

## 1. Introduction

On 15 November 2016, Norfolk County Council's Children's Services Committee agreed to consult the public on a proposal to change our road crossing patrol policy. This report provides an analysis of the consultation responses.

### 1.1 Background

It is the responsibility of parents and carers to make sure that their child gets to school. The Road Traffic Regulation Act 1984 allows the County Council to put in place road crossing patrols to help pupils get to school safely. You might know road crossing patrol staff as 'lollipop' men and women. We currently fund and manage 96 road crossing patrols across Norfolk, at a cost of approximately £270,000.

There is national guidance about running road crossing patrols, which includes criteria for assessing whether or not a site needs a patrol. When a member of road crossing patrol team resigns, our current practice is to assess the site they work at against the criteria. If the site no longer meets the threshold for having a road crossing patrol we remove it.

We don't have to provide road crossing patrols by law, this is a service we choose to provide. The current financial challenges and reductions in our budget mean that we have to look again at all of our services. As part of our review of this service, we have monitored all 96 road crossing patrols to assess which still meet the criteria for having a patrol.

We are proposing to implement a new policy of only continuing to provide road crossing patrols at sites which meet the criteria for having one. If this policy were to be implemented, it would mean that 38 road crossing patrols would be removed. We would offer road safety awareness support to schools affected by our proposal; this would be on an ongoing basis to ensure all new starters in reception are covered.

### 1.2 Methods

People could respond to the consultation via our online feedback form, email, paper feedback form or letter. We also received petitions.

We asked people:

1. Whether they agreed or disagreed with our proposal.
2. What impact our proposal would have on them and their family.
3. Their ideas about how we could provide the service and save money.

We promoted the consultation by writing to schools, and we asked them to let their parents / carers and school community know about the consultation. We also wrote to town and parish councils. The consultation also received coverage in the local media.

The consultation ran from 15 November 2016 to 8 January 2017.

### 1.3 Response

We received 790 responses to the consultation and seven petitions. Over half of the responses came from parents / carers at the schools affected by our proposal.

Are you responding as...?	Total	Percent
A child who goes to one of the schools affected by our proposal	43	5.40%
The parent / carer of a child who goes to one of the schools affected by our proposal	451	56.59%
Someone who works for one of the schools affected by our proposal	42	5.27%
An individual / member of the public	129	16.19%
On behalf of an organisation	15	1.88%
A Norfolk County Councillor	9	1.13%
A district or borough councillor	7	0.88%
A town or parish councillor	24	3.01%
Not Answered	77	9.66%

We received petitions against removing the road crossing patrols at:

- Astley Primary School (562 signatories)
- Bacton Primary School (274 signatories)
- Bluebell Primary School and Colman Infant & Junior Schools (combined petition about both sites – 131 signatories)
- Colman Infant & Junior Schools (549 signatories)
- Dersingham Primary School (237 signatories)
- Heacham Infant & Nursery School (199 signatories)
- Magdalen Gates Primary School (99 signatories)

## 2. Summary of findings

### Views on our proposal

The online and paper feedback forms asked: 'Do you agree or disagree with our proposal?' 644 people answered this question. 41 respondents agreed, 587 respondents disagreed, and 16 respondents neither agreed nor disagreed.

Option	Total	Percent
Strongly agree	21	3.26%
Agree	20	3.11%
Neither agree nor disagree	16	2.48%
Disagree	79	12.27%
Strongly disagree	508	78.88%
<b>Total</b>	<b>644</b>	<b>100.00%</b>

We had a comments box for people to explain why they agreed or disagreed. The vast majority of the comments we received were points about specific road crossing patrol sites, rather than about the principle of using the Road Safety GB criteria to assess whether sites should have a road crossing patrol.

Here is a summary of the overall themes from the responses we received:

#### Comments and quotes from those agreeing with our proposal included:

- It is the parents / carers responsibility to get their child / children to school, rather than the role of the state.

“Parents should be more involved in ensuring, either individually or as groups, that their children get to school safely. I think it unfortunate that we have become a 'nanny' state. We should take more responsibility.”

“I walk my kids to school everyday. It is my responsibility and I am capable of crossing the road.”

“All School Crossing patrols should be discontinued. It is the parents responsibility to get their children to school safely. [This] hopefully would restrict the increase in my council tax.”

“Why do we need to pay someone to push the button on a pelican crossing, or to help just a handful of children to cross one road? If a child is not able to push the button on a pelican crossing themselves, or able to cross a road safely, then their parent or carer should go with them all the way to school until they can.”

- Parents / Carers rely on road crossing patrol staff to help their children cross the road, and instead they should take the time to teach their children about road safety themselves.

“Road Crossings assistants prevent children learning about road crossings as they are cotton woolled instead of being taught road skills by their parents. The presence of crossing assistants often stops more important investments such as zebra or pelican crossings being installed which benefit the entire community including those with limited sight and hearing or mobility 24/7.”

- The council should use its funding to continue to provide other services which help to keep children and young people safe, such as social workers and children’s centres.

“Public services are under huge pressure and I think that there are more important things for the council to spend our money on. Keeping children safe is paramount, which is why I would prefer that they continue to fund children's centres, fostering services and other things they do to keep children safe from harm.”

- There were also a small number of people who said that they broadly agree with our proposal, but disagree with our analysis about whether a specific site meets the threshold for having a road crossing patrol.

“Whilst I agree with your proposals in general, I cannot see how Kelling School is included in the list of those that will lose a patrol.”

**Comments and quotes from those disagreeing with our proposal included:**

- It would significantly increase the risk of accidents, and of a child or parent / carer being injured or killed, if the road crossing patrols were stopped at these schools. This was the most common response.

“I sincerely believe that if you remove someone from patrolling this crossing, there will be a serious accident.”

- Many respondents reported that their experience of using their local road crossing patrol did not match what we found when we monitored the sites. In particular, many respondents reported the road on which their local crossing patrol is situated is very busy, and some respondents also said that the road at their site is regularly used by buses and heavy goods

vehicles as well. This led some respondents to say they couldn't believe their local site does not meet the threshold, and some to question the accuracy of the County Council's monitoring.

"The decision to cease school crossing patrols in Heacham based on the criteria outlined do not in any way reflect my experience of walking my 2 children to Heacham Infant and Junior schools."

- Many respondents also raised concerns about visibility at particular sites, highlighting concerns about parked cars, bends in the road and hills. This is another point of difference between what our monitoring says and what respondents are telling us about their experience of the local road crossing patrol site.

"Visibility for road users is limited due to the school being sited between two bends."

"If you are standing on the school side your visibility is greatly reduced, especially in summer month with bushes and trees."

"Numerous cars park on the yellow lines illegally. This causes considerable issues with visibility."

- Many respondents highlighted concerns about the behaviour of drivers near schools, reporting speeding and other dangerous driving. Some respondents noted that the Road Safety GB criteria does not take into account how well people drive at a particular site and they thought this was a problem with our proposal.

"Often vehicles travel very fast past the school, they can't always be seen until they come around corner at this pace and with a child whom attends the pre school he doesn't always understand to cross quickly whilst holding a parents hand."

"The criteria simply do not take into account the behaviour of motorists at the crossings concerned."

"Unfortunately because of so many people that illegally parking outside the school, it is very chaotic at school run time, with cars parking on double yellow lines and blocking roadways, it can be quite dangerous to try to cross without the crossing patrol."

- Some respondents said that the fact that there have not been many accidents at these sites was a result of the presence of a road crossing

patrol, and not a reason to remove any of the patrols. They said the patrols are a cost effective way of preventing accidents.

“The fact that there have been few incidents in the past is testament to the fact the system works rather than evidence that the removal of the service would have no impact on child safety.”

“It also negates to consider that many accidents have been prevented by the crossing person. Any crossing will become more dangerous when the professional is removed.”

“The crossing patrol acts as a focus point for children to cross. Without this focus point, children, and adults, would cross the road at various other points instead.”

- Many respondents said that the County Council shouldn't save money by making changes that would risk the lives of children, and that we should find savings from elsewhere in our budget. Some respondents also said that this proposal would only save a small amount of money. They said it was that it was not worth the risk and that if a child was killed then the financial cost to public services would outweigh the saving, in addition to the huge personal cost.

“I find it hard to believe that the council is even thinking of saving money by putting families' and children's safety at risk.”

“Children's safety should be paramount, it shouldn't matter whether there are 1 or 100 children crossing - they should be kept safe.”

- Some respondents said they felt that the road crossing patrol staff do more than just help children cross the road twice per day. For example they also teach children about road safety and how to cross a road, and they play a wider safeguarding role by identifying concerns about individual children and families.

“Crossing patrol staff know the individual pupils by sight and are thus able to identify a child potentially at risk going home unaccompanied or with a stranger. This is a vital and essential part of safeguarding our children while en route to school or home.”

- The children who responded were also concerned that our proposal would result in an increase in the number of accidents. In addition, they highlighted a really positive relationship with their local road crossing patrol staff, they regard them as an individual they can trust, were sad about the

prospect of no longer seeing them and were concerned about the impact on staff losing their jobs.

“Please dont make my lollypop lady leave i will miss her and i will feel upset as she has helped me in lots of ways not just crossing the busy road”

### **Impact of our proposal**

We asked people ‘What impact would our proposal have on you and your family?’ Comments and quotes from people included:

- Parents / Carers responding said that they would worry about their child’s safety, with some saying that this would mean they would have to start to accompany their children to school, or that they would have to continue to accompany them even as they got older. They feared that this would affect their child’s independence, but didn’t feel they would have a choice. It would also affect their family life, because it would make it difficult for them to get to work on time.

“We would worry greatly about the safety of our children. We have seen cars drive through red lights and more importantly, the situation at our crossings is a dangerous one, with two sets of red lights causing confusion in drivers who use that crossing for the first time.”

“It would mean me changing my job as my daughter couldn't get home independently. Children need the security of feeling safe to cross the road to become independent before taking the giant leap to high school.”

“A school crossing patrol person is essential as some parents have multiple children and can not always keep hold of all children at once.”

“This would have a significant impact on my family as we walk to school everyday and use the patrol service. I encourage my children to be independent as they get older and have allowed them to walk to school (my responsibility) as this is the only road to cross which cannot be seen from home. I would not allow them to do this if the patrol is removed. We will be risking our lives on a daily basis along with all the other local families.”

- Some respondents said that the proposal would result in more children being driven to school, which would be worse for environment and children’s health. They said the increase in the number of cars would also make the roads more dangerous, particularly as it is hard to park safely outside or near to schools.

“If there is no assisted crossing for us to use it is likely we will drive to and from school. The road is simply too dangerous for us all to cross without help, particularly in the mornings. This will mean a huge decrease in the social contact between us as a family and other parents, villagers and of course the crossing patrol person. It will mean less fresh air and exercise for us all”

- Some respondents said that removing the road crossing patrols would mean that children and parents / carers would cross roads in lots of different locations, rather than at one focal point, which would make it more dangerous for children and their parents / carers, as well as more difficult for drivers.

“Danger for drivers with people then trying to cross in different areas of the road instead of one main place.”

- A few respondents said that they think our proposal is unfair on smaller, particularly rural schools. This is because one of the criteria in the Road Safety GB guidance is the number of children using a crossing, which respondents said is always going to disadvantage smaller schools. A few also said that the roads and pavements were also worse in rural areas, and that there are fewer road safety measures, like pelican crossings.

“It seems smaller schools and sites are being penalised for their size. Each child is as important as another where ever their location. I pass two school crossings each morning. Astley primary and fakenham infants. Astley is far more dangerous road safety wise than the other but astley is far less busy with children yet those fewer children are at more risk than the others. Your scoring seem to forget this.”

“There is a sign but no flashing lights or speed bumps etc. Urban schools generally have zigzags and 20 mph zones. I feel we are (once again) being discriminated against for being in a rural area.”

- A few respondents said that they think our proposal is particularly dangerous for urban areas, because there are so many vehicles on the roads, as well as lots of pedestrians, which makes it a challenging environment for drivers and pedestrians.

“The crossing patrol provide an essential service in keeping our children safe from road accidents on the very busy city roads next to the school.”



“I consider the lollipop lady to be invaluable as the site is one of the busiest in the city as it is on the very busy inner ring road with a junction to South Park Avenue.”

- A few respondents raised concerns about the impact our proposal would have on disabled children and disabled parents / carers. This is because the road crossing patrol staff provide extra support to disabled people, and because some disabled children are less able to cross the road independently.

“Our road crossing patrol has been invaluable to me. I am a disabled parent with two children. I walk with two crutches and therefore cannot hold my children's hands across the road, I also cannot cross quickly and would not be able to quickly pick my children up should they fall. Without our road crossing patrol, my children will not be safe and there is nothing I can do about it and that petrifies me, as it would any parent.”

“I really rely on the lollipop lady to get my autistic son across the road, when he chooses to run across the road without knowing any dangers. I have an other child to handle too at the same time.”

“My two children are both profoundly deaf and attend Colman schools (one at infant and one at junior). I believe removing the crossing patrol puts them at risk because their road awareness is impacted by their hearing impairments. Many other deaf and disabled children attend Colman and Clare school and rely on this crossing patrol. The idea of removing it is ridiculous, particularly given the special educational needs of many pupils at these schools.”

- A few respondents raised concerns about the impact our proposal would have on children who are neglected, because they are more likely to walk to school on their own at an inappropriately young age or when they don't have the ability to cross the road independently. They said that the road crossing patrol staff help these children to get to school safely.

“The majority of parents in the event of losing the crossing patrol will adapt and insure their children cross the road safely but its not those children that need the guidance and support, its that child, you ve all seen them late in for school, scruffy, not cared for, crossing the main road by themselves as they are late, and now we are asking them to cross a main road by themselves?”

## **Ideas about how we could provide the service and save money**

We asked people to tell us their ideas about how we could provide the service and save money. Here is what they said:

- The most common response was that we should make savings from another budget that does not put the safety of children at risk. Respondents gave a number of suggestions, including reducing councillors and senior officers pay, reducing management costs and making efficiencies, as well as using the money raised by speed cameras.

“There must be services which you provide which could be considered for cuts which do not put children at risk.”

“The wages of some of the people at the top end of County Hall might be a start.”

“Get some money from the health budget to promote walking to school - if there is school crossing patrol officers there is more chance parents will let their children walk to school. We are a nation of rising obesity levels and we need to do all we can to encourage young people to know that walking to school is good for their health!”

“Put some of the money from speeding fines direct into this. The same should be done for those using mobile phones whilst driving.”

- Some respondents said that we could get volunteers to run the service, if the County Council could provide them with equipment and training, as well carry out monitoring of the sites. It was suggested that either parents or school staff could volunteer.

“Parent volunteers to draw up a rota or replace the patrol with a zebra crossing.”

“Make the service "volunteers" and just provide training. Make the school responsible for attendance of volunteers.”

“Utilise a teacher to monitor the crossing (teaching assistant) as they do with walking bus. Reduce speed zone to 20mph.”

- Some respondents said that we should explore sponsorship opportunities to see if it is a viable option.

“Could you find a sponsor(s) which would have their company logo on the back of the patrol persons jacket and maybe a sign nearby too - like the roundabouts in the city have sponsors?”

- Some respondents said parents or schools could fundraise to pay for the cost of their local road crossing patrol.

“We could have an annual day where lollipop ladies and men had a collection at their crossing for money towards the service to make a saving. Or a muffy day where children could donate towards the lollipop ladies.”

- A few respondents said that schools should be able to fund it out of their budget if they want to.

“Consideration should be taken by the council to allow schools to directly employ a lollypop person out of the funding they receive.”

- A few respondents said that they would be willing to pay more Council Tax, if either the County Council raised their part of the precept or if their local town or parish council did.

“In terms of paying for the service perhaps a council tax rise for villagers to cover part or all of the cost of the lollipop lady?”

“Our crossing patrol lady could not give better value for money, she is the eyes and ears of our school and goes far beyond her paid role. Put council tax up a £1 per month.”

- A very small number of respondents said that the County Council should ask the Government for more funding.

“Stand up and robustly challenge government Local Authority settlements.”

- Install a permanent crossing, which could be used by everyone, 24 hours per day, seven days per week.

“Save money in the long run and give us a pelican crossing!”

“If the council would fund the 20 mph flashing signs on school road South Walsham it would help to slow down the traffic and be a one off expenditure to help keep the children attending south Walsham school safe.”

Other ideas included:

“Service is perfect maybe make lollypop lady's and men a charity to save costs.”

“Only provide in the darker winter months?”

“Sub contract the role to the Parish Council to administer.”

“Could another option be to use the money currently allocated to the remaining 58 sites, to actually cover the 'on costs' of road crossing patrols (i.e. training, insurance, line manager etc.) and then allow ANY school that wants a road crossing patrol outside their school to buy into this service, supplementing the overall cost.”

### 3. Responses about specific road crossing patrol sites

We received similar feedback from people across the different road crossing patrol sites affected by the proposal (as described in section 2 of this report). In addition, there were some comments and submissions which made very specific points about one road crossing patrol site.

#### **All Saints Academy School, Stoke Ferry**

The Head Teacher, Executive Deputy Head Teacher and governors conducted their own monitoring of the number of children using the crossing and the number of vehicles using the road. They carried out six monitoring sessions over three days at the start of December 2016. Each monitoring session lasted 30 minutes.

The below table summarises their results. The results in the table are an average of the six monitoring sessions that the school conducted. For comparison, the table includes the results of the last monitoring visit made by the Road Crossing Patrol Manager.

<b>Average of the six monitoring results conducted by the school</b>	<b>Last monitoring results conducted by the Road Crossing Patrol Manager</b>
52 accompanied children	8 accompanied children
10 unaccompanied children	2 unaccompanied children
92 cars	83 cars
6 lorries / coaches	3 lorries / coaches

## **Astley Primary School, Melton Constable**

Comments included:

- There is a history of accidents at this site.
- The number of children using the service has been miscalculated. One response from a group of parents / carers who use the site believe that 18 is a more accurate total of child pedestrians using the crossing in the busiest period.
- The school is currently being expanded, which will see it increase in size by 54%, from 205 places to 315. This will increase the number of children crossing the road – parents / carers estimate to 27 by the end of the school year 2017/18 – as well as the number of cars using the road.
- The guidelines were questioned because they assess the average number of children using the crossing every day during the busiest 30 minutes, rather than the total number of individuals impacted. In response to a survey carried out by parents / carers of their peers, 53 out of 79 respondents said they had used the crossing in past 12 months.
- The Road Safety GB criteria has been applied incorrectly because the County Council's assessment of the site does not take account of all the adjustment factors, such as visibility issues caused by parked cars, bends in the road and foliage in spring and summer.
- A group of parents / carers who responded don't want the County Council to go ahead with the proposal, but if the County Council does want to, then the Road Crossing Patrol at Astley Primary School should not be removed for a year in order to monitor the actual speeds of cars and the effect of the expansion of the school.

562 people signed this petition:

'Norfolk County Council has decided to suspend the Briston school crossing patrol from March 2017. The loss of this valuable service will see children in Melton Constable put in danger without a safe way to cross the B1354 Fakenham Road.

Lorries and big agricultural vehicles use this road daily at school drop off and pick up times. Also in this location it is difficult to see traffic coming from the direction of the school if you are on the Co-op side of the road. In the other direction the road bends making it difficult to see vehicles coming and visibility is further impaired by parked cars.

Currently there is no permanent pedestrian crossing on this road or any other road safety measures to help make this road safe. There has recently been a 20mph speed restriction added to the stretch of road directly outside the school but no such measures in the heart of the village.

The decision to suspend the Briston school crossing patrol has been made based on a number of criteria such as numbers of school children crossing at the site, number and type of vehicles passing through the site, width of the road and visibility and other road safety measures, but the crossing has not been adequately assessed.

Please sign our petition so we can keep all children in Briston and Melton Constable safe.'

### **Bacton Primary School**

Comments included:

- There are lots of heavy goods vehicles who use the road because of the Bacton Gas Terminal complex – this makes the road particularly dangerous.
- The assessment and monitoring of the site is inaccurate – the site is on the brow of a hill, with a bend on either side and poor visibility in spring and summer because of foliage.
- One respondent had conducted their own assessment of the site using the Road Safety GB criteria: "I have also arranged our own monitoring at the site over a two week period. It was immediately apparent that there were significant variations in the data collected. Using the formula PV squared and using the adjustment factor of 8 (erring on the side of caution) to give a multiplier of 2.144, I calculated that on two of the days we were significantly over the 4 million required and on one of the days we were just under. The monitoring you undertake on just one morning is not enough to give you a true understanding of our site."
- One suggestion is that the companies at the Bacton Gas Terminal complex could contribute towards the cost of the patrol.

274 people signed this petition:

'Norfolk county council are proposing to cut the road crossing patrol service they currently provide to Bacton primary school. This is a cost cutting exercise that will put children's lives at risk. Our school was monitored and noted that 'visibility is not masked' but we completely disagree as its on a bend, a hill and also has overgrown hedges which all reduce visibility.

County council states that parents/guardians are responsible for getting their children safely to and from school, but this takes away the independence we like to allow our older children as they prepare for secondary school. This is not a safe enough place for children to cross themselves. We have already had incidents in which families have been put at risk on the rare occasion that our road crossing patrol officer has not been there.

You might ask why the school doesn't just provide this service themselves? Under the law, only people employed by the county are legally allowed to stop traffic on a public highway, making it impossible for us to keep our children safe.

Ultimately, the only way we will know if this is the wrong decision for the county council to make is when a child is hurt or worse killed and this is not a risk we are willing to take.'

### **Bluebell Primary School, Norwich & Colman Infant & Junior Schools, Norwich**

131 people signed this petition:

'We the undersigned call on the Norfolk County Council to stop putting children's lives at risk and to keep the crossing patrols for the Bluebell and Colman Schools.'

### **Colman Infant & Junior Schools, Norwich**

Comments included:

- The information about accidents in the report to the Children's Services Committee in November 2016 was inaccurate. There have been four accidents involving pedestrians at or near to this road crossing patrol site over the last six years. Two of these involved children. There was one in June 2016, which happened half an hour after the school crossing patrol stops. The other accident was in June 2013, when the child did not use the road crossing patrol site or the pelican crossing.
- Road Crossing Patrols can be located on pelican crossings when there are exceptional circumstances. This site meets the exceptional circumstances because:
  - There is poor driver behaviour, for example red light running and vehicles straddling the crossing when it is green for people to cross.
  - There are large groups of children crossing and there are concerns about the children's age, because the site is used by pupils at Colman Infant and Junior schools, the Clare School, the Bee Hive pre-school, the City of Norwich School and St Francis of Assisi.
  - There are concerns about the children's ability to use the facility correctly, because students at the Clare School have a range of complex medical and learning needs including physical and sensory needs.
  - Visibility on the junction is poor because of the number of large vehicles using the ring road (including trucks and buses) and because of the left turn signal from Colman Road onto South Park Road, where cars frequently mistake the left turn green signal for a straight on green signal and cause accidents; and e) the extremely narrow refuge in the middle of the junction, which fits no more than 2 or 3 people at a time. As you can see from the above, the school

patrol meets 5 of the national criteria for keeping this patrol and it is not simply a pelican crossing.

- One respondent had conducted their own assessment of the site using the Road Safety GB criteria: “The threshold stipulated in the national guidelines is PV2 4 million. The value at the SPA/CR site is exceptionally high at PV2 17,976,144 – over four times the threshold.”
- The road is very busy and is used by a variety of vehicles, including lots of buses and heavy goods vehicles.
- There is a complex road layout, with multiple traffic lights, filters and sequencing that confuse drivers and pedestrians.
- The existing RCP is good value for money as they patrol two busy crossings.
- The County Council has a statutory duty to reduce and prevent accidents (Road Traffic Act 1988) and removing the road crossing patrol would be a breach of this.
- One suggestion is that the phasing of the lights is changed to make it easier for pedestrians and drivers using the road.

Here is a link to a video shot during one respondent’s own monitoring of the site on 16 December:

[https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=JbH5aVTQdlo&feature=em-share\\_video\\_user](https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=JbH5aVTQdlo&feature=em-share_video_user)

Here is a link to a video created by parents / carers about why they think the road crossing patrol should remain:

<https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=S-KNrecym04>

549 people signed this petition:

‘We the undersigned; parents and residents of the Colman Road area, object to plans to cut the Colman Road school crossing patrol in April 2017.

We, the undersigned, call on Norfolk County Councillors to reject this proposal and retain our crossing patrol for the continued safety of local children and members of the community.’

### **Cromer Junior School**

Comments included:

- There have been accidents at this site.

### **Dersingham Primary School**

Comments included:

- The assessment and monitoring of the site is inaccurate – the bend in the road significantly limits what you can see when crossing.



237 people signed this petition:

'Norfolk County Council is proposing to cancel the Dersingham school crossing patrol from March 2017. The loss of this valuable service will see children in Dersingham put in considerable danger, without a safe way to cross Manor Road at the bottom of Dodds Hill.

It is believed that as it is half a mile from the school site, it is not a main thoroughfare; however children regularly use this crossing to get to and from school safely. A number of our children walk to and from school independently, and with no other safe way of crossing this road, their safety would be put at significant risk.

This location is the only possible route to our school. The crossing is just after a bend, making it impossible to see oncoming vehicles. The road has a 30mph speed restriction and considerable traffic for a small village, particularly during the summer period.

Although we appreciate it is the legal responsibility of parents and carers to make sure their child gets to school safely, adults similarly have difficulties in crossing this road and rely on our lollipop lady.

By signing this petition, we wish to show Norfolk County Council just how much we use our lollipop lady, and how it would be a reckless decision to remove this service.'

### **Heacham Infant & Nursery School / Heacham Junior School**

Comments included:

- The assessment and monitoring of both sites is inaccurate:
  - The road crossing patrol outside Heacham Junior School is on a main road into the village, which is busy and used by buses and heavy goods vehicles. The traffic coming down Cheney Hill is fast, and the bend at the top of the hill reduces visibility.
  - The road crossing patrol supporting Heacham Infant & Nursery School is on a busy road.
  - Visibility is limited at both sites because of parked cars.
- Plans have been approved to build 69 new houses off Cheney Hill, which could increase to 100 new homes. This will increase the number of children using the road crossing patrols and the amount of traffic.

199 people signed this petition:

'NCC are proposing to cut our school crossing patrol at both sites by March 2017, in order to save money. The consultation period ends on 8th January

2017. They site Broadway as "an extremely quiet road" and Cheney Hill as "not a main thoroughfare". We strongly disagree.

We, the undersigned, are concerned citizens who urge our leaders to act now to protect our Schools' Crossing Patrol.'

### **Kelling Church of England Primary School**

Comments included:

- The road that passes directly in front of the school is the A149, the main coastal artery used by all vehicles accessing and servicing the villages that run along it.
- There is no footpath on either side of the road, pedestrians are forced to walk on the carriage way.
- Visibility is limited because the road is on a slope approaching a sharp bend, and is near to a junction which leads to the rest of the village. Parked cars also limit visibility.
- It was suggested that having signs with flashing lights operating in the period before and after school would improve safety.

### **Magdalen Gates Primary School, Norwich**

Comments included:

- Visibility is limited because the road bends and it is on a hill. Parked cars also limit visibility.
- The road is very busy.
- It was suggested that the speed limit on Spencer Street should be reduced to 20mph to improve safety.

99 people signed this petition:

'From your local Sewell Ward Labour Party: Save our School Crossing Patrols

Tory cuts to local government mean lollipop crossing patrols across our city are under threat of closure. We believe these cuts are dangerous and could put lives of children, parents and other crossing users at risk if they were to go ahead.

Please sign our petition to show that residents of Sewell ward oppose dangerous cuts to our school crossing patrols.'

[N.B. In the covering email this was submitted as a petition about Magdalen Gates Primary School, although the wording of the petition does not specify this.]

### **Ormesby Village Infant School and Ormesby Village Junior School**

Comments included:

- There was greater concern about removing the road crossing patrol supporting Ormesby Village Junior School.

### **St. Andrews Church of England Primary School, North Lopham**

Comments included:

- The assessment and monitoring of both sites is inaccurate:
  - The school is set back from the road on a blind bend. There is limited parking at the school and without the current number of families walking their children to school, more cars will need to drop off their children and will have no choice but to park on or near the already dangerous bend.
  - It is a very busy road, which is used by heavy goods vehicles (for example from Crown Milling) and agricultural equipment.
  - The number of children using the crossing exceeds the minimum criteria and currently the school is not at capacity.
- For children walking from the western end of the village, they need to cross the road as the footpath runs out.

### **St Georges Primary School, Great Yarmouth**

Comments included:

- The school is changing from an infant to a primary school. So although at present most of the children are accompanied by adults, in the future this will not be the case and the presence of the road crossing patrol will help to keep those children travelling independently safe.
- The entrance to the school is almost directly onto the crossing. The school entrance and the pavement are both very narrow. This creates a dangerous environment which the road crossing patrol staff help to manage.
- This is a very busy road, particularly in the summer term. It is a main access to and from the seafront to the Quay and with increased tourism in the summer there is increased traffic.
- There have been accidents at this site.
- The road crossing patrol plays a wider safeguarding role by identifying concerns about individual children and families.

Enclosed with the response from the Head Teacher of the school were letters and posters produced by the pupils. The children who responded were also concerned that there would be accidents without the road crossing patrol. In addition, they highlighted a really positive relationship with their local road crossing patrol staff, they regard them as an individual they can trust, were sad about the prospect of no longer seeing them and were concerned about the impact on staff losing their jobs.

## **West Winch Primary School**

Comments included:

- The site should have been monitored, because having a pelican crossing is just one factor in calculating whether a site should have a road crossing patrol, for example lots of children use this crossing. The decision should be postponed until the site has been monitored and properly assessed.