

## HAMPSHIRE COUNTY COUNCIL

### APPENDIX 4 to Draft Cabinet Report

#### Purpose of this appendix

1. The purpose of this appendix is to provide Cabinet with further detail of the Savings Programme 2025 (SP25) proposal on the **School crossing patrol (SCP) service** and the specific recommendations relating to this proposal for Cabinet approval as part of the overarching decision report '**Savings Programme to 2025 Revenue Savings Proposals**'.

#### Recommendation(s)

That Cabinet approves the following recommendations:

2. To note the outcome of the 2024 Future Services Consultation in relation to the proposals on the future of the School Crossing Patrol service.
3. That the School Crossing Patrol (SCP) service provided at 17 SCP sites, as set out within this report, is withdrawn at a saving of £0.114 million. This comprises of 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, in accordance with the County Council's policy.
4. That a further 156 SCP sites, including 4 sites that have been vacant for four or more years, are reviewed to assess whether suitable alternative measures that are financially viable in the long term could be put in place for children to cross the road safely at the site without the requirement for an SCP.
5. 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without the requirement for an SCP, that the alternative measures are implemented and the SCP service at those sites is withdrawn.
6. That authority is delegated to the Director of Universal Services, in consultation with the Executive Member for Highways and Waste, to progress and make any necessary arrangements to implement these decisions.

#### Executive Summary

7. The County Council currently operates 177 SCPs across Hampshire, of which four are funded directly by the school the site operates close to through a Service Level Agreement (SLA) with the County Council.
8. The current criteria to identify if an SCP is justified is set out in the County Council's SCP policy and is based on a number of factors including the PV<sup>2</sup>

value (refer to Contextual information section for an explanation of PV<sup>2</sup>) and any potential duplication of existing resources (crossing already in place).

9. This paper makes recommendations to withdraw SCP provision at 17 sites that do not meet the criteria for justifying an SCP and to withdraw the SCP provision at the remaining County Council funded sites where suitable alternative measures that are financially viable in the long term are put in place that would remove the requirement for an SCP at school entry and exit times. Schools and other groups would be given the opportunity to retain the provision through fully funding an SLA with the County Council.
10. It currently costs the County Council approximately £1.1m a year to provide the SCP service across Hampshire. On average it costs around £6,000 per year for each SCP.
11. Removing the SCP provision from April 2025 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 £0.114m. This saving would contribute to the financial pressure the authority is facing, whilst continuing to ensure the County Council meets its duty to promote road safety and to take reasonable steps to reduce road casualties.
12. 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 up to a further £1.0m. It is anticipated, however, that there would be some sites that could be more difficult to make safe without an SCP, as well as some sites where the alternative could be too costly. In these cases, the SCP would remain.
13. Where sites could be made safe, it is expected that any saving from these sites would be achieved from 2025/26 and beyond due to the timescale required to identify, develop and deliver any alternative safety measure. Given this, the total potential saving would likely be lower than £1.1m with only £0.114m achieved from April 2025.
14. 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 4555 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.

15. It is noted that the numbers of sites consulted on differs slightly from the number of sites in the recommendations of this paper. This is due to changes in the number of SCP officers since the start of the consultation.
16. Consultation respondents demonstrated greater agreement with proposal 2 (53% agreement) than proposal 1 (43% agreement). Disagreement generally tended to be higher amongst respondents who either uses the service or know someone who uses the services.
17. The main concerns raised by the respondents were in relation to safety, with mitigations suggesting any alternative measures would be safe. Hampshire Youth Forum also suggested education on road safety for young people and the use of lights and sounds at crossing for greater safety.
18. If the recommendations are approved, engagement would take place with the schools to take into consideration their concerns and support the introduction of any new safety measures. This would include working with the school to promote the importance of road safety.

### **Contextual information**

19. Hampshire County Council currently provides 177 School Crossing Patrols (SCPs), which help children and parents/carers to cross the road safely on their way to and from school all around Hampshire. Four of these are funded directly by the school the site operates close to through a Service Level Agreement (SLA) with the County Council and are therefore not in scope of this proposal. These are located at the following four sites: Brook Lane (Sarisbury), Sway Road (Brockenhurst, New Forest), Winklebury Way (Basingstoke) and The Avenue (Alverstoke, Gosport).
20. The criteria to define when an SCP is justified is detailed within the Road Safety Great Britain (RSGB) School Crossing Patrol guidelines, and is reflected in the County Council [School Crossing Patrol Policy](#), as set out below:
  - The crossing location achieves a  $PV^2$  value of at least 4 million in accordance with National Criteria identified in the Road Safety GB guidelines.
  - The crossing location does not serve a secondary school alone.
  - The crossing location is not located in the vicinity of a controlled crossing i.e. zebra, pelican etc.
  - The crossing location is not located at a pedestrian refuge island, unless site factors indicate that an SCP can operate safely and a single carriageway meets the  $PV^2$  criteria.
21. The  $PV^2$  value is based on the number of vehicles that pass a location (V) and the number of pedestrians that cross the road close to that point (P) within the

'busiest' half hour. This is the nationally accepted method used by Local Authorities, of assessing whether a site is appropriate for the location of an SCP, if the calculation value comes over 4 million then the site justifies an SCP, unless other safety alternatives could be implemented instead to make the SCP not justified.

22. Where an SCP would not be justified, schools or other groups could pay for an SCP through a Service Level Agreement (SLA) with the County Council. Four of the 177 SCPs operating are provided to schools on this basis.
23. An SLA establishes an arrangement where the County Council would continue to provide the SCP, including the recruitment, training and supervision of the SCP to ensure that it operates safely, with the full costs of its provision fully funded by the school or the local community. This would include the costs the County Council would incur such as the SCP's salary and associated on-cost (including national insurance and pension scheme), as well as costs incurred from recruitment, provision of uniform, and the supervisory costs relating to the role.

### Summary of service area proposal

24. The SCP proposal within the County Council's Future Services Consultation consisted of two sub-proposals as follows:
- **Sub-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.
  - **Sub-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.
25. Due to staff changes and routine surveying of sites since the publication of the Consultation, the categorisation of sites now in scope is as detailed below.
26. Fourteen SCP sites do not justify the provision as they do not meet the PV<sup>2</sup> criteria. As such it is recommended that the provision is withdrawn at these sites from April 2025. The list of these sites is shown in table 1.

<b>Table 1 - SCP sites recommended for withdrawal from April 2025 as they do not meet the criteria set for justifying an SCP (do not meet PV<sup>2</sup> criteria)</b>			
	<b>PV<sup>2</sup> (million)</b>	<b>District/Borough</b>	<b>Location</b>
1	1.54	Eastleigh	Chamberlayne Road/Blenheim Road

2	2.9	Eastleigh	Chapel Road/Moorgreen Road, West End
3	1.82	Fareham	Hunts Pond Road/Longacres, Park Gate
4	3.91	Fareham	Red Lion/Stubbington Green, Stubbington
5	1.72	Havant	Aldermoor Road, Purbrook
6	0.59	Havant	Padnell Avenue, Waterlooville, outside school
7	1.9	Havant	Mill Road, Waterlooville, outside school
8	0.06	Gosport	Gosport Road/Cambridge Road
9	0.76	Gosport	Wych Lane/Kent Road
10	0.3	New Forest	Exbury Road/Hampton Lane, Blackfield
11	1.85	New Forest	Studley Avenue/Lime Kiln Lane, Holbury
12	1.42	Test Valley	Parkhouse Road, Shipton Bellinger
13	1.49	Winchester	Church Lane, Kings Worthy
14	2.68	Winchester	Church Road, Swanmore

27. It should be noted that during the publication of the consultation the number of sites in this category had reduced from 17 to 15 due to the resignation of one SCP officer and another moving to a different site. In accordance with the County Council policy, provision at these sites has now been withdrawn. In addition, there has been a recent resignation of one further SCP that formed part of the original consultation list reducing the number of sites in this category to 14.

28. Three SCP sites do not justify the provision as they already have alternative measures in place. As such it is recommended that the provision is withdrawn at these sites from April 2025. The list of these sites is shown in table 2:

<b>Table 2 - SCP sites recommended for withdrawal from April 2025 as they do not meet the criteria set for justifying an SCP (duplicate resource).</b>			
	<b>PV<sup>2</sup> (million)</b>	<b>District/Borough</b>	<b>Location</b>
1	63	Eastleigh	Wildern Lane, Hedge End (Zebra Crossing)
2	59.86	Hart	Gally Hill Road, Crookham, outside school (Zebra Crossing)
3	66.62	New Forest	A35 High Street, Lyndhurst (Zebra Crossing)

29. It should be noted that during the consultation the number of sites in this category reduced from 4 to 3 in accordance with County Council policy.
30. Where the SCP provision is proposed to be withdrawn, we would speak to each school impacted to understand and respond to their concerns and any suggestions they may have for alternative arrangements that could be put in place before withdrawing the service. This would include working with the school to promote the importance of road safety.
31. In addition, the school would also be given the opportunity to fund the SCP themselves through an SLA between the County Council and the school. Where a fully funded SLA is put in place, the SCP would not be withdrawn. In circumstances where the SCP is withdrawn and there is a resultant workforce impact, this would be managed in accordance with HR policy.
32. The consultation also included five SCP sites that exceed the PV<sup>2</sup> threshold but have remained vacant for a period of at least four years. It should be noted that during the consultation the number of sites in this category reduced from 5 to 4 following recruitment to a long term vacancy. It is recommended that further analysis of these sites is undertaken to establish whether suitable alternative measures that are financially viable in the long term could be implemented that would enable the SCP provision to be withdrawn at each site.

**Table 3 - SCP sites that exceed the PV<sup>2</sup> threshold but have remained vacant for a period of at least four years**

	<b>PV<sup>2</sup> (million)</b>	<b>District/Borough</b>	<b>Location</b>
1	24.7	Rushmoor	Fleet Road, Farnborough
2	8.5	Test Valley	A3057 Stockbridge, outside The White Hart pub
3	8.11	Winchester	Badger Farm Roundabout, Olivers Battery
4	20.81	Winchester	Stockbridge Road/Hatherley Road

33. There are a remaining 152 sites that exceed the PV<sup>2</sup> threshold and are not funded through an SLA. It is recommended that further detailed analysis of these sites is undertaken to establish whether suitable alternative measures that are financially viable in the long term could be implemented that would enable the SCP to be withdrawn at each site. This analysis would also consider wider initiatives that the County Council could undertake to support any changes, for example through enforced traffic management or speed limit reductions close to the school.

34. Where the analysis 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, the County Council would implement the measure. This would remove the requirement for an SCP at school entry and exit times and as such the SCP service at these sites would be withdrawn.

35. It should be noted that since the publication of the consultation the number of sites in this category has reduced from 154 to 152 in accordance with current policy.

36. In addition, the school would also be given the opportunity to fund the SCP themselves through an SLA between the County Council and the school. Where a fully funded SLA is put in place, the SCP would not be withdrawn.

### **Legal, financial and performance implications**

37. There are a number of legal, financial and performance implications to take into consideration before making any decisions on withdrawing SCP sites.

38. School crossing patrols were established by the School Crossing Patrols Act 1953 and instituted on 1 July 1954 through the School Crossing Patrols Order 1954. They are now governed by the Road Traffic Regulation Act 1984 (Sections 26-28) which gave Appropriate Authorities (defined as county

councils, metropolitan district councils, the Commissioner of the Metropolitan Police and the Common Council of the City of London) the power to appoint school crossing patrols to help children cross the road on their way to or from school, or from one part of the school to another, between the hours of 8am and 5:30pm.

39. Section 270 of the Transport Act 2000, which came into force 30 January 2001, amended the 1984 Act to permit school crossing patrols to operate at such times as the authority thinks fit and to stop traffic to help anyone (child or adult) to cross the road, whether or not they are travelling to or from school.
40. The law gives a school crossing patrol officer, appointed by an Appropriate Authority, wearing a uniform approved by the Secretary of State and by displaying a prescribed sign, the legal power to stop traffic. The Education and Inspection Act 2006 (section 508a) puts a duty on schools to promote sustainable travel to school. School crossing patrols are one option that can contribute to this duty. The responsibility for ensuring the safety of children travelling to and from school is a parental one.
41. The County Council has a legal duty to promote road safety, to carry out studies into accidents and, in light of those studies, to take reasonable measures that it considers appropriate to prevent such accidents ([Road Traffic Act 1988](#)). However, there is no specific legal requirement for the County Council to provide SCPs.
42. It currently costs the County Council approximately £1.1m a year to provide the SCP service across Hampshire. On average it costs around £6,000 per year for each SCP service. The withdrawal of the County Council funding for the 17 SCP sites that do not currently justify the provision, in addition to two further SCP sites where, in accordance with County Council policy, provision has been withdrawn, would generate an estimated annual saving of £0.114m. There may, however, be costs incurred to implement (or remove) any signage or other measures that would assist with the withdrawal of the SCP service.
43. If the County Council was able to implement alternative safety measures at all sites that currently meet the criteria for justifying an SCP, and was therefore able to withdraw all SCP provision, the likely saving would be up to a further £1.0 million. It is anticipated, however, that there would be some sites that could be more difficult to make safe without an SCP, as well as some sites where the alternative could be too costly. In these cases, the SCP would remain. It is expected that any saving from these sites would be achieved from 2025/26 and beyond due to the timescale required to identify, develop, and deliver any alternative safety measure. Given this, the total potential saving would likely be lower than £1.1m with only £0.114m achieved from April 2025.
44. When determining whether to seek approval for safe alternative measures to be put in place, and the SCP provision subsequently withdrawn, consideration would need to be made to both the implementation (capital) costs and the on-going maintenance (revenue) costs of the measure, as well as the source of

funding. Consideration would also be made to wider benefits that the alternative measure could bring in terms of place-making and enabling the community to use the alternative measure outside of standard SCP times and days.

45. It is therefore anticipated that there would be some SCP sites where the identified alternative measure is too costly to implement and maintain. Given this it is expected that any further saving would be lower than the full £1.0m that could be achieved if the provision at all sites was either withdrawn or funded through an SLA with the school.
46. The County Council has a duty under the National Parks and Countryside Act 1949 (as amended by the Levelling Up and Regeneration Act 2023). This requires the County Council to seek to further the purposes of the National Park when considering proposals that relate to, or affect, land within a National Park. In this instance, the relevant purposes are of conserving and enhancing the natural beauty, wildlife and cultural heritage of the areas and of promoting opportunities for the understanding and enjoyment of the special qualities of those areas by the public.
47. The County Council recognises its duty in respect of the National Parks and continues to seek to further their relevant purposes through its services. Across the Highways service, there are work programmes contributing to its duty, for example investigations into low carbon solutions across the Highways which will support a future net zero with nature. Another example includes Local Cycling and Walking Infrastructure Plans including one along the waterside area of the New Forest and another in Winchester contributing to further the purposes of the South Downs National Park.
48. The proposals within this report would have a positive impact on this duty as each of the crossings concerned within the National Parks would be assessed, and if they were deemed to require a safe crossing, infrastructure would be considered allowing the crossing to be used at all times of the day, not just during school hours; this would encourage more walking across the National Parks, furthering their purpose. The duty would be considered when establishing what appropriate safety measures are suitable at each of the concerned sites in the parks.

### **Future Services Consultation - Approach**

49. 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. 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.
50. It should be noted, as detailed in section Summary of service area proposal above, that since the launch of the consultation, the SCP sites in scope within these two proposals have reduced slightly.
51. An overview of the approach to the Future Services Consultation is set out within paragraphs 17 to 24 of the draft Cabinet report, including the approach taken to communicating and promoting the consultation (informed by a stakeholder analysis) to invite respondents to share their views on some or all of the proposals.
52. 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.
53. 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.
54. A further targeted email on 9 January 2024, was sent to a number of stakeholders, related directly with school crossing patrol 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.

### **Future Services Consultation – Feedback**

55. The SCP consultation received 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, SCP in Hampshire.
56. 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.
57. The demographic of the individual responses to the consultation reflects that:

- (40%) of responses are from individuals aged 45 to 64, (26%) aged 65 or over, (1%) were under 25, and (23%) were aged 25 to 44.
- The majority of respondents were from non-ethnic minority groups.
- While the majority reported no health or disability issues, around (17%) reported a health or disability issue that impacted their day-to-day activities either a little or a lot.
- (33%) had children and young people under 19 in their household.
- (7%) of respondents came from households with the lowest income bracket (up to £20,000), (26%) had an income of £20,001 to £60,000 and (25%) were from households with higher incomes (£60,001 or more).
- Responses were received from residents of all districts in Hampshire, ranging from 128 in the borough of Gosport to 523 in the district of East Hampshire.

58. The levels of agreement and disagreement, detailed below, demonstrate greater agreement with proposal 2 (53% agreement) than proposal 1 (43% agreement).

<b>Proposal</b>	<b>Disagree overall</b>	<b>Agree overall</b>	<b>Neither agree nor disagree</b>	<b>Strongly Disagree</b>	<b>Strongly Agree</b>
Proposal 1 - To remove SCPs from crossing points which we believe are safe	47%	43%	11%	30%	14%
Proposal 2 - Where a crossing point is not currently safe, to take measures that would make it safe without the need for an SCP	37%	53%	10%	24%	19%

59. The main groups that disagree with withdrawing the SCP sites on Proposal 1 are:

- (68% disagreeing) children and young people who attend school in Hampshire
- (66% disagreeing) people who use or know someone who uses Hampshire school crossing patrols
- (64% disagreeing) people who use or know someone who uses school crossings proposed for improvement
- (61% disagreeing) those who are family members of children at school in Hampshire
- (60% disagreeing) school governors, employees, and crossing patrollers

- (58% disagreeing) households with children, particularly high for those with children aged 0-4 (63% disagreeing) and 5-11 years old (65% disagreeing)
- (54% disagreeing) organisations who responded

60. The disagreement also tended to be higher amongst urban residents (49%) than rural ones (43%). The higher disagreement focused on Hart (65%) and Rushmoor and Fareham (59%), and some notably lower including Test Valley at 37% and East Hampshire at 41%.

61. Some of the examples included as part of the disagreement on Proposal 1 were related to:

- Driving opposition to proposal 1 was dangerous behaviour at or near crossings e.g. speeding, near misses. This was commented on by 34% of those opposed to the proposal, compared to 9% of those supporting the proposal. *"People drive too fast and parents park poorly making the road dangerous for pedestrians and car/bus traffic."*
- Those opposed to the proposal were also concerned about the increased risk of injury or death (commented on by 24% of those who opposed the proposal compared to only 4% of those who were supportive). *"To reduce this would increase child/ parent accidents on the roads. It is unsafe for these proposals."*
- Those who were opposed were also more likely to mention that a crossing is seen as unsafe and needing an SCP (24% compared to 3% for those who were supportive). *"The amount of drivers who do not stop at the crossing is shocking. It seems unless a lollipop man is there I take my life in my hands crossing."*

62. The main groups in disagreement with withdrawing SCP sites after safe measures could be implemented were related to:

- (54% disagreeing) organisations
- (46% disagreeing) those under 25
- (47% disagreeing) those who are family members of children at school in Hampshire
- (54% disagreeing) children and young people who attend school in Hampshire
- (50% disagreeing) people who use or know someone who uses Hampshire school crossing patrols
- (49% disagreeing) people who use or know someone who uses school crossings proposed for improvement
- (45% disagreeing) school governors, employees, and crossing patrollers
- 16-24 year olds (47% disagreeing) and 35-44 year olds (44% disagreeing).
- (52% disagreeing) those who were pregnant
- those with children 0-4 (45% disagreeing) and among those with children 5-11 (48% disagreeing).

- (disagreement was at 50%) people who use, or know someone who uses school crossings
63. The main reasons behind those groups broadly matched those for proposal 1, namely the risk of increased risk of injury and death (60% of those who disagreed mentioned this), concern about the loss of social value of a crossing patrol (24% of those who disagreed).
64. The agreement on Proposal 2 of implementing alternative safe measures was related to:
- Elected Representatives (58% agreeing) but this was not notably different as the sample size was low
  - those aged 44-64 (56% agreeing)
  - support was notably higher among males (57% agreeing) than females (51% agreeing).
  - those with higher household incomes (ranging from 50% among those earning up to £20,000 per year to 60% for those earning over £60,000 per year).
65. However, despite the agreement, some respondents still had concerns over safety but seemed more accepting of the alternatives proposed with 14% of those who agreed with the proposal saying it would be acceptable if a pelican crossing was installed and 17% saying they agree if a zebra crossing was installed.
66. The main concerns raised by respondents who indicated that they currently use one of the 171 crossing points identified in the proposals included:
- drivers going too fast near crossing points (76%)
  - poor visibility for people crossing the road (43%)
  - parking nearby (42%)
  - crossing point being near a busy junction or roundabout (42%)
  - poor visibility for drivers (38%)
  - narrow or obstructed pavements (27%)
  - width of road/ time needed to cross (23%)
67. 798 out of 1,437 people (55%) that provided comments in the consultation made suggestions about any alternatives to the proposal or how they felt the service could be carried out differently. The most frequent suggestions mentioned were:
- maintaining SCPs – mentioned by 61% who provided an alternative
  - an alternative practical approach (10%)
  - parents/individuals should be responsible for road safety (10%)
  - parents/ volunteers to provide crossing provision (9%)
  - suggestions that SCPs be replaced by an alternative crossing (5%)
  - don't remove if there is no safe alternative (4%)

- reduce speed limits near schools (4%)
- charge extra for existing services to cover the cost (2%)
- one unstructured comment summarised the conditional nature of much support for the proposals *“my recommendation would be 1. Retain the SCP 2. Failing that then for the crossing to be “protected” by a 20 mile speed warning in force during school arrival & departure periods. And the installation of a Pedestrian Signal Controlled Crossing”*

68. Additional comments regarding training were also provided – one respondent commented that training for children should be thorough if SCPs are removed:

*“If they are to be replaced, make sure the children get thorough training in using the alternatives and make them hyper aware of the dangers - as you CANNOT trust self-entitled drivers to look out for anyone but themselves.”*

69. The Hampshire Youth Forum also suggested education on road safety for young people as well as use of lights and sounds at crossings to bring greater safety, citing Australia as a place where this already happens.

70. Some concerns were expressed about how the proposals were developed and the criteria used for selection. These are detailed in the table below:

<b>Comment/ concern</b>
It is inappropriate to comment/prioritise cuts to services when there is no evidence of a professional approach to determining the costs of those services and particularly the administrative cost. We do not accept that reducing service levels represents a saving. We cannot see the evidence that the County Council has properly analysed its expenditure to differentiate between added and non-added value activity. Because of this we are presented with a series of service reductions rather than an insight into method/process improvement.
This work needs to be completed to get a better understanding of what alternative measures might be introduced.
I'd be grateful if you could explain the PV squared formula used to determine whether a controlled or uncontrolled crossing or School crossing patrol warden may be considered.
The information provided in the survey including linked information does not explain how the Council will define what is safe. Any proposal which risks the safety of children in any way is unacceptable.
No crossing has been in Pullen's Lane for two years. This leads to an impression that the information in this survey is outdated.
If they were safe places to cross you wouldn't of put them there in the first place

I think the need for improved safety features should not be based on PV2 but instead on healthy streets metrics which are a key component of LTP4. This will ensure much better crossings that meet the needs of all users.

You have deliberately failed to tell us how you 'might make roads safer' if crossings were reduced to fix the results of the survey to enable you to proceed without limit/public recourse. This is disgraceful. Knowing how draconian councils can be I voted against it as I do not trust you.

71. If the recommendations in this paper are accepted, officers would work to mitigate potential impacts that have been identified from the consultation, including by:

- Continuing to provide an SCP service where a safety measure is required and there is no suitable alternative.
- Offering the schools an opportunity to share their concerns and any suggestions for alternative arrangements that could be put into place.
- Where physical changes to roads, pavements or signage would be suitable, not removing the SCP until after the changes have been implemented.
- Engaging with the local community throughout the process.
- Continuing to provide the SCP through an SLA, fully funded by the school.

72. A more detailed summary can be found in sub-appendix A.

Key concerns/impacts from consultation	Mitigation from Hampshire County Council
Concerns raised on the consultation about safety if the SCP was withdrawn	<p>This concern would be mitigated by offering alternative safe measures, either minor changes if the site is already considered safe or physical changes in roads and pavements, before considering withdrawing the SCP.</p> <p>Where alternative measures have been considered, or alternative safer routes to school needs to be implemented, there would be road safety training provided to the schools.</p>
Concerns raised regarding the type of alternative measures	<p>This concern would be mitigated by analysing each SCP individually and provide an alternative measure if suitable according to the County Council SCP policy.</p> <p>If alternative measure is not suitable, an SLA would be offered to the school to continue with the SCP funded by the school.</p>

<p>Environmental concerns regarding the increase in traffic</p>	<p>This concern would be mitigated by implementing alternative safety routes that help to reduce the traffic in drop-off and pick-up hours, by also providing alternative walking routes.</p> <p>The mitigation above would also contribute to reduce the environmental impact and climate change concerns.</p>
---	---

**Other forms of stakeholder responses – Petitions**

- 73. The County Council received 2 petitions, related to the opposition of the removal of SCP on a number of sites listed below.
- 74. Petition 1: Eggar’s School situated in London Road, Holybourne, Alton. The petition was submitted on 19 April 2024, including 138 signatures (135 accepted and 3 not accepted).
- 75. Petition 2: St Mark’s CofE Primary School’ situated in Danebury Road, Basingstoke. The petition was submitted on 26 January 2024, including 395 signatures (222 accepted and 173 no accepted, due to 7 no providing an address and 215 signatures were outside of the Hampshire area).

**Equality Impact Assessment**

- 76. As previously noted in paragraphs 32 to 38 of the draft report to Cabinet, a key part of the SP25 Programme is ensuring that the County Council understands the impact of the SPSP25 proposals on people with protected characteristics and has due regard to the need to eliminate discrimination, harassment and victimisation and any other conduct prohibited under the Equality Act 2010; to advance equality of opportunity between persons who share a relevant protected characteristic and persons who do not share it; and to foster good relations between persons who share a relevant protected characteristic and persons who do not share it.
- 77. Whilst councils are not mandated to conduct Equality Impact Assessments (EIAs), in keeping with good practice to record the steps taken in seeking to meet the County Council’s Public Sector Equality Duty, Equality Impact Assessments (EIAs) previously completed in relation to the proposals set out within this Appendix have been reviewed and updated. These reflect the feedback received through the Future Services consultation and incorporate any additional impacts identified, so that these can be considered as part of the final decision taken by the Cabinet. The EIA is provided as an Annex.
- 78. By the very nature of the services that the County Council provides, there are inevitably changes that impact those people with protected characteristics. Whilst this does not mean that a proposal cannot be implemented, it does mean that the County Council needs to have an understanding, both

individually and collectively, of the impact on those groups of people and look at ways of mitigating that impact.

79. The following paragraphs draw out any key points to note in terms of impacts identified in relation to these proposals for residents, service users, or staff, and any mitigations identified.
80. The EIA identifies a neutral impact on all protected characteristics for service users. If an SCP is withdrawn, this could impact the number of parents/guardians and young people using the walking route to school. However, impacts are believed to be mitigated as a result of providing safe alternatives for the continuation of active travel to school. Although 43% of consultation respondents expressed concern about the impact on age, and specifically young people, and 29% expressed concern about 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.
81. In respect of staff, there is an anticipated medium negative impact on sex and age characteristics given the demographics of the workforce being predominantly female and older people, therefore any reduction in school crossing patrols could disproportionately affect these groups. To seek to mitigate this impact the school would be given the option of continuing the provision of the SCP through an SLA. In circumstances where an SCP is withdrawn and there is a resultant workforce impact, this would be managed in accordance with HR policy.
82. In respect of staff, the impact on all other protected characteristics is considered to be neutral, as there is no evidence of impacts on these characteristics.
83. Whilst not protected characteristics for the purposes of the Equality Act 2010, given the profile of the county, the County Council has chosen to understand the impact on poverty and rurality when making decisions. In this case, the impacts are assessed as neutral as there is no evidence of the proposal affecting the poverty and rurality.

### **Climate Change Impact Assessment**

84. As noted in paragraph 39 of the draft Cabinet report, consideration is given to potential climate change impacts of decisions through the two decision-making tools which assess the carbon emissions and resilience impacts of a decision.
85. At this stage it is difficult to assess any specific climate change impacts relating to these proposals. However, as the implementation of these

proposals progresses, we would continue to assess the potential impacts to ensure that consideration is given to how these would contribute towards the County Council's climate change targets. While we are still working to assess the potential impacts, a reduction in number of SCP sites could have an impact on carbon emissions as a result of alterations in travel plans or habits amongst parents that may wish to drive their children to school instead of choosing the walking route which could have a climate change impact.

### **Scrutiny Committee feedback**

86. The recommendations set out in this appendix will be scrutinised by the Universal Services Select Committee, in advance of a decision by Cabinet.
87. To support the decision, written feedback will be separately provided by the Chairman of the Select Committee to the Cabinet, outlining any feedback and potential recommendations from the Select Committee, for consideration by Cabinet.

### **Rationale for the recommendations being made**

88. As noted in the draft report to Cabinet, in response to a predicted two-year budget gap to 2025/26 of £132m, Directorates were asked last year to consider what savings could be made if they started to move towards a legal minimum service level. In October and November 2023, following a stage 1 consultation process on our options for balancing the budget, Cabinet and County Council respectively approved savings proposals totalling £90.4m. Since that time, following continued growth and high inflation across adults' and children's social care, special educational needs and school transport, the predicted budget gap for 2025/26 has increased to at least £175m, underlining the need for the County Council to secure recurring savings to help towards balancing the budget on a sustainable basis.
89. Through the Equality Impact Assessment process, it was identified that some of the proposals directly impacted on residents and users of the services and therefore a consolidated stage 2 consultation process for 13 of the proposals (totalling £17.5m) was launched at the beginning of 2024.
90. The final recommendations made to Cabinet have been informed by the feedback received as part of the consultation, alongside other relevant factors. These recommendations will achieve total savings of £16.3million, which is a reduction from the £17.5million originally identified, albeit there is some further work to be undertaken on some proposals.
91. The proposals set out within this appendix originally accounted for up to £1.1m of this total, however following consultation and further analysis the savings proposal has been revised to £0.114m by 2025/26 with further potential savings of up to £1m dependent on factors detailed in this report from 2025/26 and beyond.

92. Until a sustainable long-term national funding solution can be found to address the intense financial pressures facing not only the County Council, but also wider local government, we have no choice but to consider changing or reducing services in some areas and propose options for savings.
93. The County Council's duty is to promote road safety. It is the responsibility of parents or guardians to get their child safely to school. However, to assist in meeting its statutory duties, the Council is proposing to only withdraw SCPs at sites that do not meet the criteria, or where alternative measures are put in place that mean the site does not then meet the criteria, for an SCP.
94. Concerns raised through the County Council's Future Services Consultation have helped to shape the mitigation actions that would be taken if the recommendations in this report are taken forward. For example, through providing road safety training, offering SLA and through liaising with schools and local groups prior to withdrawing the service at any site.
95. The County Council would provide schools where an SCP is proposed for removal with the alternative option of entering into an SLA with the County Council and to self-fund the SCP.

**REQUIRED CORPORATE AND LEGAL INFORMATION:**

**Links to the Strategic Plan**

<b>Hampshire maintains strong and sustainable economic growth and prosperity:</b>	Yes
<b>People in Hampshire live safe, healthy and independent lives:</b>	Yes
<b>People in Hampshire enjoy a rich and diverse environment:</b>	Yes
<b>People in Hampshire enjoy being part of strong, inclusive communities:</b>	Yes

**Other Significant Links**

<b>Links to previous Member decisions:</b>
--

<u>Title</u>	<u>Date</u>
<p>Savings Programme to 2025 – Revenue Savings Proposals</p> <p><a href="#">Executive Member for Universal Services</a></p>	<p><u>18 September 2023</u></p>

**Direct links to specific legislation or Government Directives**

<u>Title</u>	<u>Date</u>

**Section 100 D - Local Government Act 1972 - background documents**

**The following documents discuss facts or matters on which this report, or an important part of it, is based and have been relied upon to a material extent in the preparation of this report. (NB: the list excludes published works and any documents which disclose exempt or confidential information as defined in the Act.)**

Document

Location

None

## **EQUALITIES IMPACT ASSESSMENT:**

### **Equality Duty**

The County Council has a duty under Section 149 of the Equality Act 2010 ('the Act') to have due regard in the exercise of its functions to the need to:

- Eliminate discrimination, harassment and victimisation and any other conduct prohibited by or under the Act with regard to the protected characteristics as set out in section 4 of the Act (age, disability, gender reassignment, marriage and civil partnership, pregnancy and maternity, race, religion or belief, sex and sexual orientation);
- Advance equality of opportunity between persons who share a relevant protected characteristic within section 149(7) of the Act (age, disability, gender reassignment, pregnancy and maternity, race, religion or belief, sex and sexual orientation) and those who do not share it;
- Foster good relations between persons who share a relevant protected characteristic within section 149(7) of the Act (see above) and persons who do not share it.

Due regard in this context involves having due regard in particular to:

- The need to remove or minimise disadvantages suffered by persons sharing a relevant protected characteristic that are connected to that characteristic;
- Take steps to meet the needs of persons sharing a relevant protected characteristic that are different from the needs of persons who do not share it;
- Encourage persons sharing a relevant protected characteristic to participate in public life or in any other activity in which participation by such persons is disproportionately low.

### **Equalities Impact Assessment:**

An Equalities Impact Assessment has been carried out to determine the impacts of these recommendations on both residents / users of the service, and staff that would be affected should they be approved.

The EIA identifies a neutral impact on all protected characteristics for service users. If an SCP is withdrawn, this could impact the number of parents/guardians and young people using the walking route to school. However, impacts are believed to be minimal and mitigated as a result of providing safe alternatives for the continuation of active travel to school. Although 43% of consultation respondents expressed concern about the impact on age, and specifically young people, and 29% expressed concern about 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.

In respect of staff, there is an anticipated medium negative impact on sex and age characteristics given the demographics of the workforce being predominantly female and older people, therefore any reduction in school crossing patrols could disproportionately affect these groups. To seek to mitigate this impact the school would be given the option of continuing the provision of the SCP through an SLA. In circumstances where an SCP is withdrawn and there is a resultant workforce impact, this would be managed in accordance with HR policy.

In respect of staff, the impact on all other protected characteristics is considered to be neutral, as there is no evidence of impacts on these characteristics.

Whilst not protected characteristics for the purposes of the Equality Act 2010, given the profile of the county, the County Council has chosen to understand the impact on poverty and rurality when making decisions. In this case, the impacts are assessed as neutral as there is no evidence of the proposal affecting the poverty and rurality.

## Sub-appendix A

### Future Services Consultation 2024

#### School Crossing Patrols (SCPs) Proposal Insight Summary

##### Background

From 8 January to 31 March 2024, Hampshire County Council invited residents, partners, and stakeholders to provide their views on options to change and reduce some local services to help the Authority address a £132 million budget shortfall faced by April 2025.

One of the options proposed was to make two changes relating to School Crossing Patrols (SCPs):

- **Proposal 1** - To remove SCPs from crossing points which we believe are safe
- **Proposal 2** - Where a crossing point is not currently safe, to take measures that would make it safe without the need for an SCP

##### Who responded to the proposal?

In summary, 4,515 responses to this proposal were received 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, school crossing patrols in Hampshire.

Respondents were invited to add further comments to support their views on the proposal via an open-ended question. This allowed people to expand on impacts they felt the proposed changes would cause and suggest alternative courses of action. 1,437 respondents chose to provide comments on the proposals in this way. In addition, 51 people also mentioned this proposal in a general 'further comments' box at the end of the response form.

Alongside this, 29 unstructured written contributions were received, 23 from individuals, 4 from elected bodies and 1 from a school crossing patroller.

In order to help capture the views of young people about the consultation, 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.

##### Who responded: demographics of individual responses

- Two fifths (40%) of responses from individuals were from those aged 45 to 64, with just over a quarter (26%) aged 65 or over. Just 1% were from those aged under 25, and 23% were aged 25 to 44.
- The majority of respondents were from non-ethnic minority groups (i.e. White British, English, Welsh, Scottish or Northern Irish) with 7% of responses from an ethnic minority group.
- While the majority reported no health or disability issues, around 1 in 5 (17%) reported a health or disability issue that impacted their day-to-day activities either a little or a lot.
- A third of respondents (33%) had children and young people under 19 in their household.
- 7% of respondents came from households with the lowest income bracket (up to £20,000), 26% had an income of £20,001 to £60,000 and 25% were from households with higher incomes (£60,001 or more).
- Responses were received from residents of all districts in Hampshire, ranging from 128 in the borough of Gosport to 523 in the district of East Hampshire.

No demographics were captured about the individuals who provided unstructured responses to this proposal.

Please note this was an open consultation the respondents were self-selecting so do not provide a representative sample of the total Hampshire population.

### Levels of agreement with the proposals

Overall, there was more support for proposal 2 than proposal 1:

- for proposal 1 there was more opposition (47%) than support (43%)
- for proposal 2 there was more support (53%) than opposition (37%)

For both proposals the strength of feeling among those opposed (i.e. those saying they strongly disagreed with the proposal) was greater than the strength of feeling among those supporting (i.e. those saying they strongly agreed with the proposal).

Proposal	Disagree overall	Agree overall	Neither agree nor disagree	Strongly Disagree	Strongly Agree
Proposal 1 - To remove SCPs from crossing points which we believe are safe	47%	43%	11%	30%	14%
Proposal 2 - Where a crossing point is not currently safe, to take	37%	53%	10%	24%	19%

measures that would make it safe without the need for an SCP					
--	--	--	--	--	--

Overall, support for measures to make crossing points safer before removing them is stronger than support for removing sites where the County Council currently believe it is safe to do so. People appear to want more reassurance that crossing points will be made safer and not just removed, leaving nothing in place.

## Proposal 1

### What is driving disagreement with this proposal?

Certain groups of respondents disagreed with the proposed removal of SCPs more strongly than others, in particular:

- children and young people who attend school in Hampshire (68% disagreeing)
- people who use or know someone who uses Hampshire school crossing patrols (66% disagreeing)
- people who use or know someone who uses school crossings proposed for improvement (64% disagreeing)
- those who are family members of children at school in Hampshire (61% disagreeing)
- school governors, employees, and crossing patrollers (60% disagreeing)
- households with children (58% disagreeing), particularly high for those with children aged 0-4 (63% disagreeing) and 5-11 years old (65% disagreeing)
- organisations who responded (54% disagreeing)

Some additional patterns in the data also revealed that disagreement:

- tended to be higher amongst urban residents (49%) than rural ones (43%)
- varied by district with some districts having notably higher disagreement (65% in Hart, 59% in Rushmoor and Fareham), and some notably lower (Test Valley at 37%, East Hampshire at 41%)
- was strongest among younger age groups with 56% of both under 25s and 25-44 year olds disagreeing, compared to 40% of those aged 45-64 and 45% of respondents aged 65 and over
- was notably higher among females (48%) than males (43%)

Driving opposition to proposal 1 was dangerous behaviour at or near crossings e.g. speeding, near misses. This was commented on by 34% of those opposed to the proposal, compared to 9% of those supporting the proposal.

*"People drive too fast and parents park poorly making the road dangerous for pedestrians and car/bus traffic."*

Those opposed to the proposal were also concerned about the increased risk of injury or death (commented on by 24% of those who opposed the proposal compared to only 4% of those who were supportive).

*"To reduce this would increase child/ parent accidents on the roads. It is unsafe for these proposals."*

Those who were opposed were also more likely to mention that a crossing is seen as unsafe and needing an SCP (24% compared to 3% for those who were supportive).

*"The amount of drivers who do not stop at the crossing is shocking. It seems unless a lollipop man is there I take my life in my hands crossing."*

### **What is driving agreement with this proposal?**

Support for proposal 1 was notably higher among those with higher household incomes (50% support among those with a household income of £60,000 or over compared to 40% for those with household incomes up to £20,000). It was also strongest among the age bracket 55-64 (51%) compared to other age groups.

Driving support for the proposal was belief in alternatives. Among those who supported the proposal, 8% said they would accept the proposal if a pelican crossing was installed and 7% if a zebra crossing was installed (compared to only 3% of people who opposed the proposal).

*"Install pelican or zebra crossings and then parents have the opportunity to educate their children about safe crossing use. Walking busses can be set up."*

In addition to this, of those who were supportive of the proposal 11% commented that parents or volunteers could provide the patrols compared to only 2% of those who were opposed.

*"Can volunteers from school/parents be recruited and trained?"*

### **Proposal 2**

#### **What is driving disagreement with this proposal?**

Certain groups of respondents were more likely to disagree strongly than others with the proposed removal of crossing points after measures that would make it safe to do so, in particular:

- organisations (54% disagreeing)

- those under 25 (46% disagreeing)
- those who are family members of children at school in Hampshire (47% disagreeing)
- children and young people who attend school in Hampshire (54% disagreeing).
- people who use or know someone who uses Hampshire school crossing patrols (50% disagreeing)
- people who use or know someone who uses school crossings proposed for improvement (49% disagreeing)
- school governors, employees, and crossing patrollers (45% disagreeing)
- 16-24 year olds (47% disagreeing) and 35-44 year olds (44% disagreeing).
- those who were pregnant (52% disagreeing)
- those with children 0-4 (45% disagreeing) and among those with children 5-11 (48% disagreeing).
- people who use, or know someone who uses school crossings (disagreement was at 50%)

Reasons for opposing this proposal broadly matched those for proposal 1, namely the risk of increased risk of injury and death (60% of those who disagreed mentioned this), concern about the loss of social value of a crossing patrol (24% of those who disagreed) and belief that there would be increased congestion (12% who disagreed), the impact on school children developing safe crossing skills (11% who disagreed) drove opposition.

*"I think SCPs are a vital part of school days and make families happier about children walking to school rather than using motor vehicles."*

### **What is driving agreement with this proposal?**

Some groups of people were more likely to support the proposal, in particular:

- Elected Representatives (58% agreeing) but this was not notably different as the sample size was low
- those aged 44-64 (56% agreeing)
- support was notably higher among males (57% agreeing) than females (51% agreeing).
- those with higher household incomes (ranging from 50% among those earning up to £20,000 per year to 60% for those earning over £60,000 per year).

Those who supported the proposal still had concerns over safety but seemed more accepting of the alternatives proposed, with 14% of those who agreed with the proposal saying it would be acceptable if a pelican crossing was installed and 17% saying they agree if a zebra crossing was installed.

*"Consider adding pelican crossings at schools - how long would it take to break even, with the cost of a pelican crossing versus the oncosts for a school crossing patrol."*

Toucan crossings got far fewer mentions, but this may be due to a lack of familiarity with this type of crossing. Of those who agreed with the proposal and made a comment, 10% said they saw no reason for this type of service, showing that some agreement is based on scepticism of school crossings. Of those who commented, 9% also said that alternatives do the same job.

*"So many primary aged children are taken to school in cars so crossing patrols not needed or they are walked to school by an adult so not required either."*

Also driving agreement may be less experience of safety issues, as those agreeing with the proposal are far less likely to have seen dangerous behaviour (32% compared to 53% of those who disagreed with the proposal). There was also sentiment that responsibility for safety should lie with parents and individuals (17% of those who agreed mentioned this in their comments).

Interestingly more people who agreed with the proposal commented that more people would drive their children to school (20% of those who agreed versus 10% of those who disagreed with the proposal). This suggests that those who agreed thought this option was more acceptable as an alternative to crossings.

### **Concerns among those currently using crossing points**

Respondents who indicated they currently use one of the 180 crossing points identified in the proposals were asked what their current concerns were. These included:

- drivers going too fast near crossing points (76%)
- poor visibility for people crossing the road (43%)
- parking nearby (42%)
- crossing point being near a busy junction or roundabout (42%)
- poor visibility for drivers (38%)
- narrow or obstructed pavements (27%)
- width of road/ time needed to cross (23%)

### **Main impacts of the proposed change**

440 people out of 1,437 who left a comment (31%) mentioned a potential impact. The main perceived impact was the risk of injury and death with 58% of those mentioning an impact citing that concern. Loss of social value was mentioned by 22% commenting on impacts (this related to the social role that crossing patrols have with conversations and the personalities of the crossing patrol officers cited).

Increased congestion was mentioned by 13% and concern that more parents would drive their children to school was mentioned by 12%. Another impact highlighted was on children having more difficulty developing crossing skills (11% who mentioned an impact cited that concern).

### **Impacts on protected characteristics**

Those who commented were asked whether their comments related to any protected characteristics. They were most likely to indicate that the removal of SCPs would impact people because of;

- age - 43% (concerns about impacts on younger people)
- disability - 29% (concerns about those less able to cross roads safely)
- environmental impact - 17% (concerns about more car use)
- pregnancy - 7% (concerns about impacts on younger people)

Other characteristics were also mentioned but at much lower levels like rurality (12%) with concerns about busy roads or difficult crossing, and poverty (10%) with concerns about particular geographic areas. Also, 440 people out of 1,437 (31%) who left a comment mentioned a potential impact. The top perceived impact was the risk of injury and death with 58% of those mentioning an impact citing that concern. Loss of social value was mentioned by 22% commenting on impacts. Increased congestion was mentioned by 13% and concern that more parents would drive their children to school was mentioned by 12%. Another impact highlighted was on children developing crossing skills (11% who mentioned an impact cited that concern).

### **Suggested alternatives to the proposal**

798 out of 1,437 people (55%) who chose to provide comments on this proposal made a suggestion about any alternatives to the proposal or how they felt the service could be carried out differently. The most frequent suggestions mentioned were:

- maintaining SCPs – mentioned by 61% who provided an alternative
- an alternative practical approach (10%)
- parents/individuals should be responsible for road safety (10%)
- parents/ volunteers to provide crossing provision (9%)
- suggestions that SCPs be replaced by an alternative crossing (5%)
- don't remove if there is no safe alternative (4%)
- reduce speed limits near schools (4%)
- charge extra for existing services to cover the cost (2%)
- one unstructured comment summarised the conditional nature of much support for the proposals *“my recommendation would be 1. Retain the SCP*

*2. Failing that then for the crossing to be “protected” by a 20 mile speed warning in force during school arrival & departure periods. And the installation of a Pedestrian Signal Controlled Crossing”*

One respondent commented that training for children should be thorough if SCPs are removed:

*“If they are to be replaced, make sure the children get thorough training in using the alternatives and make them hyper aware of the dangers - as you CANNOT trust self-entitled drivers to look out for anyone but themselves.”*

The Hampshire Youth Forum also suggested education on road safety for young people as well as use of lights and sounds at crossings to bring greater safety, citing Australia as a place where this already happens.

There was a wide range of additional and detailed suggestions which have been passed to the Directorate for consideration, both in relation to preparing recommendations on this proposal and for managing the service generally.

**Comments on the consultation**

Some concerns were expressed about how the proposals were developed and the criteria used for selection. These are detailed in the table below:

Comment/ concern	Source
It is inappropriate to comment/prioritise cuts to services when there is no evidence of a professional approach to determining the costs of those services and particularly the administrative cost. We do not accept that reducing service levels represents a saving. We cannot see the evidence that the County Council has properly analysed its expenditure to differentiate between added and non-added value activity. Because of this we are presented with a series of service reductions rather than an insight into method/process improvement.	Unstructured response from East Boldre Parish Council (C511)
This work needs to be completed to get a better understanding of what alternative measures might be introduced.	Unstructured response from Hook PC (C507), line 519
I'd be grateful if you could explain the PV squared formula used to determine whether a controlled or uncontrolled crossing or School crossing patrol warden may be considered.	Correspondence log, line 141

<p>The information provided in the survey including linked information does not explain how the Council will define what is safe. Any proposal which risks the safety of children in any way is unacceptable.</p>	<p>Codeframe line 553</p>
<p>No crossing has been in Pullen's Lane for two years. This leads to an impression that the information in this survey is outdated.</p>	<p>Codeframe line 791</p>
<p>If they were safe places to cross you wouldn't of put them there in the first place</p>	<p>Codeframe line 958</p>
<p>I think the need for improved safety features should not be based on PV2 but instead on healthy streets metrics which are a key component of LTP4. This will ensure much better crossings that meet the needs of all users.</p>	<p>Codeframe line 1279</p>
<p>You have deliberately failed to tell us how you 'might make roads safer' if crossings were reduced to fix the results of the survey to enable you to proceed without limit/public recourse. This is disgraceful. Knowing how draconian councils can be I voted against it as I do not trust you.</p>	<p>Codeframe line 20035</p>