Leicestershire County Council

Meeting: **Highways, Transport and Waste Overview and Scrutiny Committee**

Date/Time: **Thursday, 5 March 2026 at 2.00 pm**

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

Contact: **Mr. A. Sarang (0116 3056844)**

Email: **aqil.sarang@leics.gov.uk**

Membership

Mr. B. Piper CC (Chairman)

Dr. J. Bloxham CC	Mr. P. Morris CC
Mr. S. Bradshaw CC	Mr. M. T. Mullaney CC
Mr. G. Cooke CC	Mr. O. O'Shea JP CC
Mr. N. Holt CC	Mrs B. Seaton CC
Mr. B. Lovegrove CC	Mr. B. Walker CC
Mr. J. McDonald CC	

Please note: this meeting will be filmed for live or subsequent broadcast via the Council's web site at http://www.leicestershire.gov.uk

AGENDA

Item		Report by
1.	Minutes of the meeting held on 22 January 2026.	(Pages 5 - 12)
2.	Question Time.	
3.	Questions asked by members under Standing Order 32 (1).	
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 33.

8. Road Casualty Reduction in Leicestershire. (Pages 13 - 98)

9. Environment and Transport 2026/27 Highways and Transportation Capital Programme and Works Programme. (Pages 99 - 154)

10. 2025/26 Highways Drainage Programme and Works Update. (Pages 155 - 168)

11. Highways, Transport and Waste Performance Report to December 2025. (Pages 169 - 186)

12. Date of next meeting.

    The next meeting of the Committee is scheduled to take place on Thursday 4 June 2026 at 2.00pm.

13. Any other items which the Chairman has decided to take as urgent.

QUESTIONING BY MEMBERS OF OVERVIEW AND SCRUTINY

The ability to ask good, pertinent questions lies at the heart of successful and effective scrutiny. To support members with this, a range of resources, including guides to questioning, are available via the Centre for Governance and Scrutiny website www.cfgs.org.uk. The following questions have been agreed by Scrutiny members as a good starting point for developing questions:

- Who was consulted and what were they consulted on? What is the process for and quality of the consultation?
- How have the voices of local people and frontline staff been heard?
- What does success look like?
- What is the history of the service and what will be different this time?
- What happens once the money is spent?
- If the service model is changing, has the previous service model been evaluated?
- What evaluation arrangements are in place – will there be an annual review?

Members are reminded that, to ensure questioning during meetings remains appropriately focused that:

(a) they can use the officer contact details at the bottom of each report to ask questions of clarification or raise any related patch issues which might not be best addressed through the formal meeting;

(b) they must speak only as a County Councillor and not on behalf of any other local authority when considering matters which also affect district or parish/town councils (see Articles 2.03(b) of the Council's Constitution).

This page is intentionally left blank

Agenda Item 1

Leicestershire County Council

Minutes of a meeting of the Highways, Transport and Waste Overview and Scrutiny Committee held at County Hall, Glenfield on Thursday, 22 January 2026.

PRESENT

Mr. B. Piper CC (in the Chair)

Dr. J. Bloxham CC	Mr. P. Morris CC
Mr. S. Bradshaw CC	Mr. M. T. Mullaney CC
Mr. G. Cooke CC	Mr. O. O'Shea JP CC
Mr. N. Holt CC	Mrs B. Seaton CC
Mr. B. Lovegrove CC	Mr. B. Walker CC
Mr. J. McDonald CC	

In attendance

Mr. A. Tilbury CC - Lead Member for Environment and Transport.

11. Minutes.

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

12. Question Time.

The Chief Executive reported that no questions had been received under Standing Order 35.

13. Questions asked by Members under Standing Order 7(3) and 7(5).

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

14. Urgent Items.

There were no urgent items for consideration.

15. Declarations of interest in respect of items on the agenda.

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

Mr. S. Bradshaw CC declared an Other Registrable Interest in that he is a Trustee of Syston Volunteer Centre who had recently received grant Funding from the County Council to provide passenger transport.

Mr. J. Mcdonald CC declared an Other Registrable Interest in that he was an owner at Beaver Bus Limited that had home to school contracts with the County Council.

16. Declarations of the Party Whip in accordance with Overview and Scrutiny Procedure Rule 16.

There were no declarations of the party whip.

17. Petitions.

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

18. Medium Term Financial Strategy 2026/27 - 2029/30.

The Committee considered a joint report of the Director of Environment and Transport and the Director of Corporate Resources which provided information on the proposed 2026/27 to 2029/30 Medium Term Financial Strategy as it related to the Highways, Transport and Waste Services within the Environment and Transport Department. A copy of the report marked 'Agenda Item '8' is filed with these minutes.

The Chairman welcomed Mr. A. Tilbury CC, the Cabinet Lead Member for the Environment and Transport to the meeting for this item.

Arising from discussion, the following points were noted:

Growth

(i) In response to a Member query about street lighting maintenance costs referred to in Table 3 of the report, it was noted that although the section refers to growth, the figures shown are negative and consistent across each year. Officers clarified that in the 2025/26 financial year the service received a significant growth allocation to support street lighting maintenance costs, which included a one-off growth requirement of £135,000. The negative figures now appearing within the growth area show the reimbursement of that one-off amount to the budget.

(ii) In response to a question about how much additional funding the Authority would require to bring the roads up to the ideal standard, officers explained that work undertaken in the last five years estimated the cost to be at approximately £200–£230m at that time. Spread over ten years, this would require approximately £20m per year in additional investment. It was noted that the criteria used to assess the condition of road surfaces had since changed, and the Department was currently re-evaluating the Leicestershire highways network against the new Government reporting requirements. This would provide a more up to date and accurate estimate of the funding required to get the roads up to the standard the Authority would want to provide.

(iii) The Council was expecting to receive around £28m in capital allocation next year from the Government for highway maintenance; the level of funding would need to be almost double the current allocation to bring the present road surfaces back to a desired standard. It was emphasised that this was not a matter of adding one or two million pounds but would require a significant step change in capital investment.

SEN Transport

(iv) A Member expressed significant concern regarding the rising costs of Special Educational Needs (SEN) transport and mainstream school transport, noting that the growth increase from £5m to £13m by 2029/30 was exceptionally large. The Member queried whether any financial support from the Government was anticipated, given that Leicestershire was one of the lowest funded authorities

nationally. The Member emphasised that such pressures risked diverting resources away from other key services.

(v) It was confirmed that the County Council continued to engage in national discussions about tackling the rising costs of SEN transport. The Council had taken a leading role in establishing a national working group that also involved the Department for Education, and it was acknowledged that legislative changes were needed, actual outcomes had not yet materialised. Officers noted that the issue remained a severe national challenge.

Savings

(vi) Addressing the reference to a necessary step-change in paragraph 23 of the report, officers explained that local authorities had been maintaining services with reducing resources for over 15 years. The Department had delivered savings of approximately £28m from revenue budgets since 2009/10, despite rising demand across areas such as SEN transport, school transport and highways maintenance. Officers emphasised that the scope for further efficiency savings was extremely limited, and that fundamentally different approaches were now required.

(vii) In response to a question regarding whether the vehicle maintenance costs had taken into account savings from reduced mileage due to the loss of the school food service, it was noted that the major efficiency set out in the report was a result of the replacement of the ageing vehicles and efficiency had arisen from the purchase of new minibuses in the previous year which would require maintenance less often. The older vehicles were becoming increasingly costly to maintain and replacing them helped to significantly reduce maintenance costs, therefore the saving was mainly as a result of the improved condition and reliability of the new fleet, rather than operational mileage changes.

(viii) It was highlighted that the number of utility company excavations on the highways had increased significantly, and the Council was seeking to use technology more effectively to monitor when works were opened and closed, and to ensure appropriate fines or charges against the utility companies were applied where legislation allowed. This work would also explore charging for officer time spent providing advice and consultation to developers and new event organisers, as this activity currently created substantial unfunded demand.

(ix) Members shared their concerns regarding the large number of traffic cones, temporary signs and road closure notices left on highways and verges long after works had finished. Members suggested that the current system was not functioning effectively and that abandoned signage became buried by vegetation growth and then damaged grass cutting machinery, leading to avoidable costs and operational difficulties for the Council and other providers. It was noted that while the Council carried out its own highway maintenance, a large proportion of works on the network were undertaken by utility companies and developers. These organisations typically use separate contractors for traffic management, excavation, reinstatement and associated activities, which could lead to communication delays and to cones and signage being left behind by different parties. Members were requested to continue reporting the left signage to the Department so that removal could be actioned by the relevant organisation.

(x) It was suggested that the packaging reforms expected to bring behavioural changes from the public, such as reduced packaging and lower waste tonnages,

should be factored into future financial assumptions. Officers confirmed the matter was referenced in the report at paragraph 42 and highlighted that the Council expected to receive £5.8m in 2026/27, funded by the packaging industry to recognise costs councils incur in managing packaging waste. It was acknowledged that the key question was the behavioural impact and that the packaging industry was likely to reduce packaging in response to the new reforms. The Council anticipated year on year reductions in Extended Producer Responsibility income as producers innovate and minimise packaging and that the financial planning therefore assumed a declining income and that waste management costs are already built into existing service budgets.

(xi) Regarding Civil Enforcement Officers (CEOs), officers confirmed that parking enforcement operated on a self-financing model where the CEOs were paid for by the fines in partnership with district councils who were responsible for off-street parking and managing the CEO operation. While staffing and recruitment remained a challenge, CEOs were deployed at peak times when parking infringements were most prevalent in an area, and the service remained responsive to reported local issues. Members also highlighted that local people were aware of times when CEOs would be coming and avoided parking illegally at these times.

Other Funding Sources

(xii) A Member highlighted that several bus services in Leicestershire had recently been introduced or reinstated on a one-year experimental basis. It was queried whether the continuation of the bus grant and the new long-term funding meant these services would generally be expected to continue. Officers welcomed the confirmation of continued grant funding for bus services and stated that this provided greater stability for the expanded network but highlighted that no guarantee could be given for any individual service and that performance would continue to be reviewed to ensure routes met expectations. It was emphasised that the new, longer-term funding meant that the recently introduced routes can continue beyond the initial experimental period and that any new routes would have more time to establish and grow patronage and that the Demand Responsive Transport initiatives will also be maintained. It was highlighted that many communities had already benefited from the expanded network, and the extended funding will allow the Council to gather more data, refine services, and work with communities to improve provision.

(xiii) A Member suggested that the Department considers the option of purchasing its own stress testing equipment for lamppost as it could potentially be a way of making additional income throughout the year as the current method of parish councils getting an external company to carry out these works was costly over a long period of time. It was acknowledged that when stress testing and column testing equipment was first considered, the costs of the equipment and associated setup fees had been extremely high, and the required computerised systems also contributed to the expense. It was suggested that officers would look into the available options.

Capital Programme

(xiv) A Member highlighted that funding for major schemes decreased significantly year on year as highlighted within paragraph 46 of the report. Concerns were raised over whether the decline would be problematic or whether funding typically fluctuated. Officers explained that major schemes relied on external grant funding, as the Authority could not finance such large projects from its core capital budget. The report reflected current secured grants only and funding for schemes, such as the A511 scheme, were not yet listed as the full business case had not been submitted to the Department for Transport and that the majority of funding would be released once approved. As a result, the Capital Programme was expected to change over time as future grants were secured.

(xv) The Government had also announced a national structures fund, which the Authority intended to bid for into.

RESOLVED:

a) That the report on the Medium Term Financial Strategy 2026/27 - 2029/30 be noted;

b) That the comments now made be forwarded to the Scrutiny Commission for consideration at its meeting on 28 January 2026 and then to the Cabinet on 3 February 2026.

19. Pedestrian Crossing Assessment and Justification in Leicestershire.

The Committee considered a report of the Director of Environment and Transport which provided an overview of the County Council's existing approach to pedestrian, pedal cycle and horse rider crossing assessments and justification, against revised national guidance and accepted best practice, and outlined a proposed minor modification to the assessment process. A copy of the report marked 'Agenda Item '9' is filed with these minutes.

Mr A. Tilbury CC welcomed the changes, stating that the increased transparency was positive and that he supported measures encouraging active travel and safer streets.

Arising from discussion, the following points were noted:

i) The introduction of one-way systems to help alleviate heavy traffic in village areas could be considered appropriate where they improved safety and supported traffic flow. However, in some cases they could attract more through traffic which would be counterproductive. Any proposal would therefore require detailed assessment, including consideration of whether it could lead to increased speeds.

ii) Members were reminded that implementing a one-way system would require a Traffic Regulation Order to be put in place which would require a public consultation to take place before implementation. Although such schemes could be considered under the current funding arrangements, no specific commitments could be given regarding particular sites without detailed assessment.

RESOLVED:

That the report be noted.

20. Melton Mowbray Distribution Road.

The Committee considered a presentation of the Director of Environment and Transport which provided an update on delivery of the Melton Mowbray Distribution Road which was nearing completion. A copy of the presentation marked 'Agenda Item '10' is filed with these minutes.

Arising from discussion, the following points were noted:

i) The Chairman thanked Officers for arranging a site visit for Committee Members which helped them understand the complexity of the project which was 10 years in the making. It was noted that there was some outstanding work that needed to be carried out on the road but this was dependant on dry weather conditions. The scheme was, however, still on schedule to be opening in late spring 2026.

ii) Officers were commended for the delivery of the scheme which was of significant benefit for the community and the wider area. It was highlighted that the process for the naming of the road was well underway and suggestions from local residents had been put forward. The set list would be approved through both the street naming authority and the County Council with a public vote on the shortlist then taking place.

iii) Members requested that Officers consider providing the Committee with an evaluation of the project at a future meeting following the scheme being opened. It was suggested this would help Members get an understanding on how the project developed through its various stages and what learning could be taken from the scheme.

RESOLVED:

a) That the contents of the presentation be noted:

b) That the Director of Environment and Transport be requested to present a report at a future meeting of the Committee providing an evaluation of the Melton Mowbray Distribution Road scheme.

21. Healthy Streets.

The Committee considered a report of the Director of Environment and Transport which provided an overview of the Healthy Streets approach, its strategic alignment and practical applications for the benefit of Leicestershire communities. A copy of the report marked 'Agenda Item '11' is filed with these minutes.

Arising from discussion, the following points were noted:

i) A Member commented that the scheme appeared to be very positive, noting that south Leicestershire already had one such scheme in place and referenced the extensive network of paths in areas such as Blaby, Glen Parva, Whetstone and Countesthorpe. The Member sought reassurance regarding the inclusion of the canal footpath in planning work, given the number of local paths connecting to it, and suggested that large district parks should also be in the mapping.

ii) It was noted that Local Cycling and Walking Infrastructure Plan contact details would be shared with Members as these would be key to implementing the Healthy Streets principles. Members also noted that the recent Big Travel Survey included both policy questions and an interactive map where residents could pinpoint locations and suggest improvements. A significant number of comments had been received and would be built into future work. The mapping tool from the survey would remain open to allow ongoing public suggestions.

RESOLVED:

That the report be noted.

22. Date of Next Meeting.

The next meeting of the Highways, Transport and Waste Overview and Scrutiny Committee was confirmed as 5 March 2026 at 2.00pm.

2.00pm – 4.05pm CHAIRMAN
22 January 2026

This page is intentionally left blank

Agenda Item 8

Leicestershire County Council

HIGHWAYS, TRANSPORT AND WASTE OVERVIEW AND SCRUTINY COMMITTEE - 5 MARCH 2026

ROAD CASUALTY REDUCTION IN LEICESTERSHIRE

REPORT OF THE DIRECTOR OF ENVIRONMENT AND TRANSPORT

Purpose of the Report

1. The purpose of this report is to provide the Committee with updates on the confirmed reported road casualty statistics up to the end of 2024; the Council's approach to casualty reduction; and the Leicestershire Police's approach to road safety (Appendix A).

Policy Framework and Previous Decisions

2. In May 2022, the County Council approved its Strategic Plan (2022-26). The refreshed Plan (2024-26) contains five strategic outcomes:

   - **Safe and Well** - ensuring that people are safe and protected from harm, live in a healthy environment and have the opportunities and support they need to live active, independent and fulfilling lives.
   - **Strong Economy, Transport, and Infrastructure** - use local innovation and skills to build a productive, inclusive and sustainable economy at the cutting edge of science, technology and engineering.
   - **Clean and Green** - the need to protect and enhance the environment and tackle climate change.
   - **Great Communities** - Leicestershire to have active and inclusive communities in which people support each other and participate in service design and delivery.
   - **Improved Opportunities** - all children and young people get the best start for life and have the opportunities they need to fulfil their potential, regardless of their circumstances.

3. Road safety and casualty reduction contributes to the five strategic outcomes in a range of ways. As an example, reducing road casualties will help to reduce the fear of collisions, help to increase the use of active travel modes (cycling, walking, and wheeling), reduce the Council's carbon footprint and support its aims to improve health outcomes.

4. In June 2024, the Cabinet approved Leicestershire County Council's Road Safety Strategy (RSS). The RSS presented everything that the Council does through a Safe Systems approach to improve road safety. New ambitious casualty reduction targets support continuous improvement to road safety and road casualty reduction.

5. In October 2024, the Cabinet approved the updated Leicestershire Highway Design Guide. A range of policies and guidance within the Guide relate to road safety, including:

   a) Highway Development Management (HDM) policy 2: access to the existing highway network – The Council will apply a risk-based assessment of proposals for new accesses onto the existing highway network and alterations to and/or intensification of existing accesses so that they do not result in unacceptable road safety and operational concerns.
   b) HDM policy 3: highway safety – The Council will review development road safety information, to ensure that the scheme and the development proposals do not raise unacceptable safety concerns, and the Road Safety Audit process has been satisfactorily undertaken.
   c) HDM policy 4: development impact policy – Significant operational and road safety impacts of development on the transport network must be mitigated to an acceptable degree.

6. In November 2024, the Cabinet considered the development of the Council's fourth Local Transport Plan (LTP4) and approved the LTP4 Core Document. This includes a range of core themes that the RSS and the casualty reduction targets support, including:

   a) Enabling health and wellbeing;
   b) Protecting the environment;
   c) Delivering economic growth;
   d) Enhancing the transport network's resilience;
   e) Embracing innovation.

7. The LTP Core Document also contains a range of policies. The LTP4 Core Policy 3 ('Enabling Travel Choice') aims to enable "travel choice in our communities that reflects their unique needs, ensures their safety, actively promotes health and wellbeing, and protect the environment". The RSS and casualty reduction targets contribute to this policy.

Background

8. Great Britain continues to have some of the lowest road casualty rates in the world. Despite significant increases in traffic over the last few decades, the number of road deaths has fallen by 50% since 2004, although progress has slowed somewhat in recent years.

9. This long-term reduction is due to a variety of reasons, including safer infrastructure, new vehicle technologies, improvements to driver testing such as the introduction of the theory test and hazard perception testing, tougher enforcement, shifting social attitudes and better trauma care.

10. Most road traffic collisions occur on local roads (the Local Road Network) which are under the direct control of the local highway authorities (LHAs), who are key partners in the delivery of the Government's Road Safety Strategy (2026) and casualty reduction objectives.

11. The Department for Transport (DfT) monitors each LHA's casualty reduction progress through the national STATS19 road collision database.

12. The DfT released its annual road casualty report (the Reported Road Casualties Great Britain, annual report: 2024) in September 2025, which set out the number of personal injury road traffic casualties in Great Britain, as reported by the Police to the DfT using the STATS19 reporting system. The report focuses on severity, the road user group, age, and the sex of the casualties, which is compared with previous years since 2014. In 2024, there were declines in the reported road casualties in Great Britain for total, fatal, and killed or seriously injured (KSI) casualties. Further detail on the current trends can be found in Appendix B of this report.

13. On 7 January 2026, the Government launched its new national Road Safety Strategy. Approximately four people die on Britain's roads every day, with thousands more seriously injured each year. Through targeted action on speeding, drink and drug driving, not wearing seat belts, mobile phone use, improving training for young drivers and introducing mandatory eye tests for older motorists, thousands of these tragedies can be prevented.

14. The Council's Road Safety Strategy sets out its use of the Safe System approach to road safety, setting a 2035 casualty reduction target and the long-term target of zero deaths. This aligns well with the National Road Safety Strategy's use of the Safe System approach and in setting the 2035 casualty reduction targets and long-term ambition for nobody to be killed or seriously injured on roads in Great Britain. The Council will assess the implications of the Government's new national Road Safety Strategy in detail. Where appropriate, it will review its own approach to ensure that it aligns with the Government's new national Road Safety Strategy.

15. There has been some community concern about the increasing and inappropriate use of a range of relatively new modes of transport, including e-scooters, e-bikes, and mobility scooters. Members will continue to be kept advised of any issues in Leicestershire relating to these modes and any future changes to the legislation.

16. The Council's approach to casualty reduction is consistent with the Government's known priorities and industry best practice. Full details of Leicestershire's road safety initiatives and actions can be found in Appendix C of this report. This includes information covering, but not limited to:

    a) Planning a safer road environment through development management and safety audits;
    b) Managing speed through the Community Speed Enforcement Initiative, safety cameras and advisory 20mph school safety zones;
    c) Road safety education programme covering education, training, and publicity, including driver education workshops, bespoke targeted campaigns, pre-driver and fleet driver training, publicity campaigns;
    d) Improving safety for vulnerable road users, including motorcyclists, pedestrians, cyclists;
    e) School Keep Clear, which involves Camera Car enforcement for improving behaviour outside schools.

Statistical Update

17. A set of definitions used throughout the remainder of this report is shown in Appendix D of this report. The term 'collision' is used throughout. This should not be taken as the Council's view of the relative merits of terms 'collision', 'crash' or any other term (please note that the term 'accident' is no longer used).

Collision Data Management

Collection and Validation – Current Process

18. Leicestershire Police is responsible for recording details of road traffic collisions. The DfT sets the rules on what information must be collected. This includes basic information about the collision, the people that are injured, and the vehicles that are involved. The aim is to capture the key circumstances, and to provide enough information for any future investigation.

19. The DfT also publishes guidance (called STATS20) that explains what should and should not be reported. In the past, this information was collected on a paper form called STATS19. Since April 2020, Leicestershire Police has used a digital system called Pronto instead. This means that the Council now receives collision reports immediately after they are completed, rather than waiting for the paper forms to arrive by post.

20. Using a standard format makes it easier to share and understand the data. It also allows software companies to create tools that help to check and analyse the information.

21. The Council checks and records collision information on behalf of Leicestershire Police for the entire force area (including the City of Leicester and Rutland), using a system called AccsMap. When data is entered, the system checks that all required details are included and meet the DfT's rules. The Council's staff also manually review the information before and during the entry. If any information is missing or if the information looks incorrect, the staff contact the police to make sure that the data is accurate.

Data Provision and Sensitivity

22. Collision data is shared monthly with Leicestershire Police, Leicester City Council, Rutland Council, National Highways, and Leicestershire Fire and Rescue Service. It is also supplied to the DfT on behalf of Leicestershire Police, contributing to the DfT's national data and analysis for Great Britain.

23. The Council also receive ad-hoc requests for data, for both commercial and non-commercial purposes. Collision records include information that is classed as personal or sensitive, such as:

    a) Contributory factors based on the attending police officer's opinion;
    b) Personal details about the casualties (such as age or gender);
    c) Other circumstances that could affect the ongoing investigations (such as the description, the breath test results, the seat belt use).

24. Consequently, some of the information provided by the Police cannot be shared, as doing so would breach information security and data protection laws.

25. Data considered to be 'non-sensitive' or 'non-personal' is shared more widely, often for commercial requests or through Freedom of Information requests. Any additional information is only provided when it is essential for a road safety audit, and only if the third party agrees to use it solely for that purpose.

Data Quality

26. Every effort is made to ensure that collision data is accurate, but some factors are outside of the Council's control. For a report to reach the Council, the collision must either be attended by a police officer, reported at a police station or be an online submission that has been reviewed by a police officer. Only then will the Police send the report to the Council for validation.

27. In 2017, the number of reported collisions dropped by 30% compared to 2016, and this lower level has continued. A Leicestershire Police study found that changes in police processes (due to resource constraints) explained about 17% of the reduction, suggesting that the rest reflects a real fall in collisions. Police officers are now rarely deployed to collisions involving slight injuries, even though these should be included in the STATS19 dataset. This means that such collisions rely on the people who are involved to report them.

28. In January 2019, Leicestershire Police introduced an online reporting system called Single Online Home which allows the public to report Road Traffic Collisions. In May 2023, the Traffic Prosecutions Team at Leicestershire Police has started sending reports from this system to the Council, when the quality of information received by the Police is sufficient for validation. After consultation with the Road Safety Partnership and the DfT, these reports are now included in the STATS19 dataset.

29. The Council works closely with several teams at Leicestershire Police to keep data quality as high as possible. The common issues include:

    a) Reports of known collisions apparently not being sent through to the Council;
    b) Pedal cycles not always being recognised as vehicles, and reporting cyclists as pedestrians;
    c) Incorrect, missing, or contradictory information (such as the casualty severity, the locations, the vehicle directions, the speed limits, and goods vehicle details);
    d) No records of vehicles that failed to stop at the scene.

30. Improvements to the Police's Pronto system have reduced these problems, but any ongoing concerns are raised with Leicestershire Police and through Road Safety Partnership meetings.

STATS19 Changes

31. After a DfT review (2018-2021), the STATS19 specification changed for all collisions from 1 January 2024. The key changes include:

a) A new vehicle type for “personal powered transporter” (such as e-scooters);
b) Replacing the 79 “Contributory Factors” with 36 “Road Safety Factors”;
c) Removing the severity categories and introducing injury lists (which were mapped to old categories for comparison);
d) Adding in a way to show whether a report was made by a police officer or by a member of the public online.

32. To help the stakeholders adapt, the DfT released an updated technical specification (STATS21) and guidance (STATS20). A National Collision Reporting Form is also available for police forces that are not yet using digital systems, thereby replacing the old STATS19 paper form.

33. Leicestershire Police updated its Pronto system to meet these requirements, and so reports for collisions from 1 January 2024 now comply with the new specification.

Impact of the Change from Severity to Injury-Based Reporting

34. From 1 January 2024, the STATS19 specification replaced the traditional severity categories (slight, serious, fatal) with detailed injury lists, with each injury falling into one of the traditional severity categories. These lists are designed to provide a more accurate picture of the injuries that are sustained in collisions.

35. Under the old system, the classification of “serious” versus “slight” was often based on the attending police officer’s opinion and could vary between police forces. This sometimes led to an under-reporting of serious injuries, especially when the injuries were not immediately obvious at the scene.

36. Based on the DfT’s analysis of this historical under-reporting, the Council would expect to see more serious injuries being recorded, compared to slight injuries. Injuries that previously might have been incorrectly classed as “slight” will now automatically be classed as “serious” under the new definitions. This does not mean that the road safety has suddenly worsened, as it reflects a more accurate way of recording the severity of the injuries.

37. To avoid misleading trends, the DfT has published adjusted historical figures. These figures apply the new injury-based definitions to past data, so that local authorities can compare trends over time without misinterpreting the apparent rise in serious injuries.

38. The adjustment process uses statistical modelling to estimate how many injuries in previous years would have been classified differently under the new system. This ensures that comparisons between pre-2024 and post-2024 data are fair and meaningful.

39. The model which calculates the adjusted totals is updated each year alongside the published figures. This means that the estimated historical totals are likely to change year-on-year, but the DfT has stated that it does not expect these changes will be large or will result in a change in trends.

40. In Figure 1 below is a chart comparing Leicestershire’s unadjusted and adjusted totals for seriously injured casualties between 2015 and 2023, where it can be seen that the adjusted totals are higher for the reasons explained above.

Figure 1: Seriously Injured Casualties – Unadjusted vs Adjusted

41. Consequently, the number of slightly injured casualties is reduced each year, as can be seen in the chart in Figure 2 below.

Figure 2: Slightly Injured Casualties – Unadjusted vs Adjusted

42. While these adjustments improve comparability, they rely on modelling assumptions and carry some uncertainty, so figures should be interpreted with caution.

Reported Road Casualties 2024

Great Britain

43. The DfT uses data from local authorities to produce Reported Road Casualties Great Britain (RRCGB), the official national statistics on traffic casualties, fatalities, and related road safety data. The RRCGB is published in two stages each year, with provisional results at the end of June and an annual report with the final results at the end of September.

44. Local authorities compare these national statistics with their own statistics to identify any trends. However, differences are expected because local factors, such as geography, the road environment and driver behaviour, vary across the country. For example, wealthier areas may have more vehicles with advanced safety features, which can influence collision outcomes.

45. Both national and local decisions affect collision statistics. National policies shape local priorities and resources, which influence the decisions on services including road safety. These local outcomes then feed back into the national figures.

46. The RRCGB 2024 annual report and datasets were published at the end of September 2025, and they have been used to compare Leicestershire's performance against the national picture.

47. As recommended by the DfT, the adjusted historical totals are used for comparison in this report. Therefore, it should be assumed, unless it is otherwise stated, that it is adjusted totals that are being referred to for any years from 2023 and earlier (see paragraphs 35 to 43 for more information).

<u>Leicestershire</u>

48. Appendix B contains detailed information on Leicestershire's road traffic collisions and casualties. This includes information relating to:

    a) Collisions and casualties in 2024;
    b) Short, medium, and long-term trends;
    c) Travel modes;
    d) Road type (built-up vs non-built-up, local vs strategic road network);
    e) Age groups;
    f) Comparisons with other authorities and Great Britain.

49. Where possible, these figures have been compared with the national trends using the RRCGB 2024 data release.

50. The key statistics for 2024 include:

    a) **27 fatalities** in reported collisions, which is down from 34 in 2023.

    b) **259 serious injuries,** making **286 killed or seriously injured (KSI)**, the highest total since 2014 (adjusted figures). This continues the concern that KSI numbers are not falling.

    c) **942 casualties of all severities**, which is higher than in 2023 but still among the lowest that is on record and around half the level that was seen ten years ago.

    d) Long-term trends show **decreases of casualties for car occupants, pedestrians, and pedal cyclists,** but recent years have seen slower reductions or slight increases.

e) Over the past five years, **KSI casualties among car occupants, motorcyclists, children (0-15) and older people (60+) are generally rising.**

f) **Collisions involving personal powered transporters (such as e-scooters) remain very low**, just six in 2024. The national figures are relatively stable.

g) **Leicestershire ranks highly** when comparing the 2020-24 casualty rates against other counties, characteristically similar authorities, and the East Midlands average.

51. A further visual summary of these results has been produced by the Road Safety Partnership, and it is included in Appendix E of this report.

Vulnerable Road Users

52. The detailed statistics and trends for vulnerable road users in Leicestershire and Great Britain are provided in Appendix B, and it is broken down by the road user type and the age group. The key findings for 2024 (compared to the 2017-21 average unless stated) are:

a) **Pedestrians** – 4% fewer casualties overall in Leicestershire (the same as Great Britain), and 19% fewer KSI, with 32 in total and one fatality.

b) **Pedal cyclists** – overall casualties fell by 1% (compared to a 15% decrease nationally), but KSI casualties increased by seven, reaching 33 in total (two fatalities).

c) **Motorcyclists** – 15% more casualties (compared to 1% decrease nationally), and 19 more KSI casualties, with 63 in total (two fatalities).

d) **E-scooters** – six casualties in 2024 (one fewer than 2023), including three KSI (up from one in 2023). The national trends are covered in Appendix B.

e) **Children (aged 15 or under)** – 12% more casualties in 2024 (compared to a 9% decrease nationally). KSI casualties fell by two, with 14 in total and no fatalities.

f) **Older casualties (aged 60+)** – 10% fewer total casualties (compared to a 4% increase nationally), but 15% more KSI casualties (seven more), bringing the total to 50.

g) Local KSI trends by road user type or age group can be hard to interpret, because the small numbers involved can be prone to significant natural variation year-on-year.

<u>Human Error in Road Traffic Collisions</u>

53. It is difficult to say exactly what proportion of collisions are caused by human error, but the detailed analysis of reports over many years suggests that it is over 90%. Engineering measures help to reduce this risk by creating road environments that are easier for drivers to understand, thereby lowering the

chance of mistakes. Education, training and publicity campaigns focus on driver attitudes, and encouraging safer and more responsible behaviour.

2025 Provisional Update

54. Collision information for any year is provisional until it is validated by the DfT in the following year. The figures below are estimates and they may change, as the 2025 data has not yet been finalised.

Fatal Casualties

55. In 2025, **20 people were killed** in reported road traffic collisions in Leicestershire. Of these, 13 occurred on the Local Road Network, which is maintained by the Council.

Figure 3: Fatal Casualties in Leicestershire 2015-25 (provisional)

Killed or Seriously Injured Casualties

56. The rolling 12-month total (October 2024 to September 2025) suggests that **KSI casualties in 2025 will be lower than in 2024** once final figures are confirmed.

Figure 4: KSI Casualties in Leicestershire 2015-25 (provisional)

All Casualties

57. The same rolling 12-month total indicates that overall casualty numbers will remain similar to recent years. However, this estimate may change after the end-of-year process to capture missing collision reports.

Figure 5: All Casualties in Leicestershire 2015-25 (provisional)

Statistical Targets Review

National Targets

58. In November 2025, the DfT published the results of a review of road safety performance indicators (PIs) and targets, to determine if they are effective in improving road safety. The study examined the background to targets within the context of international efforts to improve road safety and the increasingly widespread adoption of the ‘safe system’ approach to road safety management.

The evidence suggests that targets play a role in reducing fatalities, but their impact cannot be separated from wider road safety strategies. The study recommended that the DfT considered adopting a national road safety performance framework. The Council will await further detail on the Government's approach to performance indicators and targets and assess the implications for the Council's own PIs and targets at that time.

59. On 7 January 2026, the Government published its new national Road Safety Strategy. This sets out an ambitious plan to reduce deaths and serious injuries on Britain's roads by 65% by 2035, with an even more stretching target of 70% for children under 16.

Local Targets

60. The Council's Road Safety Strategy sets two main targets:

    a) A 40% reduction in KSI casualties by 2035.
    b) Zero deaths caused by road traffic collisions by 2050.

61. The 40% reduction target is based on the 2016-2022 average "adjusted" KSI totals (as of December 2024), excluding 2020 and 2021 because the Covid-19 Pandemic affected traffic and casualty figures. This average is 284 KSIs per year, so the target for 2035 is 171 KSIs (rounded). Using this baseline ensures that the target reflects recent, reliable data.

62. It is important to note that the 2016-22 average may change in the future as the DfT updates its severity adjustment model for totals prior to 2023. However, the Council does not plan to update the target or milestones annually.

Figure 6: Path to 2035 Target (40% reduction in total KSI casualties)

63. Leicestershire has made significant progress in road safety over past decades. Setting a long-term goal of zero deaths caused by road traffic collisions by 2050 supports a 'vision zero' Safe Systems approach, which aligns with the national and international best practice.

64. These targets will be monitored through the annual casualty reduction report and reviewed, if necessary.

65. Additionally, the Council tracks key performance indicators for internal reporting:

    a) Total casualties on Leicestershire roads;
    b) Number of people KSI;
    c) Total casualties involving road users, walking, cycling and motorcyclists (excluding cars);
    d) Number of people KSI, walking, cycling and motorcyclists (excluding cars).

Approach to Casualty Reduction Update

Collision Investigation and Site Prioritisation

66. A list of 'cluster sites' is the starting point to the methods used by the Council for site prioritisation. A cluster site is a group of collisions that have occurred within a specified distance of each other, between a specified timeframe.

67. The Council uses 50 metres as the distance threshold (groups of collisions within a 50-metre radius), using collisions from the five most recent full calendar years (as confirmed with the DfT). This approach ensures comparability between years, and avoids results being skewed by factors such as seasonal variance. The site must also be on the Local Road Network (as opposed to the Strategic Road Network, which is managed by National Highways).

68. Cluster site lists are produced shortly after the data has been finalised for the previous year. These can only be used for site prioritisation once the DfT's RRCGB annual report has been released, to enable assessment against national averages and predicted collision rates. The cluster site list can be re-generated periodically through the year to identify emerging sites of concern.

69. The 2020 to 2024 cluster site list is shown in Appendix F of this report. Only cluster sites with seven or more collisions will be included on the list for site prioritisation. These sites include locations that are currently under investigation, where schemes are at present in design or have been recently implemented, locations that have been assessed but no further action is proposed, or where other major schemes are proposed.

70. An assessment is undertaken to identify sites with patterns of treatable collisions.

71. Sites which have been identified through this method are then investigated to identify any appropriate measures to reduce casualties.

72. If an appropriate scheme is identified, funding will be sought, or measures may be introduced as part of other schemes.

73. Where appropriate, an assessment of collisions involving specific vulnerable users or types of collisions may take place. As an example, these may include collisions in wet/damp conditions, collisions involving pedestrians, cyclists or motorcyclists or collisions on rural bends. This list would be used to bid for

funding that is targeted at specific types of measures. Alternatively, where appropriate, improvements could be delivered as part of other works.

Schemes

Schemes Completed or Ongoing

74. In the most recent interim cluster site list, 12 sites were identified where seven or more collisions were recorded within the previous five years of data. A list of these sites is provided in Appendix F of this report.

75. Of these, three have had a scheme recently implemented either as a cluster or a Rural Routes Initiative (RRI) scheme, or as part of another major scheme completion. These sites continue to be monitored, but no additional action is proposed.

76. Of the remaining sites:

    a) Four sites have a scheme currently proposed;
    b) Four sites are under investigation;
    c) One site was investigated and no clear pattern in the collisions was identified whereby a scheme could have been considered that is likely to result in a reduction in collisions.

77. Ten cluster site schemes are currently underway based on previous years analysis, the emerging 2024/25 end of year data and in year emerging concerns. These are:

    a) One Ash roundabout – signal installation.
    b) One Ash roundabout – Speed limit reduction (part of overall scheme for 25/26).
    c) B591 Charley Road, Crossroads – Traffic Signal Scheme.
    d) Fenn Lane, junction with Shenton Lane (VAS scheme).
    e) A5199 Welford Road junction with Bruntingthorpe Road.
    f) Beacon Road junction with Shepshed Road, Ulverscroft.
    g) Long Lane junction with Belvoir Road, Redmile.
    h) Shoby Bends.
    i) Paudy Lane, Seagrave.
    j) Station Street junction with Blaby Road, Wigston.

Potential Future RRI Routes and Schemes

78. The Rural Roads Initiative is a scheme where officers looked at all of the County's roads that were assigned the national speed limit and that are above 2.2km in length and reviewed these routes to identify those with a collision rate higher than the national average. Where the collision rate was found to be higher than the national average a scheme was proposed to reduce the speed limit from national to 50mph. Following on from the previous RRI completed schemes, a review of the potential routes for inclusion in future waves of schemes is undertaken annually once the complete and validated collision data from the previous year is available.

79. However, the fragility of the rates for these routes, specifically where collision numbers are low (one per year or fewer) suggest that a higher threshold for inclusion in the programme would help to identify those schemes whereby a change in the speed limit is most likely to be of benefit.

80. As such, a minimum of seven collisions in the most recent five years along the route will be introduced as a minimum threshold, as is the case with cluster sites, to be able to better justify further routes.

Casualty Reduction – the next steps

81. The above shows the Council's recent approach to casualty reduction in terms of cluster analysis and the RRI. The annual cluster analysis will continue to pick up new sites and the Council will continue to monitor existing sites annually.

82. It is, however, becoming more difficult to clearly identify viable intervention measures at the majority of the outstanding cluster sites, as there are no common identified causation factors for which an engineering solution would be appropriate.

83. Due to a combination of factors, including the continued underreporting issues of injury collisions, the significant decrease in slight injury collisions in 2020 due to the Pandemic travel restrictions and the impact of previous interventions, fewer viable sites are being identified through the RRI and cluster site studies, and therefore additional analysis is to be undertaken.

84. Whilst it is proposed to continue to undertake these studies, additional analysis has been carried out by the Council using a larger radius area which has identified several additional schemes. Council officers also looked at several sites which were not highlighted through the cluster analysis, but which had a high KSI rate.

85. The locations identified through this analysis have been looked at as a route, taking a holistic view of the whole location rather than looking at sections in isolation. This has led to the development of several schemes for analysis, including the A47 East and the works implemented along the A444 in addition to the cluster sites identified in Appendix F.

86. Periodic desktop reviews of KSI collisions will continue to be undertaken to ensure that the Council is aware of any emerging collision problems across the network. This will be undertaken alongside updates for cluster sites throughout the year.

87. National trends suggest that it is the strategic network of key 'A' and 'B' roads where casualty reduction is slower than on other parts of the national and regional highway network. A review of the Council's own Major Road Network has showed that rates are comparable or below the national levels. Therefore, route studies are being undertaken on other 'A' and 'B' roads across Leicestershire, with a focus on KSI collisions.

88. Officers have reviewed collision data on all 'A' roads within the County looking at the collision rate per billion vehicle kilometres and comparing this to the national

average for 2024, which is 235 collisions per billion vehicle kilometres. All 'A' roads within Leicestershire are below the national average rate.

Community Speed Enforcement

89. In March 2017, the Cabinet approved a trial Community Speed Management Initiative (CSMI), to combat issues around speeding and safety. The trial involved average speed cameras in seven locations across the County at a cost of £500,000 (funded from the Council's 2016/17 underspends).

90. The areas chosen were Sharnford, Woodhouse Eaves, Measham, Walcote, the A6 Harborough Road at Oadby, the A50 Field Head and the B676 Melton. The results of the trial showed that average speed cameras had a positive impact in reducing vehicle speeds.

91. Following the trial, the Cabinet considered a report in October 2020 on the establishment of a CSMI. It noted that funding of the programme would be identified and managed through the annual Environment and Transport Highways and Transportation Capital Programme and Works Programme. The report noted that the ongoing revenue budget for additional sites would need to be managed as part of the existing maintenance programme.

92. The Cabinet approved an ongoing programme of community speed enforcement, to deliver appropriate measures to reduce speed in communities. Before being considered as a suitable location for installation of cameras, several criteria must be satisfied.

93. The proposal involves a rolling programme of sites being identified, and average speed camera assets being moved around the County. A data collection exercise has been developed to identify sites that meet the criteria, as set out in the report considered by the Cabinet in October 2020.

94. Over 300 locations have been identified under CSMI as requiring extensive surveys to assess if they meet Council criteria and have a factual or perceived speeding issue. Countywide surveying began in January 2023 once the traffic levels had stabilised post-Pandemic, with all of the sites being completed by the summer of 2024.

95. Upon analysis of the data, officers identified an issue with some early sites surveys requiring to be re-surveyed. This took place in late 2024. The data collection was completed in late 2024, and it was then reviewed and analysed. Officers found no additional sites met the current criteria for average speed cameras. Officers are currently reviewing the initiative and the Council will look to bring an update on how the Council will move forward with the initiative or a new proposal.

20mph Zones

96. The guidance set out by the DfT suggests that the mean speed for a village road that is being considered for a 20mph speed limit/zone should be at or below 24mph. 24mph is the suggested speed since it falls in the lower end of the 20mph's and, therefore, the implementation of a 20mph limit would be self-enforcing, such as without the need for any physical traffic calming measures.

97. Where the mean speeds are higher that 24mph, physical calming measures, such as speed humps and chicanes, would be required to control and maintain speeds. For physical traffic calming features to be allowed on the highway, street lighting is required.

98. The requirements for the use and siting of such measures are set out in the same guidance from the DfT. Since 2002, the Council has been implementing advisory 20mph school safety zones at schools that have produced School Travel Plans. Appendix C of this report provides further information.

Road Safety Education in Primary Schools

99. There has been a gap in road safety education (RSE) delivery in schools for a number of years due to previous removal of funding however a recent review of services within the Department has now enabled a new RSE programme to be delivered by existing staffing resource. RSE is important because it saves lives. Teaching children and young people about how they can use the road safely is likely to reduce accidents and deaths on Leicestershire's roads. Road accidents are one of the main reasons that young people die with most of the injuries taking place between 8am and 9am and between 3pm and 7pm.

100. To deal with this, the Traffic & Safety team have developed a comprehensive road safety education programme that builds on children's learning from Foundation Year through to Year 6. The programme is a blended approach to teaching with a mix of live visits and digital teacher resources to enable maximum reach. All of the lessons are outcome led, they link to the national curriculum and they have clear learning objectives; through cooperative learning and behaviour change techniques, the Council's aim is to equip children with the skills required to become safe independent road users. Further information regarding this is provided in Appendix C, section 39.

Leicester, Leicestershire, and Rutland Road Safety Partnership (LLRRSP)

101. The LLRRSP brings together the following organisations:

a) Leicestershire County Council;
b) Leicester City Council;
c) Rutland Council;
d) Leicestershire Police;
e) National Highways;
f) Leicestershire Fire and Rescue Service;
g) Public Health;
h) East Midlands Ambulance.

102. The overall objective of the LLRRSP is to reduce the numbers of people killed and injured on the highway network within the Partnership area through collaborative working. The LLRRSP seeks to achieve this through the provision of camera enforcement and evidence-based programmes of road safety education, training, and publicity.

103. The Safety Camera Scheme is directly managed by Leicestershire Police. The police run and manage the static and mobile cameras and the processing of

offences from their Road Safety Unit. The police offer Driver Education Workshop (DEW) courses to drivers within a prescribed threshold.

104. The Council runs and manages the DEW operation; during the period 1 April 2024 to 31 March 2025, 41,796 drivers attended a National Driver Offender Retraining Scheme course. The DEW continues to offer clients the option of undertaking either a classroom or online course. This equates to more than 125,000 hours of driver training.

105. There is a memorandum of understanding between the main LLRRSP partners which runs from April 2023 until March 2028.

106. The LLRRSP structure consists of:

    a) A Board represented by senior managers from the individual organisations;
    b) A Management Group (allowing time to pick up items in detail from the Board);
    c) Service groups – Camera Operations, Data and Communications function, and the DEW are all represented by officers from across the Partnership.

107. A key focus for the Camera Operations Group has been the establishment of new hard standing areas for mobile enforcement plus the expansion of existing routes.

108. The digital cameras have not resulted in any significant changes in client numbers; the operation has worked hard to maintain a strong delivery presence in 2024/25.

109. The Data Group has produced casualty information to highlight trends and issues to inform the work of the Communications and Publicity Group (Appendix E).

110. A full programme of communication and training initiatives for 2024/25 was developed and approved by the LLRRSP Board. There has been an ongoing focus on the use of social media and social media-based advertising which matches the national approach from the THINK! campaign. During 2024, there were two separate road safety campaigns, one was aimed at reminding drivers of the dangers of selfish and unsafe parking at school pickup and drop off times, and the second highlighted the risks of driving while tired. This work is funded by the Partnership and managed by its Communications Officer.

111. The Senior Traffic Management Officer at Leicestershire Police has provided a report giving further detail on the Leicestershire Police's contribution to casualty reduction and the LLRRSP (Appendix A).

Consultations

112. Individual road safety schemes will continue to be subject to consultations with the local Members and the public, and reports will be made available to members, as appropriate.

Resource Implications

113. The Environment and Transport 2026/27 Highways and Transportation Capital Programme and Works Programme is the subject of a separate report for consideration by the Committee at this meting. This includes a Medium-Term Financial Strategy (MTFS) total of £8.91m for safety schemes of which £1.245m has been allocated for casualty reduction schemes for the four-year period 2026/27-2029/30.

Figure 7: MTFS: Capital Programme – Casualty Reduction Scheme allocation

Capital Programme allocation for Casualty Reduction Schemes	
2026/27	£538,000
2027/28	£207,000
2028/29	£250,000
2029/30	£250,000
4-year total: £1,245,000	

114. Despite being a low funded authority and regardless of years of austerity and budget savings, the Council has continued to provide a wide range of road safety initiatives in Leicestershire (as shown in Appendix C). Going forward, the Council's financial situation will be even more challenging. Whilst limited, funds will be focused on delivering the statutory duties along with other priorities, and this will include any necessary safety measures.

115. The Director of Corporate Resources and the Assistant Director of Law and Governance have been consulted on the contents of the report.

Conclusions

116. Overall, roads in Leicestershire are significantly safer than they were 20 or even 10 years ago, despite increases in motor vehicle traffic.

117. 2024 saw one of the lowest numbers of total casualties on record (942), while KSI casualties decreased but remain relatively high.

118. In June 2024, the Council adopted the Leicestershire Road Safety Strategy. This sets out its use of the Safe System approach to road safety and sets a 2035 casualty reduction target and long-term target of zero deaths caused by road traffic collisions.

119. On 7 January 2026, the Government launched its new national Road Safety Strategy. The Council's strategy aligns well with the Governments new strategy, including its use of a Safe System approach and its casualty reduction targets (2035 casualty reduction targets and long-term ambition for nobody to be killed or seriously injured on roads in Great Britain).

120. The Council will assess the implications of the Government's new national Road Safety Strategy in detail and, where appropriate, it will review its own approach to ensure that it aligns with the Governments new national strategy.

121. The approach taken to identifying sites and investigating concerns has been designed to ensure that benefits are maximised within the framework of the significant challenges that the Council faces.

122. Cluster sites will continue to be reviewed annually, but, as more of these sites are treated year-on-year, it is becoming more difficult to identify a significant number of schemes where appropriate and cost-effective mitigation measures can be justified from a collision reduction perspective.

123. As a result, and to continue contributing to reducing casualties, a review of the routes in the County (regardless of the speed limit and starting with the Major Road Network) will be undertaken to identify those where collision rates are high and where there is sufficient commonality in the collision types to justify the intervention.

124. The Council's road safety education programme will complement this process in targeting measures in an evidence-led approach.

Background Papers

18 May 2022 - County Council - Strategic Plan (2022-2026)
https://democracy.leics.gov.uk/ieListDocuments.aspx?CId=134&MId=6482&Ver=4#AI71461
https://www.leicestershire.gov.uk/about-the-council/council-plans/the-strategic-plan
(2024-26 refreshed plan)

21 June 2024 – Cabinet – Leicestershire County Council's Road Safety Strategy
https://democracy.leics.gov.uk/ieListDocuments.aspx?CId=135&MId=7507&Ver=4

Parliamentary Advisory Council for Transport Safety (PACTS): Manifesto for Road Safety 2024
https://www.pacts.org.uk/wp-content/uploads/PACTS-Manifesto-for-Road-Safety-2024-FINAL-1-.pdf

The Road Safety Trust: Manifesto for Road Safety 2024
https://www.roadsafetytrust.org.uk/news/new-manifesto-calls-for-immediate-and-strategic-action-to-improve-road-safety

Link to Minister's Statement
https://questions-statements.parliament.uk/written-questions/detail/2024-09-04/4310/

22 October 2024 – Cabinet – Leicestershire Highway Design Guide Review Update and Consultation Outcomes
https://democracy.leics.gov.uk/ieListDocuments.aspx?CId=135&MId=7510&Ver=4

22 November 2024 – Cabinet – Local Transport Plan (LTP4)
https://democracy.leics.gov.uk/ieListDocuments.aspx?CId=135&MId=7511&Ver=4

27 November 2025 – Department for Transport 'Effectiveness of targets for road safety' review
https://www.gov.uk/government/publications/effectiveness-of-targets-for-road-safety

7 January 2026 – Department for Transport – Road Safety Strategy

https://www.gov.uk/government/publications/road-safety-strategy

3 February 2026 – Cabinet – Provisional Medium Term Financial Strategy 2026/27 to 2029/30
https://democracy.leics.gov.uk/ieListDocuments.aspx?CId=135&MId=8304&Ver=4

Circulation under the Local Issues Alert Procedure

None

Equality Implications

125. Initiatives to reduce road casualties benefit all road users, but they are particularly important for vulnerable groups such as pedestrians, motorcyclists, cyclists, the young/elderly, and those with a disability.

126. Where appropriate, Equality Impact Assessments will be undertaken during the review of departmental policies and strategies or the development of measures and schemes.

Human Rights Implications

127. There are no human rights implications arising from this report.

Environmental Implications

128. As set out in paragraph 2 of this report, one of the key outcomes in the Council's Strategic Plan is 'Clean and Green'. Improvements in road safety and casualty reduction help toward achieving this outcome. Improving road safety through casualty reduction helps to reduce safety concerns associated with cycling, walking, and wheeling, and also helps to improve air quality, carbon reduction and public health through mode shift away from car use.

129. Environmental Impact Assessments will be carried out in relation to work undertaken on individual projects and programmes, where appropriate.

Health Implications

130. As set out in paragraph 2 of this report, one of the key outcomes in the Council's Strategic Plan is 'Safe and Well'. Improvements in road safety and casualty reduction help toward achieving this outcome. Casualty reduction achieved through road safety programmes outlined in this report have positive health implications, protecting the health and wellbeing of people, through reducing severity and number of casualties.

131. Improving road safety through casualty reduction helps to reduce both the existing and the perceived safety concerns that might deter people from using active and sustainable modes of transport, such as cycling, walking, and wheeling. These modes help to improve public health, along with air quality and carbon reduction, through mode shifts away from car use.

Appendices

Appendix A - Leicestershire Police Road Safety Report
Appendix B - Reported Road Casualties in Leicestershire 2024
Appendix C - Leicestershire's Road Safety Initiatives
Appendix D - Definitions
Appendix E - LLRRSP Road Safety Report 2024
Appendix F - Cluster Sites

Officers to Contact

Ann Carruthers
Director, Environment and Transport
Telephone: (0116) 305 7000
Email: Ann.Carruthers@leics.gov.uk

Janna Walker
Assistant Director, Development and Growth
Telephone: (0116) 305 0785
Email: Janna.Walker@leics.gov.uk

Appendix A

Environmental and Transport Overview and Scrutiny Meeting March 2026
Police and Road Safety Report For 2025

1. Leicester, Leicestershire, and Rutland Road Safety Partnership (RSP)

1.1 The Leicester, Leicestershire, and Rutland Road Safety Partnership (RSP) Board, chaired by Janna Walker, met several times during the year tackling a range of road safety matters in an ongoing effort to reduce casualties. Topics included: the continual rise in the number of drivers arrested for Drink/Drug driving (many having been involved in collisions); E-Scooters/E-Bikes, governance of the Road Safety Unit and funding of a variety of road safety projects throughout the year.

1.2 Topics referred to the Management Team for further investigative work included: the ongoing safety concerns around the emergence of E-Scooters/E-Bikes; School Gate Parking; Auto SpeedWatch and the procurement of camera equipment for the Road Safety Unit.

1.3 Membership of the RSP included representatives from each of the emergency services, National Health Service, local authorities and National Highways.

1.4 During the year, the Board approved bids from members for projects and initiatives totalling some £200,000. This funding was made available by the Road Safety Unit from payments received from attendees at the Driver Education Workshops who contravened a red light or were caught exceeding a speed limit.

1.5 Funded road safety projects included: social media campaigns; subsidised motorcycle training; Police Fatal Four operations; Leicestershire Fire and Rescue Service initiatives and the Road Safety Warning Zone in Leicester.

1.6 The RSP Data Group produced a concise report for the Board detailing its findings relative to casualties in 2024. Vulnerable road users were of particular concern and as such will remain a priority for attention going forward. This group includes young and elderly drivers; motor cyclists; pedal cyclists; pedestrians and horse riders.

1.7 Promotion of campaigns throughout the year was undertaken by the RSP Communications Officer, who made full use of the social media and liaised directly with officers in the Force, ensuring that all road safety initiatives were captured and made known to the wider media.

1.8 The RSP continued to receive many road safety messages via the police Neighbourhood Link website throughout 2025. Some thousands of residents have been signed up to this site which helps to swiftly recognise issues of public concern including speeding; car cruising; HGV movements; vehicle obstruction etc.

1.9 The RSP, once again, contributed to the National Police Chiefs Council campaign calendar throughout 2026, in addition to delivering local projects and campaigns.

2 Brief Interim Casualty Report

2.1 Regional Fatalities

Force	2020	2021	2022	2023	2024	2025
Derbyshire	18	28	32	35	33	20
Lincolnshire	52	37	46	46	53	37
Nottinghamshire	21	32	36	34	40	32
Northamptonshire	21	28	35	30	34	31
Leicestershire	26	28	34	39	28	31
TOTAL	**138**	**153**	**183**	**184**	**188**	**151**

2.2 It was pleasing to note the fall in the total number of fatal road collisions across the Region in 2025.

2.3 Every effort will continue to be made in 2026 to impact upon driver behaviour, to improve compliance with the traffic legislation and to deal with those drivers causing the most risk to other road users.

Number of people killed or seriously injured in road traffic collisions in Leicester, Leicestershire and Rutland in 2024.

2025 casualty data is yet to be validated

3. Enforcement

3.1 The Force continued to build up its strength during 2025. Subsequently, it is anticipated that the Road Policing Unit (RPU) will build up its strength in 2026 which will enable more enforcement of the Road Traffic laws, focussing on road safety matters.

3.2 Bi-monthly a meeting took place between the Serious Collision Investigation Unit, RPU and a representative from each Neighbourhood Policing Area (NPA) to discuss emerging road safety topics. This ensured that matters reported by our communities were swiftly acted upon.

3.3 A full Fatal4 programme was held across the Force area in 2025 involving personnel from the RPU, NPA, Special Constabulary and Volunteers. Events took place twice monthly in all Leicestershire towns with a view to enforcing road traffic regulations in the four most important collision contributory factors namely:

Drink/Drug-Driving
Non-Use of Seat Belt
Distraction
Speed

3.4 Regrettably, non-compliance across the Force area in 2025 continued to be disturbingly high at each Fatal4 event, raising ongoing road safety concerns with many drivers simply ignoring the danger caused by non-compliance, thereby putting others and themselves at risk of injury.

3.5 Each Fatal4 event, of four-hours duration, produced many traffic offences despite the RSPs ongoing efforts to gain compliance and improve road safety through education.

3.6 The Fatal4 programme, totalling around 30 events, will continue throughout 2026. The Police and Crime Commissioner and the media fully support this initiative and will continue to be invited to each operation.

4 Community Speed Watch (CSW)

4.1 CSW has been a popular and excellent speed deterrent during the past two decades when delivered in numerous villages in the Force area.

4.2 Throughout 2025, the RSP continued to place much importance on community engagement mindful of speed concerns and their relevance to road safety across Leicestershire and Rutland.

4.3 CSW again relied upon volunteers, trained by LCC officers, to gather the speed data using a calibrated handheld speed device, at sites across the county. This data was forwarded to the Traffic Management Section at FHQ where warning letters were despatched to each registered vehicle keeper.

4.4 During 2025, 17 CSW schemes, held at locations in Leicestershire, resulted in over 1,700 letters being sent to the registered keepers of vehicles found to be exceeding the posted speed limit.

4.5 The 2026 programme is currently being discussed between LCC and the Force. A full programme of schemes will go ahead during the year. The 2026 programme will be fully supported by the police, including the use of Force volunteers, together with the Safer Roads Team and attention by local neighbourhood officers.

4.6 In order to provide a more complete response and give additional community and volunteer reassurance, mobile speed enforcement vans deliver limited enforcement at the conclusion of each scheme.

5 Weight Restricted Zones

5.1 The increasing level of commercial and residential development, together with business activity, continued to lead to many complaints of possible breaches by HGVs of the 7.5 tonne weight restricted zones. Ongoing liaison between the Force and highway engineers regarding roadwork schemes was undertaken with a view to keeping local concerns on diversion routes to a minimum.

5.2 Complaints from members of the public regarding lorry movements were tackled primarily in a proactive manner by the Traffic Management Section in liaison with the Leicestershire CC. Wherever possible, telephone contact was made with the haulier concerned, with suitable advice being given. In the main, this action proved effective but where high levels of possible non-compliance continued, action was taken by the local area officers, supported by the Safer Roads Team, during their normal patrols.

6 Safer Roads Team (SRT)

6.1 The SRT, made up of trained Special Constables, continued to be a valuable help to the Roads Policing Unit, dealing with a raft of traffic related complaints across our communities. Subsequently, favourable comments were received from residents. Activity focussed on the many speed, car cruising and weight limit complaints sites, together with work on the ongoing problem of bridge strikes.

6.2 A vehicle dedicated to the team and financed through the RSP in 2021 proved invaluable ensuring that our communities received full value from the RSP investment.

6.3 Additional members of the Special Constabulary will continue to be sought to strengthen the SRT in 2026.

7 E-Scooters/E-Bikes

7.1 In 2025, it remained illegal to ride an E-Scooter on a public road in Leicestershire (N.B. the DFT pilot study has not taken place in this Force area).

7.2 These machines continued to be of concern to the RSP, with many collisions and casualties being reported. Officers completed the DFT Stats19 form after each occurrence involving an injury, with stats being collected at national level to help assess the growing problem.

7.3 E-Scooters are defined as 'powered transporters' and as such are covered by the road traffic acts, requiring to be taxed and insured, with the rider holding an appropriate driving licence.

7.4 The guidance to frontline officers operates on a two-stage process:

First Stop	Engagement and Education. Police computer record made.
Second Stop	Enforcement action taken with the machine confiscated and destructed.

Periodic enforcement events by NPA Commanders will continue into 2026.

7.5 It should be noted that the DFT's legislative and technical process, which includes road safety matters, will not conclude until 2026/27. All forces, therefore, await a government decision relative to legality and safety issues.

7.6 Frontline officers have and continue to give attention to the safety matters emerging from the use of modified E-Bikes which enable the machines to travel at excess speeds, thereby endangering other road users.

8 Movement of Abnormally Large Loads

8.1 The Force Abnormal Loads Officer liaised with her counterpart in E & T regarding the safe movement of large loads through Leicestershire. The number of daily notifications from hauliers intending to move a load through Leicestershire continued to rise in 2025.

8.2 A small minority of these movements related to very high loads not permitted to use the strategic road network, including the motorway. Such journeys are required to be undertaken on identified high load routes under the supervision of the Road Policing Unit.

8.3 The Traffic Management Section (TMS) maintained close liaison with E & T colleagues regarding the movement of infrastructure from a factory in Melton Mowbray to the West Midlands where the HS2 route was and continues to be under construction. Excessively long loads are escorted by the RPU. No community concern matters came to light during these movements in 2025.

8.4 Close liaison will continue until the conclusion of this major project in 2029.

9 Car Cruising

9.1 Frontline staff tackled the problem of car cruising at various sites across the Force area in 2025. These events, involving numerous cars, occurred spontaneously during the evening period, posing operational difficulties for the Force.

9.2 Operations will continue during 2026 with many drivers being dealt with for various offences.

10 Road Safety Unit (RSU)

10.1 All operational static speed, red light or combined red light and speed cameras are digital across the Force area, with data being transmitted wirelessly from the cameras directly to the RSU.

10.2 Despite continued best efforts to change driver behaviour, once again non-compliance to the posted speed limits and red-light running left much to be desired in 2025. This was evidenced by the number of drivers being prosecuted or opting to attend a driver educational course (as an alternative to prosecution).

10.3 In 2025:

10.3.1 The static digital cameras located across the Force area resulted in:

29563 Notices of Intended Prosecution being issued for speed.

6720 Notices of Intended Prosecution being issued for failing to comply with a red traffic signal.

10.3.2 The three older vehicles within our fleet have been replaced, completing a full complement of six speed camera vans equipped with enhanced imaging technology and all-wheel drive.

10.3.3 These vehicles continued to regularly visit both the core and community concern sites throughout the year, providing visible reassurance to residents concerned about the excessive speed of road users in their localities. The speed enforcement officers delivered 2345 site visits, equating to 3410 hours of speed enforcement, detecting 15432 road users exceeding the pre-set threshold of 10% + 2mph, above the posted speed limit.

10.3.4 The 7 average speed cameras, installed as a pilot by Leicestershire County Council, resulted in 11623 Notices of Intended Prosecution being issued.

10.3.5 The Motorway speed cameras installed by National Highways on the M1 J23A – J25 resulted in 5834 Notices of Intended Prosecution being issued (4091 speed and 1743 Red X).

10.3.6 Overall the RSU issued a combined total of 69172 Notices of Intended Prosecution

10.3.7 A total of 39567 drivers - inclusive of officer issued notices, opted for and completed a Driver Educational Course.

10.3.8 The Road Safety Unit had a busy year dealing with speeding concerns from Communities.

10.3.9 A total of 221 concerns were dealt with. Of these, 168 were speed related and 53 were other traffic related issues such as HGV's which were dealt with outside of the Unit.

10.3.10 16 covert speed surveys were completed and of these, 1 met the speed and collision criteria for Mobile Van Speed Enforcement. A further 6 had high speeds but fewer collisions and enforcement was requested from Police Officers for these. During 2025 the Partnership purchased the Agilysis Speed Compliance Tool which has been used by the Police and Councils to provide speed data and respond to complaints. The Tool has identified 1 new site for the van and 2 for Police enforcement.

10.3.11 Including sites on known Community Concern Bike Routes, Speed Enforcement Vans made 940 visits to Community Concern Sites, equating to over 1361 hours of enforcement time detecting 6128 road users exceeding the pre-set threshold of 10% + 2mph, above the posted speed limit.

10.3.12 In addition, the speed enforcement officers supported Community Speed Watch schemes in Leicestershire and Rutland making a total of 152 visits equating to 212 hours of speed enforcement time detecting 495 road users exceeding the pre-set threshold of 10% + 2mph, above the posted speed limit.

11 Concluding Comments

11.1 The RSP continued to strive to make an impact on road casualties during 2025 and will address any emerging trends in the coming year. Funding, by the Board in 2026, will again be made available by the Road Safety Unit to undertake a number of projects in order to continue to get the road safety messages across to a wide range of road users.

11.2 Despite ongoing work by the RSP tackling road safety matters on a number of fronts, road casualties continue to be a major concern going forward. Interim data for 2025 indicates that over 400 people will have been killed or seriously injured in the Force area.

11.3 Day to day liaison between officers of the Environmental & Transport Department, the Force Traffic Management Section and the Road Safety Unit continues to be an important part of our effectiveness. An excellent working relationship between the parties has been fostered over many years which ensures that the best possible service is afforded to our communities when dealing with their traffic and road safety concerns. The ongoing support from our

elected representatives also continues to underpin the RSP road safety strategy including enforcement of traffic laws by the police.

11.4 The Police and Crime Commissioner took an active interest in road safety and the RSP in 2025 and continues to do so. A regular meeting takes place at HQ with a PCC representative, the RSP Comms Officer and the Senior Traffic Management Officer to discuss mutual road safety initiatives.

11.5 Ongoing analysis of casualty data by the RSP continues to ensure that any emerging trends are identified and acted upon in a collaborative manner in order to reduce the risks involved. As always, innovation and partnership working will continue to be the order of the day.

11.6 On the policing front, additional frontline resources are to be welcomed and these officers will assist greatly in helping to deliver our aims and objectives in the coming year with a view to further reducing road casualties. The close working relationship with local teams, the RSP and the Traffic Management Section will continue into 2026.

Graham Compton
Senior Traffic Management Officer
Leicestershire Police

Matthew Chester
Road Safety Unit Manager
Leicestershire Police

,'

APPENDIX B

Leicestershire County Council

REPORTED ROAD CASUALTIES

LEICESTERSHIRE 2024

IMPORTANT NOTE:
Totals for 2023 and earlier use the Department for Transport's adjusted figures, which account for historical underreporting of serious injuries as slight. This ensures a fair comparison with 2024 and later data, where this underreporting is no longer an issue.

There were 286 reported killed or seriously injured casualties in 2024, 32 more than 2023. Compared with the 2012–2016 average, killed or seriously injured casualties in 2024 were 11% higher, while total casualties were 49% lower.

ABOUT THIS REPORT

This report provides an overview of reported road casualties in 2024 in Leicestershire. This is created to support LCC's annual report on casualty reduction.

CONTENTS

Introduction p.2

Summary and headline figures p.3

Casualties by road user type p.5

Casualties by road type p.14

National comparisons p.17

Definitions & sources p.20

CONCLUSIONS

- Total casualties in 2024 were among the lowest on record, continuing the long-term trend that appears to show overall casualty numbers are decreasing albeit with a slowed rate of decline in recent years.
- Killed or seriously injured (KSI) casualties have shown little reduction nationally but have increased locally compared to previous averages.
- Leicestershire continues to be a high performing authority when compared with other County authorities, East Midlands authorities and statistical neighbours.
- Leicestershire generally performs well on overall casualty statistics compared to the rest of Great Britain. However, trends for KSI casualties often show a divergence between local and national patterns.

INTRODUCTION

This report provides the number of personal-injury road traffic collisions in Leicestershire that were reported by the police in 2024 using the Department for Transport's STATS19 reporting system. It also includes the number of people killed or injured in these collisions and which road user group they were in. This information has been collected since 1979, providing a long period for comparison.

The information used to create these statistics are collected by police forces, either through officers attending the scene of collisions or from members of the public reporting the collision after the incident. There is no obligation for people to report all personal-injury collisions 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 collisions or casualties in Leicestershire.

All collisions that were reported by the police and that occurred on a public highway involving at least one motor vehicle, horse rider or pedal cyclist, and where at least one person was injured are included. Collisions that happened on private land (including private drives) or car parks are not included in the statistics. Damage only collisions that do not result in personal injury are also excluded from these statistics.

Throughout this document, 2024 statistics are compared against:

- **2023** – for information rather than meaningful comparison, as year-on-year variation can be high
- **2017-2021 average & 2012-2016 average** – averages to represent the approximate situation five and ten years ago respectively. Averages are used rather than single years (2019 and 2014) to ensure that "anomaly" years do not skew the comparisons too greatly.

STRENGTHS AND WEAKNESSES OF THE DATA

Comparisons of road collision reports with death registrations show that very few, if any, road collision fatalities are not reported by the police. However, it has long been known that a considerable proportion of non-fatal casualties are not known to the police, as hospital, survey and compensation claims data all indicate a higher number of casualties than police collision data would suggest.

For years prior to 2024, reported serious injury figures were affected by differences in police reporting systems, with judgment-based methods historically underestimating severity compared to injury-based systems. To address this, the Department for Transport now applies statistical adjustments to earlier data, providing a more comparable basis for trend analysis. While these adjustments improve comparability, they rely on modelling assumptions, are updated annually, and carry some uncertainty, so figures should be interpreted with caution.

Resource-driven process changes at Leicestershire Police have been acknowledged by the Force to have contributed to a 17% fall in the number of reported collisions. Officers are typically no longer deployed to collisions where casualties have only suffered slight injuries, despite such collisions being part of the STATS19 dataset. It is therefore incumbent on the casualties involved to report such collisions to the ever-lessening number of police stations.

Therefore the data used as the basis for these statistics should not be regarded as a complete record of all personal injury road collisions. Nevertheless, police data on road collisions, whilst not perfect, remain the most detailed, complete and reliable single source of information on road casualties covering the whole of Great Britain, in particular for monitoring trends over time.

SUMMARY FIGURES

The table below shows the number of reported road casualties in Leicestershire in 2024 compared with previous years, and the percentage change reported by DfT in comparison with 2024 casualty figures for Great Britain (GB):

Leicestershire	2024	2023			2017-2021 average			2012-2016 average		
		Leics		GB	Leics		GB	Leics		GB
All casualties	942	916	+3%	-4%	1040	-9%	-12%	1832	-49%	-32%
KSI	286	254	+13%	-1%	235	+22%	+3%	257	+11%	-11%
Killed	27	34	-21%	-1%	23	+17%	-4%	29	-6%	-9%
Seriously injured	259	220	+18%	-0.5%	212	+22%	+3%	228	+14%	-12%
Slightly injured	656	662	-1%	-4%	806	-19%	-16%	1575	-58%	-36%

HEADLINE STATISTICS

A total of **27 people were killed** in reported road traffic collisions in Leicestershire in 2024, seven fewer than 2023.
Fatal collisions

The long-term trend of Great Britain is a statistically significant fall between 2006 and 2010, followed by relative consistency between 2010-24 aside from a reduction during the COVID-19 pandemic. Most of the year-on-year changes since 2010 are either explained by one-off causes (for instance, the snow in 2010) or natural variation, which is stronger at a local level due to the smaller numbers involved.

At a local authority level, trends can be more reliably seen by comparing killed and seriously injured casualties together, a nationally recognised statistic with the acronym "KSI".

A total of **286 people were killed or seriously injured** in reported road traffic collisions in Leicestershire in 2024. This is more than 2023 (254), and more than both the 2017-2021 average (235), and the 2012-2016 average (257).

Long-term national trends from 2000 to now shows a consistent decrease from 2000 to 2010, but generally little change from 2010 to now, aside from a marked decrease during the COVID-19 pandemic. Locally, it's hard to determine how much of the 2024 increase reflects changes in reporting methods, but if the DfT's adjusted estimates are accurate, it suggests a significant rise compared with recent years.

There was a total of **942 casualties of all severities (combined)** in reported road traffic collisions in Leicestershire in 2024. This is broadly in line with totals seen since 2019, but is a significant decrease when compared with the 2017-2021 average (1040) and the 2012-2016 average (1832).

This mirrors the long-term trend seen nationally of decreasing casualty numbers across Great Britain, although with similar numbers reported over the past few years.

CASUALTIES BY ROAD USER TYPE

TOTAL CASUALTIES BY ROAD USER TYPE

Mode	2024	% share	2023		2017-2021 Average		2012-2016 average	
Car Occupant	**591**	**63% (GB 55%)**	**580**	**+2%**	**695**	**-15%**	**1258**	**-53%**
Pedestrian	**101**	**11% (GB 15%)**	**103**	**-2%**	**105**	**-4%**	**158**	**-36%**
Motor Cyclist	**104**	**11% (GB 12%)**	**97**	**+7%**	**91**	**+15%**	**167**	**-38%**
Pedal Cyclist	**85**	**9% (GB 11%)**	**68**	**+25%**	**86**	**-1%**	**152**	**-44%**
Van Occupant	**34**	**4% (GB 3%)**	**44**	**-23%**	**39**	**-13%**	**60**	**-43%**
HGV Occupant	**9**	**1% (GB 0.5%)**	**8**	**+13%**	**6**	**+45%**	**19**	**-53%**
Bus Occupant	**9**	**1% (GB 2%)**	**7**	**+29%**	**6**	**+61%**	**4**	**+105%**
Other Vehicle Occupant	**9**	**1% (GB 2%)**	**9**	**0%**	**13**	**-31%**	**14**	**-34%**

Percentages may not total 100% due to rounding

The split of casualties by road user type in Leicestershire largely mirrors the share across Great Britain, with the most noticeable difference being that only 63% of casualties in Leicestershire are car occupants whereas this is 55% across Great Britain.

Further information on casualties and casualty rates by road user type across Great Britain can be found in the Department for Transport's 2024 Annual Report (https://www.gov.uk/government/statistics/reported-road-casualties-great-britain-annual-report-2024/reported-road-casualties-great-britain-annual-report-2024#casualties-and-rates-by-road-user-type).

CAR OCCUPANTS

Leicestershire	2024	2023			2017-2021 average			2012-2016 average		
		Leics		GB	Leics		GB	Leics		GB
All casualties	591	580	+2%	-4%	695	-15%	-16%	1258	-53%	-38%
Killed or Seriously Injured	145	122	+18%	+1%	111	+31%	+8%	130	+12%	-7%

All Severities (Combined)

Killed or Seriously Injured (KSI)

Car occupants continue to account for the largest proportion of casualties of all severities. There were a total of **591 car occupant casualties**, which is higher than 2023 but the joint second lowest total on record. 73% of the car occupant casualties were drivers and 27% were passengers.

A total of 145 car occupants were killed or seriously injured in 2024. This is up from 2023 by 23 and also higher than the 2017-2021 and 2012-2016 averages. Of the 145 car occupant casualties, 21 were fatal, accounting for 78% of all fatal casualties in Leicestershire in 2024.

The general long-term trend for overall car occupant casualties appears to be downwards albeit with the rate of decline appearing to slow in recent years. However, the same cannot be said for killed or seriously injured casualties, either locally or nationally, which appear to be rising.

PEDESTRIANS

Leicestershire	2024	2023			2017-2021 average			2012-2016 average		
		Leics		GB	Leics		GB	Leics		GB
All casualties	**101**	**103**	**-2%**	**-0.5%**	**105**	**-4%**	**-4%**	**158**	**-36%**	**-21%**
Killed or Seriously Injured	**32**	**41**	**-22%**	**-3%**	**40**	**-19%**	**+1%**	**34**	**-7%**	**-16%**

All Severities (Combined)

Killed or Seriously Injured (KSI)

A total of **101 pedestrian casualties** were reported in 2024, which is two less than 2023. Similarly, there has been little change nationally between the two years.

The long-term trend is still downwards, with a significant decrease compared with the 2012-2016 average (36%), although the rate of decline has slowed with the past two years both higher than 2022's total.

A total of **32 pedestrians were killed or seriously injured** in 2024, 9 less than in 2023. Of the 32 casualties, one was fatal.

The small numbers of killed or seriously injured pedestrian casualties in Leicestershire makes it difficult to identify local trends, as variations could be a result of natural variation and cannot be easily attributed to underlying causes.

PEDAL CYCLISTS

Leicestershire	2024	2023			2017-2021 average			2012-2016 average		
		Leics		GB	Leics		GB	Leics		GB
All casualties	85	68	+25%	-3%	86	-1%	-15%	152	-44%	-25%
Killed or Seriously Injured	33	24	+39%	-3%	26	+28%	-11%	23	+45%	-16%

All Severities (Combined)

Killed or Seriously Injured (KSI)

Overall pedal cyclist casualties increased in 2024, with **85 pedal cyclist casualties** reported in Leicestershire.

Although total pedal cyclist casualties have declined significantly over the past decade, most of that reduction occurred before 2019. Since then, numbers have largely stagnated, with 2024 recording the highest total since 2018.

There were **33 killed or seriously injured pedal cyclists** in 2024 in Leicestershire, 9 more than 2023, with two fatalities.

Due to the significant year-on-year variation caused by the small numbers involved, it is difficult to identify local trends for killed or seriously injured pedal cyclist casualties.

However, the national picture suggests significant reductions in casualty totals across Great Britain, which are not reflected in Leicestershire's figures.

MOTORCYCLISTS

Leicestershire	2024	2023			2017-2021 average			2012-2016 average		
		Leics		GB	Leics		GB	Leics		GB
All casualties	**104**	**97**	**+7%**	**-6%**	**91**	**+15%**	**-1%**	**167**	**-38%**	**-18%**
Killed or Seriously Injured	**63**	**54**	**+18%**	**+0.4%**	**44**	**+42%**	**-0.4%**	**56**	**+12%**	**-18%**

All Severities (Combined)

Killed or Seriously Injured (KSI)

In total there were **104 motorcyclist casualties** in Leicestershire in 2024, seven more than in 2023.

Motorcycle casualties in Leicestershire and across Great Britain appear to be following a similar increasing trend following the COVID-19 pandemic, although nationally 2024's total was lower than 2022 and 2023.

There were **63 motorcyclists reported killed or seriously injured** in Leicestershire in 2024, up from 54 in 2023 and continuing the recent upward trend. It is higher than both the 2017-2021 average (44) and the 2012-2016 average (56). Of the 63, two were fatal.

Due to the significant year-on-year variation caused by the small numbers involved, it is difficult to identify local trends for killed or seriously injured motorcyclist casualties.

E-SCOOTERS

Number of casualties in collisions involving e-scooters	2024		2023		2022		2021	
	Leics	GB	Leics	GB	Leics	GB	Leics	GB
All Severities	**6**	**1390**	**7**	**1387**	**7**	**1502**	**5**	**1434**
Killed or Seriously Injured	**3**	**450**	**1**	**422**	**3**	**453**	**0**	**431**

Very few collisions involving e-scooters have been reported to-date in Leicestershire, as is the case in most other force areas. It is therefore impossible to identify any trends at a local level, until more data is available.

The Department for Transport (DfT) has produced an e-scooter factsheet to accompany its Reported Road Casualties in Great Britain 2024 report. The main points of this report state that:

- there were 1,312 collisions involving e-scooters, compared to 1,292 in 2023
- of all collisions involving e-scooters, 306 included only one e-scooter with no other vehicles involved in the collision (single vehicle collision), compared to 284 in 2023
- there were 1,390 casualties in collisions involving e-scooters, compared to 1,387 in 2023
- of all casualties in collisions involving e-scooters, 1,096 were e-scooter users, compared to 1,117 in 2023
- there were 6 people killed in collisions involving e-scooters (5 of whom were e-scooter riders) compared to 6 in 2023
- the Department for Transport's best estimate, after adjusting for changes in reporting by police, is that there were 444 seriously injured and 940 slightly injured casualties in collisions involving e-scooters, this compares to 415 and 966 respectively in 2023.

Further detail is included in the factsheet, including:

- Reported casualties in collisions involving e-scooters by month, age, sex and time of day
- Reported casualties by police force area. There were 19 casualties in the Leicestershire Police force area (including the City of Leicester and Rutland) in 2024, accounting for just 1% of the figures nationally. The highest proportion by some way (20%) is the Metropolitan Police force area.
- Reported e-scooters involved in collisions by ownership type (in trial areas where private and rental e-scooters are distinguished from each other)
- Reported casualties in collisions involving e-scooters by injury type. Three out of the top five most common type of injuries sustained in collisions involving e-scooters (to the e-scooter users or others) are all of slight severity, although five out of the top ten are of a serious nature.

It should be noted that in 2023, e-scooters were not one of the designated vehicle types collected in the STATS19 specification. Until the end of 2023, they were recorded as "Other vehicle" with the type of vehicle being added in a free text field. This makes it possible to report on collisions and casualties involving e-scooters, prior to the change coming into effect from 2024 onwards making them a specific vehicle type in the specification.

CHILDREN (AGED 15 OR UNDER)

Leicestershire	2024	2023			2017-2021 average			2012-2016 average		
		Leics		GB	Leics		GB	Leics		GB
All casualties	92	69	+33%	-1%	82	+12%	-9%	140	-34%	-30%
Killed or Seriously Injured	14	20	-30%	+1%	16	-10%	+4%	15	-8%	-16%

All Severities (Combined)

Killed or Seriously Injured (KSI)

There were **92 reported child casualties in total** in 2024 in Leicestershire. This is higher than the 2023 total (69) and 2017-2021 average (82), but lower than the 2012-2016 average (140).

There were **14 children killed or seriously injured** in Leicestershire in 2024, six less than 2023, with no fatalities.

While the total number of casualties increased, fewer involved serious injury (13% in 2024 compared to 22% in 2023).

Nevertheless, the natural variation of the small numbers involved makes it difficult to identify any clear trends at a local level.

YOUNGER CASUALTIES (AGED 17 TO 24)

Leicestershire	2024	2023			2017-2021 average			2012-2016 average		
		Leics		GB	Leics		GB	Leics		GB
All casualties	**144**	**161**	**-11%**	**-5%**	**207**	**-30%**	**-16%**	**431**	**-67%**	**-43%**
Killed or Seriously Injured	**58**	**43**	**+33%**	**-1%**	**47**	**+23%**	**+2%**	**58**	**+0.2%**	**-22%**

All Severities (Combined)

Killed or Seriously Injured (KSI)

There were **144 reported younger total casualties** in 2024 in Leicestershire, continuing the consistent decrease seen over the past five years.

As is the case nationally, the trend is generally downwards with a 30% reduction in Leicestershire against the 2017-2021 average, and 67% when compared with the 2012-2016 average.

There were **58 killed or seriously injured younger casualties** in Leicestershire in 2024, 15 more than 2023, with 1 fatality.

OLDER CASUALTIES (AGED 60 AND OVER)

Leicestershire	2024	2023			2017-2021 average			2012-2016 average		
		Leics		GB	Leics		GB	Leics		GB
All casualties	145	173	-16%	+3%	162	-10%	+4%	236	-39%	-14%
Killed or Seriously Injured	50	53	-5%	+2%	43	+15%	+17%	42	+20%	+11%

All Severities (Combined)

Killed or Seriously Injured (KSI)

The **total number of older casualties was 145** in Leicestershire in 2024. This is a 16% decrease from 2023, a 10% decrease from the 2017-2021 average and 39% from the 2012-2016 average indicating a generally downward long-term trend.

There were **50 killed or seriously injured** older casualties in Leicestershire in 2024, three less than 2023, continuing a short-term downward trend after a significant increase between 2020 and 2022. However the number of killed or seriously injured older casualties has continued to increase across Great Britain.

In previous years, it has been speculated by the Department for Transport that the growing population of people within this age group may partly explain the slight upturn in killed or seriously injured casualties.

CASUALTIES BY ROAD TYPE

BUILT-UP ROADS (20/30/40MPH)

Leicestershire	2024	2023			2017-2021 average			2012-2016 average		
		Leics		GB	Leics		GB	Leics		GB
All casualties	**490**	**453**	**+8%**	**-4%**	**521**	**-6%**	**-12%**	**891**	**-45%**	**-30%**
Killed or Seriously Injured	**138**	**110**	**+25%**	**-1%**	**107**	**+30%**	**+4%**	**106**	**+30%**	**-9%**

All Severities (Combined)

Killed or Seriously Injured (KSI)

There were **490 total casualties on built-up roads** in Leicestershire in 2024. This is 8% more than 2023 (453), but a decrease compared to the 2017-2021 average (521), and 2012-2016 average (891).

The long-term trend is similar across Great Britain, with a relatively continuous decrease among casualties of all severities over the past ten years excluding the increase following the Covid-19 pandemic, although in recent years the casualty totals in Leicestershire are increasing, contrary to what is happening nationally.

There were **138 killed or seriously injured casualties reported on built-up roads** in 2024, 28 more than 2023 while there was little change across Great Britain.

There does not appear to be a clear trend either locally or nationally, with numbers staying broadly within the same range for the past ten years.

NON-BUILT-UP ROADS (50/60/70MPH)

Leicestershire	2024	2023			2017-2021 average			2012-2016 average		
		Leics		GB	Leics		GB	Leics		GB
All casualties	**396**	**393**	**+1%**	**-1%**	**455**	**-13%**	**-9%**	**774**	**-49%**	**-35%**
Killed or Seriously Injured	**138**	**136**	**+2%**	**-0.3%**	**113**	**+22%**	**+1%**	**133**	**+4%**	**-17%**

All Severities (Combined)

Killed or Seriously Injured (KSI)

There were **396 total casualties on non-built-up roads** in Leicestershire in 2024. This continues a five-year trend of near-identical totals, with no clear increase or decrease.

The long-term trend is similar locally and nationally across Great Britain, with a relatively continuous decrease among casualties of all severities, although the decrease appears to have slowed in recent years.

There were **138 killed or seriously injured casualties reported on non-built-up roads** in 2024, which is two higher than 2023 and one of the highest totals in the past ten years.

National trends show little significant change over a ten-year period, with the KSI totals hovering around the same area, while locally the totals since the COVID-19 pandemic remain higher than they were in the years prior to this.

LOCAL ROAD NETWORK V STRATEGIC ROAD NETWORK

Leicestershire County Council is responsible as Local Highway Authority for all non-strategic publicly maintainable highways in Leicestershire – the Local Road Network (LRN). The Strategic Road Network (SRN) comprises of motorways and major trunk roads which are managed by National Highways. Across England, they comprise just 2.4% of total road length but 20.3% of major road length and 33.8% of motorised traffic.

Severity	2024		2023				2017-2021 average				2012-2016 average			
	LRN	SRN	LRN		SRN		LRN		SRN		LRN		SRN	
All	821	65	785	+5%	62	+5%	905	-9%	74	-12%	1547	-47%	121	-46%
KSI	259	17	225	+15%	22	-21%	204	+27%	18	-8%	221	+17%	22	-22%

All Severities (Combined)

Killed or Seriously Injured (KSI)

The trends for overall casualty totals on local (LCC) and strategic (National Highways) roads in Leicestershire are broadly in line with each other, which illustrates a significant decrease from 10 years ago although with a slowing rate of decline in recent years, and a small recent increase.

Killed or seriously injured (KSI) casualties on the Strategic Road Network fluctuate considerably year-on-year because of the relatively small numbers involved.

On the Leicestershire County Council–maintained local road network, overall KSI figures show little change compared to ten years ago. While there was a notable decline up to 2019, this improvement has been offset by increases since 2020.

COMPARISONS WITH OTHER AUTHORITIES

When comparing with other authorities it is far more worthwhile comparing casualty rates, rather than absolute numbers. This allows the statistics to take demographics into account, which in this case are population (per million people) and amount of traffic (billion vehicle kilometres).

STATISTICAL NEIGHBOURS

The authorities listed below were identified as being similar enough characteristically to Leicestershire with respect to road length, urban/rural % and population, for direct comparison to be worthwhile.

Leicestershire ranks 3rd for population-based casualty rates and 2nd for traffic flow-based rates among its statistical neighbours, based on the 2020-2024 average.

COUNTIES

Leicestershire continues to perform well compared to other defined counties, ranking 2nd for casualty rates per million population and per unit of traffic flow based on 2020-2024 averages.

EAST MIDLANDS

Within the East Midlands, Leicestershire ranks second for casualty rates per million population and also second for rates per billion vehicle kilometres, based on 2020-2024 data.

DEFINITIONS

Casualty: A person killed or injured in a collision. Casualties are sub-divided into killed, seriously injured and slightly injured.

Collision*: Involves personal injury occurring on the public highway (including footways) in which at least one road vehicle or a vehicle in collision with a pedestrian is involved and which becomes known to the police within 30 days of its occurrence. One collision may give rise to several casualties. “Damage-only” collisions are not included.

Fatal collision: A collision in which at least one person is killed.

Injury collision: A collision involving human injury or death.

Killed: Casualties who sustained injuries which caused death less than 30 days after the collision. Confirmed suicides are excluded.

KSI: Killed or seriously injured.

Serious collision: One in which at least one person is seriously injured but no person (other than a confirmed suicide) is killed.

Serious injury: An injury for which a person is detained in hospital as an “in-patient”, or any of the following injuries whether or not they are detained in hospital: fractures, concussion, internal injuries, crushing, burns (excluding friction burns), severe cuts, severe general shock requiring medical treatment and injuries causing death 30 or more days after the collision. An injured casualty is recorded as seriously or slightly injured by the police on the basis of information available within a short time of the collision. This generally will not reflect the results of a medical examination, but may be influenced according to whether the casualty is hospitalised or not. Hospitalisation procedures will vary regionally.

Severity: Of a collision; the severity of the most severely injured casualty (either fatal, serious or slight). Of a casualty; killed, seriously injured or slightly injured.

Slight collision: One in which at least one person is slightly injured but no person is killed or seriously injured.

Slight injury: An injury of a minor character such as a sprain (including neck whiplash injury), bruise or cut which are not judged to be severe, or slight shock requiring roadside attention. This definition includes injuries not requiring medical treatment.

* The term ‘collision’ is used throughout this report. This should not be taken as the Council’s view of the relative merits of the terms ‘accident’, ‘collision’, ‘crash’ or any other term.

OTHER SOURCES

Department for Transport: Reported Road Casualties in Great Britain: 2024 Annual Report

Department for Transport: Road Lengths in Great Britain 2024

Department for Transport: Road Traffic Estimates: Great Britain 2024

Office for National Statistics: Population estimates

APPENDIX C

Leicestershire's Road Safety Initiatives

Providing a Safer Road Environment

Development Control

1. Most individual applications are for quite small sites and, in total during 2024, the Council made approximately 1921 minor responses to consultations on planning applications. In granting planning permission, the local planning authority considers comments made by Leicestershire County Council as the local highway authority. When making comments on planning applications, the account is taken of where the proposal is located and whether it is in an accessible location with appropriate provision for walking, cycling and public transport. The Council also aims to ensure that the highway infrastructure required to serve new development is designed to minimise the risk of road traffic collisions.

2. These principles also apply to large sites. Throughout Leicestershire, several strategic development sites are planned for delivery over the next 10-15 years to meet housing need across the County. These strategic sites can vary in size from a few hundred to several thousand dwellings. During 2024, plans for highway infrastructure at a number of these strategic development sites across the County were worked on, and in total, approximately 1752 major responses to these consultations were made.

Road Safety Audit

3. Whilst road improvement schemes are designed in accordance with established guidance and standards, unintended safety problems can arise. To guard against this, improvement schemes are subject to road safety audit by accident investigation staff that use their experience of looking into why collisions have happened at other locations throughout the County to identify and correct potentially dangerous features within an improvement scheme. The design of the scheme is checked at least once before construction commences and the scheme is checked again once construction is complete. 26 audits were undertaken on improvement schemes in 2024.

4. Road safety audits are also undertaken on developer schemes by the private sector, as part of the development process.

Traffic Management Schemes

5. There is an ongoing programme of low-cost improvements aimed at managing existing traffic flows more effectively and thereby enhancing road safety. Such schemes generally deal with:

    - the provision of double yellow lines around junctions to prevent parking and improve visibility,

- the imposition of parking restrictions to prevent parking at locations where a potential hazard existed,
- the implementation of signing and lining schemes to improve driver perception of hazards and consequently their behaviour,
- the imposition or amendment of weight restrictions to reduce the dangers caused by HGV's using inappropriate roads.

Managing Speed

Safety Cameras

6. The Safety Camera Scheme is administered by the Road Safety Partnership. 25 fixed safety camera sites were in operation (ten speed, two bi-directional speed, six red light and seven combined red light and 'speed on green'). There were 161 mobile camera sites/routes (59 core sites, four core routes, seven motorcycle specific routes and 91 community concern sites). In addition, the Mobile Safety Camera Vans supported Community Speedwatch in Leicestershire and Rutland in 15 towns and villages. Locations and further information on the scheme itself can be found at www.speedorsafety.com.

7. Since the break-up of the National Camera Scheme in 2007, the national site selection guidance has been used when considering the potential for new permanent camera sites, here is a pdf link to the Road Safety Partnership camera site selection criteria: https://llrrsp-uploads.s3.amazonaws.com/uploads/2023/08/Rules-for-proposed-camera-sites.pdf. This guidance has allowed mobile camera enforcement at locations where traffic speeds and collision numbers are insufficient to justify a permanent camera site, but there are genuine local road safety concerns.

8. Throughout 2024, the Camera Scheme identified 72,686 drivers travelling at excessive speeds and/or running red traffic signals across the police force area (City, County and Rutland).

Driver Education Workshops (DEW)

9. Driver education remains an important part of speed management and, in 2024/25, 32,996 drivers completed a Speed Awareness course in Leicestershire as an alternative to receiving a fine and points on their driving licence. The DEW operation offers a blended approach with both online and in person classroom provision made available to clients.

10. In addition to the Speed Awareness Workshops, many drivers accused of other motoring offences were offered the opportunity to attend workshops. A total of 4,661 drivers have completed the national What's Driving Us course in Leicestershire in 2024/25. This three-hour classroom-based course has also been adapted to be delivered virtually and can be offered to drivers committing traffic light offences and other offences such as using a mobile phone whilst driving.

11. In 2024/25, 196 drivers accused of careless driving (often involving an accident) chose to attend the Safe & Considerate Driving Course, which combines classroom activities and practical driving instruction, as an alternative to prosecution.

12. In 2024/25, 3,943 drivers completed the National Motorway Awareness Course (NMAC). The theory course aims to increase knowledge of the meaning of smart motorway signs, as well as improve understanding of variable speed limits and lane closures and complying with the rules on smart motorways.

13. Workshops are offered to offenders in 30 and 40 mph speed limit areas. The aim of the courses is to help drivers understand the adverse consequences of their driving behaviour. In total around 125,000 hours of training per year is provided through the DEW in Leicestershire - a significant road safety input.

Advisory 20mph School Safety Zones

14. Since 2002, the Council has been implementing advisory 20mph safety zones at schools. The zones include prominent signing and flashing amber lights to indicate their extent and times of operation. They are aimed at reducing vehicle speeds to improve safety and encourage walking and cycling to school. The programme was completed in summer 2014 with over 250 zones being created and maintained.

Mandatory 20-mph Speed Limit / Zones

15. The requirements for a 20mph speed limit are set out by the Department for Transport - Setting Local Speed Limits. The guidance set out by the DfT suggests that mean speed for a village/road that is being considered for a 20mph limit/zone should be at or below 24mph. 24mph is the suggested speed due to the fact it falls in the lower end of the 20's and, therefore, the implementation of a 20mph limit would be self-enforcing, i.e., without the need for any physical traffic calming measures.

16. Where the mean speeds are higher than 24mph, physical calming measures such as speed humps and chicanes would be required in order to control and maintain speeds.

Traffic Management

17. It is important for the safety of all road users that drivers are advised of the maximum speed that they should be traveling at along any length of road, this is the speed limit. In 2013, speed limits on a number of local roads were changed in order to ensure, as far as possible, that the speed of traffic was reduced to a level consistent with the environment of the road and the hazards on it.

18. Any speed limit changes are implemented in line with the DfT national guidance on setting local speed limits, which were published in January 2013.

Community Speed Watch

19. Community Speed Watch (CSW) continues to be a popular initiative which encourages local communities to get involved in identifying speeding motorists and thereafter encouraging them to drive at more appropriate speeds. CSW is an educational scheme to help people reduce speeding traffic through their community. The scheme enables volunteers to work within their community to raise awareness of the dangers of speeding and to help control the problem locally. CSW incorporates poster campaigns and a pledge system linked to direct action using speed detection equipment all under the supervision of the council. The use of speed detection equipment does not lead to prosecution – drivers receive a letter from the Police instead to help support and underline the community's commitment to road safety. In 2024 13 Leicestershire communities were supported by road safety education officers to run volunteer based schemes. Further information can be found at https://www.leicestershire.gov.uk/roads-and-travel/road-safety/community-speed-watch/about-the-scheme.

Education Training and Publicity

20. Human error is a significant factor in many collisions. Various available training and publicity educates, alerts and informs road users about hazardous behaviours. The diverse array of initiatives which are currently employed within the County are described below.

Drink Drug-Driving

21. Whilst the police continues to target drink drug drivers throughout the year, the two main month-long campaigns reminding drivers of the risk they take if they choose to both drink and drug drive are held throughout December and June.

22. Local media, including daily and weekly newspapers, radio and TV remain very supportive of the summer and winter drink drug drive campaigns and there is ongoing newspaper coverage along with regular interviews of police spokespersons to remind people not to drink and/or drug drive and/or consider alternative means of transport such as buses, taxis or identifying designated sober drivers in order to get home safely and legally.

23. During December 2024, across the Leicestershire Police force area 81 people were caught drink driving, 29 drug driving and 5 failed to provide a sample (December 2023 saw 75 drink and 18 drug drive arrests). Of these, 26 arrests were made following a road traffic collision, around half of these arrests were made in Leicester City with the remainder spread across our rural towns and villages. There is no formula to determine how much any one person can drink in an evening and be okay to drive the next day as it depends on several factors, including weight, gender, age, metabolism and how much food has been eaten. The penalties for drinking and driving are a minimum 12-month disqualification, which rises to three years for a second offence within 10 years, a fine of up to £5,000 and up to six months in prison.

24. Leicestershire Police now use roadside drug testing kits to help enforce legislation introduced in March 2015 which makes it illegal to drive with certain levels of illegal and prescription drugs in the bloodstream. The law can be enforced with the use of kits that detect traces of cannabis and cocaine in saliva. More traditional “field impairment tests”, including measuring the size of a driver’s pupils or asking them to walk in straight line, can also be used where impairment through other drug groups is suspected.

Pre-Driver Training

25. In 2024 there were six events and over 260 participants, concentrating on driver responsibility, peer pressure, impairment, and the costs of motoring. Each participant had two driving sessions with approved driving instructors on the Mallory Park circuit where they were introduced to the basics of car control. The Official Theory Test was also explained and tried by the participants on iPads equipped with the test. The events were also supported by the Road Safety Partnership with presentations from the Fire Service, Hazard Express and the Safety Camera Team attended with a safety Camera van.

Older Car Drivers

26. The ‘Safer Driving with Age’ (SAGE) scheme for drivers aged 60 and over operates throughout the County. Older drivers need to ensure that they have undertaken an eyesight check, answered a health questionnaire and undertaken a driving assessment in their own vehicle with an Approved Driving Instructor (ADI). During 2024, there was continued interest in the scheme and work continued to encourage ADIs to deliver this scheme and drivers to take part. Administration of the scheme has now moved over to the Driver Education Manager and will re-launch in the coming months. It is noted that there is ‘an aging population’ and continuing to drive safely helps to tackle social isolation and can contribute to general wellbeing.

Winter Driving

27. Driving conditions throughout the winter months can be very different from those experienced by motorists throughout the remainder of the year, with clear road safety implications. Alerting motorists to these changing conditions is an integral part of Council ongoing road safety advice.

Publicity Campaigns

28. Much of the campaign work is now channelled and supported by the Road Safety Partnership. During 2024, there were two seperate social media campaigns, one aimed to raise awareness about the dangers of selfish and unsafe parking at school pick up and drop off times and the second campaign focussed on the dangers of driving while tiried. .

The FATAL4 Clinics

29. Over the past 14 years, Leicestershire Police, with the support of the Leicester, Leicestershire & Rutland Road Safety Partnership, have held a series of FATAL4 clinics at locations across the police force area. These are designed to reinforce concerns about speeding, using mobile phones (while driving), not wearing seatbelts along with drink drug driving.

30. Since 2013, FATAL4 operations targeting HGV drivers and other drivers using the local motorway and trunk road network have taken place. Police officers travelling in an unmarked HGV tractor unit covertly filmed those drivers seen to be committing FATAL4 offences who were then escorted by a following patrol car to a nearby safe place off the motorway to be dealt with accordingly.

Improving Road Safety for Vulnerable Road Users

31. In looking to improve safety for vulnerable road users, motorcyclists, pedestrians and cyclists are primarily targeted. Details of the initiatives employed for these three groups are given below.

Motorcyclists

32. The Enhanced Rider Scheme (ERS) is a national rider training scheme for post-test riders. The cost is typically £130 but, with a £70 subsidy from the Road Safety Partnership the rider only pays £60. In the financial year 2024/25, 73 riders took advantage of this scheme which is down on the 92 of the previous financial year. A six week social media campaign aimed at older and returning bikersin the form of an interactive reaction game ran from mid-July until the end of August 2025 directing people to a dedicated ERS webpage on the www.speedorsafety.com website (https://speedorsafety.com/enhanced-rider-scheme) which includes contact details for the subsidised training providers.

33. Compulsory Basic Training (CBT+) offers four hours of additional on-road tuition to newly qualified riders allowing them to focus on areas where they need to improve their confidence. The Road Safety Partnership provides a £75 subsidy towards each course with the rider paying £30. In the financial year 2024/25, 191 courses were delivered compared to 149 in the previous financial year.

34. Bike Safe workshops are run by Police Class 1 Advanced riders from the police motorcycle section, accredited for the delivery of training. The purpose of Bike Safe is to reduce casualties among bikers by giving them an insight into safer/ smoother riding and a heightened awareness of possible hazards.

35. Leicestershire Fire and Rescue Service (LFRS) launched their #DoItForDave campaign in 2023 with the aim of raising awareness about motorcycle safety and highlight the life-saving potential of the free BikerDown courses which LFRS hosts. The campaign tells the inspiring story of Dave, a dedicated motorcycle rider who survived a cardiac arrest, thanks to individuals who had

attended BikerDown courses. Dave's journey serves as a powerful testament highlighting the importance of acting quickly and using the invaluable skills acquired through these courses, the video is available to watch here: https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=CuOZBpGVm2k

36. The Road Safety Partnership in conjunction with Leicestershire County Council purchased a Triumph motorcycle to be used for Road Safety purposes including the promotion of training for motorcycle riders. To help promote this further the bike has been transferred to staff at Leicestershire Fire and Rescue Service who have capacity to use this resource. The bike has been re-branded as “FireBike”. The bike has featured at many events and biker meets.

37. The Council remains a supporter of The Shiny Side Up Partnership (SSUP) an East Midlands motorcycle safety partnership. The group is presently made up of Leicestershire County Council, Leicester City Council, Nottinghamshire County Council and Nottingham City Council. Originally set up to try and drive down casualties relating to Sports Bike riders, this has now broadened to include lower capacity scooters and motorcycles. The website has been redesigned and carries a wealth of useful information www.shinysideup.co.uk.

38. The County Council uses a variety of SSUP roadside posters at sites that have a poor motorcycle casualty history; these messages include Bike Crash Site Ahead and Think Bike. The roadside posters are bright yellow and have become a regular seasonal way of reminding riders and other road users to take extra care and look out for each other.

Road Safety Education in schools

39. Road Safety Education - there has been a gap in road safety education delivery in schools and for a number of years. To address this the Traffic & Safety team have developed age appropriate road safety presentations and messages to build on children’s knowledge year on year. Through cooperative learning and behaviour change techniques the council aims to give young people the skills they need to stay safe and to then have the skill set to become independent road users. The programme is a blended approach to teaching with a mix of live visits and digital resources to enable maximum reach. All year group lessons are outcome led, link to the national curriculum, are inclusive, have clear learning objectives and will be evaluated (internal quality assurance and where appropriate externally validated) to ensure that the programme is fit for purpose/ measure the effectiveness. The development of the Road Safety Education programme will support the CHYM team in delivery of their active travel programme by building the foundation ‘feeling safe’ to then encourage more to travel actively.

40. Following work with a test group of primary schools in the autumn term 2024/25. The Programme was rolled out to all Primary schools after February 2025 half-term. During the period March-25 to end of term (July-25) 54 schools signed up to our ‘Road Safety Mission’ programme. Through the

delivery of exciting 'Top Secret' challenges and missions children in Foundation to Year 6 I covered the following objectives:

- **Foundation** – To be able to identify road users, safe and non-safe places to play. To be able to explain the 5 key steps to cross a road safely (Stop / Look / Listen / Think / Hold Hands).
- **Year 1** – Building on prior learning (Foundation) - Safe places to cross – introduction to key vocabulary (Zebra Crossing / Toucan Crossing / Puffin Crossing / School Crossing Patrol / Under and Over pass.
- **Year 2** – Reinforce prior learning - Scooter safety (how to use the road safety code when travelling actively / scooter and self, safety check / balance and control / pavement etiquette).
- **Year 3** – Reinforce prior learning – introduce how to cross a road safely using the green cross code (safer places to cross / tricky crossings – how to safely cross between parked cars / tricky junctions if there is no other option). Be Bright Be Seen and Car Seat rules.
- **Year 4** – Reinforce prior learning (Foundation to Year 3) – introduce speed and what might affect a drivers stopping distance (distraction / speed / road conditions / tyre grip / weight of vehicle / tiredness) – making good judgements and cross like a boss.
- **Year 5** – Building on prior learning and introduce dangerous distractions and hazards (focus on responsibility / safe choices / distractions (mobile phones, listening to music) / coping strategies to minimise risk) – key steps to independent travel.
- **Year 6** – By Year 6 most pupils will be familiar with the road safety code and know basic road safety skills but can fail to deploy this knowledge because they act on impulse – they go for a short-term gain rather than a long-term safety gain, so Year 6 will focus on impulse control (distractions / peer pressure / time pressure / poor decision making) to prepare them for transition to secondary school (independent active travel / plan journeys and strategies to avoid acting impulsively).

At the start of each new academic (September) primary schools will be invited to join us on our road safety mission. By signing up to our road safety education programme and carrying out initiatives with their students, they can become a recognised road safety conscious school. Schools can collect points and be awarded a bronze, silver, or gold status, for their efforts. New for 2025/26 academic year is a brand new monitoring tool which will track school sign-ups and chase those schools who have not engaged.

41. Years 7-9 – work is completed to develop a road safety education programme for the secondary school cohort (Y7-9) – 'Get Street Wise'. A test group of schools will be invited to trial this ahead of full county roll-out.

Key learning objectives:

Year 7 – 'Get Street Wise' – Ice Age to My Age – Evolving our Caveman Brains for Modern Roads

- to understand, and be able to recall our brains' limitations, and the risks these pose when travelling independently (reaction times, weakness to distractions, impulsivity)
- to understand, and be able to practise strategies that help strengthen our brains' ability to process information when travelling independently
- be able to demonstrate awareness of surroundings when travelling independently.

Year 8 – 'Get Street Wise' - Choose Your Own Adventure

- I understand the importance of the choices we make when travelling independently (positive and negative choices).
- I can recall, write about, and take the safest actions when travelling independently.

Year 9 – 'Get Street Wise' – Protecting the Future You

- be able to describe the risks of the road, and how they can affect others around me and myself.

- I can explain and chart the significance of making the correct decisions, when travelling independently.

- I can evaluate the impact of allowing distractions, peer pressure, and poor headspace into my journeys

Work is now underway to develop Years 10 -13 – key subject themes below:

Year 10 – 'Get Road Wise'- - Hierarchy of road users, social responsibility and the law.

Year 11 – 'Get Road wise' – Passenger Safety and social responsibility

Year 12 – 'Get Road Wise' – New driver safety, social responsibility and the law

Year 13 – 'Get Road Wise' – What if it all goes wrong! - mock trials make academic subjects engaging and teach students about the legal system through inquiry-based learning. It allows students to use their critical thinking skills, think about morals, the law and impact on society. It also links to British Values, looking at democracy, the rule of law, individual liberty, and mutual respect.

42. The Junior Road Safety Officer (JRSO) scheme has been operating in Leicestershire since 1987. and is now part of the Traffic & Safety Teams Road Safety Education Programme offering. JRSO is aimed at primary schools, and schools select four children to take on this role:

Becoming a Junior Road Safety Officer (JRSO) can offer a variety of benefits to the student:

• Safety Awareness: They will learn valuable skills and knowledge about road safety, which can help them, and their peers stay safe when using the road.
• Leadership: Being a JRSO involves taking on an important role with responsibilities to ensure that other students are using the road safely. They will lead by example, which can develop their leadership skills.
• Public Speaking: They will speak in front of classmates, teachers and external stakeholders, enhancing their confidence and public speaking skills.
• Teamwork: as a JRSO they will work with others such as; JRSOs, students, parents and school staff which will give them the skills to work collaboratively.
• Community Role: They will play an important role in their community, striving to make it safer, which can be very rewarding.
• Problem-Solving: They will identify road safety issues and come up with creative solutions.

British Values and Safeguarding by teaching children the values that not only promote a safer community but also contribute to a more respectful and understanding society.

• Democracy: As a JRSO, they'll have the opportunity to listen to their peers' concerns and represent their views on road safety matters.
• Rule of Law: They'll understand and promote the importance of Road Safety and the Highway Code ensuring everyone knows and follows them for the benefit of all.
• Individual Liberty: By making informed choices about how to use the road safely and encouraging others to do the same, they'll be supporting the principle of individual liberty, where everyone has the freedom to make safe decisions.
• Mutual Respect: Teaching and promoting road safety, fosters an environment of mutual respect, where everyone's right to be safe is acknowledged and valued.
• Tolerance of Different Faiths and Beliefs: As JRSO's, they'll interact with diverse groups, learning to respect and value different perspectives and practices regarding road safety.

43. Bikeability is the government's national cycle training programme. It teaches practical skills and understanding of how to cycle on today's roads. Our team of Road Safety Tutors/Bikeability Instructors continued to provide cyclist training (Bikeability) to primary school children, training to National Standards. Level 1/2 training usually takes place in the last year of primary school and can encourage children to cycle when they move to high school. Funding has been secured to March 2026 to support the delivery and training to children in Year 6. In 2024/2025 3,447 children were trained to Level 1 / 2 standard, Bikeability Level 3 was also undertaken by 224 children.

44. The School Crossing Patrol (SCP) service was founded in 1953 and continues to help children and parents across busy roads at school journey times. A number of patrollers have involved themselves in wider aspects of road safety work, such as road safety talks in schools and pre-schools.

Pedestrians and Cyclists

45. The Fire Service has developed a cycle safety virtual reality (VR) film as part of their VR education programme (existing young driver film). Such films are very engaging and use 360-degree camera footage and are played using a mobile phone connected to a VR headset.

46. Walking to school is a genuine safety concern for many parents as children living less than 3 miles from the catchment area school for their home address (2 miles for primary school age children) are only provided with free transport by the Council if their walking route is assessed as 'not available'. The availability of such a route is assessed against local criteria (based on national statutory guidance) which look at highway-related safety issues. Walking route assessments look at the issues which might affect a child walking to school, accompanied (as necessary) by a responsible adult. When walking along the road, the main issue is the presence or otherwise of a footway but, where there is no footway, the assessment asks:

    - Is there a verge to step onto to avoid oncoming traffic?
    - What is the traffic flow?
    - Are there suitable sightlines?

47. Crossing of the road is also assessed and here the main issues are the visibility of approaching traffic and how long pedestrians must wait for a suitable gap in that traffic.

48. School Keep Clear – Camera Project aims to change the behaviour of parents when taking their children to school by ensuring the entrances to schools are clear of traffic, reducing the risk to children.

Sustainable Travel Team

49. The School Streets initiative addresses parking, congestion, and safety around schools during school drop off and pick up times. This initiative prioritises pedestrians such as parents/carers and children by providing a safe space for people to walk and cycle in the vicinity of the school through a hard or soft closure of the road or street. Expressions of interest for new School Streets went out in August 2024, with an expected launch August 2025. This time however, it was felt that the previous Experimental Order (ETRO) was not needed and so permanent Traffic Regulation Order (TRO), were applied for instead. From this, two new School Streets were launched at St Bartholomew's Primary School in Quorn and St Clare's Primary School in Coalville. Evaluation across both schools is still ongoing but initial survey results from St Bartholomew's shows that 49% of children are arriving at school via active travel modes, including walking, cycling, scooting and park and stride. When asked how parents and carers felt about the School Street, responses indicated a positive feeling toward the closure and noted the safer entrance to school and the good example it gives to children. Parents/carers who continue to drive to the school have indicated that the main reasons for this are an onward journey

to make (either to work or another school) at 29% and time constraints at 22%. It should be noted that only 6% indicated safety concerns as a reason to drive their child(ren) to school.

50. Cyclist training has been referred to those over-16s who either cannot cycle, have not cycled for a while or who wish to develop their skills and confidence through on and/or off-road training to Mini Bikers to access adult cycle training for free. In October and November 2024, they trained 10 from our waiting list. E-Bike Scheme also allowed residents to try out an e-bike before buying and received a £300 reimbursement if they bought an e-bike, in October 2024 17 people attended and 10 redeemed their £300.

51. Sustainable Travel programme for schools - travelling actively to schools is a great way for pupils to start the day, with research finding a link to improved behaviour and concentration as well as contributing to the recommended 60 minutes of physical activity a day for those aged 5-18. The Sustainable Travel Team works with schools to reduce school gate congestion and create a safer environment for pupils, staff, families and the wider community. The Schools Officer offers practical advice and support to increase levels of cycling, walking and scooting to school. There are a number of ways schools can get involved and more information can be found here https://www.choosehowyoumove.co.uk/schools-programme-2/

Appendix D

Road Traffic Collision Definitions

Casualty: A person killed or injured in a collision. Casualties are sub-divided into killed, seriously injured and slightly injured

Collision*: Involves personal injury occurring on the public highway (including footways) in which at least one road vehicle or a vehicle in collision with a pedestrian is involved and which becomes known to the police within 30 days of its occurrence. One collision may give rise to several casualties. “Damage-only” collisions are not included.

Fatal collision: A collision in which at least one person is killed.

Injury collision: A collision involving human injury or death.

Killed: Human casualties who sustained injuries which caused death less than 30 days after the collision. Confirmed suicides are excluded.

KSI: Killed or seriously injured.

Serious collision: A collision in which at least one person is seriously injured but no person (other than a confirmed suicide) is killed.

Serious injury: An injury for which a person is detained in hospital as an “in-patient”, or any of the following injuries whether or not they are detained in hospital: fractures, concussion, internal injuries, crushing, burns (excluding friction burns), severe cuts, severe general shock requiring medical treatment and injuries causing death 30 or more days after the collision. An injured casualty is recorded as seriously or slightly injured by the police on the basis of information available within a short time of the collision. This generally will not reflect the results of a medical examination, but may be influenced according to whether the casualty is hospitalised or not. Hospitalisation procedures will vary regionally.

Severity:

- Of a collision: the severity of the most severely injured casualty (either fatal, serious or slight).
- Of a casualty: killed, seriously injured or slightly injured.

Slight collision: A collision in which at least one person is slightly injured but no person is killed or seriously injured.

Slight injury: An injury of a minor character such as a sprain (including neck whiplash injury), bruise or cut which are not judged to be severe, or slight shock requiring roadside attention. This definition includes injuries not requiring medical treatment.

* The term ‘collision’ is used throughout. This should not be taken as the Council’s view of the relative merits of the terms ‘accident’, ‘collision’, ‘crash’ or any other term.

This page is intentionally left blank

The Leicester, Leicestershire and Rutland Road Safety Partnership

Casualty Report 2024

LEICESTER • LEICESTERSHIRE • RUTLAND
Road Safety Partnership
DRIVING CASUALTIES DOWN

Welcome

Our 2024 Casualty Report provides a local overview of our key road users, our three local authority areas and our trunk routes based on the annual national Department for Transport (DfT) data which is produced each autumn. This information helps identify emerging casualty trends and informs our future road safety interventions to help reduce death and serious injuries on our roads.

Janna Walker
Assistant Director (Development and Growth), Leicestershire County Council
Chair of the Leicester, Leicestershire and Rutland Road Safety Partnership

Adjusted Severity Figures

On the 1st of January 2024 Leicestershire Police adopted the Department for Transport's (DFT) new method for recording casualty severity based on the type of injury sustained.

Injury in CRASH	Detailed severity	Severity classification		Injury in CRASH	Detailed severity	Severity classification
Deceased	Killed	Killed				
Broken neck or back	Very Serious	Serious		Fractured lower leg or ankle or foot	Less Serious	Serious
Severe head injury, unconscious	Very Serious	Serious		Fractured arm or collarbone or hand	Less Serious	Serious
Severe chest injury, any difficulty breathing	Very Serious	Serious		Deep cuts or lacerations	Less Serious	Serious
Internal injuries	Very Serious	Serious		Other head injury	Less Serious	Serious
Multiple severe injuries, unconscious	Very Serious	Serious				
Loss of arm or leg (or part)	Moderately Serious	Serious		Whiplash or neck pain	Slight	Slight
Fractured pelvis or upper leg	Moderately Serious	Serious		Shallow cuts or lacerations or abrasions	Slight	Slight
Other chest injury (not bruising)	Moderately Serious	Serious		Sprains and strains	Slight	Slight
Deep penetrating wound	Moderately Serious	Serious		Bruising	Slight	Slight
Multiple severe injuries, conscious	Moderately Serious	Serious		Shock	Slight	Slight

Fatal numbers remain unchanged, but the new method has seen a rise in serious injury casualties and consequently, a reduction in slight injury casualties. To account for this when comparing recent with historic data the DFT have produced adjustment figures[1].

Detailed adjustment figures are available for different local authorities and for some road user types, however for the purposes of this report a single adjustment figure has been used for the Partnership area. This has been calculated in May 2025 to be 15.53% for data up to the end of 2023.

New Road Safety Factors

Another change brought in by Leicestershire Police in 2024 is the replacement of Contributory Factors with Road Safety Factors. These were designed to focus on recording factors related to areas where action can be taken to improve road safety, and a reduction in the list of potential factors from 79 to 36 factors, with new codes.[2]

References

1. https://www.gov.uk/government/statistical-data-sets/reported-road-accidents-vehicles-and-casualties-tables-for-great-britain#geographical-breakdowns-ras04

2. https://www.gov.uk/government/statistics/road-safety-factors-initial-analysis/road-safety-factors-initial-analysis

LEICESTER • LEICESTERSHIRE • RUTLAND
Road Safety Partnership
DRIVING CASUALTIES DOWN

Leicester, Leicestershire & Rutland Road Safety Report 2024

KEY STATS	Change since 2023
28 Fatalities	▼30%
379 Serious injuries	▲2%
1,109 Slight injuries	▼7%

Fatalities

Serious Injury

Injuries sustained

27% Killed or serious injury

73% Slight injury

KSI Casualties compared to 2023

All casualties compared to 2023

	851 ▼29	56%
	143 ▼2	9%
	177 ▲2	12%
	230 ▲4	15%
Other	115 ▼16	8%

KSI Casualties by Age

Follow Us:

www.speedorsafety.com

@LLRRoadSafety

LEICESTER • LEICESTERSHIRE • RUTLAND
Road Safety Partnership
DRIVING CASUALTIES DOWN

Leicester City Road Safety Report 2024

KEY STATS	Change since 2023
1 Fatality	▼80%
110 Serious injuries	▼17%
424 Slight injuries	▼8%

Injuries sustained

21% Killed or serious injury

79% Slight injury

All casualties compared to 2023

	247 ▼43	46%
	36 ▼6	7%
	87 ▼17	16%
	122 ▲1	23%
Other	43 ◄►0	8%

Follow Us:

www.speedorsafety.com

@LLRRoadSafety

LEICESTER • LEICESTERSHIRE • RUTLAND
Road Safety Partnership
DRIVING CASUALTIES DOWN

Leicestershire County Road Safety Report 2024

KEY STATS	Change since 2023
27 Fatalities	▼21%
258 Serious injuries	▲16%
655 Slight injuries	◄►0%

Fatalities

Serious Injury

Injuries sustained

30% Killed or serious injury

70% Slight injury

All Collisions

All casualties compared to 2023

	579 ▲24	62%
	103 ▲6	11%
	85 ▲17	9%
	101 ▼2	11%
Other	72 ▼16	8%

KSI Casualties by Age

Follow Us:

www.speedorsafety.com

@LLRRoadSafety

LEICESTER • LEICESTERSHIRE • RUTLAND
Road Safety Partnership
DRIVING CASUALTIES DOWN

Rutland County Road Safety Report 2024

KEY STATS	Change since 2023
0 Fatalities	▼100%
11 Serious injuries	▼27%
30 Slight injuries	◄►0%

Injuries sustained

27% Killed or serious injury

73% Slight injury

All casualties compared to 2023

Car	25 ▼10	61%
Cycle	4 ▼2	10%
Motorbike	5 ▲2	12%
Pedestrian	7 ▲5	17%
Other	0 ◄►0	0%

Follow Us:

www.speedorsafety.com

@LLRRoadSafety

LEICESTER • LEICESTERSHIRE • RUTLAND Road Safety Partnership DRIVING CASUALTIES DOWN

Strategic Network Road Safety Report 2024

KEY STATS	Change since 2023
5 Fatalities	▼29%
24 Serious injuries	▲9%
97 Slight injuries	▼2%

Injuries sustained

23% Killed or serious injury

77% Slight injury

All casualties compared to 2023

Follow Us:

www.speedorsafety.com

@LLRRoadSafety

LEICESTER • LEICESTERSHIRE • RUTLAND Road Safety Partnership DRIVING CASUALTIES DOWN

Young Drivers in Leicester, Leicestershire & Rutland 2024

KEY STATS	Change since 2023
48 Killed or Serious Injury	▲10
94 Slight Injury	▼20

LEICESTER • LEICESTERSHIRE • RUTLAND Road Safety Partnership DRIVING CASUALTIES DOWN

Older Driver Casualties in Leicester, Leicestershire & Rutland 2024

KEY STATS	change since 2023
16 Killed or Serious Injury	▲ 1
41 Slight Injury	▲ 2

LEICESTER • LEICESTERSHIRE • RUTLAND Road Safety Partnership DRIVING CASUALTIES DOWN

Car User Casualties in Leicester, Leicestershire & Rutland 2024

KEY STATS	change since 2023
168 Killed or Serious Injury	▼1
671 Slight Injury	▼40

LEICESTER • LEICESTERSHIRE • RUTLAND Road Safety Partnership DRIVING CASUALTIES DOWN

Motorcyclist Casualties in Leicester, Leicestershire & Rutland 2024

KEY STATS	change since 2023
77 Killed or Serious Injury	▼4
62 Slight Injury	▼2

LEICESTER • LEICESTERSHIRE • RUTLAND
Road Safety Partnership
DRIVING CASUALTIES DOWN

Cyclist Casualties in Leicester, Leicestershire & Rutland 2024

KEY STATS	change since 2023
64 Killed or Serious Injury	▲12
113 Slight Injury	▼6

LEICESTER • LEICESTERSHIRE • RUTLAND
Road Safety Partnership
DRIVING CASUALTIES DOWN

Pedestrian Casualties in Leicester, Leicestershire & Rutland 2024

KEY STATS	change since 2023
77 Killed or Serious Injury	▼5
150 Slight Injury	▲6

Leicester • Leicestershire • Rutland Road Safety Partnership
Driving Casualties Down

Partnership Activity Output 2024

Fatal 4 Operations

20
Clinics

135
Phone Violations

211
Seatbelt Violations

68
Other Offences

Safety Camera Scheme

65,118
Camera Speeding Notices Sent

7,568
Camera Red Light Notices Sent

3,246
Mobile Camera Van Hours

2,386
Mobile Camera Van Visits

371 Red X Notices Sent

Driver Education Workshop Attendees

4,578
Motorway Awareness

191
Safe or Considerate

29,963
Speed Awareness

4,531
What's Driving Us

Officer Issued Tickets

361
Seatbelt Tickets

461
Mobile Phone Tickets

170
Speeding Tickets

Additional Research

Child Pedestrian Casualties

Young children and teenagers tend to be involved in collisions earlier in the day (12:00-18:00) coinciding with school finish times. For 11-17 year olds there is also a noticeable pattern during weekdays between 06:00-12:00, which coincides with school starting, perhaps due to more children in this age group walking unassisted to school.

Tables showing the number of pedestrian casualties by age group and time of day and day of week

Ages 0-10					
	0-6	6-12	12-18	18-24	Total
Mon	0	0	3	2	5
Tue	0	0	1	0	1
Wed	0	1	2	1	4
Thu	0	1	0	0	1
Fri	0	0	4	1	5
Sat	0	0	3	0	3
Sun	0	0	2	1	3
Total	0	2	15	5	22

Ages 11-17					
	0-6	6-12	12-18	18-24	Total
Mon	0	5	3	0	8
Tue	0	4	5	1	10
Wed	0	5	6	0	11
Thu	0	1	5	1	7
Fri	0	0	4	2	6
Sat	0	0	1	0	1
Sun	0	0	2	1	3
Total	0	15	26	5	46

Ages 18-24					
	0-6	6-12	12-18	18-24	Total
Mon	0	2	1	2	5
Tue	0	1	1	2	4
Wed	0	2	0	3	5
Thu	0	0	0	2	2
Fri	0	1	4	1	6
Sat	1	0	0	2	3
Sun	1	0	0	2	3
Total	2	6	6	14	28

Pedestrian casualties for older teenagers tend to be higher later in the day 18:00-24:00 and there are fewer casualties at the weekend.

Single Vehicle Collisions (2022 – 2024)

For the purposes of this report a single vehicle collision excludes those where a pedestrian has been injured and is the only casualty in the collision. Three years of data post Covid collision data have been used to create a larger dataset from which to draw more robust conclusions.

A total of 428 single vehicle collisions were recorded resulting in 538 casualties. Whilst this represents just 12% of all collisions and casualties, it represents 28% of all fatal collisions and 26% of all fatal casualties. There is therefore a wide disparity in the severity of single vehicle collisions with a much higher proportion of collisions resulting in fatal or serious injuries.

The table below shows the percent of single vehicle collisions (428) for the past 3 years. The fluctuating numbers perhaps represent the apparent random nature of single vehicle events.

Table showing the percentage of single vehicle collisions (2022-24)

Severity	2022	2023	2024	Total
Fatal (%)	36.7	19.4	30.8	28.3
Serious (adj.) (%)	20.5	13.4	14.5	14.6
Slight (adj.) (%)	11.8	9.1	9.5	10.6
Total (%)	**15.1**	**10.6**	**11.3**	**12.2**
Collisions (n)	**163**	**129**	**136**	**428**

The vast majority of the collisions (70.5%) involved a car with a further 17.8% involving a motorbike, the majority being high powered bikes over 500cc.

The ages of 410 drivers were recorded. 27% (111) of these were young drivers aged 16 – 24, despite accounting for just 10.2% of licence holders nationally (2023 data). Older drivers over 75 years were involved in 22 collisions (6% of the total), a slight under representation of the number of licence holders.

78% of the drivers were male.

119 collisions resulted in an injury to one or more passenger. 45 (37.8%) involved a young driver, a much higher percentage than the number of young driver collisions overall. These 45 collisions resulted in 64 vehicle passenger casualties. Almost all of these (54) were within the age range 16 – 24. 31 were male and 23 were female.

It is clear from the table below that weekends are the most prevalent days for single vehicle collisions. 35% of collisions take place after 6pm, particularly Friday and Saturday nights but this also carries over into Saturday and Sunday mornings up until around 3am.

Table showing single vehicle collisions by day of week and time period of day

Day/Time	0-6	06-12	12-18	18-24	Total
Mon	7	15	10	20	**52**
Tue	5	14	17	18	**54**
Wed	6	9	11	15	**41**
Thu	15	5	13	10	**43**
Fri	12	12	16	29	**69**
Sat	22	16	16	36	**90**

Sun	22	16	19	22	**79**
Total	**89**	**87**	**102**	**150**	**428**

May (54), January (48) and July (42) are the three highest months for single vehicle collisions. New Years Eve / Day was not a factor in collisions.

Table showing number and percentage of collisions by local authority and strategic network by severity of collision

Severity	City	County	Rutland	Total	N Highways
Fatal	2	22	2	**26**	4
Serious	24	125	11	**160**	13
Slight	54	181	7	**242**	20
Total	**80**	**328**	**20**	**428**	**37**
Total %	**5.9**	**15.9**	**23.5**	**12.2**	**14.6**

Single Vehicle Collisions are relatively rare in Leicester City whereas in Leicestershire County, Rutland and on the Strategic Network they make up a significant proportion of collisions.

There were no obvious hotspots for collisions perhaps emphasising the more random nature of single vehicle collisions.

A fifth of collisions on the strategic network took place on slip roads from dual carriageways or motorways suggesting vehicles travelling too fast on exit.

57% (97) of all killed or serious injury collisions take place on roads with a speed limit of 50mph or higher with 52 collisions being on a 60mph road.

'Fatal 4' factors of excess speed, mobile phone, seatbelt and drink / drug driving feature prominently in single vehicle collisions. The number of collisions where these factors were recorded are shown below.

Table showing the fatal 4 factors and number and percentage of single vehicle collisions related to them

Factor	Collisions
Excess Speed / Driving too fast and / or aggressively	296 (69%)
Drink / Drug Driving	121 (28.2%)
Seatbelt	38 (8.9%)
Using a mobile phone	12 (2.8%)

In total at least 338 (79.0%) of single vehicle collisions involved one or more of the Fatal 4 factors.

Conclusion

Single vehicle collisions make up a small number of overall collisions but a significant number of fatal and serious injury collisions.

By their nature they are random and hard to predict.

Younger Drivers are over-represented, and collisions often occur when carrying vehicle passengers of a similar age.

The Fatal 4 factors are prominent in single vehicle collisions as are high speed rural roads, particularly at night.

Context and Recommendations

Overall, in 2023 there has been a reduction in all casualty types across our area.

	Compared to 2023	
Fatalities	↓	30.0%
KSI Casualties (adj.)	↓	1.0%
All Casualties	↓	2.6%

These can be viewed in the context of the following:

	Compared to 2023	
National Vehicle Km	↑	1.6%
National Fatalities	↑	1.0%
National Drivers Licence*	↑	1.3%
National Drivers Licence 15-24	↑	1.9%
National Drivers Licence 70+	↑	1.3%

*National DL: National driving licence holders (full + provisional).

Traffic levels increased further in 2024, albeit at a slightly slower rate than in 2023. The number of licence holders has increased from the previous year, although at a slower rate than in 2023.

Both the number of young driver licence holders and older driver licence holders increased in 2024 but at a much slower rate than the previous two years. It could be that 2022 and 2023 saw a “rebound” from a reduction in Covid years which is now no longer an effect.

Recommendations

1. Continue to target key road user groups in campaign strategies including:

    Motorcyclists – both younger riders and middle aged riders
    Cyclists
    School Children
    Young Drivers
    Pedestrians of all ages

2. Account for ageing population / increase in over 70’s drivers in campaigns

3. Fatal 4 factors – especially around single vehicle collisions

4. Further research into single vehicle collisions especially younger drivers with passengers

Appendix F

Cluster Sites

(Leicestershire Injury Accidents Interim Review 1 January 2020 to 31 December 2024 with 7 or more accidents)

Rank	Location	Injury Severity				Status
		Fatal	Serious	Slight	Total	SC = Scheme Completed SP = Scheme proposed/In Design NP = Investigated, not progressed UI = Under Investigation PI = Pending Investigation MS = Major Scheme
1	A606 NOTTINGHAM ROAD AB KETTLEBY CROSSROADS JW SIX HILLS LANE.	1	6	5	12	SC
2	C4502 KILBY ROAD KILBY JW LEICESTER ROAD	0	2	9	11	SC
3	A5460 NARBOROUGH ROAD SOUTH ENDERBY JW SERVICE ROAD	0	3	7	10	UI
4	B591 NANPANTAN ROAD CHARLEY CROSSROADS JW CHARLEY ROAD	0	4	5	9	MS/ SP
5	A47 NORMANDY WAY HINCKLEY JW ASHBY ROAD	1	1	7	9	MS/ SP
6	A47 HINCKLEY ROAD BRAUNSTONE CROSSROADS JW BRAUNSTONE LANE	0	5	4	9	NP
7	C7207 PAUDY LANE SEAGRAVE JW BIG LANE	0	1	7	8	SP

8	C6103 FENN LANES SUTTON CHENEY JW SHENTON LANE	0	3	5	8	SC/ UI
9	A444 ATHERSTONE ROAD WITHERLY JW FENN LANES	0	4	3	7	SC
10	A607 THURMASTON AT ROUNDABOUT WITH BARKBY THORPE LANE	0	1	6	7	SP
11	VIKING ROAD WIGSTON JW AYLESTONE LANE	0	4	3	7	UI
12	B4114 ST JOHNS ENDERBY JUNCTION WITH B582 BLABY ROAD	0	1	3	7	UI

Agenda Item 9

Leicestershire County Council

HIGHWAYS, TRANSPORT AND WASTE OVERVIEW AND SCRUTINY COMMITTEE – 5 MARCH 2026

ENVIRONMENT AND TRANSPORT 2026/27 HIGHWAYS AND TRANSPORTATION CAPITAL PROGRAMME AND WORKS PROGRAMME

REPORT OF THE DIRECTOR OF ENVIRONMENT AND TRANSPORT

Purpose of the Report

1. The purpose of this report is to inform the Committee of the development of the Environment and Transport Department 2026/27 Highways and Transportation Capital Programme and Works Programme (Programmes), both of which are appended to this report, and to seek comments prior to these Programmes being presented to the Cabinet on 24 March 2026 for approval.

2. These Programmes have been developed in accordance with the overall budget envelopes included in the Medium Term Financial Strategy (MTFS) 2026/27 to 2029/30, as approved by the County Council on 18 February 2026. No additional funding is being sought through this report.

Policy Framework and Previous Decisions

3. The Programmes are rolling financial and business plans that are updated annually.

4. The Government's budget, announced in October 2025, set out national spending totals for 2026/27 and a direction of travel in terms of future policy by the Government. In December 2025, the DfT provided details of the new local transport funding system for Local Transport Authorities (LTAs) and confirmed the funding allocations for the next spending review period (2026/27 – 2028/29 for revenue funding; 2026/27 – 2029/30 for capital funding).

5. Alongside providing these multi-year settlements, the DfT now requires each LTA to produce a Local Transport Delivery Plan (LTDP), setting out details of how all the available funding has been prioritised, with details of schemes and interventions or programmes and packages of spend. A detailed draft of the LTDP with all spending for 2026/27 and an outline plan to 2029/30, needs to be submitted by 20 March 2026. The final LTDP to 2029/30 needs to be submitted to the DfT by 18 September 2026, although it is anticipated that the finer details of the later years' plan will be developed closer to delivery. The Programmes comprise the first year of the LTDP.

6. Following the approval of the provisional MTFS 2026/27 to 2029/30 by the Cabinet on 16 December 2025, the Cabinet recommended at its meeting on 3 February 2026 a proposed MTFS 2026-30 for approval by the County Council. The County Council approved the MTFS at its meeting on 18 February 2026. This approval included an amendment of an additional £160,000 for footway works.

7. The Programmes have been developed with reference to the Department's key plans and strategies and align with these aims. These include:

   a) Highways Asset Management Policy and the Highways Asset Management Strategy – originally approved by the Cabinet on 23 June 2017, they were updated in December 2020 and refreshed in June 2025.

   b) Highway Infrastructure Asset Management Plan – originally approved by the Cabinet on 15 September 2017, it was updated in March 2023 and refreshed in September 2025.

   c) Leicester and Leicestershire Strategic Growth Plan – approved by the Cabinet on 23 November 2018.

   d) Environment Strategy 2018-30 – approved by the County Council on 8 July 2020 and its Action Plan 2025-2030.

   e) Network Management Policy, Strategy and Plan – approved by the Cabinet on 15 December 2020.

   f) Leicestershire Local Transport Plan (LTP4) – approved by the Cabinet on 22 November 2024.

8. Leicestershire County Council's refreshed Strategic Plan 2024 – 2026 sets out the Council's long-term vision, which is based on five strategic outcomes:

   - Clean and Green,
   - Great Communities,
   - Improved Opportunities,
   - Strong Economy, Transport and Infrastructure,
   - Safe and Well.

9. The effective functioning of Leicestershire's transport system is vital to day-to-day life and supports the area's future population and economic growth. As such, the Programmes will contribute to supporting all the Strategic Plan's five outcomes, particularly, they support the 'Clean and Green' and 'Strong Economy, Transport and Infrastructure' outcomes, through maintaining and improving the highway network, which can help to reduce traffic congestion.

Background

10. The development of the Programmes has taken place against a challenging and evolving backdrop. In general, the Programmes continue to be affected by

increased costs on some major schemes, due to the impact of inflation and more frequent severe weather events, as well as additional pressures in highways maintenance. The following sub-sections of this report will provide further details.

Financial/Funding

11. In December 2025, the DfT announced that it would consolidate and simplify local transport funding for all LTAs meaning that LTAs will receive the Integrated Transport Fund (ITF) and Bus Services Fund (BSF).

12. These pots will consolidate the following stable formula-based grants:

    a) Highways Maintenance (Capital),
    b) Active Travel (Revenue and Capital),
    c) Local Electric Vehicle Infrastructure (LEVI) Capability Funding (Revenue),
    d) Local Transport Grant (Revenue and Capital),
    e) Local Authority Bus Grant (LABG) (Revenue and Capital).

13. Certain funds which are used to deliver specific schemes (namely Major Road Network, Levelling Up Fund and Structures Fund) are not part of the ITF and BSF funding pots. Neither is the transport element of the resource funding paid via the Local Government Finance Settlement.

14. The purpose of consolidation is to give LTAs flexibility to use funding more effectively and efficiently across programmes and packages of spend to deliver the priorities set out in their Local Transport Plans. LTAs will be able to make the strategic decisions that best support their local network and align with wider place-based and local/regional objectives (growth, spatial, environmental and social) and have the freedom to accelerate projects that are most beneficial.

Funding Allocations

15. Based on the 2025 spending review settlement and subsequent ministerial decisions, published allocations for Leicestershire County Council total £251.8m in funding from the DfT for 2026/27 to 2028/29 (and to 2029/30 for capital). This consists of:

    a) £233,337,190 capital (covering 2026/27 - 2029/30)
    b) £18,499,638 revenue (covering 2026/27 - 2028/29)

Table 1: Allocations, by year and spending category, in thousands (£000s)

Fund Type	2026/27	2027/28	2028/29	2029/30
Capital	£48,704	£55,907	£60,684	£68,042
Revenue	£5,835	£6,333	£6,331	-
Total	**£54,539**	**£62,240**	**£67,015**	**£68,042**

16. Below is a breakdown the funding allocations by type with 2025/26 as a comparison.

Table 2: Allocations, by year and fund type, in thousands (£000s)

Allocations	Fund Type	2025/26 (£)	2026/27 (£)	2027/28 (£)	2028/29 (£)	2029/30 (£)
Active Travel	Capital	1,005	890	890	890	890
Active Travel	Revenue	442	279	279	279	
Highways Maintenance	Capital	28,789	29,785	34,668	37,451	42,815
LABG	Capital	3,146	2,698	2,752	2,806	2,860
LABG	Revenue	4,474	4,758	4,758	4,758	
Local Electric Vehicle Infrastructure Grant (LEVI)	Revenue	217	217	217	217	
Local Transport Grant (LTG)	Capital	15,055	15,331	17,597	19,538	21,477
Local Transport Grant (LTG)	Revenue	581	581	1,079	1,076	
	Total	**53,709**	**54,539**	**62,240**	**67,015**	**68,042**

17. In summary, Leicestershire County Council is allocated funding of £14,273,817 from the BSF (corresponding to the LABG revenue line of Table 2 above), and £237,563,011 from the ITF.

18. The ITF is intended to be used to deliver a wide range of local transport outcomes, but the BSF should only be used to support outcomes for bus passengers/services.

Assurance, Monitoring and Evaluation

19. The funding allocations set out above are conditional on the submission to the DfT of a LTDP setting out how the Council plans to use the consolidated funding to achieve progress against the indicators in the Local Transport Outcome Framework over the funding period. This should provide details of schemes and interventions or programmes and packages of expenditure covering both ITF and BSF.

20. The DfT expects the LTDP to be updated and published annually with a formal submission through an online portal. The DfT and Active Travel England (ATE) should be updated of significant changes through regular reporting. The published delivery plan should also be updated in a timely manner to reflect any significant changes.

21. The DfT has introduced a new transport funding and accountability system which is broken down as below:

a) **Set out what funding is available** - Single grant letters will be issued to LTAs alongside a Memorandum of Understanding that will detail how funding can be used and when DfT agreement is needed.

b) **Set out what the DfT expects LTAs to deliver** - DfT ministers will set priority outcomes – including through a new Local Transport Outcome Framework – that they want LTAs to achieve with this funding in delivering their local plans/priorities.

c) **LTAs develop delivery plans** - A single LTDP will detail how the LTA has prioritised the funding available to deliver shared outcomes.

d) **LTAs report to the Government** - LTAs will report to the DfT to show progress against the delivery plans, key monitoring data and the Local Transport Outcomes Framework via a new online data portal.

e) **Potential intervention by the Government** – the DfT will establish an intervention framework to identify where they can provide further enabling support to LTA delivery, or where additional reporting or engagement may be required. The DfT will monitor and assess LTAs against the reporting of outputs and outcomes – to assess LTA performance and if any DfT actions should be considered.

f) **Evaluation** – all LTAs will be responsible for evaluation of their own funding programmes and schemes. The DfT will undertake a programme level evaluation of its consolidated local transport funding to understand the impact of transport schemes and build a national picture.

<u>Incentive Elements and Interventions</u>

22. There are different incentive arrangements for different transport modes, reflecting their different purposes and characteristics.

a) Highways Maintenance: As was the case in 2025/26, a portion of this funding will be designated as incentive funding. This funding will be subject to Local Highway Authorities demonstrating that they comply with best practice in highways maintenance, for example, through the amount of capital spending on highways maintenance and adopting more preventative maintenance. Leicestershire will receive a total of £105.4m in baseline maintenance funding with £39.3m available in incentive funding over the four-year period.

b) In all four years, at least 25% of the annual incentive funding will be dependent on the Local Highway Authority publishing transparency reports. All incentive funding will be withheld if reports are not published. The DfT will set out further details on the requirements for transparency reports for future years in due course.

c) In 2026/27, 50% of the incentive funding will be subject to the Local Highway Authority's performance. To support the effective investment of the increased funding, the DfT announced a new traffic light rating system for Local Highway Authorities on 11 January 2026. Leicestershire County Council received a red rating overall based on data provided in the 2025 highways transparency report. https://www.leicestershire.gov.uk/sites/default/files/2025-06/local-highways-maintenance-transparency-report.pdf A discussion has been held with the DfT officials setting out the County Council's position, requesting reassessment of Leicestershire's score on the basis of the total investment into capital maintenance for 2025/26 rather than only on the DfT's grant investment. The DfT's response is awaited and further details on the performance-based measure will be confirmed in due course.

d) Local Authority Active Travel Capability Ratings will remain central to funding allocations for active travel. ATE has reserved some funding to uplift LTAs allocations in response to future increases in capability and performance. For LTAs who increase their capability ratings in 2027/28, the DfT plans to recognise this in Active Travel funding allocations in the following years. This will be paid as part of the quarterly grant payment.

e) Bus funding is contingent on the timely receipt of a delivery plan satisfying the expectations of the DfT.

Wider MTFS Position

23. The challenges that local government has faced are expected to continue and, in all likelihood, worsen. This is due to over a decade of austerity, combined with significant growth in spending pressures, particularly from rising demand and cost within social care and special education needs services, exacerbated by external factors such as the impact of the Covid-19 pandemic and significant increases in inflation not seen for many decades.

24. The Council is required to set a balanced budget each year. It also has a duty to secure best value by making "arrangements to secure continuous improvement in the way in which its functions are exercised, having regard to a combination of economy, efficiency and effectiveness". This duty is supplemented by statutory guidance to which the Council must have regard.

25. The MTFS for 2026-30 projects gaps in all years, with the gaps in the second, third and fourth years being particularly concerning, especially as several mitigations have already been included, such as future increases in Council Tax. There is a gap of £18m in the first year that (subject to changes from later information such as the Local Government Finance Settlement) will need to be balanced by the use of earmarked reserves. There is then a gap of £36m in year two rising to £85m in year four, based on a 2.99% Council Tax increase. To have a realistic chance of closing the gap, the County Council will need to quickly identify additional savings or source additional income that allows 2027/28 to be balanced without the use of reserves, which the Efficiency Review will support.

26. The overall approach to developing the Capital Programme is set out in the MTFS and includes the following key principles:

    a) To invest in priority areas of growth, including roads, infrastructure, economic growth and to support delivery of essential services.
    b) Capital schemes will only be added to the Programme once a Business Case has been completed.
    c) To invest in projects that generate a positive revenue return (spend to save). Minimum 7% return on investment for new schemes.
    d) No new forward funding of section 106 contributions.
    e) Maximise external sources of income, including capital receipts, section 106 housing developer contributions and bids to external funding agencies.
    f) No investment in capital schemes primarily for financial return where borrowing is required anywhere within the Capital Programme.

27. Over the period of the MTFS, a County Council Capital Programme of £501m is required of which £134m is planned for 2026/27. The main elements for the Department total £275m, including completion of the Zouch Bridge replacement major scheme; investment in the Transport Asset Management programme – preventative and restorative highways maintenance - and the Environment and Waste Programme. Other significant projects include the Melton Depot replacement and the corporate wide vehicle replacement programme.

28. Through prudent financial management and robust budgeting, the Council is in a better position than many other authorities. However, it is severely limited as to the extent to which it is able to fund highway and transport works and programmes from its own budgets, in comparison to the challenges and demands it faces.

Population Growth

29. In December 2025, the Cabinet considered a report on strategic spatial and transport planning. It noted that the population of Leicestershire is projected to increase by 23% to 830,618 between 2018 and 2043. This is higher across all age bands in comparison to the East Midlands and England averages.

30. As the population of Leicester and Leicestershire increases, so will demands for travel (by individuals and, for example, through increased travel by businesses in order to meet the goods and services needs of a growing population).

31. Evidence points to one fundamental conclusion: the County Council cannot ‘prevent’ growth. Therefore, unless significant changes occur in societal behaviours and expectations, the extent to which the impacts of growth on the County’s transport system can be mitigated in the future are very limited.

32. The key pieces of transport evidence conclude:

a) There is no 'magic bullet' to meeting the needs of the area's growing population, such as a strategy that avoids the need for significant investment in strategic transport infrastructure.
b) There are cumulative impacts across areas or along particular corridors.
c) There are no longer any straightforward or inexpensive ways to mitigate the strategic transport impacts of growth.
d) The scale of strategic transport investment (for all modes) required to address the impacts of growth is becoming increasingly beyond that which a Community Infrastructure Levy, combined with likely future levels of public funding, can afford.

33. The scale of investment in the County's transport system has failed to keep pace with the increased travel demands generated by a growing population. As further growth is coming forward, there is no longer appropriate and suitable transport capacity to support it. In the absence of strategic infrastructure improvements, traffic conditions on existing routes will continue to deteriorate and/or traffic will be displaced on to far less suitable routes, with potential asset management, safety and environmental consequences.

34. Although the new consolidated funding from the DfT is welcome, the demands on the network in terms of both the impacts of growth and asset deterioration are such that the County Council's ability to invest in constructing new infrastructure will still require significant funds from developers. Whilst the County Council will always be mindful of its statutory duty to ensure that highway safety is not compromised, there could be adverse impacts of development, such as congestion, if sufficient developer funding is not secured through the planning process.

Climate Resilience

35. Transport is an enabler of everyday lives; when it fails, normal life is disrupted. This is becoming ever more the case with the apparent impacts of changes in weather patterns.

36. Leicestershire County Council faces increasing risks to its operations and assets from climate change and extreme weather events. In 2021, the Council produced a Climate Change Risk and Resilience Review and Assessment report. This set out eight high risks and 56 medium risks to Council services due to changes in the UK climate which have already happened, as well as projected changes up to the end of this century.

37. The effects of warmer and wetter winters, hotter and drier summers and more frequent and intense weather extremes include:

a) Increased levels of, and more frequent occurrences of, highway flooding that result in road closures or damage to vehicles (where people inadvisably attempt to drive through flood waters).
b) More wind damage to trees, resulting in road closures from blockages caused by fallen trees and, in some cases, fatalities where trees fall on vehicles.

c) Fresh damage to highway assets or worsening existing conditions, causing risks of increased vehicle damage (and subsequent increased levels of insurance claims to the County Council); in some circumstances, the need for road closures in the interests of safety.
d) Increases in demand as a result of the impact of bad weather, causing pressures to services which in turn will increase demand for climate adaption to the Council's assets.
e) Disruption of the delivery of the safe, resilient and operation of the Council's transport networks, including the bus network, which increases the potential for social isolation, which undermines the health and wellbeing of Leicestershire's communities and residents.
f) Disruption to planned maintenance programmes (for example, where temperatures are too hot to carry out surface dressing), which in the long-term will have implications for the condition of the highway assets.

38. Further, increased levels of flooding, including of property, places pressures on the County Council, as the Lead Local Flood Authority, to be responding promptly by investigating the causes of such flooding, with corresponding resourcing (financial) consequences in terms of increased demand for revenue repairs and for the capital flood alleviation schemes. Therefore, long-term funding is required from the Government.

Highway Asset Condition

39. The impacts of population growth and climate adaption do not just have environmental impacts (including presenting challenges to managing extremes in weather) and economic implications (such as the impacts on businesses' operating efficiencies and costs arising from the increased traffic congestion), but population growth will also significantly impact on the condition of the County's highway assets.

40. The condition of the County's highway network has been deteriorating at an increasingly rapid rate. This is particularly the case in respect of the network overall, where the percentage of network requiring maintenance to prevent the need for structural intervention (full replacement rather than resurfacing or other treatment) is increasing. This situation is reflective of the UK Roads Liaison Group Report and the 2025 National Highways and Transport Network Survey results, which demonstrate a continuing national decline in the public satisfaction of highway maintenance services and the network condition.

41. The under-investment in highway maintenance over many years at a national level has meant that the Council has been unable to manage and slow the decline in the condition of the local highway network or mitigate the risks of further deterioration of the Council's highway assets. The Programmes in previous years have only been sufficient to maintain the rate of decline of highway assets.

42. Proactive, planned (as opposed to reactive and unplanned), consistent, and sustained investment in the Council's transport services, and infrastructure condition and capacity, is necessary to mitigate the implications of network

deterioration, population growth and climate change. The Council, as the LTA has been operating in circumstances of one-year financial settlements from the Government (an approach that makes it difficult to plan spending effectively); until this year uncertainty in national spending promises; and one-off annual allocations from the County Council's own budgets.

43. For the reasons described in the above paragraphs, the introduction of the consolidated Local Infrastructure Fund allocated over multiple years is welcome. Having foresight of the funding available will allow the Council to develop and deliver more proactive asset renewal programmes rather than depending on short-term reactive interventions. This will start to mitigate the impacts on other service areas due to the impact of poor transport provision, which undermines the health and wellbeing of Leicestershire's communities, as well as the ability for businesses to deliver goods and services in a reliable and timely manner.

44. In recognition of the challenges faced in seeking to maintain the County's highway assets, a Resilient Network Strategy is being developed by the Council. This will codify the Council's risk-based approach to asset management, as laid down in the national Code of Practice 'Well-managed highway infrastructure' 2016 and will consolidate the Council's asset management policies and strategies.

National and Local Policy

45. In November 2024, the Secretary of State for Transport heralded an intended significant shift in national transport policy to put 'the needs of people first'. That is to move away from an approach that delivers transport choices for transport purposes to an approach that more widely reflects peoples' travel needs.

46. The Government called for ideas to inform the development of an Integrated National Transport Strategy (INTS), which will give effect to the policy shift. Following consultation with the Cabinet Lead Member, the Director of Environment and Transport submitted a response to the call for ideas under their delegated powers in March 2025. The Government is yet to publish the INTS although it is anticipated in Spring 2026, unfortunately this means that it is not available to inform the 2026/27 LTDP.

47. The Government will be publishing updated guidance on Local Transport Plans (LTPs) in due course, but it does not expect LTAs to update existing LTPs ahead of developing the LTDP for 2026/27 (either for the March or September LTDP deadlines). From the information available, it appears that the County Council's LTP4 Core Document will be well aligned with the intent of the proposed INTS and the draft LTP guidance, as it is based on the premise of transport being an enabler to help improve the health, safety and wellbeing of Leicestershire's communities

48. The evolving national and local policy situation has come too late to have a material impact on the contents of the proposed Programmes, but it is anticipated that the Programmes will be in broad alignment with the principles

once published. Any changes in policy direction may have a significant impact on both the content and structure of the Programmes in future years, including the need for greater clarity about how the work of the LTA is helping to deliver on national and local policies and bringing wider health and environmental benefits to local communities. An example of this is when the Government published its new Road Safety Strategy on 8 January 2026, the first one in 10 years and moving forward, the Council will need to take account of the ambitions set out in this Strategy.

Accessibility

49. As part of the allocation of LTF and BSF funding, the DfT has advised that LTAs must role model inclusive policy making and embed active consideration of accessibility within the development and delivery of policies funded through their consolidated funding settlement.

50. In particular, LTAs must assess equalities impacts throughout the policy development and delivery lifecycle, and reflect such consideration in Equality Impact Assessments for individual projects, which must be made available to the Secretary of State upon request:

    i. Co-design policy, infrastructure and service change initiatives funded from consolidated funding with disabled groups.
    ii. Align their processes with the Government's Transport Accessibility Charter, once published.

Local Transport Outcome Framework

51. The DfT has advised that ministers will set priority outcomes through the Local Transport Outcome Framework. This will outline measurable priority outcomes the Government wants LTAs to achieve, reflecting shared national and local priorities for transport in line with the Plan for Change and the priorities in the upcoming INTS.

52. Most indicators will be baselined against national data so there is consistency in how performance is tracked and monitored, and to avoid placing unnecessary data burdens on LTAs. In seeking a proportionate approach to reporting, the Framework does not capture every detailed priority and there are some areas – such as fares and ticketing and key aspects of accessibility – not currently included because there are no readily available measures at an LTA level.

53. As well as considering existing guidance documents, LTAs should also consider the detail in forthcoming national strategies – e.g. the INTS, LTP guidance, Cycling and Walking Investment Strategy 3, the Road Safety Strategy and the cross-government strategy addressing violence against women and girls – when planning and delivering interventions, even if they do not relate to a specific, measurable outcome.

54. Whilst it does not intend to set explicit targets at this stage, the DfT will consider performance against these outcomes as part of an overall assessment of LTA delivery and may explore options for setting more explicit targets for improving outcomes in the future.

Quantifiable Carbon Guidance

55. LTAs are required to report on the forecast carbon emissions estimates of their LTDP as an outcome framework indicator. To achieve this, places must use the Quantifiable Carbon Guidance to provide the DfT with carbon metrics for their proposed programme of interventions. These metrics must include the methods and tools, assumptions, caveats, and justifications for the approaches taken to calculate them.

56. Further detail on reporting, including how places can use the Quantifiable Carbon Guidance to report against the carbon indicator, will be covered in further guidance from the DfT this spring.

2026/27 Highways and Transportation Capital and Work Programmes

General Overview

57. The Programmes reflect the Department's duties and the key highway service-related policies, strategies, and plans, as detailed above, whilst also taking account of the Council's future priorities. The Programmes will be monitored and evaluated to assess success against the LTP4 objectives and priorities.

58. The Programmes will be updated to reflect any changes in national or local legislation by the Director of Environment and Transport and the Director of Corporate Resources (using the existing delegated authority), following consultation with the Cabinet Lead Members..

59. Furthermore, these Programmes will continue to be driven by wider strategic agendas, being heavily informed by transport evidence associated with district councils' work to develop Local Plans. The way particular projects support the delivery of growth, is highlighted in the overview of the Programmes, set out further on in this report and in Appendix B.

60. The Programmes have been prepared using the most current information available and will be revised as necessary to ensure value for money and to respond to changing circumstances (for example, changes in the Government's policy or funding announcements from the Government). The Programmes will continue to evolve, as outlined earlier in this report.

61. A range of factors are considered when preparing the Programmes, such as:

    a) Progress with the delivery of prior year programmes.
    b) Schemes/projects spanning across multiple financial years (such as continued commitment).
    c) Alignment with policies, strategies, and plans.

d) Resource availability.
e) Circumstances, for example needing to adjust in the light of severe weather events.
f) Evidence such as the performance of and the condition of the highway assets, the Local Plans, environment and health, and from public engagement and consultations.
g) Funding.
h) Seeking to maximise value for money and benefits.

62. The Department's Capital Programme budget totals £275m over the four years 2026-30, of which the major part, £271m (99%), is the Highways and Transportation element (it should be noted that these figures do not include any potential slippage/acceleration). This capital funding comes from several sources, such as various grants from the Government and competitive funding streams; capital receipts; the County Council's capital budget and revenue balances; external contributions, such as developer contributions; and earmarked funds.

63. There will be a very limited scope to add further major capital schemes to the Capital Programme (unless funded through developer contributions) but new LTF funding will allow the reintroduction and expansion of programmes that the Council has not had budget for in previous years, including:

a) Resurfacing or proactive maintenance schemes on footways (this has been the case for many years, and, as mentioned, above results in safety issues, such as slips and trips).
b) Clearing of drainage pipes, culverts or other underground drainage assets.
c) Funding for major renewals, such as the replacement of major assets at the end of their lifespan.
d) Expansion of road safety and accessibility programmes to support communities.

<u>The 2026/27 Capital Programme</u>

64. The Capital Programme (attached as Appendix A) sets out a summary of the budget breakdown for each of the capital lines set out in the refreshed MTFS. It also presents figures for the period 2027/28 to 2029/30, although those may be subject to change because of future MTFS refreshes and/or funding announcements from the Government.

65. Over the period of the MTFS, a Capital Programme of £271.4m is required for Highways and Transportation (£501m for the entire Authority's Capital Programme) of which £72.m is planned for 2026/27. The Programme reflects the need to ensure that monies available are invested in projects and measures that deliver the maximum benefit over the longest possible period whilst noting it still only leads to a managed state of decline. The areas of spend are as follows:

I. Major Schemes

a) Melton Mowbray Distributor Road - North and East Sections, No additional allocation in 2026/27

A key element of the Interim Melton Mowbray Transport Strategy, which supports delivery of the Melton Local Plan. This project enables the strategic growth of the town, in particular helping to support the delivery of around 4,000 new homes and 30 hectares of employment land. Work on the main contract for the scheme is due to complete in spring 2026.

b) Zouch Bridge Replacement – Construction and Enabling Works, £3.7m in 2026/27

A new bridge will replace the old bridge which has major structural issues and has had a temporary weight limit already imposed to protect the current structure. Main construction work has started and will continue until early 2027.

c) Advance Design / Match Funding (Local Transport Plan Implementation), £3.2m in 2026/27

On 22 November 2024, the Cabinet adopted the LTP4 Core Document, which sets out the strategic vision, core themes and policy for how the Council will deliver the transport network to support people, communities and businesses across Leicestershire.

The Cabinet also approved progress onto Phase 2 of the LTP4 development, which will be undertaken over the 2026/27 financial year. This work will focus on the development of the Focused Strategies, the Multi-Modal Area Investment Plans (MMAIPs) Pilot and the Countywide Strategic Transport Investment Plan.

The Focused Strategies will provide transport solutions to issues and challenges which are affecting the vitality and prosperity of Leicestershire's communities and businesses across the county. Initial work has already begun on the development of the first focused strategy: Enabling Travel Choice Strategy. A programme of further focused strategies is also being developed.

The MMAIPs are a key delivery mechanism for the delivery of the LTP4 vision, core themes and policies at the local level, through the identification and implementation of transport solutions. This will be in the form of a strategy and supporting delivery plan covering a five-year period. The first three MMAIPs are being developed and will cover the following areas:

i. Market Harborough,
ii. South of Leicester,
iii. Hinckley.

In these three areas, Local Plans have significant transport needs and challenges, which need to be addressed. In addition, the development of the wider MMAIP programme will also be progressed.

Alongside this, the Council will set out the strategic transport needs and requirements to support the delivery of the LTP4, as well as the objectives of the Leicester and Leicestershire Strategic Growth Plan.

Initial evidence work has taken place, including:

i. Planning for potential new future transport networks across south Leicestershire.
ii. Exploring the potential benefits of improving strategic transport orbital connectivity around the east and south of the Leicester Urban Area.
iii. Understanding more about the make-up of journeys made along the A6 south corridor, including through the Kibworth villages.

Whilst this initial work has not reached any definitive conclusions, it has provided a positive basis for identifying and taking forward further work, which builds on the initial evidence work. In response to local concerns, an initial set of scheme identification and development work has been identified:

i. To develop a multi-modal, mapped strategic vision for the Housing Market Area's future transport system.
ii. To examine options for improving strategic transport orbital connectivity around the east and south of the Leicester Urban Area.
iii. To examine options for the A6 corridor to the south of the City of Leicester, including the Kibworth's villages junction feasibility work.
iv. To explore options for the use of the Eastern District Distributor Road reservation in Oadby.

d) Melton Depot Replacement, £9.3m in 2026/27

To find an alternative highways depot site to replace the existing Melton depot for which the lease is due to expire in December 2027.

e) Market Harborough Improvements, £2.4m in 2026/27

The current programme includes the following schemes:

i. Rockingham Road Cycling and Walking Enhancements - Delivery of a 3-metre shared-use cycle/footway and cycle and pedestrian priority crossings at side roads. The proposals also include upgrades to traffic signals and junction layouts at Gores Lane and at the Clarence Street/Kettering Road junction with St Mary's Road, as well as the installation of a new signalised crossing on Rockingham Road.

ii. Great Bowden Traffic Calming Measures - Implementation of a 20mph zone in Great Bowden, supported by associated traffic calming measures.
iii. Lubenham Hill Walking and Cycling Improvements - Provision of a 3-metre shared-use cycling and walking facility at Lubenham Hill.
iv. Bus Shelter Provision - Installation and upgrade of bus shelters at key locations.
v. Public Rights of Way Improvements - Enhancements to local public rights of way to support safer and more accessible active travel routes.

f) Leicestershire Cycling and Walking Infrastructure Plan Delivery, £0.81m in 2026/27

Budget to enable the development of a Local Cycling and Walking Infrastructure Plan on the ground.

g) A511 / A50 Major Road Network, awaiting Full Business Case approval, proposed to use £10m of section 106 funding in 2026/27

Allocated for the ongoing design work for the scheme, which is partly funded by the Government's Major Road Network programme. This project is a key element of the ICTS and is essential to enabling the ongoing growth in the area, including to support the delivery of 3,500 new homes in Southeast Coalville. Planning approval has been secured for the Bardon Link Road works, and the compulsory purchase order for required land together with the side roads order have both been confirmed by the Secretary of State for Transport for the scheme overall. Subject to the final funding confirmation by the Government, the works are intended to commence on site in winter 2026, with an anticipated completion date of winter 2028.

h) The Parade Oadby, £1.0m in 2026/27

This scheme proposes to upgrade the junction of the A6 (Leicester Road and Harborough Road), joining Regent Street, Stoughton Road and the Parade to make it safer for cyclists and pedestrians.

i) Local Electric Vehicle Infrastructure (LEVI) Full Roll Out, £0.3m in 2026/27

The Government capital funding to subsidise the installation of electric vehicle chargepoints across Leicestershire.

II. Minor Schemes / Other

a) Local Authority Bus Grant (LABG), £2.7m in 2026/27

Highway network improvements to support bus journeys.

b) Property Flood Risk Alleviation, £1.2m in 2026/27

Flood alleviations schemes to mitigate the impact of flooding within Leicestershire.

c) Safety Schemes, £2.5m in 2026/27

To enable the delivery of road safety and traffic management schemes where accident levels highlight that they are required or other community needs are identified.

d) Active Travel Infrastructure Improvement, £0.6m in 2026/27

Improvements to walking, wheeling and cycling routes to provide active travel choices for residents.

e) Plant Renewals, £0.1m in 2026/27

Scheduled plant replacement purchases to fully support operational teams with key equipment.

f) Highways Depot Improvements, £0.2m in 2026/27

To carry out improvements to the various highway depots such as building alterations to Mountsorrel depot highway stores.

g) County Council Vehicle Replacement Programme, £4.5m in 2026/27

Investment in new vehicles to replace aged vehicles and reduce running costs. It is a 20-year replacement programme.

h) Externally Funded Schemes (Section 106), £1.1m in 2026/27.

This covers developers/section 106 funded schemes.

III. Transport Asset Management

a) Transport Asset Management Programme, £38.8m in 2026/27

For capital maintenance works for highways and transport assets across the County such as roads and footways. Types of maintenance works include surface dressing, patching, bridge repairs, street lighting column replacements, and traffic signal renewals.

Funding - Capital Grants

66. Grant funding for the Authority's Capital Programme totals £274m across the 2026-30 Programme. Most grants are awarded by the Government's departments, such as the DfT.

67. The main DfT grant for maintenance has been announced for 2026/27 as part of a four-year consolidated funding settlement to 2029/30 (see paragraphs 15-18):

    a) Base line allocation 2026/27 – circa £21.8m.
    b) New funding 2026/27 – the maximum potential is circa £8.0m, subject to incentivisation.

The 2026/27 Works Programme

68. The Works Programme (attached as Appendix B) contains actions (such as intervention/work/treatment), some of which are part of longer-term projects that will take place over several years or may be implemented beyond 2026/27. Appendix B provides more information behind the budget lines set out in Appendix A, further highlighting how the work is aligned to the delivery of strategies supporting growth.

Funding

69. The actions outlined in the Works Programme will be funded from a variety of sources, including capital budgets and current external sources of funding, including, for example, developer contributions. Officers will continue to explore and, as appropriate, pursue any additional sources of external funding should these opportunities arise.

Consultation

70. Where appropriate, individual schemes and projects will continue to be subject to further consultation with Local Members and the public, and reports will be presented to Members, as necessary.

Resource Implications

71. The Programmes involve significant amounts of money and represent a continued commitment by the Council to deliver on its strategic objectives.

72. However, based on the current evidence, population growth projections and societal behaviours and expectations, the levels of funding available through the Council's own budgets and funding allocations from the Government, whilst delivering vital work, are insufficient to meet current and future needs of the County. This is evidenced through work underpinning Local Plans development and driven by the growth proposals that those Local Plans include (inclusive of meeting the Government's imposed housing number requirements). Without investment from other sources, growth will be frustrated and/or travel conditions on Leicestershire's transport system will deteriorate.

73. Leicestershire has traditionally been recognised for having well maintained roads. However, a lack of proactive investment over the last decade due to insufficient funding has led to a rapid deterioration of the road network, creating

a maintenance backlog which will not be recovered in the short- to medium-term. The multi-year consolidated funding allocated by the DfT is welcomed and will go some way to address the current condition of the highway network but the funding is insufficient to address the overall decline of Leicestershire's existing highways assets (roads, cycleways and footways, verges, bridges, signs, and lines). Again, without additional funding from other sources, the condition of the County's roads and other assets will continue to decline.

74. The Department's risk register recognises that if services do not take into account current and future climate change in their planning, they may be unable to respond adequately to the predicted impacts, leading to significantly higher financial implications and service disruption, as well as making future adaptation more costly.

75. Thus, what monies are available, need to be invested in projects and measures that deliver the maximum benefit over the longest possible period. Also, the importance of ensuring that the Council is well prepared to secure additional funding from other sources, including via 'bids' to the Government and from developers (not just via planning applications, but also through ensuring that the Local Plans prepared by district councils provide a robust policy basis for seeking contributions), needs to be emphasised.

76. The Works Programme is resource intensive, both in staff and financial terms. Work by other bodies also creates resource pressures that have the potential to impact on the Programme's delivery. Additionally, like many sectors of the economy, skill shortages and/or the inability to retain the necessary skills will continue to impact on the Programme's delivery. The implications of this are the risk of slippage on the Programme's delivery and cost escalation as market prices increase. Thus, going forward, it will be evermore important to ensure that resources are focused on the effective delivery of the approved Programme.

77. Carrying out monitoring and evaluation for the Programmes is key to ensuring that the Council can assess the impact of the various schemes and interventions being delivered against its Strategic Outcomes and the new Local Outcome Framework (see paragraph 19).The monitoring and evaluation requirements for the new consolidated grant funding from the DfT (as outlined in paragraphs 19-22) will require additional resource to ensure that incentivisation requirements can be met and grant funding maximised.

78. The Director of Corporate Resources and the Assistant Director of Law and Governance have been consulted on the content of this report.

Timetable for Decisions (including Scrutiny)

79. The Programmes will be considered by the Cabinet on 24 March 2026 and, subject to its approval, the Programmes will be published on the Council's website afterwards. The Committee's comments will be reported to the Cabinet.

80. A detailed draft of the LTDP is required to be submitted to the DfT by 20 March 2026, this will include all spending for 2026/27 and an outline plan to 2029/2030.

Conclusions

81. The commitment from the Government to a multi-year settlement is to be welcomed as it is something that the Authority has been campaigning for. However, this does come with its own risks and challenges such as recruiting the necessary staff and procuring contracts in competition with other authorities.

82. This year's Programmes have been put together against a challenging and evolving backdrop. Evidence is showing the enormous challenges faced in seeking to provide for population growth, whilst simultaneously seeking to maintain an effectively operating transport system and mitigate the effects of extreme weather. Furthermore, the condition of the County's road, footway and cycleway networks continue to deteriorate, and more and heavier vehicles will cause further damage to the road network, further exacerbating the problem. The additional funding will help to mitigate the demands on the highway network but will not be sufficient to address the backlog of maintenance to return them to a good state of repair.

83. This year's Programmes contain important projects that will help to support the County's growth and that ultimately seek to deliver improved facilities across all modes, including for cyclists and pedestrians.

84. The Programmes are of value and importance in delivering on the Council's Strategic Plan's outcomes and seeking to improve the health and wellbeing of Leicestershire communities.

85. Looking beyond 2026/27, the structure and content of future year Programmes are likely to evolve in the light of significant changes in local and national policy, including to reflect and align to the County Council's LTP4 and the proposed INTS, as well as mitigating extreme weather and discussions on local government reorganisation and devolution.

Background Papers

Report to the Environment and Climate Change Overview and Scrutiny Committee on 21 June 2022 – Corporate Climate Change Risk Assessment Review 2021
https://democracy.leics.gov.uk/ieListDocuments.aspx?CId=1292&MID=6754

Report to the Cabinet on 22 November 2024 – Leicestershire County Council's Local Transport Plan 4 (LTP4) Core Document
https://democracy.leics.gov.uk/ieListDocuments.aspx?CId=135&MId=7511&Ver=4

Local highways maintenance transparency report on 30 June 2025
https://www.leicestershire.gov.uk/roads-and-travel/road-maintenance/local-highways-maintenance-and-improvements

Report to the Cabinet on 15 July 2025 – Leicestershire County Council's Approach to Flooding
https://democracy.leics.gov.uk/ieListDocuments.aspx?CId=135&MID=7878#AI85747

Report to the Cabinet on 16 December 2025 – Strategic Spatial and Transport Planning
https://democracy.leics.gov.uk/ieListDocuments.aspx?CId=135&MId=7882&Ver=4

Report to the Cabinet on 16 December 2025 – Leicestershire County Council's Approach to Flooding – Spending Proposals for £2 million Redistributed from Reserves
https://democracy.leics.gov.uk/ieListDocuments.aspx?CId=135&MId=7880&Ver=4

Report to the Cabinet on 3 February 2026 – Medium Term Financial Strategy 2026/27 to 2029/30
https://democracy.leics.gov.uk/ieListDocuments.aspx?CId=135&MId=8304&Ver=4

Circulation under the Local Issues Alert Procedure

86. This report will be circulated to all Members.

Equality Implications

87. There are no equality implications arising directly from the content of this report. It has not been necessary to undertake a detailed Equality Impacts Assessment on the Programmes.

88. Equality Impact Assessments will be carried out in relation to work undertaken on individual projects contained within the Programmes, when appropriate. This is in line with the latest guidance from the DfT on the commissioning of LTDP and funding expectations.

89. The DfT has advised that the LTDP should comply with the LTA's statutory requirements, including to have due regard to the Public Sector Equalities Duty; and that the Authority should continue to monitor this and comply with the DfT's requirements. Accessibility and inclusion will be built into the new LTDP.

Human Rights Implications

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

91. Relevant assessments will be carried out in relation to work undertaken on individual projects contained within the Programmes, when appropriate.

Environmental Implications

92. No detailed environmental assessment has been undertaken on the Programmes but assessments will be carried out for major schemes and programmes as appropriate in line with the Equality Impact Assessment carried

out for the Council's LTP4. LTAs are required to report on the forecast carbon emissions estimates of their LTDP as an outcome framework indicator. To achieve this, places must use the Quantifiable Carbon Guidance to provide the DfT with carbon metrics for their proposed programme of interventions. Further detail on reporting, including how places can use the Quantifiable Carbon Guidance to report against the carbon indicator, will be covered in further guidance in early 2026.

Partnership Working and Associated Issues

93. Working and consulting with key partners (such as Leicester City Council, the district councils, the DfT, National Highways, Network Rail, developers and Midlands Connect), will be considered along with any impact issues, and will continue to be important in seeking to secure additional funding to deliver future transport measures and infrastructure.

Risk Assessment

94. The Programmes have been risk assessed as part of a wider risk assessment of the Department's business planning process and robust governance is in place to identify, assess and mitigate risk across the Programmes.

95. The delivery of both Programmes is supported by the Department's business planning process and risk assessments will be undertaken for individual teams, schemes and initiatives, with mitigation strategies put in place to manage identified risks as appropriate.

Appendices

Appendix A - Environment and Transport 2026/27 Highways and Transportation Capital Programme

Appendix B - Environment and Transport 2026/27 Highways and Transportation Works Programme

Officers to Contact

Ann Carruthers
Director, Environment and Transport
Tel: (0116) 305 7000
Email: Ann.Carruthers@leics.gov.uk

Janna Walker
Assistant Director, Development and Growth
Tel: (0116) 305 7215
Email: Janna.Walker@leics.gov.uk

ENVIRONMENT & TRANSPORT - CAPITAL PROGRAMME 2026-30

Estimated Completion Date	Gross Cost of Project £000		Capital Programme 2026/27 £000	2027/28 £000	2028/29 £000	2029/30 £000	Total £000
		Major Schemes					
Apr-27	19,600	Zouch Bridge Replacement - Construction and Enabling Works	3,675	76			3,750
Mar-30	12,174	Advance Design / Match Funding	3,248	2,975	2,975	2,976	12,174
Mar-27	9,870	Melton Depot Replacement	9,321				9,321
Mar-28	2,509	Market Harbough improvements	2,421	88			2,509
Mar-30	3,818	Leicestershire Cycling Walking Improvements Plan Delivery	809	1,228	891	890	3,818
Mar-27	1,880	The Parade Oadby Cyclops	1,000				1,000
Mar-29	3,151	Local Electric Vehicle Infrastructure (LEVI) Full Roll out	299	599	2,237		3,135
							0
			20,773	**4,965**	**6,103**	**3,866**	**35,707**
		Minor Schemes / Other					
Mar-30	11,115	Local Authority Bus Grant (LABG)	2,697	2,752	2,806	2,860	11,115
Mar-28	1,528	Property Flood Risk Alleviation - funded externally + LCC	1,176	352			1,528
Mar-30	8,909	Safety Schemes	2,512	2,327	1,975	2,095	8,909
Mar-30	1,829	Active Travel Improvements	620	309	430	470	1,829
Mar-30	400	Plant renewals	100	100	100	100	400
Mar-28	575	Highways Depot Improvements	200	200			400
Mar-30	14,538	County Council Vehicle Replacement Programme	4,540	3,436	4,880	1,682	14,538
Mar-28	1,479	Externally Funded Schemes	1,128	351			1,479
			12,973	**9,827**	**10,191**	**7,207**	**40,198**
		Transport Asset Management					
Mar-30	19,884	Capital Schemes and Design	4,784	5,033	5,034	5,033	19,884
Mar-30	8,805	Bridges	1,755	1,385	1,165	4,500	8,805
Mar-30	3,320	Highways Flood alleviation	600	925	925	870	3,320
Mar-30	13,050	Street Lighting	3,398	3,320	3,321	3,011	13,050
Mar-30	4,231	Traffic Signal Renewal	866	1,199	1,174	992	4,231
Mar-30	49,037	Preventative Maintenance - (Surface Dressing)	11,780	12,509	13,336	11,412	49,037
Mar-30	66,883	Restorative (Patching)	14,436	15,671	17,515	19,261	66,883
Apr-29	1,711	Public rights of way maintenance	661	517	517	16	1,711
Mar-30	1,400	Network Performance & Reliability	350	350	350	350	1,400
Mar-30	27,056	Other LTG Funds - to be allocated across the TAM	0	5,978	7,844	13,234	27,056
			38,630	**46,887**	**51,181**	**58,679**	**195,377**
		Environment & Waste					
Mar-30	148	Ashby Canal	37	37	37	37	148
Mar-30	1,628	Recycling Household Waste Sites - General Improvements	511	390	437	290	1,628
Mar-27	490	Recycling Household Waste Sites - S.106 funded schemes	490				490
Mar-28	1,139	Food Waste Treatment Service Delivery	288	851			1,139
			1,326	**1,278**	**474**	**327**	**3,405**
		Total E&T	**73,702**	**62,957**	**67,949**	**70,079**	**274,687**

This page is intentionally left blank

Appendix B

2026/2027 Highways and Transportation Capital Works Programme

Major Schemes (1-7)

01. Zouch Bridge Replacement

District / Parish	Location / Scheme Name	Intervention / Work / Treatment Description	Cost Band A = Over £1m B = £201,000 - £1m C = £51,000 to £200,000 D = £50,000 and below
Charnwood Borough Council	A6006 near Zouch Zouch Bridge replacement scheme	Construction of replacement bridge on A6006 followed by demolition of existing bridge.	Cost Band A

Budget	**£ 3,675,000**

02. Advance Design/Match Funding

District / Parish	Location / Scheme Name	Intervention / Work / Treatment Description	Cost Band A = Over £1m B = £201,000 - £1m C = £51,000 to £200,000 D = £50,000 and below
Countywide	Emerging Priorities Fund	Fund to support any new initiatives which may arise from funding opportunities during the year.	Cost Band B
Countywide	Rail Strategy Contribution	Council annual contribution to funding for two Rail Officer posts created for dealing with rail matter as part of East Midlands Councils / Transport for East Midlands.	Cost Band D
Countywide	Multi Modal Area Investment Plans (MMAIPs) Development	To enable the development of the MMAIPs programme for the forthcoming MMAIPs pilots and to enable feasibility design for priority schemes under the MMAIPs.	Cost Band C
Countywide	Strategic Transport Planning and Feasibility	To support any work associated with the Leicester and Leicestershire Strategic Growth Plan, and feasibility studies including the A6 in Kibworth.	Cost Band B
South of Leicester (area includes towns of Blaby, Oadby and Wigston)	South of Leicester MMAIP	Leicestershire's Local Transport Plan 2025-2040 (LTP4) includes a commitment to develop locally focussed MMAIPs. The MMAIPs will set out plans to invest in solutions that help people to connect in an easy, efficient and sustainable way, to the employment/education/health/retail/leisure	Cost Band D

District / Parish	Location / Scheme Name	Intervention / Work / Treatment Description	Cost Band A = Over £1m B = £201,000 - £1m C = £51,000 to £200,000 D = £50,000 and below
		services and facilities that they need. The South of Leicester MMAIP is one of three pilot MMAIPs.	
Desford	Desford Crossroads	The overall objective of this scheme is to deliver the junction improvements at the A47/ B582 Desford Crossroads junction.	Cost Band B
North West Leicestershire	North West Leicester Growth Plan	Support to North West Leicestershire District Council for the development and adoption of its next Local Plan, including its transport evidence base. An adopted Local Plan will have the benefit of enabling the delivery of growth and supporting transport infrastructure to be best coordinated and provide the basis for securing developer contributions towards the delivery of such.	Cost Band C
Countywide	Resilient Transport Network Strategy	To enable the development of the Resilient Transport Network Strategy that will set out Council asset management policy and strategy in alignment with the LTP4 Core Document. Which will then set out the actions of deliverables in the Network Management Plan, Winter Maintenance Operational Plan, and Highway Infrastructure Asset Management Plan.	Cost Band D

District / Parish	Location / Scheme Name	Intervention / Work / Treatment Description	Cost Band A = Over £1m B = £201,000 - £1m C = £51,000 to £200,000 D = £50,000 and below
Countywide	Local Cycling and Walking Infrastructure Plan (LCWIP) Development Programme	To support development of LCWIPs. LCWIPs represent a strategic approach to identifying cycling and walking infrastructure improvements required at the local level. They enable a long-term approach to developing local cycle and walking networks, ideally over a 10-year timescale, and represent a vital part of the Government strategy to increase the number of trips made on foot or by cycle.	Cost Band B
Countywide	Asset Management Advance Design	Advanced design for asset management schemes.	Cost Band C
South Leicester	South Leicester Joint Transport Evidence Programmes	To support work associated with the ongoing development of evidence work required to inform the delivery of the Leicester and Leicestershire Strategic Growth Plan to 2050, including to inform the content of policies and Infrastructure Delivery Plans of Local Plans that will be key to the delivery of the vision in practice.	Cost Band D
Countywide	Local Transport Plan (LTP4)	To support the ongoing management of the development programme for LTP4 during Phase 2 of the MMAIPs Pilot and Focused Strategies development. In addition to the	Cost Band C

District / Parish	Location / Scheme Name	Intervention / Work / Treatment Description	Cost Band A = Over £1m B = £201,000 - £1m C = £51,000 to £200,000 D = £50,000 and below
		implementation of the monitoring and evaluation procedures.	
Hinckley	Hinckley MMAIP	Leicestershire's LTP4 includes a commitment to develop locally focussed MMAIPs. The MMAIPs will set out plans to invest in solutions that help people to connect in an easy, efficient and sustainable way, to the employment/education/health/retail/leisure services and facilities that they need. The Hinckley MMAIP is one of three pilot MMAIPs.	Cost Band C
Market Harborough	Market Harborough MMAIP	Leicestershire's LTP4 includes a commitment to develop locally focussed MMAIPs. The MMAIPs will set out plans to invest in solutions that help people to connect in an easy, efficient and sustainable way, to the employment/education/health/retail/leisure services and facilities that they need. The Market Harborough MMAIP is one of three pilot MMAIPs.	Cost Band D

Budget **£ 3,248,000**

03. Melton Depot Replacement

District / Parish	Location / Scheme Name	Intervention / Work / Treatment Description	Cost Band A = Over £1m B = £201,000 - £1m C = £51,000 to £200,000 D = £50,000 and below
Melton / Melton Mowbray	Melton Highways Depot and Recycling and Household Waste Site Replacement	Replacement highways depot due to existing site being unavailable past 2027 (due to housing construction). Replacement likely to be on former North East Melton Mowbray Distributor Road site compound location and to include relocation of the existing recycling and household waste site (subject to separate capital bid).	Cost Band A

Budget **£9,321,000**

04. Market Harborough Improvements

District / Parish	Location / Scheme Name	Intervention / Work / Treatment Description	Cost Band A = Over £1m B = £201,000 - £1m C = £51,000 to £200,000 D = £50,000 and below
Market Harborough Phase 1	Rockingham Road, Market Harborough	Junction improvements; Signal upgrades; New shared cycling and walking off road route; Priority cycling and walking side road uncontrolled crossings; New signalised crossing; One-way proposal for Clarence Street.	Cost Band A
Market Harborough Phase 2	Concept/preliminary design and surveys - The Square and Welland Park Rd/Springfield Street	Concept/preliminary design and surveys - The Square and Welland Park Rd/Springfield Street and Great Bowden Road.	Cost Band B
Great Bowden	Traffic calming Great Bowden	Speed cushions; Crossing facilities; Junction improvements; 20mph speed limit.	Cost Band B
Market Harborough	Cycling and walking improvements Lubenham Hill	New shared walking and cycling and walking off-road route; Walking and cycling priority crossings.	Cost Band B

Lubenham	Upgrading of footpaths at six locations: A23 Leicester Road to the Green in Lubenham; A24 and A37 north of Gallow Field Road.	Right of Way improvements	Cost Band D
Market Harborough	The installation of new and/or improvement to existing bus stops/shelter that serve the development	New bus shelter	Cost Band D

Budget **£ 2,421,000**

05. Leicestershire Cycling Walking Infrastructure Plans Delivery

District / Parish	Location / Scheme Name	Intervention / Work / Treatment Description	Cost Band A = Over £1m B = £201,000 - £1m C = £51,000 to £200,000 D = £50,000 and below
Various	Various	Delivery of cycling and walking schemes identified in the LCWIPs, which will encourage people to travel more sustainably.	Cost Band B

Budget	**£ 809,000**

06. The Parade Oadby

District / Parish	Location / Scheme Name	Intervention / Work / Treatment Description	Cost Band A = Over £1m B = £201,000 - £1m C = £51,000 to £200,000 D = £50,000 and below
Oadby and Wigston	The Parade, Oadby	Rescoped to a package of corridor interventions addressing multiple barrier points between Victoria Court and New Street junctions with Leicester/Harborough Road. Proposed measures include new controlled crossings, pedestrian priority treatments at side road junctions, shared use path widening, and a Toucan crossing to reduce A6 severance.	Cost Band A

Budget **£ 1,000,000**

07. Local Electric Vehicle Infrastructure (LEVI) Full

District / Parish	Location / Scheme Name	Intervention / Work / Treatment Description	Cost Band A = Over £1m B = £201,000 - £1m C = £51,000 to £200,000 D = £50,000 and below
Various	Various	Central Government capital funding to subsidise the installation of electric vehicle chargepoints across Leicestershire by two chargepoint operators.	Cost Band A

Budget	**£ 299,000**

Minor Schemes/Other (8-14)

08. Bus Grant

District / Parish	Location / Scheme Name	Intervention / Work / Treatment Description	Cost Band A = Over £1m B = £201,000 - £1m C = £51,000 to £200,000 D = £50,000 and below
Countywide	Bus service improvements	Activity under consolidated Bus Grant funding to deliver bus service improvements.	Cost Band A

Budget	**£ 2,697,000**

09. Property Flood Risk Alleviation

District / Parish	Location / Scheme Name	Intervention / Work / Treatment Description	Cost Band A = Over £1m B = £201,000 - £1m C = £51,000 to £200,000 D = £50,000 and below
Various	Various Flood Risk Alleviation Schemes	Funding to alleviate flood risk to properties across Leicestershire.	Cost Band B
Various	Various study / early concept works for Flood Risk Alleviation schemes	Study / early concept works to explore options for Flood Risk Alleviation schemes in identified areas.	Cost Band C
Kilby, Blaby	Main Street	Main Street - measures to divert water away from reaching the bottom of Main Street, and / or drain it away more quickly.	Cost Band C
Appleby Magna, North West Leicestershire	Church Street, Bowley's Lane and Old End	Widening and naturalisation of the roadside watercourse to install a two-stage channel.	Cost Band C
Diseworth, North West Leicestershire	Diseworth Flood Alleviation Scheme	Flood alleviation works in Diseworth.	Cost Band B
Kibworth, Harborough	Kibworth Mead Sustainable Drainage System	Sustainable Drainage System in Kibworth Mead.	Cost Band C
Breedon on the Hill, North West Leicestershire	Breedon on the Hill Flood Alleviation Scheme	Final works and snagging.	Cost Band D

Budget	**£ 1,176,000**

10. Safety Schemes

District / Parish	Location / Scheme Name	Intervention / Work / Treatment Description	Cost Band A = Over £1m B = £201,000 - £1m C = £51,000 to £200,000 D = £50,000 and below
Countywide	Various	Vehicle Activated Signs replacement	Cost Band A
Countywide	Various	20 mph village schemes	Cost Band D
Countywide	Various	School zones	Cost Band D
Countywide	Various	Residents parking	Cost Band A
Countywide	Various	Pedestrian crossing	Cost Band B
Countywide	Various	Traffic calming	Cost Band B
Countywide	Various	Village gateways	Cost Band C
Countywide	Various	Road safety innovations	Cost Band C
Countywide	Various	Footway schemes	Cost Band B

Budget **£ 2,512,000**

11. Active Travel Improvements

District / Parish	Location / Scheme Name	Intervention / Work / Treatment Description	Cost Band A = Over £1m B = £201,000 - £1m C = £51,000 to £200,000 D = £50,000 and below
Various	Various	Active travel	Cost Band B

Budget	**£620,000**

12. Plant Renewals

District / Parish	Location / Scheme Name	Intervention / Work / Treatment Description	Cost Band A = Over £1m B = £201,000 - £1m C = £51,000 to £200,000 D = £50,000 and below
Countywide	Owned plant replacement	Plant purchases will be made to align with Council Hand Arm Vibration Syndrome (HAVS) requirements ensuring health and safety whilst supporting operational teams with key equipment. Purchases will focus on replacing end of life items and those where HAVS exposure can be improved upon.	Cost Band C

Budget **£ 100,000**

13. Highways Depot Improvements

District / Parish	Location / Scheme Name	Intervention / Work / Treatment Description	Cost Band A = Over £1m B = £201,000 - £1m C = £51,000 to £200,000 D = £50,000 and below
Highways Depots	Highways Depots	Priority Depot Maintenance	Cost Band C
Mountsorrel Depot	Mountsorrel Depot Highways Stores	Petrol and Diesel Fume Mitigation	Cost Band D

Budget **£ 200,000**

14. County Council Vehicle Replacement Programme

District / Parish	Location / Scheme Name	Intervention / Work / Treatment Description	Cost Band A = Over £1m B = £201,000 - £1m C = £51,000 to £200,000 D = £50,000 and below
Countywide	County Council Vehicle Programme	Vehicle twenty-year replacement programme. To support service delivery for service areas, with cost effective and least carbon, like for like compliant replacement vehicle. All vehicles are approved and purchased by Approved in Principle Vehicle Procurement Process. This supports all departments.	Cost Band A

Budget	**£ 4,540,000**

15. Externally Funded Schemes

District / Parish	Location / Scheme Name	Intervention / Work / Treatment Description	Cost Band A = Over £1m B = £201,000 - £1m C = £51,000 to £200,000 D = £50,000 and below
Various	Various	S106 secured funding for various improvements across the County works such as Kibworth delivery and further scheme development for A511 Major Road Network.	Cost Band A

Budget	**£ 1,128,000**

Transport Asset Management Schemes (16-24)

16. Capital Schemes and Design

District / Parish	Location / Scheme Name	Intervention / Work / Treatment Description	**Cost Band** **A = Over £1m** **B = £201,000 - £1m** **C = £51,000 to £200,000** **D = £50,000 and below**
Harborough, Lutterworth	A4303 Coventry Road, Lutterworth Southern Bypass	Resurface carriageway	Cost Band C
Melton, Melton Mowbray	A607 Norman Way	Strengthen carriageway	Cost Band B
Melton, Waltham, Garthorpe	A607 Melton Road, Waltham Road	Strengthen carriageway	Cost Band B
Harborough, Market Harborough	A508 Northampton Road	Strengthen carriageway	Cost Band B
Oadby and Wigston, Oadby	A6 Glen Road and Harborough Road	Strengthen carriageway	Cost Band B
Melton, Melton Mowbray	A606 Leicester Street, Market Place, Burton Street, Sherrard Street	Strengthen carriageway	Cost Band B
Melton, Stapleford, Leesthorpe	Cuckoo Hill, Stapleford Road	Strengthen carriageway	Cost Band B
Harborough, Billesdon and Houghton on the Hill	A47 Leicester Road and Uppingham Road	Resurface carriageway	Cost Band B
Harborough, Market Harborough	A4304 / B6047 High Street / The Square	Remove concrete channel blocks and block paving and reconstruct with bituminous material, topped with coloured surfacing. 100mm	Cost Band B

District / Parish	Location / Scheme Name	Intervention / Work / Treatment Description	Cost Band A = Over £1m B = £201,000 - £1m C = £51,000 to £200,000 D = £50,000 and below
		carriageway strengthen, including red asphalt.	
Melton, Sproxton	From B676 Buckminster Road to B676	Retread or Bituminous Option	Cost Band C
Hinckley and Bosworth, Groby	A50 Bradgate Hill	Resurface carriageway	Cost Band B
Harborough, West Langton	A6 Roundabout at junction with A6 and B6047	Resurface carriageway and patch footway	Cost Band B
Melton, Saxelby and AB Kettleby	Saxelby Road	Strengthen carriageway	Cost Band B
Melton, Harston	Croxton Lane	Strengthen carriageway	Cost Band C
Oadby and Wigston, Wigston	A5199 Welford Road	Strengthen carriageway	Cost Band C
Blaby, Leicester Forest East	A47 Hinckley Road, Braunstone Lane, Ratby Lane	Resurface carriageway	Cost Band C
Harborough, West Langton and Kibworth	A6 Harborough Road	Strengthen carriageway	Cost Band B
Countywide	Various	Footway schemes	Cost Band C

Budget **£4,944,000***

* Total includes additional funding as approved by County Council 18 February 2026

17. Bridges (Structures)

District / Parish	Location / Scheme Name	Intervention / Work / Treatment Description	Cost Band A = Over £1m B = £201,000 - £1m C = £51,000 to £200,000 D = £50,000 and below
Harborough	London Road, Great Glen	Arch strengthening (concrete saddle)	Cost Band B
Harborough	Cosby Road, Broughton Astley	Deck replacement	Cost Band B
North West Leicestershire	Grace Dieu Brook	Concrete overslab	Cost Band D
North West Leicestershire	Mineral Railway, Groby (A50)	Waterproofing	Cost Band B
Blaby	Earl Shilton Road, Thurlaston	Culvert replacement	Cost Band C
Melton	Glebe Road, Stapleford	Arch strengthening (concrete saddle)	Cost Band C
Charnwood	River Wreake, Syston (SNB)	Expansion joint replacement	Cost Band D

Budget **£ 1,755,000**

18. Highway Flood Alleviation

District / Parish	Location / Scheme Name	Intervention / Work / Treatment Description	Cost Band A = Over £1m B = £201,000 - £1m C = £51,000 to £200,000 D = £50,000 and below
Blaby	Whetstone, Enderby Road	Highway drainage improvement	Cost Band C
Blaby	Enderby, Mill Hill	Highway drainage improvement	Cost Band C
Harborough	Bitteswell, Lutterworth Road	Highway drainage improvement	Cost Band D
Harborough	Thorpe Langton, Bowden Road	Highway drainage improvement	Cost Band C
North West Leicestershire	Diseworth, Shakespear Close	Highway drainage improvement	Cost Band C
Charnwood	Cossington, Main Street	Highway drainage improvement – reserve scheme	Cost Band C

Budget **£ 600,000**

19. Street Lighting

District / Parish	Location / Scheme Name	Intervention / Work / Treatment Description	Cost Band A = Over £1m B = £201,000 - £1m C = £51,000 to £200,000 D = £50,000 and below
Countywide	Countywide programme - Replacement of ageing columns and associated private cable networks (high level)	Replacement of ageing columns and associated private cable networks (high level).	Cost Band B
Countywide	Countywide Programme - Town centre wall mounted light replacement	Replacement of wall mounted town centre lights and associated private cable networks that have come to the end of their useful life.	Cost Band C
Countywide	Countywide Programme - Replacements from structural testing failures	Replacing street lights that have failed their structural test.	Cost Band B
Countywide	Countywide Programme - Illuminated sign replacement programme	Replacing illuminated sign lights with new energy efficient LED sign lights with Central Management System capability.	Cost Band B
Countywide	Countywide Column replacement programme (low level)	Replacing life expired low level lighting columns.	Cost Band A
Blaby district	Lubbesthorpe Way, Braunstone	Replacement of ageing columns and associated private cable networks (high level).	Cost Band C

Budget	**£ 3,398,000**

20. Traffic Signal Renewal

District / Parish	Location / Scheme Name	Intervention / Work / Treatment Description	Cost Band A = Over £1m B = £201,000 - £1m C = £51,000 to £200,000 D = £50,000 and below
Blaby / Whetstone	A426 / Enderby Road	Traffic signal renewal dual crossing	Cost Band C
Blaby / Whetstone	Enderby Rd / A426	Traffic signal renewal dual crossing	Cost Band C
Hinckley and Bosworth / Hinckley	Trinity Lane / Mansion Street	Traffic signal renewal junction	Cost Band C
Charnwood / Loughborough	Ashby Road / Frederick Street	Traffic signal renewal junction	Cost Band C
Oadby and Wigston	Oadby Road / Estoril Avenue	Traffic signal renewal Toucan Crossing	Cost Band D
Charnwood / Loughborough	Ashby Road / University	Traffic signal renewal dual crossing	Cost Band C
Blaby / Narborough	King Edward Avenue SB / Black Pad	Traffic signal renewal Toucan Crossing	Cost Band C
Blaby / Narborough	King Edward Avenue / Leicester Road	Traffic signal renewal junction	Cost Band C
Charnwood / Loughborough	Epinal Way / Emanuel Way	Traffic signal renewal Toucan Crossing	Cost Band D
Hinckley and Bosworth / Hinckley	Bond Street / Hollycroft	Traffic signal renewal junction	Cost Band C
Oadby and Wigston	Bull Head Street / Near Glebe Close	Traffic signal renewal dual crossing	Cost Band C

North West Leicestershire / Coalville	London Road / Whitwick Road	Traffic signal renewal crossing	Cost Band D
Various	Various / Countywide CCTV Renewals and associated comms upgrades	CCTV and comms renewals	Cost Band C

Budget	**£866,000**

21. Preventative Maintenance

District / Parish	Location / Scheme Name	Intervention / Work / Treatment Description	Cost Band A = Over £1m B = £201,000 - £1m C = £51,000 to £200,000 D = £50,000 and below
Blaby	Various streets	Surface dress carriageways	Cost Band B
Charnwood	Various streets	Surface dress carriageways	Cost Band B
Harborough	Various streets	Surface dress carriageways	Cost Band B
Hinckley and Bosworth	Various streets	Surface dress carriageways	Cost Band B
Melton	Various streets	Surface dress carriageways	Cost Band B
Northwest Leicestershire	Various streets	Surface dress carriageways	Cost Band B
Oadby and Wigston	Various streets	Surface dress carriageways	Cost Band C
Countywide	Various streets	Retexturing	Cost Band B
Countywide	Various streets	Asphalt preservation/ micro-asphalt	Cost Band B
Countywide	Various streets	Joint sealing	Cost Band C
Countywide	Various streets	Carriageway patching (external)	Cost Band A
Countywide	Various streets	Road studs	Cost Band C
		Budget	**£11,780,000**

22. Restorative

District / Parish	Location / Scheme Name	Intervention / Work / Treatment Description	Cost Band A = Over £1m B = £201,000 - £1m C = £51,000 to £200,000 D = £50,000 and below
Countywide	Various locations	Footway patching	Cost Band A
Countywide	Various locations	Internal carriageway patching	Cost Band A
Countywide	Various locations	Pre-patching surface dressing	Cost Band A
Countywide	Various locations	Roadmender	Cost Band A
Blaby, Oadby and Wigston, Harborough and Hinckley and Bosworth	Various sites within the County – Vehicle Restraint Systems re-tensioning	Vehicle Restraint Systems (Safety Fencing) re-tensioning	Cost Band C

Budget **£14,436,000**

23. Public Rights of Way (PROW) Maintenance

District / Parish	Location / Scheme Name	Intervention / Work / Treatment Description	Cost Band A = Over £1m B = £201,000 - £1m C = £51,000 to £200,000 D = £50,000 and below
Countywide	Various locations	PROW maintenance and improvement schemes and reactive.	Cost Band B

Budget	**£661,000**

24. Network Performance and Reliability

District / Parish	Location / Scheme Name	Intervention / Work / Treatment Description	Cost Band A = Over £1m B = £201,000 - £1m C = £51,000 to £200,000 D = £50,000 and below
The Resilient Network	SCRIM - carriageway skidding resistance survey	Road condition survey	Cost Band D
Countywide	PAS2161 road condition survey	A driven road condition survey captured by highway inspectors, using video and AI to capture asset condition and inventory data collection.	Cost Band C
Countywide	Footway and cycle route condition and inventory data collection	Footway Network Survey capturing asset location and condition.	Cost Band C
Countywide (where required)	Asset Data Improvement Projects	Primarily desktop exercises but may also involve site surveys, to support the identification and resolving of asset data gaps.	Cost Band D
Various	Various	Traffic Counter Renewal	Cost Band C

Budget	**£ 350,000**

Leicestershire County Council

HIGHWAYS, TRANSPORT AND WASTE OVERVIEW AND SCRUTINY COMMITTEE: 5 MARCH 2026

2025/26 HIGHWAYS DRAINAGE PROGRAMME AND WORKS UPDATE

REPORT OF THE DIRECTOR OF ENVIRONMENT AND TRANSPORT

Purpose of the Report

1. The purpose of this report is to update and inform the Committee on delivery of the highway drainage works that form part of the 2025/26 Highways and Transportation Capital Programme and Works Programme, approved by the Cabinet on 18 March 2025.

2. These Programmes were developed in accordance with the overall budget envelope included in the Medium-Term Financial Strategy (MTFS) 2025/26 to 2028/29, as approved by the County Council on 19 February 2025.

Policy Framework and Previous Decisions

3. The Highways and Transportation Capital Programme and Works Programme are rolling financial and business plans that are updated annually.

4. The Programmes have been developed with reference to the Department's key plans and strategies and align with these aims. These include:

   a) Highways Asset Management Policy and the Highways Asset Management Strategy – approved by the Cabinet on 23 June 2017 (updated in December 2020).
   b) Highway Infrastructure Asset Management Plan – approved by the Cabinet on 15 September 2017 (updated in October 2025).
   c) Leicester and Leicestershire Strategic Growth Plan – approved by the Cabinet on 23 November 2018.
   d) Environment Strategy and Action Plan – approved by the County Council on 8 July 2020.
   e) Leicester and Leicestershire Strategic Transport Priorities - approved by the Cabinet on 20 November 2020.
   f) Network Management Policy, Strategy and Plan – approved by the Cabinet on 15 December 2020.
   g) Leicestershire Local Flood Risk Management Strategy (updated February 2024).

Background

5. Delivery of the highway drainage element of the Highways and Transportation Capital Programme and Works Programme for 2025/26 has taken place against an ever more challenging and evolving backdrop.

6. In general, the highway drainage programmes continue to be affected by increased costs due to the impact of inflation, under funding in previous years' budgets creating greater backlogs, new highway developments and an increasing highway network to maintain. The use of Sustainable Urban Drainage Systems (SuDS) in the Highway to slow surface water run-off and temporarily store and manage water at or near its source has also increased significantly; to date, there has been no budget allocation for the maintenance of these drainage assets.

7. Weather-related delays (increasingly exacerbated by the apparent effects of a changing climate), as well as additional pressures from more frequent severe weather events has also put pressure on programme delivery and resources:

   a) June 2023: Oadby, Wigston and Kilby (52 properties reported as internally flooded);
   b) October 2023: Storm Babet (50 properties reported as internally flooded);
   c) January 2024: Storm Henk (450 properties reported as internally flooded);
   d) 21 September 2024: Market Harborough town centre (42 properties reported as internally flooded);
   e) 26 September 2024: Blaby district (48 properties reported as internally flooded);
   f) 24 November 2024: Little Bowden, Market Harborough (eight properties reported as internally flooded);
   g) 6 January 2025: Countywide (720 properties reported as internally flooded) - worst event in Leicestershire in modern history in terms of number of properties flooded;
   h) 14 November 2025: Storm Claudia (seven properties reported as internally flooded).

8. Recent flood events over the past three years have had a significant impact on many communities across Leicestershire. In turn, this has placed substantial pressure on the resources of the County Council in its capacity as the Local Highway Authority (LHA) in trying to support those communities alongside delivery of services and programmes of work.

9. The occurrence of multiple significant flood events has increased the workload for the LHA. Such events have become more frequent in recent years. Increased flooding events have seen a high demand in the number of requests for further gully cleansing and other drainage maintenance, in addition to routine cleansing; along with an increase in the need to investigate often complex drainage issues.

10. A common perception is that if gullies are not draining, it means that they are blocked. This is not always the case; for example, the surface water network they connect to may be at capacity or blocked, or the river level is high and the outfall is submerged and therefore cannot discharge. The highway drainage systems often discharge into the surface water network which is usually the responsibility of water companies (Severn Trent, Anglian Water), or they may connect to rivers, canals or watercourses managed by the Environment Agency or riparian owners, or a

combination of asset owners. There is very little data available on third-party asset condition or investment plans, however, if a third-party system such as a storm water sewer, river or watercourse is blocked or full and at capacity, the highway drainage system will not work because the water will have nowhere to go.

11. The LHA continues to support the Council's role as the Lead Local Flood Authority by working collaboratively with other authorities and organisations, supporting public flooding drop-in sessions and supporting Leicestershire's multi agency response to adverse weather events through the Resilience Partnership.

Environmental Implications

12. Transport is an enabler of everyday lives; when it fails, normal life is disrupted. This is becoming ever more the case with the apparent impacts of adverse weather events. The effects of warmer and wetter winters, hotter and drier summers and more frequent and intense weather extremes include:

    a) Increased levels of, and more frequent occurrences of highway flooding that result in road closures or damage to vehicles (where people inadvisably attempt to drive through flood waters).
    b) More wind damage to trees, resulting in road closures from blockages caused by fallen trees and, in some cases, fatalities where trees fall on vehicles.
    c) Fresh damage to highway assets or worsening existing conditions, causing risks of increased vehicle damage (and subsequent increased levels of insurance claims to the County Council) and in some circumstances, the need for road closures in the interests of safety.
    d) Increases in demand as a result of the impact of bad weather, causing pressures on services which drives the need to adapt how the Council's assets are managed and maintained.
    e) Disruption to the delivery of safe and resilient transport networks, including the bus network, which increases the potential for social isolation, which undermines the health and wellbeing of Leicestershire's communities and residents.

13. Further, increased levels of highway flooding, places pressures on the Highway Drainage Team to be responding promptly by investigating the causes of such flooding, with corresponding resourcing, (financial) consequences in terms of increased demand for revenue repairs and for capital highway flood alleviation schemes.

2025/26 Highways and Transportation Highway Drainage Programmes

Table 1: 2025/26 Revenue and Capital Programmes, budget and forecast spend

Revenue Programme	Revised Budget (including reserves)	Forecast (as of January 2026)
Gully Emptying	£1,962,810	£2,383,441
Camera Van	£86,034	£81,585

Drainage Repairs	£360,000	£450,000
Capital Programme	**Revised Budget**	**Forecast (as of January 2026)**
Drainage Repairs	£1,481,145	£1,488,613

Programme Delivery

14. There are over 130,000 gullies on local public roads in Leicestershire.

15. Planned, routine gully cleansing is carried out by external contractors using a risk-based approach, which utilises various data such as past and predicted flooding alongside the actual silt level data collected every time a gully is cleansed. This means that some gullies will be cleansed/inspected more often than others.

16. Reactive cleansing and high-pressure jetting, in response to customer enquiries, is carried out by the in-house workforce.

17. Overview of revenue drainage programmes:

    a) Gully Emptying Service - is on target to deliver this financial year's planned gully emptying programme (also known as the cyclic cleanse) - a total of 89,560 gullies are scheduled to be cleaned this financial year. By the end of December 2025, 81,042 have been completed. Further, there were 1,866 additional locations where gullies were reactively cleaned following customer enquiries. Routine gully emptying priorities have also been reviewed (March 2025) and gully emptying priorities at known flooding sites have been reviewed and the frequency of cleansing increased for 5,240 gullies (see Table 2 below).
    b) Camera Van and Jetting – at the end of December 2025, the service has carried out CCTV surveys and high pressure jetting at 961 locations so far this financial year to identify the cause of underground drainage blockages.
    c) Drainage Repairs – by the end of December 2025, the service has excavated and investigated or repaired 418 locations so far in this financial year.
    d) Rural grip cleansing – the programme of cleansing out 51,428 rural drainage grips has been completed.
    e) A programme of asset data collection and a programme of pipe relining funded from reserves is on target to be delivered as per Table 3 below.
    f) Capital Highway Flood Alleviation programme is on target for completion as per Table 4 below.

Table 2 – Gully emptying frequencies changed March 2025

Cleansing Priority Changed	**Number of Gullies Changed Priority**
Priority 2 changed to Priority 1	4677 gullies
Priority 3 changed to Priority 1	11 gullies

Cleansing Priority Changed	Number of Gullies Changed Priority
Priority 3 changed to Priority 2	552 gullies

Table 3 – Total number of gullies

Priority	Total Number of Gullies (March 25)
Priority 1	44,676
Priority 2	62,064
Priority 3	28,047

*Gully Emptying priorities:
Priority 1 – Cleansed every 10 months;
Priority 2 – Cleansed every 20 months;
Priority 3 – Inspected every 24 months currently (trial of a fixed 40-month cleansing interval for all Priority 3 gullies due to start April 2026).

Table 4 – 2025/26 Programme of data collection and pipe re-lining schemes

Asset Data Collection Locations	Status at December 2025
Sinope	Complete
Twycross	Complete
Gaddesby	Complete
Sheepy Magna	Complete
Walton	Complete
Stapleton	Complete
Packington	Complete
Osgathorpe	Complete
Pipe Lining Schemes	
Churchill Road, Thurmaston	Programmed Quarter 4
Ashby Road, Measham	Programmed Quarter 4
Glencoe Crescent, Braunstone	Complete

Dunton Road, Broughton Astley	Programmed Quarter 4
Shenton Lane, Dadlington	Programmed Quarter 4
Orton Lane, Norton-juxta-Twycross	Programmed Quarter 4

Table 5 – 2025/26 Programme of Capital Flood Alleviation schemes

Highway Flood Alleviation Schemes	**Status at December 2025**
Derby Road, Hathern	Complete
Warwick Road, Whetstone	Complete
Leicester Road, Enderby	Complete
A6006 Broughton and Old Dalby	Complete
London Road, Great Glen	Complete
Town Street, Burton Overy	Complete
Fenn Lane, Shenton	Complete
Welland Park Rd, Markt Harborough	Deferred to 2026/27 for additional funding
Culvert Replacements	
Blackfordby Main Street	Complete
Newton Burgoland Snarestone Road	Complete
Redmile Wood Lane	Complete
Osbaston Lount Road	Complete
Norton Juxta, Orton Lane	Complete
Kibworth New Road	Deferred to 2026/27

2026/27 Highways and Transportation Highway Drainage Programmes

18. Looking ahead, the budget in 2026/27 for gully emptying and drainage repairs continues to benefit from contributions from Council reserves and part of the £2m reallocated carbon reduction funding.

Table 6 – 2026/27 Revenue and Capital funding allocations

Revenue Programme	**2025/26 Budget (including reserves)**	**2026/27 Budget (including reserves and reallocated carbon funding)**
Gully Emptying	£1,962,810	£2,100,009
Camera Van	£86,034	£86,034
Drainage Repairs	£360,000	£881,640
Capital Programme	**2025/26 Budget**	**2026/27 Budget**
Drainage Repairs	£1,481,145	£1,481,145

19. The additional funding will enable additional cleansing and repairs to defective highway drainage assets such as gullies and connecting pipework.

20. The budget in 2026/27 for Highway Flood Alleviation Schemes is £500,147 plus an additional £100,000 from Local Transport Grant funding for investigation works into future schemes to support delivery of the backlog.

Reallocated £2m Carbon Reduction Reserves

21. On 15 July 2025, the Cabinet approved the reallocation of the £2m carbon reduction reserve towards flood mitigation initiatives and adapting services towards mitigating the impacts of severe weather events. The allocation of this funding is set out in Table 6 above and is shared across both highway (LHA) and flood (LLFA) teams. This includes funding for “Effective Management and Investment of Highways Drainage Assets”. This funding has been added to the 2026/27 budgets and has been allocated across the following main activities:

    a) Proactive culvert maintenance – introduce a proactive programme where the current approach is reactive, and undertake high priority repairs and/ or replacements.
    b) Project to develop a system of management for Highway SuDS as they become more commonly adopted.
    c) An increased gully emptying trial – introduce a 40-month cycle for priority 3 gullies.
    d) Further mapping of underground drainage assets to improve the Council’s ability to investigate issues and plan maintenance activities.

Table 7 – Delivery proposals and distribution of £2m funding 2026-2028

	2026/27	**2027/28**	**2028/29**	**Total**
Working with Communities	£135,000	£135,000	£135,000	£409,000

	2026/27	2027/28	2028/29	Total
(LLFA)				
Adaptation and Resilience Action Plan (LLFA)	£100,000	£100,000	£100,000	£300,000
Repair / replace highway culverts	£100,000	£100,000	£100,000	£300,000
Inspect highway culverts	£90,000	£90,000	£90,000	£270,000
Agency resource for SuDS project	£30,000	£0	£0	£30,000
SuDS maintenance	£0	£50,000	£50,000	£100,000
Highway ditch cleaning	£30,000	£30,000	£30,000	£90,000
Priority 3 gully trial	£67,000	£67,000	£67,000	£210,000
Map underground assets	£100,000	£100,000	£100,000	£300,000
TOTAL	**£652,000**	**£672,000**	**£676,000**	**£2,000,000**

22. The above funding is included in the 2026/27 budgets for drainage repairs and gully emptying.

23. The additional funding above, in 2026/27, will support the Highway Drainage Team to:

    a) Increase its inspections and replace or repair “at risk” culverts.
    b) Employ a resource to undertake an asset inventory of all ponds and SuDS and ditches associated with the highway drainage network. Record location, capacity, condition, and ownership details within the drainage asset database.
    c) Carry out proactive cleaning of highway ditches, rather than responding reactively when a problem arises.
    d) Trial a fixed 40-month cleansing intervals for all Priority 3 gullies, which are currently inspected rather than routinely emptied. They are cleansed only on a reactive basis when inspections indicate a loss of performance or blockage. While the current approach reduces unnecessary works, it can result in extended intervals between cleanses, deterioration in performance over time, and limited cost savings.
    e) Continue to map and record underground drainage assets to build a comprehensive and accurate register of highway drainage assets, enabling the Authority to:
        i. Support proactive and prioritised maintenance activity.
        ii. Reduce the risk of localised flooding.

iii. Improve lifecycle planning and resource allocation.

24. Currently, only around 15% of underground drainage assets are mapped. This investment will help the Authority to continue to build on the information recorded to date and help to refine and identify priority locations where survey data would be of most use; for example, mapping would be carried out to identify missing asset data in flooding investigations, or to map unrecorded drainage systems in flooding hotspots. It should be noted that the cost of surveying and mapping of all underground drainage assets is estimated at over £8m.

Demand, Customer Enquiries and Works Instructions

25. Demand for highway drainage services continues to increase year on year as flooding events become more common; each one having severe and devastating impacts on communities.

26. Customer enquiries are prioritised following a risk-based approach:

a) Priority 1 enquiries: Where surface water from the highway is causing internal property flooding and / or flooding to critical infrastructure (hospitals, schools, airports etc).
b) Priority 2 enquiries: Where surface water from the highway is causing flooding to private land or the resilient network.
c) Priority 3 enquiries: Highway surface water, or any gully which if blocked (or not working) would result or contribute to a road being not passable or cars having to drive on the opposite side of the road. Pedestrians having to walk off the footway into the road due to a blocked gully or a build-up of surface water at a bus stop or pedestrian crossing.
d) Priority 4 enquiries: Other reports of flooding or blocked gullies will be considered and prioritised using available resources. All other issues will be picked up by our routine cleansing activity, or reactively if resources become available.

27. Table 8 below shows the number of enquiries and jobs raised. The number of unresolved enquiries still outstanding will comprise of lower priority 4 work and issues that rely on work to be completed by other agencies – the water authority (Severn Trent Water) or riparian owners for example.

28. The additional resources will help enable investment in a new team structure for 2026/27 that will support the team to manage customer demands on a risk-based priority.

Table 8 – Number of jobs / enquiries raised per year

	2022	2023	2024	2025
Unresolved/outstanding drainage and blocked gully enquiries from year	37	70	118	422
Number of drainage and blocked gully enquiries received per year from customers	2158	3366	4077	2866

	2022	2023	2024	2025
Jobs Raised – gullies still blocked after routine cleansing by external contractor – requires further investigation and cleansing	1312	1904	1478	1505
Jobs Raised – high pressure Jetting and CCTV surveys	936	1217	1052	1111
Jobs Raised – repairs (excavate and repair damaged pipework)	432	555	513	621

Resource Implications

29. The highway drainage programmes included in the Highways and Transportation Capital and Works Programmes involve significant amounts of money and represent a continued commitment by the Council to deliver on its strategic objectives. However, based on the current evidence, growth projections for demand, societal behaviours and expectations and the projected change in severe weather patterns, the levels of funding available through the Council's own budgets and funding allocations from the Government, while delivering vital work, are likely to be insufficient to meet current and future expectations of residents. Even if substantial investment from other sources was available, the ability to adapt and introduce resilience into County's highway drainage assets will be limited by the effects of intense precipitation on local rivers and watercourses, like the River Soar, leading to more frequent impacts on communities during severe weather, as well as hampering travel conditions on Leicestershire's transport system.

30. Delivery of the 2026/27 highway drainage works programme and the programme of work from the reallocated carbon reduction reserves is dependent on the service being able to recruit to vacant posts in the Highway Drainage Team. Recruitment of suitable candidates is being actively pursued during Quarter Four of the 2025/26 financial year and if required, will continue into 2026/27.

31. A key focus of the team is to ensure that funding is invested in projects and measures that deliver the maximum benefit over the longest possible period ensuring activities are prioritised based on risk. The data collected from inspections and programmes of asset mapping will be used to develop programmes of potential future schemes that can be used for bidding opportunities or as part of the planning process.

Timetable for Decisions

32. The 2026/27 highway drainage programme will be included in the Highways and Transportation Capital Programme and Works Programme which will be considered by the Cabinet on 24 March 2026 and is included on this Committee's agenda. The Committee's comments on that report will be reported to the Cabinet. Subject to the Cabinet's approval, the Programmes will be published on the Council's website.

Conclusions

33. This year's highway drainage programme has been put together against an ever more challenging and evolving backdrop. Evidence is showing the enormous

challenges faced in relation to rainfall intensification and local flash flooding. While consideration needs to be given to the future resources required for adaptation to severe weather, and to strengthen resilience to manage the highway network in the face of increasingly severe extreme weather events, the Highway Drainage Team is on target to successfully deliver this year's programme. Meeting customer expectation is becoming increasingly difficult, but the team continues to deliver the service focused on priority and risk to ensure maximum benefit to the residents of Leicestershire from the funding available.

Background Papers

Report to the Cabinet 15 September 2017 – Highway Infrastructure Asset Management Plan (HIAMP)
https://democracy.leics.gov.uk/ieListDocuments.aspx?CId=135&MId=4863&Ver=4

Report to the County Council 8 July 2020 - Revised Environment Strategy and Action Plan
https://democracy.leics.gov.uk/ieListDocuments.aspx?CId=134&MId=6040

Report to the Cabinet on 15 December 2020 - Network Management Plan
https://democracy.leics.gov.uk/ieListDocuments.aspx?CId=135&MID=6000

Report to the County Council on 18 May 2022 – Leicestershire County Council's Strategic Plan 2022 – 2026
https://democracy.leics.gov.uk/ieListDocuments.aspx?MId=6774

Report to the Cabinet on 7 February 2025 – Medium Term Financial Strategy
https://democracy.leics.gov.uk/ieListDocuments.aspx?CId=135&MId=7873&Ver=4

Report to the Cabinet on 24 November 2023 - Leicestershire Local Flood Risk Management Strategy – Public Consultation Outcomes and Publication
https://democracy.leics.gov.uk/ieListDocuments.aspx?CId=135&MId=7080&Ver=4

Report to the Cabinet on 22 October 2024 - Leicestershire County Council Lead Local Flood Authority Protocol
https://democracy.leics.gov.uk/ieListDocuments.aspx?CId=135&MId=7510&Ver=4

Report to the Cabinet on 7 February 2025 - Flooding in Leicestershire in January 2025 and Implications for the Lead Local Flood Authority and Local Highway Authority
https://democracy.leics.gov.uk/ieListDocuments.aspx?CId=135&MId=7873&Ver=4

Report to the Cabinet on 15 July 2025 - Leicestershire County Council's Approach to Flooding
https://democracy.leics.gov.uk/ieListDocuments.aspx?CId=135&MId=7878&Ver=4

Report to the Cabinet on 15 July 2025 - Proposal to Reprioritise Net Zero Action Plans
https://democracy.leics.gov.uk/ieListDocuments.aspx?CId=135&MId=7878&Ver=4n

Leicestershire Local Flood Risk Management Strategy:
https://www.leicestershire.gov.uk/sites/default/files/2024-02/Local-Flood-Risk-Management-Strategy-for-Leicestershire.pdf

Circulation under the Local Issues Alert Procedure

34. This report will be circulated to all Members.

Equality Implications

35. An Equality Impact Assessment was undertaken to support the development of the Leicestershire Local Flood Risk Management Strategy. This assessment identified that some groups with protected characteristics are potentially more vulnerable to flood risks (for example, elderly, pregnant, or disabled persons). Whilst this is recognised, the Strategy focusses on reducing the impacts of flooding on communities, in turn benefitting those vulnerable members of the community.

36. Officers will continue to explore opportunities to address the impacts of flooding on groups with protected characteristics, particularly when working with partners and in seeking external funding.

Human Rights Implications

37. Residents in flood affected areas have the risk of losing their homes and shelter would be adversely impacted. However, the highway drainage programmes contribute to reducing this risk. The additional resources and actions identified within this report will also have a positive impact on the risk to human rights arising from severe flood events.

Other Relevant Impact Assessments

38. A Strategic Environmental Assessment was undertaken to develop the Leicestershire Local Flood Risk Management Strategy and as the action and proposals set out within this report are in line with those assessed in the Strategy, there are no negative environmental impacts arising from the content of this report. However, it should be noted that the increased number of weather events and associated increased workload will mean that there will be a longer timeframe for the identification of potential solutions and the delivery of schemes.

39. Flooding has significant impacts on health and wellbeing. These impacts occur both acutely and over the long-term. While the immediate dangers to physical health from flooding events are highly visible, longer-term health effects associated with flooding are harder to identify and may include effects relating to displacement. Most of the health burden associated with flooding in England is, however, due to impacts on mental health and wellbeing. Measures to reduce the risk and effects of flooding will reduce such impacts. The programmes of work identified within this report will enable officers to mitigate some of the adverse effects of flooding from the highway reducing some negative impacts on health.

Officers to Contact

Ann Carruthers
Director, Environment and Transport
Tel: (0116) 305 7000
Email: Ann.Carruthers@leics.gov.uk

Pat Clarke
Assistant Director, Highways & Transport
Tel: (0116) 305 4244
Email: Pat.Clarke@leics.gov.uk

This page is intentionally left blank

Leicestershire County Council

HIGHWAYS, TRANSPORT AND WASTE OVERVIEW AND SCRUTINY COMMITTEE – 5 MARCH 2026

HIGHWAYS, TRANSPORT AND WASTE PERFORMANCE REPORT TO DECEMEBER 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, Transport and Waste 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, Transport and Waste Services (within the Environment and Transport Department) to December 2025 (Quarter Three).

Policy Framework and Previous Decisions

2. The updates in this report reflect progress against the Council's Strategic Outcomes Framework within the Strategic Plan up to 2026, the Highways, Transport and Waste (HTW) 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 how a variety of HTW KPIs are performing up to December 2025. It includes a new performance summary of all the HTW KPIs that support the Council's corporate and departmental aims in Appendix A. These are covered in more detail in the performance dashboards provided in Appendix B, which is the focus of this report. Appendix C covers the long-term charts of the KPIs for background information.

4. The performance 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 HTW in Leicestershire, to inform policy making 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 in Appendix B.

5. In order to review performance for each KPI, the performance dashboards in Appendix B show the latest data (if available), the Direction of Travel (DOT, performance since the previous update), the target, the Red/ Amber/Green rating (RAG) (if applicable) and the comparative quartile position. These refreshed dashboards also show more detailed trends over time than previous reports.

6. Coloured DOT arrows (red, amber, green) in the dashboards 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 31 English authorities (referred to as comparator authorities) made up of 21 county councils and 10 unitary authorities which cover large, principally non-urban geographical areas. Where it is available, the performance dashboards within Appendix B indicate which quartile Leicestershire's performance falls into. The first quartile is defined as performance that falls within the top 25% of comparator authorities (highest performing). The fourth quartile is defined as performance that falls within the bottom 25% of comparator authorities (lowest performing). The comparison quartiles are updated annually.

9. The frequency with which the indicators are updated 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 B.

10. To fully assess progress, HTW KPIs are reviewed by performance against comparative performance, the previous update and performance against target as previously described. In summary, compared to other English comparator authorities, there are seven indicators in the top quartile, eight in the second quartile, three in the third quartile and three in the fourth quartile. Since the

previous performance update, six showed performance improvement, 10 had declined in performance and eight remained the same as the previous update. Of the indicators assigned a target (20), seven KPIs are green (they have met the target or are on track), 12 are amber (performance is currently not meeting the target or is set to miss the target by a narrow margin) and one is rated red (where performance is currently not meeting the target or is set to miss the target). These summary results are displayed in Appendix A (which also lists those KPIs that have either fallen into in the fourth quartile (bottom), seen a decline in performance since the previous update or missed its target).

Performance Update – Latest Data to December 2025

11. The following performance updates cover HTW indicators up to December 2025 (Quarter Three) (details are contained in paragraphs 12 to 29), which are displayed in Appendix B.

Highways and Transport

12. The National Highways and Transport Network (NHT) Annual Survey gathers respondents' satisfaction levels with a range of Highways and Transport services, ranging from the condition of the highways to local bus services in Leicestershire. The survey was sent to 3,300 households across the Authority area in 2025. It had a 19% response rate in Leicestershire (635 responses), which was made up of 131 online responses and 504 postal (paper) responses. Leicestershire has taken part in the NHT Survey since 2008. It has proven useful to indicate satisfaction levels through an independent survey over a long time and to better understand the Council's comparative performance. There are seven indicators within this report that are sourced from this survey.

13. The Council was amongst the highest rated councils for 'Overall satisfaction with condition of highways' in the NHT Survey 2025 (in the top quartile). Satisfaction levels declined by two percent from 22% in 2024 to 20% in 2025 and missed its 30% target. For this indicator, low satisfaction levels are typical across the country, and the Council remains in the first quartile (best) compared to other comparator authorities (31 counties participated in the NHT Survey for 2025). The latest data is below the long-term average of 32% from 2015, so worse recent performance than the long-term.

14. Results from the NHT Survey 2025 showed a decline in satisfaction with local bus services from 43% in 2024 to 37% in 2025 (a 6% decline). This indicator had missed its 45% target (rated as amber by the Department). This is a significant decrease since 2021 when satisfaction was 54%. Leicestershire's comparative performance showed it had moved down to the fourth quartile for 2025.

15. The 'Local bus passenger journeys originating in the authority area (millions)' declined in performance by 4% since the previous update to 10.22m journeys in Quarter One 2025/26 from 10.59m journeys in Quarter Four 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 more similar to the long-term average of 11.1m annual journeys since 2015. Data is normally one quarter in arrears. Figures come from bus operatives 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 comparator authorities for 2024/25 (comparison data covers the number of passenger journeys on local buses per head).

16. The 'Overall satisfaction with cycle routes and facilities (NHT)' remained relatively static at 32% since the previous year (31% in 2024) and missed its 35% target. Comparative performance has declined from the top quartile in 2024 to the second quartile in 2025; however, this still remains above average when compared to other comparator authorities in 2025.

17. The 'Overall satisfaction with the Rights of Way network (NHT)' improved in satisfaction (by 2% points) from 38% in 2024 to 40% in 2025 and slightly missed its 42% target. Comparative performance has declined from the top quartile in 2024 to the second quartile in 2025; however, this still remains above average when compared to other comparator authorities in 2025.

18. The 'Overall satisfaction with the condition of pavements and footpaths (NHT)' declined by 5% points from 55% in 2024 to 50% in 2025 and missed its 55% target. However, the Council remained in the top quartile for this indicator in 2025, when compared to other comparator authorities.

19. The 'Overall satisfaction with traffic levels and congestion (NHT)' saw a decline in performance (4% points) as satisfaction levels decreased from 30% in 2024 to 26% in 2025 and missed its 30% target. Comparative performance has declined from the second quartile in 2024 to the third quartile in 2025 and now performs below average when compared to other comparator authorities in 2025.

Road Safety

20. The Department continues to support road safety primarily through its various road safety initiatives and partnership working. Overall, Leicestershire is a high performing authority, which is reflected in the fact that four of the road casualty indicators are in the top quartile when compared to other comparator authorities (2024). 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 and should be treated with a degree of caution. The comprehensive Road Casualty Reduction in Leicestershire Annual Report provided the latest available details on road casualties, schemes and initiatives to reduce casualties, and is the subject of a separate report for consideration by the Committee at this meeting'.

21. Within this section, five indicators were updated this quarter with provisional road casualty data up to September 2025 (as data is available one quarter in arrears). In summary, both 'Road safety satisfaction (NHT)' and the 'Total casualties on Leicestershire roads' indicators had met their targets. Three indicators had seen an improvement in performance since the previous update and only the 'Number of people killed or seriously injured (KSI), walking, cycling & motorcyclists (excluding cars)' had seen a decline in performance since the previous update. 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 22 to 26 of this report.

22. Satisfaction levels for 'Road safety satisfaction' in the NHT Survey had static performance at 46% in performance for 2025 compared to the previous year (45% in 2024) and met its 45% target. In comparison with other comparator authorities, this indicator was in the second quartile in 2025 (a slight decline in comparative performance since being in the top quartile position for 2024).

23. The 'Total casualties on Leicestershire roads (provisional)' improved in performance by 1% as casualties decreased from 944 in June 2025 to 931 in September 2025. It also performed well against its 1,076 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 1,136 (since January 2015) (sourced from verified long-term data from the DfT). In comparison with other comparator authorities, it remains in the top quartile for 2024.

24. The 'Number of people killed or seriously injured (KSIs) (provisional)' decreased slightly (by 1%) from 271 in June 2025 to 268 in September (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 target of 258 KSIs. Over the longer-term, this indicator performs worse than the average of 227 (since January 2015) (sourced from verified adjusted long-term data from the DfT). In comparison with other comparator authorities, it remains in the top quartile for 2024.

25. The 'Total casualties involving road users, walking, cycling & motorcyclists (excluding cars) (provisional)' improved in performance by 2% since the previous update as casualties decreased from 301 in June 2025 to 295 in September 2025 (rolling 12-month figure, and in-year data is provisional and sourced from Leicestershire Police Road Accident data). It slightly missed its target of 291 casualties. Over the longer-term, this indicator performs better than the average of 316 casualties since (since January 2015) (sourced from verified long-term data as published by the DfT). In comparison with other comparator authorities, it remains in the top quartile for 2024.

26. The 'Number of people killed or seriously injured walking cycling and motorcyclists (excluding cars) (provisional)' declined in performance (7%) since

the previous update as KSIs increased from 127 in June 2025 to 136 in September 2025 (3-year rolling average and the in-year data is provisional and sourced from Leicestershire Police Road Accident data). The latest result had not met its deliberately challenging target of 116 KSIs. Over the longer-term, the latest result is higher (worse performance) than the long-term average of 106 (since January 2015) (sourced from verified adjusted long-term data from the DfT). In comparison with other comparator authorities, it remained in the top quartile for 2024.

Waste

27. The 'Percentage of household waste sent by local authorities across Leicestershire for reuse, recycling or composting (former NI 192)' declined in performance slightly (1%) from 45% in Quarter Four 2024/25 to 43% in Quarter One 2025/26 over a 12-month rolling period up to and including Quarter One 2025/26 (data is two quarters in arrears) and narrowly missed its 45% target. It lies within the third quartile position using latest 2023/24 published data compared to other comparator authorities. This indicator has had relatively static performance over the past year ranging between 43% and 45%. It is anticipated that the Collection and Packaging Reforms will improve performance against this indicator in the coming years. The Reforms include the roll out of mandatory weekly food waste collections from all households and an extended producer responsibility scheme for packaging, which, by making producers responsible for their packaging throughout its whole life cycle, will encourage the use of more easily recycled materials. The Council adopted the Leicestershire Resources and Waste Strategy in April 2023, which includes a pledge to put in place collection systems to contribute towards the future national target of 65% recycling by 2035 (Source: WasteDataFlow).

28. The 'Annual percentage of municipal waste sent to landfill (former NI 193)' improved in performance slightly (1%) as waste declined from 10% in Quarter Four 2024/25 to 9% in Quarter One 2025/26, 12-month rolling period up to and including Quarter One 2025/26 and achieved its target of 10%. Since the same time last year, waste landfilled has decreased by 3% points (from 12% in Quarter One 2024/25) showing an improvement in performance over the year. When compared to other comparator authorities, this indicator remained in the fourth (bottom) quartile in 2023/24. In order to achieve an average position when compared to the other comparator authorities, performance would have to meet a more challenging 1% landfill rate (2023/24). Through the Leicestershire Resources and Waste Strategy, the Council is committed to ensuring that waste sent to landfill remains fewer than 10% by 2035. There has been a large improvement in performance over recent years, and the Council will continue to improve performance where it is cost effective to do so. The energy from waste contract that commenced in April 2023 is expected to further reduce the amount of municipal waste being sent to landfill this year. (Source: WasteDataFlow).

29. The 'Total household waste per household (kg)' improved in performance slightly as waste declined by 2% from 952kg in Quarter Four 2024/25 to 937kg in Quarter One 2025/26 (over the 12-month rolling period up to and including

Quarter One 2025/26 (data is two quarters in arrears)). In comparison to other comparator authorities, Leicestershire's performance was below average as it is in the third quartile for 2023/24 (same as the previous year's quartile). (Source: WasteDataFlow).

Background Papers

Highways and Transport KPI definitions:
https://democracy.leics.gov.uk/documents/s191341/Appendix%20B%20-%20Highways%20and%20Transport%20KPI%20Definitions%20-%20HT%20Scrutiny%20040925.pdf

Waste KPI definitions (pages 33-35)
https://democracy.leics.gov.uk/documents/s191471/Appendix%20B%20-%20ECC%20KPI%20Definitions%202025%20-%20E%20Scrutiny%20100925.pdf

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 2025:
https://www.nhtnetwork.co.uk/isolated/page/793

Leicestershire County Council's Local Transport Plan 4 (2026-2050):
https://democracy.leics.gov.uk/documents/s182763/Appendix%20A%20-%20A%20Local%20Transport%20Plan%20for%20Leicestershire%20-%20Core%20Document%202026-2040.pdf

Leicestershire Resources and Waste Strategy 2022 – 2050
https://www.lesswaste.org.uk/wp-content/uploads/2023/04/Leicestershire-Resources-and-Waste-Strategy-2022-2050.pdf

Circulation under Local Issues Alert Procedure

None.

Equality Implications

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

Human Rights Implications

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

Appendices

Appendix A – HTW KPI Performance Summary Dashboards to December 2025

Appendix B – HTW KPI Performance Dashboards to December 2025

Appendix C – Long-term HTW KPI Performance Dashboards up to 2025

Officers to Contact

Ann Carruthers
Director, Environment and Transport Department
Tel: (0116) 305 7000
Email: Ann.Carruthers@leics.gov.uk

Nicola Truslove
Business Partner, Business Intelligence Service, Department of Public Health, Law and Governance
Tel: (0116) 305 8302
Email: Nicola.Truslove@leics.gov.uk

Highways, Transport & Waste (HTW) KPI Performance Summary Dashboard to December 2025

1. Comparative performance

Quartile Indicators - 4th

* Annual percentage of municipal waste sent to landfill (former NI 193)
Local bus passenger journeys originating in the authority area (millions)
Overall satisfaction with local bus services/(sustainable travel options) (NHT satisfaction survey) (%)

2. Direction of Travel (since previous update)

DOT Indicators - DOWN
* % of household waste sent by local authorities across Leicestershire for reuse, recycling, composting etc. (former NI192)
Average vehicle speed - on locally managed 'A' roads (mph)
Local bus passenger journeys originating in the authority area (millions)
Number of park and ride journeys
Number of people killed or seriously injured (KSI), walking, cycling & motorcyclists (excluding cars) (provisional)
Overall satisfaction with local bus services/(sustainable travel options) (NHT satisfaction survey) (%)
Overall satisfaction with the condition of highways (NHT satisfaction survey) (%)
Overall satisfaction with the condition of pavements & footpaths (NHT satisfaction survey) (%)
Overall satisfaction with traffic levels & congestion (NHT satisfaction survey) (%)
Tonnes of waste produced from LCC sites

3. Performance Against Target (RAG)

Performance Against Target (Red, Amber, Green (RAG)) Summary

RAG Rating Indicators - RED

Overall satisfaction with the condition of highways (NHT satisfaction survey) (%)

This page is intentionally left blank

Highways, Transport & Waste (HTW) KPI Performance Dashboards to December 2025

1. HTW KPIs updated to December 2025

Improved Performance | No Change | Decline in Performance

Indicator (* = Statutory Returns)	Latest Data	Period	Perform. DOT	Target (Yearly)	RAG	Quartiles	Previous Updates	C/L
Overall satisfaction with the condition of highways (NHT satisfaction survey) (%)	19.9	2025/26	↓	30	R	1st 2025	32 33 22 22 20	L
Overall satisfaction with local bus services/(sustainable travel options) (NHT satisfaction survey) (%)	37.3	2025/26	↓	45	A	4th 2025	54 41 42 43 37	C
Local bus passenger journeys originating in the authority area (millions)	10.22	Q1 2025/26	↓	10	G	4th 2024/25	10 10 11 10 10 11 11 10	C
Overall satisfaction with cycle routes & facilities (NHT satisfaction survey) (%)	31.6	2025/26	→	35	A	2nd 2025	38 32 35 31 32	L
Overall satisfaction with the Rights of Way network (NHT satisfaction survey) (%)	39.7	2025/26	↑	42	A	2nd 2025	50 43 42 38 40	L
Overall satisfaction with the condition of pavements & footpaths (NHT satisfaction survey) (%)	49.9	2025/26	↓	55	A	1st 2025	62 53 56 55 50	L
Overall satisfaction with traffic levels & congestion (NHT satisfaction survey) (%)	26.4	2025/26	↓	30	A	3rd 2025	38 34 27 30 26	C
Road safety satisfaction (NHT satisfaction survey) (%)	45.8	2025/26	→	45	G	2nd 2025	57 49 50 45 46	L
Total casualties on Leicestershire roads (provisional)	931	Mth 09 Sep 2025	↑	1,076	G	1st 2024	916 950 939 908 943 953 944 931	L
Number of people killed or seriously injured (KSIs) (provisional)	268	Mth 09 Sep 2025	↑	258	A	1st 2024	255 270 280 286 284 271 268	L
Total casualties involving road users, walking, cycling & motorcyclists (excluding cars) (provisional)	295	Mth 09 Sep 2025	↑	291	A	1st 2024	268 287 281 291 291 304 301 295	L
Number of people killed or seriously injured (KSI), walking, cycling & motorcyclists (excluding cars) (provisional)	136	Mth 09 Sep 2025	↓	116	A	1st 2024	108 122 124 131 128 125 127 136	L

Continued

* % of household waste sent by local authorities across Leicestershire for reuse, recycling, composting etc. (former NI192)	**43.45**	Q1 2025/26	↓	45	A	3rd 2023/24	43	44	44	44	44	44	45	43	C
* Annual percentage of municipal waste sent to landfill (former NI 193)	**9**	Q1 2025/26	↑	10	G	4th 2023/24	18	15	13	12	11	10	10	9	C
* Total household waste per household (kg)	**937**	Q1 2025/26	↑		G	3rd 2023/24	957	957	960	961	956	958	952	937	C

2. HTW KPIs with older data that has been previously reported (not recently updated).

Indicator (* = Statutory Returns)	Latest Data	Period	Perform. DOT	Target (Yearly)	RAG	Quartiles	Previous Updates (Improved Performance / No Change / Decline in Performance)	C/L
Carbon emissions (estimates) from transport within LA influence (Kt)	**1,147**	2023	→		NA	2nd 2023	1,180 1,008 1,133 1,152 1,147	C
* % of principal (A class) road network where structural maintenance should be considered	**3**	2024/25	→	2	A	2nd 2023/24	2 2 2 3 3	L
* % of non-principal (B & C class) road network where structural maintenance should be considered	**4**	2024/25	→	4	G	1st 2023/24	4 3 4 4 4	L
% of the unclassified road network where maintenance should be considered	**12**	2024/25	→	13	G	2nd 2023/24	16 11 10 12 12	L
Number of park and ride journeys	**177,152**	Q1 2025/26	↓		NA	NA	179,527 207,135 188,522 173,827 168,476 198,093 186,192 177,152	C
Average vehicle speed - on locally managed 'A' roads (mph)	**29.5**	2024	↓		NA	2nd 2024	31 30 30 31 30	C
Tonnes of waste produced from LCC sites	**372.3**	Q4 2024/25	↓	364.5	A	NA	264 265 272 275 289 290 313 372	L
% waste recycled from LCC sites (non-operational)	**58.6**	Q4 2024/25	→	65.7	A	NA	58 62 62 62 61 61 59 59	L
Total fly-tipping incidents per 1,000 population	**5.4**	2023/24	→		NA	2nd 2023/24	6 9 6 5 5	C

Data notes

C = Countywide Indicator, where the Council has less influence.

L = Local internal indicator, where the Council has more influence

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 Energy Security and Net Zero) and the Office of National Statistics population data.

Renewable electricity generated within LA area (MWh per 1000 households)

Renewable electricity capacity within LA area (MW per 10k households)

In the 'previous updates' column covering the historical data: the quarterly data covers two years and the annual data covers five years.

Appendix C

Long-Term KPI Performance Dashboards covering Highways, Transport & Waste (HTW) up to 2025

Light blue represents worse performance and dark blue shows better performance

Continued

Graphs can be viewed and explored using Tableau.