

HAMPSHIRE COUNTY COUNCIL

APPENDIX 6 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 **Street lighting** 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)

It is recommended that Cabinet approves the following recommendations:

2. Notes the outcome of the 2024 Future Services Consultation in relation to the proposals on future Street lighting operations.
3. That on residential streets where streetlights are already switched off between 1am and 4am, this period is extended by two hours per night so that lights are switched off from midnight until 05:00, excluding the night of 24 December into 25 December, and the night of 31 December into 1 January, when the lights would remain on all night.
4. To approve the approach for the removal of up to £0.5 million budget provision for street lighting energy as detailed in this report and based on the results of the consultation.
5. To reduce lighting levels in residential streets as follows:
 - 23:30 to midnight and 05:00 to 05:30 – Lighting levels would be reduced by changing dimming from 65% to 80%.
6. To reduce lighting levels on the classified (A, B and C Class) road network as follows:
 - Between dusk and 23:30 – Lighting levels would be reduced by changing dimming from 30% to 45%.
 - 23:30 to 05:30 – There would be no change and lighting levels would remain at 50%.
 - 05:30 to dawn – Lighting levels would be reduced by changing dimming from 25% to 40%.

Executive Summary

7. This paper seeks approval to extend existing part-night switch-off times in residential streets by two hours, combined with reducing the brightness of streetlights on Hampshire's residential streets and classified road network as

outlined in paragraphs 5 and 6. These proposals were subject to a stage 2 public consultation.

8. The County Council currently spends around £4.2 million per year on energy for street lighting. If agreed, this proposal, along with activity to move to LED use, could save the County Council up to £0.5million per year.
9. As well as this, energy price rises over the past few years have seen the County Council spending more than expected to operate streetlights. The proposals would help reduce the impact of future price rises.
10. The proposals outlined above would reduce the amount of energy being used by street lighting and therefore, result in a reduction in spend by the County Council. Adopting these proposals would not only have a financial benefit, they would also have a positive impact in respect of reducing CO2 emissions by approximately 500 metric tonnes, supporting wildlife (such as bats) and reducing lighting pollution.
11. Between 8 January and 31 March 2024 the County Council consulted on the proposal to extend existing part-night switch-off times in residential streets by two hours, combined with reducing the brightness of streetlights on Hampshire’s residential streets and classified road network. The proposal received 5,026 responses as well as 28 unstructured responses. This consultation formed part of the County Council’s wider Future Services Consultation.
12. The results from the consultation were broadly supportive of all elements of this proposal, with both potential positive and negative impacts cited by respondents. A high-level breakdown is below:

	Base	All responses						Summarised, excluding 'Don't know'	
		Strongly disagree	Disagree	Neither agree nor disagree	Agree	Strongly agree	Don't know	Disagree overall	Agree overall
Where we already switch off street lights on residential streets for 3 hours per night, to extend this to 5 hours per night	4930	16%	13%	8%	34%	28%	1%	29%	63%
To dim street lights further on residential streets where it is considered safe to do so	4926	15%	11%	7%	38%	28%	0%	26%	67%
To dim street lights further on the classified road network where it is considered safe to do so	4889	15%	14%	8%	36%	26%	1%	29%	63%

13. Responses were proactively sought from stakeholder groups that may be particularly impacted by the implementation of the proposal. Those identified were contacted to ensure that they had the opportunity to have their say on this and the other proposals put forward in the County Council’s Future Services Consultation.
14. Approximately two-thirds of respondents agreed with the proposals. Comments in favour of the proposals were focused on a decrease in County

Council spending as well as a decrease in visible light pollution should the proposals be implemented. Additionally, those that agreed with the proposal were more likely to suggest the dimming could go further or for longer. Over one in five recognised the positive impacts the proposal would have on the environment.

15. Those respondents with lower levels of support include those that are younger (specifically, those under the age of 25 that answered the consultation), those that are more vulnerable residents, such as those with disabilities, those from ethnic minority groups, female respondents, and those from areas with higher levels of social and financial deprivation.
16. Additionally, organisations that responded were more likely to mention negative impacts of the proposal on various different groups of people; including women, young people/children, disabled and other vulnerable people, shift workers and the public in general.
17. Analysis of the comments left by respondents indicate that the main concerns in relation to all three proposals were regarding safety, to the potential for an increase in crime against vulnerable groups, in particular women, those from an ethnic minority, those limited by health or disability and shift workers.
18. Research suggests that there is no direct relationship between part-night lighting/dimming and crime or road traffic incidents. However, the County Council does work with Hampshire and Isle of Wight Constabulary and other organisations to review lighting levels when concerns are raised.
19. Therefore, recognising the majority agreement to the proposals and the positive impacts predicted, the proposals are recommended to help ensure the County Council continues to spend public money effectively whilst maintaining essential services.

Contextual information

20. The main street lighting cost that the County Council can control is for energy. Currently, energy for street lighting costs the County Council approximately £4.2 million per year.
21. Since 2010, the County Council has reduced the brightness of streetlights by dimming them in residential streets as well as on the classified road network and has also switched some streetlights off during periods of the night. This has resulted in a reduction in the cost of energy for streetlights by over half in that period.
22. Following public consultation, the County Council introduced part-night lighting in 2019. This involved switching off some streetlights on residential streets for part of the night (01:00 to 04:00).

23. The County Council is also progressing the implementation of LED lanterns in our streetlights. This activity does not require public consultation but would contribute towards savings for 2025 onwards.

Summary of service area proposal

24. Street Lighting: It is proposed that on residential streets where we already switch off streetlights between 01:00 and 04:00, we extend this period by two hours per night so that lights are switched off from midnight until 05:00. This would not include the night of 24 December into 25 December, nor the night of 31 December into 1 January, when the lights would remain on all night. No additional streetlights would be turned off. This proposal would only impact those which are already switched off for a period at night.

25. Reduction in lighting levels: For streetlights in residential streets, we are proposing to decrease lighting levels by the amounts as follows:

Time	Current Diming	Dimming to
Dusk – 23:30	65%	No change
23:30 – 00:00	65%	80%
05:00 – 05:30	65%	80%

Residential (Unclassified) roads would generally have very low significance to traffic and be of only very local importance.

26. For streetlights on the classified road network (A, B and C Class), we are proposing to reduce lighting levels as follows:

Time	Current Dimming	Dimming to
Dusk – 23:30	30%	45%
23:30 – 05:30	50%	No change
05:30 – dawn	25%	40%

27. A Class roads would generally be among the widest, most direct roads in an area, and would be of the greatest significance to through traffic. B roads would still be of significance to traffic (including through traffic), but less so than an A road. C Class roads would be of lower significance and be of primarily local importance but would perform a more important function than an unclassified road.

Legal, financial and performance implications

28. A Highway Authority has a power, not a duty, under the Highways Act 1980 to provide road lighting. Section 41 imposes the absolute duty on the Highway Authority to maintain the public highway. In exercising its Highways Act powers, the Highway Authority is required, under s17 of the Crime and Disorder Act 1998, to have regard to the effect on crime and disorder in the exercise of those powers and to have regard to the need to do what it reasonably can to prevent crime and disorder. However, there is no overriding duty on a Highway Authority to provide or keep lit systems of street lighting to prevent crime.
29. There is already an agreed procedure with Hampshire and Isle of Wight Constabulary by which they can request lights to be turned on throughout the night. As well as this, emergency procedures are in place for situations in which lights need to be turned on in response to an immediate incident. Both procedures have been in place since 2019 and take into account the County Council's responsibility to respond to ongoing and emerging issues (such as tackling serious violence and violence against women and girls).
30. In addition to working with Hampshire & the Isle of Wight Constabulary, the County Council would consider local factors and potential impacts when implementing the proposals, to address any concerns of community organisations and other local groups in relation to safety and/or crime, in line with existing procedures.
31. Although research suggests that there is no direct relationship between part-night lighting/dimming and crime or road traffic incidents, the County Council would continue to monitor publications and studies into the matter and review the approach should this relationship change.
32. 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.
33. 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 would 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.

34. This proposal would have a positive impact on this duty as the further potential dimming of street lights would improve the darker skies within the parks, conserving and enhancing natural beauty within the parks. It would also have a positive impact on wildlife and help to reduce CO2 emissions.
35. For 24/25 the street lighting energy budget has been set at £4.2m. The proposed changes to dimming and part-night operations, as well as changing to the use of LED lights, are expected to deliver savings of up to £0.5m but would vary due to changes in annual energy rates. Contract negotiations regarding the LED replacement programme are currently being finalised and are expected to start rolling out this financial year therefore, whilst the proposal would save approximately £0.28m, the LED lighting transition could enable the realisation of the full £0.5m saving. The potential saving from dimming and part-night operations can be broken down as shown in the next Table.

Residential Streets	Cost savings £'000
23:30 to midnight and 05:00 to dawn from 65% to 80%	58
Extension of part-night by 2 hours	157
Classified (A, B and C) road network:	
Between dusk and 23:30 from 30% to 45%	55
5:30 to dawn – from 25% to 40%	11
Total savings (based on current rates)	281

These savings are based on 24/25 energy rate of £0.128 per kilowatt hour down from £0.242 in 23/24.

Future Services Consultation – Approach

36. This was one of 13 proposals included within the 'Future Services Consultation', which sought to understand the potential impacts of each proposal in more detail, to consult on the potential options being considered, and to clarify whether there could be other ways to deliver the savings.
37. 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 the proposals.

38. Stakeholder mapping was conducted prior to the commencement of the consultation, engaging pertinent individuals within the Universal Services Directorate to ascertain and identify, as fully as possible, all relevant parties that may be impacted by the proposals. Through this process, particular emphasis was placed on incorporating insights gleaned from past consultations on streetlights, using both experiential knowledge and resident feedback, specially ensuring that groups with a low consultation response rate were identified. Efforts were directed towards identifying and addressing stakeholders from hard-to-reach demographics, for example those in those areas suffering from social and economic deprivation, women, those with poor health or disabilities. Steps were taken to ensure that, as much as was possible, these groups were reached.
39. Our engagement approach identified a diverse array of stakeholders across multiple sectors, including those residing with Hampshire, and those from outside, that may utilise the street lighting network and therefore be impacted by the proposals. As an example, engagement efforts were made with organisations that could be directly impacted by the proposals or, represent people that could have an interest in the proposals such as the Automobile Association (AA), Royal Automobile Club (RAC), the Macular Society, Royal National Institute for the Blind (RNIB), **women's** groups, youth groups, Age UK, educational institutions et cetera. Additionally, the consultation was extended to the District Councils within Hampshire, the Police and Crime Commissioner, blue light services, and elected members.

Future Services Consultation – Feedback

40. A copy of the Insights report is attached as sub-appendix A. However, a summary of the responses is outlined below.
41. 63% of respondents agreed overall with the proposal – where the County Council already switches off streetlights on residential streets for three hours per night, to extend this to five hours per night. Specifically:
 - 55% of individuals that are out and about in residential areas in Hampshire between midnight and 5:00am agreed with this proposal.
 - 69% of those aged 65 or over agreed with this proposal.
 - 63% of those aged between 45 and 64 agreed with this proposal.
 - 57% of those aged between 25 and 44 agreed with this proposal.
 - 43% of those aged under 25 agreed with this proposal. 39% of those that responded disagreed with this proposal.
 - 55% of those from an ethnic minority background that responded agreed with this proposal. 40% of those that responded disagreed with the

proposal. 5% of those that responded neither agreed nor disagreed with the proposal.

- 58% of those respondents limited by health or disability agreed with this proposal. 28% disagreed with the proposal.
- 45% of organisations that responded agreed with this proposal. 40% of those the responded disagreed with the proposal.
- The responses suggest that those with a household income of more than £20,000 agreed with the proposals (66% with an income between £20,001 and £60,000, 69% with an income over £60,000).
- 62% of respondents living in urban areas agreed with the proposal.
- 77% of respondents living in rural areas agreed with the proposal.
- Respondents living in Fareham, Gosport and Rushmoor had the lowest levels of agreement with this proposal at 58%, 47%, and 42%, respectively.
- Respondents living in Basingstoke and Deane, Winchester and Test Valley had the highest levels of agreement with this proposal at 65%, 72% and 71%, respectively.

42. 67% of respondents agreed overall with the proposal – to dim streetlights further on residential streets where it is considered safe to do so. Specifically:

- 62% of individuals that are out and about in residential areas of Hampshire between midnight and 5:00am agreed with this proposal.
- 69% of those aged 65 or over agreed with this proposal.
- 68% of those aged 45 to 64 agreed with this proposal.
- 67% of those aged 25 to 44 agreed with this proposal.
- 50% of those aged under 25 agreed with this proposal. 37% of those that responded disagreed with the proposal.
- 64% of those respondents from an ethnic minority group agreed with this proposal. 31% disagreed with the proposal.
- 62% of those respondents limited by health or disability agreed with this proposal. 28% disagreed with the proposal.
- 56% of organisations that responded to the consultation agreed with the proposal. 27% disagreed with the proposal.
- The responses suggest that those with a household income of more than £20,000 agreed with the proposal (71% with an income between £20,001 and £60,000, 74% with an income over £60,000).
- 65% of respondents living in urban areas agreed with the proposal.
- 80% of respondents living in rural areas agreed with the proposal.

- Respondents living in Fareham, Gosport and Rushmoor had the lowest level of agreement with this proposal standing at 61%, 56% and 49%, respectively.
 - Respondents living in Test Valley, Winchester, and East Hampshire had the highest levels of agreement with this proposal standing at 76%, 75% and 71%, respectively.
43. 63% of respondents agreed with the proposal- to dim streetlights further on the classified road network where it is considered safe to do so. Specifically:
- 57% of individuals out and about in residential areas of Hampshire between midnight and 5:00am agreed with this proposal.
 - 65% of those aged 65 or over agreed with this proposal.
 - 64% of those aged between 45 and 64 agreed with this proposal.
 - 62% of those aged between 25 and 44 agreed with this proposal.
 - 49% of those aged under 25 agreed with this proposal. 36% of those that responded disagreed with the proposal.
 - 61% of those respondents from an ethnic minority group agreed with this proposal.
 - 58% of those respondents that are limited by health or disability agreed with this proposal.
 - 45% of those organisations that responded agreed with this proposal. 24% neither agreed nor disagreed and 2% did not know how they felt.
 - The responses suggest that those with a household income of more than £20,000 agreed with the proposal (66% with an income between £20,001 and £60,000, 70% with an income over £60,000).
 - 62% of respondents living in urban areas agreed with the proposal.
 - 76% of respondents living in rural areas agreed with the proposal.
 - Respondents living in Fareham, Gosport and Rushmoor had the lowest level of agreement with this proposal standing at 56%, 49%, and 43%, respectively.
 - Respondents living in Test Valley, Winchester, and East Hampshire had the highest levels of agreement with this proposal standing at 71%, 70% and 68%.
44. The overall comments provided about the street lighting proposals were also analysed to understand what potential impacts the proposal could have if it were to be implemented. The most frequently mentioned impact was an increase in safety concerns (43%). This includes the general belief that people would be and feel less safe when travelling in the dark.
45. When asked to consider the current situation, 22% of respondents suggest there is an existing lack of visibility already due to the current street lighting

levels. 16% of those that responded said they already feel unsafe and 13% suggest that the County Council consider the accident and crime levels. 7% mentioned disagreements with the proposal, with 7% also against the dimming.

46. Of those who commented on the proposal, 22% of those that responded suggested that the proposal would have a positive impact upon the environment, 7% suggest it would have a positive budgetary impact upon Hampshire County Council, 4% suggests that it would have a positive impact on energy use.
47. Reflecting on the responses it would be reasonable to conclude that the proposal is broadly supported by those that responded. Those respondents with lower levels of support, include those that are younger, those with disabilities, those from ethnic minority groups, and female respondents. The concerns raised about the proposals are around safety and the potential for there to be an increase in crime. There is less support from respondents from more socially and economically deprived areas.
48. When considering the support for the proposals, those with higher incomes were in support of this proposal. Additionally, respondents, in particular the Commission for Darker Skies, felt that the proposal would have a positive impact upon the environment, a reduction in light pollution and carbon emissions, energy savings as well as the proposal having a financial saving to the County Council.
49. Agreement with the proposals was also reflected in comments that were submitted via the 'general comments' question within the overall consultation. Of the 111 comments relating to the street lighting proposal, the following were mentioned: agreement of a reduction of this service (46%), consider/monitor crime and accident levels (17%), reduce street lighting by other criteria (16%).
50. The consultation asked respondents if they had any comments or alternative suggestions on how the County Council could meet its savings targets to the street lighting service. 20% of those that responded [513 comments that mentioned suggested alternatives] suggested adjusting lighting according to the type of route or area. 17% of those that responded suggested switching more lights off. 13% suggested that lighting is adjusted according to the time of year and/or that we extend to switch off for different hours. 12% suggested that the County Council consider changing to solar powered lighting, 9% suggested considering switching to motion sensor lights, and 8% suggested changing to LED lighting. 3% suggested that we maintain the current the level of lighting.

Key themes/concerns from consultation	Response from Hampshire County Council
Safety Concerns	

Increase in Crime	Hampshire County Council would continue to monitor the areas where the proposals have been implemented and take remedial action should the need arise as required under s17 of the Crime and Disorder Act 1998.
Negative Impact on women	
Negative impact upon shift workers	
Negative impact upon vulnerable	

Equality Impact Assessment

51. 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 SP25 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.
52. 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.
53. 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.
54. 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.
55. The EIA identified that these proposals could have a medium negative impact on the protected characteristics of Age Disability and Sex because in most areas streets would be darker or darker for longer, and this may increase the fear of crime, particularly for women. Additionally, travel at night may become more difficult for people with specific disabilities, such as visual impairments. As a result of consultation responses and feedback, the assessment also showed these proposals could have a low negative impact on Race, mainly due to the reduction in lighting resulting in a potential increase in fear of crime, especially in areas where crime is higher, and for those who belong to minority groups. All other protected characteristics were identified as being neutral.

56. 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. As a result of consultation responses and feedback, the assessment showed these proposals could have a low negative impact on poverty, mainly due to the reduction in lighting resulting in a potential increase in fear of crime. However, the EIA identified a potential positive impact on rural areas. Most rural areas have either no or minimal lighting provision, so it is unlikely any changes to lighting levels would have any meaningful impact either way, but some consultation respondents indicated support of the proposal in terms of reducing light pollution.
57. The EIA corresponds with the responses from the public consultation in that those who opposed or were less likely to support the proposals tended to have protected characteristics such as those with disabilities, those from ethnic minority groups, younger people (under 25), and female respondents. The concerns raised about the proposals are around safety and the potential for there to be an increase in crime, and also around ease of travel for those with certain disabilities such as visual impairments. There is also less support from respondents from more socially and economically deprived areas.
58. When considering the support for the proposals, those with higher incomes and from areas with typically less social and financial deprivation were in support of this proposal. Additionally, respondents felt that the proposals would have a positive impact upon the environment (reduction in light pollution as well as energy savings) as well as the proposals having a financial saving to the council.
59. Considering the results of the consultation it is recommended these proposals be approved but their impact mitigated where possible or monitored in line with existing County Council policies.

Climate Change Impact Assessment

60. 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.
61. Based upon previous work undertaken it is expected that implementation could cause a reduction in carbon emissions by approximately **500** metric tonnes and reduce energy consumption by approximately 2.2 gigawatt hours a year. Given this reduction, the proposal is not thought to require any adaptations.
62. As the implementation of these proposals progresses, the County Council 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.

Scrutiny Committee feedback

63. The recommendations set out in this appendix will be scrutinised by the Universal Services Select Committee, in advance of a decision by Cabinet.
64. To support the decision, written feedback will be separately provided by the Chair 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

65. 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.
66. 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.
67. 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. The proposals set out within this appendix account for £500,000 of this total.
68. Overall, approximately two-thirds of respondents broadly agreed with proposals to extend part-night lighting and increase dimming. Over one in five respondents recognised the anticipated positive environmental impacts – reduction in light pollution and energy usage - associated with the proposals.
69. Reducing streetlighting levels can have several positive impacts on light pollution and human (and animal) health. By dimming or turning off street lighting, the County Council would decrease light pollution, allowing people to enjoy clearer night skies. Furthermore, there is evidence to show that night lighting reduction minimises disruption to nocturnal animals' natural behaviours. Additionally, reducing artificial light at night can have a positive impact on people's overall health and well-being including sleep.

70. The recommendation is supported by research that suggests there is no direct relationship between part-night lighting/dimming and crime or road traffic incidents. Furthermore, the reduction in night lighting will have a positive impact upon the environment, both in terms of a reduction in carbon emissions, wildlife and human health.
71. Overall, the savings made would help ensure the County Council continues to spend public money effectively whilst maintaining essential services. Mitigations would ensure that the concerns raised as part of the consultation would be reviewed and, where necessary, steps taken to maintain lighting levels, where it is considered prudent to do so in line with County Council policy. The recommendation is supported by research that suggests there is no direct relationship between part-night lighting/dimming and crime or road traffic incidents. Furthermore, the reduction in night lighting will have a positive impact upon the environment, both in terms of a reduction in carbon emissions, wildlife and human health. On balance, therefore, it is recommended to implement the proposed changes to street lighting as outlined in the recommendations in this paper.

REQUIRED CORPORATE AND LEGAL INFORMATION:

Links to the Strategic Plan

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

Other Significant Links

Links to previous Member decisions:
--

<u>Title</u>	<u>Date</u>
<p>Savings Programme to 2025 – Revenue Savings Proposals</p> <p>Executive Member for Universal Services</p>	<p><u>18 September 2023</u></p>
<p>Savings Programme to 2025 – Revenue Savings Proposals</p> <p>Executive Member for Hampshire 2050 and Corporate Services (Hampshire 2050 Proposals)</p>	<p><u>19 September 2023</u></p>
<p>Savings Programme to 2025 – Revenue Savings Proposals</p> <p>Executive Member for Hampshire 2050 and Corporate Services (Corporate Services Proposals)</p>	<p><u>22 September 2023</u></p> <p><u>25 September 2023</u></p>
<p>T21 Street Lighting Project</p>	<p><u>10 March 2022</u></p>
<p>Direct links to specific legislation or Government Directives</p>	
<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 regarding 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 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 identified that these proposals could have a medium negative impact on the protected characteristics of Age Disability and Sex because in most areas streets would be darker or darker for longer, and this may increase the fear of crime, particularly for women. Additionally, travel at night may become more difficult for people with specific disabilities, such as visual impairments. As a

result of consultation responses and feedback, the assessment also showed these proposals could have a low negative impact on Race, mainly due to the reduction in lighting resulting in a potential increase in fear of crime, especially in areas where crime is higher, and for those who belong to minority groups. All other protected characteristics were identified as being neutral.

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. As a result of consultation responses and feedback, the assessment showed these proposals could have a low negative impact on poverty, mainly due to the reduction in lighting resulting in a potential increase in fear of crime. However, the EIA identified a potential positive impact on rural areas. Most rural areas have either no or minimal lighting provision, so it is unlikely any changes to lighting levels would have any meaningful impact either way, but some consultation respondents indicated support of the proposal in terms of reducing light pollution.

The EIA corresponds with the responses from the public consultation in that those who opposed or were less likely to support the proposals tended to have protected characteristics such as those with disabilities, those from ethnic minority groups, younger people (under 25), and female respondents. The concerns raised about the proposals are around safety and the potential for there to be an increase in crime, and also around ease of travel for those with certain disabilities such as visual impairments. There is also less support from respondents from more socially and economically deprived areas.

When considering the support for the proposals, those with higher incomes and from areas with typically less social and financial deprivation were in support of this proposal. Additionally, respondents felt that the proposals would have a positive impact upon the environment (reduction in light pollution as well as energy savings) as well as the proposals having a financial saving to the council.

Sub-appendix A to the Cabinet Report Future Services Consultation 2024 Street Lighting Proposal Insight Summary

Background

From 8 January to 31 March 2024, Hampshire County Council asked for people's views on the future of some local services in a public consultation on options to help the Authority meet a £132 million budget shortfall by April 2025.

One of the options proposed was to extend the time streetlights are switched off at night and to reduce their brightness at certain times. Specifically:

1. On residential streets where streetlights are already switched off between 1am and 4am, it was proposed that this period is extended by two hours per night so that lights are switched off from midnight until 5am.

2. Increase the level of dimming of streetlights:
 - a. from 65% to 80% between 11.30pm to 12 midnight and 5am to 5.30am in residential areas
 - b. from 30% to 45% between dusk and 11.30pm, and from 25% to 40% from 5.30am to dawn, on the classified road network

Who responded to the proposal?

Overall, 5026 responses to this proposal were received via the consultation Response Form. Of those:

- 4917 responded as an individual, 46 responded in an official capacity on behalf of an organisation, group or business, and 35 responded in their capacity as a democratically Elected Representative of a constituency in Hampshire. 28 responses did not specify the capacity in which they were responding.

Respondents were invited to add further comments to support their views on this 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. 691 respondents left a comment relating to an impact of the proposal, 513 made a suggestion, and 1023 left a general comment. A further 111 respondents also commented on the street lighting proposal in the any further comments open text box at the end of the consultation, designed to capture any further feedback to any of the proposals in the consultation.

In addition, 32 unstructured responses relating specifically to the street lighting proposal were received (via email and/or letter). 16 were from individuals, 13 were from organisations, two were from multiple Councillors who had sent collective responses and one was from a democratically Elected Representative of a constituency in Hampshire.

In order to help capture the views of young people about the consultation, members of the Hampshire Youth Forum (aged between 11 and 18) were invited to consider the proposals and attend a discussion group to share their feedback.

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

Who responded: Demographics of individual responses

Of the 4917 individual responses to the Response Form:

- 54 (1%) respondents were aged under 25, 885 (19%) were aged 25 to 44, 2158 (47%) were aged 45 to 64 and 1496 (33%) were aged 65 or over.
- 2592 (58%) of the respondents were female, compared to 1859 (42%) who were male, and 24 (1%) were of non-binary gender.
- 3740 (91%) responses were from non-ethnic minority groups (i.e. White British, English, Welsh, Scottish or Northern Irish), with 359 (9%) responses from an ethnic minority group.
- 2904 (65%) respondents reported no health or disability issues, 918 (21%) reported a health or disability issue that impacted their day-to-day activities either a little or a lot.
- Responses were received from residents of all districts in Hampshire, ranging from 154 (3%) responses from residents in the borough of Gosport, to 724 (23%) responses from those in the district of East Hampshire. 2053 (72%) respondents resided in an urban area compared to 785 (28%) respondents living in a rural setting.

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

Who responded: Service users

Street lighting is a universal service, so service users are broadly anyone living, working, studying, visiting or travelling through Hampshire. However, it was particularly important to capture the views of those who travel around Hampshire at the times when the level of street lighting was being proposed to change – i.e. between midnight and 5am.

- 78 (2%) individuals indicated that they were out and about in residential areas of Hampshire between midnight and 5am on every day, 151 (3%)

were out during those hours most days, 2285 (52%) were out occasionally and 1859 (43%) were never out during those hours.

Mode of transport can also vary which was captured in this consultation to understand any differences in views based on the type of transport being used to travel around Hampshire:

- 2987 walkers, 114 wheelchair/ mobility scooter users, 1048 cyclists and 4387 drivers responded. Please note that respondents were able to select all of the different modes of transport they used so these categories were not exclusive.

Who responded: Types of organisations responding

- Among the 46 organisations, groups or businesses that responded via the Response Form, 19 were from charity, voluntary or local community groups, 16 were from local authorities (City, Borough, District, Parish or Town Councils), five from local businesses or business representatives, two from a nursery, school, college or place of education, one from a public sector organisation and three from other types of organisations.
- Among the 13 unstructured responses from organisations, 11 were from other local authorities (City, Borough, District, Parish or Town Councils), one from an internal working group within Hampshire County Council and one from a political party of a local constituency.

Levels of agreement with the proposals

In general, all three proposals relating to street lighting received a larger proportion in favour of the proposal, compared to those who disagreed with it.

The proposal to dim street lights further on residential streets had a marginally higher level of agreement overall (67%) compared to the other two (both 63%).

		Disagree overall	Agree overall	Neutral
1.	Where we already switch off street lights on residential streets for 3 hours per night, to extend this to 5 hours per night	29% (16% strongly disagreed)	63% (28% strongly agreed)	1%

2a	To dim street lights further on residential streets where it is considered safe to do so	26% (15% strongly disagreed)	67% (28% strongly agreed)	7%
2b	To dim street lights further on the classified road network where it is considered safe to do so	29% (15% strongly disagreed)	63% (26% strongly agreed)	8%

What were the reasons driving agreement with the proposals: Overall themes

Those who agreed with the three proposals were more likely to comment on the following impacts:

- **Positive impact on the environment** was the most likely impact to be mentioned by those who agreed with the proposals (53%, 46%, 48% compared to 22% overall). Comments referenced a reduction in light pollution and the benefits of darker skies for people and for wildlife.
"There is so much light pollution that reducing the number of hours street lights are on would help wildlife."
- **Positive financial impacts** were also more likely to be mentioned by those who agreed compared to the overall sample (18%, 16%, 16% compared to 7% overall). These comments were generally around it being a sensible idea as a way to save money for the Council.
"Switching off lighting between these hours would be far less wasteful of electricity costs."
- Linked to both of the above were positive impacts of **reduced energy usage** (10%, 9%, 9% of those who agreed mentioning this compared to 4% overall) which was felt to have the dual benefit of saving money and being better for the environment.
"Not only will this help save money, but will also reduce energy consumption and the council's carbon footprint."
- The proposals having **no or minimal impact** was also more likely to be mentioned by those agreeing (15%, 12%, 12% compared to 7% overall).

"Not many lights around here and we enjoy the darkness"

Those who agreed with the proposals were also more likely to make the following suggestions:

- **The proposals could go further** – e.g. switching more lights off (24%, 21%, 22% compared to 17% overall), extending switch off for longer length (11%, 10%, 10% compared to 7% overall). Some of the reasons given for reducing the service further included comments that some of the current streetlights do not really provide much benefit so might as well be switched off.

"You could switch them off altogether in many places. I go out early mornings in the dark for a walk around my local streets and there are so many pointless security lights that the street lights are superfluous."

"I have always wondered why street lights were not turned off for longer periods of time, it is an easy way to reduce costs, so please turn them off as soon as is possible. Also, turning on at 6am would work, as people who get up then would be accustomed to the darkness. Maybe lights could go off at 11.30pm Sunday to Wednesday, then 12pm Thursday to Saturday."

- **Adjusting lighting according to type of route / area** was also more likely to be mentioned by those who agreed (26%, 25%, 24% compared to 20%). This included comments that areas that are safer or already lit by other means (e.g. car headlights, houses or local businesses) did not need streetlights, but they may still need be needed in areas where there are safety concerns.

"Wasting money lighting up streets that are lit by cars. Perhaps always look at main routes to be lit, the areas that are considered dangerous for pedestrians"

Agreement with the proposals was also reflected in comments that were submitted via the 'general comments' question within the overall consultation.

- Of the 111 comments relating to the Street lighting proposal, 46% were supportive of a reduction of this service.

Who is driving agreement with the proposals: Overall themes

Certain groups of people were more likely to agree with all three of the proposals relating to street lighting, specifically:

- **Older people** - agreement with the proposals generally increased with age but was notably higher for those **aged 65 and over** (69%, 69%, 65% agreement for over 65's versus 43%, 50%, 49% for under 25's).
 - Older people were more likely to comment that the proposal would have no / minimal impact for them and were more likely to suggest turning streetlights off more than proposed.

- Those living in **rural areas** (77%, 80%, 76%), and those living in **East Hampshire** (67%, 71%, 68%), **New Forest** (68%, 70%, 66%), **Test Valley** (71%, 76%, 71%) and **Winchester** (72%, 75%, 70%).
 - Those living in rural areas were more likely to comment on the positive impact on the environment and the positive financial impacts.

 - Those living in the New Forest and Test Valley were more likely to comment on the positive impact on the environment, whereas East Hampshire was more likely to comment that there was no / minimal impact, as well as the positive financial impact and reduced energy use.

 - All these areas were less likely to comment that there would be an increase in crime, and all apart from Winchester were less likely to report safety concerns.

- Those with **no health issues** (66%, 70%, 66%) or health issues that do not impact their day-to-day activities
 - Those with no health or disability issues were more likely to report that the proposals had no/ minimal impact, compared to those that did.

- Those on annual household **incomes of £40,001 or more** (for example, 70%, 75%, 70% agreement for those with annual household income £40,001 to £50,000)
 - While this group show similar levels of mentions for impacts compared to the overall sample, they are less likely to make a comment about dissatisfaction with the current service, such as lack of visibility.

- Those who reported they are **never out between the hours of midnight and 5am** (77%, 79%, 75% agreement)
 - This group were more likely to report no/ minimal impact or the positive impact on the environment.
 - They were also less likely to report concerns about crime or safety.

- Those who **travel by bicycle** (70%, 73%, 69% agreement)

- This groups were slightly more likely to cite the positive impact on the environment and the positive financial impact of the proposal.
- They were also more likely to suggest switching to motion sensor, solar powered or LED lighting.
- In general, members of the **Hampshire Youth Forum** who focussed on the street lighting proposals expressed agreement with them due to the view that they would not have a significant impact on the public, as well as being cost effective.

What the reasons driving disagreement with the proposals: Overall themes

Those who disagreed with the three proposals were more likely to comment on the following impacts:

- **Safety concerns** (59%, 59%, 57% of those who disagreed compared to 43% overall), specifically that the proposals compromise the safety of residents, pedestrians, cyclists and other roads users. Safety included both references to impacts of anti-social behaviour or crime on safety, as well as the risk of lack of visibility causing trips, falls and other accidents.
"It is already dangerous with how dark our roads are at night. There have been break ins down my road as youths/perpetrators are not as visible and there has been accidents with the population not being able to see when walking their dogs or returning home in the winter."
- Often linked to the point above, **an increase in crime** was also more likely to be mentioned (38%, 37%, 36% compared to 25% overall) as a potential impact, specifically burglaries, assaults and vandalism. It was felt that the cover of darkness was more likely to provide opportunities for crime to take place.
"I am worried about personal safety if lights are not maintained and also the risk of burglaries, vandalism etc if roads are not illuminated."
- **Negative impact on women** (21%, 20%, 20% compared to 14% overall), specifically risks to women's safety such as risk of attacks on women, or women generally feeling more unsafe on unlit streets. This could mean women feel less confident, or would avoid, leaving the house after dark.
"It will make women feel even less safe or avoid going out after dark"
- **Negative impact on shift workers** (14%, 14%, 14% compared to 11% overall) as they would be more likely to be about during the hours of

reduced light and may not have access to a car so would be forced to walk on dark streets.

“It should be remembered that some people work at unsociable times of day and night and should not be expected to travel - either by car or on foot - in darkness.”

Those who disagreed with the proposals were also more likely to make suggestions that either maintained or increased the amount of current street lighting, such as changing to LED lighting to reduce costs that way, or to find other ways to fund it (rather than reduce the service).

- **Change to LED lighting** (14%, 13%, 16% compared to 8% overall)
- **Maintain current lighting** (8%, 7%, 8% compared to 3% overall)
- **Light more than currently** (8%, 7%, 8% compared to 3% overall)
- **Find alternative funding** (7%, 6%, 5% compared to 2% overall)

Other general comments that were more likely to be mentioned by those who disagreed with the proposals were:

- Dissatisfaction with the current street lighting service, specifically **lack of visibility** such as lights already being too dim, and it is already hard to see at night (30%, 39%, 36% compared to 22%).

“As a pedestrian I find the street lights inadequate for safe walking even in the town where I live. I have to use a torch as they are too spaced out and too dull now.”

- **Street lighting is important for safety** (15%, 12%, 14% compared to 9%), specifically that it deters criminals and anti-social behaviour and is important for visibility.

“All roads should have street lighting as a Health and Safety matter. No lights increases the probability of accidents and assaults on the individual”

- **Women feel unsafe already** (11%, 10%, 10% compared to 6%) which included comments about women of all ages feeling unsafe walking when out and about, particularly walking alone.

“As an older female I felt unsafe both from either falling or a potential victim of crime.”

I am young and (...) as a female, I also fear going out in the dark and street lighting does make me feel safer

Who is driving disagreement with the proposals: Overall themes

While the majority of respondents agreed with the proposals overall, certain groups of people had higher levels of disagreement with the three proposals compared to the total sample, often on the basis of safety concerns.

These were notably:

- **Younger age demographics**, notably those aged under 25 were more likely to mention safety concerns and impacts on women, vulnerable people or shift workers:
 - Open text comments about the proposals suggest young people are more likely to be employed as shift workers, or travelling at night during these hours and therefore would be more at risk of becoming a victim of crime or feeling unsafe.
 - This is exemplified in a comment from The University of Winchester and the University of Winchester Students' Union suggesting the proposals would lead to increased fear of harm as well as increased risk of injury amongst students.
 - However, young people were more likely to suggest adjusting lighting according to time of year or day of the week as an alternative.
- Those living in **Fareham** (33%, 31%, 35%), **Gosport** (45%, 34%, 38%), **Hart** (33%, 34%, 38%) and **Rushmoor** (50%, 44%, 45%)
 - Those in Fareham, Gosport and Hart were more likely to raise concerns about safety issues increasing as a result of the proposals
 - Those in Gosport and Rushmoor were more likely to comment that the proposals would increase crime, and less likely to comment that the proposals would have a positive impact on the environment.
 - Those in Hart were also more likely to comment on the negative impact of the proposals on women.
- Those **limited by a health problem/ disability** (33%, 28%, 32%)
 - Open text comments suggest that those who are limited in how they move around, particularly those who are vulnerable or have a visual impairment, would feel less safe as a result of this proposal.
 - This group was also more likely to comment that they feel unsafe already compared to those without health or disability issues.

“For those with sight issues, dimming streetlights during evening and early morning is dangerous.”

- **Ethnic minority groups** (40%, 31%, 33%)
 - This groups were more likely to comment on the negative impact on women and also that accident and crime levels need to be considered.
- Those from **lower income households**, notably those on incomes up to £10,000 (42%, 36%, 40%)
 - It was suggested in open text comments that those on lower incomes are more likely to be doing shiftwork and therefore could be adversely impacted by the proposals due to safety concerns arising from less lighting.

“I think this will impact poor people most as they are more likely to be walking and to be doing shift work, once again putting the most vulnerable at risk.”

- Individuals who are out and about in **residential areas between midnight and 5am on most days** (58%, 43%, 47%)
 - Disagreement increased with the regularity in which respondents reported being out and about during that time frame.
 - Individuals out and about in residential areas between midnight and 5am on most days were also more likely to mention feeling unsafe already (25% versus 19% overall) in open text comments.
- **Bus** (32%, 29%, 33%) **taxi**, (33%, 30%, 34%) and **taxi share** (50%, 47%, 53%) users
 - Comments from the open text data suggest people are often walking to and from bus stops in the dark / low level lights and therefore adequate lighting is necessary for them to feel safe.
“I have to walk to the bus stop at 5:30 and sometimes the street lights aren’t even on then. So not having them turned on until later seems mad!”
- Some other groups also showed slightly higher levels of disagreement across the proposals included those of **gay or lesbian sexual orientation** (36%, 38%, 37%) those who have **never been married** (35% 30%, 33%), and those who are **neurodiverse** (33%, 30%, 33%).

- Open text comments suggest that those who are already vulnerable or a minority group may feel more at risk or impacted by these proposals.

“Safety should always be a priority and none of this should be taken lightly, particularly for women, gay people or others who may be vulnerable in the darkness.”

“As a single woman I'd feel unsafe if streetlights are turned off more or dimmed.”

As a female, I also fear going out in the dark and street lighting does make me feel safer. I believe there is research suggesting that many women and other vulnerable people feel the same way”

Breakdown of the proposals:

This section will look at each of the three proposals individually to show if there were any specific comments related to switching off versus dimming and any additional groups (other than those already mentioned) that were also more likely to agree or disagree with specific individual proposals.

Proposal 1: Where we already switch off street lights on residential streets for 3 hours per night, to extend this to 5 hours per night

Additional groups more likely to agree with this proposal:

The following additional groups had higher levels of agreement with this proposal specifically compared to the overall agreement (63%).

- **Those living in Havant** (68%).
 - Residents from this district were less likely to mention a negative impacts on safety (24% compared to 43% overall) and more likely to suggest the proposals would have no/ minimal impact (17% compared to 7% overall).
- Although only accounting for a small proportion of respondents (35), **Democratically Elected Representatives** expressed a higher level of agreement with this proposal (69%)

Additional groups more likely to disagree with this proposal:

The following additional groups had higher levels of disagreement with this proposal compared to the overall disagreement (29%).

- **Organisations** (40% disagreement)
 - The small number (16) of organisations who left a comment about potential impacts were more likely to mention negative impacts of the proposal on various different groups of people; including women, young people/children, disabled and other vulnerable people, shift workers and the public in general.
 - Organisations were also more likely to make a general comment that the roads were in a poor state of repair currently and that accident and crime levels need to be considered.
- Those with **children or young people up to the age of 18 living in their household** (33%).
 - This group were also more likely to mention that woman feel unsafe already, as well as on negative impact of the proposals on woman.
- **Ferry** (32%) and **wheelchair/mobility scooter** users (35%). A small number of **minibus** users (32) also had a higher level of disagreement (39%). compared to overall

Feedback on how the switch off would be implemented

Respondents were also asked their views on the timings for the proposed extended switch off, and whether they thought the proposed timings were about right, or whether they felt should be earlier or later.

Overall, more respondents felt the proposed switch on time of 5am was about right (68%), compared to the proportion of respondents who thought the proposed switch off time of midnight was about right (57%). This was because around a quarter of respondents felt the switch off time should be later than midnight.

		Should be earlier	About right	Should be later	Don't know
a.	Switching off street lights at midnight (instead of 1am)	14%	57%	25%	4%
b.	Switch on street lights at 5am (instead of 4am)	12%	68%	16%	5%

a) Feedback on switching off street lights at midnight (instead of 1am)

Certain groups of people were more likely to select that the proposed switch off time of midnight was about right, in particular:

- **The small number (35) of Elected Representatives** who responded (66%).
- **Older age groups**, specifically those aged 75-84 and 85+ (65% and 75% respectively).
- **Residents of East Hampshire, Eastleigh, Havant and Test Valley** (62%, 60%, 65%, and 64% respectively).
- **Motorcycle/ moped users, ferry users and cyclists** (65%, 61% and 60% respectively).

Those who mentioned agreeing with switching the streetlights off at midnight in an open text comment felt that the current street lighting levels were unnecessary and switching off at this time would be better for the environment.

Despite the majority of respondents agreeing to the proposed switch off time, there were a minority of respondents (14%) who felt street lighting should be switched off earlier than midnight. Specifically, this included:

- **Rural residents** (21%) as well as residents from **Basingstoke and Deane** (20%) and the **New Forest** (20%).

Furthermore, a quarter of respondents (25%) felt that street lighting should be switched off later than midnight. In particular:

- **Those aged under 25** (51%)
- **Ethnic minorities** (30%)
- Residents from **Rushmoor** (38%), **Gosport** (34%), **Fareham** (30%), and **Hart** (30%)
- People **travelling around in residential areas between midnight and 5am every** (40%) **or most** (46%) **days**
- Those who travelled by **taxi** (29%).
- The small number (17) of charities who submitted a response (35%).

Those who mentioned disagreeing with switching the streetlights off at midnight in an open text comment felt this would be unsafe as people are often still travelling at this time (such as people frequenting pubs/ restaurants and train users).

b) Feedback on switching street lights on at 5am (instead of 4am)

Certain groups of people were more likely to select that the proposed switch on time was about right, in particular:

- Those **aged 75-84** (72%) and **85 and over** (76%)
- Residents from **Havant** (75%)
- Households in **higher income brackets**, specifically those with household incomes of £70,001 or more (73%).

Despite the majority of respondents agreeing to the proposed switch on time, there were a minority of respondents (12%) who felt street lighting should be switched on earlier than 5am. Specifically, this included:

- **Ethnic minorities** (19%)

- **Those aged under 25** (21%),
- Those who were **impacted a lot day-to-day by a health problem or disability** (16%),
- Residents from **Rushmoor** (22%), **Gosport** (19%), **Fareham** (16%) and **Eastleigh** (15%)
- People **travelling around in residential areas between midnight and 5am on every** (42%) **or most** (32%) **days.**
- The small number (17) of **charities** who submitted a response (18%)
- The small number (17) of **local authorities** who submitted a response (25%)

Furthermore, a small number of respondents (16%) felt that street lighting should be switched on later than 5am. In particular, those:

- **Travelling around in residential areas between midnight and 5am most days** (24%)
- **Those aged under 25** (19%)
- Residents from **New Forest** (20%) and **rural** areas (20%).

Proposal 2a: To dim street lights further on residential streets where it is considered safe to do so

Additional groups more likely to agree with this proposal:

The following additional groups had higher levels of agreement with this proposal compared to the overall agreement (67%).

- **Men** were slightly more likely to agree with the proposal than woman (70% and 67% respectively).
 - Men were less likely to mention feeling unsafe already due to the current lighting level, or cite concerns about current visibility
 - They were also less likely to mention the impact of the proposals on women, and slightly lower mentions of safety impacts generally
- **Those with no children in the household** (70%)
 - This group were less likely to report safety concerns compared to those with children (38% versus 50% respectively)
- Although only accounting for a small proportion of respondents (35), **Democratically Elected Representatives** expressed a higher level of agreement with this proposal (74%)

Additional groups more likely to disagree with this proposal:

The following additional groups had higher levels of disagreement with this proposal compared to the overall disagreement (26%).

- Residents of **Basingstoke and Deane** (30%) and **Eastleigh** (29%)
 - Residents of Basingstoke and Deane were more likely to comment about the increase in crime.
 - Residents of Eastleigh were more likely to cite safety concerns and were less likely to mention benefits of the proposals on the environment.
- Those who travel by **ferry** (29%)
 - This group were also more likely to mention concerns about crime and safety.

Specific open-ended comments about this proposal:

Open ended comments that specifically mentioned residential areas included both comments both for and against:

“Street lighting is not required in residential areas; villages do not have lighting-most anyway. Everyone has a very good torch on their mobile phone; car lights and bike lights. Not good for environment especially bird life.”

“Light levels in residential roads already fall below national recommended limits which makes it too dark already to walk safely.”

Proposal 2b: To dim street lights further on the classified road network where it is considered safe to do so

Additional groups more likely to agree with this proposal:

The following additional groups had higher levels of agreement with this proposal compared to the overall agreement (63%).

- **Men** were slightly more likely to agree with the proposal than woman (66% and 62% respectively).
 - As mentioned for proposal 2a, men were less likely to mention feeling unsafe already, or cite concerns about current visibility, and less likely to mention the impact of the proposals on women and safety impacts generally
- **Motorcycle/moped users** (71%)
 - This group were more likely to mention that the proposals would have no or minimal impact, as well as general comment that there were no street lights near them currently anyway.

Additional groups more likely to disagree with this proposal:

No other additional groups were more likely to disagree with this proposal specifically, other than those previously mentioned who were more likely to disagree with all three of the street lighting proposals in this consultation.

Specific comments about this proposal:

Open ended comments that specifically mentioned the classified road network, mentioned that these areas are busier and therefore dimming the street lighting would cause safety issues.

“On the classified road network, street lights are essential for safe car travel, so disagree with that one.”

Main impacts of the proposed changes

The overall comments provided about the street lighting proposals were also analysed to understand what potential impacts the proposal could have if it were to be implemented.

691 out of 1591 people who chose to provide comments on these proposals mentioned a potential impact in their feedback.

- The most frequently mentioned impact was an increase in **safety concerns** (43%). This includes the general belief that people will be and feel less safe when travelling in the dark.

“I feel that reduced lighting at night is very dangerous to personal safety.”

- Other frequently mentioned negative impacts include an **increase in crime** due to a reduced level of lighting (25%) (including burglaries, vandalism, assaults and mugging), as well as a **negative impact on woman** (14%) (such as feeling less confident and safe when travelling at night).

“Crime rates will continue to rise if you are providing criminals with optimum opportunities such as no lights.”

“These proposals are dangerous to lone women walking home at night.”

Perceived impact on protected characteristics

1277 respondents indicated in the Response Form which characteristics or issues they felt would correspond with the impacts of the changes proposed for street lighting. Respondents were able to select any of the protected characteristics covered by the Equality Act 2010, as well as poverty, rurality, and environmental impacts.

- They were most likely to indicate that the withdrawal of funding would impact people because of **age** (33%).
 - Specifically, it was suggested that older people would feel less safe and be more at risk if street lighting was reduced.

“Reducing street lighting causes stress and anxiety in the elderly who needs reassurance over their welfare and safety.”

“Our aging population are being left vulnerable by turning down / off street lights.”
- Around 3 in 10 (29%) selected that their impact related to the **environment**.
 - 22% of the open text comments about impacts mentioned a positive impact on the environment (for example, a reduction in light pollution and improved welfare of wildlife).

“Turning street lighting off should be a priority as not just save money is good for the environment saves electric and reduces light pollution.”
- 27% mentioned that impacts could affect those with a **disability**, and this characteristic was more likely to be selected by those limited by a health problem or disability (44%).
 - Open ended comments specifically called out that the proposal could have negative impacts on those with sight or mobility issues and was often mentioned alongside impacts on elderly people.
 - Some comments also mentioned that the proposal could have safety impacts on those who are already vulnerable, such as putting them at greater risk of assault, crime or accidents.

“For those with sight issues, dimming street lights during evening and early morning is dangerous.”

“the more vulnerable or possibly isolated people would be in most danger of being attacked on dark streets”
- 24% noted impacts on **rurality**,
 - The majority of open ended comments on rurality mentioned that the proposals would have positive benefits (e.g. less light pollution, darker skies and benefits to wildlife) or no impact (already have less lighting anyway)
 - However, there were also some who mentioned potential negative impacts on rural areas such as increased vulnerability to crime (e.g. burglaries), increased isolation when walking home in the dark, visibility already being bad and more likely to be hazards in the roads (e.g. animals).
- 17% mentioned **sex**, and this characteristic was more likely to be selected by women (21%) compared to the proportion of men selecting this characteristic (12%)

- 14% of open ended comments on impacts mentioned that the proposals would have a negative impact on women, specifically that it could risk women's safety, women would feel (more) unsafe and less confident walking in the dark which may mean their travel is restricted.

"It is never safe for women for street lights to be dimmed. It will increase the chance of unwanted advances from men, of sexual assault and general abuse. These proposals impact women far more than men and women are already disadvantaged when it comes to walking on our streets in the dark.

"As a woman, this concerns me to dim and shorten the time of lights. We need to be safe and it is more likely that attacks will happen if it's dark. I want to be walking around my area not worried about my safety in the evenings."

- 13% made reference to **poverty**
 - Open ended comments mentioned that it is more likely to impact those without access to their own transport or not able to afford to use taxis.
 - Some also mentioned that those with less money (including students, hospitality workers) were more likely to be doing shift work so would be disproportionately affected. Similarly, some people who are struggling with the cost of living already may have had to work additional/late hours to make ends meet.

"I think this will impact poor people most as they are more likely to be walking and to be doing shift work, once again putting the most vulnerable at risk"

"Please bare in mind those working antisocial hours who dont have access to their own transport"

Other characteristics were also mentioned but at much lower levels (5% or less). 32% suggested that they did not think that any of the characteristics listed would be disproportionately impacted by the proposals, and 7% did not know.

Alternative solutions suggested

513 out of 1591 people who chose to provide comments on these proposals offered a suggestion about any alternatives to the proposal or how they felt the service could be carried out differently.

- The most commonly mentioned idea was **adjusting street lighting according to the type of road or area** (such as reducing in safer locations

lit by other means such as residential estates and keeping lighting on main roads/ roads with lower levels of safety) (20%).

- Respondents also suggested **switching off streetlights more than the proposed amount** (for example, reducing the number of lights that are close together) (17%).

“It will depend heavily on the area. Those with problems with anti-social behaviour might need longer lighting periods. Some areas could have street lights switched off earlier. ideally this could be controlled at a more local level.”

“The amount of street lights throughout the county should be reviewed, and where possible the numbers should be reduced. This would significantly reduce all associated costs and light pollution.”

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

Other comments about these proposals to consider

- Hampshire County Council’s Centre of Active Travel Excellence (CATE) raised a number of questions about the data used to inform the proposals relating to street lighting. They also offered to support with future work on the topic.
- New Forest District Council (NFDC) also asked for clarification on data used to evidence the proposed Christmas Eve, Christmas Day and New Years Eve exemptions.
- A few respondents wished to understand how areas would be assessed as safe to reduce street lighting.
“It would be interesting to know who has decided that streets are safe with less lighting. I have no objection to the changes per se but I would like to know the decision makers or contributors to the decision.”
- A number of open text comments also mentioned a need to consider and monitor crime and accident levels to ensure that the public are kept safe.
“Good idea, but please do this with due consideration and review frequently in light of crime and accident statistics.”