



Minutes of a meeting of the Highways and Transport Overview and Scrutiny Committee.
held at County Hall, Glenfield on Thursday, 7 March 2024.

PRESENT

Mr. T. Gillard CC (in the Chair)

Mr. D. C. Bill MBE CC

Mrs. H. J. Fryer CC

Mrs. A. J. Hack CC

Mr. B. Lovegrove CC

Mrs. R. Page CC

Mr. L. Phillimore CC

In attendance

Mr O. O'Shea CC (Lead Member for Highways and Transport)

Mrs M. Wright (Cabinet Support Member)

47. Minutes of the previous meeting.

The minutes of the meeting held on 18th January 2024 were taken as read, confirmed and signed.

48. Question Time.

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

Question asked by Ms Rachael Wigginton (Better Biking for Blaby District)

“The progress made by the County Council in prioritising Active Travel is to be commended. We trust this will be reflected in an improved Local Authority Capability Rating when the results of the next assessment by Active Travel England are published. However there are elements of the approach taken in developing LCWIPs that are frustrating community groups and Active Travel campaigners, including:

1. Lack of external Governance forums and involvement of second tier authorities and their active travel officers. They are currently operating independently with limited discussions around more detailed aspects of the LCWIPs.
2. Limited face to face engagement or workshops held with key active travel community groups and stakeholders in order to build a small number of ‘trusted partners’ or ‘critical friends’ to engage with, as other local authorities do.
3. Clarity of vision and strategy e.g. should commuter corridor routes be prioritised over travel to schools and short journeys?
4. Missed opportunities for small schemes and quick wins.

As a result, it is difficult to see how the present approach will deliver the transformational change needed in the way our communities travel for short distances to schools, shops and local transport hubs.

Will the County Council commit to addressing the points above including a review of the

approach taken in developing LCWIPs and bring the key small number of stakeholders and partners together to discuss and clarify the points above?”

Reply by the Chairman

“The Council recognises the importance of community engagement and involvement as part of the Local Cycling and Walking Infrastructure Plans (LCWIPs). The development of those to date has been informed by engagement exercises, including with representatives from relevant local groups and from district councils. A [report to the Cabinet in November 2023](#) outlined the considerable amount of engagement work undertaken to inform the development of the first two LCWIPs – for the Loughborough and the South of Leicester areas - and this approach will continue as further LCWIPs are developed. Additionally, the Council is working with North West Leicestershire District Council and Blaby District Council to support work that they are undertaking to develop their own (equivalent) LCWIP documents.

In response to requests from, amongst others, Better Biking for Blaby, the Council established an Active Travel Forum to enable interested parties to participate in wider discussions around this agenda; this was welcomed and supported by those who attended its inaugural meeting in September 2023. The next forum is due to take place in spring 2024. The Council would like to ensure the meeting date corresponds with other announcements about schemes and the latest funding position. The Council aims for the forum attendees to be in a position to be informed about wider events and developments at the earliest opportunity. An update has been shared with forum attendees and also on the ‘Choose How You Move’ website. Following the next forum, the Council intends to work to engage with key active travel community groups and stakeholders building smaller groups to act as critical friends and delivery partners.

In addition, the LCWIP development team has begun engaging with other stakeholders such as Neighbourhood Forum groups and further consultation with stakeholders will take place when the Council is developing specific local schemes.

As schemes progress towards implementation, the Council will be engaging with local active travel groups.

The Council is also now in the process of updating its Local Transport Plan (LTP) which will set out a vision and strategy for movement and travel across the County for the future. Through the LTPs development, the Council will be undertaking a series of consultation exercises as the LTP progresses and develops.

With regard to priorities, each of the LCWIPs published to date set out a prioritised 10-year pipeline programme, and those in future will also do so. This is in accordance with guidance published by the Government for the development of LCWIPs and as informed by evidence and consultations to identify corridors where there are greatest opportunities to achieve uplifts in cycling and walking levels and achieve best value for money, again in accordance with Government requirements.”

The Chairman reported that Ms Wigginton had confirmed that she did not have any supplementary questions.

Question by Mr Bob Bellm (Harborough Transport Action)

“The County Council’s Cycling and Walking Strategy will unlock health benefits and is a key step towards the council’s commitment towards net zero emissions by 2030. In the forward to CAWS it says *“This Strategy will help the council secure vital government funding to support delivery of cycling and walking infrastructure and equally important encourage and enable programmes to help our communities walk and cycle more.”*

Given the announcement on 26th February 2024 that £238m has been awarded to Leicestershire from the Government’s Local Transport Fund, available over a seven year period from 2025/26, will the County Council prioritise the Active Travel programme - improving our streets so they are safer for children to walk, wheel and cycle to school with the aim of reducing school run traffic - over building new roads and improving junctions? This money could transform our way of life, making our streets safer and improving the health of our communities.”

Reply by the Chairman

“The Council welcomes the Government’s announcement on the Local Transport Fund (LTF) and is now in the process of identifying its way forward. Further guidance from the Department for Transport on the profile of the funding and the criteria on projects and measures that can be used for is awaited although it is anticipated that active travel will be a key component of LTF delivery plans.

In addition, the Council is now in the process of updating its LTP which will incorporate active travel and set a vision and strategy ensuring safe travel by all modes of transport.”

The Chairman confirmed that Mr Bellm had advised that he had no supplementary questions.

Question by Mr John Marriott

“Traffic modelling carried out in connection with the Charnwood Local Plan showed that vehicle delay on the road network in Charnwood in the evening peak would increase from 1593 vehicle hours (vh) to 2880vh by 2037. These figures appeared in Table 3.3 of the Interim Traffic Forecasting Report which was submitted to the Charnwood Local Plan Inquiry where it is referred to as EXAM 4.

The two Charnwood Local Plan development Options that were considered both showed a further increase to around 3300vh. That represents over a doubling of vehicle delay and a substantial increase in vehicle miles travelled from the 2014 baseline reflecting the increased congestion.

Given the above: -

1. Does the County Council consider these forecasts for vehicle delay to more than double to be valid?
2. Do the forecasts include walking, cycling and public transport initiatives?
3. If so, what is their effect on the forecast vehicle delay?
4. What would be the impact in terms of reducing the vehicle delay increase of each of the ten junction projects that have been put forward as part of the transport infrastructure for Charnwood Local Plan both individually & cumulatively?

5. What consideration has there been with regard to reconciling the conflict of altering junctions to increase traffic capacity & making walking, cycling and public transport more attractive?"

Reply by the Chairman

"Note: Exam 4 is Schedule of Main Modifications. For the purposes of this response, it has been presumed that it is in fact Evidence Base Document EB/TR4 Charnwood Local Plan Interim Forecasting Report, AECOM, October 2020 (TR4) that is being referred to.

- 1, 2 & 3. The evidence work contained in TR4 was prepared using Leicestershire County Council's Pan Regional Traffic Modal (as was other Local Plan transport evidence), which has been developed fully in accordance with prevailing Department for Transport guidance. This work was prepared at an early stage of the Local Plan's preparation and has since been supplanted by later evidence, including as referenced in response to point 4. The purpose of the work encapsulated in TR4 was to assess two possible alternative growth scenarios for the Borough, without any transport mitigation measures (see response to point 4 below) and their comparative forecast transport impacts. In that regard and accepting that any transport modelling results are only representative of a scenario being modelled and not a definitive portent of the future, the results are valid in terms of informing decision making and no questions have been raised by the Inspectors regarding the transport evidence base.
4. The outcomes of the evidence work to test, inter-alia, walking, cycling and passenger transport measures is encapsulated in Exam 31 Charnwood Local Plan Transport Evidence Options Assessment Report. Whilst the document should be read as a whole to ensure a clear and comprehensive understanding of the work and its context, nevertheless the following extract summarises the sequential approach to the testing of transport mitigation measures and the broad conclusions reached:

Summary of findings

In all cases the total delay and kilometres travelled increased, and speed reduced when comparing the **Do Nothing to the Do Minimum**. This was to be expected as the trip demand increased due to development, because no mitigation was applied.

The **sustainable transport measures** (Scenario 1) had the greatest impact in Loughborough and Shepshed, increasing both bus and rail patronage in the AM and PM peak periods. Public transport measures had less of an impact in more rural areas of Charnwood. This is due to the distance from large service centres and the greater reliance on private car travel. Scenario 1 showed an increase in take-up of active modes across the borough in 2036.

The combined impact of **sustainable transport measures and MRN mitigation** (Scenario 2) almost entirely mitigated the impact of 2026 development, reducing delay, kilometres travelled, and link congestion.

Scenario 3 (**Sustainable transport measures, MRN mitigation, and SRN mitigation**) did not wholly mitigate the impact of 2036 development. There was a residual impact on delays, kilometres travelled, and link congestion in the AM peak, although PM peak was close to being fully mitigated.

The approach to the development of the overall transport mitigation package has also previously been set out, inter-alia, in the County Council's, as the Local Highway Authority, Hearing Statement relating to Matter 8 Issues 1 and 2.

The level of testing undertaken has been proportionate to that required to underpin a Local Plan and the Inspectors have raised no questions about the Plan's evidence base in this regard.

5. Such considerations have not been undertaken at this time, and it would have been disproportionate to do so for the purposes of a Local Plan's evidence base. Such matters will be considered through the ongoing development of the three area transport strategies proposed to underpin the Local Plan's delivery, as set out in Exam 75 Transport Strategies to Enable Growth in the Borough of Charnwood."

Mr Marriott asked the following supplementary question

"I am concerned that the County Council is not doing enough to ensure that new development is found and located to reduce the use of cars and that this will outstrip any conceivable increase in capacity. Will the County Council take a more proactive line to address this in the future?"

At the invitation of the Chairman, the Director of Environment and Transport advised that the County Council as the Highway Authority had to work within the confines of the policy and guidance within the national planning policy framework and that provided by the Department for Transport. The County Council was a consultee in the planning process, it did not therefore make decisions as part of the local plan process. As a consultee the Authority considered sustainable transport, how a development would be served, connectivity via walking and cycling etc. The Council had also recently undertaken work with Active Travel England regarding planning for walking and cycling networks so it was prepared when a development came forward to respond to ensure those who moved into those developments had the opportunities for sustainable transport. The Director confirmed that the Council took a holistic view to support road users and look at other sustainable transport options when providing its consultation response to planning authorities who then took the final decision through the local plan process on where a development was sited.

The Chairman thanked Mr Marriot for his questions.

49. 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).

50. Urgent Items.

There were no urgent items for consideration.

51. 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 Phillimore declared a non-registerable interest in agenda item 9 (Special Educational Needs School Transport Service – Update) due to his wife's employment.

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

There were no declarations of the party whip.

53. Presentation of Petitions under Standing Order 35.

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

54. Environment and Transport 2024/25 Highways and Transportation Capital Programme and Works Programme.

The Committee considered a report of the Director of Environment and Transport, the purpose of which was to inform the Committee of the development of the Environment and Transport Department 2024/25 Highways and Transportation Capital Programme and Works Programme, both of which were appended to the report, and to seek its view prior to these Programmes being presented to the Cabinet for approval on 26 March 2024. A copy of the report marked 'Agenda Item 8' is filed with these minutes.

Arising from discussion, the following points were made:

- (i) Members welcomed the recent announcement of Network North Funding (NNF) allocated by the Government. An indicative allocation for the County Council of £238m under the Local Transport Fund (LTF) element of NNF had been announced which would be received over a period of 7 years beginning in 2025/26. Members noted that this did not therefore form part of the current capital programme now presented for comment.
- (ii) The annual allocation of the LTF had not yet been confirmed. The Department of Transport (DfT) had indicated that this would be back loaded (i.e. start low and increase year on year). The Director suggested it would therefore be a while before substantial funding was received. Full details were awaited, but indications were that the funding could be spent on a wide range of capital works. Further guidance was expected by the end of March.
- (iii) In response to questions about how the back loading of funding might affect activity in the earlier years, the Director explained that larger projects had a long lead in time due to the level of preparation and planning needed. It would therefore be possible to plan these scheme and contract at appropriate times in line with when funding would be received. This would also become clearer when the annual allocations had been confirmed.
- (iv) Low, static levels of funding in recent years had limited the amount of improvement and maintenance works carried out by the Department. Members were pleased to hear that the NNF would allow for a more long-term approach to be taken. The Director highlighted, however, that some context was required to manage expectations. The Department's current capital budget for maintenance was £18m for 2024/25, and the additional NNF Road Resurfacing funding stream for maintenance would increase this next year by approximately £2.25m. Whilst the funding would be welcome, it would not therefore address all the issues currently faced across the County's road network.
- (v) The Department was required to develop a two year delivery plan for the LTF by the end of the year. Officers were currently working on this and engagement with members, MPs and other stakeholders would take place as appropriate over the coming year. The guidance expected later this month would provide more clarity on what could be included in the plan.

- (vi) Members welcomed the announcement by Government of a LTF for highways and transport capital improvements. This would be aimed to support more small-scale improvements across the network. The Director reported that if this came to fruition, along with the Road Resurfacing NNF, an improved capital program might be possible in future years.
- (vii) Funding would, if appropriate under the conditions of funding and where investigations highlighted possible schemes, be set aside to support flood alleviation work. A significant amount of work had been undertaken in response to recent storms, like Storm Henk. However, this was in addition to considerable work still in progress from ongoing section 19 investigations which related to past flooding events. Investigations took time to resolve and would likely result in actions for the various flood risk management authorities including the County Council in its role as Highway Authority. Some funding would therefore be allocated to deliver these.
- (viii) A Member questioned if funding would be targeted to more hard-wearing, longer-term repairs, noting that a lack of resources had meant more short-term fixes to the road network in recent years. There were concerns that over time this had affected the overall standard of the network which now needed to be addressed. The Director confirmed that this would be the planned approach and a holistic view of assets (highway, drainage and street lighting) would be taken.
- (ix) Members commented on the deterioration of pavements and the need for some of the new funding to be targeted towards addressing this in future years, as well as roads. It was acknowledged that a lack of resources had meant that minimal maintenance works to pavements and cycleways had been possible for some time. The NNF would help address this.
- (x) A Member questioned how the Department sought to ensure adequate section 106 developer contributions were secured from logistics developments given these would have a greater, long-term impact on roads due to HGVs travelling to and from such sites. It was noted that the Highway Authority sought to include conditions that monitored the impact of the construction phase on the highway. However, there was no mechanism for the Council to seek contributions for future general maintenance which had to be managed by the Council as business as usual within its normal maintenance budget. Members noted that to seek more through the section 106 process would require a change in national policy.
- (xi) Members were pleased to hear that the Department was undertaking a review of its approach to pedestrian crossing requests. The conclusions of this review would be shared with Members as appropriate.

The Lead Member for Highways and Transport commented that the additional NNF and potential LTF was to be welcomed. This would be targeted to address local highways issues, which would include pavements and cycleways. There was some risk, however, regarding future years as a change in Government might result in changes being made to the fund and/or the levels of allocation.

RESOLVED:

- (a) That the development of the Environment and Transport Department 2024/25 Highways and Transportation Capital Programme and Works Programme be

noted;

- (b) That the comments now made be presented to the Cabinet at its meeting on 26 March 2024 for consideration.

55. Special Educational Needs School Transport Service - Update

The Committee considered a report of the Director of Environment and Transport, the purpose of which was to provide an update on the performance and delivery of Special Educational Needs (SEN) Transport for the 2023/24 academic year. The report also provided a summary of the next steps to be taken by the service over the next 12 months. A copy of the report marked 'Agenda Item 9' is filed with these minutes.

Arising from discussion, the following points were made:

- (i) Members acknowledged the challenges faced by the Service and the limited ability to plan ahead when demand continued to grow so quickly. Members recognised that other authorities were experiencing the same problems and questioned what was being done nationally to address this. A Member expressed concern at the lack of additional funding being provided in the Government's recent budget to address the crisis affecting local government with regards to SEN services, including SEN transport.
- (ii) The Director reported on discussions by the Association of Directors of Environment, Economy, Planning and Transport (ADEPT) and the Association of Directors of Children's Services (ADCS). Members were reassured that the Council regularly fed into discussions at a national level directly and through these groups. It was noted that there was general agreement across both Associations that children should be at the core of how services were directed with transport tailored to a child's needs. However, this did not always align with parental expectations. A change in legislation to redress the balance and to move away from what was currently an adversarial system was needed. Representations had been made to the Department for Education on that basis, but unfortunately feedback to date was that there was no appetite by the Government to amend the legislation.
- (iii) Members noted the ADEPT toolkit which shared actions taken by authorities to address pressures locally within the current legislative framework. The Council was seeking to learn from what others had done, and it had shared its work undertaken with Blaby District Council to trial the introduction of school only taxi license badges. Members noted the success of the trial so far which was in its very early stages, and the Director undertook to provide more detailed information on this after the meeting. A Member questioned if this type of targeted licence could be rolled out to other types of volunteer drivers (for example, those providing community transport in rural areas). The Director undertook to share details of the contact at Blaby District Council so that members could discuss future options.
- (iv) The Authority provided transport services as required by legislation but had discretion to determine locally how best to deliver this. It was therefore difficult to make comparisons with other authorities as each operated differently and this was reflective of the level of funding they received. The County Council's low funded position meant it had, over a number of years, sought to deliver its services as efficiently as possible and it would make use of the ADEPT toolkit to look at other

areas for improvement. One example being considered was improving its independent travel training which other authorities had done to make sure those over the age of 16 were better able to use public transport, rather than require personal transport services from the Council.

- (v) A Member expressed concern that some children were not able to attend their nearest special school which added to the transport burden. The Director explained that under current regulation's placements were agreed as part of a child's ECHP (education and health care plan) and transport was considered at the end of that process. This was one of the areas where legislative change was being sought. However, locally the Department was seeking to address this with closer joint working with the Children and Family Services Department through its TSIL (Transforming SEND in Leicestershire) Programme. Transport officers were now involved in discussions to ensure transport needs were considered at a much earlier stage.

The Lead Member commented that it was not always possible for children with SEN to attend their nearest special school. Their needs could sometimes be complex which meant they had to travel to a school which was appropriately equipped to meet their specific needs. This would always be a factor despite the improvements being made across the service and through the TSIL programme.

- (vi) A Member commented that looking at SEN transport in isolation made it difficult to understand the strategic overview being taken to address the high level of growth being seen each year. They questioned, for example, how growth was modelled to identify where new special schools were needed as perhaps this would then help reduce the number and length of transport journeys required. The Director undertook to liaise with the Children and Families Department to establish what could be provided to inform the Committee on this matter.
- (vii) Members noted that the safeguarding practices and procedures for SEN transport were being reviewed. It was acknowledged that the market for these services had changed considerably in recent years and the review was necessary to ensure this did not affect the robust, safe systems in place.
- (viii) A Member requested more information regarding the numbers and different types of transport types being sought by the public. The Director undertook to provide such information after the meeting.

The Lead Member acknowledged the work of the Transport team, recognising that this was often under significant pressure and thanked them for their continued hard work.

RESOLVED:

- (a) That the update on the performance and delivery of Special Educational Needs transport for the 2023/24 academic year be noted.
- (b) That the next steps to be taken by the service over the next 12 months be noted.
- (c) That the Director of Environment and Transport be requested to:
 - (i) provide more detailed information on school only taxi license badges being trialled with Blaby District Council;

- (ii) share details of the contact at Blaby District Council so that members could discuss future options regarding school only taxi license badges and whether this might be rolled out to other types of voluntary transport in their areas;
- (iii) liaise with the Children and Families Department to establish what could be provided to inform the Committee on work taking place to address SEN growth and help minimise transport need and journey times;
- (iv) provide some generic information regarding the numbers and different types of transport types being sought by the public to help member understanding of the service.

56. Road Casualty Reduction in Leicestershire.

The Committee considered a report of the Director of Environment and Transport, the purpose of which was to provide an update on confirmed reported road casualty statistics up to the end of 2022, the Council's approach to casualty reduction and the Leicestershire Police's approach to road safety (as set out in Appendix A to the report). A copy of the report marked 'Agenda Item 10' is filed with these minutes.

The Chairman welcomed Mr Graham Compton, Road Safety Officer at Leicestershire Police, to the meeting. Mr Compton presented the Police Road Safety update (attached as appendix A to the report).

Arising from discussion the following points were made:

- (i) Members noted that despite efforts by the Leicester, Leicestershire and Rutland Road Safety Partnership drink and drug driving were still on the rise. There was also an emerging problem related to e-scooters and e-bikes which had been involved in a number of collisions during the reporting period. It was questioned whether current communication routes had been reviewed to ensure these provided the best reach to the widest demographic of people. Members were pleased to hear that the Partnership had its own communications officer that liaised with Councils and the Police and other partners and ran a number of campaigns through a range of media sources. The Board had also identified possible actions to improve contacts with communities through community centres and existing locality groups and networks, as well as improve messaging through social media. It was suggested that engaging with schools and universities, particularly regarding e-scooter and e-bike safety might be beneficial. A Member also suggested the use of the Council's Leicestershire Matters as a means of reaching every household in the County.
- (ii) Concerns were raised about the number of vehicles that had attempted to drive through flooded roads during the recent storms and the safety and resource implications this gave rise to. The Director confirmed that through the recently revised Flood Risk Management Strategy action to improve messages around flooding were being undertaken. Mr Compton further commented that responding to vehicles stuck in flood water used up considerable Fire Service resources and it had therefore done some excellent work in providing advice to residents and communities on this issue. A Member commented that early flood warnings advising which roads were affected could help to encourage people to plan their routes to avoid these in the first place.

- (iii) Members commented that a growing number of complaints were being raised by residents about parking on footpaths. This not only caused damage to footpaths but also hindered or prevented use entirely by those, for example, with pushchairs, who were partially sighted, or in a wheelchair. It was recognised that the Police had limited resources to address such matters. It was suggested that more needed to be done to educate communities to change their behaviour.
- (iv) Members welcomed the actions being taken by the Partnership to engage directly with hauliers regarding the inappropriate use of weight restricted roads. Members noted that public reports of lorries travelling through weight restricted zones should be passed to local town or parish councils. They were able to collate this data and the Partnership then used this to identify patterns of use or use by a specific business to support action being taken. It was recognised that policing weight restricted zones to pursue a formal prosecution was labour intensive. The Partnership therefore utilised the data provided by the public to issue warnings to drivers and/or hauliers. A fall in complaints suggested that this approach was helpful. The Director undertook to consider with the Partnership where residents in non parished areas could similarly report such information.
- (v) At the request of a Member, the Director undertook to share a copy of the report now presented with the A5 Partnership which would be considering casualties along that stretch of road.
- (vi) Members noted that monthly meetings at Force Headquarters were now being held involving all area commanders with the Road Safety Team. This was proving to be an excellent forum through which all complaints emerging in each area could be shared and considered centrally.

RESOLVED:

- (a) That the update on confirmed reported road casualty statistics up to the end of 2022, the Council's approach to casualty reduction and the Leicestershire Police's approach to road safety be noted;
- (b) That the Director be requested to consider with the Partnership where residents in non parished areas could report sightings of lorries using weight restricted roads;
- (c) That the Director be requested to share a copy of the report now presented with the A5 Partnership.

57. Development of the Leicestershire County Council Road Safety Strategy

The Committee considered a report of the Director of Environment and Transport, the purpose of which was to inform the Committee of the development of the Council's Road Safety Strategy, and to seek its views on the draft as part of the engagement being undertaken and on the new casualty reduction targets proposed. A copy of the report marked 'Agenda Item 11' is filed with these minutes.

Members noted that the full revised draft strategy would be shared with Members at the end of March/early April and feedback was welcomed.

Arising from discussion, the following points were made:

- (i) In response to a question regarding the A5, the Director advised that this was managed by National Highways. The Strategy would include a commitment from the Council to work collectively with National Highways regarding those parts of the A5 which passed through Leicestershire.
- (ii) Members noted that fewer traditional 'cluster' sites in terms of accidents were coming through due to measures introduced in those areas. However, the Strategy retained the Council's commitment to look at sites or stretches of road where patterns of behaviour were identified. The Council would continue to seek to understand these and respond appropriately. It was acknowledged that a single approach would not be appropriate.
- (iii) The Council looked at the motorway network, including the M1, to help its understanding of how this impacted the use of roads in the County for which it was responsible for. Through the Road Safety Partnership information and learning was also shared. However, the County Council would not intervene in measures adopted on such roads. This was a matter for National Highways.

RESOLVED:

That the development of the Council's Road Safety Strategy be noted.

58. Highways and Transport Performance Report to December 2023.

The Committee considered a report of the Director of Environment and Transport, the purpose of which was to present the latest performance update on the Key Performance Indicators (KPIs) the County Council was solely or partly responsible for within its Strategic Plan covering Highways and Transport Services to December 2023 (Quarter three). A copy of the report marked 'Agenda Item 12' is filed with these minutes.

A Member commented on the condition of byways open to all traffic in the Belvoir division which required remediation works and action taken to stop inappropriate use. It was noted that this was an issue being seen in other parts of the County too. Members noted that the Council did not have a statutory duty to upgrade or maintain public byways for vehicle use and so due to a lack of resources, this was a low priority issue. However, this could be looked at in the future depending on how much funding was received.

It was noted that the emissions figures contained in the report were in arrears and related to 2022 and so were reflective of post pandemic increases in traffic.

RESOLVED:

That the performance update for the period up to December 2023 (quarter three) be noted.

59. Date of next meeting.

RESOLVED:

It was noted that the next meeting of the Committee would be held on 6th June 2024 at 2.00pm.

2.00 - 4.00 pm
07 March 2024

CHAIRMAN

This page is intentionally left blank