

HAMPSHIRE COUNTY COUNCIL

Decision Report

Decision Maker:	Executive Member for Environment and Transport
Date:	29 October 2018
Title:	Consolidation and Review of School Crossing Patrol Policy
Report From:	Director of Economy, Transport and Environment

Contact name: Adrian Gray

Tel: 01962 846892

Email: adrian.gray@hants.gov.uk

1. Recommendations

- 1.1. That the Executive Member for Environment and Transport gives approval to consolidate the School Crossing Patrol (SCP) policy in Hampshire to provide clear and transparent criteria for establishing new sites and maintaining or relocating existing SCP sites.
- 1.2. That the Executive Member for Environment and Transport gives approval for the offer of a Service Level Agreement (SLA) to schools where a location does not meet the criteria for a County Council funded SCP, to enable schools and local communities to fund a SCP that would otherwise not be provided.
- 1.3. That authority is delegated to the Director of Economy, Transport, and Environment to enter into contractual arrangements, in consultation with the Head of Legal Services, to secure the Service Level Agreements as necessary.

2. Executive Summary

- 2.1. The purpose of this paper is to consolidate the policy guidance for the School Crossing Patrol Service in Hampshire in order to provide clear and transparent criteria for managing the service, including establishing new sites and maintaining or relocating existing sites.
- 2.2. This paper seeks to provide an opportunity for schools to purchase a Service Level Agreement (SLA) for the provision of a SCP where sites do not meet the current criteria to be funded by Hampshire County Council.

3. Contextual information

- 3.1. Responsibility for the SCP service passed from Education Services to the Economy, Transport & Environment (ETE) Department in 2002. The processes and procedures in place to manage the SCP service have not been substantially amended since this time.
- 3.2. The SCP service in Hampshire is managed in accordance with the Road Safety Great Britain (RSGB) School Crossing Patrol guidelines which are periodically updated. These national guidelines are endorsed and supported by the Royal

Society for the prevention of Accidents (RoSPA). The guidelines have been compiled based on existing legislation, best practice, health and safety and case law. The guidelines cover managing the SCP Service and the criteria for assessing SCP sites.

- 3.3. Hampshire currently has funding for 266 SCP sites, located throughout the County, excluding the unitary authorities of Southampton and Portsmouth. This is one of the largest SCP services in the UK.
- 3.4. Despite the comparative scale of the SCP service in Hampshire, the County Council regularly receives and assesses requests for new SCPs. Where a location meets the County Council's assessment criteria a SCP is recruited.
- 3.5. Given the scale of the SCP service in Hampshire, vacancies regularly occur. A vacant site is re-assessed before commencing recruitment to ensure the site continues to meet the County Council's assessment criteria. Where a location does not meet the County Council's assessment criteria a SCP is not recruited.
- 3.6. This assessment and re-assessment process ensures County Council funding is directed as a priority to locations where SCPs provide the greatest benefit.
- 3.7. When a new request or a vacant site does not meet the assessment criteria for County Council funding, a school or community group may seek to fund a SCP.
- 3.8. Currently Alverstoke Junior School in Gosport and Brookfield Community School in Fareham are funding a SCP under a Service Level Agreement (SLA) with the County Council, with further SLAs being developed for Brockenhurst Primary School in the New Forest and Hatherden Primary School in Test Valley.
- 3.9. Requests to self-fund SCPs are anticipated to continue as schools and local community groups seek more choice in managing access to their school sites. More guidance is needed to assist schools and local community groups understand the process for funding SCPs and to ensure road safety considerations continue to be adequately assessed for non-County Council funded SCPs.

4. The proposal

- 4.1. The consolidated School Crossing Patrol (SCP) policy is attached in Appendix 1.
- 4.2. The policy describes the criteria for the provision of a school crossing patrol, the process for assessing a request for a school crossing patrol, the process for decommissioning of sites, and the process for externally funded sites.
- 4.3. The policy consolidates the processes and procedures in place to manage the SCP service in Hampshire to provide clear and transparent criteria for establishing new sites and maintaining or relocating existing SCP sites. The policy does not change the assessment criteria, which is based on RSGB guidance.
- 4.4. The policy further provides a formal process for offering a sold service via a Service Level Agreement (SLA) to schools where sites do not meet the required criteria.

5. Finance

- 5.1. There are no financial implications for the SCP service arising from the policy itself where it relates to County Council funded SCPs, which consolidates the processes and procedures already in place to manage the SCP service in Hampshire.
- 5.2. It is anticipated the number of SCPs in Hampshire will be increased through the adoption of a formal process to offer a sold service to schools by way of a Service Level Agreement where sites do not meet the required criteria.
- 5.3. The current cost of a Service Level Agreement for a SCP is £5,500 per annum. This covers the employment costs of the SCP officer along with the supervision, training and provision of uniform and equipment.
- 5.4. The future charge for a SLA will increase in line with the County Council's costs to move towards fully recovering the direct costs of providing the service such that financial implications for the County Council will be minimised. It is anticipated that the charge will increase to £6,000 for new SLAs from 1 April 2019, with existing SLA charges increasing at their respective renewal dates.
- 5.5. Some costs may be incurred in establishing a site and maintaining fixed equipment e.g. advisory signs and flashing amber lanterns. These costs are anticipated to be broadly comparable with the costs of establishing and maintaining an informal crossing location without a SCP.
- 5.6. Some non-recoverable costs may also be incurred in terminating a SLA. These costs are anticipated to be minimal and will be met from existing resources.

6. Performance

- 6.1. The policy is anticipated to improve public perception of the SCP service by consolidating the processes and procedures in place to manage the SCP service in Hampshire and to provide clear and transparent criteria for establishing new sites and maintaining or relocating existing SCP sites.
- 6.2. The policy will further provide clarity for schools and local communities regarding funding a SCP where the County Council's assessment criteria are not met.

7. Consultation and Equalities

- 7.1. No specific consultation has been carried out in developing this policy, which consolidates the processes and procedures already in place to manage the SCP service in Hampshire without changing the assessment criteria, which is based on RSGB guidance.

CORPORATE OR LEGAL INFORMATION:**Links to the Strategic Plan**

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

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.)

DocumentLocation

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:

It is considered that the proposal will have a neutral impact on groups with protected characteristics. The School Crossing Patrol service in Hampshire is managed in accordance with the Road Safety Great Britain (RSGB) School Crossing Patrol guidelines which are periodically updated. These national guidelines are endorsed and supported by the Royal Society for the prevention of Accidents (RoSPA). The guidelines have been compiled based on existing legislation, best practice, health and safety and case law. The guidelines cover managing the SCP Service and the criteria for assessing SCP sites. The purpose of the proposal is to consolidate this guidance into a policy and no changes are proposed beyond formalising the process for offering School Crossing Patrol on a paid for basis where they do not meet the criteria for HCC funding.

2. Impact on Crime and Disorder:

2.1. The proposal in itself has no impact on crime and disorder.

3. Climate Change:

- a) How does what is being proposed impact on our carbon footprint / energy consumption?

The proposal in itself has no impact on climate change. School Crossing Patrols may encourage walking to school, and the service as a whole may reduce carbon emissions from vehicles used to transport children to schools.

- b) How does what is being proposed consider the need to adapt to climate change, and be resilient to its longer term impacts?

It is considered that the proposal will have no impact on the need to adapt to climate change and be resilient to its longer term impacts.