>	<b>Timescale</b>
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Disproportionate adverse impact on people with certain disabilities and/or vulnerabilities through greater risk of personal injury (slips/trips/fall).</li> <li>• Potential perception of being more at risk of crime or antisocial behaviour for several protected and other groups.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Risk assessment developed. This is to reduce risk at some key locations as set out in the EIA, by retaining existing lighting levels, thereby balancing safety and the need to achieve financial and environmental outcomes.</li> </ul>	Owner - Pat Clarke	<b>By December 2023</b>
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Run the 'be seen and safe' campaign as usual throughout the winter reminding people of the measures they can take to stay safe.</li> </ul>	Owner- Lee Quincey, Head of Service Network Management	<b>Throughout winter 2023/2024</b>

On-going through pilot
Ongoing through pilot

<b>6- Way forward</b>	
<b>How will the action plan and recommendations of this assessment be built into decision making and implementation of this proposal?</b>	Will be included in the report presented to the Cabinet in December 2023 for its approval.
<b>How would you monitor the impact of your proposal and keep the EIA refreshed?</b>	As in this draft of the document, this document will be updated following quarterly monitoring identifying any new patterns, trends and unforeseen consequences.  The document will be submitted for 6-monthly reviews to the DEG.
<b>Sign off by DEG Chair/Director or Head of Services</b>	Ann Carruthers 07/11/23