

Universal Services

Name of SP25 proposal:	SP25 Proposal Reference:
Street lighting	EIA – US02 Universal Services

EIA writer(s) and authoriser

No.		Name	Department	Position	Email address	Phone number	Date	Issue
1	Report Writer(s)	Julian Higgins	Universal Services	Assistant Highways Manager			30/04/2024	2
2	EIA authoriser	Patrick Blogg	Universal Services	Director – Universal Services			15/05/2024	2
3	EIA Coordinator	Patrick Poyntz-Wright	Universal Services	Capital and Governance Support Manager			14/05/2023	2

Section one – information about the service and service change

Service affected	Street lighting
Please provide a short description of the service / policy/project/project phase	The County Council provides and maintains over 157,000 streetlights and illuminated signs and bollards.

	<p>The main street lighting cost that the County Council can control is energy consumption, which accounts for approximately £4.2 million per year. Since 2010, street lighting energy consumption has significantly reduced in Hampshire using more efficient lamps, and by dimming streetlights and switching some lights off for part of the night. However, this should be understood in the context of energy cost increases that have occurred in subsequent years.</p>
<p>Please explain the new/changed service/policy/project</p>	<p>Changes to the energy cost of managing Hampshire’s Street lighting network could be sought by:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Extending the hours streetlights are switched off during the night on some residential roads 2. Additional dimming of streetlights to lower levels during the night.

Engagement and consultation

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

Has any pre-consultation engagement been carried out?

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

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

A stage 2 public consultation was completed in March 2024.

The results received were broadly in support of the proposals. Residents that responded to the consultation for Street lighting were broadly in support of the three proposals. Specifically:

- Where we already switch off streetlights on residential streets for 3 hours per night, to extend this to 5 hours per night – 63% of respondents agreed with this proposal.
- To dim streetlights further on residential streets where it is considered safe to do so – 67% of respondents agreed with this proposal.
- To dim streetlights further on the classified road network where it is considered safe to do so – 63% of respondents agreed with this proposal.

Respondents with lower levels of support tended to have protected characteristics such as those with disabilities, those from ethnic minority groups, younger (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.

Section two: Assessment

Carefully and consciously consider the impacts of the proposed change.

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

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

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

Table 1 Impact Assessment [add ✓ to relevant boxes)

Protected characteristic	Positive	Neutral	Negative - low	Negative - Medium	Negative - High	Affects staff, public or both?
Age				✓		Public
Disability				✓		Public
Gender reassignment		✓				Public
Pregnancy and maternity		✓				Public

Race			✓			Public
Religion or belief		✓				Public
Sex				✓		Public
Sexual orientation		✓				Public
Marriage & civil partnership		✓				Public
Poverty			✓			Public
Rurality	✓					Public

Table 2 Geographical impact

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

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

Section three: Equality Statement

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

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

Protected characteristic	Brief explanation of why this has been assessed as having neutral. or low negative impact
Race	<p>LOW NEGATIVE: Public consultation responses indicated that opposition to this proposal was higher among people with these characteristics, and this is thought in part to be related to fear of 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.</p> <p>New infrastructure enables flexibility over lighting and dimming regimes, and if negative impacts are identified, this could potentially provide options for mitigation. The County Council would work closely with the constabulary to ensure suitable lighting levels based on evidence.</p>
Poverty	<p>LOW NEGATIVE: Although poverty is not a statutory protected characteristic, consultation responses indicated that opposition to this proposal was higher among people with these characteristics, and this is thought in part to be related to fear of 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.</p>

	New infrastructure enables flexibility over lighting and dimming regimes, and if negative impacts are identified, this could potentially provide options for mitigation. The County Council would work closely with the constabulary to ensure suitable lighting levels based on evidence.
Gender Reassignment, Pregnancy and maternity, Religion or belief, Marriage, and Civil Partnership, Sexual Orientation	NEUTRAL: The impact of these proposals on these protected characteristics has been assessed as neutral.

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

Table 4 Explanation and mitigation for medium and high impacts

Protected characteristic	Brief explanation of why this has been assessed as having medium or high negative impact	Is there a Geographical impact? If so, please explain - use list above to identify geographical area(s)	Short explanation of mitigating actions
Age, Disability, and Sex	MEDIUM NEGATIVE IMPACT Public consultations responses indicated that opposition to this proposal was higher among people with these characteristics. In most areas streets would be darker or darker for longer, and this could well increase the fear of crime, particularly for women. In addition, some consultation	All Hampshire	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.

	respondents expressed concern that travel at night may become more difficult for people with specific disabilities, such as visual impairments, also affecting those who are neurodiverse.		New infrastructure enables flexibility over lighting and dimming regimes, and if negative impacts are identified, this could potentially provide options for mitigation. The County Council would work closely with the constabulary to ensure suitable lighting levels based on evidence.
--	--	--	--

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

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

Table 5 Consideration of and explanation for positive impacts

Protected characteristic	Brief explanation of why this has been assessed as having positive impact
Rurality	Although rurality is not a statutory protected characteristic, 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.

Further actions and recommendations to consider:

- If neutral or low negative impacts have been carefully considered and identified correctly, the activity is likely to proceed.
- If medium negative or high negative have been identified:
 - The policy, service review, scheme or practice may be paused or stopped.
 - The policy, service review, scheme or practice can be changed to remove, reduce, or mitigate against the negative impacts.
 - Consider undertaking consultation/re-consulting¹.
 - If all options have been considered carefully and there are no other proportionate ways to remove, reduce, or mitigate - explain and justify reasons why in the assessment.
 - Carry out a subsequent impact severity assessment following mitigating actions.

Box 1

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

Box 2

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