

# Public Document Pack



## NOTICE OF MEETING

<b>Meeting</b>	Economy, Transport and Environment Select Committee
<b>Date and Time</b>	Thursday 10th March, 2022 at 10.00 am
<b>Place</b>	Mitchell Room, Ell Court, Winchester
<b>Enquiries to</b>	members.services@hants.gov.uk

Carolyn Williamson FCPFA  
Chief Executive  
The Castle, Winchester SO23 8UJ

### FILMING AND BROADCAST NOTIFICATION

This meeting may be recorded and broadcast live on the County Council's website and available for repeat viewing, it may also be recorded and filmed by the press and public. Filming or recording is only permitted in the meeting room whilst the meeting is taking place so must stop when the meeting is either adjourned or closed. Filming is not permitted elsewhere in the building at any time. Please see the Filming Protocol available on the County Council's website.

### AGENDA

#### 1. APOLOGIES FOR ABSENCE

To receive any apologies for absence.

#### 2. DECLARATIONS OF INTEREST

All Members who believe they have a Disclosable Pecuniary Interest in any matter to be considered at the meeting must declare that interest and, having regard to Part 3 Paragraph 1.5 of the County Council's Members' Code of Conduct, leave the meeting while the matter is discussed, save for exercising any right to speak in accordance with Paragraph 1.6 of the Code. Furthermore all Members with a Personal Interest in a matter being considered at the meeting should consider, having regard to Part 5, Paragraph 4 of the Code, whether such interest should be declared, and having regard to Part 5, Paragraph 5 of the Code, consider whether it is appropriate to leave the meeting while the matter is discussed, save for exercising any right to speak in accordance with the Code.

#### 3. MINUTES OF PREVIOUS MEETING (TO FOLLOW)

To confirm the minutes of the previous meeting

**4. DEPUTATIONS**

To receive any deputations notified under Standing Order 12.

**5. CHAIRMAN'S ANNOUNCEMENTS**

To receive any announcements the Chairman may wish to make.

**6. HAMPSHIRE HIGHWAYS - HIGHWAY NETWORK RECOVERY STRATEGY (Pages 5 - 28)**

To pre-scrutinise a report of the Director of Economy, Transport and Environment for the Executive Lead Member for Economy, Transport and Environment on the Highway Network Recovery Strategy.

**7. PARKING - SERVICE CONSOLIDATION EFFICIENCIES (Pages 29 - 46)**

To pre-scrutinise a report of the Director of Economy, Transport and Environment for the Executive Lead Member for Economy, Transport and Environment on Parking consolidation efficiencies.

**8. SCHOOL STREETS (Pages 47 - 64)**

To pre-scrutinise a report of the Director of Economy, Transport and Environment for Cabinet on the School Streets pilot.

**9. INFORMATION ITEM - HWRC UPDATE**

To receive a presentation and update on HWRC's.

**10. WORK PROGRAMME (Pages 65 - 68)**

To review and approve the current work programme for the Economy, Transport and Environment Select Committee.

**ABOUT THIS AGENDA:**

**On request, this agenda can be provided in alternative versions (such as large print, Braille or audio) and in alternative languages.**

**ABOUT THIS MEETING:**

The press and public are welcome to attend the public sessions of the meeting. If you have any particular requirements, for example if you require wheelchair access, please contact [members.services@hants.gov.uk](mailto:members.services@hants.gov.uk) for assistance.

County Councillors attending as appointed members of this Committee or by virtue of Standing Order 18.5; or with the concurrence of the Chairman in connection with their duties as members of the Council or as a local County Councillor qualify for travelling expenses.

This page is intentionally left blank

## HAMPSHIRE COUNTY COUNCIL

### Report

<b>Committee:</b>	Economy, Transport & Environment Select Committee
<b>Date:</b>	10 March 2022
<b>Title:</b>	Hampshire Highways – Highway Network Recovery Strategy
<b>Report From:</b>	Director of Economy, Transport and Environment

**Contact name:** Peter Rooney

**Tel:** 0370 779 4628

**Email:** peter.rooney@hants.gov.uk

### Purpose of Report

1. For the Economy, Transport & Environment Select Committee to pre-scrutinise the proposals for a longer-term strategy for managing and maintaining the highway network in Hampshire in light of additional County Council funding and also improving how the highway maintenance service is delivered (see report attached due to be considered at the decision day of the Executive Lead Member for Economy, Transport and Environment, Executive Member for Highways Operations and Executive Member for Climate Change and Sustainability at 2.00pm on 10 March 2022).

### Recommendation

2. That the Economy, Transport and Environment Select Committee:

Either:

Supports the recommendations being proposed to the Executive Lead Member for Economy, Transport and Environment in section 2 of the attached report.

Or:

Agrees any alternative recommendations to the Executive Lead Member for Economy, Transport and Environment, with regards to the proposals set out in the attached report.

This page is intentionally left blank

## HAMPSHIRE COUNTY COUNCIL

### Decision Report

<b>Decision Maker:</b>	Executive Lead Member for Economy, Transport and Environment
<b>Date:</b>	10 March 2022
<b>Title:</b>	Hampshire Highways – Highway Network Recovery Strategy
<b>Report From:</b>	Director of Economy, Transport and Environment

**Contact name:** Peter Rooney

**Tel:** 0370 779 4628

**Email:** peter.rooney@hants.gov.uk

#### Purpose of this Report

1. The purpose of this report is to set out a longer-term strategy for managing and maintaining the highway network in Hampshire in light of additional County Council funding, and also improving how the highway maintenance service is delivered.

#### Recommendation

2. That the Executive Lead Member for Economy, Transport and Environment approves the proposed Highway Network Recovery Strategy, included as Appendix A, which sets out how the delivery of the highways service can be sustained, and improved over the longer term, taking into account the recurring additional £7million funding agreed by the County Council on 4 November 2021.

#### Executive Summary

3. This report is an update to the *Hampshire Highways Service Update Decision Report* that was approved by the Executive Member for Highways Operations on 29 July 2021. This outlined the challenges that have emerged as a consequence of the Covid-19 pandemic and Brexit, and others that have developed from long-term significant under-investment in local highway infrastructure on a national scale, following more than a decade of austerity measures and inadequate funding from central government.
4. The previous report recommended the development of a Highway Network Recovery Strategy to set out how the issues outlined in that report can be managed and mitigated.
5. The additional funding of £7million per year that was agreed by the County Council on 4 November 2021 specifically for highway maintenance will, in conjunction with existing budgets, provide the necessary financial footing to

enable the slowing down, and ideally the gradual reversal, of the managed decline in the condition of Hampshire's road network.

6. The Highway Network Recovery Strategy sets out how *Hampshire Highways* will proactively manage the highway network utilising existing capital and revenue budgets, together with the extra £7million. The strategy is essentially a ten-year forward plan to address the longstanding backlog of highway maintenance on the local road network and, to ensure improvements are targeted in the most effective way, established asset management principles and cost modelling will be utilised. Hampshire-specific asset datasets have been developed to demonstrate the important linkage between investment and improvement and these are included as Appendix B.
7. Indicative target spend areas have already been identified for 2022/23 to address a number of immediate network needs, primarily focussed on carriageway and surface water drainage assets.
8. The new strategy will:-
  - a. Enable faster response times to reported defects and incidents which, in turn, should yield a better customer experience with improved perception of the highways service.
  - b. Improve how highway asset data is used to enable more efficient and effective targeted interventions.
  - c. Facilitate a more proactive approach to highway maintenance.

### **Contextual Information**

9. It is important to note that the condition of Hampshire's highway network and the current state of managed decline is not a Hampshire-specific problem, this is a challenge affecting all local highway authorities across the country at present.
10. The construction industry continues to face a number of challenges nationally which were outlined in detail in the July 2021 report. These have resulted in a high degree of ongoing uncertainty and risk, largely centred around the volatility in prices relating to construction related activity, linked to inflation.
11. In September 2021 the UK Roads Liaison Group published a report "The Case for Investing in Highways Maintenance". This comprehensive report outlined many of the issues that are currently affecting the highway network across England (excluding London) and several highlights from the report are included below to provide an overview of the situation from a national perspective:
  - the condition of roads is increasing motorist operating costs;
  - over 6 years, the RAC reports that motorists believe that the condition of local roads is getting worse;
  - road users state the road surface condition is a top priority/concern;
  - Department for Transport (DfT) data indicates a decline in maintenance undertaken across the local road network, with the minor roads taking the biggest hit;



- DfT data highlights the reduction of strengthening work, with local authorities having to adopt short-term fixes to spread their budget across an ageing asset;
  - recent Annual Local Authority Road Maintenance (ALARM) surveys indicate circa. 1% (2,800km) of the local road network degrades into the poor condition category each year;
  - nearly one in three (31%) of older adults (aged 65+) are prevented from walking more or at all on their local streets because of cracked and uneven pavements (footways). The new research found that half of older adults (48%) would walk more if their pavements were well-maintained; and
  - for every additional £1 invested, an absolute minimum return of £2.20 can be expected, with analysis identifying typical returns of up to £9.10 at a national level. Further socio-economic benefits are estimated to provide up to a further £5+, and work is underway by the highways sector to monitor this more closely.
12. In addition to the Roads Liaison Group report, the 2021 National Highways and Transport (NHT) survey results demonstrate a continuing decline nationally in the public perception of highway maintenance services and network condition. Hampshire County Council's overall position against its peer group remains largely unchanged from previous years, but the falling satisfaction figures show that service expectations are increasing, possibly as a result of changing societal behaviours in light of the covid pandemic. This is evident in the numbers of highway enquiries that the service receives which have shown a marked and sustained increase since 2020.
13. The County Council's highway maintenance strategy has, for many years, been asset management driven and this has ensured the allocated funding is routinely invested in the right areas of the network to provide the best value outcome, based on whole life costs. The July report commented that the condition of Hampshire's highway network was deteriorating at an increasingly rapid rate and the under-investment in highway maintenance at a national level has meant that the County Council has been unable to manage and slow the decline in the condition of the local highway network. Planned Maintenance activities, which are delivered by the Operation Resilience team, include larger-scale structural repairs such as carriageway resurfacing and reconstruction, structural drainage and footway resurfacing schemes remains effective, but this programme only addresses a small percentage of the network in any given year. Operation Resilience adopts a "prevention is better than cure" approach and any reduction in Planned Maintenance significantly increases the need for routine and reactive repairs, which are not cost-effective in the long run, increase carbon emissions and generate higher numbers of enquiries and claims. In recent years there has been a noticeable shift back towards more reactive maintenance due to the need for accelerated interventions due to the changing degradation profile. This is undesirable from a network management perspective where a higher proportion of the under-funded budget is spent on reactive repairs rather than long-term planned maintenance operations

14. Analysis of locally held highway asset management data has clearly shown that over the past decade the condition of Hampshire’s local road network has deteriorated. Table 1 provides an overview of the decline of the classified road network over a 4-year period.

Year	Percentage and lengths of carriageway requiring structural maintenance		Total length of road in need of structural maintenance
	A Roads	B & C Roads	
2016/17	3% (37km)	3.4% (97km)	134km
2020/21	4.8% (59km)	4.8%* (137km)	196km

Table 1 - Overview of Classified Road Carriageway Condition (\* average percentage for combined B & C roads)

15. Table 1 shows that the length of Hampshire’s classified road network (A, B and C class roads) requiring major structural maintenance has increased by 3.2% over a 4-year period, which equates to an additional 62km. It is important to emphasise that this only relates to the proportion of the classified network (approximately 38% of the total road network) in the worst condition and does not include the unclassified network or other highway assets.

16. The declining network has resulted in a maintenance backlog across all highway assets and the latest data for Hampshire estimates the cost to be in the region of £377million, as detailed below:

Carriageways	£240m
Footways	£38m
Structures	£78m
Traffic Signals	£21m
<b>Total</b>	<b>£377m</b>

17. As part of the County Council’s commitment to an asset management driven maintenance strategy, individual performance targets have been assigned for each highway asset category. For example, the department’s performance target of “Good” for the percentage of A-Road network in the red band, i.e. in need of structural repair, is between 3-5%. From Table 1 above the condition in 2016/17 was 3% and comfortably within the good target, in 2020/21 this has dropped to 4.8% and heading towards the “Fair” category, 6-7%.

18. The highway network condition data is also used for lifecycle planning purposes, which aims to predict how an asset will deteriorate over its life given a variety of treatment regimes. Those treatments can be costed so that

a theoretical annual budget for the most efficient regime can be derived. The combination of lifecycle planning and performance standards creates various investment models to suggest the best use of budget allocations and it is possible to assess what level of service will be achieved after a given level of investment or, conversely, calculate the investment needed to attain a certain level of service. Appendix B contains extracts from the department's cross asset analysis, which uses deterioration models to identify the level of funding required over a 15-year period to provide a condition outcome. The Performance Management Framework (PMF) banding categorises condition percentage requirements in terms of poor, fair, good and exceeding. As previously mentioned, the County Council's performance target is "Good" and Appendix B shows various investment scenarios for A, B, C and Unclassified roads and the condition outcome for maintaining current levels of spend, increasing or reducing spend, and also achieving a steady state. The change in road length refers to the additional length of network in need of structural repair. It is important to note that the values quoted do not take into account inflationary increases, therefore the actual figure is likely to be higher.

19. Table 2 provides a summary of all the highway assets included in Appendix B with details of their current annual investment values and the additional annual funding required per year to maintain their current levels of performance for a 15-year period.

Highway Asset	Current Performance Target (PMF)	Current Annual Investment	Additional Annual Investment to Maintain Performance Target	Total Additional Investment (over 15 years)
A Roads	Good	£4.6m	£1m	£15m
B Roads	Good	£2.6m	£1.7m	£25.5m
C Roads	Good	£6.9m	£3.5m	£52.5m
U Roads	Good	£10.2m	£8.1m	£121.5m
Footways	Good	£3.7m	£4.6m	£69m
Structures	Good	£4m	£9.05m	£135.75m
Traffic Signals etc.	Fair	£150k	£3.55m	£53.25m
<b>Totals</b>		<b>£32.15m</b>	<b>£31.5m</b>	<b>£472.5m</b>

Table 2 - summary of scenario planning for all assets, to maintain current performance targets over the next 15 years

20. From the data provided in Table 2 it is evident that annual funding for the highway assets will need to almost double to maintain their current state for the next 15 years. Given current funding levels and financial pressures at a national and local level, this is clearly an unrealistic expectation, therefore it is essential that the funding is invested in the right areas at the right time to achieve maximum benefit and value.
21. In October 2021 the government announced details of the Comprehensive Spending Review, where an indication was given that capital funding allocations from the Department for Transport (DfT) for highways maintenance in England would be £1.125billion (2021/22 allocation) for the next three financial years (2022/23, 2023/24 & 2024/25). In terms of capital budgets for Hampshire this equates to £45.3million for the next three financial years, although it should be noted that formal confirmation of this had still not been received from DfT when this report was prepared. The commitment to a longer-term funding allocation by the Government is welcome news and will help to provide stability, resilience, and better opportunities for asset management driven maintenance strategies although it is disappointing that it is still below the optimum level to reverse the declining trends from the last decade.
22. The UK Roads Liaison Group report models various investment scenarios for different levels of funding from the DfT. The model includes an investment scenario for £1.125billion and states that the backlog will be “unsustainable” and growing by c. £375million per annum. Network condition will continue to decline, which will be evident through bridge restrictions, flooding, more footway and carriageway defects and the continuation of “reactive management strategies”.
23. Decisions to cut funding for highway maintenance over the past decade have been led by central government rather than the County Council. Central government has tried to reduce the impact for local authorities by providing sporadic short-term funding allocations to deal with problems such as potholes and flooding. Whilst any additional funding is welcome, short-term funding injections do not provide the necessary long-term financial commitment to enable an asset management-driven maintenance strategy to be optimally followed. Short-term funding allocations increases demand across the industry and can create a scenario where local highway authorities are effectively competing with each other to secure additional resources from a limited supply pool. In recent years the County Council has acknowledged the cuts in funding and tried to mitigate the impact through additional investments of £10million per year for Operation Resilience activities. The additional £7million per year funding will provide higher confidence of achieving sustainable network stability and serviceability.
24. The construction industry is currently experiencing high levels of inflation, mainly for materials. The Hampshire Highways Service Contract (HHSC) contains annual price adjustment mechanisms that allow the contract prices to fluctuate in accordance with inflation measures, which are based on the consumer price index (CPI) and other construction inflation indices. Whilst the contract mechanism protects the County Council to some degree, the early

indications are that highway maintenance costs for a large proportion of capital funded maintenance works are likely to increase by at least 6% for 2022/23, with similar increases expected for the years ahead until the economic outlook stabilises. The 6% increase is not wholly reflective of the current market conditions. Inflation in the construction industry continues to be volatile and it is affecting different parts of the sector in different ways, so it is difficult to forecast the full impact. The duration of the current unstable situation is the subject of much debate across the construction sector, but the consensus seems to be that the financial instability and uncertainty will remain for several years. Compounding the inflationary pressures further are the impending increases to National Insurance contributions and changes to the legislation around the permitted use of red diesel, which will directly affect the highways service. From a forecasting perspective, if an indicative figure of 10% was applied to estimate the impact of inflation on DfT capital funded highway budgets it would result in a reduction in deliverable work of £4.5m in 2022/23 as the funding allocations from the DfT are fixed and therefore any inflationary increase is effectively a direct reduction in the amount of work that can be undertaken on the ground to maintain the network. Revenue budgets are relatively well protected with inflationary increases up to 2.5% and over 3.5% being covered by the County Council's corporate finances, leaving a potential reduction of up to 1% (£424k) for revenue funded work. Table 3 below provides an overview of the impact of a 10% reduction in capital budgets and a 1% reduction in revenue budgets. The total annual budget of £87.7m is effectively reduced by £4.95m. It should be noted that the 10% is **an indicative figure only** and the duration of increased inflation is unknown. However, as the construction industry inevitably stabilises in time the net amount of work undertaken on the ground could increase.

<b>Budget</b>	<b>2022/23 Budget Allocation</b>	<b>Impact of 10% inflation on Capital works</b>	<b>Impact of 1% inflation on Revenue</b>	<b>Total Reduction</b>
Capital (DfT)	£45.3m	-£4.53m	n/a	-£4.53m
Core Revenue	£35.4m	n/a	-£354k	-£354k
Additional Revenue	£7m	n/a	-£70k	-£70k
<b>Totals:</b>	<b>£87.7</b>	<b>-£4.53m</b>	<b>-£424k</b>	<b>-£4,954,000</b>

*Table 3 – Summary of the impact of inflation and other pressures on the highway budgets*

25. A key aim of the strategy is to reverse the trend for short-term reactive maintenance back to long-term planned maintenance. However, it is likely that the additional £7million will initially be used to fund additional revenue activity with, over time, an increasing proportion capitalised to increase funding for planned maintenance. Appendix A details the proposed strategy and includes

indicative TOTAL budget allocations for 5 years from 2022/23, aligned to the increase in Government funding. The additional £7m funding is available from 2022/23 with the flexibility for the Director of Economy, Transport and Environment to allocate this between Operation Resilience (Planned Maintenance) and reactive maintenance budgets as required.

26. It should be noted that revenue funded works will generally not improve the condition of the highway network structurally, although the additional spend in drainage cleansing and maintenance should help to reduce the incidence of flooding, which in turn should reduce structural defects such as potholes. The additional capitalised funding will provide additional support for structural repairs, i.e. more patching gangs and an enhanced Operation Resilience programme.
27. The funding will also be used to improve frontline staff capacity. Highway staff numbers have reduced by around a quarter since 2010. Whilst these measures were necessary to meet transformational savings targets it has put an unsustainable strain on the highways service in terms of customer service and managing the network on the ground, particularly during and after severe weather events. Highways is a resource intensive area and increasing the numbers of front-line and support staff will provide an improved customer service and much needed resilience for the delivery of all highway activities, and especially so in light of the increased funding provision.
28. The UK construction industry continues to struggle with the availability of operational resources, material supplies, HGV drivers and increased costs, and the uncertainty of this evolving situation could result in difficulties in obtaining the necessary operational resources to address and resolve the issues as quickly as desired. However, with surety over longer term funding the County Council will be in a much stronger position to commit to larger programmes of work that will undoubtedly be attractive to Milestone and its supply chain partners increasing the likelihood of securing key resources for extended periods. The Network Recovery Strategy in Appendix A outlines how the current risks and challenges will be managed and expected outcomes are:-
  - a. Faster response times to reported defects and incidents which, in turn, should yield a better customer experience with improved perception of the highways service.
  - b. Improved use of highway asset data to enable more efficient and effective targeted interventions.
  - c. A more proactive approach to highway maintenance.
29. The collaborative working relationship with the County Councils service provider, Milestone Infrastructure, remains strong and is an exemplar in the highways sector. This will be a vital element to maintaining and sustaining increased operational delivery, productivity, and efficiency across the highways service.

## **Consultation and Equalities**

30. Due to the nature of the approval sought for this report, limited consultation has been undertaken. However, Milestone Infrastructure has been closely involved in the formulation of the new strategy to ensure it is deliverable from a service providers perspective.
31. The decision sought in this report will not reduce the scope of the service provided or have any impact on the individuals working on the service or service users, so has been assessed as having a neutral impact on groups with protected characteristics. Approval is sought for service adjustments to accommodate and address current pressures and it is not anticipated that these proposals will have a direct impact on people with protected characteristics. Rather, they are intended to minimise disruption and improve service delivery to all residents and help maintain and/or improve highway safety.

## **Climate Change Impact Assessments**

32. Hampshire County Council utilises two decision-making tools to assess the carbon emissions and resilience of its projects and decisions. These tools provide a clear, robust, and transparent way of assessing how projects, policies and initiatives contribute towards the County Council's climate change targets of being carbon neutral and resilient to the impacts of a 2°C temperature rise by 2050. This process ensures that climate change considerations are built into everything the Authority does.

## **Climate Change Adaptation**

33. Adaptations will be made to reduce the highway network's vulnerability to climate change by reducing the impact of flooding on the highway caused by heavy rainfall. Carbon sequestration and biodiversity in highway verges will be increased through enhanced maintenance regimes. The investment in proactive planned maintenance activities will reduce the number of reactive repairs, which generate carbon emissions. Increased numbers of repairs also generate disruption and diversions to the travelling public. Expanding the use of the County Council's highway materials recycling facility at Micheldever will provide cold recycled materials for use in Hampshire's highway network, reducing the need for traditional materials that use quarried virgin aggregates, production processes using high temperature batching plants and can be transported significant distances by road.

## **Carbon Mitigation**

34. The carbon mitigation tool was not applicable because the decision relates to a programme of measures and is strategic in nature.

## **Conclusions**

35. The network recovery strategy is a 10-year plan and is intended to return Hampshire's highways into a position where the service can meet the increasing levels of service demand and also improve highway user perception. The current fluid nature of the industry makes it difficult to predict how long it will take to turn the tide and be in a position to return to proactively managing the highway network. However, the strategy will need to be regularly reviewed, ideally annually, in the context of the wider sector issues, and amended accordingly so that it remains flexible and agile to meet changing priorities.



**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> Hampshire Highways – Service Update	<u>Date</u> 29 July 2021

**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.)

<u>Document</u>	<u>Location</u>
None	

## **EQUALITIES IMPACT ASSESSMENT:**

### **1. 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 characteristic connected to that characteristic;
- Take steps to meet the needs of persons sharing a relevant protected characteristic 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 which participation by such persons is disproportionately low.

### **2. Equalities Impact Assessment:**

The decision sought in this report is for information purposes and will not change the scope of the service provided or have any impact on the individuals working on the service or service users, so has been assessed as having a neutral impact on groups with protected characteristics. Approval is sought for service adjustments to accommodate current pressures and it is not anticipated that these proposals will have a direct impact on people with protected characteristics. Rather, they are intended to minimise disruption to all residents arising from the current challenges and to help maintain highway safety.

## Appendix A

### Highway Network Recovery Strategy

#### Introduction

1. The Network Recovery Strategy aims to address the highway maintenance backlog in Hampshire and arrest degradation and depreciation across the network. Current levels of Planned Maintenance (Operation Resilience) replace less than 0.5% by area each year during which time the rate of deterioration greatly exceeds this level of replacement.
2. The optimal outcome of the Network Recovery Strategy is to recover the network to reach a sustainable steady state at a minimum cost. A key aim for the strategy is to move from an expensive, reactive maintenance regime to a more planned, proactive and affordable programme. As part of the strategy the annual spend between reactive and planned maintenance activities will be tracked to provide an overview of the anticipated shift over time.
3. To start to recover the network it is important to address two main areas:
  - (i) the longstanding maintenance backlog must be tackled in a targeted way. The maintenance backlog has been defined as the value of the work required to remove those areas requiring urgent interventions.
  - (ii) the natural year-on-year deterioration of the network. Deterioration occurs on the highway due to a number of reasons:
    - Ageing process. Oxidation of bituminous materials occurs over a period of time causing surfacing to become loose and eventually to break up.
    - Traffic Loading. Vehicles, especially heavy goods vehicles, have a detrimental effect on the carriageway, causing defects by wear or making existing defects worse.
    - Damage. This can be described as events that compromise the road surface. A good example would be poor utility reinstatements. Utility work needs to be rigorously policed in order maintain high standards of workmanship and materials.
    - Water, either standing on the highway or penetrating the underlying structure of the road, due to poor drainage and the increase in demand caused by the effects of climate change.

4. The Network Recovery Strategy will be delivered in conjunction with the recently reviewed network hierarchy which, subject to further analysis, will beneficially assist with prioritisation of network repairs over the life of the strategy, i.e. focus expenditure to those parts of the network most used and most important. The Strategy defines an approach for improving the overall condition of highway asset by the reintroduction of planned, preventative maintenance and cyclic maintenance and the extra highways funding will facilitate this.
5. By applying asset management condition analysis and experience in the right way, the deterioration of the highway network can be accurately mapped which can help to determine and drive priorities to manage the maintenance backlog, arrest the deterioration and return the road network to a steady-state condition that is sustainable going forward.
6. It is proposed to identify a comprehensive revenue and capital programme for the first year of the Strategy – 2022/23 - and then indicative programmes of work and target sites for the next four years. At year five the Strategy will be subject to a comprehensive review and, at the end of year ten, it is hoped that the deterioration can be arrested to such an extent that the value of the highway network can be maintained. The ultimate outcome for the Strategy is that it can be devised and delivered in such a way that the rate of improvement will exceed annual depreciation rate.

### **Service Improvement, Risk Management and Collaborative Working**

7. Working in close collaboration with Milestone Infrastructure, measures to manage and improve the service, and mitigate risks, will include such things as improving systems and processes, obtaining additional resources, prioritising work types to ensure the safety of the network is not compromised, exploring new innovations, whether new digital technologies or alternative products and materials, and investigating new ways to maximise existing assets such as the County Council's new highways materials recycling facility at Micheldever.

## Budget Allocations and Indicative Spend Areas 2022/23 to 2026/27

8. Indicative budget allocations for the financial years 2022/23 to 2026/27 are included in the table below, this includes Capital funding from the DfT, Revenue base budgets and the additional £7m Revenue budget.

Budget	Financial Years				
	2022/23	2023/24	2024/25	2025/26	2026/27
Capital (DfT)	£45.3m	£45.3m	£45.3m	£45.3m*	£45.3m*
Core Revenue	£35.4m	tbc	tbc	tbc	tbc
Additional Revenue	£7m	£7m	£7m	£7m	£7m
Total budget:	£87.7m				

\* The Capital (DfT) funding for these years is not confirmed and is based on previous allocations

9. The indicative spend for highway maintenance works for the 2022/23 financial year is outlined in the table below.

Work Type/Area	Works Budget		
	Capital (HCC & DfT) £m	Revenue (HCC) £m	
Operation Resilience (Planned Maintenance)	£29.7	0	
Routine & Reactive Maintenance	£5.1	£5.5	
Cyclical Maintenance	0	£5.1	
Winter Maintenance	0	£5.9	
Arboriculture	0	£0.9	
Structures	£4	£0.6	
Intelligent Transport Systems	£0.7	£1.7	
Street Lighting	0	£11.9	
Street Works Coordination	0	£0.1	
Miscellaneous	£5.8	£3.7	
Additional £7m outlined in paragraph 10	£3.5	£2.5	
<b>Totals:</b>	<b>£48.8m</b>	<b>£37.9m</b>	<b>£86.7m*</b>

\* the table above excludes the £1m revenue funding for staff from the additional £7m

10. The indicative areas of spend for the additional £7m in 2022/23 are included in the next table. It is acknowledged that the work types shown include a large proportion of revenue funded activity, but it is anticipated that this will gradually change, over time, to a larger proportion being capital maintenance. The County Council approval included flexibility for the Director of Economy,

Transport and Environment to allocate this between Operation Resilience (Planned Maintenance) and reactive maintenance budgets as required. Therefore, the areas of spend and proportions of revenue and capital will change for subsequent years, subject to service requirements:

<b>Work Type</b>	<b>Allocation</b>
Routine reactive (pothole) repairs, footway siding out, sign cleaning, localised drainage repairs and vegetation clearance	£1.1m
Rural grass cutting – increase quantities of the full width verge cutback, expand the trial of cut and collect arising from verges and further trials of re-wilding verge areas	£0.4m
Weed control – increase more localised additional treatments and undertake trials of alternatives to herbicide treatments	£0.1m
High performance reinstatements around carriageway ironwork	£0.2m
Drainage – additional routine maintenance and cleansing of drainage assets. Additional grip cutting and ditch clearance	£1.8m
Carriageway and footway defect repairs and patching	£2.4m
Delivery resources (staff)	£1m
<b>Total</b>	<b>£7m</b>

Indicative spend for the additional £7m for 2022/23

11. The funding will provide additional resources to undertake repairs that typically generate a high number of customer enquiries such as pothole repairs, overgrown vegetation, gully cleansing and obscured traffic signs.
12. Additional targeted rural grass cutting will be undertaken, with a full cutback of all highway verges being undertaken each year. In conjunction with this, the current cut-and-collect trials will be expanded along with further trials of re-wilding highway verges. These measures have been developed in consultation with the conservation charity Plantlife to increase biodiversity and carbon sequestration in Hampshire’s highway verges.
13. Weed growth on the highway is an area that generates high volumes of enquiries. The funding will be used to undertake additional weed control treatments to targeted areas. Trials of alternative treatment methods will be undertaken with a view to finding a replacement to the herbicides currently used.
14. The increased funding provision will provide additional resources to undertake first-time permanent repairs to carriageway and footway defects such as potholes and loose paving slabs. This will include specialist treatments such as high-performance repairs around chamber covers and drainage gullies in the carriageway, which take a significant impact on the higher trafficked network and can lead to repeated failures. The increase in resources will enable more proactive routine repairs to be undertaken and arrest the deterioration of the network. This will also reduce the number of public enquiries, reactive repairs and damage claims.

15. Highway drainage will be reviewed and reprioritised with the additional funding through a variety of measures. Additional cleansing frequencies for drainage assets such as gullies and soakaways will be undertaken, and additional resources will be provided for rural areas including additional grip cutting (intercepting ditches) and ditch clearance. The investment in additional drainage maintenance will help Hampshire's adaption to manage and mitigate the effects of climate change such as increased rainfall and storm events. Improvements to highway drainage systems will reduce surface water flooding which is a major contributor to highway defects such as potholes, and claims.

## Appendix B

### Cross Asset Investment Planning

#### A Road Summary

#### PMF Banding

Percentage of the network in the Red 'Road Condition Index' (RCI) band. RCI is a DfT measure of road condition.

Poor	Fair	Good	Exceeding
>7% Red	6-7% Red	3-5% Red	<3% Red

A Scenarios	Annual Investment	Change in Investment	Total Investment	Current Condition	Condition Outcome	Condition Change	Current Red Length (km)	Outcome Red Length (km)	Change in Red Length (km)
1 – Current Spend	£4.6m	-	£69m	4.8%	7.1%	2.3	32	48	16
2 – £250k reduction	£4.35m	-£250,000	£65.25m	4.8%	7.7%	2.9	32	52	20
3 – £250k increase	£4.95m	+£250,000	£72.75m	4.8%	6.5%	1.7	32	44	12
4 – £500k increase	£5.1m	+£500,000	£76.5m	4.8%	6%	1.2	32	41	9
5 – Steady State	£5.6m	+£1m	£84m	4.8%	4.8%	0	32	32	0



## B Road Summary

### PMF Banding

Percentage of the network in the Red 'Road Condition Index' (RCI) band. RCI is a DfT measure of road condition.

Poor	Fair	Good	Exceeding
>8% Red	6-8% Red	3-5% Red	<3% Red

B Scenarios	Annual Investment	Change in Investment	Total Investment	Current Condition	Condition Outcome	Condition Change	Current Red Length (km)	Outcome Red Length (km)	Change in Red Length (km)
1 – Current Spend	£2.6m	-	£39m	5.2%	9.5%	4.3	30	55	25
2 – £250k reduction	£2.35m	-£250,000	£35.25m	5.2%	10.3%	5.1	30	59	29
3 - £250k increase	£2.85m	+£250,000	£42.7m	5.2%	8.7%	3.5	30	50	20
4 – £500k increase	£3.1m	+£500,000	£46.5m	5.2%	8%	2.8	30	47	17
5 – Steady State	£4.3m	+£1.7m	£64.5m	5.2%	5.2%	0	30	30	0

## C Road Summary

### PMF Banding

Percentage of the network in the Red 'Road Condition Index' (RCI) band. RCI is a DfT measure of road condition.

Poor	Fair	Good	Exceeding
>9% Red	6-9% Red	3-5% Red	<3% Red

C Scenarios	Annual Investment	Change in Investment	Total Investment	Current Condition	Condition Outcome	Condition Change	Current Red Length (km)	Outcome Red Length (km)	Change in Red Length (km)
1 – Current Spend	£6.9m	-	£103.5m	4.5%	8.3%	3.8	92	169	77
2 – £750k reduction	£6.15m	-£750,000	£92.25m	4.5%	9.3%	4.8	92	189	97
3 – £500k reduction	£6.4m	-£500,000	£96m	4.5%	9%	4.5	92	183	90
4 – £250k reduction	£6.65m	-£250,000	£99.75m	4.5%	8.7%	4.2	92	176	84
5 – £500k increase	£7.4m	+£500,000	£111m	4.5%	7.8%	3.3	92	158	56
6 – Steady State	£10.4m	+£3.5m	£156m	4.5%	4.5%	0	92	92	0

## U Road Summary

### PMF Banding

Percentage of the network in the Red 'Road Condition Index' (RCI) band.

Poor	Fair	Good	Exceeding
>9%	7-9%	3-7%	<3%

U Scenarios	Annual Investment	Change in Investment	Total Investment	Current Condition	Condition Outcome	Condition Change	Current Red Length (km)	Outcome Red Length (km)	Change in Red Length (km)
1 – Current Spend	£10.2m	-	£153m	5%	8.4%	3.4	236	409	173
2 – £750k reduction	£9.45m	-£750,000	£141.75	5%	9%	4	236	430	194
3 – £500k reduction	£9.7m	-£500,000	£145.5m	5%	8.7%	3.7	236	424	188
4 – £250k reduction	£9.95m	-£250,000	£149.25m	5%	8.6%	3.6	236	417	181
5 – £500k increase	£10.7m	+£500,000	£160.5	5%	8.1%	3.1	236	397	161
6 – Steady State	£18.3m	+£8.1m	£274.5m	5%	5%	0	236	236	0

## Footway Summary

The PMF banding is based on the percentage of the footway network in the resurfacing band.

Poor	Fair	Good	Exceeding
>25%	20 - 25%	10 - 20%	<10%

Scenario	Annual Investment	Change in Investment	Total Investment	Current Condition	Condition Outcome	Condition Change	Current Red Length (km)	Outcome Red Length (km)	Change in Red Length (km)
1 – Current Spend	£3.7m	-	£55.5m	10.5%	25.40%	14.9	634	1,534	900
2 – £500k reduction	£3.2m	-£500k	£48m	10.5%	27.20%	16.7	634	1,642	1,008
3 – £250k reduction	£3.45m	-£250k	£51.75m	10.5%	26.30%	15.8	634	1,588	954
4 – £250k increase	£3.95m	+£250k	£59.25m	10.5%	25%	14.1	634	1,485	851
5 – £500k increase	£4.2m	+£500k	£63m	10.5%	23.70%	13.2	634	1,431	797
6 – Steady State	£8.3m	+£4.6m	£124.5m	10.5%	10.50%	0	634	634	0

## Structures Summary

### PMF Targets

The structures PMF target is based on the Structures Stock Condition Index score and maintaining this within the good band overall

Condition	Poor, Very Poor or Substandard	Fair	Good Condition	Very Good
SSCI Range	0 - 65	65 - 80	80 - 90	90 - 100

Scenarios	Annual Investment	Change in Investment	Total Investment	Current Condition	Condition Outcome	Condition Change	No of bridges V good	No of bridges Good	No of bridges Fair	No of bridges Poor or V Poor	Backlog
1 – Current Spend	£4.0m	-	£60m	84.5	70.97	-13.53	34	241	781	662	£213,238,905
2 – PMF into poor band	£1.5m	-£2.5m	£22.5m	84.5	65	-19.5	18	180	731	789	£257,775,870
3 – £500k reduction	£3.5m	-£500,000	£52.5m	84.5	69.64	-14.86	30	215	785	688	£225,948,734
4 – £250k reduction	£3.75m	-£250,000	£56.25m	84.5	70.22	-14.28	30	220	783	685	£218,560,978
5 – £250k increase	£4.25m	+£250,000	£63.75m	84.5	71.15	-13.35	35	239	800	644	£207,850,502
6 – £500k increase	£4.5m	+£500,000	£67.5m	84.5	71.85	-12.65	31	240	806	641	£201,195,989
7 – Remain in good band	£9.25m	+£5.25m	£138.75m	84.5	80.19	-4.31	73	585	835	225	£109,253,937
8 – Steady State	£13.05m	+£9.05m	£195.75m	84.5	84.5	0	215	1024	463	16	£39,484,444

## ITS Summary

The PMF indicators are the percentage of assets in the poor band.

Poor	Fair	Good	Exceeding
>10%	5-9%	2-4%	1%

Scenarios	Annual Investment	Change in Investment	Total Investment	Current Condition	Condition Outcome	Condition Change	No of ITS Assets V Good	No of ITS Assets Good	No of ITS Assets Fair	No of ITS Assets Poor or V Poor	Backlog
1 – Current Spend	£150k	-	£2.25m	8	47%	41	12	304	300	539	£45,000,000
2 – £250k increase	£400k	+£250,000	£6m	8	44%	38	44	311	290	510	£43,000,000
3 – £500k increase	£650k	+£500,000	£9.75m	8	42%	36	66	318	283	488	£41,000,000
4 – £1m increase	£1.15m	+£1m	£17.25m	8	37%	31	108	346	271	430	£36,000,000
5 – Remain in Fair	£3.3m	+£3.15m	£49.5m	8	9%	3	335	424	291	105	£18,000,000
6 – Steady State	£3.7m	+£3.55m	£55.5m	8	8%	0	353	439	288	75	£15,000,000

## HAMPSHIRE COUNTY COUNCIL

### Report

<b>Committee:</b>	Economy, Transport & Environment Select Committee
<b>Date:</b>	10 March 2022
<b>Title:</b>	Parking - Service Consolidation Efficiencies
<b>Report From:</b>	Director of Economy, Transport and Environment

**Contact name:** Adrian Gray

**Tel:** 0300 555 1388

**Email:** adrian.gray@hants.gov.uk

#### Purpose of Report

1. For the Economy, Transport & Environment Select Committee to pre-scrutinise the proposals for serving notice on the remaining Traffic Management and Civil Parking Enforcement district agency agreements (see report attached due to be considered at the decision day of the Executive Lead Member for Economy, Transport and Environment, Executive Member for Highways Operations and Executive Member for Climate Change and Sustainability at 2.00pm on 10 March 2022).

#### Recommendation

2. That the Economy, Transport and Environment Select Committee:

Either:

Supports the recommendations being proposed to the Executive Member for Highways Operations in sections 2 and 3 of the attached report.

Or:

Agrees any alternative recommendations to the Executive Member for Highways Operations, with regards to the proposals set out in the attached report.

This page is intentionally left blank

# HAMPSHIRE COUNTY COUNCIL

## Decision Report

<b>Decision Maker:</b>	Executive Member for Highways Operations
<b>Date:</b>	10 March 2022
<b>Title:</b>	Parking - Service Consolidation Efficiencies
<b>Report From:</b>	Director of Economy, Transport and Environment

**Contact name:** Adrian Gray

**Tel:** 0300 555 1388

**Email:** adrian.gray@hants.gov.uk

### Purpose of this Report

1. The purpose of this report is to seek approval to serve notice on the remaining Traffic Management and Civil Parking Enforcement district agency agreements.

### Recommendations

2. That the Executive Member for Highways Operations approves the termination of current district/borough council agency arrangements for Traffic Management and for Civil Parking Enforcement, with alternative arrangements for a traffic management and civil parking enforcement service put in place to provide a consistent countywide service in accordance with County Council policy objectives.
3. That the Executive Member for Highways Operations delegates authority to the Director of Economy, Transport and Environment, in consultation with the Head of Legal Services, to make any necessary arrangements to terminate the agency agreements for Civil Parking Enforcement and Traffic Management.

### Executive Summary

4. This paper seeks to provide an update on work to develop the County Council's on-street parking service and recommends ending the remaining district/borough council agency arrangements for Traffic Management and for Civil Parking Enforcement for the seven districts and boroughs (Winchester, Havant, East Hampshire, Rushmoor, Hart, Basingstoke & Deane and Eastleigh) that currently operate on-street parking on the County Council's behalf.
5. A fundamental requirement for the parking service is to ensure that it operates on a full cost recovery basis with all associated expenditure covered by income to minimise the need to draw funding away from essential highways activity to meet any shortfall. The County Council's new directly managed parking service is shown to be more efficient than the district delivery model and a decision to serve notice on the district/borough council agency arrangements is now appropriate.

6. Ending the current agency arrangements and creating a single countywide service for traffic management and for civil parking enforcement will enable the County Council to integrate these functions within the wider highways service and deliver a consistent countywide service in accordance with County Council policy objectives. It will also enable the County Council to prepare for anticipated new moving traffic enforcement powers due to be granted under Part 6 of the Traffic Management Act 2004.
7. Bringing together a full directly managed on-street parking service across Hampshire will enable the County Council to create a centre of excellence for enforcement, providing a resilient, cost-effective, and highly efficient service, with anticipated new enforcement powers for moving traffic offences.

### **Contextual information**

8. Six previous reports for the T19 Parking Project have been considered by the Executive Member for Economy Transport and Environment at meetings held in November 2017, June 2018, October 2018, March 2019, October 2020, and on 17 June 2021.
9. The on-street parking project was one of the department's key projects in meeting its Transformation to 2019 savings targets. Whilst research, market testing, and an independent review of the service showed a directly controlled on-street parking enforcement service, outsourced to a specialist service provider, to be the most cost-effective model, the County Council recognised that the function had been run by the district councils on the County Council's behalf for some years. Therefore, seven districts (Winchester, Havant, East Hampshire, Rushmoor, Hart, Basingstoke & Deane and Eastleigh) were given the opportunity to enter into updated agreements aimed at delivering a more modern and efficient service to consistent standards on a full cost recovery basis. The new district agreements came into effect as of 1 April 2020.
10. A fundamental requirement for the parking service is to ensure that it operates on a full cost recovery basis with all associated expenditure covered by income from Penalty Charge Notices (PCNs), residential parking permit income and revenue from on-street chargeable parking. Under the current agency model, this includes a share of surplus parking income generated by the various district councils, with income first offsetting those district councils' direct costs such as enforcement and then shared equally to meet authorities' related maintenance costs and associated overheads.
11. In July 2021, RTA Associates were commissioned by the County Council to review civil parking enforcement of on-street parking in Hampshire. RTA Associates has worked with the County Council since 1998 on a wide range of parking matters, including assisting in the original implementation of Decriminalised parking. The RTA review has analysed financial information for the seven district agencies and compared this with the in-house service to aid comparisons in costs of service delivery and to highlight where savings have been made.
12. The Covid-19 pandemic is acknowledged to have reduced parking revenue, particularly through PCNs and chargeable parking revenue, but reported district expenditure for the on-street service remains high, meaning that the County



Council's associated costs for activities such as maintaining parking signs and lining, still cannot be recovered.

13. It is clear that individual district council run parking teams are costly and make achieving savings through efficiencies more difficult. Separate parking management and frontline enforcement teams, parking management software, vehicles, uniforms, equipment, and residential permit management systems are all costly to operate when duplicated by the districts.
14. The condition of Hampshire's highway network is deteriorating at an increasingly rapid rate due to historic under-investment in highway maintenance at a national level. There is a demonstrable decline in the public perception of highway maintenance services and network condition, evidenced in increased numbers of highway enquiries since 2020. An additional annual £7m of new funding is being provided by the County Council to slow the decline in the condition of the local highway network, and the Hampshire Highways – Highway Network Recovery Strategy sets out how this money will be prioritised. Notwithstanding this additional funding, given continuing financial pressures, it is essential that the limited funding available is invested in the right areas.
15. The County Council's highway maintenance strategy seeks to allocate funding in the right areas of the network to provide the best value outcome. Part of this approach is to minimise drawing funding away from highways maintenance to fund other activities. Ending agency arrangements for traffic management and for civil parking enforcement will provide the County Council with the best opportunity to deliver a countywide on-street parking service on a full cost recovery basis and avoid drawing funding away from essential highways activity to meet the shortfall.
16. An expanded County Council directly managed parking service, using one contractor to provide the on-street enforcement across the County, will provide greater flexibility and better purchasing power through bulk orders, and will also provide the opportunity to better fund and manage the Highway network, providing the County Council with the best opportunity to deliver a modern, consistent, and sustainable on-street parking service on a full cost recovery basis.
17. The County Council is also aware that the Department for Transport is currently developing the policy detail to support the implementation of the remaining Traffic Management Act - Part 6 powers, which will enable highway authorities to enforce additional moving traffic offences such as banned turns and yellow box markings. The County Council welcomes this further devolution of powers and considers that a countywide traffic enforcement team will ensure the greatest benefit to Hampshire residents.
18. The County Council's 2050 Commission of Inquiry established a vision to achieve better outcomes for the economy, environment, and society. Transport contributes to all these outcomes. The new LTP (LTP4) describes our transport vision for 2050 and proposes a major shift in approach and emphasis, with an increased focus on policies which support modal shift and manage demand for road space. Effective enforcement of traffic regulations will be a key enabling activity to support this work.
19. The County Council has signed up to the Climate Emergency and set carbon neutrality targets for 2050. Achieving carbon neutrality from transport will require

transformational change to decarbonise the transport system and to promote greener and sustainable forms of transport. Effective enforcement of traffic regulations will be key to supporting this shift.

20. The proposal is to terminate agency arrangements for both Traffic Management and for Civil Parking Enforcement as the traffic management agency function primarily supports the on-street parking service by facilitating the implementation or amendment of new or existing parking controls. In the future, the traffic management function for a countywide enforcement team will include enforceable moving traffic offences permitted within the Traffic Management Act - Part 6 powers as well as existing bus lane contraventions. This supports the policy aims associated with LTP4 and climate change.
21. Bringing together a full directly managed on-street parking service across Hampshire will enable the County Council to create a centre of excellence for enforcement, providing a resilient, cost-effective, and highly efficient service, with anticipated new enforcement powers for moving traffic offences, and utilising linked resources across this broad range of highway enforcement activity.
22. The County Council's Parking Services contractor, NSL, is the largest parking enforcement specialist provider in the UK. NSL currently employ over 4,000 frontline staff and operate from over 250 UK bases with contracts in place with over 60 UK councils. The Hampshire Parking Services contract was set up to be scalable with the ability of becoming a countywide on-street service.
23. The consolidation efficiencies achievable with a directly managed parking service can also contribute to the Savings Programme 2023 and beyond.
24. A report recommending ending agency arrangements was scheduled for the September 2021 Decision Day, but was deferred to allow time for engagement with affected district and borough councils.
25. Subsequent discussions with affected district and borough councils took place in October and November 2021 regarding ending agency arrangements. The change is limited to service delivery and will not affect policy in respect of on-street parking and related traffic management. The current agency arrangement for civil parking enforcement and for traffic management is not a devolved service, and there is no change in the policy arrangements in ending agency arrangements, which have always been for the County Council to determine.
26. Consideration has been given to staff who are currently employed by the district and borough councils being transferred over to the County Council under TUPE (Transfer of Undertakings (Protection of Employment)) or equivalent means. Discussions have taken place but cannot continue until notice is served to end the agency arrangements, but TUPE is anticipated to apply for district council staff affected by ending the current agency arrangements, with details to be worked through as part of the termination process.
27. If the recommendation to end the current agency arrangements is approved, notice of this change would be issued in March 2022 allowing time to address TUPE requirements.
28. It is estimated that a maximum of 25 staff would be affected.

## **Finance**

29. The RTA review shows a number of the district agencies report very high levels of expenditure compared to the in-house service to provide equivalent on-street services. It is clear from the annual financial returns from the agents that there are costs included in the returns that are not compatible with the scale of the service provision. The impact of the Covid-19 pandemic on parking services should be recognised, but whilst a reduction in parking revenue, particularly from PCNs and Pay and Display income is to be expected, this would not have had a significant impact on the expenditure to operate the service, with district costs remaining consistently high.
30. Whilst it may be possible for the district agents to reduce their operational expenditure, they will always be constrained by their need to operate individual district-based enforcement services with all the associated duplication of resources and equipment. Centralising the service would remove the need for duplicated costs across individual districts, and a single countywide parking service is the most cost-effective solution by some margin.
31. The anticipated costs of TUPE have been considered in assessing the overall financial position. A total of approximately £230,000 currently paid to the district and borough councils per annum for traffic management agency staffing, which would be used to offset staff cost, with the remainder, including the cost of back-office parking support staff, met from income and charges.
32. The continuing work to modernise the on-street parking service in Hampshire will enable the service to operate on a full cost recovery basis, removing the need to draw on limited highways maintenance funding, which is increasingly prioritised for essential safety repairs.
33. The creation of a single countywide traffic enforcement team will ensure the County Council is able to enforce moving traffic violations permitted within Traffic Management Act - Part 6 powers in the most cost-effective way, providing the greatest benefit to Hampshire residents.
34. Camera enforcement of traffic violations is generally very effective in eradicating contraventions once people understand that the regulation is enforced through fines. Revenue funding would therefore be required to support traffic enforcement activity. Creating a single, countywide traffic enforcement team, together with continuing work to modernise the on-street parking service in Hampshire, will minimise the revenue support required.

## **Performance**

35. Bringing together a single countywide team aims to create a centre of excellence to provide the best possible service to customers, within the County Council's policies and priorities, with the capability and capacity to provide a consistent standard of service across Hampshire.
36. A directly managed service will enable the strategic development of the on-street parking regulation service to deliver wider transport policy and climate change outcomes and to align traffic enforcement with other highways enforcement functions.

37. Future enforcement activity may be prioritised using data drawn from multiple sources, including other highway activity. This will enable targeted enforcement in market towns and smaller villages and where seasonal parking contraventions cause problems. The enforcement resource is flexible with staff able to adapt to cover multiple areas or later evening enforcement when needed.
38. Whilst it is recognised that the district and borough councils have looked to reduce their service expenditure, the inefficiency of operating seven individual parking teams with duplication of the associated management, software, uniforms, vehicles and systems means that their scope for further savings will be difficult.
39. The economies and efficiencies from a single countywide service, delivered in partnership with the authority's Parking Service contractor NSL, will enable the service to be financially self-sufficient, including meeting the full costs of all associated functions and management overhead.
40. It is anticipated that a single countywide service will deliver IT efficiencies, with a single IT solution for things like residents parking permits. It will also ensure a consistent deployment of new technology for parking information, payment and enforcement across Hampshire.

### **Consultation and Equalities**

41. It is considered that the proposal to end agency arrangements for civil parking enforcement and for traffic management would have a neutral impact on protected groups as existing service delivery would be unaffected. Any changes to traffic regulations are subject to the Traffic Order process and therefore formal consultation will be undertaken on a scheme specific basis.
42. Meetings were held with affected district and borough councils to discuss the withdrawal process as set out in the agency agreement documents and to identify issues requiring further dialogue over the notice period for ending the agency arrangements. Concerns raised included impact on efficiency, on staff, residents, and communities. These and other issues, together with the County Council's response, are set out in the appendix.

### **Climate Change Impact Assessments**

43. Hampshire County Council utilises two decision-making tools to assess the carbon emissions and resilience of its projects and decisions. These tools provide a clear, robust, and transparent way of assessing how projects, policies and initiatives contribute towards the County Council's climate change targets of being carbon neutral and resilient to the impacts of a 2°C temperature rise by 2050. This process ensures that climate change considerations are built into everything the Authority does.

### **Climate Change Adaptation**

44. The climate change mitigation tool was not applicable to the proposed changes to the agency arrangements because this relates to a change in the service

delivery model. Proposals for new areas of pay-and-display on-street parking in affected district/borough council areas will be subject to individual assessments.

### **Climate Change Mitigation**

45. The effective enforcement of parking and other traffic regulations is important in supporting strategic transport policy, including achieving transport-related climate change outcomes.

### **Conclusions**

46. A fundamental requirement for the parking service is to ensure that it operates on a full cost recovery basis and action is required now to secure the most cost-effective service for the longer term and avoid drawing funding away from essential highways activity to meet the shortfall.
47. The new directly managed parking service is more efficient than the district delivery model and it is now appropriate to serve notice to end the agency arrangements for Traffic Management and for Civil Parking Enforcement.
48. Creating a single directly managed, on-street parking service will also enable the County Council to prepare for anticipated new moving traffic enforcement powers in accordance with County Council policy objectives.

**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

**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:**

### **1. 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 characteristic connected to that characteristic;
- Take steps to meet the needs of persons sharing a relevant protected characteristic 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 which participation by such persons is disproportionately low.

### **2. Equalities Impact Assessment:**

It is considered that the proposal to end agency arrangements for civil parking enforcement and for traffic management would have a neutral impact on protected groups as existing service delivery would be unaffected. Any changes to traffic regulations are subject to the Traffic Order process and therefore formal consultation will be undertaken on a scheme specific basis.

Should TUPE requirements arise from the withdrawal of the agreements, all appropriate HR and Legal processes will be followed, including engagement with affected staff.

This page is intentionally left blank



## **APPENDIX 1 – Summary of issues raised by affected district and borough councils**

### **Lack of opportunity to put forward alternative proposals**

1. A number of district and borough councils felt that they were not being given an opportunity to consider how they might contribute to the County Council's costs associated with on-street parking controls. They felt that terminating the agency agreements had not tried to find another way, such as setting a maximum sum for district costs for on-street parking enforcement.

The County Council's response

2. While some district and borough councils have made some progress in reducing their operational deficits, the district agency model is unable to reimburse the County Council for its associated costs including maintaining signs and lining and contributing towards the expenditure of running the district agencies.
3. While it may be possible for district and borough councils to contribute directly to the County Council's costs by increasing parking charges, this could cover where savings and efficiencies are achievable with a single countywide service, potentially losing the opportunity for the most cost-effective service.
4. Whilst the service changes are relatively new in Hampshire, the majority of County Councils in England are either delivering on-street enforcement directly themselves or via a partnership arrangement with a specialist service provider.

### **Loss of efficiency**

5. Concerns were raised that the proposals could lead to less efficient local parking enforcement as the district and borough council services do not differentiate between on and off-street enforcement, undertaking both as part of enforcement beats. The current district agency model for on-street enforcement is provided at a nil cost to the County Council. By terminating the agreements, the cost will transfer to the County Council and is likely to outweigh any financial gain from perceived efficiencies arising from a single countywide on-street parking enforcement service.

The County Council's response

6. The County Council developed a directly managed, modernised on-street parking service as part of the Transformation to 2019 savings proposals, delivering the on-street parking service across Fareham, Gosport, New Forest and Test Valley. The new directly managed parking service is shown to be more efficient than the district delivery model.
7. The proposals will deliver efficiencies in countywide on-street parking enforcement and help the authority recover its associated full costs. It is vital that the County Council is able to deliver services on a full cost recovery basis and

the district agency model does not facilitate this. Looking ahead it is very important that on-street parking does not continue to draw funding away from our limited highway budgets. Any impact on district and borough council's off-street parking service will be limited.

### **Impact on customers**

8. From the customer's perspective, it is not clear which services are provided by the County Council and which are delivered locally by district and borough councils. The apparent duplication between on-street and off-street parking enforcement is likely to appear to residents and businesses as inefficient.
9. A concern has been raised about the potential financial incentivisation for a private sector operator to issue large numbers of PCNs to increase income.
10. Rural areas will be unlikely to receive the same quality of service compared with urban areas as enforcement activities will be concentrated on areas of high traffic and contravention of regulations.
11. Specific concerns were raised about customer expectations not being met for traffic management, with district and borough councils more able to be responsive to local community needs, with local consultation.
12. The County Council's response
13. Similar concerns were expressed prior to ending the agency arrangements in Fareham, New Forest and Test Valley, but experience in practice has shown that these issues do not generally arise. Those who receive a PCN, whether on-street or within car parks, are provided with full details of the issuing authority together with payment and appeal details. The County Council's website has a dedicated parking page that provides extensive information and facilitates a range of functions from payment of PCNs through to purchasing parking permits.
14. The Parking Services contract is based on paid enforcement hours, not PCNs issued, with extensive use of parking technology, such as digital permit systems, to help drive down costs.
15. Whilst it would be expected that the main focus of enforcement activity will be directed to those areas with the most problems, the Parking Services contract includes Key Performance Indicators (KPIs) requiring CEOs to regularly patrol all parking controls.
16. With regard to the specific concern in respect of local traffic management, this will not necessarily be affected as many traffic management functions are not included in the existing agency agreements.

### **Impact on communities**

17. Concerns were raised that in moving to data led deployment of on-street parking enforcement, the County Council would not be able to provide genuinely local

service, undermining community relationships built up over time and leading to reputational damage for both parties. It was felt that, from the local perspective, there would be no benefit in moving to a single, countywide service where the ability to deploy local resources in response to problems could be lost because the number of districts competing for resources will increase.

18. While there was support for the wider policy outcomes, there were also concerns about the impact of a high-level policy led service on nuanced local issues, with a need to ensure meaningful consultation with district and borough councils and recognise the importance of engaging with local communities in constructive dialogue, including reviewing potential options and opportunities that may improve services to residents.
19. Concerns were raised about the impact on local communities and a potential loss of investment in local projects currently provided by district councils, but which the County Council may not necessarily provide in the future.

#### The County Council's response

20. Similar concerns were raised by the district and borough councils in the four areas that the County Council now controls, but such issues have not arisen. The County Council is the sole client for the Parking Services contract and there will be no issue over districts competing for resources. The County Council determines all aspects of the service including the hours of enforcement, priority locations and the policies to which CEOs work to, with contract performance monitored through a range of KPIs. By having complete focus on the on-street service, the County Council is able to flex and adapt frontline resources to deal with demand as necessary, directing a pool of scalable resources to target parking hotspots as and when they arise without resourcing constraints or being tied to district boundaries.
21. The County Council can respond to local issues either reported to CEOs or via the automated enforcement request system whereby residents can report issues themselves via the simple online form.
22. Local complexity in particular parking controls, including resident parking permit schemes, will need to be worked through in detail to understand how the transition will work in practice, and whether any changes to current arrangements are required.
23. With regard to the concern in respect a potential loss of investment in local projects currently provided by district councils, the proposal only relates to ending agency arrangements for civil parking enforcement and for traffic management. Nothing in this proposal limits collaborative working on locally important projects where funding is prioritised for traffic management and parking controls.

#### **Impact on staff**

24. All districts and borough councils noted the impact on staff and wanted early clarification on staff transfer, roles and responsibilities in the new County Council team. Clarification would also be required for the transfer of asset.
25. Some district and borough councils expressed a concern that the resources needed to run the service had been underestimated, with the scope for savings exaggerated.

#### The County Council's response

26. Formal discussions on staff transition cannot commence before serving notice to terminate the agency agreements. The County Council will work with district and borough council colleagues to provide the desired clarity on the staff transition arrangements.
27. Should TUPE requirements arise from the withdrawal of the agreements, all appropriate HR and Legal processes will be followed, including engagement with affected staff.
28. The County Council will also work with district and borough council colleagues on the transition of parking assets.
29. Efficiencies will accrue from economies of scale and not necessarily through reducing resourcing across each district. It is recognised that each district/borough is different and has different demands.

#### **Loss of local ambassadorial role of Civil Enforcement Officers**

30. Some district and borough councils cited the added ambassadorial role of CEOs in signposting local services and felt that integrating on and off-street enforcement in CEO beats enhanced this added ambassadorial role.
31. The County Council's response
32. This ambassadorial role is equally or more applicable to other highways functions such as reporting potholes or defective street lighting, and to wider County Council functions.

#### **How civic events will be managed in the future**

33. Some district and borough councils asked how civic events will be managed in the future, noting that they currently manage these events in-house. They were concerned that while they will retain powers to close roads under the Town and Police Clauses Act, they may not be able to sustain the technical resource in the future if the responsibility for processing other temporary Traffic Regulation Orders transfers to the County Council. There was also a concern about coordinating parking related suspensions as it will no longer be one internal team.

34. A number of district and borough councils identified examples of civic events where an increased CEO presence has been helpful, and which has been straightforward to arrange as a district delivered service. Concerns were raised about how these events might be supported in the future, particularly around costs and availability of resource

The County Council's response

35. While there would not be scope for CEOs to act as marshals for civic events, where there are enforceable parking restrictions for CEOs to patrol and/or parking suspensions to be administered, then there may be scope to assist.
36. Where there will be an impact on managing major events e.g., traffic management involvement with the Safety Advisory Group (SAG), then this will be provided by the County Council's Highways Service in addition to their current role in the SAG.
37. Where there are local concerns about a smaller event's impact on a community, such as school parents' evenings etc, then the County Council's Parking Service can provide sensitive management of traffic and parking to support this.
38. Support for planning significant civic events and coordinating associated road closures and parking suspensions can be provided subject to local funding.

#### **Future collaborative management of on and off-street parking**

39. A number of district and borough councils feel that in implementing the countywide service, the County Council should give consideration to the role of parking in achieving policy objectives at a local level, specifically how the County Council proposes to engage with partners on this and also provide an appropriate degree of responsiveness to local issues. District and borough councils wanted to be reassured that the County Council will work collaboratively with them to achieve ambitions in areas like air quality, climate change and town centre management, and will not frustrate their plans.

The County Council's response

40. In the future, there will need to be positive engagement with the district and borough councils on parking and traffic management, and consultation on pricing strategy for on and off-street parking, with sufficient time for a dialogue with district and borough council colleagues prior to making any changes. We propose to develop partnership working with district and borough councils on future parking and access plans to support this.

#### **Policy**

41. While district and borough councils generally agreed with the County Council's emerging transport and climate change policies, some felt that there would be considerable local variation, not least between rural and urban locations, that would require a more nuanced approach.

#### The County Council's response

42. The current agency arrangement for civil parking enforcement and for traffic management is not a devolved service, and there is no change in the policy arrangements, which have always been for the County Council to determine.
43. It is agreed that no two Hampshire districts are the same. The County Council's soon to be published Local Transport Plan 4 will set out the vision, outcomes and guiding principles for transport in Hampshire. A modern and efficient traffic enforcement service will be a key element to the future of transport in the County.

#### Timings

44. A number of districts and boroughs felt that transferring the on-street parking enforcement service would be simplified by timing this to take place with the start of a new financial year. Some districts and boroughs felt that ending the agency agreements for traffic management could happen sooner than the twelve-month notice period, but that there will need to be a dialogue on data transfer for Traffic Regulation Orders and for residents parking.
45. There will also need to be communications strategy to prepare residents for the change.

#### The County Council's response

46. There may be scope to reduce the individual notice periods to coincide with the start of a new financial year i.e., 1 April 2023, but the actual time required will be subject to completing any staff transfer processes, which will be reliant on all parties' active participation. Extending notice periods to coincide with the end of the financial year i.e., 31 March 2024 may be possible where there are specific transition issues that could be resolved by extending the notice period.
47. A communications plan to support the change will be developed in collaboration with district and borough council colleagues. Similar concerns were expressed with the earlier ending of agency arrangement in Fareham, New Forest and Test Valley, and with the commencement of civil parking enforcement in Gosport, and the County Council planned ahead and publicised these changes through various media channels coupled with direct communication to residents where needed.

## HAMPSHIRE COUNTY COUNCIL

### Report

<b>Committee:</b>	Economy, Transport & Environment Select Committee
<b>Date:</b>	10 March 2022
<b>Title:</b>	School Streets
<b>Report From:</b>	Director of Economy, Transport and Environment

**Contact name:** Dominic McGrath

**Tel:** 0370 779 3710

**Email:** dominic.mcgrath@hants.gov.uk

#### **Purpose of Report**

1. For the Economy, Transport & Environment Select Committee to pre-scrutinise the proposals for a potential future Hampshire School Streets programme (see report attached due to be considered at the Cabinet decision day at 10.30am on 15 March 2022).

#### **Recommendation**

2. That the Economy, Transport and Environment Select Committee:

Either:

Supports the recommendations being proposed to Cabinet in section 2 of the attached report.

Or:

Agrees any alternative recommendations to Cabinet, with regards to the proposals set out in the attached report.

This page is intentionally left blank



# HAMPSHIRE COUNTY COUNCIL

## Decision Report

<b>Decision Maker:</b>	Cabinet
<b>Date:</b>	15 March 2022
<b>Title:</b>	School Streets
<b>Report From:</b>	Director of Economy, Transport and Environment

**Contact name:** Dominic McGrath

**Tel:** 0370 779 3710

**Email:** dominic.mcgrath@hants.gov.uk

### Purpose of this Report

1. The purpose of this paper is to provide an update on the Hampshire School Streets Pilot, specifically to discuss the conclusions from the initial monitoring and assessment of the trial to date; and to provide recommendations on an initial policy approach to the development of a potential future Hampshire School Streets programme.

### Recommendations

2. It is recommended that Cabinet:
  - a) Notes the findings and initial conclusions from the first phase of the pilot scheme evaluation.
  - b) Endorses the continued operation of the existing School Streets pilot sites on a trial basis during 2022, with a report on the further data and evaluation to be considered in the autumn of 2022.
  - c) Authorises design and evaluation of alternative operating models, including ANPR camera enforcement, for School Streets, to inform the final evaluation and recommendations from the pilots.

### Executive Summary

3. The high-level delivery approach for the School Streets was set out in a report titled '*School Streets*' that was approved by Cabinet on 9 February 2021. This report detailed that the trials would take place from the start of the 2021/22 academic year until the October 2021 half-term, the pilot would be included within the Active Travel Fund Tranche 2 programme and that the outcomes and conclusions were to be reported back to the Cabinet thereafter.
4. Trials have been undertaken at three schools during the Autumn Term, at Harrison Primary School (Fareham), Cadland Primary School (Holbury) and Alverstoke Infants School (Gosport). The trials have involved the temporary closure of a nearby street, to remove motor traffic from the immediate vicinity of the schools, at the start and end of the school day.

5. Data from the monitoring and evaluation exercise was analysed during late 2021, and the results and conclusions that can be drawn from the Pilot are described within this report. The data demonstrates that the three trial schemes have been generally successful, with community support for all three trial schemes. There is evidence to indicate a reduction in motor vehicle activity in the areas of concentrated pedestrian usage around the school entrance.
6. The data also indicates that the School Streets generally have a positive impact on active travel mode choice for the journey to school, and this benefit appears to be more significant when School Streets are implemented over larger areas and/or in schools with larger pupil numbers. The trials also highlight a key issue relating to the long-term sustainability of these initiatives, in that each of the schools participating in the trial have had difficulties resourcing and retaining volunteer stewarding of the scheme, with pressures on school staff and a low level of volunteer support meaning that their capacity to manage these schemes for the longer term under current operating arrangements is at risk.
7. A decision paper was considered by the Executive Member for Highways Operations at Decision Day on 18 November 2021, with approval given for the interim continued operation of School Streets measures at the three participating trial sites.
8. It is recommended that the existing School Streets sites at Harrison Primary School and Cadland Primary School are continued on a trial basis, until at least the end of the 2021/22 academic year. (As noted in the report, Alverstoke Infant school withdrew from the trial in November 2021, for resourcing reasons.) During this period, further consideration can be given to potential modifications to the existing arrangements to seek operational efficiencies and increased sustainability in terms of steward resources. Following the end of the 2021/22 academic year, a decision will be required on whether or not to make the existing School Streets arrangements at these two locations permanent.

### **Contextual information**

9. School Streets schemes seek to reduce motor vehicle traffic from roads in the vicinity of school entrances at busy times to help make journeys to school safer and make active travel to school (cycling and walking) more appealing. The schemes aim to improve the walking environment and reduce congestion issues around the school entrance, to encourage parents and pupils to travel more sustainably, and to contribute to the wider public health targets of the Local Authority (such as making streets safer, improving air quality and promoting physical activity). This is achieved through implementation of timed access restrictions on motor vehicle traffic on the roads providing the main route of pedestrian access to the school site, thus providing increased road-space for those walking and cycling during the start and end of the school day.
10. Following a motion to Full Council on 24 September 2020 and subsequent Cabinet endorsement of the high-level delivery approach on 9 February 2021, the implementation plan for the Council's School Streets Pilot was developed.

The Pilot was included in the Active Travel Fund (ATF) Tranche 2 programme and funding. The implementation plan and the recommended sites for trial interventions were approved by the Executive Member for Highways Operations on 17 June 2021, with authority to make arrangements to implement the three individual trial schemes being delegated to the Director of Economy, Transport and Environment. The detailed implementation proposals were approved by the Director on 6 July 2021, for three trial schemes to be delivered at:

- Alverstoke Infant School, Gosport;
- Cadland Primary School, Holbury, New Forest; and
- Harrison Primary School, Fareham.

11. The County Council commissioned Sustrans (a national walking and cycling charity, involved in School Streets nationwide) to provide support during the project; specifically, to provide steward training and to undertake monitoring and assessment of the trials to gauge the effectiveness of the initiative.
12. Testing of the trial arrangements commenced at the three participating schools in the final days of the 2020/21 academic year, to ensure there were no significant operational issues in advance of the main trial period. The main trial period commenced at the start of autumn term of the 2021/22 academic year and School Streets have been in continuous effect during term-time periods at the three trial sites thereafter (except at Alverstoke, where the trial ran until November -see below).
13. The Executive Member for Highways Operations considered a Decision Report titled 'School Streets Pilot – Update' at Decision Day on 18 November 2021, where approval was given for the interim continued operation of School Streets measures at participating trial sites pending a policy decision on the future of the School Streets initiative in Hampshire.
14. Initial consideration of the monitoring data indicates that the trials have been effective, particularly in terms of improving the walking environment around the school at peak times and promoting active travel modes. The initiative appears to have a high level of public support.
15. All participating schools have indicated that resourcing the stewarding arrangements presents a significant challenge, with pressures on school staff and a low level of volunteer support meaning that their capacity to manage these schemes under current operating arrangements is a risk which may affect the long-term sustainability of the initiative. As a result of these resource pressures, one of the three participating schools, Alverstoke Infants School in Gosport, confirmed during the trial that it could not continue to commit the necessary resources, and withdrew from the trial in November 2021. The other two participating schools (Harrison Primary School, Fareham, and Cadland Primary School, Holbury) both confirmed a desire to continue with the school street arrangements over the coming months, despite these resourcing pressures.

16. A programme of monitoring and assessment has been implemented to gauge the effectiveness of the School Streets intervention; the results and analysis of this monitoring and evaluation are outlined below. Also within this report are details of the potential next steps in the process of developing a future Hampshire School Streets programme.

### Monitoring and Assessment

17. The monitoring undertaken by Sustrans included user perception surveys, focus groups, pupil travel surveys and traffic surveys. The key findings from the pilots are described below, with the significant site-specific monitoring and assessment results contained within Appendix A.

18. The data indicates that the School Streets pilot schemes at Harrison and Cadland Primary schools have been generally successful in meeting the intended objectives: improving the road environment to the front of the school in terms of perceived road safety and air quality, and also encouraging an increased use of active travel modes for journeys to school. The public feedback received during the pilot indicates a high level of local support for the School Street and these participating schools have also indicated satisfaction with the positive impacts and have expressed a desire to continue. While still positive to some extent, the trial at Alverstoke had a lower level of public support and was subject to resourcing difficulties, which ultimately resulted in its early withdrawal.

19. The key outcomes of the monitoring and assessment are set out in the table below:

	Level of public support for school street to continue or continue with changes (%)	Change in active travel mode use for journeys to school (%)	Change in motor vehicle use for journeys to school (%)	Change in Motor Traffic (Average net change in frequency of traffic counters being tripped on the surrounding network during peak times)	Perception of safety (survey participants who agreed or strongly agreed that the street was safer) (%)
Harrison Primary School	75.4	+5.1	-6	-273	84.4
Cadland Primary School	81.2	+10.6	-18.6	-58	71.4
Alverstoke Infants School	57.0	-6.4*	+12.8*	+26	44.7

\*Alverstoke Infants School had a low response rate to the user perception surveys, with 38 responses recorded. This potentially affects the reliability of conclusions that can be drawn from this data, particularly for any marginal net changes such as modal shift.

20. The purpose of the trial was to test the School Street implementation process as much as a test of the outcomes, and as such, has resulted in some key learning points. The primary issues at all three trial sites are described below, and these are expected to be common also to any future site potentially under consideration.
21. Steward resource pressures: The closures require the presence of stewards, to erect and remove temporary barriers at the start and end of each closure. Such barriers are currently required because of road safety requirements and potential liability issues. Stewards also need to 'man' the barriers, to allow local access for residents. All pilot schemes have been affected by lower-than-expected volunteer numbers for School Streets stewards. All schools managed this issue using staff, either to supplement or in place of volunteers. The use of a volunteer steward model indicates a potential for heavy reliance on school staff, which may affect the long-term sustainability of the initiative in its current form. It should also be noted that the pilot has been undertaken during a time of ongoing pressure and change for schools and for parents, in part due to Covid19. This may have impacted in terms of school staff and volunteer availability due to illness, changes to parent working patterns or locations affecting drop-off/pick-up transport choices and changes to social distancing and drop-off/pick up times affecting school access arrangements.
22. Displaced parking: this is the most common public complaint or observation and ad-hoc parking observations during the pilot have identified that parking is an issue at a number of locations, mainly residential side roads off Whitefield Road near Cadland School, and around the Southampton Road junction with Harrison Road at Harrison School. It should be noted that parking issues typically exist around schools; these streets have historically had school related parking issues to some extent and therefore it can be difficult to identify the actual impact of the School Street on parking patterns. A learning outcome from the pilot is that consideration of parking matters is essential during site selection, as is obtaining robust 'before' data on parking patterns, along with regular observations and enforcement during the operation of the school street.
23. In summary, the pilot has demonstrated that School Streets interventions are potentially effective solutions in addressing the issues that typically exist in the high-footfall areas around school entrances. When implemented effectively, these schemes have potential to generate a strong level of public support and high level of satisfaction from the participating school, and these interventions demonstrate good overall value for money relative to the benefits that can be achieved for the local community.
24. However, implementation of these schemes does come with challenges, most notably with the trials the difficulty in recruiting and retaining volunteers. This has meant that school staff have had to carry out much of the day-to-day work to run the scheme. While this has been acceptable to the schools for the initial period of the trial, it remains to be seen if this is a sustainable arrangement for the longer term. Therefore, the 'next steps' proposed below are focussed on sustaining the existing trial and exploring alternative means of enforcement.

25. The trial has highlighted that the suitability of site selection and strong early engagement with the school community and local residents is fundamental to their early success. The pilot has demonstrated that school streets schemes covering a larger area are likely to be more sustainable and have a higher impact, however this is subject to site suitability and availability of sufficient resources to operate a scheme over a wider area. Also important to success in many cases, is considering the School Street as part of a package of measures, potentially including increased parking enforcement and engagement with the school to encourage travel behaviour change and promote the School Streets initiative within its local community. The ongoing resourcing requirements and commitment to make school streets effective should therefore not be underestimated.

## **Finances**

26. The cost of setting up running the initial trial across the three schools was £74,000. This has covered equipment supply (including barriers and PPE), traffic orders, training, programme development, research and monitoring costs. These set-up costs for the trial programme have been funded from money allocated to Hampshire County Council under the Government 'Active Travel Fund' (ATF) and from Hampshire County Council Public Health budgets.
27. The cost to HCC of extending the existing trials to the end of the school year is anticipated to be minimal. This would be limited to monitoring and evaluation costs are these are expected to be up to £5,000, which can be met from existing budgets.
28. To date, running costs have been minimal, because once up and running the schemes are run day-to-day by the schools. The costs to them are, to a large extent, dependent on volunteer capacity and the school's willingness to deploy staff to augment volunteer support. There may be a need to provide further volunteer training, in the event that existing volunteers withdraw, but beyond that HCC would not incur any significant running costs as a result of extending the trials
29. Initial indications are that rolling out the programme more widely would be expected to incur a set-up cost in the region of £12,000 - £15,000 per school. Complex schemes, for example where revisions to parking are required, could cost more. Provision would also need to be made for the potential removal of traffic orders for any scheme that ceased, which would be at a cost of up to £5,000 per site. The current operating model, utilising volunteers, would seem to offer the cheapest option (to HCC) for providing school streets, and this should be considered a baseline cost.
30. To scale that up to a programme level, a calculation has been undertaken to review the baseline cost for a potential wider programme. While not all schools would be suitable for the introduction of a School Street, because of local factors such as being sited on an A road, being on a bus route, etc, as an indication of the scale of cost (and assuming that there was a sufficiently high level of interest), rolling out the programme to 40% of maintained primary phase schools across the County would involve set up costs in the region of

£2 - £2.5million in total, which would presumably involve a multi-year roll-out. This is based on the existing operating model, and alternative forms of enforcement (e.g., ANPR cameras) would be expected to be more expensive.

31. Above the set-up costs there would also be programme management costs as an overhead. This would include the cost of monitoring, training, co-ordination, and programme development/support. This could be expected to be in the range £30,000 - £40,000 per annum. Provision would also need to be made for future maintenance and replacement of equipment over time.
32. As noted in the report, the trial schemes have been heavily reliant on volunteer/school staff. Alternative forms of enforcement would reduce this reliance on volunteers but would involve additional cost. It is recommended that further work is undertaken to identify and evaluate alternative operating models, to see what scope there is to reduce the reliance of the existing model on recruitment and retention of volunteers. The cost of this work is expected to be up to £3,500 and could be accommodated within existing budgets.
33. As an example, anticipated Moving Traffic Enforcement powers (due to be introduced in June 2022) may offer the potential to enforce schemes through the use of automatic number plate recognition (ANPR) cameras. However, the cost of this is estimated at around £30,000 for installation and this would be in addition to existing set up costs. Additional provision would need to be made for maintenance, equipment replacement, licencing, etc. This is likely to be one of the most expensive options and others will be reviewed alongside it.

### **Proposed Next Steps**

34. While the initial trials have shown that the School Streets projects have been generally successful in meeting the project objectives, they have also highlighted difficulties in attracting and retaining volunteers, to the extent that most of the work in running the schemes has fallen to school staff. The viability of the school streets model is dependent on volunteers or school staff support and the initial pilot scheme evaluation calls into question whether this is a sustainable arrangement for the longer term. However, the pilots have only been running for a relatively short period, and the data is therefore by definition somewhat limited.
35. It is proposed, therefore, to focus next on continuation of the existing trials, running them for the rest of the school year. It is not proposed to invite any applications from schools for starting additional trials until at least the next school year.
36. Alongside the continuation of the existing trials, it is proposed that officers review alternative options for managing the School Streets, to reduce the burden on local volunteers and staff. This might include the potential for use of ANPR-based camera enforcement, although this would require approval from the Department for Transport. Other options under existing powers will also be explored, with an evaluation of costs for each of the options.

## **Legal and insurance considerations**

37. The County Council's insurer confirmed that the arrangements for the School Streets Pilot were acceptable and were provided with evidence that the County Council had undertaken appropriate public engagement, conducted detailed risk assessments, and provided appropriate training/guidance and equipment to the marshals who will be operating the scheme. The approval was on the basis that the schools shortlisted were Hampshire County Council maintained schools and the volunteers were volunteering to the County Council. Agreements were in place between Hampshire County Council and the participating school setting out roles and responsibilities for the trial.
38. For a wider rollout of School Streets, further discussions will be required with the insurer to confirm that the activity would be covered and, in particular, that any variations to School Streets procedures will need to be approved by the insurer. It is proposed that any future rollout of School Streets would be limited to County Council maintained schools, pending further work to confirm if the initiative can be extended to Academies which would need to insure under their own Public Liability insurance.
39. A written Memorandum of Understanding (MoU) was put in place with schools involved in the Pilot, setting out roles and responsibilities. This would be required to be replicated for any new sites.

## **Consultation and Equalities**

40. Details of the engagement undertaken in relation to the School Street Pilot are provided in Appendix A.
41. In general, there is a high level of support for the School Streets initiatives undertaken to date.
42. Each future School Street would be supported by its own EqIA as part of the decision stage reports (stages 5 and 8).

## **Climate Change Impact Assessments**

43. The School Streets trial schemes are intended to promote active travel and reduce the use of the private motor car for local journeys. On this basis, School Streets initiatives are expected to have a positive Climate impact, by reducing the carbon emissions and energy consumption associated with travel to/from the participating schools for school pick up and drop off. The schemes require a minimal amount of equipment to operate, therefore the negative Climate impact of the schemes is negligible. Overall, the net Climate impact of the project is positive.
44. Application of the Carbon Mitigation Tool and Climate Change Adaptation tool to this project has been considered. The Carbon Mitigation Tool is not considered to be applicable as the amount of embodied carbon and operational carbon emitted as a result of the construction and operation of these schemes is negligible. The Climate Change Adaptation tool is also considered to be not



applicable as, when considering all variables, the scheme is not expected to be significantly affected by climate change. On balance, the scheme encourages a modest modal shift toward active travel modes, which has direct benefits in carbon reductions and also indirect benefits by promoting a change in behaviours toward more sustainable travel choices for local journeys.

## **Conclusions**

45. The School Street trials have shown in the initial data analysis that the concept largely delivers the objectives sought, though the results were inconsistent between the three pilot sites. They have generally been popular locally although there have been issues with reports of displaced parking.
46. The trials have highlighted a particular issue in the chosen operating model, with availability of local resource (volunteers/school staff) to run the schemes on the ground.
47. It is proposed to continue the existing trials for the remainder of the school year, to better understand whether the resourcing issue can be resolved, and to explore potential alternative – and less resource intensive – options for local management.
48. A further evaluation report will be brought before Members in the autumn, following the conclusion of the extended trials in July 2022.

**REQUIRED CORPORATE AND LEGAL INFORMATION:**

**Links to the Strategic Plan**

<b>Hampshire maintains strong and sustainable economic growth and prosperity:</b>	no
<b>People in Hampshire live safe, healthy and independent lives:</b>	yes
<b>People in Hampshire enjoy a rich and diverse environment:</b>	no
<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>
The high-level delivery approach for the School Streets pilot was set out in a report titled ' <i>School Streets</i> ' that was approved by Cabinet on 9 February 2021. This report detailed that the trials would take place from the start of the 2021/22 academic year until the October 2021 half-term, with the outcomes and conclusions from the trial to be reported back to the Cabinet thereafter.	9 February 2021
"Active Travel – Update" was considered by the Executive Member for Highways Operations at Decision Day on 17 June	17 June 2021
A decision paper was considered by the Executive Member for Highways Operations at Decision Day on 18 November 2021, with approval given for the interim continued operation of School Streets measures at the three participating trial sites until such time as Cabinet determines a policy decision on the future of the School Streets initiative in Hampshire.	18 November 2021
<b>Direct links to specific legislation or Government Directives</b>	
<u>Title</u>	<u>Date</u>
N/A	N/A

**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:**

### **1. 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 characteristic connected to that characteristic;
- Take steps to meet the needs of persons sharing a relevant protected characteristic 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 which participation by such persons is disproportionately low.

### **2. Equalities Impact Assessment:**

An EIA has been completed and it indicates that the proposed approach has a neutral impact on people with protected characteristics. The trial schemes continue to allow access for all non-motorised users at the start and end of the school day.

## Appendix A

### Monitoring and Assessment Approach and Key Site-Specific Findings

A programme of monitoring and assessment was implemented to gauge the effectiveness of the School Streets. The monitoring deliverables were as follows:

- a. User perception surveys: online perception surveys for adults in each of the school communities. Preliminary surveys were completed in summer 2021 at each participating school and a further, more detailed perception survey was available online from 20 September to 12 October 2021. Local residents and businesses were contacted by letter in advance and provided with information on how to complete the survey, as were the local County and District/Borough Councillors. The school community was contacted with this same information, disseminated via the school's own email communication channels. Pupil surveys were also launched, but the response rate was not high enough to provide statistically significant information.
- b. Focus group: In September 2021, Sustrans ran two independent focus groups with representatives of the Harrison Primary and Cadland Primary school communities.
- c. Pupil travel surveys: Schools provided a breakdown of pupil travel modes using 'Hands Up Surveys' in the summer term and another in the autumn term, to gather data on modal shift associated with the School Street.
- d. Video analysis<sup>1</sup> (GDPR Compliant): vehicle activity at the School Streets barrier at the Harrison Road junction with Serpentine Road was recorded by static camera over a five-day period from 27<sup>th</sup> September to 1<sup>st</sup> October 2021.
- e. Traffic surveys: traffic survey data was collected in the summer term, prior to the launch of the School Streets, and again in the autumn term, to allow analysis of the impacts of the School Streets on traffic speed and volume on the local road network.

#### Harrison Primary School

The scheme restricts the use of motor vehicles on Harrison Road from Southampton Road to Serpentine Road during the school drop-off/pick up periods, covering the main point of pedestrian and public vehicle access to the school. This restriction affects 316m of road, including the access to 14 residential properties, approximately 32 on-street parking spaces and a further 20 resident permit-holder only parking bays. Due to the town centre location and local parking restrictions, there is relatively short supply of alternative on-street parking, however this is offset by the existing arrangements the school has in place for local park and stride options, the nearest being within approximately 0.2 miles walking distance at Fareham Leisure Centre. Harrison Primary School has approximately 620 pupils.

A total of 208 responses were received during the autumn survey, and the majority of these respondents (76%) were local residents. The key findings of the scheme monitoring and autumn user perception survey are as follows:

- 75% want the School Street to become permanent, either in its current form (65%) or subject to changes (11%).
- 84% agreed that the scheme brings benefits to road safety, 0% indicated no change and 12% perceived a negative impact.
- 34% agreed that congestion had improved, 14% indicated no change and 45% perceive a negative impact.
- 54% agreed that the air quality on the school street improved; 7% indicated no change and 13% perceive a negative impact. 26% were uncertain.
- Adult respondents indicated significant increases in walking (+19%) and cycling (+12%) and Park and Stride use (+5%) as a result of the scheme, while travelling to school directly by car decreased (-7%). In the pupil 'hands-up' travel survey, slight increases in scoot/skate and cycle were indicated, resulting in an overall increase (+5%) in active travel modes, whilst journeys to school directly by car recorded a reduction (-6%).
- Respondents indicated that the advantages of the closures were 'Less congestion' (67%), 'Fewer cars on the road and pavement' (67%) and 'Feeling safer on the street' (67%), whilst other significant perceived advantages were 'Better air quality' (57%), 'More space to move around' (53%), 'Increased Physical Activity' (52%) and 'Fewer carbon emissions' (52%).
- Respondents indicated that the disadvantages of the closures were 'Traffic gets displaced to other streets' (60%) and 'Cars are blocking my driveway' (33%).

Comparison of the traffic data from the 'before' and 'during' surveys indicates minor increases in vehicle traffic on Park Lane and the western end of Serpentine Road, in the area close to the Fareham Leisure Centre Park and Stride site. Aside from this, a general decrease in traffic was noted throughout the survey area across both the AM and PM periods of operation. The most significant reductions were evident within the road closure itself and adjacent roads, such as the remainder of Harrison Road, Serpentine Road, and Osborn Road. The reduction in vehicle traffic was more significant in the PM peak. The traffic survey indicates that the School Street had no significant impact on local traffic speeds.

### Cadland Primary School

The main route of vehicle access to Cadland Primary School is via a spur off Whitefield Road, which also provides access to Mary Drake Close (a residential cul-de-sac). The School Street restricts the use of motor vehicles between the main Whitefield Road and the end of the Mary Drake Close cul-de-sac during the school drop-off/pick up periods. This affects an approximate length of 140m of road, including the access to the school staff car park and 27 residential properties. It also affects the use of approximately 4 on-street parking spaces that would typically be used for school pick-up/drop off. School related parking on Whitefield Road and adjacent residential side roads is an existing issue, with regular occurrences of illegal or anti-social parking during school peak periods. Cadland Primary School has approximately 370 pupils.

A total of 110 responses were received during the autumn survey, 92% of whom were parents/guardians of pupils at the school. The key findings of the scheme monitoring and autumn user perception survey are as follows:

- 81% want the School Street to become permanent, either in its current form (71%) or subject to changes (10%).
- 71% agreed that the scheme brings benefits to road safety, 15% indicated no change and 13% perceived a negative impact.
- 30% agreed that congestion had improved, 13% indicated no change and 55% perceive a negative impact.
- 43% agreed that the air quality on the school street improved, 32% indicated no change and 13% perceive a negative impact. 13% were uncertain.
- Adult respondents indicated significant increases in walking (+19%), scoot/skating (+13%) and Park and Stride use (+5%) as a result of the scheme, while travelling to school directly by car decreased (-3%). In the pupil 'hands-up' surveys, significant increases in walking and cycling were recorded, resulting in an overall increase (+11%) in active travel modes. Park and Stride use increased (+7%) and travel by car directly to school recorded a reduction (-19%).
- Respondents indicated that the advantages of the closures were 'Feeling safer on the street' (61%), 'Fewer cars on the road and pavements' (51%) and 'Less congestion' (36%).
- Respondents indicated that the disadvantages of the closures were 'Traffic gets displaced to other streets' (71%) and 'Cars are blocking my driveway' (13%).

The direct impact of the School Street on traffic is unclear from the traffic survey data. A reduction in vehicle traffic within the School Street is evident, as is a slight increase in traffic in the area around the recommended park and stride location. The traffic surveys indicate increases in some residential side streets to the east of the site and corresponding decreases in other streets to the west. The traffic count results are likely to have been affected by external factors relating to changing school access arrangements in response to social distancing and the Covid-19 pandemic, where the school closed a temporary second access on the west side of the school site, that had been in use for social distancing purposes until the end of the 2021 academic year.

### Alverstoke Infant School

The main route of pedestrian, cycle and vehicle access to Alverstoke Infant School is via Ashburton Road. The scheme restricts the use of motor vehicles on Ashburton Road (40m in length from the junction with Paget Road through to the school gates (cul-de-sac)), during the school drop-off/pick up periods. This restriction directly affects the route of access to approximately 9 residential properties and 5 on-street parking spaces. Alverstoke Infant School has approximately 180 pupils.

A total of 38 responses were received during the autumn survey; 58% of these were school parents/guardians and 34% were local residents. The key findings of the scheme monitoring and autumn user perception survey are as follows:

- 58% want the School Street to become permanent, either in its current form (41%) or subject to changes (17%).
- 45% agreed that the scheme had a positive impact on road safety, 37% indicated no change, whilst 13% perceived a negative impact.
- 18% agreed that congestion had improved, 21% indicated no change and 45% perceived a negative impact.
- 17% agreed that the air quality on the School Street improved, 37% indicated no change, while 23% perceived a negative impact.
- Adult respondents indicated increases in walking (+3%), cycling (+11%), scoot/skating (+11%) and Park and Stride use recorded an increase (+11%) as a result of the scheme, whilst travelling directly to school by private car decreased (-11%). In the pupil 'hands-up' survey, slight reductions were recorded in scoot/skating and Park and Stride use, resulting in an overall 6% reduction in active travel modes and a 13% increase in car use when compared to the pre-scheme implementation baseline. There is some uncertainty in these figures due to the low overall response rate.
- Respondents indicated that the advantages of the closures were 'Feeling safer on the street' (50%), 'Increased Physical Activity' (47%), 'Better Air Quality' (42%) and 'Less congestion' (42%).
- Respondents indicated that the disadvantages of the closures were 'Traffic gets displaced to other streets' (55%).

Comparison of the traffic data from the 'before' and 'during' surveys indicates a negligible impact on traffic volumes and speeds on the road network surrounding the road closure during both the AM and PM periods.



## HAMPSHIRE COUNTY COUNCIL

### Report

<b>Committee:</b>	Economy, Transport and Environment Select Committee
<b>Date:</b>	10 March 2022
<b>Title:</b>	Work Programme
<b>Report From:</b>	Chief Executive

**Contact name:** Katy Sherwood, Senior Democratic Services Officer

**Tel:** 01962 847347      **Email:** [katy.sherwood@hants.gov.uk](mailto:katy.sherwood@hants.gov.uk)

#### 1. Summary

1.1. The purpose of this item is to provide the work programme of future topics to be considered by this Select Committee.

#### 2. Recommendation

That the Economy, Transport and Environment Select Committee approve the attached work programme.

**CORPORATE OR 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>	no
<b>People in Hampshire enjoy being part of strong, inclusive communities:</b>	no

**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

## **IMPACT ASSESSMENTS:**

### **1. Equality Duty**

- 1.1. 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 under the Act;
  - Advance equality of opportunity between persons who share a relevant protected characteristic (age, disability, gender reassignment, pregnancy and maternity, race, religion or belief, gender and sexual orientation) and those who do not share it;
  - Foster good relations between persons who share a relevant protected characteristic and persons who do not share it.

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

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

### **1.2. Equalities Impact Assessment:**

- 1.3. This is a forward plan of topics under consideration by the Select Committee, therefore this section is not applicable to this report. The Committee will request appropriate impact assessments to be undertaken should this be relevant for any topic that the Committee is reviewing.

### **2. Impact on Crime and Disorder:**

- 2.1. This is a forward plan of topics under consideration by the Select Committee, therefore this section is not applicable to this report. The Committee will request appropriate impact assessments to be undertaken should this be relevant for any topic that the Committee is reviewing.

### **3. Climate Change:**

- a) How does what is being proposed impact on our carbon footprint / energy consumption?
- b) How does what is being proposed consider the need to adapt to climate change, and be resilient to its longer term impacts?

This is a forward plan of topics under consideration by the Select Committee, therefore this section is not applicable to this report. The Committee will consider climate change when approaching topics that impact upon our carbon footprint / energy consumption.

**WORK PROGRAMME – ECONOMY, TRANSPORT AND ENVIRONMENT SELECT COMMITTEE**  
 (Edits since previous meeting in red)

Topic	Issue	Reason for inclusion	Status and Outcomes	12 May 2022	19 September 2022	23 January 2021	13 March 2023
For future review	20mph Speed Limits	Following discussion at Full Council on 4 November 2021	Working group to report back to the Select Committee		✓		

**To be added to the work programme when timely:**

- Bus Back Better
- Environmental Strategy
- Hampshire Economy
- Waste and Collaborative Working
- Freeports
- County TRO presentation