

Title: School Crossing Patrol (SCP) Review	
Ward: City Wide	Cabinet lead: Cllr Mhairi Threlfall
Author: Ed Plowden	Job title: Head of Local and Sustainable Transport

Revenue Cost: £90K savings; c£50k one-off redundancy cost	Source of Revenue Funding: General fund
Capital Cost: £	Source of Capital Funding: 10947
One off <input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	Saving <input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
Ongoing <input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	Income generation <input type="checkbox"/>

Finance narrative:

This proposal seeks approval to carry out necessary changes to the management and delivery of School Crossing Patrol savings. The associated full year savings approved by February 2017 Full Council were originally at £155k, phased over 17/18 (£90k) and 18/19 (a further £65k). Due to various reasons including the timeline for necessary public consultations, the savings delivery was delayed. However, the £90k 17/18 savings shortfall has been mitigated by in-year one-off savings under the overall Transport department budget. Subsequent to the consultation responses, Cabinet proposed to limit the reduction / savings to £90K. This would result in a £65k savings gap under 18/19 budget that would require separate mitigation under the Council’s overall budget for 18/19.

It is proposed that the revised £90k savings will be delivered by removing funding and resources from 24 identified sites. The associated redundancy cost is estimated to be around £50k. This has been available under the Transport 17/18 budget and will be carried forward in a reserve to be utilised around May 2018.

Finance Officer: Tian Ze Hao – Finance Business Partner

Summary of issue / proposal:

As a part of the proposed budget reduction for School Crossing Patrol (SCPs) we have recently undertaken a comprehensive re-assessment of all SCP sites using the Royal Society for the Prevention of Accidents (RoSPA) national criteria for allocating SCPs. This is the first full re-assessment of all SCP sites, and in addition, Road Safety officers have also complemented this quantitative assessment with a qualitative assessment. It is recommended that both these assessments are used in order to prioritise the remaining budget to the SCP sites with the greatest need.

The consultation proposals were based on an initial reduction in budget of £155K, which meant that funding would be removed for around half the SCP sites in Bristol. These proposals involved removing approximately 40 sites, which included those that had existing engineering (e.g. Pedestrian Crossing) and those sites that failed to reach the quantitative (RoSPA) national criteria for an SCP.

Subsequent to the consultation responses, Cabinet proposes to limit the reduction in the budget to £90K. This additional budget means that funding is now available for retaining a further 18 sites. As a result only 24 active sites will lose their funding. If approved, this will meet the identified budget reduction of £90K and will reduce the current 80 SCP locations across 56 schools to around 52 sites.

All sites which meet the ROSPA criteria will continue to be served by an SCP, complemented by the top 13 sites where the qualitative assessment shows that an SCP would be beneficial and additionally one engineered site. The sites that will be maintained are listed at Appendix A.

Providing safer routes to school is very important and a role the Council takes seriously in support of parents and carers. While the review will reduce available SCP funding, the Council remains committed to enabling children to walk to school safely and will continue to provide SCPs at the sites with the highest need, prioritising those that meet the ROSPA thresholds.

Summary of proposal & options appraisal:

- *An assessment based on the nationally established criteria (see Appendix A) was undertaken at each site on 3 mornings and 3 evenings and the average value taken to arrive at the score for each site. These scores have been used to prioritise the available budget and determine where SCPs should operate and a list of sites is at Appendix A*
- *All current SCP sites that meet the criteria for providing an SCP will be maintained.*
- *Those sites that do not meet the criteria have been assessed through a combination of the National Assessment Criteria (PV2), consultation feedback and specialist officer assessment. Those assessed to be of the highest need will retain their funding. They will be reassessed when the current SCP leaves or if there are substantial changes in the area affecting the site.*
- *If when the SCP leaves a site the PV2 is above 100 the site will be retained however, if PV2 is below 100 we will review the site based on demand from other sites. If PV2 is below 20 then funding will be removed.*
- *Of the 16 SCP sites which are also served by a zebra or signalised crossings (known as engineered crossings), 15 will have their funding removed. Guidance from RoSPA advises that a SCP situated alongside a physical crossing such as a signal controlled crossing can be confusing for both motorists and pedestrians. Further explanation of this rationale is in Appendix A.*
- *Note: some SCPs cover two sites and under the proposals two sites are being combined under one patrol.*
- *Following the consultation, the decision has been made to retain funding for one engineered site. This is site 32 on Wells Road which is attached to Hillcrest Primary School. The site has the highest PV2 value and attracted the largest number of concerned comments of any site through the consultation.*
- *The site at Shirehampton was re-assessed as part of the consultation and found to meet the RoSPA threshold. The consultation also proposed removing 3 sites which met the threshold and all of these will now be maintained*
- *A further 8 sites where there is no zebra or signalised crossing in place, will no longer be funded by the Council as they do not meet the RoSPA criteria and have been assessed as having a low need in comparison to the other sites that are to be retained. At Greenfield E-Act two sites will be combined. A list of these sites is at Appendix A.*
- *Measures to reduce impact of potentially losing a SCP will continue to be developed. They include BCC officers reviewing community feedback from the Your Neighbourhood consultation and considering physical solutions crossings in areas which might lose their SCP and do not have such measures already in place. Solutions that may be considered include signage, speed humps, buildouts to narrow the crossing and slow traffic, parking restrictions, puffins or zebra crossings. An initial visual assessment has already taken place and those sites that have been assessed as potentially suitable for physical measures will be referred for a specialist road safety engineering appraisal.*
- *For this year a capital budget has been identified for this assessment to take place, which will enable costed proposals to be considered for potential funding in future years' capital programming. Proposals will depend on need, feasibility and availability of funding. However, there are likely to be insufficient funds to introduce engineering solutions at all sites and the timing will not coincide with the removal of the SCP.*
- *The Council will continue to support road safety education to give families the confidence to travel to school sustainably and help prepare pupils for independence when they get to secondary education. Pavement Professors will continue to be provided and we will seek to target schools that are losing their SCP to offer training to the children to develop their road safety skills – a one-off budget will be needed for this, which has not yet been identified. See appendix A*
- *Schools have already been contacted via a questionnaire in December 2016 although the response rate was low and indicated that schools are unable or unwilling to fund the service themselves. A further consultation with the affected schools will be undertaken to see if an alternative method of funding or service delivery is appropriate and can be found by the school and its local community. Now the schools know that this is possibly the only alternative there may be a*

greater interest and energy in the locality.

- *Any redundancies will be managed so that wherever possible the service will not terminate in the middle of a term.*
- *It is proposed that any future requests for a new SCP following the review will be assessed according to the RoSPA criteria and an assessment fee will be charged to the school. Sites that meet the criteria will be added to a waiting list to be prioritised by need. If the need for an existing site no longer exists for example after a review or where a Pedestrian Crossing is introduced, then the funding will be reallocated to the site with the highest need on the waiting list. If an SCP resigns then the site will be considered alongside those on the prioritised waiting list and the ability to recruit.*
- *At present there is no budget to reassess every site so this will not be routinely undertaken and in future years a decision will be needed how often to re-assess and whether this needs to include every site.*

Recommendation(s) / steer sought: Cabinet is asked to Agree removal of funding 15 of 16 sites with an existing light controlled or zebra crossing

- Agree removal of funding on those sites that fail to reach national (RoSPA) assessment criteria and have additionally been assessed to be of lower need of a SCP.
- Agree to progress specialist assessment of the potential for introduction of physical road safety measures at sites where funding is to be removed and a consideration of applying future capital funds from the Transport Capital Programme.
- Agree to stop funding the service on proposed sites to coincide with term times rather than the earliest opportunity.
- Agree the proposal as to alternative service delivery and how to manage new requests for a School Crossing Patrol
- Delegate the authority to undertake the above recommendations to the Service Director (Transport) in consultation with the Cabinet Portfolio holder

City Outcome: *The proposals go towards the overall budgetary savings that are included in the Corporate Plan enabling other higher priorities for funding to be fulfilled. No sites that currently meet the national criteria will be disestablished.*

Health Outcome summary: If the existing crossings are reduced more children could potentially be transported by car to school rather than walking and making use of the current network of school crossing patrol sites. There is a concern that changes to school crossing provision could discourage families from walking or cycling, leading to reduced physical exercise. This possible outcome could be attributed to a lack of assistance crossing the road and/or from the probable growth in the number of vehicles arriving at any one school during the school run. There could be a greater risk of injury from collisions due to the removal of the patrol and/or if traffic increases. These may be mitigated if physical measures are introduced to calm the traffic and make crossings safer and if parents locally self-organise e.g. to establish walking buses.

Sustainability Outcome summary: The removal of the SCP service is likely to have a negative impact on sustainability. Parents might be less likely to allow their children to walk to school, especially unaccompanied and more likely to drive them to and from school. This would have consequences on local air quality, local traffic congestion as well as safety implications. However, these negative impacts may be reduced by the implementation of some or all of the mitigation proposals currently being investigated by the SCP service, including physical measures such as speed tables or Zebra crossings. Overall, the proposals are likely to have a negative environmental impact, despite any mitigation measures.

Equalities Outcome summary: EQUI report Appendix E

Impact / Involvement of partners: *What is the impact on key partners? What engagement have they had?* Schools: Schools do not have any responsibility for their student's journey to and from school until they have gone past the gates. The schools have been involved in the initial consultation which ended in Jan 2017 as well as the 'Your Neighbourhood' consultation 13th June to 5th September 17. Now the list of sites is confirmed Bristol City Council officers will work with Head Teachers of affected schools who wish to identify potential mitigation actions that are appropriate for their school.

Consultation carried out (and received): In January 2017 there was a citywide consultation on the budget proposals. Schools were sent a questionnaire and were asked to encourage parents to get involved in the citywide consultation. A 3000-strong petition was presented to Full Council and another online petition with 1650 signatures demonstrates that people were aware of these proposals. Responses from the budget consultation have confirmed that people have strong concerns over the proposed changes in terms of safety, and that this impact may disproportionately affect some equalities groups.

The proposed changes to the service were included as part of the 'Your Neighbourhood' consultation which was carried out between 13th June and 5th September 2017. This time the proposals included the actual locations or sites where the service might lose its funding. The schools and the School Crossing patrols were encouraged to take part in the consultation and encouraged to send details of the consultation to parents and guardians as well. There were several consultation meetings held around the city. A further breakdown of consultation results is at **Appendix B** and a full consultation report is available at <https://www.bristol.gov.uk/council-spending-performance/your-neighbourhood-consultation-2017>

Scrutiny considered this proposal as part of an overview of all budget proposals in January 2017

Legal Consideration: *Local authorities have a specific power to provide school crossing patrols established by the School Crossing Patrol Act 1953 and now contained in the Road Traffic Regulation Act 1984 as amended by the Transport Act 2000 which provides that (1) Arrangements may be made by the appropriate authority for the patrolling of places where children cross roads on their way to or from school, or from one part of a school to another, by persons appointed by or on behalf of the appropriate authority, other than constables.*

(1A) Arrangements under subsection (1) above may be made for patrolling places at such times as the authority thinks fit. This is a discretionary service. Any decision to cease provision of a SCP should be based on reasoned criteria with a risk assessment of the options. As with all other statutory powers there is a risk of legal challenge if we exercise our discretion unreasonably and without a clear objective rationale.

The Royal Society for the Prevention of Accidents (RoSPA) guidance provides SCP sites should only be disestablished following a review, and there should be an objective basis for the decisions.

Consultation - the consultation responses must be taken into account in finalising the decision. The process has complied with the established consultation principles:

- Consultation should occur when proposals are at a formative stage;
- Consultations should give sufficient reasons for any proposal to permit intelligent consideration;
- Consultations should allow adequate time for consideration and response;

Cabinet must demonstrate that it has considered the consultation responses, or a summary of them, before taking its decision.

Equality Act - the decision maker must also comply with the Public Sector Equality duty to consider the need to promote equality for persons with "protected characteristics": age, disability, gender reassignment, pregnancy and maternity, race, religion or belief, sex, sexual orientation and have due regard to:

- i) eliminate discrimination, harassment, and victimisation
- ii) advance equality of opportunity
- iii) foster good relations between persons who share a relevant protected characteristic and those who do not share it.

In order to do this Cabinet will need to have sufficient information about the effects of the proposed changes on the aims of the Equality Duty. The Equalities impact assessment is designed to assist with compliance with this duty and so Cabinet must take into consideration the assessment and the public sector equality duty before taking the decision.

Legal Officer: Sarah Sharland

DLT sign-off	SLT sign-off	Cabinet Member sign-off
	26/9/2017	Cabinet Members for Transport and Schools 23/10/2017

Appendix A – Further essential background / detail on the proposal	YES
Appendix B – Details of consultation carried out - internal and external	YES
Appendix C – Summary of any engagement with scrutiny	NO
Appendix D – Risk assessment	YES
Appendix E – Equalities screening / impact assessment of proposal	YES
Appendix F – Eco-impact screening/ impact assessment of proposal included in the comments above	NO
Appendix G – Exempt Information – financial information on a site by site basis, including redundancy costs	NO – to be determined post finance business partner comments