

Leicestershire County Council Transparency report 2026-27 – Technical Annex



Contents

Leicestershire County Council Transparency report 2026-27 – Technical Annex	0
Contents.....	0
B1 - Highways maintenance funding and spending figures.....	1
B1.1 – Capital funding allocation sources	1
B1.2 - Spending	1
B2 – Highway Maintenance Activity (Surface Treatments and Repairs).....	3
B2.1 – Road resurfacing and surface treatments	3
B3 – Pothole repairs	4
B3.1 – Pothole/Defect intervention criteria	4
B3.2 – Number of potholes filled	7
B3.3 - Prices of pothole interventions	7
B3.4 - Defect repair quality	7
B3.5 - Public reporting system for defects and other issues	8
B4 – Maintenance of highway structures	9
B4.1 Highway Structures	9
B5 – Asset Management	10
B5.1 - Asset Management Strategy and Policy	10
B5.2 - Asset data This section seeks to establish whether asset management decisions are supported by appropriate and up-to-date condition data.	10
B5.3 – Asset data integration and management	11
B5.4 – Lifecycle planning and investment decision-making	11
B5.5 – Performance monitoring and continuous improvement	12
B6 - Maintaining footways and cycleways.....	13
B7 – Drainage	14
B8 – Skills and training	15
B9 – Adapting roads to withstand climate pressures.....	16

B10 – Innovation	17
B11 – Working with utility companies to reduce disruption to road users	19
B12 – Managing highways maintenance contracts effectively	20

B1 - Highways maintenance funding and spending figures

B1.1 – Capital funding allocation sources

Financial year	2024-25	2025-26	2026-27 (projected)
Highways maintenance capital funding allocated through DfT	£16,153,000	£28,790,790	£29,785,000
Other DfT capital funding utilised by local authority for highways maintenance	£3,280,783	£13,553,517	£10,373,000
Other Government capital funding allocated by local authority to Highways Maintenance	£0	£0	£0
Other capital funding allocated to highways maintenance	£6,160,569	£3,418,323	£10,517,911
Total Capital funding allocated to highways maintenance	£25,594,352	£45,762,630	£50,675,911

B1.1.2 - Additional information on funding figures

2024/25 revenue included £3.86m Capital substitution - removed from 2025/26 onwards.
--

B1.2 - Spending

B1.2.1 – Total spending

The questions in this section (B1.2.1) relate to the spending condition set out in the 2026–27 [local highways maintenance incentive funding requirements](#). Completion of this section forms part of the evidence required to meet this incentive funding condition.

Please confirm that you understand the answers provided in this section (B1.2.1) relate to your compliance under the 2026-27 local highways maintenance incentive funding requirements, as set out to your authority via letter to your chief executive in April and as published online .	Yes
--	------------

Financial year	2024-25	2025-26	2026-27 (projected)
Total highways maintenance capital spend	£25,594,352	£45,762,630	£50,675,911
Total highways maintenance revenue spend	£38,611,640	£42,266,324	£37,548,053

Financial year	2024-25	2025-26	2026-27 (projected)
Total spend	£64,205,992	£88,028,954	£88,223,964

B1.2.2 - Additional information on total spending figures

2024/25 revenue included £3.86m Capital substitution - removed from 2025/26 onwards.
--

B1.2.3 Spending on carriageways by type of spend in financial year 2025-26 and 2026-27 (projected)

Carriageway spend related maintenance type	Capital 2025-26	Revenue 2025-26	Capital 2026-27 (projected)	Revenue 2026-27 (projected)
Planned maintenance				
Preventative carriageway maintenance	£6,288,551	£1,572,811	£7,660,569	£2,144,006
Structural carriageway maintenance	£5,470,858	£461,025	£4,783,519	£462,411
Planned carriageway repair / patching programmes	£7,784,217	£953,142	£9,281,571	£873,461
Reactive carriageway maintenance				
Reactive carriageway repairs / patching (temporary repairs)	£0	£464,519	£0	£413,697
Reactive carriageway repairs / patching (permanent repairs)	£3,695,965	£1,817,589	£4,248,719	£1,655,467
Reactive carriageway repairs / patching (total)	£866,100	£1,400,809	£1,006,594	£1,073,065
Other carriageway-related spend	£1,982,897	£12,109,314	£2,884,057	£11,263,412
Total	£26,088,588	£18,779,209	£29,865,029	£17,885,519

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

N/A

B2 – Highway Maintenance Activity (Surface Treatments and Repairs)

B2.1 – Road resurfacing and surface treatments

Financial year	Road receiving preventative road surface treatments (length, km)	Road receiving planned structural maintenance (length, km)	Area receiving planned repair / patching programmes	Area receiving reactive repair / patching (permanent methods)	Area receiving reactive repairs/ patching (temporary methods)
2025-26	142.97 km	23.2 km	428,590m ²	m ²	m ²
2026-27 projected	167 km	19.8 km	551,000m ²	n/a	n/a

B2.1.1 – additional information on surface treatments and repairs

Does table B2.1 reflect all your carriageway-related road surface treatments & repair activities (for example, including pothole repairs)? If no , please add further information on any other types of treatments (planned to be) delivered and their extent in the table below.	No
--	-----------

B2.1.2 – Further information and context

The reactive (category 2) patching carried out by our in-house teams are not included in B2.1 “data not available” (only planned patching is included) and the pothole repairs reported in B3.2 / B3.2.2 is not included in B2.1 – reactive pothole repairs are measured by “number”, not “m2”.	
---	--

B3 – Pothole repairs

This section sets out how authorities identify and repair potholes and other defects in carriageways, and how this activity fits within their wider maintenance approach. The Department is clear that prevention is better than cure: planned, preventative maintenance should be the foundation of a well-managed network, reducing the need for repeated reactive interventions.

B3.1 – Pothole/Defect intervention criteria

Emergency Response

These are those incidents or defects which, due to their nature, size and/or location, represent an immediate hazard or serious risk to the public.

Emergency incidents/defects, usually reported via the emergency services, will be corrected or made safe at the time of the inspection, if reasonably practicable. In this context, making safe may constitute displaying warning notices, coning-off, fencing-off or closing the highway or other suitable action, to protect the public from the defect.

If the inspection team cannot make the incident or defect safe at the time of inspection, then they will instigate the relevant emergency call procedures to ensure appropriate resources are mobilised to make the incident/defect safe. In some situations, it may be necessary for the inspector to remain on site until the response team arrives and the incident/defect is made safe. These procedures aim to ensure initial attendance to the incident/defect as soon as practicably possible and are given the highest priority.

Except for emergency defects, the Council will endeavour to inspect and categorise all defects as soon as reasonably practicable and within a maximum of 10 working days of the original report to determine the level of response required.

Category 1 Defects

Require prompt attention because they represent an immediate or imminent hazard or because there is a risk of short-term structural deterioration, including carriageway potholes greater than 40mm and footway potholes greater than 20mm in depth.

Response

Repairs of a temporary or permanent nature will be carried out in accordance with the LCC carriageway hierarchy Table 1. Repairs of a permanent nature will be carried out within a timescale according to the defect status, following the completion of the temporary repair.

Category 2 Defects

Require attention but do not represent an immediate or imminent hazard, including carriageway potholes up to 40mm and footway potholes up to 20mm in depth.

Response

Repairs of a temporary or permanent nature will be carried out in accordance with the LCC carriageway hierarchy Table 1.

Category 3 Defects (Low Priority)

These defects do not exceed the policy intervention level and do not require attention, but the area may require future maintenance. The condition of the defect will be assessed at the next scheduled inspection or if third-party reports of deterioration are received.

Response

No immediate action. The repair of these defects is to be undertaken as resources become available or be included within a planned maintenance programme.

Table 1 - Pothole/Defect intervention criteria:

Pothole/Defect category name (as used by your authority)	Minimum investigatory or definitional threshold (e.g. depth, area, width – include units)	Additional risk or contextual factors considered (e.g. road hierarchy, traffic levels, location in carriageway)	Target response time – make safe	Target response time – permanent repair
Category 1	>40mm	Risk-based approach based on LCC Road Hierarchy (see table 2)	3, 5, 10 or 15 days based on RBA - LCC Road Hierarchy	3, 5, 10 or 15 days based on RBA - LCC Road Hierarchy.
Category 2	<40mm	Risk-based approach based on LCC Road Hierarchy (see table 2)	N/A	60, 75 or 90 days based on RBA - LCC Road Hierarchy
Category 3	These defect/s do not exceed the appropriate safety intervention level, but the area may require maintenance. Review the condition of the defect at the next scheduled inspection		N/A	No immediate action. The repair of these defects is to be undertaken as resources become available or be included within a planned maintenance programme

Table 2 - Pothole/Defect response time by carriageway hierarchy:

Carriageway Hierarchy					
Ref.	Description	Inspection frequency	Response Times (Cat1)	Response Times (Cat2)	Response Times (Cat3)
CH1	The highest-risk roads form our Resilient Network, which represents the top tier of our carriageway hierarchy. These routes have been designated due to their ability to support economic activity and provide access to critical infrastructure during severe weather events (see Leicestershire Resilient Network).	Monthly	3 working days	60 working days	Programmed for when resources are available
CH2	This category encompasses the remaining A and B class carriageways that are not part of the designated Resilient Network.	Monthly	5 working days	60 working days	Programmed for when resources are available
CH3	The third category includes predominantly C class roads that span the county, connecting villages. While they carry less traffic than CH1 and CH2 routes, they play a vital role in linking communities and supporting local accessibility.	Quarterly	10 working days	75 working days	Programmed for when resources are available
CH4	Carriageways that provide access to essential community facilities such as schools, medical practices, and local shops are included in this category. They may also occasionally serve as connecting routes between small hamlets	Annual	10 working days	90 working days	Programmed for when resources are available
CH5	This category includes residential through-routes that may connect to CH4 or higher classifications, as well as bus routes running through residential areas. It also covers business parks and small industrial estates. Additionally, rural roads that do not serve as the main access points into or out of villages are included in this group.	Annual	15 working days	90 working days	Programmed for when resources are available
CH6	This category are residential roads with minimal through traffic, typically have a 30mph speed limit and street lighting.	Annual	15 working days	90 working days	Programmed for when resources are available
CH7	All remaining publicly maintainable metalled carriageways fall into this category, mainly single-track roads serving few properties.	Annual	15 working days	90 working days	Programmed for when resources are available

B3.2 – Number of potholes filled

B3.2.1 - Number of potholes filled in 2025-26 (estimate)	10,372
--	---------------

B3.2.2 - Of these how many do you estimate were resolved using each of the following approaches?

Planned repair / patching programmes	Planned structural maintenance programmes	Reactive repair using temporary repair methods	Reactive repair using permanent repair methods
Data not held for potholes fixed by planned repairs	Data not held for potholes fixed by structural maintenance programmes	2,593	7,779

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

Note the above numbers relate to the number of works instructions and each works instruction could include more than one pothole per job.

CAUTION FOR READERS – Authorities have different criteria for identifying potholes and different methodologies for counting how many they have filled or resolved. Summing the figures in the above table across authorities will therefore not provide a reliable estimate of the total number of potholes filled across England.

B3.3 - Prices of pothole interventions

Unit/average cost of a permanent pothole repair on your network (reactive)	£74.51	Unit/average cost of a temporary pothole repair on your network (reactive)	£48.72
--	---------------	--	---------------

B3.3.1 - Additional information on pothole prices

These are the authority unit costs as set in the Highway Management system (CONFIRM) and reflects a 1.00sqm pothole.

B3.4 - Defect repair quality

ID	Question	Yes/no
3.4.1	Do you set requirements to those delivering repairs about the longevity of both a) planned repairs/patching and b) reactive repairs using permanent methods?	Yes
3.4.2	If yes, do you base your material and process specifications on these longevity requirements?	Yes
3.4.3	Do you regularly monitor the appropriateness of the carriageway interventions chosen by your workforce or contractor and the quality of work delivered?	Yes
3.4.4	If yes, do you systematically record information about expected and delivered longevity of repairs?	No

B3.4.5 - Evidence Summary

3.4.1 – Highway Contracts

3.4.2 – Contract material specs

3.4.3 - The Highway Inspection team undertakes routine inspections which include the assessment of network condition and completed repairs. Highway works supervisors oversee works to ensure the quality of work being delivered. Operational gangs take “before” and “after” photographs that are recorded in the Highway Management System for quality control checks.

3.4.4 – All works information is captured and retained for reporting in the Highway Management system (CONFIRM).

B3.5 - Public reporting system for defects and other issues

ID	Question	Answer
3.5.1	Are defect reports from the public routinely used as an input into maintenance planning and inspection regimes?	Yes
3.5.2	Do you inform users about the outcomes from their feedback, including when no action is to be taken?	Yes

B3.5.3 - Evidence Summary

LCC website link to the Report it page - [*Report it*](#)

Defect reports from the public are assigned to the area highway inspector for on-site assessment and inclusion in reactive and/or planned maintenance programmes.

All reports are logged in the Highway Management System and auto-updates to the customer on progress / action required are generated from the status updates for the individual enquiry.

There are over 40 auto alerts set up in the Highway Management System to help keep customers updated. The team will also provide individual customer responses where required.

B3.5.4 - Tools used for reporting

The public can contact the council's Customer Service Centre (CSC) on 0116 3050001. Or report defects and potholes on the council's website. Customer-reported defects are logged in CONFIRM Highways Management System and assessed by a highway inspector, who determines priority based on urgency, response times, location and traffic management requirements.

B4 – Maintenance of highway structures

B4.1 Highway Structures

<i>ID</i>	Question	Answer
4.1.1	Number of highway structures on your highway network	927
4.1.2	Number of highway structures with interim measures in accordance with CS470 applied?	0
4.1.3	Number of structures due a General Inspection in 2025-26 in accordance with CS450	358
4.1.4	Number of General Inspections carried out in 2025-26	343
4.1.5	Number of structures due a Principal Inspection in 2025-26 in accordance with CS450	16
4.1.6	Number of Principal Inspections carried out in 2025-26	13

B5 – Asset Management

This section focuses on asset management practices that underpin how the authority plans, prioritises and delivers highways maintenance. It is intended to provide confidence that decisions are evidence led, risk based and aligned to whole life value, in line with the Code of Practice for Well Managed Highways Infrastructure.

B5.1 - Asset Management Strategy and Policy

The questions in this section (B5.1) relate to the asset management condition set out in the 2026–27 [local highways maintenance incentive funding requirements](#). Completion of this section forms part of the evidence required to meet this incentive funding condition.

5.1.1	Please confirm that you understand the answers provided in this section (B5.1) relate to your compliance under the 2026-27 local highways maintenance incentive funding requirements, as set out to your authority via letter to your chief executive in April and as published online.	Yes
5.1.2	Please provide a link to your authority's published highways asset management policy and strategy.	
	Leicestershire highways asset management information	
5.1.3	Please provide the date it was last reviewed or updated	11/06/2025
5.1.4	Please provide proof of the review or update.	
	The previous revision dates relating to both the Policy and the Strategy can be found on the Record of Amendments table which can be located on page 2 of the respective documents.	
5.1.5	If your asset management policy or strategy has not been reviewed or updated since 1 August 2024, please confirm that it will be reviewed or updated by 30 September 2027 and provide a brief timetable for doing so.	
	N/A	

B5.1.6 - Further context

Leicestershire County Council have all of our procedures documented and carry out annual internal audits of our processes and procedures. We are certified under ISO55001 for Asset Management, and ISO9001 for our Procedures and are externally audited annually by the British Standard institute (BSi).

Key aspects of highways asset management approach

B5.2 - Asset data This section seeks to establish whether asset management decisions are supported by appropriate and up-to-date condition data.

Asset type	Asset inventory held? (None / partial / full)	Condition data held? (None / Partial / Full)
Carriageways	Full	Full
Footways and cycleways	Partial	Partial
Structures	Full	Full
Drainage assets	Partial	Partial
Street lighting	Full	Full
Traffic signals	Full	Full

B5.3 – Asset data integration and management

This section seeks to understand the maturity of how asset data is managed and integrated to support planning and investment decisions.

B5.3.1 – Asset data integration

How is asset inventory and condition data for your key highway assets primarily managed? (please indicate one option with an X)

Discrete spreadsheets or documents held by individual teams	
Multiple digital platforms with limited integration	
A single digital platform or a set of connected platforms used across the highways service	
Other (<i>please set out in further context</i>)	X

B5.3.2 - Further context

We have various systems and databases some of which are bespoke to the asset type, such as the Structures toolkit, or Pavement Management System (PMS). Some databases are managed by a third-party as part of a contract. However, the data is transferred to a central database (currently Siemens, formerly Brightly's Confirm system). All data is digitised and can be accessed and visualised using a Geographical Information System (GIS).

B5.4 – Lifecycle planning and investment decision-making

This section focuses on whether the authority uses **lifecycle planning** to inform maintenance investment decisions, rather than relying solely on reactive demand or short-term pressures.

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

B5.4.4 - Evidence Summary

We currently use Siemens Predictor software for lifecycle planning for all of our major asset groups. This tool allows us to create individual lifecycle plans for each asset group and then determine the most cost-effective method to manage the asset over its lifetime. This will enable us to make maintenance decisions and long-term planned maintenance programmes.

B5.5 – Performance monitoring and continuous improvement

This section focuses on whether the authority monitors the effectiveness of its asset management approach and uses performance information to inform ongoing investment and prioritisation decisions.

ID	Question	Answer
5.5.1	Do you have a defined set of key performance indicators (KPIs) to monitor the outcomes of your highways asset management approach?	Yes
5.5.2	Are these KPIs reviewed on a regular basis (at least annually)?	Yes
5.5.3	Are KPI trends used to inform maintenance planning, prioritisation or changes to forward programmes or investment decisions?	Yes
5.5.4	Have you conducted a value for money review or peer review of your service in the last 3 years	No (last review was 4 years ago)

B5.5.5 - Evidence Summary

We have a platform for managing a variety of risks across the Department, called Ideagen. This platform assigns KPI's to individuals, allowing us to manage and monitor progress, actions, responsibilities and delegation of duties across the Department.

In 2022, the Council appointed the Future Highways Research Group (FHRG) to assess the performance of the Council's highway service across categories of Economy, Efficiency, Effectiveness, Strategic Value and Stakeholder Value. The FHRG quoted "Leicestershire County Council Highways Service (LCCHS) demonstrates excellent performance against all the VfM dimensions. LCCHS is the top performing member of FHRG as assessed within the last 18 months".

B6 - Maintaining footways and cycleways

ID	Question	Answer
6.1.1	Do you have a defined footway hierarchy (e.g. based on footway function and usage levels) that underpins a risk-based approach to inspection frequencies and maintenance programmes?	Yes
6.1.2	For 2026-27, please provide the length of footways that you have earmarked for structural maintenance / reconstruction / renewal	7.132 km
6.1.3	For 2026-27, please provide the length of footways that you have earmarked for preventative maintenance treatments	0 km
6.1.4	Are priority footways and cycleways included in your winter service (e.g. gritting or snow clearance), and in a routine programme for keeping them clear of overgrown vegetation and debris (e.g. sweeping, cutting back)?	No (see note below)
6.1.5	For 2026-27, are you planning to deliver structural or preventative maintenance to cycleways which is not yet covered as part of your carriageway maintenance programmes or footway maintenance programmes (e.g. segregated cycleways that are not shared with pedestrians or motorists). If yes, please set out the length of such cycleways that you have earmarked for:	No
	a. Structural maintenance / reconstruction (in km)	In km
	b. Preventative maintenance treatments (in km)	In km

B6.1.6 - Please provide any brief additional information you consider helpful in explaining your approach to maintaining footways and cycleways

A programme of clearing back overgrown vegetation and debris on footways is carried out each winter, sites are selected on a risk based / priority need taking into consideration the footway hierarchy and safer routes to schools.

B7 – Drainage

ID	Question	Answer
7.1.1	Please provide an estimate of your drainage maintenance expenditure split (in percentages) between:	
	b) Reactive (incident- or failure-driven) maintenance	64% for A
	b) Planned maintenance (routine/cyclical and/or risk-based)	36% for B
7.1.2	Does your authority utilise a digital drainage management platform, covering asset inventory, inspection history, sensor data, and risk scoring?	Yes
7.1.3	Do you maintain a record of locations where drainage issues are known to cause or contribute to carriageway deterioration or surface water ponding?	No
7.1.4	Do you utilise smart sensors or other remote monitoring technologies to monitor performance of your drainage assets. If yes please provide some high level information in bullet points below	No
	Guidance – This is space for additional information on sensors/technologies for remote monitoring – please list technologies used in bullet form, including approximate number of installations.	

B7.1.5 - Evidence Summary

The council utilises Map16 as its digital drainage platform. A public version of Map16 is available on the council website to see the gullies we maintain, their priority status, when they are due to be cleaned and when we last emptied them. [Leicestershire public drainage maintenance map](#)

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

Approximately 64% of drainage expenditure is driven by customer contacts and reactive investigations, including gully emptying, CCTV surveys, and dig-down works undertaken to identify and resolve drainage issues. The remaining 36% is invested in planned and programmed activities, such as identified drainage improvement schemes and routine drainage asset cleansing. Drainage assets are managed through Map16 and Confirm, which provide records of inspection histories, scheduled maintenance activities, and risk scores for gullies and culverts. While trials of smart gully sensors have been completed, the technology has not yet demonstrated sufficient reliability or accuracy to support routine operational use across the network.

B8 – Skills and training

ID	Question	Answer
8.1.1	Do you have an up-to-date training and development plan for those responsible for highways asset management in your authority?	Yes
8.1.2	Do you or your main highways contractors support professional development through a recognised professional training scheme (e.g. Institution of Civil Engineers (ICE) or Institution of Highway Engineers (IHE))?	Yes
8.1.3	Does your authority contribute towards the cost of professional membership or professional development required for relevant highways roles?	No
8.1.4	Do you employ a professionally qualified engineer (e.g. Chartered Engineer (CEng) or equivalent competence) with responsibility for the management of highway structures (either in house or through a contracted arrangement)?	Yes
8.1.5	Does your authority define competence requirements for key highways asset management roles and take steps to address any identified gaps (either directly or through contractual arrangements)?	Yes
8.1.6	Do you or your main contractors support early career development in your local area, for example through apprentice schemes, traineeships or pre-apprenticeship programmes, sponsored qualifications (e.g. HNC/HND, degree, MSc), graduate schemes etc	Yes

B8.1.7 - Evidence Summary

The Council maintains a training and development framework. The framework supports over 1,100 employees across the Department. Training and competency requirements are identified through annual Performance Development Reviews and regular one-to-one meetings with line managers. A centrally managed training register is used to prioritise development needs, coordinate training delivery and monitor refresher training requirements. Oversight is provided through a quarterly Training and Development Board chaired by the Programme Lead for Investment, Risk and Resilience. The Council operates an approved training scheme with the Institution of Civil Engineering and supports professional qualifications employing Chartered and Incorporated Engineers in key highways disciplines.

B8.1.8 – Further context on skills/training

The Council supports career development through apprenticeships, graduate development programmes, mentoring and work experience opportunities. A quarterly Training and Development Board, supported by the Departmental Training Coordinator, oversees workforce planning, succession planning, university engagement and professional development across all service areas.

The department currently supports over 30 apprentices across a range of disciplines, with plans to recruit further civil engineering apprentices. Ten Graduate Transport Planners are currently progressing through structured five-year development programmes. Each graduate and apprentice is assigned a mentor.

The Council worked closely with the Transport Planning Society in developing the original Professional Development Scheme and was one of the first authorities to implement the scheme. The Council continues to use the scheme as a key pathway for supporting

succession planning across the service. Annual work experience placements are provided for local students, alongside engagement with universities and colleges to promote careers in highways, transport and infrastructure.

B9 – Adapting roads to withstand climate pressures

Climate and environmental factors, such as heavy rainfall, prolonged heat, and freeze-thaw cycles, are integral to effective highways asset management, as they influence asset performance, deterioration rates and long-term resilience. Understanding both the impacts of a changing climate and the carbon implications of maintenance activities supports better decision-making, helping authorities to optimise durability, manage risk and deliver best whole life value from their assets.

ID	Question	Yes/no
9.1.1	Have you updated your asset management policy and strategy to reflect the increased probability of extreme-weather and/or geohazards now and in the future?	Yes
9.1.2	Have you identified your resilient network and agree this with senior decision-makers	Yes
9.1.3	If yes when did you last update this.	26/03/2025
9.1.4	Have you identified locations that are repeatedly affected by extreme weather (e.g. flooding, heat damage, storms)?	Yes
9.1.5	Which climate-adaptation measures are currently implemented on your network?	
	- Targeted drainage upgrades or maintenance	Yes
	- Natural flood management / SuDS	Yes
	- targeted slope / ground stability / landslip mitigation	No
	- Heat-resilient materials or surface treatments	Yes
	- Tree planting / shading for heat management	No
	- Other (please specify)	No
9.1.6	Have you measured and benchmarked the greenhouse gas emissions from your highways maintenance service using a recognised industry standard? Or do you have arrangements in place to do this, such as by signing up to the DfT funded ADEPT Carbon Leadership Programme.	Yes
9.1.7	Have you formally engaged with the DfT funded ADEPT live labs 2 Programme, to understand what lessons your authority can utilise to increase the efficiency of your operations and support decarbonisation efforts?	Yes

B9.1.8 - Evidence Summary

Carbon Measurement and Management certificate (for the reporting year 2024/25) received from ADEPT Carbon Leadership Programme.
Leicestershire also provides a representative for the LL2 expert advisory panel.
All of our asset management documents have recently been updated (HAMP - June 2025, HAMS - June 2025, HIAMP - July 2026) and all reflect the increased probability of extreme weather. We are currently writing a new Strategy on Resilient Transport which will go into greater detail on this subject.

B10 – Innovation

ID	Question	Yes / No
10.1.1	Do your procurement and contracting approaches encourage and reward innovative practice?	Yes
10.1.2	Can you demonstrate that innovative materials and practices are regularly reviewed and, where appropriate, integrated into business as usual operations?	Yes
10.1.3	If you have conducted innovation trials, have you shared the findings of these publicly or with professional networks?	Yes (but not shared publicly)

10.1.4 - Evidence Summary

A public report on Highway trials and innovation will be presented to overview and scrutiny committee (due 5th November 2026) detailing and summarising the evaluation of over 40 Highway trials.

B10.1.5 - Further context

Where Highways Maintenance is procured through Public Tenders, quality questions are designed to encourage innovation within supply chains. For example, Q4 within LCC's Machine Lay Carriageway Surfacing Contract 2024 invites bidders to propose proprietary alternatives to specified AC10/14 surface courses, including polymer modified and lower carbon options such as warm mix asphalt.

Bidders must demonstrate that proposed products offer:

- equivalent or enhanced performance;
- reduced CO2 production; and
- equivalent or reduced whole life costs.

Responses are evaluated against these criteria, and any bidders scoring below 2 will be eliminated from further evaluation and their tender rejected.

10.2 – Examples of innovations that have been adopted

1. Use of foam-mix recycling in binder and base layers (permanent foam-mix plant within Leicestershire): Efficiency and cost savings. Foam mix asphalt offers a sustainable, low-carbon alternative to traditional hot-mix asphalt, reducing CO2 emissions by at least 40% while using up to 95% recycled materials. Foam-mix significantly reduces fumes, odours, and steam on-site. It eliminates risks of burns, creating a safer environment for workers and the public. There is the option to encapsulate tar bound materials leading to significant cost savings versus the disposal costs for hazardous material. The foam-mix plant is part of a recycling hub at Holcim's Croft Quarry (next to the Council's depot), providing other recycling benefits for the Council such as recycling and re-use of hardcore waste back into Granular sub-base.
2. Use of Polymer Modified Binders (PMBs): Durability benefits. Use of Polymer Modified Binders (PMBs) in surfacing to increase durability (lifecycle) and increase the softening point of bitumen. PMBs have a higher softening point than conventional bitumen, preventing the road surface from becoming too soft in high heat, especially

during the summer months which can lead to damage to the surface. Reduced potholes: Improved moisture resistance prevents water stagnation from causing early-life failures like stripping and the resulting potholes. PMBs also retain their properties better over time, resisting oxidation and maintaining performance for a longer period.

3. Interactive customer maps developed in-house for the Council website. Interactive customer maps for grass cutting that show areas to be cut, any missed areas & the reason why, the date of last cut and date of next cut has reduced our customer enquiries from 800 in 2016 to just over 200 therefore saving significant officer time. A similar map is available in the winter months to show our gritting network.
4. Tweel Wheel Trial: currently in use with a plan to replace all wheels and tyres on mowers. The Tweel is an airless tyre developed by Michelin USA. Michelin estimates Tweel treads can last 2–3 times longer than conventional tyres, and the tread is replaceable without discarding the entire unit, reducing waste and reducing long-term cost.
5. In summer 2026 we trialled the use of a product called Lockchip on different types of roads during this year's surface dressing season, varying from residential roads to dual carriageways. 135,000m² of the surface dressed sites have had this treatment applied. The treatment is designed to lock down loose chippings enhancing chip retention in the matrix of the dressing bed, improve long term chip retention, help suppress dust, maintain texture depth and enhance appearance.

B11 – Working with utility companies to reduce disruption to road users

ID	Question	Yes / No
11.1.1	Do you routinely monitor and enforce utility works quality as part of your streetworks management?	Yes
11.1.2	Have you undertaken a senior-endorsed assessment of whether a lane rental scheme would be suitable for your area?	No
11.1.3	Do you seek input from utility companies when determining your highways maintenance programme to help reduce disruption?	Yes
11.1.4	Have you conducted and published a permit scheme evaluation within the last three years?	No
11.1.5	Have you conducted a traffic sensitive review in the last three years?	Yes

11.1.6 - Evidence Summary

As part of its statutory duties under the **New Roads and Street Works Act 1991 (NRSWA)** and the **Traffic Management Act 2004**, Leicestershire County Council is currently reviewing its **Traffic Sensitive Streets Register**, with completion scheduled for **September 2026**. In addition, a **Permit Scheme Evaluation Report** is being prepared in accordance with the requirements of the **Traffic Management Permit Scheme (England) Regulations 2007** to assess the effectiveness of the Permit Scheme and is due to be completed by **December 2026**.

B12 – Managing highways maintenance contracts effectively

Only answer this sections if you utilise a contractor to deliver any of your **carriageway** maintenance operations, including: structural maintenance, planned repairs / patching, or reactive repairs / patching

ID	Question	Yes / No
12.1.1	Does your authority retain in-house technical capability to independently assess maintenance interventions proposed by contractors?	Yes
12.1.2	Do you routinely analyse actual unit costs (for example £/m ² of road surface treatments, or £/pothole repair) for core highways maintenance activities delivered under contract and compare them against benchmarks or historic performance?	Yes
12.1.3	Do you have defined KPIs for your highways maintenance contract(s), and are they actively monitored by your authority to manage performance?	Yes
12.1.4	If reactive pothole repairs are delivered by a contractor, do your contracting arrangements incentivise single-visit permanent repairs where it is safe and appropriate to do so?	N/A

12.1.5 - Evidence Summary

Leicestershire County Council delivers its highways maintenance programme through a combination of directly delivered services and specialist outsourced contracts. Performance against all outsourced contracts is monitored through agreed key performance indicators (KPIs), while contract rates and costs are subject to ongoing review to ensure they continue to represent the most effective and value-for-money approach to service delivery for the Council.