

Universal Services

Name of SP25 proposal:	SP25 Proposal Reference:
School Crossing Patrols	EIA – US03 Universal Services

EIA writer(s) and authoriser

No.		Name	Department	Position	Email address	Phone number	Date	Issue
1	Report Writer(s)	Martin Wiltshire	Universal Services	Assistant Highways Manager (Traffic Management)			30/04/2024	2
2	EIA authoriser	Patrick Blogg	Universal Services	Director – Universal Services			15/05/2024	2
3	EIA Coordinator	Patrick Poyntz-Wright	Universal Services	Capital and Governance Support Manager			14/05/2024	2

Section one – information about the service and service change

Service affected	School Crossing Patrols
-------------------------	-------------------------

<p>Please provide a short description of the service / policy/project/project phase</p>	<p>Hampshire County Council currently provides a School Crossing Patrol (SCP) service close to various schools across Hampshire. Where provided, these can be used by children on their journeys to and from school. Hampshire County Council does not have a statutory duty to provide this service, but if another provider chooses to do so, we do have duties to ensure the provision is appropriate.</p> <p>Currently we use defined criteria to assess whether to provide and fund the School Crossing patrol (SCP) based on the number of children crossing at a location and the volume of traffic. More than one SCP may serve a school where children cross at different locations, and a single SCP may serve children attending different schools where they cross at the same location.</p> <p>Where the threshold for County Council funding is not met, schools or other groups may currently obtain an SCP where it is safe for one to operate through a service level agreement with the County Council by paying the full cost of providing the SCP. Where this is the case, we ensure the provision is appropriate by requiring the provider to purchase equipment and training at cost from us.</p> <p>The County Council currently funds 177 SCPs across Hampshire, of which four are funded directly by the school through a Service Level Agreement (SLA) with the County Council. It costs County Council approximately £1.1m a year to provide the SCP services across Hampshire, and on average it costs around £6,000 per year for each SCP.</p>
<p>Please explain the new/changed service/policy/project</p>	<p>Recommendations to cabinet are as follows:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Proposal 1: To remove SCPs from 14 sites that do not meet the criteria for justifying an SCP, and 3 sites that already have safe alternative measures in place for children to cross the road without the requirement for an SCP.

	<p>Proposal 2: That a further 156 SCP sites, including 4 sites that have been vacant for four or more years, are reviewed to assess whether financially viable and suitable alternative measures could be put in place for children to cross the road safely at the site without the requirement for an SCP. Further, that at sites where the assessment determines suitable alternative measures that are financially viable in the long term are in place or can be put in place for children to cross the road safely without the requirement for an SCP, that the alternative measures are implemented and the SCP service at those sites is withdrawn</p> <p>Removing the SCP provision at the 17 sites that do not meet the criteria for justifying an SCP, in addition to two further SCP sites where, in accordance with County Council policy, provision has been withdrawn, would generate an annual saving of around £0.114 million from April 2025.</p> <p>If the County Council was able to implement alternative safety measures at all sites that are not already considered safe, and was therefore able to withdraw all SCP provision, the likely saving would be around a further £1.0 million.</p>
--	---

Engagement and consultation

The County Council's *Making the Most of your money budget* consultation (2024-2026) sought residents' and stakeholders' views on strategic options for funding the Authority's budget gap. Where applicable, detailed proposals for making savings were subject to further, more detailed 'stage two' consultation (detailed below).

Has any pre-consultation engagement been carried out?

No

Describe the consultation or engagement you have performed or are intending to perform.

Describe who was engaged or consulted. What was the outcome of the activity and how have the results influenced what you are doing? If no consultation or engagement is planned, please explain why.

Between 8 January and 31 March 2024, the County Council consulted on a proposal regarding the SCP service provided by the County Council as part of the County Council's wider Future Services consultation. The proposal received 4,555 responses, there were two parts to the SCP consultation:

- Proposal 1: To remove SCPs from 21 sites that do not meet the justification criteria for an SCP, and from 5 sites that have remained vacant for a period of at least four years.
- Proposal 2: For the remaining 154 SCPs that are not funded through an SLA, to take measures that would make the site safe without the need for an SCP.

In addition to the communication and promotion undertaken by Corporate Services, the SCP service disseminated communications to targeted stakeholders identified as key contacts, included below.

The Assistant Director for Highways, Engineering & Transport sent a targeted letter on 8 January 2024 to all school crossing patrol staff ahead of the formal consultation being published for all the Hampshire residents.

A further targeted email on 9 January 2024, was sent to a number of stakeholders, with an interest in the school crossing patrol service, including Road Safety GB, the Parliamentary Advisory Council for Transport Safety (PACTS), the Royal Society for the Prevention of Accidents (RSPA), Active Travel England and Monitoring Organisations (AA, RAC). A follow up reminder was also sent on 7 March 2024 to the same stakeholders ahead of the closure of the consultation on 31 March 2024.

The second public consultation had 4,555 responses via the consultation response form, including 41 responses from organisations (including 6 places of education) and 40 responses from elected representatives. Within these responses, 2,006 people specified that they used, or know people who use, an SCP in Hampshire.

1,437 respondents chose to provide comments plus another 51 people also provided 'further comments'. Alongside this, 39 unstructured written contributions were received, 18 from individuals, 17 providing the official response of an organisation, group or business and 4 responding as a democratically Elected Representative of a constituency. Also, members of the Hampshire County Council Youth Forum (aged between 11 and 18) were invited to consider the proposals and attend a discussion group to share their feedback.

Consultation respondents demonstrated greater agreement with proposal 2 (53% agreement) than proposal 1 (43% agreement). The disagreement generally tended to be higher amongst respondents who either use the service or know someone who uses the service. Also, the main concerns raised by the respondents were in relation to safety. Hampshire Youth Forum also suggested education on road safety for young people and the use of lights and sounds at crossings for greater safety.

Section two: Assessment

Carefully and consciously consider the impacts of the proposed change.

Consider at this point whether the assessment is of impacts on staff or service users. If it is both the impacts may be contradictory for each group (negative for staff but positive for customers, or vice versa). Consider completing two assessment tables (one for staff and one for customers) and providing one equality statement for both groups.

If the proposed change is expected to have a positive, neutral (no impact) or negative (low, medium or high) impact on people in protected characteristics groups or those who may be impacted by poverty or rurality. Indicate the impact by entering the risk score in the relevant column in the table below.

If an overview assessment of due regard is appropriate, please go to box 2.

Table 1 Impact Assessment [add ✓ to relevant boxes)

Protected characteristic	Positive	Neutral	Negative - low	Negative - Medium	Negative - High	Affects staff, public or both?
Age		✓		✓		Public Staff

Disability		✓				Public
Gender reassignment		✓				Public
Pregnancy and maternity		✓				Public
Race		✓				Public
Religion or belief		✓				Public
Sex		✓		✓		Public Staff
Sexual orientation		✓				Public
Marriage & civil partnership		✓				Public
Poverty		✓				
Rurality		✓				

Table 2 Geographical impact

Does the proposal impact on a specific area? Consider the [demographic data](#) of the locations.

Area	Yes / no
All Hampshire	✓
Basingstoke and Deane	
East Hampshire	
Eastleigh	
Fareham	
Gosport	
Hart	
Havant	
New Forest	
Rushmoor	
Test Valley	

Winchester	
------------	--

Section three: Equality Statement

For all characteristics marked as either having a neutral or low negative impact, challenge your assessment - carefully consider the protected characteristics, if necessary, review the Inclusion and Diversity eLearning, discuss with an EIA co-ordinator.

Table 3 Consideration of and explanation for neutral or low negative impacts

Protected characteristic	Brief explanation of why this has been assessed as having neutral or low negative impact
All (public)	<p>NEUTRAL: The County Council would undertake assessments of each SCP controlled site to determine whether alternative safe measures that are financially viable in the long term could be put in place which would enable the SCP provision to be safely withdrawn. In these cases, school crossing patrols may continue to be funded by local schools. Where the site is not safe or cannot be made safe an HCC-funded SCP would continue to be provided.</p> <p>Although 43% of consultation respondents expressed concern about the impact on age, and specifically young people, and 29% expressed concern on the impact on people with disabilities, it is considered that there would be a neutral impact as the provision would only be withdrawn where the site is already safe, or where it could be made safe through the implementation of suitable alternative measures. In addition, the County Council would work with the school to promote the importance of road safety. For people of all characteristics, the implementation of alternative safety measures at some sites could be positive in terms of place-making and enabling the community to use the alternative measure outside of standard SCP times and days.</p>

--	--

For all characteristics marked as either having a 'medium negative' or 'high negative', please complete table 4:

Table 4 Explanation and mitigation for medium and high impacts

Protected characteristic	Brief explanation of why this has been assessed as having medium or high negative impact	Is there a Geographical impact? If so, please explain - use list above to identify geographical area(s)	Short explanation of mitigating actions
Age and Sex (staff)	A medium negative impact has been identified for these characteristics with respect to staff only, as the school crossing patrol service is predominantly staffed by female and older people. A reduction in the numbers of school crossing	All Hampshire	In circumstances where an SCP is withdrawn and there is a resultant workforce impact, this would be managed in accordance with HR policy.

	patrols could disproportionately affect these groups.		All SCPs that can be safely withdrawn would have the option of a Service Level Agreement whereby the school can fund and retain the affected SCP. If SCPs are removed, options would be explored to reallocate affected staff to other sites.
--	---	--	---

If you have specified mitigations as part of the assessment, now consider reviewing the impact severity/risk assessment.

For all characteristics marked as either having a positive impact please explain why in table 5.

Table 5 Consideration of and explanation for positive impacts

Protected characteristic	Brief explanation of why this has been assessed as having positive impact

Further actions and recommendations to consider:

- If neutral or low negative impacts have been carefully considered and identified correctly, the activity is likely to proceed.
- If medium negative or high negative have been identified:
 - The policy, service review, scheme or practice may be paused or stopped
 - The policy, service review, scheme or practice can be changed to remove, reduce or mitigate against the negative impacts.

- Consider undertaking consultation/re-consulting¹.
- If all options have been considered carefully and there are no other proportionate ways to remove, reduce, or mitigate - explain and justify reasons why in the assessment.
- Carry out a subsequent impact severity assessment following mitigating actions.

Box 1

Please set out any additional information which you think is relevant to this impact assessment:

With the proposed mitigation in place to minimise the impact of this decision, it is considered that the proposals should proceed because of the wider financial challenges facing the County Council.

Box 2

If appropriate, (i.e., it is immediately evident that a full EIA is not necessary) please provide a short succinct assessment to show that due regard has been given and that there is no requirement for a full EIA:

It is the responsibility of parents or guardians to get their child safely to school, but the County Council has a duty to assert and protect the rights of the public to use the highway, and should there be a particular safety concern at a specific location then specific mitigation would be considered.
