

Children's Services Committee

Date: **Tuesday, 24 January 2017**

Time: **10:00am**

Venue: **Edwards Room, County Hall, Norwich**

SUPPLEMENTARY A g e n d a

7 Road Crossing Patrols

A2

A Report by the Interim Executive Director of Children's Services

Chris Walton
Head of Democratic Services
County Hall
Martineau Lane
Norwich
NR1 2DH

Date Supplementary Agenda Published: 20 January 2017



If you need this document in large print, audio, Braille, alternative format or in a different language please contact Customer Services on 0344 800 8020 or 0344 800 8011 (textphone) and we will do our best to help.

Children's Services Committee

Item No 7

Report title:	Road Crossing Patrols
Date of meeting:	24 January 2017
Responsible Chief Officer:	Andrew Bunyan, Interim Executive Director, Children's Services
Strategic impact Following the 2014/15 spending consultation (item 29) it was agreed at County Council that the budget for this service would be decreased by £150k in each of the financial years 15/16 and 16/17. Last year's saving were achieved through underspend but this year the budget is £128610 but the cost to run the current service is approximately £269530 (plus living wage adjustments. This leaves us with an in year budget pressure of approximately £140920 . Whilst it is not a statutory service, it is one that has a high public profile, but legally the responsibility for getting a child to and from school safely sits with the parent or guardian not Norfolk County Council.	

Executive summary

Currently Children's Services operates 97 Road Crossing Patrols, (RCP) at sites that provide crossing facilities for 93 schools. Since March 2016 there have been 3 papers submitted to committee regarding the future of the RCP Service, see background chronology below.

Before the initial paper in March 2016 we sought legal advice about our interpretation of the Road Traffic Act and it does accord with what we have always believed. Where an RCP Service exists we are responsible for management and oversight, this includes recruitment, safeguarding checks, training, the provision of equipment, management, monitoring and the provision of relief staff.

Norfolk County Council follows the national guidance as determined by Road Safety GB (formerly LARSOA) and its interpretation is consistent with other authorities and colleagues in CES.

Any recommendations were based on a pattern of activity identified over a period of time and confirmed in the final monitoring visit. Our monitoring visits are conducted in line with national guidance, in that, as with mystery shoppers, we do not announce visits, we do not stand with the patrol, we only count school age children that cross, not other siblings, parents and carers. Only vehicles that actually cross the designated site are counted, not those that turn into car parks or other roads just before the site.

The decision made by Children's Services Committee on March was to only continue with sites that meet the national threshold; implementation was delayed until end of the 16/17 financial year. Background chronology below.

Recommendation:

Members are asked to read the report and consultation responses and decide whether they wish to proceed. If the decision is not, the committee is asked to agree that we continue to operate as we do now.

1. Background

- 1.1 Road Crossing Patrols (RCP) were previously known as school crossing patrols, and were first introduced into England in the early 1950's and pre-date the road safety measures we have now with the possible exception of zebra crossings that were introduced at a similar time.
- 1.2 Over the years as further road safety measures have been introduced near schools we have not replaced staff when they leave if, after further monitoring, the site no longer meets the national threshold.
- 1.3 Legal interpretation of the Road Traffic Act 1984 has confirmed that where a RCP Service exists we are responsible for management and oversight (a complete response can be found in section 2 of the March 2016 committee paper).
- 1.4 We follow the guidance laid down by Road Safety GB (formerly LARSOA) to monitor and assess whether or not a site meets the national threshold. Norfolk's approach is consistently used by other authorities who still have an RCP Service.

2. Decisions / actions to date

- 2.1 A paper was presented to Children's Services Committee on **8 March 2016** explaining the budgetary position, the legal position and giving five options for members to consider, these were:

- 2.1.1 ***Option 1 - Manage the service within the set budget already set (including in year one-off costs)***

This option would require the cessation of all sites that failed to meet the national threshold and the development of a local threshold to reduce the remaining sites by a further 20ish

- 2.1.2 ***Option 2 – Continue the service as it is***

This would require an additional investment, in year of up to £140000 although this figure may reduce in year as employees leave the sites who are below threshold and are not replaced.

- 2.1.3 ***Option 3 – Continue the service for those sites that still meet the criteria***

The budget required to run the sites that still meet the criteria would be approximately £180000

- 2.1.4 ***Option 4 – Stop the service all together***

This would provide annual a budget saving to the authority of £128610, but there would be in year costs therefore reducing this amount in 2016/7

- 2.1.5 ***Option 5 – Subcontract the service***

If we subcontracted out there would be a TUPE situation and the need for any organisation to take on the associated staff liabilities such as pension and continuous service. The value of the contract would be the budget minus the costs to us of:

Supporting recruitment

Training

Termly monitoring of all sites (done in the morning when traffic is heaviest)

Managing the contract (s)

Provision of equipment

2.2 Decision reached:

- 2.2.1 Members agreed **option 3** with an implementation date of October half term 2016. A member / officer task and finish group was formed to agree a monitoring approach and review the results of the agreed monitoring exercise. A report was to come back to the **June 2016 committee**.
- 2.2.2 Following a change of the leadership of Norfolk County Council the new Lead Member for Children's Services requested that proposals regarding the Road Crossing Patrol Service were postponed until the **September 2016 committee**.
- 2.2.3 The decision of the committee in September 2016 was to delay implementation of the decision to March 2017 and start a further period of monitoring.
- 2.2.4 A paper was delivered to the November 2016 Children's Services Committee paper outlining those sites that no longer met the national threshold and recommending a period of public consultation on the 38 sites that did not meet the national threshold.
- 2.2.5 Within the paper there was also an offer to provide road safety training, on an annual basis, to all schools affected to raise road safety awareness in pupils and also parents if needed. This will enable children to have the confidence to cross the road safely when the patrol is not on duty i.e. outside of the 2 x half hour patrols, 5 days per week when schools are open.
- 2.2.6 Controlled crossings (e.g. pelican etc.) enable all citizens to safely cross the road 24 hours a day, 365 days of the year.

3. Subsequent activity

- 3.1 We have continued to monitor sites since committee to keep our records up to date. As part of the original monitoring exercise we did not monitor sites with a road crossing patrol as by definition a controlled site is the safest form of crossing, however we still visit them to make general observations (e.g. red light running and speeding) and visit our staff members. Due to the responses from councillors and members of the public we visited the sites to observe how they were being used. There is no laid down criteria for controlled crossings but the RCP Manager did a child and vehicle count at each of these 4 sites. In these visits the RCP Manager did not witness any deliberate red light running or speeding that might be deemed to be exceptional circumstances. Were pedestrians witness this they should report it to the local constabulary.
- 3.2 Monitoring visits have happened at the sites below and the up to date monitoring outcomes are on the attached spreadsheet in Appendix A.

All Saints Academy

Astley

Bacton

Bradwell Homefield, Willow Avenue

Colman Infant and Junior, A140 / South Park Avenue (Pelican)

Heacham Junior

Magdalen Gates

Mile Cross, Drayton Road (Pelican)
Ormesby Junior
Sprowston Infant and Junior, North Walsham Road (Pelican)
Stalham Junior
Stalham Infants
West Winch (Pelican)

- 3.3 Whilst we have seen an increase in use of the crossing that is outside the All Saints Academy, this does not push it over the threshold. On the other non-controlled sites the usage was similar to the pattern seen over time.
- 3.4 Please also note that the accident figures for the Mornington Road controlled crossing (which also provides a safe crossing for children accessing the Colman schools) were incorrectly used in the original paper. This was identified and the consultation documents amended immediately. At the Colman Road / South Park Avenue patrol there has been 4 accidents involving pedestrians in a 5 year period. 2 were adults and the other two young people, 11 and 12. Both of these incidents occurred when the patrol was not on duty and the reasons for both incidents indicates that neither used the pedestrian crossing.

4. Consultation Outcomes

4.1 Responses

- 4.1.1 As expected the consultation attracted a large number of responses with 790 received throughout the consultation period which ran from 15 November 2016 to 8 January 2017. We also received 7 petitions. Over half of the responses we received came from parents / carers at the schools affected by our proposal.
- 4.1.2 The vast majority of those responding who expressed a view strongly disagreed (508) or disagreed (79) with our proposal.
- 4.1.3 A minority of those responding who expressed a view strongly agreed (21) or agreed (20) with our proposal.
- 4.1.4 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.
- 4.1.5 A summary of the responses can be found in the attached report, Members can view individual responses to the consultation by contacting the Stakeholder and Consultation Team.

4.2 Main themes emerging:

- 4.2.1 The most common response as from respondents was that they felt our proposal would significantly increase the risk of accidents, and of a child or parent / carer being injured or killed.
- 4.2.2 Many respondents reported they felt their experience of using their local road crossing patrol did not match what we found when we monitored the sites, citing concerns

about their crossing being very busy, the route being regularly used by buses and heavy goods vehicles and issues with visibility.

- 4.2.3 Another common response highlighted concerns about the behaviour of drivers near schools, reporting speeding and other dangerous driving.
- 4.2.4 Several comments relating to our financial approach, including:
- Some felt that the patrols are a cost effective way of preventing accidents.
 - Many felt that we should find savings from elsewhere in our budget.
 - Some said that this proposal would only save a small amount of money or if a child was killed then the financial cost to public services would outweigh the saving, in addition to the huge personal cost.
- 4.2.5 Respondents also felt that road crossing patrol staff do more than just help children cross the road. This was echoed in the responses we received from children who highlighted the positive relationship they had with their local road crossing patrol staff.
- 4.2.6 When asked how our proposals might impact on them, parents / carers responding cited concerns about their child's safety, worries they would have to accompany their child to school and an increase in cars driving children to school increasing road dangers and adversely affecting the environment.
- 4.2.7 A minority of those responding who expressed a view strongly agreed (21) or agreed (20) with our proposal.
- 4.2.8 When asked how we could provide the service and save money people offered a range of suggestions including, amongst other things, making savings from another budget, using volunteers, exploring sponsorship and encouraging schools to fundraise.
- 4.2.9 A full summary of the consultation findings, including comments made about specific road crossings and further detail on the petitions can be found in the appendix B.
- 4.2.10 A number of responses were in respect of the use of volunteers. We have considered this in the past and again in light this consultation. The legal risk and responsibility would still sit with the county council as would the costs of providing training, safeguarding and equipment. As things would be on a voluntary basis there could potentially be no control and serious safeguarding concerns. The same would apply to sponsorship, even if we were the employer still we would carry all the employment indemnities and there would be no guarantee that the sponsorship would continue.
- 4.2.11 A number of people suggested schools be allowed to use their school budget to employ their own Crossing Patrol, the current rules around funding prohibit this. Even if this were to change, the County Council would still have all of the legal responsibility as defined by the Road Traffic Act 1984.
- 4.2.12 Some of the responses were directly related to allegations of speeding motorists and motorists who jump the red lights at controlled crossings. Both of these issues are a matter for the constabulary not Norfolk Council and should be reported to them so that they can take some corrective action.

5. Recommendation

- 5.1 Members are asked to consider this report, consultation responses and the equalities impact assessment and confirm whether or not they wish to proceed with their decision made in March 2016 which was to cease running any RCP site that does not meet the national threshold.
- 5.2 If the Committee decide not to proceed as previously agreed up to £150000 would need to be added to the budget to cover the costs of the current service, this would also allow for any wage adjustments. We would also need members to agree that we will continue with our current practices.

6. Issues, risks and innovation

- 6.1 This is a high profile service that can easily become emotive with citizens. Working with colleagues in Road Safety and partners we must ensure that schools have access to road safety awareness materials.
- 6.2 We must also work with Parish Councils to make sure they maximise access to the Parish Partnerships funding.
- 6.3 Planning authorities should take issues of road safety into account when granting permission for developments.
- 6.4 If the committee decide to continue with the decision they made in March 2017, Chdiren's Services could purchase some SAM (speed activated messaging) 2 mobile cameras to use at those sites where residents were concerned about speeding motorists. They could be placed at the site for periods of 28 days; these are known to modify driver behaviour over the longer term. These cost approximately £3000 each and colleagues in the Road Safety Team have offered to help us position them for maximum effect. This would be in addition to Road Safety Awareness training.

7. Equality and Rural Impact assessment – findings and suggested mitigation

- 7.1 When making decisions the Council must give due regard to the need to promote equality of opportunity and eliminate unlawful discrimination of people with protected characteristics.
- 7.2 The Council's impact assessment process seeks to identify the potential for adverse impact on protected groups and rural communities, so that decisions can be informed, and where appropriate, action can be taken to address any negative impact.
- 7.3 The assessment of the proposal has identified that it may have a detrimental impact on young people, their parents and carers, particularly disabled parents and carers, lone parents (who are more likely to be female) and pregnant women.
- 7.4 This is because removal of the service may have the effect of making the journey to school less safe, potentially increasing the number of injuries on the road.
- 7.5 Full details are set out in the equality and rural assessment, attached at Appendix C
- 7.6 Three mitigating actions are proposed to address this:

(i) Provide road safety awareness support to schools affected by the proposal; this would be on an ongoing basis to ensure all new starters in reception are covered.

(ii) Ensure this awareness training is targeted at the specific needs of children and schools in each area, to take account of the characteristics of young people and their parents/carers in each area, e.g. in terms of disability, gender, age etc.

(iii) Consider the purchase of SAM2 mobile speed cameras to help change driver behaviour where there are proven concerns of speeding

7.7 In addition to the monitoring information and the consultation feedback, the Committee is recommended to also:

(1) Consider the findings of the equality and rural assessment, and in doing so, note the Council's duty under the Equality Act 2010 to have due regard to the need to:

- Eliminate discrimination, harassment, victimisation and any other conduct that is prohibited by or under the Act;
- Advance equality of opportunity between persons who share a relevant protected characteristic and persons who do not share it;
- Foster good relations between persons who share a relevant protected characteristic and persons who do not share it.

(2) Consider and agree any mitigating actions proposed in the equality and rural impact assessments.

8. Supporting Documents

8.1 Attached spreadsheet give details of the current data regarding Road Crossing Patrols at the 38 schools that do not meet the national threshold Appendix A.

8.2 Summary of the public consultation Appendix B.

8.3 Equalities and Rural
Impact Assessment Appendix C.

Officer Contact

If you have any questions about matters contained or want to see copies of any assessments, eg equality impact assessment, please get in touch with:

Officer Name: Jo Richardson Tel No: 01603 223816

If you have any questions about other matters contained in this paper please get in touch with:

Officer Name: Elly Starling Tel No: 01603 223476 Email address:
elly.starling@norfolk.gov.uk



If you need this report in large print, audio, Braille, alternative format or in a different language please contact 0344 800 8020 or 0344 800 8011 (textphone) and we will do our best to help.

School	No. of accompanied Children	No. of unaccompanied Children	No. of Cars	No. of Lorries/Coach es	Location	Road Markings	Speed	Visibility	Date of last monitoring report	Local County Councillor
Astley Primary Melton Constable	18	2	191	6	Between Burgh Beck Road and Hillside	Very low number of children crossing. Varies between 7 to 20. Site 1/2 mile from school.	30	Village road with good visibility in both directions	05/12/2016	David Ramsbotham
Bacton Primary	22	7	147	7	Outside school on Walcott Road	Site outside school with flashing lights as a warning aid	30	Coast road with no parked vehicles so visibility is not masked.	07/12/2016	Wyndham Northam
Bluebell Primary Norwich	22	6	66	1	Opposite Ivory Road on Lovelace Road Norwich	Site outside school. Very low vehicle count, narrow road	20	Residential road	12/09/2016	Bert Bremner
Bradwell Homefield Primary	9	2	276	1	Opposite Briar Avenue on Willow Avenue Bradwell	Site 1/2 mile from school. Busy road into Gt Yarmouth but very low children count	30	No parked vehicles to mask oncoming traffic	09/01/2017	TBC
“	61	4	62	0	Outside school on Homefield Avenue Bradwell	Site outside school. Low vehicle count on narrow road in residential area.	30	Parked vehicles but road has school markings and is not a main thoroughfare	20/04/2016	TBC
Cawston Primary	32	10	159	5	Opposite Howards Way Cawston	Site outside school. Has flashing lights as a warning aid.	30	No parked vehicles to mask oncoming traffic	04/10/2016	James Joyce
Clackclose Primary, Downham Market	18	0	74	0	Paradise Road opposite Snape Lane Downham	Site outside the school annexe.Very low vehicle count on quiet road	20	Not a main thoroughfare in residential area.	08/11/2016	Tony White
Colman Inf & Junior A140 South Park Avenue	33	53 2	493 262	29 7	Pelican crossing on A140/South Park Avenue.	Pelican crossing	30		30/11/2016	Brian Watkins
Cromer Junior	45	7	311	5	Outside School on guarded island on Norwich Road Cromer	Site outside school. Large protected island in middle of Norwich Road which holds approx 10 people. Children cross one lane at a time. Flashing Lights	30	Main thoroughfare in and out of Cromer but with very good visibilty in both directions.	19/04/2016	Hilay Cox
Dersingham Primary	28	7	97	3	On Manor Road opposite Dodd Hills Road Dersingham	Site 1/2 mile from School. Flashing lights as an aid.	30	Not a main thoroughfare.	22/09/2016	John Dobson
Fairhaven Primary South Walsham	20	4	38	2	Outside school on School Road South Walsham	Site outside school. An extremely quiet road with few children and vehicles. Flashing Lights as a warning aid	30	Not main thoroughfare in quiet part of village.	15/06/2016	Tom Garrod
Garrick Geen Primary Norwich	17	3	178	4	On St Faiths Road near Church Lane Norwich	Site 1/4 mile from school. Busy road but very low children count. Good visibility in both directions.	30	Standing traffic awaiting entry into Fifers Lane.	28/09/2016	Judy Legget
Heacham Infant	75	0	60	0	Outside school on Broadway Heacham	Site outside school. Extremely quiet road	30	Not main thoroughfare in quiet part of village.	27/09/2016	Michael Chenery of Horsburgh
Heacham Junior	61	13	74	2	On Cheney Hill at back entrance to school near Malthouse Crescent Heacham	Site at the back entrance to school. High number of children crossing but little traffic movement. Flashing lights as an aid which flash at 20 mph. when the patrol is on duty.	30	Not a main thoroughfare.	08/12/2016	Michael Chenery of Horsburgh
Hilgay Riverside Academy	12	0	45	0	Ely Road near Church Road Hilgay	Site outside school. Low children and vehicle count. Flashing lights as an aid.	30	Not a main thoroughfare in quiet village.	09/11/2016	Martin Storey
All Saints Academy Stoke Ferry	31	4	38	1	Outside school on Wretton Road Stoke Ferry	Site outside school. Extremely low children and traffic count. Good visibility in both directions. Vehicle activated sign.	30	Not main thoroughfare in a quiet village.	11/01/2017	Martin Storey
Kelling Primary	27	2	52	4	Outside school on Salthouse Road Kelling	Site outside school. Low traffic count. Flashing Lights as an aid.	20	Coast road with no parked vehicles. Near bends at both ends of school.	21/03/2016	Michael Baker
Lingwood Primary	49	5	71	1	Outside school on Station Road Lingwood	Site outside school. Extremely quiet road with very good visibility in both directions.	30	Not a main thoroughfare in residential area of village.	27/04/2016	Brian Illes

Do not meet national threshold

Lionwood infant Norwich	56	0	95	0	Outside school on Telegraph Lane East Norwich	Site outside school. School markings with a raised platform. (This is an extended speed bump)	20	Residential area on quiet road.	09/09/2016	Adrean Dearnley
Lionwood Junior	68	17	44	0	On junction of Wolfe Road and Wellesley Avenue Norwich	Site outside junior school and 1/2 mile from Infant. Extremely quiet road with low traffic movement.	20	Residential area on quiet road.	11/11/2016	Adrean Dearnley
Loddon Junior Norwich	47	14	95	8	Outside school on Kittens Lane opposite Hobart Road Loddon	Site outside school. Raised platform and very good visibility	20	Not a main thoroughfare on quiet road.	26/09/2016	Barry Stone
Magdalen Gates Primary Norwich	70	10	108	2	Outside school on Spencer Street near Nightingale Lane Norwich	Site outside school. School markings and raised platform	30	Not a main thoroughfare in residential area.	13/12/2016	Julie Brociek-Coulton
Mile Cross Primary	4	1	597	14	Drayton Road	Pelican crossing	30		23/11/2016	Chrisie Rumsby
Moorlands Primary Belton	21	7	109	2	On Bracon Road near Moorlands Way Belton	Site outside school.	30	Not a main thoroughfare in residential area.	13/05/2016	TBC
Necton Primary	82	2	66	1	Outside school on School Road Necton	Site outside school. Low vehicle count and school markings	20	Not a main thoroughfare	13/04/2016	Mark Kiddle-Morris
Ormesby Infant	39	0	83	1	On Spruce Avenue/Appleton Drive Ormesby	Site outside school. Little vehicle movement.	20	Not a main thoroughfare on very quiet residential road	21/09/2016	Jonathon Childs
Ormesby Junior	28	16	83	0	On West Road junction with North Road Ormesby	Site outside school. Low vehicle count.	20	Not a main thoroughfare in residential area.	12/12/2016	Jonathon Childs
Sporle Primary	14	3	68	0	Outside school on The Street Sporle	Extremely low children count and little vehicle movement. Good visibility in both directions.	30	Not a main thoroughfare in quiet street in village.	29/09/2016	Paul Smyth
Sprowston Junior	7	3	452	13	North Walsham Road	Pelican			06/12/2016	John Ward
St. Andrews, Lopham	17	5	102	9	Outside school on The Street North Lopham	Site outside school. Low children count and flashing Lights as an aid.	20	Not a main thoroughfare in quiet village.	09/05/2016	Stephen Askew
St Georges Primary Gt Yarmouth	71	1	91	1	Outside school on St Peters Road Gt Yarmouth	Site outside school. Low vehicle count on a zebra crossing	30	Not a main thoroughfare in relatively quiet road in Gt. Yarmouth.	11/05/2016	Rex Parkinson-Hare
St. Marys Beetley	11	0	162	3	On Fakenham Road junction with Elmham Road Beetley	Site 200 yards from school. Low children count on a road with very good visibility in both directions. Flashing Lights as a warning aid	30	No parked vehicles and very good visibility on long straight road.	08/09/2016	Mark Kiddle-Morris
St Nicholas, Dereham	8	4	379	11	On London Road near Commercial Road Dereham	Site 1/2 mile from school on busy road with slow moving traffic in Dereham but extremely low children count. The Road Safety (GB) recommendation is if sites with less than 15 children crossing the road in the busiest 130 minute period should not be considered for a patrol site.	30	No parked vehicles but near roundabout.	06/05/2016	Paul Gilmour
Stalham Infant	25	1	105	0	Outside school on Brumstead Road Stalham	Site outside school. Raised platform on quiet road.	30	Not a main thoroughfare in quiet street in town.	16/01/2017	Nigel Dixon
Stalham Infant	14	7	215	1	On Ingham Road Stalham	Site 1/4 mile from Infant school and 1/2 mile from Junior school. Low children count on a zebra crossing.	20	Not a main thoroughfare but near a roundabout.	16/01/2017	Nigel Dixon
Walpole Cross Keys Primary	8	0	78	3	Outside school on Sutton Road Walpole X Keys	Site outside school. Extremely low children and vehicle count with flashing lights as a warning aid.	30	Not a main thoroughfare in quiet village.	11/10/2016	Fred Agnew
Walsingham Primary	12	0	59	2	Outside school on Wells Road Walsingham	Site outside school. Extremely low children and vehicle count.	30	Not a main thoroughfare in residential area of quiet village.	20/09/2016	Marie Strong
West Winch Primary	8	0	586	91	A10	Pelican crossing	40		02/12/2016	Alexandra Kemp

Road Crossing Patrols consultation

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%
Total	644	100.00%

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 aide 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.

Average of the six monitoring results conducted by the school	Last monitoring results conducted by the Road Crossing Patrol Manager
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

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.



Children's Services Proposed changes to the road crossing patrol service

Equality and rural assessment – findings and recommendations

January 2017

Lead officer – Jo Richardson, Corporate Planning and Partnerships Manager, in consultation with Elly Starling, Lead HR and OD Business Partner supporting Children's Services

This assessment helps you to consider the impact of service changes on people with protected characteristics and in rural areas. You can update this assessment at any time to inform service planning and commissioning.

For help or more information please contact Corporate Planning & Partnerships team, email: cpp@norfolk.gov.uk or tel: 01603 222611.

Contents

		Page
1.	The purpose of equality and rural assessments	3
2.	The legal context	3
3.	The assessment process	3
4.	The proposal	4
5.	Who is affected by the proposal	6
6.	Potential impact	7
7.	Recommended/mitigating actions	9
8.	Evidence used to inform this assessment	10
9.	Further information and contact details	10

The purpose of equality and rural assessments

1. The key aim, with both equality and rural assessments, is to enable elected members to consider the potential impact of decisions on different individuals and communities prior to decisions being taken. Mitigating actions can then be developed if adverse impact is identified.
2. It is not always possible to adopt the course of action that will best promote the needs of people with protected characteristics or people in rural areas. However, assessments enable informed decisions to be made, that take into account every opportunity to minimise disadvantage.

The Legal context

3. Public authorities have a duty under the Equality Act 2010 to consider the implications of proposals on people with protected characteristics. The Act states that public bodies must pay due regard to the need to:
 - Eliminate discrimination, harassment, victimisation and any other conduct that is prohibited by or under the Act¹;
 - Advance equality of opportunity between people who share a relevant protected characteristic² and people who do not share it³;
 - Foster good relations between people who share a relevant protected characteristic and people who do not share it⁴.
4. The full Act is available [here](#).

The assessment process

5. This assessment comprises three phases:
 - **Phase 1** – we gather evidence on the proposal – looking at the people who might be affected, the findings of related assessments and public consultation, contextual information about local areas and populations and other relevant data. Where appropriate, we engage with residents, service users and stakeholders to better understand any issues that must be taken into account.
 - **Phase 2** – we analyse all the results. We make sure that any impacts highlighted by residents and stakeholders inform the final assessment. If the evidence indicates that the proposal may impact adversely on people with protected characteristics, mitigating actions are identified.
 - **Phase 3** – we report the early findings to the Council's Strategic Equality Group, so that elected members can scrutinise the process, and highlight any specific equality or accessibility issues that should be factored into the assessments.
6. When completed, the findings are provided to decision-makers, to enable any issues to be taken into account before a decision is made.

The proposal

Overview

7. Road crossing patrol staff are also known as 'lollipop' men and women. The County Council currently funds and manages 96 road crossing patrols across Norfolk, at a cost of approximately £270,000.
8. 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 the road crossing patrol team resigns, the Council's 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.
9. The Council is proposing to implement a new policy of only continuing to provide road crossing patrols at current sites that meet the threshold for having one. If this policy were to be implemented, it would mean that 38 road crossing patrols would be removed. The Council would offer road safety awareness support to schools affected by the proposal; this would be on an ongoing basis to ensure all new starters in reception are covered.

Background

10. It is the legal 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 schools.
11. The Council does not have to provide road crossing patrols by law, but where there is one in place the authority is responsible for making sure it operates safely.
12. This means that the Council is responsible for the following:
 - Monitoring of all road crossing patrol sites
 - Providing a uniform for members of staff, as specified by the Road Traffic Act
 - Recruitment and selection (including safeguarding checks)
 - Training
 - Risk assessments
 - Liaising with the local Police
 - Handling complaints
 - Providing relief for members of staff when they are ill.

Road Safety GB guidance

13. There is national guidance produced by Road Safety GB (formerly the Local Authority Road Safety Officer's Association) about running road crossing patrols. The Council uses the guidance to decide how often road crossing patrols should be monitored and the criteria to take into account when calculating if a site meets the threshold for having a patrol.

14. Here are some examples of the criteria the Council takes into account when patrol sites are monitored:

- Number of primary school children crossing at the site, accompanied and unaccompanied by an adult (the guidance states that sites having less than 15 children crossing should not be considered for a road crossing patrol)
- Number and type of vehicles passing through the site over the time period being monitored (the busiest 30 mins of the morning patrol)
- Width of road / footpaths
- The vicinity of a site to busy junctions
- Visibility (bends in the road, and obstructions such as foliage and signage)
- Whether there are speed bumps, raised platforms, speed restrictions, formal crossings (such as zebra, pelican, puffin and toucan crossings) and safety bars outside of schools
- “Refuges” in the middle of a road (these help children to cross each lane separately)
- Flashing lights / Wig Wags

More about the proposal

15. The Council is proposing to implement a new policy of only continuing to provide road crossing patrols on existing sites that meet the threshold for having one. The Council would continue to regularly visit all of the sites to monitor usage, in addition to reassessing them when a member of staff resigns. If this policy were to be implemented, it would mean that the Council would continue to provide 58 road crossing patrols, but that 38 would be removed.

16. The Council has looked at accident reports on or near to the affected sites for the last six years. There have been a total of 29 reported incidents near to the 38 sites in that time, of which four involved pedestrians. One of the Council’s own road crossing patrol staff was involved in an incident when they thought that a car wasn’t going to stop. A young person (not primary age) failed to correctly use a pelican crossing. One child was not using either the road crossing patrol or the pelican crossing, but the incident happened near to it. One child was injured at 4.22pm, over half-an-hour after the school crossing patrol had finished.

17. The remaining incidents involved two and four wheeled vehicles.¹

18. Here is a list of the road crossing patrols that would be removed:

- All Saints Academy School, Stoke Ferry
- Astley Primary School, Melton Constable
- Bacton Primary School
- Bluebell Primary School, Norwich
- Cawston Church of England Primary Academy School
- Colman Infant & Junior Schools, Norwich
- Cromer Junior School
- Dereham Church of England Junior Academy School

¹ This paragraph was amended on 30 November 2016.

- Dersingham Primary School
- Fairhaven Church of England VA Primary School, South Walsham
- Garrick Green Infant Primary School, Norwich
- Heacham Infant & Nursery School
- Heacham Junior School
- Hilgay Riverside Academy, Downham Market
- Homefield Church of England VC Primary School, Bradwell (both patrols)
- Kelling Church of England Primary School
- Lingwood Primary Academy School
- Lionwood Infant & Nursery School, Norwich
- Lionwood Junior School, Norwich
- Loddon Junior School, Norwich
- Magdalen Gates Primary School, Norwich
- Mile Cross Primary School, Norwich
- Moorlands Church of England Primary Academy, Belton
- Necton Primary School
- Nelson Academy, Downham Market
- Ormesby Village Infant School
- Ormesby Village Junior School
- Sporle Primary Academy School
- Sprowston Junior School
- St. Andrews Church of England Primary School, North Lopham
- St Georges Primary School, Great Yarmouth
- St. Mary's Community School, Beetley
- Stalham Infant School (both patrols)
- Walpole Cross Keys Primary School
- Walsingham Primary School
- West Winch Primary School

19. The Council would offer additional support to all the affected schools if this policy were to be implemented. Whenever the Council removes a road crossing patrol, it works closely with the Road Safety team to make sure the school is offered road safety awareness support. This offer of support includes visits from Road Safety Officers to provide guidance to pupils and parents / carers about road safety.
20. If this proposal goes ahead, the road crossing patrols would be cease to operate from Friday, 31 March 2017.

Who is affected?

21. This proposal will primarily impact on children and young people, as the main beneficiaries of the service. It could also impact on their parents and carers, particularly disabled parents and carers, lone parents (who are more likely to be female) and pregnant women.

People of all ages (particularly younger people)	YES
Disability (all disabilities and long-term health conditions)	YES
Gender reassignment (e.g. people who identify as transgender)	YES
Marriage/civil partnerships	YES

Pregnancy & Maternity	YES
Race (different ethnic groups, including Gypsies and Travellers)	YES
Religion/belief (different faiths, including people with no religion or belief)	YES
Sex (i.e. men/women/intersex)	YES
Sexual orientation (e.g. lesbian, gay and bisexual people)	YES

22. The proposal will also affect people in both rural and urban areas.

Potential impact

23. This proposal may have a detrimental impact on children and young people. This is because removal of the service may have the effect of making the journey to school less safe, potentially increasing the number of injuries on the road.
24. This risk may only be marginal, but it is a possibility. The road crossing patrol service provides enhanced safety for children and young people wherever it operates – whether or not the sites meet the Government's criteria for providing patrols. Road accidents are sporadic in nature, and there will always be an element of risk when crossing the road. Road crossing patrols offer a safer location for people to cross the road as well as a visual reminder to motorists that they are near a school and should adjust their speed accordingly. This is in addition to other road safety measures.
25. In Norfolk, data monitoring of people killed or seriously injured (KSI) on the road shows that, unsurprisingly, pedestrians are more likely to be killed or seriously injured while crossing the road compared to other activities, such as walking on the footpath or next to the carriageway.
26. Child pedestrians may be at a slightly increased risk when travelling to and from school. Nationally, the majority of all child KSI casualties are pedestrians travelling between the hours of 7.30 am and 8.59 am or 3 pm and 4.59 pm on a school day. In Norfolk, just over half (52%) of all child KSI are recorded between the hours of 7.30 am and 8.59 am or 3 pm and 4.59 pm on a school day.
27. It should be noted that these times are during or close to peak travel times, so there will be increased traffic flow on the network which increases exposure to risk rather than risk itself.
28. Certain groups of young people are at an increased risk of being killed or seriously injured on the road. For example, children and young people are more likely to be crossing the road while being masked by stationary vehicles, failing to look properly or careless and less aware while playing dangerously on the street in comparison with older pedestrians aged 20 and above.
29. In Norfolk, pedestrians aged 10-14 and 15-19 have the highest rate of involvement as KSI casualties in Norfolk, with rates of 76 KSI per 100,000 people and 62 KSI per 100,000 people respectively. Casualties aged 5-9 and 0-4 rank lower, with the 9th and 16th highest rates of involvement out of 18 five-year age bandings.

30. People aged 0-15 have a higher rate of KSI casualties per 100,000 population than those aged 16 or older, with 44 KSI casualties per 100,000 people for the 0-15 age group, and 31 KSI casualties per 100,000 in those aged 16 or older.
31. In the five years from the beginning of 2011 to the end of 2015, 65 people aged 15 or younger were killed or seriously injured in Norfolk compared to 230 aged 16 or older. Casualties aged 0-15 are approximately three times more likely to be KSI when crossing while masked by a vehicle or object than those aged 16 or older.
32. Around 69% of child KSI casualties in Norfolk are male, compared to adult males who account for 61% of adult KSI casualties – the male bias in road casualties is prevalent across the board.
33. The proposal may also have a detrimental impact on disabled children, disabled parents and carers, lone parents and pregnant women who may rely more than others on the road crossing patrol service for assistance to cross the road safely by using their stop sign to stop any vehicles whilst they cross.
34. This is because the service can provide people with additional time to cross the road safely. For example, some patrols make use of existing pedestrian crossings facilities, which will continue to be available for children making their way to school. However, if there is no pedestrian crossing facility and the school crossing patrol ceases, there will potentially be less time for people to cross the road. This could cause problems for disabled people, particularly Blind and visually impaired people, people with learning difficulties and people with reduced mobility, as well as pregnant women, lone parents, or single adults with groups of children, particularly groups of children with learning difficulties or SEN.
35. It should be noted that the patrol is not allowed to have physical contact with the children / adults, which includes holding their hands. The patrol officer moves to the centre of the road and holds up their sign to stop any approaching vehicles, they do not walk across with the children.
36. Of the 38 schools affected, 22 are in urban areas and 16 are in rural areas.
37. Nationally, the majority of pedestrians killed or seriously injured occur on urban roads. This is due to greater population densities in urban areas and the average distance walked by residents in urban areas in comparison with rural areas. Urban areas have more pedestrians crossing busier roads which leads to a greater number of interactions between vehicles and pedestrians, increasing the risk of accidents.
38. In Norfolk, 95% of child pedestrian KSIs are recorded on urban parts of the network (roads with speed limits of 20, 30, and 40mph), with 82% of adult pedestrian KSI on these roads, and 85% of pedestrian KSI overall.
39. However, this does not mean that there is a reduced road safety risk in rural areas, it just means that different factors and different types of risk may apply.
40. For instance, there may be fewer road safety measures in rural areas, like pelican crossings, and different obstructions or features, like large hedges and narrow roads, which could mean that young people in some rural areas are exposed to greater risk when crossing the road to school without a road crossing patrol. The nature of any risk

would depend on a multitude of factors at the site and may change on a day-to-day basis.

41. An additional rural impact highlighted in the public consultation is that the proposal may disadvantage rural schools, as these may often be smaller, and therefore not meet the Road Safety GB thresholds for providing road crossing patrols.
42. There is some evidence to suggest that people in low income groups may be at an increased risk of being killed or seriously injured on the road. This should be taken into account when developing road safety awareness support to schools affected by the proposal.
43. The Index of Multiple Deprivation takes into account a number of variables, including income, to rank areas of the national population, known as lower super output areas (LSOAs), according to the prevalence of deprivation within them. Norfolk has 538 LSOAs within it.
44. In Norfolk, 27% of child KSI casualties come from LSOAs recognised nationally as being in the top 20% most deprived areas of the country, with another 27% from the second 20%, 31% from the middle 20%, 10% from the fourth 20%, and 5% from the least deprived 20%
45. When rated according to the population of these LSOAs, children from the most deprived LSOAs have the highest rate of KSI injury compared to their peers in other less-deprived LSOAs from which we may infer an increased likelihood of injury compared to others
46. The proposal may also have the effect of discouraging walking and cycling trips to and from school and an increase in car journeys. This may have a consequence of a fall in health and fitness levels among both children and adults.
47. This equality and rural assessment should be considered alongside the results of public consultation, summarised elsewhere on the agenda.

Action to address any negative impact

	Action/s	Lead	Date
1.	Provide road safety awareness support to schools affected by the proposal; this would be on an ongoing basis to ensure all new starters in reception are covered.	Elly Starling (Lead HR and OD Business Partner)	From 1 April 2017
2.	Ensure this awareness training is targeted at the specific needs of children and schools in each area, to take account of the characteristics of young people and their parents/carers in each area, e.g. in terms of disability, gender, age, relative deprivation etc.	Elly Starling (Lead HR and OD Business Partner)	From 1 April 2017

Evidence used to inform this assessment

- Equality Act 2010
- Public Sector Equality Duty
- Published information about the proposal
- Norfolk County Council Road Safety Monitoring data
- National guidance produced by Road Safety GB (formerly the Local Authority Road Safety Officer's Association) about running road crossing patrols
- Public consultation on the proposal

Further information

For further information about this equality impact assessment please contact Jo Richardson, Corporate Planning and Partnerships Manager, tel: 01603 223816, email jo.richardson@norfolk.gov.uk



If you need this document in large print, audio, Braille, alternative format or in a different language please contact Customer Services on 0344 800 8020 (Textphone) and will do our best to help

¹ Prohibited conduct:

Direct discrimination occurs when someone is treated less favourably than another person because of a protected characteristic they have or are thought to have, or because they associate with someone who has a protected characteristic.

Indirect discrimination occurs when a condition, rule, policy or practice in your organisation that applies to everyone disadvantages people who share a protected characteristic.

Harassment is “unwanted conduct related to a relevant protected characteristic, which has the purpose or effect of violating an individual’s dignity or creating an intimidating, hostile, degrading, humiliating or offensive environment for that individual”.

Victimisation occurs when an employee is treated badly because they have made or supported a complaint or raised a grievance under the Equality Act; or because they are suspected of doing so. An employee is not protected from victimisation if they have maliciously made or supported an untrue complaint.

2 The protected characteristics are:

Age – e.g. a person belonging to a particular age or a range of ages (for example 18 to 30 year olds).

Disability - a person has a disability if she or he has a physical or mental impairment which has a substantial and long-term adverse effect on that person's ability to carry out normal day-to-day activities.

Gender reassignment - the process of transitioning from one gender to another.

Marriage and civil partnership

Pregnancy and maternity

Race - refers to a group of people defined by their race, colour, and nationality (including citizenship) ethnic or national origins.

Religion and belief - has the meaning usually given to it but belief includes religious and philosophical beliefs including lack of belief (such as Atheism).

Sex - a man or a woman.

Sexual orientation - whether a person's sexual attraction is towards their own sex, the opposite sex or to both sexes.

3 The Act specifies that having due regard to the need to advance equality of opportunity might mean:

- Removing or minimizing disadvantages suffered by people who share a relevant protected characteristic that are connected to that characteristic;
- Taking steps to meet the needs of people who share a relevant protected characteristic that are different from the needs of others;
- Encouraging people who share a relevant protected characteristic to participate in public life or in any other activity in which participation by such people is disproportionately low.

4 Having due regard to the need to foster good relations between people and communities involves having due regard, in particular, to the need to (a) tackle prejudice, and (b) promote understanding.